

University of Rhode Island

DigitalCommons@URI

Arts and Humanities: Correspondence (1982)

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

5-2-1982

Arts and Humanities: Correspondence (1982): Report 01

Livingston Biddle

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_7

Recommended Citation

Biddle, Livingston, "Arts and Humanities: Correspondence (1982): Report 01" (1982). *Arts and Humanities: Correspondence (1982)*. Paper 20.

https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_7/20

This Report 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: Correspondence (1982) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons-group@uri.edu.

HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
CHAIRMAN

United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON
LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

TO: SENATOR
FROM: LB

May 3

Attached is a synopsis of the Arts and Humanities leg. as per your thoughts on how best to present the legislation to the full committee -- tentatively to meet on this and other matters on May 12, three days before the May 15 reporting deadline. (I've told Nancy to expect this meeting.) You'll recall Javits asked that it be postponed from the present week.

I've tried to make the synopsis brief, but informative enough so that each change has its own sound reason.

I will have a shorter synopsis for you to read from or outline verbally, but the attached would be placed in each members folder along with the bill.

Attached also, and to go with the synopsis is a table showing comparative figures for funding.

If you approve, I'll put these in the works for the meeting.

OK? _____

Discuss _____

SYNOPSIS OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES LEGISLATION

TITLE I

Section 101 -- By deleting the words "in the United States" from Section 5 (c) of the enabling Act, which prescribes the general purview of the Arts Endowment, this amendment brings the permissible scope of the Endowment into conformity with that of the Humanities Endowment. ✓

The Humanities Endowment has never been limited in law to the United States for its activities and, for example, has assisted in archeological work abroad when such American-sponsored research serves to increase American knowledge.

The amendment gives greater flexibility to the Arts Endowment to further enhance American arts activities, when they would benefit by experience gained abroad and permits an opportunity for appropriate cooperative activities with the Department of State.

This provision has been adopted in action taken by the House.

* * *

Section 102 -- This is a technical amendment to ensure that States match funds from the Arts Endowment.

Traditionally, States arts agencies have matched support from the Endowment. This amendment simply clarifies language adopted the last time the bill was amended in 1973, so that the traditional principle is maintained.

This provision has been adopted by the House.

* * *

(ex) Section 103 -- This amendment makes ^{appointment to} the two private citizen councils, which guide the activities of the Arts Endowment and the Humanities Endowment, subject to ~~advice and consent~~ ^{confirmation by} of the Senate. ✓

There was some criticism during the reauthorization hearings that the two councils were not sufficiently broadly representative. The two councils, appointed by the President, are key advisors to the programs involved. Senate advice and consent is seen as desirable to help ensure all appropriate scope and wisdom on these councils. There is precedent, for example, with the Board of Directors of the Corporation of Public Broadcasting, whose members are appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

This provision has been adopted by the House.

Section 104 -- This amendment makes State Humanities programs more responsive to State needs by giving the States themselves an increasing voice in the formulation and conduct of such programs.

At present State programs emanate from a leadership appointed by the Chairman of the Humanities Endowment in Washington.

Criticism suggests that the present programs, while of merit in some cases, have built-in defects of self-perpetuation and an ultimate lack of State representation and accountability.

The amendment serves to correct these limitations and prescribes that within three years each State Humanities program will be guided by a majority of advisers having gubernatorial appointment.

Thus the Humanities State program would coincide in principle and format with the highly successful State arts program, which from the outset has emanated from the States themselves, which has been responsible for a 15-fold increase in State funds for the arts, for municipal support and for the growth at grass-roots level of more than 1,000 community arts councils.

It is the purpose of this amendment to increase greatly grass-roots impact of the Humanities, in accord with programs fully responsive to State desires and needs.

Funding for State Humanities programs would follow precisely the same formula proved so successful for the State arts programs.

A similar provision has been adopted by the House.

* * *

Section 105 -- This amendment makes applicable to the Humanities Endowment, where appropriate, the same fair labor practices and standards which have traditionally applied to the Arts Endowment.

Specifically, the language involves minimum wage compensation for professional performers and related or supporting professional personnel. It also involves safe and sanitary working conditions.

In recent times the Humanities Endowment has become increasingly involved in activities which utilize the work of professional performers. The "Adams Chronicles" are an example.

~~Therefore~~ it is considered desirable to apply fair labor practices equably.

This provision has been adopted by the House.

Synopsis (3)

Section 106 -- This amendment permits the two Endowments to use surplus Federal personal property in assisting grantees.

Considered desirable by the Endowments, the amendment could save some taxpayer money by reducing amounts needed by grantees, if they can acquire needed material or equipment by the surplus property route.

* * *

TITLE II -- MUSEUM SERVICES

This title provides added support for the nation's museums, particularly in the areas of administrative assistance, which museums have repeatedly testified is of crucial importance.

The two Endowments have to date provided "special project" support for museums. This title broadens museum assistance and would include museums of science and technology -- now relatively unsupported but visited by even more people than annually attend museums of art and history.

The title establishes an Institute for the improvement of Museum Services within the Arts and Humanities Foundation, with a close relationship to and cooperative procedures with the two Endowments, so as to preclude duplication of effort.

A similar program was approved by the House. The legislation has been developing for over four years.

Recommended funding: \$15 million for FY '77, \$25 million for FY '78, "such sums" for FY '79 and '80.

* * *

TITLE III -- ARTS CHALLENGE PROGRAM

This title establishes a special new challenge program for the Arts Endowment aimed at increasing long-range financial planning and funding efforts for cultural organizations.

The present Endowment program is addressed primarily to on-going, immediate needs. The new thrust looks toward the future. It involves the challenge concept of \$1 federal engendering \$3 non-federal. It is directed toward increasing private support, audience participation, cooperation among cultural groups and citizen involvement.

The Arts Endowment has had marked success with initial challenge efforts. Among other benefits, this provision could serve as a catalyst for new emphasis on corporate and business support.

This title has been adopted by the House.

Recommended funding: \$15 million for FY '77, \$20 million for FY '78, "such sums" for FY '79 and '80.

Synopsis (4)

TITLE IV ~~ARTS~~ ARTS IN EDUCATION

This title would enable the Arts Endowment to conduct programs to develop improved teaching in the arts, including a prime focus on demonstration projects of an exemplary nature and on art teacher inservice retraining.

During the hearings the importance of the arts in education was stressed and their value in developing creative thought and expression at all levels of education.

The Arts Endowment would utilize its considerable experience, research and close association with experts and consultants in all arts areas to carry out the program, and would cooperate with appropriate State agencies, with the Commissioner of Education and with the Alliance for Arts Education of the Kennedy Center.

This program would be on a pilot basis and would focus on the types of arts education that could prove best and most effective for the future.

Recommended funding: \$10 million for FY '77 and for FY '78, "such sums" for FY '79 and '80.

* * *

TITLE V -- HUMANITIES BICENTENNIAL CHALLENGE PROGRAM AND BICENTENNIAL PHOTOGRAPHIC PROJECT

This title provides for a Bicentennial Era program in two parts.

Part A encompasses a new challenge program for the Humanities Endowment, to give emphasis to broadening the efforts of the Endowment in a manner similar to Title III's challenge program for the arts, with \$1 federal stimulating \$3 non-federal.

The program, resulting in part from testimony given by John D. Rockefeller III and other leading citizens, would focus attention on national goals to be achieved during the 13-year Bicentennial Era, extending from 1976 to the 200th anniversary of the U. S. Constitution.

The Humanities Endowment and its resources would provide a fulcrum for coordinated efforts and planning and for the support of significant projects.

Recommended funding: \$15 million for FY '77, \$20 million for FY '78, "such sums" for FY '79 and '80.

Part B establishes a Bicentennial Photography and Film project to be conducted primarily at a State level, and to survey the States for the first time in this manner since the often-praised federally supported photographic projects of the 1930's, 40 years ago. This Part stems from recommendations and hearings conducted by Senator Mondale.

Recommended funding: \$5 million for FY '77 and for FY '78, "such sums" for FY '79 and FY '80.

ARTS AND HUMANITIES FUNDING

| (In millions of dollars) | 1976 Auth. | 1976 Approp. | 1977 Pres. Budget Request | 1977 Auth. | 1978 Auth. | 1979 Auth. | 1980 Auth. |
|--------------------------|------------|--------------|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|------------------|
| <u>ARTS</u> | | | | | | | |
| Basic Program | 126 | 82 | 87 | 100 | 115 | ↑ "Such Sums" | ↑ "Such Sums" |
| Challenge Program | — | — | — | 15 | 20 | | |
| Arts-in-Ed. | — | — | — | 10 | 10 | | |
| Photo Project | — | — | — | 5 | 5 | | |
| <u>HUMANITIES</u> | | | | | | | |
| Basic Program | 126 | 79.5 | 87 | 90 | 105 | ↓ "Such Sums" | ↓ "Such Sums" |
| Challenge Bicen. Era | — | — | — | 15 | 20 | | |
| <u>MUSEUM PROGRAM</u> | — | — | — | 15 | 25 | | |
| | 252 | 161.5 | 174 | 250 ^(a) | 300 ^(b) | "Such Sums" | |

(a) This amount is \$2 million less than Administration's reauthorization bill (S. 1809)

It is identical to the sum approved on April 26 by the House

(b) This amount compares with the \$297 total adopted by the House on April 26.