

University of Rhode Island

DigitalCommons@URI

Conference Position Paper (1976)

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

February 2017

Conference Position Paper (1976): Conference Proceeding 02

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_32

Recommended Citation

"Conference Position Paper (1976): Conference Proceeding 02" (2017). *Conference Position Paper (1976)*. Paper 6.

https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_32/6

This Conference Proceeding 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 Conference Position Paper (1976) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons-group@uri.edu.

For Conference

Reference Points Re State Humanities Programs and Funding levels.

- 1964-
1965
1. When program started Humanities led the way. They were the strongest partners, by far... They had the ideas which made the whole program viable... They made the arts "respectable." They had the IMPACT nationally to make the program legislatively possible.

Today the situation is reversed -- The Arts have the IMPACT. The Humanities are no longer the stronger partners -- they are weaker. They urgently ask for parity, because they realize that the Arts now have more appeal. The Arts, on the other hand, wish to justify their own separate amounts and no longer be tied to an automatic parity concept.

Both sides have now come of age. They are both closely related cultural areas -- but they should each now make their own case to Congress, to the Appropriations committees. And the Congress should place its investment in the program according to national benefit and IMPACT of the program. That means, in my judgment, the Arts today. (It could some day mean the Humanities.)

One measure: The Arts Endowment receives ^{more than} twice the number of applications as the Humanities -- ~~18,000~~ vs. approximately 7,000...

→ Another measure: The Arts have been more successful in attracting matching funds, and the special Treasury funds which require donations to an Endowment before they are released.

→ A third measure: The Arts are mounting a national program to attract corporate and business support for the arts... The Humanities have not taken such a step. The Business Committee for the Arts, representing business across the country at the most prestigious levels, is the Business Committee for the Arts. (Not Humanities).

2. One major and basic reason for the IMPACT of the Arts comes through the State programs. They are State appointed, and each varies in accord with each State's needs.
 - a. in 10 years State appropriations for the Arts have grown from \$4 million to over \$60 million -- a 15-fold increase.
 - b. There are hundreds of community Arts councils (over 1,000 nationally), while ten years ago there were less than 100. This is a direct result of State support and State interest.
 - c. Governors, mayors, State and local government officials increasingly stress the central importance of the Arts
 - d. Municipal govts. are increasingly supporting the Arts (again a real fallout from State involvement.)

- e. County governments are increasingly supporting the Arts...
(For example... In Sen. Javits State, county government funding for Arts groups has increased 90% in two years -- from \$3.9 million to \$7.6 million.)

On the Humanities side -- there are no real parallels attached to the work of the National Endowment for the Humanities.

There are State committees now in every State working for the Humanities, BUT

- a. These are unrelated to State governments.
- b. Their Chairman emanate from a Washington appointment process.
- c. Their members are appointed by their Chairman.
- d. THERE IS NO PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN STATE GOVERNMENTS AND THE HUMANITIES ENDOWMENT. THIS IS A GREAT STRENGTH OF THE ARTS PROGRAM ** AND A REASON FOR ITS IMPACT, FOR ITS MAKING THE ARTS AVAILABLE AT A GRASS ROOTS LEVEL... I HAVE TRIED HARD TO IMPROVE THAT SITUATION THIS YEAR

The Senate bill provides these options in basic form

1. A State can continue with its existing committee
2. It can phase in a program which allows for a majority of committee members, gubernatorially appointed within 3 yrs.
3. It can establish a new entity for the Humanities.
4. It can continue a combined Arts and Humanities program (applicable now to 11 States.)

In the Senate bill, the State chooses among these options, and designates one of them for its Humanities program.

The State -- not Washington -- makes the choice.

That seems to me eminently fair and just and proper

- in accord with Federal-State partnership
- in accord with the States expressing their own wishes and needs
- in accord with a decentralizing of a Washington bureaucracy
- in accord with a healthy exchange of views between Washington and the States themselves.

At present the Arts chairman has 50 potential critics in the States who often express critical opinions for assessment

At present the Humanities chairman has no such balancing force.

IN THE CONGRESS WE HAVE ALWAYS BEEN AWARE OF THE DANGER OF ONE PERSON ASSUMING TOO MUCH CONTROL OVER A GIVEN PROGRAM. THIS PRESENT HUMANITIES PROGRAM SERVES TO ENHANCE SUCH A DANGER, RATHER THAN MITIGATING AGAINST IT.

In sum: I have very strong feelings and convictions on these two issues -- State Humanities programs and the funding levels in the Senate bill...