

1975

Hearings: Questions, Memoranda (1976): Correspondence 02

Livingston L. Biddle Jr.

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_40

Recommended Citation

Biddle, Livingston L. Jr., "Hearings: Questions, Memoranda (1976): Correspondence 02" (1975). *Hearings: Questions, Memoranda (1976)*. Paper 5.
http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_40/5http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_40/5

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

TO SENATOR

FROM LB

Nov. 11, '75

Re: Hearings Nov. 12

Here is an Opening Statement

plus a witness list

plus some questions

I've tried to follow your comments yesterday that you wanted something relatively brief, about 2 pages... with some praise for the Arts Endowment, and some indication of the hearings ahead.

It's my feeling that if Press are present, your reservations about the Humanities are going to make news for the day following in the Senate -- i.e. the press will be alerted. Thus there is a final section in your opening statement looking toward this. ..

Joe Hagan called this afternoon to say that they have decided to call off their major critics of the ^{State} ~~the~~ Humanities Councils and to have simply a panel to balance the Maury Coats' one, which will be well prepared. Coats called, and they really have some thoughtful comments in support of your amendment -- convincing at least over the phone.

Joe also said that he and Berman will be at the hearings tomorrow to listen in on the Arts Endowment. On balance, I would think you could ~~include~~ ^{conclude} your remarks tomorrow, ^{as suggested,} despite the fact that the Humanities will have an extra day to prepare their reaction. I say this because I think the controversy is honest and interesting and that it may focus some national

interest and attention on the issues.

The Museum Area questions stem from discussions I've had with George Seybolt, following the dinner that night at Sans Souci, and with Nancy vis a vis a museums program in line with your earlier and initial advocacy of Museum Services.

The Hathaway bill, which sets Museum Services within the Endowment came as a surprise to me -- I wonder if Steve had been working on this with the Hathaway people. As you know, Hathaway has just joined the Subcommittee (during the last three weeks).

But an accelerated Endowment program for museums is now in the making, if you want to pursue.

Nancy, you'll recall, in the past steered clear of Museum Services under HEW, as it was originally -- and HEW opposed as did OMB -- and that's still the case.

Thus, if the program is to move forward under our initiative the questions should be asked, so as not to involve Nancy with an OMB clearance and hence a turndown.

Nancy, I know, wants very much to cooperate.

There is more to this -- but the questions I've suggested will start the ball rolling, and leave us maximum options.