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State Humanities Program

A One-Year Study

In cooperation with the State involved, each existing Committee (except as below) would conduct a one-year study to determine State needs in the Humanities, leading to the development of a plan to meet those needs.

In cases where there is a State agency for the Arts and Humanities already in place (some 14 states) the governor would determine who would conduct the study -- the State agency, or the existing committee.

In cases where the governor opted for the existing committee to conduct the study and there was in that State a State Arts and Humanities agency, the committee would cooperate with the agency, or consult with the agency, as one means of general cooperation with the State.

In cases where the governor opted for the State agency to conduct the study, the agency would cooperate with the existing committee.

(It would be implicit that if the governor opted for the State agency to conduct the study, he would have the opportunity of also opting for that agency to implement the plan.)

The plan would be implemented in accordance with the House proposal, with gubernatorial appointments, except for the first two, dependent on State matching, and with the first year requirement pegged at $100,000 rather than $200,000 for subsequent years.

\[X\] Would be spelled out in report language.
Advantages:

1. It protects the rights of existing State agencies for both Arts and Humanities without unduly favoring them. They were established before the State Humanities committees, but have never received Endowment funds for their potentials to develop State-wide programs.

2. It is a logical plan. It follows the format leading to the development of the very successful Arts programs in the States -- i.e. a one-year study preceded the establishment of these programs.

3. It is orderly. It allows for a better timing sequence than we had considered.

4. It provides a real opportunity for State input, and thus an incentive for the States to join in funding the plan and to have an equal voice in its development.

5. It requires existing Committees to cooperate with States and with Arts and Humanities state agencies where they exist.

6. It preserves the reforms in the State committees which we had already agreed on -- rotation, broad representation, etc.

7. It permits us to hold, if desired, oversight hearings on the way the studies are going, and how the cooperative efforts are proceeding... so that we can help keep a balance and prod when needed.

8. It does not contravene our basic agreement with the House.

9. It satisfies the Javits grievance concept... As the study and plan develop, all parties now excluded from State committee programs can be heard, or will have the opportunity for input.
Funding:

The Arts programs began with studies funded at $25,000 each.

In those days the States themselves supplemented the Federal grant — which was non-matching in each case for the studies.

In retrospect, it is amazing to think how much was accomplished with such a relatively small amount of money.

I would recommend a higher figure. For a good study of State needs (and I'm thinking of RI in this regard) I propose up to $100,000 per State. We really should get something for that investment, and we really should expect major State input.