4-26-1976

National Endowment for the Humanities: Mark-Up (1976): Report 01

Livingston L. Biddle Jr.

TO: SENATOR
FROM: LB

Apr. 26

Attached is the Arts and Humanities bill with notations regarding the various sections. If this seems cumbersome, I can prepare it differently -- but on a flat surface it seems to work ok, and it keeps everything together.

The mark-up is for Wedd. at 11 a.m. in Room 4232 as you know.

We have had a number of staff meetings on the bill.

As of last Friday (Apr 23) there was general staff agreement with the following important exceptions. Greg Fusco asked especially that discussion on these controversial areas be deferred at a staff level until Sen. Javits has a chance to discuss them with you personally. I gather he plans to do this in advance of the meeting, but if not it would seem that it's not too likely they can be decided in mark-up.

The controversial areas:

1. State Humanities. In the bill attached, your amendment appears which essentially would grandfather in a new State Humanities council format within the next three years -- or grandfather out the existing program.

I'm told both Stafford and Taft are most eager to maintain the present status quo -- they have been approached by personal friends on the existing State committees (Sen. Aiken, for one, in Vermont.)

I think we might win a close vote on this -- but at present Javits would oppose you on it, and this is to be avoided if possible.

Accordingly Fusco is working on a Javits compromise which he must first show to the Senator.

2. Museums. The House bill puts Museum Services under HEW. None of the staff members in the Senate like this -- but Brademas did it for very valid political reasons, unlikely to change and emenating from Al Quie who said he would back the program only under HEW. Fusco is working on a compromise which would put the program under the umbrella of the Arts and Humanities Foundation (but under neither Endowment). I like his plan. He volunteered to take this on, and I gladly accepted, as whatever comes out of the Javits camp on this would have to have clearance from the Arts and Humanities. Provided it's a good solution, it's good to have it come from the Republicans. The concept is yours -- they're merely concerned with the proper place.

3. Parity. This may be the most sticky of all. Brademas bowed to Berman's major push for parity. I know that Javits and Berman have had at least two private meetings -- without staff present. Javits is, as we know, more in favor of the arts -- but he is under lots of pressure.

ATTACHED ARE RECOMMENDED AUTHORIZATIONS AND BACK-UP

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.

Recommended

AUTHORIZATIONS

Present:

Arts and Humanities, EACH -- 113.5 (basic program) + 12.5 (Treasury) Funds -- $126 Mil. EACH

Total for the two -- $252

Funding Levels

(To Committee re Budget)

Arts	100 + 10 (Treasury)	==	110
Humanities	90 + 10 "	=	100
Museums			15
Challenge			15
Arts in Education			10
			250

Note: We allocated these funds as follows:
Arts -- 137 million
Hums -- 113 "

House

Possible New alignment

110	Arts	92.5 + 7.5	= 100
110	Humanities	82.5 + 7.5	= 90
15	Challenge (Arts and Humanities each 15)		= 30
15	Museums		= 15
—	Arts in Education		= 10
—	Photo.		= 5
250			250

Note; A Bicentennial Era Challenge program for Humanities is being prepared by Minority

2d Year of New Alignment

OR

126	Arts	113.5 + 12.5	= 126	115
126	Humanities	103.5 + 12.5	= 116	105
20	Challenge (A & H each 25)		= 50	40
25	Museums		= 25	25
—	Arts in Education		= 15	10
—	Photo		= 5	5
297			337	300