

2016

Arts and Humanities: Reauthorization (1975): Correspondence 02

Livingston Biddle

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_16

Recommended Citation

Biddle, Livingston, "Arts and Humanities: Reauthorization (1975): Correspondence 02" (2016). *Arts and Humanities: Reauthorization (1975)*. Paper 16.
http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_16/16

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 Arts and Humanities: Reauthorization (1975) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.

To; Senator

From: Lb

Jan. 22

During the recess Roger Stevens asked for a meeting to discuss possibilities for an enhanced arts in education program -- not to benefit the Kennedy Center (you arranged for a special \$750,000 program there) but the arts in general. Jean was away at the time -- but Bud Arberg from OE and the Kennedy Center (where he serves as advisor on the KC project) were present.

As a result I asked Bud to prepare, informally and for us only, some thoughts and possible draft language. He provided the attached.

I have discussed this now with Jean. As you know your bill repeals Title V for teacher training. Jean says there is some possibility that teacher retraining could be discussed in the markup sessions as a worthy program to consider restoring -- and that if so, something could be added to include the arts possibly... But she underscores your wish for all proper economies, and I remember that in your discussions with Sen. Hathaway this a.m. you indicated non-approval to the added career education proposal he was outlining. You said you were "leery of fresh expenditures."

Thus, I come to the possibility that something for the arts in education might be included in the Arts and Humanities bill -- a very modest pilot program perhaps along the lines of the Arberg suggestion. In line with your feelings that we must in the long run prepare our young people for the productive and creative use of increasing leisure time, this program have good applicability.

The program would thus emanate from the Arts Endowment, with the Chairman authorized to carry out the program... and with OE involved perhaps in an appropriate advisory capacity.

Actually, such a program would have a precedent. You'll recall that in the first Arts and Humanities Act, Teacher Training Institutes were included. These were abandoned as time went on -- but those who were involved in them felt that they were very worthwhile. They were for short-term training and ~~mostly~~ for ~~extramural~~ retraining in arts areas.

Arberg says that there are enough art teachers... the big need, he says, is for in-service retraining.

I suppose Reger may be thinking of involving the Kennedy Center at some time as a focal point for an exemplary demonstration project demonstrating the values of the arts and how they can best be taught in cooperation with a leading non-profit institution. That would accord with Bud Arberg's language.

But also -- a museum could equally serve as such a focal point.

I feel that the idea has appeal... and recommend that it be on the agenda of the matters you will want to discuss with John Brademas at lunch on Feb 3, as per my memo following up on the dates you gave to Carel and me.

Agree _____

Discuss further _____