

University of Rhode Island

DigitalCommons@URI

Obscenity: Andres Serrano Controversy (1989)

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

March 2017

Obscenity: Andres Serrano Controversy (1989): Note 01

Claiborne Pell

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_60

Recommended Citation

Pell, Claiborne, "Obscenity: Andres Serrano Controversy (1989): Note 01" (2017). *Obscenity: Andres Serrano Controversy (1989)*. Paper 15.

https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_60/15

This Note is brought to you by the University of Rhode Island. It has been accepted for inclusion in Obscenity: Andres Serrano Controversy (1989) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons-group@uri.edu. For permission to reuse copyrighted content, contact the author directly.

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510

NEA - going bullshit
over Gates proposal

→ staff working on alternative
guideline language.

stating "Excellence" is the fundamental criterion to be used
... is not synonymous with ^{by Panels}
innovation ~~etc~~ especially
public support is only

→ excellence = works that get the highest
ranking in any particular grouping.

→ panelists are assumed to be of the
highest quality.

use "ask panels to adhere
highest standards of excellence."

also

NEH - document that describes what NEH is
all about - includes

"What The Endowment ~~that~~ does not
support"

- why not add language to NEA
That is similar??

— p. 4 In Overview to NEH program.

only
by

- final reports is a great area to
get into - to explore w/o really
hurt the NEA.

It has never been invoked. Only on books for
a year.

→ now in grants manual

→ Army has forgotten all about it.

request
Grants manual - show how to handle
procedure

Tom Birch

Why not open all meetings? would
add accountability.

→ get serious - Council - it's your job.

Lee

Carla - "Bus Shelter" at NMAA - has political advertising + photos of
Helm's staff called about content of this
the Rosenberg

→ Congress could say we forced them to back down.

— no matter how outrageous a grant - you can't force a program review without consent of P.D.

final reports have been filed + not used. Although sometimes panels may have used them when discussing a second grant.

— A final report has never been used to deny a follow-up grant.

The P.D. director must initiate the review

→ of a final report by releasing. (Anna, Jack + Art Warren are review committee)

In case there is
evidence that
a grant has
been improperly
used

Endowment could disavow its connection with this one work of art. "We can not accept an association with the work of art that scholastic, a religion etc."

→ Freddie says Endowment can do this if people agree to it.

→ Can't start process without P/D on your side (Basso)

→ (This all explained in grants manual)

NEA must deny that they are
a front of anti-Christian
bigotry.

→ Anna would rather have no NEA
than one that compromises:
(Hugh has this way).