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QUESTIONS FOR AMYAS AMES

1. In your testimony you recommend that 10 percent of the operating costs of arts organizations in a State should be funded by the State, and that 10 percent of the operating costs of arts organizations throughout the country should be funded by the Federal Government.

Please give us your rationale for this conclusion.

QUESTIONS FOR AMYAS AMES

2. Please supply for us a breakdown of what this would mean State by State. Do you have figures, for example, for my own state of Rhode Island? Suggest asking him this to see how closely his figures coincide with Ann Vermel's: $19 million in costs, and 216 organizations involved...

3. You place considerable emphasis on the State arts programs. Could you expand on this and on their value, as you perceive it?

4. Your survey covers 343 arts organizations. How do these compare with a possible overall national total?

QUESTIONS FOR AMYAS AMES

5. How accurate is your research? How much dependence can we place on your survey as being truly representative of the whole field?

6. What other surveys have been made of a comparable nature?

7. Would you call yours the most comprehensive? Why?
QUESTIONS FOR RONALD Berman

1. What percentage of the membership of the State Humanities Committees have an academic orientation?

2. How many of these committees are based in educational institutions?

3. Please describe for us the approach used by these committees in determining the areas they will fund during a given year. Who determines this procedure?

4. It has been suggested that this procedure limits the overall state program in a given year, giving it a somewhat narrowed focus. Please comment.

QUESTIONS FOR RONALD Berman (cont.)

5. Do you believe the individual states should have a voice in the selection of the State Committees?

6. Do you find it strange that the leaders of the State arts councils are relatively well known to members of the Senate, while the Humanities state leaders are not? .... How do you explain this?

7. In 1966 state monies appropriated for the arts amounted to $4.5 million in total. Today that figure has grown to almost $60 million. Isn't that funding which should also be sought by the Humanities?
8. Isn't my amendment in keeping with that concept?

9. Isn't the whole process of seeking State help a healthy one? It involves State legislatures and many different facets of a State's life -- many different people. Please comment.

10. My amendment has been criticized as tending to politicize the Humanities. From where I sit, I have long believed in the political process and in its potentials for good. Please comment.

11. Isn't our political process fundamental to our democratic government? How can the application of this process be so wrong for the Humanities?

12. Would you say that our political process is wrong in the selection of the Congress?

13. How is it so wrong if it is applied to the democratic selection of State humanities committee members?
A recent Humanities project brought the Royal Shakespeare Company to the United States -- is that not correct?

How much of this company's time was devoted to an educational program -- and how much to preparations for performances and actual performances in the United States?

A comparative percentage of time spent is what I am after.

How many performances were there -- and where were they?

Adams Chronicles

In the Sunday Times of November 9, there is an article pertaining to the "Adams Chronicles". Please describe the Endowment's involvement in the project.

The article describes a serious overrun of budget. It says, and I quote:

Please comment.
Individual Artists

1. I have long believed that a very important part of the Endowment's program is its help to individual artists. I notice that this aid has grown markedly in the ten year's of the Endowment's life.

Can you describe this growth briefly to us -- and also add your comments on the desirability of expanding this part of the program in the years ahead.

I think the individual aid program is vital to the Endowment's endeavors as a whole.

We need to think imaginatively in this regard, it seems to me. If there is one criticism I can express, it is that the Endowment should concentrate on imaginative approaches, and expand its assistance to individuals.

Individual Artists

3. As you know, in the past I have suggested that there be some form of appropriate recognition given to those who receive individual grants from the Endowment -- I have suggested an appropriate scroll, or parchment, some lasting reminder and recognition of an individual's achievement, when he or she is honored by the highly competitive type of grant the Endowment awards. The legislation specifies that awards be made to individuals "of exceptional talent." It seems to me that something in keeping with those words should accompany an award.

Will you give us your comments?
Individual Artists

2. In this connection, several times in the past I have recommended that artists helped by the Federal government should -- wherever appropriate -- make a return of some kind to our country... to the taxpayers who basically finance their grants.

Perhaps this would be easier in the Visual Arts, where the product of the art work is tangible. The Canadian Art Bank is an example of this -- artists supported by the government in Canada do make a return to the government.

I'd like your comments on this -- in the visual arts field, and as the concept might be applied to other art areas and forms of expression.
Surplus Property

It has been suggested to me that the Endowment could benefit by permitting grantees to utilize excess surplus Federal personal property.

Could you comment on this -- and give some examples?

(NOTE: This is a question which if answered affirmatively could be of benefit to the Endowment and help save some money.)

Museum Area

1. As you may know, Senator Hathaway has introduced legislation to provide for expanded help for museums by the Arts Endowment -- similar in concept to legislation in which Chairman Brademas and I have been involved for the past two Congresses, under the heading of the Museum Services Act. These same concepts appear in S. 1800 which I introduced.

Let me ask:

Do you believe more Federal help for museums is needed?
Is the Endowment prepared to undertake such a task?
If you had the needed funds, how would you proceed?
2. Now let me also ask this:

In your testimony you mention new ways in which the Endowment is using the challenge concept to develop increased non-Federal support for the arts...

Would you describe this for us?

***************

Could these challenge concepts apply, as well, to museums? And if so, how?

***************

Could you foresee these concepts being further expanded? How many other art forms might benefit by special challenge programs? Would you foresee the possibility of using Treasury Fund monies for this type of a program -- recognizing that grants made under the section of the legislation which utilizes these funds are on a 3 to one ratio -- that is, one Federal dollar to stimulate three additional private dollars?