

University of Rhode Island

DigitalCommons@URI

State Humanities Committees (1979-1982)

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

2-1981

State Humanities Committees (1979-1982): Speech 02

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_69

Recommended Citation

"State Humanities Committees (1979-1982): Speech 02" (1981). *State Humanities Committees (1979-1982)*. Paper 8.

https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_69/8https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_69/8

This Speech 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 State Humanities Committees (1979-1982) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.

Federation of Public Programs in the Humanities

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
12 South 6th Street, Suite 527

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402 Phone: (612) 332-2407

NEH STATE PROGRAM CASE STATEMENT

What Are the National Endowment for the Humanities State Programs?

They are, in essence, locally run educational programs in the fifty states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico designed to stimulate understanding and the use of the humanities by the general public.

How Are the Programs Administered?

In each state a broadly representative citizen's committee, usually called the Humanities Council, is in charge, acting as an independent funding agency, setting guidelines for projects in accordance with local needs, and supervising evaluation. Upwards of a thousand citizens -- business people, academicians, elected officials, others -- contribute substantial time and expertise every year to the management of these councils. Hundreds of thousands of citizens participate annually in the projects themselves.

How Much Federal Money Supports the Work of These Councils?

In 1979-80, \$24,000,000 in grants have been awarded. Matching state and private funds for the same period are expected to amount to \$2,832,000.

What Is the Proposed Budget Cut in these Funds?

A crippling reduction of 50 percent.

What Broad Public Purposes Are Served by the State-Based Programs?

The programs help to re-energize the ideal of democratic life by providing opportunities for sustained citizen discussion of political and social values and issues.

The programs, through their focus on public meetings during which texts and issues are freely discussed, bridge gaps among groups increasingly sealed off from each other in contemporary American society. Participants include union members, women's groups, farm workers, minorities; the elderly, business people, professionals and university teachers.

The programs develop alternatives, within the citizenry, to the passive, spectator style of mind induced by modern Big Brother-style communications as practiced both in the media and in government.

The programs widen public familiarity with the intellectual, philosophical and moral foundations of our society and government.

The programs nourish awareness of the broad interest upon which the survival of all self-interest and private interest depends -- the public interest.

What Will Be Lost if the NEH State Programs Are Crippled?

Over a decade and a half a body of citizen expertise in developing and organizing informed public discussion of humanities issues has been accumulated. This would be the most immediate loss. In addition, the crippling of the NEH state programs would necessarily mean a sharp reduction in the number of U.S. citizens who succeed in renewing, each year, a concrete understanding of the ultimate meaning, purpose and aspiration of our kind of society and government. In short, abolishing the state programs would mean destroying one of the most promising instruments we possess for preventing the nation from becoming a blocked society -- a collection of non-communicating sectors incapable of speaking to each other in the common language of our tradition.

TABLE I: ESTIMATES OF THE IMPACT OF REDUCTIONS AT SEVERAL LEVELS ON NEH BUDGET FOR FY 1982

	Original request (in 1,000s)	10% reduction	20% reduction	30% reduction	40% reduction	50% reduction
Budget Authority for FY 1982	\$169,483	\$152,535	\$136,000	\$119,000	\$102,000	\$ 85,000
Treasury and Challenge Grant Funds (see note 1)	39,000	34,200	29,400	24,600	19,800	15,000
Program Funds (Authority - (Treasury + Administration))	117,750	107,335	95,600	83,400	71,200	59,000
Division of State Programs (22.37% of NEH Program Funds)(see note 2)	26,471	24,011	21,386	18,657	15,927	13,200
\$200,000 for each eligible entity (see note 3)	11,200	11,200	11,200	11,200	11,200	11,200
'Excess' DSP Allocation less \$200,000 per eligible entity (see note 3)	15,271	12,811	10,186	7,457	4,727	2,000
44% of 'Excess' (see note 4)	6,719	5,637	4,482	3,281	2,080	880
Equal Allocations (44% of excess divided by 56)(see note 3)	120	101	80	59	37	16
'Floor' Grant (\$200,000 + equal allocation)	320	301	280	259	237	216
22% of 'Excess' (see note 4)	3,360	2,818	2,241	1,641	1,040	440
34% of 'Excess' (see note 4)	5,192	4,356	3,463	2,535	1,607	680

NOTE 1: The amount available to the Division of State Programs is based on the total amount of NEH program funds available. This figure is determined by subtracting the administrative budget (fixed at \$11 million) and the amounts reserved for Treasury and Challenge Grant funds from the total (revised) NEH budget authority. The latter sum (T/C) is not known for reductions other than 50%. Hence a method is needed for arriving at a reasonable assumption of the size of the T/C request at the several levels of possible reduction.

In the original request, the T/C request (\$39 million) was 23% of the total NEH authority (\$169,483,000). With any reduction in total budget authority, there will be a reduction of some kind in the T/C request. Suppose it is decided to apply the cut evenly in all parts of the NEH budget. If so, a 50% reduction in authority (resulting in a new total of \$85,000,000) would lead to a 50% cut in the T/C request, i.e., to a request of \$19,500,000 -- still 23% of the total authority. But in fact, NEH has submitted a T/C figure of \$15,000,000 -- only 17.65% of the total authority under the 50% reduction budget.

Suppose that Congress authorizes only a 10% cut. We do not know what T/C request would be subtracted from the revised total authority to determine the program funds. We can, however, use the cut percentage as a guide to a reasonable assumption of what the T/C request would be in such a case. Instead of using the total T/C request, we refer to the difference between the NEH submission and the original FY 1982 request, i.e., the difference between \$15 million and \$39 million, or \$24 million. The ten percent cut level corresponds to 20% of this difference (\$4,800,000) because ten percent is 1/5 of the difference between no cut and one of 50%. Thus, it seems reasonable to assume that if the total authority were reduced by 10%, the T/C request would be reduced by \$4,800,000, to \$34,200,000. And so on, as follows (in thousands):

10% cut	20% cut	30% cut	40% cut	50% cut
\$39,000	\$39,000	\$39,000	\$39,000	\$39,000
- 4,800	- 9,600	- 14,400	- 19,200	- 24,000
\$34,200	\$29,400	\$24,600	\$19,800	\$15,000

Make no mistake: the T/C figures used in the general calculations are assumptions. Consequently, the other figures in Tables I and II must be treated accordingly -- with due caution.

NOTE 2: \$13,200,000 = 22.37% of \$59,000,000. The assumption is made that this percentage allocation to the Division of State Programs would be applied at all levels of cuts.

NOTE 3: \$200,000 x 56 = \$11,200,000. There are 52 active councils plus 4 U.S. territories which are in the planning stage and therefore counted as "eligible entities" by NEH.

NOTE 4: The formula contained in the 1980 legislation provides that, after \$200,000 for each eligible entity is deducted from the allocation to the Division of State Programs, if there is an excess, it shall be divided in three ways: 44% of the excess will be divided equally among the eligible entities; 22% of the excess will be allocated to the states in proportion to each state's proportion of the total population; 34% of the excess "shall be available to the Chairman for making grants . . . to States and regional groups and entities applying for such grants." (P.L. 96-496 (1980))

TABLE II: ESTIMATES OF THE IMPACT ON STATE HUMANITIES COUNCILS OF REDUCTIONS AT SEVERAL LEVELS FOR NEH FY 1982 BUDGET

STATE	Current NEH Outright Grant (as of 11/80)	% of total popul. (1979 est.)	10% reduction in NEH budget			20% reduction in NEH budget			30% reduction in NEH budget			40% reduction in NEH budget			50% reduction in NEH budget		
			Based on \$200,000 plus share of 44% of excess	Share of 22% of excess based on popul.	Share of 34% of excess (see note x)	Based on \$200,000 plus share of 44% of excess	Share of 22% of excess based on popul.	Share of 34% of excess (see note x)	Based on \$200,000 plus share of 44% of excess	Share of 22% of excess based on popul.	Share of 34% of excess (see note x)	Based on \$200,000 plus share of 44% of excess	Share of 22% of excess based on popul.	Share of 34% of excess (see note x)	Based on \$200,000 plus share of 44% of excess	Share of 22% of excess based on popul.	Share of 34% of excess (see note x)
ALABAMA	\$373,000	1.69	\$301,000	48,000		\$280,000	39,000		\$259,000	28,000		\$237,000	18,000		\$216,000	7,000	
ALASKA	396,000	.18	301,000	5,000		280,000	4,000		259,000	3,000		237,000	2,000		216,000	1,000	
ARIZONA	144,000	1.10	301,000	31,000		280,000	25,000		259,000	18,000		237,000	11,000		216,000	5,000	
ARKANSAS	358,000	.98	301,000	28,000		280,000	22,000		259,000	16,000		237,000	10,000		216,000	4,000	
CALIFORNIA	820,136	10.76	301,000	286,000		280,000	228,000		259,000	167,000		237,000	106,000		216,000	45,000	
COLORADO	375,042	1.24	301,000	35,000		280,000	28,000		259,000	20,000		237,000	13,000		216,000	5,000	
CONNECTICUT	378,000	1.39	301,000	39,000		280,000	31,000		259,000	23,000		237,000	14,000		216,000	6,000	
DELAWARE	309,000	.26	301,000	7,000		280,000	6,000		259,000	4,000		237,000	3,000		216,000	1,000	
D.C.	324,000	.29	301,000	8,000		280,000	7,000		259,000	5,000		237,000	3,000		216,000	1,000	
FLORIDA	502,000	3.96	301,000	112,000		280,000	89,000		259,000	65,000		237,000	41,000		216,000	17,000	
GEORGIA	390,660	2.29	301,000	65,000		280,000	65,000		259,000	51,000		237,000	24,000		216,000	10,000	
HAWAII	378,000	.41	301,000	12,000		280,000	9,000		259,000	7,000		237,000	4,000		216,000	2,000	
IDaho	328,000	.40	301,000	11,000		280,000	9,000		259,000	7,000		237,000	4,000		216,000	2,000	
ILLINOIS	562,000	5.03	301,000	142,000		280,000	113,000		259,000	83,000		237,000	52,000		216,000	22,000	
INDIANA	430,000	2.42	301,000	68,000		280,000	54,000		259,000	40,000		237,000	25,000		216,000	11,000	
IOWA	342,000	1.30	301,000	37,000		280,000	29,000		259,000	21,000		237,000	14,000		216,000	6,000	
KANSAS	362,000	1.06	301,000	30,000		280,000	24,000		259,000	17,000		237,000	11,000		216,000	5,000	
KENTUCKY	387,000	1.58	301,000	45,000		280,000	35,000		259,000	26,000		237,000	16,000		216,000	7,000	
LOUISIANA	398,000	1.80	301,000	51,000		280,000	40,000		259,000	30,000		237,000	19,000		216,000	8,000	
MAINE	333,000	.49	301,000	14,000		280,000	11,000		259,000	8,000		237,000	5,000		216,000	2,000	
MARYLAND	402,000	1.86	301,000	52,000		280,000	42,000		259,000	31,000		237,000	19,000		216,000	8,000	
MASS.	439,000	2.58	301,000	73,000		280,000	58,000		259,000	42,000		237,000	27,000		216,000	11,000	
MICHIGAN	516,000	4.12	301,000	116,000		280,000	92,000		259,000	68,000		237,000	43,000		216,000	18,000	
MINNESOTA	399,000	1.82	301,000	51,000		280,000	41,000		259,000	30,000		237,000	19,000		216,000	8,000	
MISSISSIPPI	363,000	1.08	301,000	30,000		280,000	24,000		259,000	18,000		237,000	11,000		216,000	5,000	
MISSOURI	418,000	2.18	301,000	61,000		280,000	49,000		259,000	36,000		237,000	23,000		216,000	10,000	
MONTEANA	333,682	.35	301,000	10,000		280,000	6,000		259,000	6,000		237,000	4,000		216,000	2,000	
NEBRASKA	344,000	.70	301,000	20,000		280,000	16,000		259,000	11,000		237,000	7,000		216,000	3,000	
NEVADA	323,000	.31	301,000	9,000		280,000	7,000		259,000	5,000		237,000	3,000		216,000	1,000	
NEW HAMP.	333,640	.40	301,000	11,000		280,000	9,000		259,000	7,000		237,000	4,000		216,000	2,000	
NEW JERSEY	474,000	3.28	301,000	92,000		280,000	74,000		259,000	54,000		237,000	34,000		216,000	14,000	
NEW MEXICO	336,000	.56	301,000	16,000		280,000	13,000		259,000	9,000		237,000	6,000		216,000	2,000	
NEW YORK	709,000	7.90	301,000	223,000		280,000	177,000		259,000	130,000		237,000	82,000		216,000	35,000	
N. CAROLINA	434,000	2.51	301,000	71,000		280,000	56,000		259,000	41,000		237,000	26,000		216,000	11,000	
N. DAKOTA	323,000	.29	301,000	8,000		280,000	7,000		259,000	5,000		237,000	3,000		216,000	1,000	
OHIO	551,000	4.80	301,000	135,000		280,000	108,000		259,000	79,000		237,000	50,000		216,000	21,000	
OKLAHOMA	374,000	1.29	301,000	38,000		280,000	29,000		259,000	21,000		237,000	13,000		216,000	6,000	
OREGON	371,683	1.13	301,000	32,000		280,000	25,000		259,000	19,000		237,000	12,000		216,000	5,000	
PENNSYLVANIA	581,151	5.25	301,000	148,000		280,000	118,000		259,000	86,000		237,000	55,000		216,000	23,000	
PUERTO RICO	381,000	1.50	301,000	42,000		280,000	34,000		259,000	25,000		237,000	16,000		216,000	7,000	
RHODE ISLAND	330,000	.42	301,000	12,000		280,000	9,000		259,000	7,000		237,000	4,000		216,000	2,000	
S. CAROLINA	374,000	1.31	301,000	37,000		280,000	29,000		259,000	21,000		237,000	14,000		216,000	6,000	
S. DAKOTA	324,000	.31	301,000	9,000		280,000	7,000		259,000	5,000		237,000	3,000		216,000	1,000	
TENNESSEE	407,000	1.96	301,000	55,000		280,000	44,000		259,000	32,000		237,000	20,000		216,000	9,000	
TEXAS	602,000	5.99	301,000	169,000		280,000	134,000		259,000	98,000		237,000	62,000		216,000	26,000	
UTAH	318,000	.61	301,000	17,000		280,000	14,000		259,000	10,000		237,000	6,000		216,000	3,000	
VERMONT	320,000	.22	301,000	6,000		280,000	5,000		259,000	4,000		237,000	2,000		216,000	1,000	
VIRGINIA	425,000	2.33	301,000	66,000		280,000	55,000		259,000	38,000		237,000	24,000		216,000	10,000	
WASHINGTON	405,000	1.76	301,000	50,000		280,000	39,000		259,000	29,000		237,000	18,000		216,000	8,000	
W. VIRGINIA	357,403	.84	301,000	24,000		280,000	19,000		259,000	14,000		237,000	9,000		216,000	4,000	
WISCONSIN	414,000	2.11	301,000	59,000		280,000	47,000		259,000	35,000		237,000	22,000		216,000	9,000	
WYOMING	318,000	.20	301,000	6,000		280,000	4,000		259,000	3,000		237,000	2,000		216,000	1,000	
Totals			16,837,000	2,818,000	4,356,000	15,682,000	2,241,000	3,463,000	14,481,000	1,641,000	2,535,000	13,280,000	1,040,000	1,607,000	12,080,000	440,000	680,000

Note x: To be determined individually by the Chairman on the basis of criteria to be announced soon.