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April 23, 1980

To: John Brademas

Under Title II--Museum Services Act--of the Arts and Humanities Cultural Affairs Act of 1976, Section 206 mandates the activities of the Institute. The most important activity, and the one for which the National Museum Services Board authorized expending at least 75% of the Institute's funds because no other federal agency was providing this kind of funding is as follows:

Activities of the Institute

Sec. 206. (a) The Director, subject to the policy direction of the Board, is authorized to make grants to museums to increase and improve museum services, through such activities as--

(3) assisting them to meet their administrative costs in preserving and maintaining their collections, exhibiting them to the public, and providing educational programs to the public through the use of their collections

It is rapidly becoming apparent that the general operating support priority of the Institute of Museum Services is in conflict with the philosophical concepts of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Research and Improvement, in which the Secretary of Education has placed IMS.

In recent appropriations hearings, Chairman Sidney Yates (D-Ill.) expressed serious reservations about IMS funding special project grants because the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities already have substantial programs for museums in those areas. At the same time, he extolled the common-sense nature of general operating support. The museum constituencies, other federal agencies, and Congress agree that General Operating Support is the most important and most difficult funds to obtain and that was the purpose of creating IMS.

The Office for Research and Improvement, on the other hand, has expressed a desire to see IMS mainly fund research and improvement projects.

Additionally, the Institute of Museum Services crosses the boundaries of Research and Improvement, as well as Elementary and Secondary Education and Postsecondary Education, Vocational and Rehabilitation Services. Museum resources should be utilized, if possible, throughout the Department; for example, international affairs activities, continuing education programs, rehabilitation services, and dissemination are a few areas in which the interdisciplinary services of museums should be tapped.
These basic philosophical differences should be resolved before IMS is permanently placed within the Department of Education.