

University of Rhode Island

DigitalCommons@URI

Duffey, Joseph: Humanities Chairman
Nomination Hearing (September 9, 1977)

Education: National Endowment for the Arts
and Humanities, Subject Files I (1973-1996)

August 2016

Duffey, Joseph: Humanities Chairman Nomination Hearing (September 9, 1977): Speech 03

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_25

Recommended Citation

"Duffey, Joseph: Humanities Chairman Nomination Hearing (September 9, 1977): Speech 03" (2016).
Duffey, Joseph: Humanities Chairman Nomination Hearing (September 9, 1977). Paper 13.
https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_25/13https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_25/13

This Speech is brought to you for free and open access by the Education: National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, Subject Files I (1973-1996) at DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Duffey, Joseph: Humanities Chairman Nomination Hearing (September 9, 1977) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.

State Humanities Programs

The purpose of the Conference agreement is to encourage and stimulate the development of a Federal-State partnership in the broad cultural areas of the Humanities, so that this partnership may be increasingly beneficial to our people in each State. The Conferees have taken note of the dramatic growth of the Federal-State partnership with respect to the programs of the National Endowment for the Arts, exemplified by a 15-fold increase in annual State funding for the Arts in ten years -- from \$4 million to \$60 million -- and by the development of more than 1,000 community arts councils. The Conferees agreement envisages the development of similar challenges and opportunities for the Humanities Endowment.

The Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities is directed to help encourage State participation and to work more closely than in the past with State governments and State officials, so that the values, particular to the Humanities, can gain better entrance to the mainstream of our democratic processes and make a more vital contribution to American life.

The Chairman is urged to study State needs in the Humanities with State leaders, so that these needs can be met in the broadest sense, through programs representing the full scope of the Humanities, and through programs which will be addressed to a multiplicity and variety of worthwhile projects. It is the position of the Conference that the 20% of the total funding allocated to the States is of deep importance in bringing the values of both the Arts and the Humanities into local communities and to groups whose needs may be relatively modest, but who have potentially great significance.

Berman may say that the Senate urged the Humanities Endowment to undertake state programs in just the manner he has been conducting them -- i.e. on "public policy issues." He made this allegation in the private letter he wrote to Brademas and Quie -- and may repeat it. He bases it on Congressional urging to develop "public programs" in the Humanities and on a definition addition for the Humanities (in 1970) which says that they should be concerned with their relevance to the "current conditions of national life."

If Berman makes this allegation, you should point out, he is WRONG on these counts:

1. In 1967 reauthorization hearings "public programs" were discussed. They were described as focusing around historical societies, around media programs. They were envisioned as including -- ~~and~~ the concepts developed -- libraries, community colleges, museums, university extension services, and historical societies.
(House report of 1970 -- pre-Berman)
2. Initially, in the 1967 hearings, these public programs were presented as involving local, regional, and state activities. In cooperative efforts to broaden the base of the humanities.
3. In 1968 Senate Report, the language draws a clear parallel between the success of the State Arts agencies, (even then) and the contemplated development of similar Humanities programs.
4. The definition addition regarding the relevance of the Humanities was approved in Senate-House conference in 1970. It was not in the Senate bill -- it was in the House bill. The Senate approved.
5. The relevance of the Humanities is highly important -- but in no way, did either House seek to limit the application of this relevance.
That is a clear distortion of the facts, if Berman implies it.
6. The Congress urged the adoption of "public programs" so that they would have the broadest possible value, and that they would include the broadest spectrum of the humanities community.

If Berman does make this charge, I recommend you take him to task...

for not knowing his facts
for presenting a distorted view.

WHEREAS, surveys, public demand and increasing private support and participation indicate that citizen involvement with the arts is strong and growing; and

WHEREAS, continued growth of the arts in quantitative and qualitative ways can no longer be sustained by traditional support resources; and

WHEREAS, the arts are an essential element in providing the opportunity for quality environment;

NACO URGES THAT:

. That counties recognize the arts as an essential service, equal in importance to other essential services, and help to make the arts available to all their citizens,

. That every county be encouraged to establish a public agency specifically concerned with the arts,

. That the physical appearance of the county, its architectural heritage and its amenities, be acknowledged as a resource to be nurtured,

. That counties should be encouraged to establish a percentage of the total costs of every county construction budget to be set aside for the purchase or commission of works of art,

. That counties working together with the public at large shall help to effect a new national goal; "That no American shall be deprived of the opportunity to experience the beauty in life by barrier of circumstance, income, background, remoteness or race."

. Adopted by the National Association of Counties
41st Annual Conference
Salt Lake City, Utah
June 30, 1976

	Fiscal 1974	Fiscal 1975	Fiscal 1976
Appropriations	\$ 60,775,000	\$ 74,750,000	\$ 82,000,000
Non-federal funds generated	\$ 67,500,000	\$ 78,400,000	\$ 85,000,000
Program	48,000,000	\$ 56,400,000	\$ 60,400,000
Treasury	19,500,000	\$ 22,000,000	\$ 24,600,000

If Berman says that State Arts councils are subject to political change -- and flux, you should make these points.

(Note -- he has noted such changes and sometimes resulting problems in his letter to Brandemas and Quie, and has cited New York, where there has been a change from Joan Davidson, and California, where Gov. Brown almost curtailed the State arts program...)

- But --
1. Isn't change a strength of our democratic process, not a weakness?
 2. Does Dr. Berman recommend no change in State governments?
 3. Is he saying he is opposed to the principles of democracy?
 4. The point is that New York State supports the arts with more than any other State government. This is the result of hard work and a full entrance into the democratic process by the Arts?
 5. Does Dr. Berman think that his Council should never be rotated?

CHANGE IS THE REAL STRENGTH OF DEMOCRACY.

A LACK OF CHANGE MEANS ONE CONTINUING AUTHORITY...

A LACK OF CHANGE IS WHAT EXISTS UNDER A DISTATORSHIP.