

University of Rhode Island

DigitalCommons@URI

---

National Foundation on the Arts and  
Humanities (1965-1967)

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

---

4-6-1966

## National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities (1965-1967): Report 01

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell\\_neh\\_II\\_54](https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_54)

---

### Recommended Citation

"National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities (1965-1967): Report 01" (1966). *National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities (1965-1967)*. Paper 49.

[https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell\\_neh\\_II\\_54/49](https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_54/49)

This Report is brought to you by the University of Rhode Island. It has been accepted for inclusion in National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities (1965-1967) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons-group@uri.edu](mailto:digitalcommons-group@uri.edu). For permission to reuse copyrighted content, contact the author directly.

and Friedman. I do not presume to speak for these gentlemen, but I can tell you that we have interviewed them and both deny knowing each other. I have never met Mr. Friedman, but I am well acquainted with Mr. Caplin and know him to be a man of integrity.

Sherar's statements in testifying before your subcommittee perhaps most effectively discredit this charge.

When asked if he knew for a fact that there was a personal friendship between Messrs. Caplin and Friedman, Sherar said: "No. This was just a rumor." Again, in his own words, when asked by you if he had any specific evidence that the alleged friendship was the reason he was not allowed to conduct the audit as he wished, Sherar replied: "Well, Senator, nobody told me that this was the case. Anything that I would say would be an assumption on my part." And finally, in his testimony before your subcommittee he indicated that he is not really sure in his own mind why he thought he was being pressured to limit the audit. The record shows that he cited four other possible reasons why he felt this way, in addition to the alleged friendship between Messrs. Caplin and Friedman. Again, in Sherar's own words: "Now, the District Director may have, because of his own friendship or he may have wanted to avoid any embarrassment with the Commissioner, or avoid any complaint going to the Commissioner or for what reasons, or perhaps this was just administratively expedient."

Then, directly after this statement, the record of Sherar's testimony shows he admitted that he did not even know for sure if his District Director knew of the alleged friendship between Messrs. Caplin and Friedman. The more this charge is exposed to the light of reason, the more absurd it becomes.

Finally, Mr. Sherar was discharged from Internal Revenue solely because he refused to cooperate and furnish his records to substantiate deductions claimed on his own tax returns. Every employee of Internal Revenue knows full well that his own tax affairs must be completely above board. He also knows he must cooperate fully with other IRS personnel when his returns are being audited. The confidence of the American people in the equity and integrity of our tax system demands that every IRS employee be scrupulously correct in his own tax affairs.

Mr. Sherar was directed numerous times, both orally and in writing, over a period of approximately 6 months to make his records available and to cooperate with the agent examining his returns. He repeatedly refused to do so. The district director was faced with no alternative but to take disciplinary action. When informed of possible adverse action, Mr. Sherar chose not to answer the charge. Consequently, he was removed from the Service.

#### CONCLUSION

In sum, I believe this whole matter can be attributed to the poor judgment of a rather immature individual. I am sure you are well aware of Mr. Sherar's erratic behavior. In his testimony before your subcommittee, he admitted his unauthorized use of electronic equipment in routine audit cases to make surreptitious recordings of his conversations with taxpayers. Of the incidents of misuse of such equipment uncovered in IRS to date, this is the only instance where a revenue agent working a regular audit case has been involved.

In the light of Inspection's investigation and the conclusive results reported to you in this letter, I feel it would serve no useful purpose for Mr. Haywood and other San Francisco officials to appear before your subcommittee on this matter. However, if you

still feel it is necessary, I will, of course, be glad to make them available.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

SHELDON S. COHEN,  
Commissioner.

[Pursuant to S. Res. 190, 89th Cong.]  
U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON THE  
JUDICIARY, SUBCOMMITTEE ON AD-  
MINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PRO-  
CEDURE,

April 5, 1966.

Commissioner SHELDON S. COHEN,  
Internal Revenue Service,  
Department of the Treasury,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COMMISSIONER: Thank you for your letter of April 5, 1966, with respect to the charges made by Mr. Archie P. Sherar.

It would be inappropriate for me to pass on the merits of this issue as none of the documents in the case have been made available.

Needless to say, we would not have permitted Mr. Sherar to make such charges without a prior investigation if we had had any inkling that such charges would be made.

Mr. Sherar was questioned twice by staff lawyers. The first time the questioning was by Bernard Fensterwald, chief counsel of the subcommittee, in San Francisco on October 29, 1965. Mr. Robert Shaeffer of the IRS regional counsel's office was present. Mr. Sherar revealed that he used clandestine electronic listening devices on ordinary taxpayers, but gave no hint of the situation with Mr. Friedman. Mr. Sherar was reinterviewed by Mr. Gordon Homme, assistant counsel of the subcommittee, on March 30, 1966, in Washington before he took the stand as a witness. On both occasions, he was asked whether he had anything to say in addition to his revelation about electronic eavesdropping. Both times he answered in the negative. Thus, despite these two interviews, we never had any hint of the existence of the situation to which he testified. However, we were interested in his information on the use of electronic listening devices on ordinary taxpayers.

Kind regards,  
Sincerely,

EDWARD V. LONG,  
Chairman.

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,  
Washington, D.C., April 6, 1966.

Hon. EDWARD V. LONG,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Administrative  
Practice and Procedure, U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter relating to Mr. Sherar's testimony on March 30, 1966.

Our records confirm that, when Mr. Sherar was interviewed by staff on October 29, 1965, he said nothing which would have necessarily alerted you to the possibility that he would testify as he did with respect to the 1962 audit. His discharge from employment by the Internal Revenue Service on March 25, 1966 would appear to have affected his attitude toward what had occurred some 4 years earlier.

We share your regrets regarding the publicity which attached to his unexpected testimony and trust that you will continue your efforts to set the record straight.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

SHELDON S. COHEN,  
Commissioner.

#### SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REPUBLIC OF SENEGAL

Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. President, on  
April 4, the people of the Republic of

Senegal celebrated their sixth anniversary of independence from French colonial rule. Under the able leadership of President Leopold Senghor, one of the most astute politicians and intellectuals in Africa, the Senegalese have demonstrated a consistent trend in overcoming the difficulties which characterize most new states.

While still largely an agricultural country, Senegal has rapidly expanded its industrial capacity. For example, its industries process such commodities as peanuts, phosphates, oil, and tobacco, for domestic and foreign consumption. Even more diversification of the economy is expected from expansion of the tuna fishing market. A modest petroleum refinery, and a fish cannery are now being constructed. Most of Senegal's economic assistance is derived from France, though American private capital and economic assistance have received generous welcome. Peace Corps volunteers have played and continue to play a significant role in Senegal's efforts to become a truly strong and modern republic. Senegal is also cooperating with United Nations and multination efforts to develop the Senegal River Basin. A successful undertaking there will be of monumental benefit to the nations taking part therein.

Even prior to achieving independence, President Senghor and other African leaders called for a union of the various components of former French West Africa on a Federal basis. Senegal's participation in the African and Malagasy Union—UAM—and the Organization of African Unity—OAU—clearly demonstrate her commitment to active intra-African cooperation.

Before closing, I should like to pay tribute to an event for which Dakar, Senegal's beautiful capital, is host. That is the First World Festival of Negro Art which is scheduled for April 1-24.

I am sure that Congress and the American people join me in wishing the people of Senegal best wishes as they celebrate their sixth anniversary and as they host this festival which will play a significant role in increasing international understanding.

May Senegal's prosperity and progress ever continue.

#### TRIBUTE TO MR. JAMES DOLAN OF BROOKLYN, N.Y.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an article honoring Mr. Jim Dolan, president of the Brooklyn Metal Trades Council, printed in the RECORD. This article, published in the Civil Service Leader of February 22, 1966, pays tribute to Mr. Jim Dolan's work in fighting to save the Brooklyn Navy Yard and his subsequent work in helping to relocate employees of the yard losing their jobs.

As president of Carpenters Local Union 2031, and unpaid president of the Brooklyn Metal Trades Council, Mr. Dolan has demonstrated his able leadership in helping employees at the Navy yard to adjust to this major social change.

I join the workers of the Brooklyn Navy Yard in paying tribute to the able job done by Mr. Jim Dolan and com-

mend him to my colleagues in the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**JAMES DOLAN; DEDICATED TO FAIR AND DECENT TREATMENT OF BROOKLYN NAVY YARD AIDS**

"It has a great past, but it has no future." With these words, it was reported, did Robert McNamara dismiss the subject of the Brooklyn Navy Yard, shortly after he announced its scheduled closing. The order to close the shipyard was made public on November 19, 1964, and is slated to be effective on June 30, 1966, a few short months from now.

Many events have taken place between the announcement date and the present time. The *Sandoval*, *Intrepid*, *Ogden*, and *Duluth*, all fighting ships of a fighting Navy, have been completed and sent to their places on the seas in the defense of this country. With unseemly haste much of the fine facilities of the Brooklyn Navy Yard have been ordered moved or destroyed. The Hammerhead Crane, the largest weight-handling structure in the port of New York, with a replacement value of over \$2 million was sold for \$6,000 and demolished for the junk value. The navy yard with a record of 165 years of achievement was left to the control of individuals who seemed to step out of the pages of "The Caine Mutiny" or "Mr. Roberts."

But what has happened to the almost 10,000 men and women workers during this time? We can answer this question best by looking to James J. Dolan, president of the Brooklyn Metal Trades Council, president of Carpenters Local Union 2031, and now general representative of the Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America. Jim Dolan, as president of the council represents all the workers at the shipyard. For the past 2½ years he led the fight to save the navy yard and later to obtain the maximum in fair and decent treatment for the workers. This was a task that required, in many instances, 16 hours a day, innumerable meetings, frequent trips to Washington, and a dedication to his fellow workers that borders on the unbelievable. It might well be thought that the salary of president of the Brooklyn Metal Trades Council must be quite high. The reverse is true; the position does not carry a salary. As Jim said when asked, "My satisfaction is being able to help the devoted, hard-working people of the Brooklyn Navy Yard in any way possible, especially at this time when most of their fair-weather political friends are not to be found."

What has this 38-year-old father of six been able to accomplish during his time as representative of the yard workers? Prior to November 1964, he spearheaded a drive to keep the yard open that will long be remembered. The assistance of chambers of commerce, labor unions, fraternal, and business groups was obtained. Petitions numbering almost half a million were collected and forwarded to the President of the United States; street rallies attended by prominent political figures were held; a letter campaign was started; proposed legislation was submitted to our lawmakers; Madison Square Garden was packed with New Yorkers protesting the threat to the navy yard; and a comprehensive program of public education was undertaken.

The President of the United States publicly acknowledged, at Albee Square in Brooklyn, having had the Brooklyn Navy Yard future repeatedly brought to his attention. Despite these efforts of Jim Dolan, and the many who joined him in the fight, the Secretary of Defense, Robert Strange McNamara, announced the intention of closing the yard that had served the Nation so well and so long.

On November 19, 1964, the civilian work force at the navy yard totaled 9,625. The

average worker's age was 46 with 18 years of service at the yard. To this group, whose only mistake was that of choosing a career with the Federal civil service, the closure announcement was a thunderclap of doom. With their shipbuilding skills not required in the New York area and with family ties that in many cases prevented moving, they felt they were destined for the industrial scrap heap. However, at no point in the ensuing months did their dedication to duty falter. They continued to perform their work on ships in the same high-quality manner that had long ago earned the "can do" name for the shipyard. Commendation after commendation was received by the yard for top-notch work, performed on time.

#### TOP WORKMANSHIP

While the shipyard commander freely predicted an inability to produce work, the faithful men and women continued to turn out top quality workmanship. All this, while they were "working on their own coffin." When this work was finished, their jobs were through. Many believe that this sterling performance was in no small part due to the leadership of Jim Dolan and the fact that the workers knew that he was there to help them. During this time an out-placement program was established and Dolan was successful in tempering certain aspects of it that would have worked extreme hardship on the workers. He was also able to have layoffs delayed until they were required by lack of work. He continued meeting with legislators and assisted directly and indirectly in obtaining the passage of laws that provided for improvement of both retirement benefits and severance pay.

On September 16, 1965, at a testimonial dinner, Borough President Abe Stark, of Brooklyn presented a citation to Jim Dolan in recognition of his efforts "not only in behalf of the 10,000 men and women at the shipyard, but also in behalf of the people of the Borough of Brooklyn." The testimonial dinner was attended by numerous prominent labor representatives, chamber of commerce officials and most important to Jim, many of the workers whose interests he has so well represented.

Since that date many of the workers have moved on to other jobs, some in other sections of the country, others have retired, and one of his worker friends gave his life while working on the U.S.S. *Intrepid* at the navy yard. With the last ship, the U.S.S. *Duluth*, gone from the once-proud Brooklyn navy yard. With the last ship, the U.S.S. gaged in dismantling or packing machinery and equipment for shipping to other locations or scrapping. The former admiral in charge of the yard has been removed, a new admiral assigned and it is hoped a final phase of decent treatment for the remaining workers has commenced.

Thus the curtain slowly falls on the Brooklyn Navy Yard; the yard that has built and repaired the finest fighting ships of the U.S. Navy. The shipbuilding tradition that extended back to the time of Washington, Jefferson, and Adams is now to be broken. Dolan has said hopefully, "May the time never come when American lives are lost because of the navy yard that no longer exists but whose ships are vitally needed."

As for Jim Dolan, he will continue to represent and fight for fairness for his workers until the last man leaves and the gates are slowly swung shut.

#### APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the House today is acting upon the appropriation bill for fiscal 1967 for the Department of Interior and related agencies, with a \$7

million provision for the newly created National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

As chairman of the special Senate subcommittee which handled the authorizing legislation for this new program, I have a very special interest in this program and I therefore want to take special note of the House action at this time.

The \$7 million allowed by the House represents a cut of \$6,930,000—or almost 50 percent—from the administration's request of \$13,930,000 for fiscal 1967.

Most of the \$6.9 million cut is accounted for by the failure of the House Appropriations Committee to take any action at all on a \$5 million request for the National Endowment for the Humanities because the program for that endowment had not been clearly formulated at the time the House committee considered the bill. The reason was simply that the National Council on the Humanities, which is establishing the policies and guidelines for the foundation, was not sworn into office until 2 days after Dr. Henry Allen Moe, the interim chairman of the Council, was called to testify before the House committee.

I was, therefore, most pleased to note that the House committee in no way closed the door to Senate action on the request for the Humanities Foundation but simply indicated that the decision had to be deferred until the program of the Humanities Council became more clear. The pertinent passage of the House report states:

The committee has passed over this item of the request without prejudice with the understanding that it may be taken up at a later date by the Senate.

The purpose of my statement today is to state that I shall lend my efforts to Senate consideration and approval of the amount needed for the National Endowment on the Humanities, and also for the restoration of the funds requested for the National Endowment for the Arts and for administrative funds.

Mr. President, I shall at the appropriate time make a detailed defense of these programs and state what I believe are the compelling reasons why these amounts should be restored, and I hope that other Senators with an interest in this area will see fit to join me at that time. For the present, I want only to have the RECORD show the effect of the cuts as they have come from the House, and in this connection I ask unanimous consent that various articles and editorials from the Washington Post, the New York Herald Tribune, the New York Times, and the Washington Star be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 6, 1966]  
HOUSE WINDS UP DEBATE ON APPROPRIATIONS BILL

(Robert L. Asher)

A couple of GOP jabs at the arts and at spending in general fizzled under bipartisan rebuttal yesterday as the House wound up debate on a \$1.2 billion appropriation bill with only minor changes from committee recommendations made last week.

With a final vote postponed until today because of the Passover holiday, the House backed Appropriations Committee cuts and spending proposals for the arts and humanities program, Washington's subway and the Interior Department's fiscal 1967 projects.

Representative WINFIELD K. DENTON, Democrat, of Indiana, chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior, shepherded the measure through the minor skirmishes, which included one move to scuttle the entire arts and humanities request.

#### DETAILED PROPOSALS

That amendment was offered by Representative H. R. GROSS, Republican, of Iowa, who branded the program to underwrite cultural projects a "hearts-and-flowers deal."

But more Republicans than not backed the proposal, which would provide \$7 million out of a \$13.9 million request.

Of the \$6.9 million cut, \$5 million had been sought for the humanities endowment. The request was knocked out by the committee last week pending more detailed spending proposals from the new Council on Humanities which was sworn into office after the subcommittee's hearings last month.

Among GOP members urging support of the program were Representatives SILVIO O. CONTE, of Massachusetts; JOSEPH M. McDADE, of Pennsylvania; FRANK J. HORTON, of New York; THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN, of New York; and OGDEN R. REID, of New York.

DENTON said the \$7 million appropriation had been justified to his complete satisfaction, adding, "I don't know a thing about art, but I admire and I respect the people who do."

#### NEITHER SIDE SATISFIED

Referring to concern about his group's cut in the program, Denton said "Neither side is satisfied \* \* \* so we might have made a pretty good figure."

Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey, floor manager of last year's bill creating the program, pointed out that the \$5 million cut can be remedied in the Senate and said he merely was asking that the recommendations "not be cut any deeper."

Urging approval of the Committee recommendation, THOMPSON said, "We are not talking about luxuries, or window dressing or hearts and flowers. We are talking about the essential quality of American life."

He noted that the per capita expense in the bill amounts to less than 4 cents annually for the arts. "It is utter nonsense to call that an extravagance," he declared.

#### MUST NOT INTERFERE

Several Congressmen, including REID, and Representatives CHARLES S. JOELSON, Democrat, of New Jersey; ROBERT N. GLAIMO, Democrat, of Connecticut and CLAUDE PEPPER, Democrat, of Florida, warned that Congress must not try to interfere with the cultural programs to be administered by the councils.

Spending proposals for Washington's subway—minus \$8 million deleted by the Committee with a provision that it could be sought in a supplemental bill if needed—drew no discussion.

Also unchallenged was a \$6.1 million committee cut in the National Capital Planning Commission's request that had been sought to preserve parkland along the shores of the Potomac.

Representative FRANK T. BOW, Republican, of Ohio, led two unsuccessful Republican attempts to make across-the-board cuts in the bill, and will try again when the measure comes up for final passage.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 4, 1966]

#### TROUBLE FOR THE ARTS FOUNDATION

Already the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, created by Congress only last September, is running into con-

gressional trouble. A House appropriations subcommittee has cut the \$5 million authorized by the bill for the Arts Endowment to \$4 million and denied the money authorized for the Humanities Endowment altogether. Chief among the subcommittee's complaints seems to have been that the endowments' plans for spending the money were not yet sufficiently detailed.

This complaint, however, cuts to the heart of the philosophy behind the Foundation: that Federal support for the arts and humanities should be provided, but that it should be insulated from Federal control. Critics of the bill originally protested that nothing would more stifle creativity in the arts and humanities than the "dead hand" of Government, and nothing would be better calculated to realize their fears than to have the endowments answerable to a Congressional committee for their choices of projects.

Each endowment has been provided with a highly distinguished council of private experts, who may know little about legislating but know a great deal about the arts and humanities. The amount of money involved is relatively small. The principle at stake—support without interference—is large. The matter is expected to come before the House this week. By all means let the experiment be funded so that it can proceed in the only way that success is possible, which is to leave the decisions in the hands of the Foundation itself and its councils.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 5, 1966]

#### FEDERAL FUNDS FOR THE ARTS

The House Appropriations Committee has recommended a cut of \$1 million in the already miniscule \$5 million sought for direct grants in the coming fiscal year by the National Arts Endowment. Compared to annual public grants to the arts in other major countries, the American appropriation—even if the full \$5 million should be provided—would be disproportionately small.

But far more serious than the proposed cut is the way in which the House committee has undertaken to interpose its ideas on artistic issues for which it has no basis of judgment. For Congress to attempt to pass on details of the program would be a grave error, bound to lead to charges of political interference in delicate areas where Congress lacks expertise.

The law adopted last year set up a National Arts Council, and the President has appointed to it a civic minded, experienced, sensitive group of men and women. Their advice should be followed. In Great Britain, where the Arts Council decides how to spend the money appropriated by the Parliament for the arts, the program has worked impressively for more than two decades. Washington would be wise to learn from the British experience.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 5, 1966]

#### FUNDING CULTURE

Although Congress overwhelmingly approved the creation of a National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities last year, the Federal Government's cultural program already is endangered. The issue is money and the arena is the House of Representatives.

Using the guns versus butter argument, Republicans are expected to attempt on the House floor to emasculate the \$7 million appropriation that came out of committee. The amount is small, far less than one-one-hundredth of 1 percent of the 1967 budget, but the principle is of great importance. The foundation was established with the support and encouragement of the artistic and academic communities, partly to help right the unfavorable balance created by lavish Government spending in the sciences

and partly to provide seed money to nourish growth in the arts and humanities throughout the United States.

To grant the Foundation only token funds in its second year would be to dash the hopes of persons who feel that there can be a creative partnership with Government in these fields and to insult the distinguished Americans who have accepted positions on the National Arts and National Humanities councils.

A further problem for the infant program was revealed in subcommittee hearings when it was suggested that Congress might want a voice in directing the grants given out by the Foundation. While rendering judgments as to the amount of money that should be budgeted for the arts and the humanities each year, Congress ought to show the same disinterest toward individual grants and programs as it does in the sciences. To do otherwise would be to disrupt the program by alienating the advisory councils or to make it another pork barrel.

Friends of the Foundation in the Congress should muster their forces, for if their creation is to grow, prosper and retain a necessary independence, its case must be made now.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Apr. 4, 1966]

#### PENNY FOOLISH

The House Appropriations Committee has cut almost in half the request for funds for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. The request was for just under \$14 million for 1967. The committee has recommended \$7 million.

This is a great mistake on the face of it. Last year was the first time the Government feebly ventured into the field of assistance to the arts, although it has long been underwriting large areas of scientific endeavor. The first year's program, announced last November by Chairman Roger L. Stevens, showed courage, imagination, and much expert thought. There is no reason to believe those qualities will diminish. There is no reason to believe the need for financial help will diminish.

The existence of the National Foundation and its Endowments and Councils in the Arts and the Humanities has been one of the most encouraging signs of these times. It has meant national concern for the higher reaches and the higher rewards of the human spirit, a concern very long overdue. The penny-pinching spirit evinced by the committee is a discouraging reminder of the days when Congress could laugh at the very idea of the arts and humanities.

The sums involved are trifling compared to the overall budget and compared to the very real needs in those fields of culture and learning. But they are enormous in relation to the past and as omens for the future.

When the matter comes to the floor of the House this week, that body should restore the cuts.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Apr. 5, 1966]

#### "KNOW NOTHINGS" COME ALIVE AGAIN (By Doris Fleenor)

The "Know Nothings" are coming to life again in Congress under cover of President Johnson's call for domestic economies. Their immediate target is the National Foundation of the Arts and Humanities, whose request for \$14 million for 1967 has been cut to \$7 million by the House Appropriations Committee.

Washington has only just been getting accustomed to some slight deference by Congress to the fact that man does not live by bread alone. It has ventured to hope that the days when the late Senator Robert S. Kerr set the cultural tone of the legisla-

tive branch with ridicule of aesthetics were gone forever.

Public debate this week will reveal House sentiment toward crippling the program put together with idealism and intelligence by Foundation Chairman Roger L. Stevens. If the cuts are restored and maintained by the Senate, the discouraging glimpses of what went on behind the scenes may be forgotten.

Yet they should not be. They show that the trend set in motion by President and Mrs. Kennedy and carried forward by President and Mrs. Johnson could be reversed if its adherents and defenders do not work hard to sustain it.

The attackers are not at all confined to the old conservative coalition or Goldwater Republicans. House Republican leaders say they will not oppose the program as a party matter, that in fact there has been no minority discussion of it.

This is an intelligent political decision. Republicans have too long been alienated from the intellectual community, and it is a major problem in their effort to restore ideas and tone to their political dialog. For Kennedy the intellectuals had a natural affinity but they have been alienated from Johnson on the Vietnam issue and in matters of form.

The arts and humanities program is so minor in contrast to vast Federal appropriations no one Congressman will be much affected by his vote for it. But opposition will be construed by the intellectuals as hostility.

The fact is that the opposition in private sessions was set off by Members identified with the Johnson party. Other Democrats professed themselves nonplussed by this circumstance. The same old sequence occurred that is sadly familiar here. Is the President really for the bill? When others were being urged to fight for it why were not his friends called? The questions are multiplying and the rollick will be watched with unusual care.

Some of the private debate was useful and friendly even though it revealed doubts. The House group is clearly unsure what its role ought to be in a Federal cultural program and how much control it should attempt to exercise. Stevens remained cool and tactful under questions that showed the gap between his point of view and the questioner's.

Those who believe in the new effort argue that it is only fair to give the dedicated Stevens a chance, and enough money to give the program at least an even chance of survival.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 5, 1966]

#### CAPITAL OPERA HOUSE

For years every city in Europe has had its own opera house while the Capital of the United States has had none. Not only have such famous cities as Paris, Vienna, and Milan long enjoyed beautiful government-owned opera houses, but even an obscure city like Socchi in southern Russia has its own attractive opera house.

Almost every European country also has its government-sponsored art and cultural centers. Recently the Kennedy and Johnson administrations have secured small appropriations from Congress to promote arts and culture in the United States of America, though this year, because of the Vietnam war, the amount has been whittled down to \$6 million.

Today, however, Republican members of the House Appropriations Committee, led by FRANK BOW, of Ohio, and GLEN LIPSCOMB, of California, are lying in wait for the arts and culture money ready to meat ax it altogether.

Chief Republican champions of culture are BEN REIFEL, of South Dakota, only American Indian in Congress, and SILVIO CONTE, from Massachusetts.

#### STREAMLINING OF APPOINTMENTS OF CONSULAR OFFICERS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, some time ago—in fact, almost 2 years ago—the Committee on Foreign Relations began exploring with the Department of State the feasibility of streamlining the so-called routine Foreign Service lists with a view toward eliminating unnecessary confirmations.

I am very pleased that the Department of State has now announced a simplified procedure for the appointment and assignment of Foreign Service personnel who perform consular functions.

The handling of these nominations in the past has, to be sure, not been an excessive burden on the Senate or on the committee. The principal beneficiary of this change is the Department itself by the elimination of unnecessary paperwork, and I commend the Department for taking this step.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Department of State Newsletter of March 1966, entitled "The New Procedures for Appointment and Assignment of Consular Officers" be printed in the RECORD at this point together with the correspondence leading up to the announced change.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Department of State Newsletter, March 1966]

#### THE NEW PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT AND ASSIGNMENT OF CONSULAR OFFICERS

A new procedure for the appointment and assignment of Foreign Service personnel who perform consular functions was announced this month.

The new procedure will eliminate considerable paperwork, and also enable the Department to tailor consular titles to assignments.

As outlined in Foreign Affairs Manual Circular No. 389 of March 11, officers in the Foreign Service who are to perform consular functions will be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as consular officers of the United States of America—instead of as vice consuls, consuls, or consuls general.

Thus, once appointed as a consular officer, an individual will receive—as the needs of the Service require—an assignment commission as vice consul, consul, or consul general for a specific consular district.

(Assignment commissions are issued by the President upon the recommendation of the Secretary and do not require Senate action.)

Effective immediately, Foreign Service commissioned appointments will be handled as follows:

An individual entering the Foreign Service Officer Corps will be nominated by the President to be (1) a Foreign Service officer of the United States of America of a specified class and (2) a consular officer and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America. Following Senate confirmation and attestation by the President, two Presidential appointment commissions will normally be issued: one as a Foreign Service officer of the United States of America, of a specified class, and one as a consular officer and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

A Foreign Service officer already holding a Presidential appointment as vice consul or consul will be appointed a consular officer incident to his promotion to a higher class or when the needs of the Service require the use of a different consular title. No further

appointment action will be taken in the case of a Foreign Service officer of class 1, 2, or 3 who has already been appointed consul general.

A Foreign Service Reserve officer will be nominated by the President to be a consular officer and a secretary in the diplomatic service in cases where he is required to serve in a diplomatic or consular capacity. Following Senate confirmation and attestation by the President, one Presidential appointment commission will be issued, as a consular officer and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

A Foreign Service Reserve officer already holding an appointment as vice consul will be appointed a consular officer when the needs of the Service require—and his Foreign Service Reserve class permits—the use of a different consular title.

A Foreign Service Staff officer or employee will be nominated to be a consular officer when he is required to serve in a consular capacity. Following Senate confirmation and attestation by the President, one Presidential appointment commission will be issued, as a consular officer of the United States of America.

The Secretary of State will no longer appoint Foreign Service Staff officers or employees to be vice consuls. Such personnel now serving under secretarial appointments will, however, complete their present assignments. If they are again required to serve in a consular capacity, they will be appointed consular officers, as described above.

The circular pointed out that none of the new procedures affect the present procedures followed in the appointment of consular agents by the Secretary.

The consular title specified in an officer's assignment commission will normally equate with his grade, as in the past. Under the new procedure, however, consular titles no longer depend upon Senate action, and consequently may be tailored to the requirements of the assignment.

There may be occasions when an officer will receive a title higher or lower than that to which he would otherwise be entitled by virtue of his grade.

The conferral of a higher consular title will not signify reward nor will that of a lower title reflect discredit upon an officer.

As a matter of policy, the Department will not lower an officer's consular title during the course of an assignment.

Consistent with the needs of the Service, consular titles will equate with grade as follows:

#### CONSUL GENERAL

Foreign Service officers of class 1.  
Foreign Service officers of classes 2 and 3 when assigned as principal officers of a consulate general, when assigned as chief of the consular section at a large diplomatic mission, or when such title is required by the nature of the assignment.

#### CONSUL

Foreign Service officers of classes 2 through 5.  
Foreign Service Reserve officers classes 1 through 5.  
Foreign Service Staff officers of classes 1 through 4.  
Foreign Service officers or Foreign Service Reserve officers of class 6 when assigned as principal officer at a consular post.

#### VICE CONSUL

Foreign Service officers and Foreign Service Reserve officers of classes 6 through 8.  
Foreign Service Staff officers and employees of classes 5 through 8.

The circular explained that a Foreign Service officer who resigns his Presidential appointment as such, in order to join the Foreign Service Reserve Corps or the Foreign Service Staff Corps, should make clear in his written resignation that he is not also resigning his appointment as secretary