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TO: SENATOR
FROM: LB

APR. 27

You might want to glance at this before the mark-up, as I think it sums up the advantages of a State-based program which is truly representative of State wishes, needs, and which is developed by the States themselves.

It shows the relative merits of State Arts Councils over existing State Humanities Committees.
Advantages of State Arts Programs and its IMPACT

1. In ten years State appropriated funds for the arts have increased 15-fold -- from $4 million in total to more than $60 million.

(There is nothing comparable on this side for the Humanities -- there is no State funding for the State Humanities committees.)

2. Related to the growth of grass roots support of the arts in the States is the development of the COMMUNITY ARTS COUNCILS. Ten years ago there were less than 100. Today there are more than 1000.

(There is no similar development of Community Humanities Councils.)

3. Now representing the arts across the nation is the privately-run Associated Councils of the Arts. This group which has finally come into maturity represents both State and Community councils and is a spokesman for their needs. Louis Harris, the well-known pollster, is Chairman of the Associated Councils of the Arts.

(There is no similar grass-roots organization on the Humanities side.)

4. More and more municipalities are supporting the arts. Again this is a reflection of the State and Community arts movement. Stress was placed on municipal support for the arts at the joint hearings with the House. Examples were given of cities doubling arts funding within the past two years. And of mayors stating that the arts are to be viewed not

"as a luxury for the few but as basically a city service as police and fire protection."

Mayor Jackson of Atlanta recently.

(There is no parallel municipal development in the Humanities.)

5. In the past 10 years community art centers have developed in more than 100 areas -- chiefly in areas for the underprivileged. This is again grass-roots emphasis on the arts.

(There are no similar community Humanities centers.)

All these forces are combining, and in some cases snow-ball ing, to bring the benefits of the arts into national focus. This is what we mean by the IMPACT of the State program -- the impact of the Humanities State program is relatively muted.
State Funding

House Bill --

Allows for continuance of State humanities committees. They must have broad representation and their accountability is emphasized. Existing committees are required to have two members appointed by "an appropriate officer or agency of the State involved." Presumably this would be the Governor.

Allows for funding of other State entity, at the Chairman's discretion. (Chairman of the Humanities Endowment, that is.) But only one of above could be funded in a given year -- either an existing committee or another entity. The Chairman would decide which

Pell Proposal, as in the Draft

Would require that within a three-year span, a majority of members of existing State committees be appointed by the State governor involved.

Would also allow for funding of other appropriate entity concerned with humanities, and funding of agencies in States which have combined arts and Humanities responsibility.

Original Pell Proposal in bill on May, 1975 mandates State programs in Humanities on format followed by State arts agencies -- appointments come from State governors.
### Recommended

**Authorization**

Present:

**Arts** and **Humanities**, **EACH** — 113.5 (basic program) + 12.5 (Treasury) Funds

Total for the two — $126 M

$252

---

#### Funding Levels

**Funds**

(To Committee re Budget)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Arts</strong></th>
<th><strong>Humanities</strong></th>
<th><strong>Museums</strong></th>
<th><strong>Challenge</strong></th>
<th><strong>Arts in Education</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>100 + 10 (Treasury)</strong></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10/250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: We allocated these funds as follows:

- **Arts** — 137 million
- **Hums** — 113 million

Breakdown Attached

---

### House

**Possible New Alignment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Arts</strong></th>
<th><strong>Humanities</strong></th>
<th><strong>Museums</strong></th>
<th><strong>Challenge</strong></th>
<th><strong>Arts in Education</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10/250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: We allocated these funds as follows:

- **Arts** — 137 million
- **Hums** — 113 million

Breakdown Attached

---

### 2d Year of New Alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Arts</strong></th>
<th><strong>Humanities</strong></th>
<th><strong>Museums</strong></th>
<th><strong>Challenge</strong></th>
<th><strong>Arts in Education</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>103.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5/300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: A Bicentennial Era Challenge program for Humanities is being prepared by Minority

OR

**115**

**105**

**40**
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**10**

**5**

**300**
Advantages of State Arts Programs and its IMPACT

1. In ten years State appropriated funds for the arts have increased 15-fold -- from $4 million in total to more than $500 million.

(There is nothing comparable on this side for the Humanities -- there is no State funding for the State Humanities committees.)

2. Related to the growth of grass roots support of the arts in the States is the development of the COMMUNITY ARTS COUNCILS. Ten years ago there were less than 100. Today there are more than 1000.

(There is no similar development of Community Humanities Councils.)

3. Now representing the arts across the nation is the privately-run Associated Councils of the Arts. This group which has finally come into maturity represents both State and Community councils and is a spokesman for their needs. Louis Harris, the well-known pollster, is Chairman of the Associated Councils of the Arts.

(There is no similar grass-roots organization on the Humanities side.)

4. More and more municipalities are supporting the arts.

Again this is a reflection of the State and Community arts movement. Stress was placed on municipal support for the arts at the joint hearings with the House. Examples were given of cities doubling arts funding within the past two years. And of mayors stating that the arts are to be viewed not "as a luxury for the few but as basically a city service as police and fire protection."

Mayor Jackson of Atlanta recently.

(There is no parallel municipal development in the Humanities.)

5. In the past 10 years community art centers have developed in more than 100 areas -- chiefly in areas for the underprivileged. This is again grass-roots emphasis on the arts.

(There are no similar community Humanities centers.)

All these forces are combining, and in some cases snow-balling, to bring the benefits of the arts into national focus. This is what we mean by the IMPACT of the State program -- the impact of the Humanities State program is relatively muted.