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HEARINGS ON MUSEUMS

TUESDAY, JULY 19, 1973

United States Senate,

Special Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and Subcommittee on the Smithsonian Institution of the Committee on Rules and Administration

Washington, D. C.

The Subcommittee met, pursuant to recess, at 10:00 a.m. in Room 4232, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Claiborne Pell (co-chairman of the Joint Subcommittee), presiding.

Senator Pell. The Subcommittee will come to order.

Today we resume hearings before the Senate Special Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities and the Subcommittee on the Smithsonian Institution on legislation related to improving Federal support for museums.

Yesterday we received comprehensive testimony from the leadership of the Smithsonian, of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and from individuals involved with museums in my home state of Rhode Island and in Massachusetts.

Today's testimony will come from a broad spectrum
of museum leaders and representatives of museum organizations throughout the nation.

And, again, we will emphasize, toward the conclusion of today's testimony, the need for conservation and preservation of our national heritage.

If I were to summarize yesterday's testimony, I would say that the evidence indicates a documented need for expanding federal assistance to museums. We will seek to further document that concept today.

Because of the number of witnesses who will testify, I ask that each limit oral testimony to approximately five minutes. The full statements of each witness will be placed in the record.

I want to add that rarely in my twelve years and more in the Senate have I seen hearings better attended.

We are not the Watergate hearings, but we have attracted almost an equal audience. And we want to open the gates, open new vistas to aiding our museums, as the holders of our heritages, as the educators of our people, as vital cultural resources which benefit all of us.

Our first witness this morning is Mr. Charles Buckley, President of the American Association of Museums and Director, of the St. Louis Art Museum, who will be introduced by his own Senator and our good friend and colleague on the committee, on Labor and Public Welfare,
Tom Eagleton.

Senator Eagleton. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be brief and to the point, realizing the considerable time constraint you have.

It is my high privilege to present to the committee as the first witness Mr. Charles Buckley of St. Louis who is not only president of the American Association of Museums but more particularly in St. Louis is our very excellent director of our St. Louis Art Museum.

He has served in that capacity as director for eight and a half years, and we are proud both of our museum and of Mr. Buckley.

I ask leave, Mr. Chairman, to put into the record at a later time, since I left it on my desk, a letter from Mr. John Roseborough, President, St. Louis Art Museum Board, with respect to S. 796, currently pending before this committee.

Without any further ado, it is my privilege to present Mr. Buckley to the committee.

Senator Pell. Mr. Buckley, I think you are accompanied by Kyran McGrath who is director of the American Association of Museums, who does an outstanding job in representing your interests here in Washington.
STATEMENT OF CHARLES BUCKLEY, PRESIDENT
OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF MUSEUMS;
ACCOMPANIED BY KYRAN MCGRATH, DIRECTOR

Mr. Buckley. It is a great honor to be introduced by Senator Eagleton and to appear before this committee this morning.

I had the honor of appearing also before Congressman Brademas' committee last September, and at that time I thought the Museum Services Act was "admirably broad the way it was written," and that it took into account some of the most basic needs of museums, especially in regard to the emphasis it placed on renovation and development of museum facilities.

From my experience the question of proper facilities in which to conduct our operations has always loomed large, but never larger than it does now.

My entire personal experience in the museum field, like that of many of my colleagues, has been one of attempting to do a maximum job for the benefit of the public under conditions which were far from being even halfway satisfactory.

Not all American museums are rundown and delapidated, though it would be difficult to deny that many of them stand in dire need of major renovation if they are not only to develop beyond the point they have now reached, but even to maintain their present position.

Museum people are traditionally good housekeepers
and they strive to put their best foot forward so that the public will see our institutions as inviting and attractive places where at their leisure they will have the opportunity to broaden their knowledge through an informal contact with scientific, historical and artistic exhibits of many different kinds.

I suppose most of us tend to be "house proud" and we have been inclined over the years to shy away from letting our visitors know just how hard a time we have had in keeping body and soul together. Nevertheless, beyond the exhibition galleries of even some of our finest museums the facilities on which the whole public thrust of those institutions rests leave much to be desired.

I refer to facilities in broad terms, such as storage areas in order to give proper protection to collections which for various reasons might not always be on public view, but which are nonetheless of vital importance to the work of any institution, to mechanical systems of all kinds, to conservation laboratories, to work areas where so much activity goes on prior to exhibitions, and in connection with keeping a building functioning on all levels to take care of our enormous public, to libraries which, regardless of size, are vital to the functions of a museum.

I refer no less to facilities such as rest areas for the public, spaces in which to conduct educational
activities, mechanical services such as elevators, the introduction of ramps and other conveniences for the handicapped, aged and the infirm.

Thus the word "facilities" covers a great deal of territory and I am sure that any one of my colleagues here today could lengthen this list.

Much of what I am talking about has to do with older buildings which, though they may appear to be in basically good condition, require often costly renovation and updating if they are to serve the public in a proper manner.

It seems ironical to me that those well-known, privately operated, and enormously popular entertainment areas in this country -- such as public amusement parks -- that lay claim to presenting history in an easily digestible form, even though it may be entirely plastic, should be so superbly staffed and operated owing to the profits they generate while our museums, which have the genuine article in their care, are often hard pressed to adequately maintain themselves.

I doubt if any of us this morning can bring before this committee precise documentation, dollar by dollar, for the case we are making because that kind of documentation is only now beginning to emerge in any sort of useful form. It can be had, however, and one way to achieve it would be through a searching study of the physical and financial
circumstances of a given number of museums.

The number need not be large and it could even be
limited to the study of one museum selected at random from
each state.

From having visited a great many museums in this
country I am convinced that the evidence that would come to
light through such an effort would be applicable to many and,
indeed, perhaps to most of the museums of this country.

Through the efforts of our admirable National
Endowment for the Arts a far reaching study which bears
heavily on what I have been saying is now achieving final
form and should soon be ready for consideration. This study
promises to be most helpful to all of us in clarifying many
of the heretofore gray areas in regard to the operation of
our museums.

What we need to find, if we are to do even a part
of that which the public expects of its cultural institutions,
is some means of giving them basic assistance. We are
fortunate in having now, through the Endowments, a growing
and most welcome support for certain areas of our programs
and to a degree for conservation and the reinstallaation of
collections.

Through the National Museum Act we are receiving
support for projects which, in a basic way, are likely to have
a beneficial effect on wide areas of the museum world. But
still that broader area of critical concern remains: how can the museums of this country in all their variety cope with the basic problems that confront all of them -- those museums that are privately funded, those that operate on state or municipal funds and those that receive support from a combination of sources.

If what we do in the way of providing a valid form of education, not to mention aesthetic pleasure, for a mass public through the presentation of our collections, through exhibitions, and through public lectures -- which, by the way, are given so frequently, and I believe so effectively in our museums for the benefit of a very sizable adult public, that I think we tend to forget just how important an activity they really are -- is judged to have real meaning to the people of our country, then we are obliged to look ahead to find some means of getting at the problems that now keep us from doing the best of which I believe we are capable.

I don't think that any of us here today are running away from the need to develop support on the local and state level, and some of us have succeeded in doing just that, but more often than not that support reaches only a certain level and is not sufficient to allow museums to strike at the heart of the matter.

We must also recognize that our public is not entirely a local one, as a very large number of our museums
attract visitors from all over the country and more frequently, as time goes on, from abroad. Many of our collections, especially those in the larger museums, are not necessarily of local interest as they represent a national or international heritage and, therefore, can be expected to have a very wide appeal.

Therefore, in my view, federal assistance in the form of a Museum Services Act, developing with the full cooperation of our museums, would surely bring about major and lasting improvements by helping us to vastly improve the shell, or framework -- that is the museum environment itself -- within which we can further develop our services and programs, and in the long run such support could be of enormous assistance in terms of the day-to-day operations of many museums which may be still a long way from the time when local communities will see fit to recognize them as something more than a local attraction which must be content with second or third place in the community.

All of us in the museum field appreciate the attention that you, Senator Pell, and your colleagues in the Senate, and that Congressman Brademas are giving to the plight of the museums of this country.

We fully appreciate, also, the remarkable progress that has been made already through the Endowments and the National Museum Act; however, I believe there is room for a
far greater and very necessary accomplishment if we are to
succeed in our purpose of putting the museums of this country
on a firmer foundation than many of them have at the present
time.

Senator Pell. Thank you very much indeed,
Mr. Buckley.

I will also place in the record at this point a
series of statements that have come in, and the record
incidentally will be kept open for a week following these
hearings if there are any supplemental points you wish to have
offered, and also the committee may have some questions it
wants to submit in writing afterwards that we would like to
have answered.

Actually I think the hearing should be kept open
for two weeks so there will be ample time in this regard.

Mr. McGrath.

Mr. McGrath. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for
the opportunity to testify here.

In your statement you pointed out that the use of
museums has been increasing to a staggering degree. This is
ture. The attendance has increased from 300 million visits
in 1967 to a figure of 700 million visits in 1970 as reported
by the U. S. Office of Education.

This usage is continuing to cause a terrific burden
on the museums and their positive operations. We conducted
a survey in 1971 and again in 1973. I would like to intro-
duce the table in the appendix that is in my prepared
statement that bears on the age levels of museum attendants.

Our estimated 1973 results showed a 57 per cent
student age level from the preschool, elementary and high
school, college and university levels.

Mr. Chairman, to summarize most of the prepared
statement, we get to the value of museum collections, one of
the hardest figures to obtain, but at least there is some
basis on which to assess museum collections in new semi-
accreditation programs. To prepare for this testimony we
tabulated the estimated value of museum collections provided
by 186 of the 252 museums presently accredited. These
estimates are minimal, and are based essentially on evaluation
largely for purposes of insurance.

This was a total figure of $2,100,000,000. Measur-
ing that figure against the operating budgets of these 186
museums, not all of them in the country, but the 186 come up
with an average of 5.6 per cent of value of collection.
If you expand the $30 million called for in your bill, you
come up with a ratio of 0.14 per cent of the amount of
federal funding that will be available just to keep the collec-
tions in those 186 museums.

That has nothing to do with the estimate of 5,000
museums in the country. So the value of collections is one
thing; just preserving the national treasures. The utilization is still an additional benefit to the public.

Because of the interstate audience of museums that has been attested to yesterday, this does get into the federal prerogative. It is a national benefit and should be a national program.

The problems faced by museums, the cost of operations and the renovation and staff salaries still continue as the highest cost factor of the priority. The median salary of a director in an institution with a budget in the range of $50,000 to $100,000 increased from $12,428 in 1971 to $14,000 in 1973.

The median salary of a curator in a museum was an annual operating budget of $500,000 to $1 million increased from $11,844 in 1971 to $15,000 in 1973.

This also is reflected in the table contained in the appendix that I am submitting here.

These costs do continue. Even taking the 5.5 per cent figure of inflation, and if museum programs stay exactly the same and no more staff is added, no more increase in attendance, taking 5.5 per cent over 6 year figures, museums would have to have an operating budget of 40 per cent higher than it is at present. 40 per cent has to be found somewhere, whether from the municipal or local governmental support or from some federal supplement.
When you look at the levels of funding available at local governmental levels, you know how tight cities and county governments are pressed already. When you look at the potential of increased private contributions, you must view this with the results of the 1969 Tax Reform Act which precluded the amount of private contributions that could be deducted to public charities, so there is a realistic limit those levels reach, and something will have to give somewhere, either in a reduction in services or an increase in costs; something will just have to come.

As to capital improvements, renovation, the Belmont report reported in 1968 that 70 per cent of the capital construction renovation costs were borne by private sources. This is the kind of source that will have to be supplemented in the future.

For solutions of museum support you must look at the sources available. One of these statistics in the 1973 survey has to do with the sources of museum income. More than 50 per cent of museum expenditures for the year 1972 were in the field of maintenance and operations, fully 52 per cent.

The balance has to do with the types of programs. Ten per cent was spent on educational programs.

Also I might add 5.2 per cent was spent on museum acquisitions, so there is not a large amount of room to move around from let's say an acquisition and turn that into
maintenance and operations. You are only talking at the most 6 per cent of the average museum's budget.

On the accredited museums I would like to say there is a table in the appendix included in here listing a great deal of statistical data on those museums that have been determined by the profession as meeting its own standards. There are 251 across the nation. They are all sizes, and they certainly are of all disciplines: art, history and science.

I will let the full statement stand for itself, Mr. Chairman. At this point I would like to ask permission that the names of the people who have come from throughout the country to attend these sessions be inserted in the record, together with their museum affiliation, to give an indication of the broad interest within this bill, and if we can obtain the names and addresses, I would like to ask that they be included.

Senator Pell. They will be inserted in the record in full.

(List referred to follows:)

COMMITTEE INSERT
Mr. McGrath. Fine. With that I shall conclude.

Thank you.

Senator Pell. If you were asked what you thought were the most urgent needs of museums today, Mr. Buckley and Mr. McGrath, what would you like to see, the one single thrust we should move on?

Would it be financing of renovation? Would it be conservation? Would it be the changing of tax laws? Where would you like to make your main thrust?

Mr. Buckley. It would seem to me in the present situation that the renovation of many of our old facilities would be very top priority as I see it. Certainly in my case it would be in my institution.

I know that is true of other museums in my city, and I know of many museums throughout the country where I think there is an enormous area that requires attention.

In order to carry out the programs that we have initiated in the museum, we certainly need the proper setting in which to do it. I think many of us are not adequately prepared to do all that I know we can do and are struggling very hard to do.

Senator Pell. I guess when it comes to trying to obtain funds from private sources, there is not much glamor in naming an air conditioning plant after a patron, as there is to naming a wing. You cannot very well call it the Jones
Air Conditioning System.

Mr. Buckley. I have suggested that to potential donors, but no one seems to be enthralled with the idea of being identified with the air conditioning equipment.

Senator Pell. What about the actual operating costs themselves? Do you see any possibility of either increasing fees across the country?

What are the fees in your museum?

Mr. Buckley. We are free. We do not charge, and by law we cannot charge.

Senator Pell. By what law, state law?

Mr. Buckley. By state law. We do charge for special exhibits, but not to get into the museum.

Senator Pell. As a matter of philosophy, do you think it is a good idea that museums be free, or do you think they should charge, with perhaps one free day a week?

Mr. Buckley. Personally I would like to see them free because they are a public service; but as things stand they cannot very well be free. We probably would charge if we were permitted to do so.

Senator Pell. Do you subscribe to the idea if there were a small charge it might increase the attractiveness to the public, with one or two free days so that the public could go without charge if the fee were a factor of discouragement?
Mr. Buckley. That is certainly a theory that works very well in a number of institutions.

Senator Pell. Mr. McGrath.

Mr. McGrath. Mr. Chairman, on the question of admissions, I would like to point out that there is a seeming contradiction on the federal level regarding admission fees. When you look at, let us say, the Federal Property Disposal Act, there are federal properties made available to public charities, especially educational institutions, that are free to the public. If they are not free to the public, then those federal properties are not made available.

The Federal Library Construction Act made its support available to free libraries. I would hope this bill would be very clear on the point that whether a museum is free or does charge an admission, that if it is enacted, the benefits would be made available to museums rather than have this contradiction continue.

Senator Pell. What are your relations with museums around the world?

Mr. McGrath. There is an international council of museums, Mr. Chairman, and each nation has a national committee within that council. As of this past June the membership of the AAM and the membership of what was the former U.S. National Commission merged, so that the AAM now is the national voice within the international council of museums.
This guarantees a very close working cooperation with the museums throughout the world.

Senator Pell. What are the dues to belong to the ICOM?

Mr. McGrath. For individuals, from $5 up to $25; and for institutions they just voted a raise last week that will take effect in January at ICOM at the Paris headquarters of $50 for the small museum up to $250 or $500, depending on the size of the annual operating budget of the museum.

Senator Pell. Is that not a rather low dues for institutions?

Mr. McGrath. Many of them can barely afford our own dues which are a minimum of $50. We get letters all the time: Please won't you let us stay in for less than that?

It is difficult to say, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Pell. I have been requested by Senator Taft to ask this question: Do you believe a special bill for museums could set up a bad precedent?

Mr. McGrath. For myself, I do not. Looking at the context of other institutions throughout the country, there have been separate legislation for universities, which was a precedent back in the early '50s, for hospital support at the federal level, the Hill-Burton Act right after World War II; for libraries, about 14 years ago, the Federal Library Construction and Services Act.
It appears there is justification when the need arises, and if a particular type of institution has such a large need and is able to demonstrate it, and it has a national effect, I think federal legislation would be very responsive and be justified.

Senator Pell. Also, Senator Taft asked me to ask this question: Why should not museums come in on regular national endowments and make their case that way?

Mr. McGrath. Reading back through the original Congressional Record and the hearings on the enactment of the National Endowments in the early and mid-'60s, and indeed continuing through their three-year reauthorizations, as most recently as this past March, the restrictions, if you will, are on operations and maintenance and renovation.

Now, they can do it on an emergency basis, which I am delighted to report, that they do with especially humidity control, but only on an emergency basis.

There are so many emergencies right now that their whole budget could be used up just meeting emergencies.

The day-to-day operation of a museum that may be avoiding reporting a deficit by cutting back on its staff members or just eliminating an education department or reducing the number of exhibitions by 50 per cent sort of belies this financial situation of those institutions that are forced to resort to those kinds of activities in reduction.
in services just to break even.

As we all are aware, many museums are prohibited by local governmental laws under which they are sponsored from reporting a deficit, so they can only spend what they have appropriated.

Senator Pell. Would you say perhaps that the need of museums can be met best through the expansion of existing programs, and that no new legislation is needed?

Mr. McGrath. Possibly if present legislation within the endowments were expanded to include operations, both in philosophy and in practice, operations, maintenance, renovation -- or where appropriate new construction, when it is less expensive than renovation -- that could be accommodated.

The National Museums Act or some kind of vehicle within it discussed under your questioning yesterday might be appropriate. Whatever vehicle would be taken, I think it is extremely important that the structure of it be proper such that in years to come, two years, five years, ten years from now the mechanics of the museum support program be so objective that the needs of the museums will be responded to, and if these needs for this decade are operational or renovational, then those are the needs that should be reflected.

Senator Pell. I am glad to say that upon my motion the Congress, between the Senate and the House, yesterday afternoon we considered its previous rejection of the idea
there should be a $250,000 limitation to renovation. It is now authorized for above $250,000, provided there is a two-thirds or more vote in support by the National Council of the Arts.

So one of these problems we have corrected yesterday in part thanks to the testimony that was offered yesterday. You see the government moves quite fast in some cases.

Mr. McGrath. It does indeed.

As a living, breathing example, I have information about the museum in Sioux City, Iowa which was closed four months ago because the structural steel had rotted through, completely rusted through, and the museum will be closed for the balance of this year, and they found it quite by accident.

During that year while they are looking for monies to repair it, the public is just shut off from that museum.

Senator Pella. I thank you very much indeed. There is a roll call vote going on so we will have to recess the committee for about 8 minutes while I go over and vote.

In the meantime I thank you, Mr. McGrath and Mr. Buckley for being here and I thank Mr. McGrath for his work and cooperation with this committee and with me and for all the leadership the AAM has given.

The next witnesses will be Mr. Otto Wittmann, Director, Toledo Museum of Art, representing the Association of Art Museum Directors; Mr. Daniel Porter, Director, Ohio
Historical Society, representing the American Association for State and Local History; and Dr. Philip S. Humphrey, Executive Secretary, Association of Systematics.

Perhaps you would all care to come forward and take your seats. If another senator comes in before I return, I trust the hearing will be resumed.

If not, we will resume at 10:45.

(Recess)

Senator Pell. The subcommittee will resume its hearings, and I realize that Mr. Otto Wittmann, Mr. Daniel Porter and Dr. Philip Humphrey are representing completely different groups of interest, but I thought some of the questions might be common to all three of you, and I would like to ask Mr. Wittmann if he would lead off.

As I said earlier, he is not only director of the Toledo Museum of Art but he is representing the Association of Art Museum Directors.

STATEMENTS OF OTTO WITTMANN, DIRECTOR, TOLEDO MUSEUM OF ART, REPRESENTING THE ASSOCIATION OF ART MUSEUM DIRECTORS; DANIEL PORTER, DIRECTOR, OHIO HISTORICAL SOCIETY, REPRESENTING THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR STATE AND LOCAL HISTORY; AND DR. PHILIP S. HUMPHREY, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, ASSOCIATION OF SYSTEMATIC COLLECTIONS

Mr. Wittmann. Senator Pell, thank you very much for
inviting me to be present today. I do represent the Association of Art Museum Directors, a national association made up of the directors of the leading major art museums of this country. I am also a vice president of the American Association of Museums.

Senator Pell, it was exactly ten years ago that I first testified before you, then on behalf of the American Association of Museums on a bill which eventually made possible the Endowment for the Arts and for the Humanities.

Much has happened during that ten year period, I think more than any of us thought possible at the time, and I want to pay tribute to you for your leadership in the growth of the arts, to Roger Stevens, who led the National Council of the Arts on which I served, and more especially to Nancy Hanks, Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts which has placed the arts and humanities on a scale never before achieved.

I also want to pay tribute to the establishment of the National Endowment for the Humanities and to the National Museums Act, all of which have affected museums.

Senator Pell. May I interrupt here and state that the on-ward march of the authorizations is very much up in the air now, and we are having a battle with the House, conferees on this, and that I am sure you are aware of the names of the conferees.
I would just invite the attention of you who are here to this fact because they would like to see a much smaller amount of money appropriated than the Senate bill would authorize, and we need a little help in this respect.

Mr. Wittmann. Thank you. However, Senator Pell, today I think after ten years the assistance, with all the assistance and good will and support, American museums are probably worse off, not better off, than they were ten years ago. Of course we all realize that inflation has taken a great toll, but really the increased emphasis on education programs in museums has brought the public in increasing numbers to museums, and, unlike any other business I know about, the more successful we are, the more it costs us.

We are all non-profit institutions, and it seems there is a great emphasis on the "non" these days.

My own museum, the Toledo Museum of Art, which is one of the great mid-west museums, has a budget which has increased 110 per cent during this past decade. We have always considered ourself an educational institution, and today we have one of the largest educational programs in the country, but all this costs more as we serve more people.

Our educational formula seems to be successful for our own reasons. It might work in another museum, it works for us, it changes and grows with the times; it is innovative, but the basis of it is a sound on-going program.
What we and what most art museums need are increased funds to carry on these existing operations.

We all need funds to update the old buildings which most of us have to preserve, and conserve the art for which we are responsible. I have not heard any figures as to how much art has come into this country since say the end of World War II, but in our own museum for instance the collections have doubled in size during that 25 year period, and we are now responsible for these works of art, for their conservation, for their preservation, for all time to come.

We not only have these works of art, but it is our responsibility to care for them. Therefore conservation is of utmost importance to art museums in this country.

We also need funds to keep our doors open, to serve the people who come in in every increasing numbers to enjoy and learn from the American museums.

None of us wants or expects complete federal support. Art museums especially have traditionally been privately supported institutions. This support should continue to be encouraged.

It can be stimulated through matching funds and federal funds. We therefore support S. 796, the Museum Services Act, because it will increase the quality of life for all Americans by allowing American museums better to serve the millions who visit us every year.
We also support the National Endowment for the Arts and the Humanities. I do not think it is a question of either/or, but the broad need for all if the people of our country are to be served in the way in which they should be by the museums of our country.

Senator Pell. Thank you very much Mr. Wittmann.

I now ask Mr. Porter if he would care to make a short statement.

I want to say to all of you that if you want to have your statements appear in the record in full, this will be done, and you may just summarize.

Mr. Porter. Thank you, sir. I am Daniel Porter, director of the Ohio Historical Society, a non-profit corporation which administers 32 museums and historic restorations throughout Ohio including the state museum, with an annual operating budget this year of $3 million and a staff of 300 serving approximately 2.75 million persons annually.

I am here today attempting to represent the history museums of the nation and hopefully to express the interest of these associations in the proposed Museum Services Act. I am also representing the American Association for State and Local History of Nashville, Tennessee, on which association Council I am privileged to sit.

Historical museums are the most numerous of all types of such institutions. If Ohio may be considered typical of
the nation as a whole, as it is so often in testing new soap and cosmetic products, the following statistics are meaningful. Ohio has at present, excluding state assisted museums of the Ohio Historical Society and federal museums, three natural history museums, ten art museums, and 103 historical museums, all of a non-profit nature.

History museums, while being the most numerous of all such associations, are certainly the poor relations of the museum world. The combined annual operating budgets of Ohio's 103 private history museums do not begin to approach that of the ten art museums. In fact, the operating budget of the Cleveland Art Museum nearly totals the combined budgets of all the state's private history museums.

Of Ohio's 103 non-profit history museum associations only 15 have one or more professional staff members. The remainder are administered by lay volunteers, trustees, and officers. The programs of these volunteer institutions are hardly educational in thrust. Rather, the majority of these historical museums are shrines to pioneer ancestor worship. They own in many instances unique and valuable collections, but these holdings are not properly utilized for public education nor are they properly maintained.

This, then, Mr. Chairman, brings me to the first point I wish to make concerning the Museum Services Act. The definition of a museum contained therein would immediately
eliminate from assistance under this act the vast majority of American museums which could be most profitably served by it. Respectfully, Mr. Chairman, I would like to request the deletion from the definition of museums given in the bill the phrase "utilizing a professional staff."

The most valuable aspect of this bill in my opinion is its potentiality in raising the status of hundreds of small history museums from shrines to educational institutions. A small, unprofessional history museum having, as do most, an annual operating budget of from $5,000 to $15,000 could literally transform itself, could rise Phoenix-like from its own ashes, with an $8,000 or $10,000 annual federal grant which would permit such museums to employ one professional staff member giving, thereby, new objective and purpose to its programs and excellent on-the-job training for beginning professionals.

Until such museums receive that extra boost, they are forced to utilize their present private resources exclusively for building maintenance and repair, utilities, and non-professional services required merely to keep their doors open. As museums are presently defined in this bill, no hope, no means of attaining useful community service, could be expected.

Mr. Chairman, you perceptively noted in your remarks introducing this bill in the Senate that the federal government...
has importantly assisted libraries to improve their services. Libraries are for the most part service organizations making available to broad segments to the public the creative efforts of authors and the commercial productions of publishers. Museums have a potential for even greater cultural service for they originate, document, as well as present knowledge. They embrace in one institution researchers, authors, artists, scholars, editors, and librarians, an array of creative talent no library can claim. They are also publishers as well as creators of works of educational art -- exhibits.

The amounts of federal assistance which this bill would authorize appear generous indeed. But when one considers the deductions required to administer the act at the federal level, then divides the amounts among the 50 states, the sum is much less dazzling. There will, then, be considerable competition among qualifying museums for pieces of this federal largess which brings me to a second comment on the bill, the manner by which it will be administered and largely for whom.

You have pointed out, Mr. Chairman, the federal assistance which libraries have been receiving. Each state, I believe, has a state library or other official state agency through which such federal assistance is funneled in an orderly fashion to individual libraries.

No such competent organization exists at the state
level for museums. Many states, a majority, have state museums. But these institutions are largely anthropologically and historically oriented. They are incapable of representing art museums.

Many states, including your own, Mr. Chairman, and California, to cite but two examples, are without state museums. How then, may be asked, is it possible for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Institute for the Improvement of Museum Services to funnel federal grants to the multitude of individual museum organizations in the states which desire this help?

The National Endowment for the Arts solved this problem by fostering the creation of state arts councils to perform this services. The Humanities Endowment deals primarily with universities and through state-based programs under appointive committees.

How can, at the state level, this proposed museums assistance program be implemented through HEW which to date in its museum support programs has dealt primarily with school boards?

We cannot recommend the creation of new state agencies for such a purpose. It would open a bucket of worms and would disrupt roles long since carved out by state museums. A cultural battle field would result if still another level of state administration were created to implement this
It would appear that the alternative would cause another type of conflict, that of grantsmanship, played to the hilt. Each museum would be responsible for applying to the institute created under this bill for its funds. This game of grantsmanship is a most dangerous and unequal one. The large museums with staffs of accountants and professionals who are familiar with museum and bureaucratic jargon have a decided advantage in playing this deadly serious game over their smaller peers.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to whether or not new construction, rehabilitation and atmospheric conditioning should be included within this bill, we think as a general rule from our experience that the easiest kind of money museums can get is for the new buildings, the brick and mortar money, and, secondly, for acquisitions, but you cannot put a plank on an operating budget.

There is not a small museum in the nation which can wade through and comply with complex and often contradictory federal regulations. The Ohio Historical Society has three accountants on its regular staff and with this expertise we are unable to fathom and comply with this unnecessary gobbledegook thus denying federal funds under other programs to which the Society is legally entitled but cannot receive because of the cost and difficulty of compliance with these
regulations on regulations.

Federal agencies are geared to working with their state counterparts. Direct federal-private grantee programs are cumbersome and trap-laden for unwary recipients.

If funds eventually appropriated by Congress to HEW are granted and audited in the same fashion as other such programs presently in existence, the intent of this bill will be subverted in the favor of a few wealthy museums which can purchase the expertise required to compete successfully in this jungle of grantsmanship.

These, then are our concerns with this bill. At the same time, I do not wish to imply that our enthusiasm for this bill is less than wholehearted. Properly and equitably administered the program can spell, at a small fraction of the total cost of administering the nation's museums, the difference between mediocrity or excellence.

And in no way can the provisions of this act be more beneficial than in raising the levels of performance, even the very tenor and direction of small museum programs, from the antiquarian to the educational, from moldy shrines to modern, educationally-oriented institutions.

The key to the success of this proposed program will rest in the hands of the Institute created by the bill. If Presidential appointments to the Board are truly representa-
grants is removed from the federal-state partnership which exists for most other federal assistance programs, rather than the creation of a new museum bureaucracy in each state, this act can have a measurably positive effect upon the public usefulness of the nation's museums.

Yet, the key to success or failure of this program lies with Congress and its ultimate funding at the full level of authorization provided in the bill, and in HEW which, with the Institute, will either make or break the bill's intent by the system they devise for its administration.

Federal funds, dangled like carrots on a string before recalcitrant beneficiaries, have proven effective means of raising standards of performance and excellence, if, and I emphasize the conditionality, such programs are administered in conformity to the intent of Congress and the betterment of recipient programs within a broad, flexible framework crafted to encourage diversity, experimentation, and creativity rather than conformity or uniformity conceived and imposed by the federal museum establishment in Washington.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, for your patient receipt of these remarks.

Senator Pell. Thank you very much. Our next witness is Philip S. Humphrey, Executive Secretary, Association of Systematics Collections, and maybe he will tell me what Systematics Collections means.
Mr. Humphrey. I will, sir.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before the Special Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities today in support of the Museum Services Act. I appear as Interim Secretary of the Association of Systematics Collections.

The Association I represent is a group of museums and other institutions housing collections of natural history specimens which together comprise a major national resource.

The Association, a new organization, has after one year a membership of forty-three institutions, of which forty are in the United States; the other three are Canadian. There are in the United States approximately 500 such institutions with an estimated 150 to 200 million biological specimens through systematics collections. About eighty per cent of these specimens are housed in the collections of ASC member institutions.

These collections are the only permanent record of the million and a half presently known species of plants and animals of the world. They are used for scientific and educational purposes and regularly are made available to the public or agencies of the public through the provision of applied scientific and educational services, which usually but not always include public exhibits.

The nation's systematics collections are growing at the rate of 1 per cent to 2 per cent per year; one and
one-half to four million specimens are added to the collections annually. While part of this growth is the natural outcome of the continuing scientific inventory of the plant and animal life of the world, a great deal is the direct result of the performance of services for the federal government and other agencies of the public.

This continued growth has grave implications for systematics collections, many of which already are overcrowded, understaffed, and housed in ancient buildings requiring major renovations and increased space.

Systematics collections and their related scientific research represent the ultimate basis for all the educational and other services which are increasingly valued by the public from natural history museums. Yet the collections themselves, inadequately housed and cared for, are becoming rapidly less and less accessible.

When the resources of an institution already are marginal, balancing the fiscal requirements of educational and other services against those of the growing collections is an increasingly difficult task.

The goal of ASC member institutions housing systematics collections is to develop these collections into a more effective national resource, responsive to the needs of science, applied science, and education at all levels.

Given skyrocketing costs, the increasing demand for
services, and the added burden of continued growth of the
collections, the problems affecting the nation's systematics
collections inevitably become worse every year and the
solutions more difficult and expensive to implement.

What are the problems? There are two kinds:

First, those which for the most part could be solved
cooperatively by the people directly responsible for the
collections, i.e., problems of inadequate information,
inadequate standards, and inadequate management.

Second, those which could be solved by increased
support from federal and other sources, i.e., problems of
inadequate space, personnel, equipment, library, and other
resources to operate the collections, and inadequate services
to the public.

The problems of institutions responsible for the
nation's systematics collections and the essential services
they provide have been addressed in several studies, copies
of which I submit to the Subcommittee.

- The systematic biology collections of the United
States. An essential resource. Part I. -- The great
collections: Their nature, importance, condition and future.
New York Botanical Garden, New York. 33 p. ["Steere Report"]

- Systematics in support of biological research.
Division of Biology and Agriculture of the National Research

In addition, a report on "The Life Sciences," issued by the National Academy of Sciences, stated that:

The natural history museums of the United States constitute an invaluable and long-neglected resource for public education and research. (p. 50)

Systematics collections of plants and animals are the only permanent record of the earth's biota, and the specialized libraries attached to these collections are the written record of the earth's natural history. The financial needs of the systematics collections are relatively small compared to the sums currently spent for facilities in other branches of science. The major systematic biological collections are national assets and should be treated as such; many of them desperately need help now. (Pages 354-356)

I cite the National Academy report today simply to emphasize the national importance of these collections and the need for the kind of aid contemplated through the Museum Services Act by the institutional members of the Association of
Mr. Chairman, the museums of the United States are one of our nation's most precious resources. They have been generously supported by private philanthropy and by local tax sources. We feel that it is now time for the federal government to begin to assume a modest portion of the operating costs of these institutions that serve a constituency far beyond local and state boundaries.

I am grateful for the opportunity to speak in support of S. 796.

Senator Pell. We will be very happy to review these reports that you mentioned, and if possible place parts of them in the record.

(Reports referred to follow:)

COMMITTEE INSERT
Senator Pell. For my own education, Systematics Collections is what we used to call natural history museums with rocks and samples of geologic matter?

Mr. Humphrey. Yes sir. They are in the context of this report scientific collections of plants and animals represented in our own great Smithsonian Institute, for example, in the Natural History Museum.

Senator Pell. This is one of the things this hearing brought out yesterday when we had the problems in my own state showing the three different museums, the large university museum, relatively large for us, the State Historical Society, and then systematics collections which I must say have the smallest operating budget of any association, I think $5,000 a year. Would that be about the smallest?

Mr. Humphrey. I do not understand your question, sir.

Senator Pell. I was asking whether or not that would be the smallest budget of any not counting the salaries. It's total operating budget was $5,000 a year.

Mr. Humphrey. I would imagine in some universities and colleges systematics collections operating budget would be substantially less than $5,000 a year, having the peculiar situation of the overhead being provided by the university as it were.

Senator Pell. I guess the fine arts cannot have the
same economy of operation you do.

I would like to ask each of you this question. What do you see as the greatest single need? Where do you think the subcommittee should focus? What is the need for your constituency?

First I would like to ask Mr. Wittmann.

Mr. Wittmann. I think our greatest single need probably is for the conservation for the works of art which have come into this country. We need to take care of these great assets which belong to us.

That would be followed very closely by the renovation of the buildings.

Senator Pell. Would you say that the rate of erosion of works of art exceeds the supply of acquisitions from outside of the United States, or is it about in balance?

Mr. Wittmann. I think there is an erosion of works of art. Any physical thing deteriorates at all times, and the fact that we are acquiring so many additional works of art in this country only brings to us the responsibility of caring for these larger numbers of works of art.

I don't think any of us is quite aware yet of the great numbers of works of art for which we are responsible, not only for our own time but for the time of our children and the future.

Here are great assets which must be preserved, and
they do deteriorate, and they must be cared for. Every work of art, for instance, needs some kind of attention. You will hear later testimony that will be much more important than mine, but I would think any major work of art has to have something done to it every 50 years. You must revise it, realign it, just take care of it. I am speaking of paintings.

Senator Pell. This applies not only to paintings and to sculpture but I know even to the cannon.

Mr. Wittmann. That is exactly right. Any kind of physical material deteriorates. Every museum has this same kind of problem. I am not speaking only for the art museums.

Senator Pell. Another philosophical question is: What do you consider your responsibility as museum director if you find you have a work of art that was received improperly?

What would be your view as a museum director if you found that your collection contained a piece that had been illegally acquired or stolen and had been in your possession, and you had acquired it innocently?

Mr. Wittmann. That is a complicated question. If the work of art were stolen, I suppose it should be returned. It is never quite as clear as that.

For instance the work of art that was taken during the war by someone, and then resold, and we bought it in good faith.
I think in most cases the museum would try to see these are returned where they belong. The question is how we can interpret this illegal acquisition which is a very different field. It involves not only our own laws but laws of other countries.

Senator Pell. I would like to ask Mr. Porter what he would think as being the principal need.

Mr. Porter. Mr. Chairman, in the History Museum world the greatest need is small additional increments of funds for the operating budget to provide for professional staff where it does not exist or where such staff are insufficient to conduct basic programs and thereby properly conserve, maintain and present collections.

Senator Pell. Dr. Humphrey, what would be your thought?

Mr. Humphrey. Senator Pell, I find it a little difficult to answer the question precisely in terms of new buildings versus additional operating budget, and this sort of thing, because as one goes from one part of the country to another and looks at the problems of different museums, you find some of them need desperately new or renovated space, while others need assistance with operating budgets or with additional staff.

I find myself impressed with the Museums Services Act because it covers most of these things. I find the only
thing it leaves out that I would like to be in there is actual monies for construction and renovation of space.
Senator Pell. Another thought I have had is that possibly this is where I have been remiss, wearing another hat as I wear as chairman of the Education Subcommittee. Maybe we ought to have tied museums more into the educational process so that states would do what is done in my state where all the students will go through the museum at least one day.

You have programs of that sort in your area? Does every student in Toledo go as a matter of course to the Toledo art museum before he or she graduates?

Mr. Wittmann. Yes. We have worked with the public school system of Toledo for four years, and with as many small towns around us. I would guess not everyone comes, but that close to 90 per cent of the children come, but they come for more than one trip.

Usually they come six times during the year and study in our museum what they are studying in school. It is a closely related program.

When they are studying American history, they come and look at the American paintings in our museum, and they are talked to along these lines. So the whole thing is tied in very carefully.

Of course in a state like Ohio we have many museums. We cannot do this for the entire state as you can in your state, but Cleveland does the same thing, and I am
sure Cincinnati does, and other parts of the state of Ohio.

Senator Pell. Mr. Porter.

Mr. Porter. The Ohio Historical Society serves approximately 500,000 school children in organized groups per year. In addition we work with the State Department of Education in preparing teaching materials coordinated with the curriculum which is most important.

But the biggest reason why museums have not been considered in my opinion educational institutions is the fact that they are non-degree granting, and until they give degrees they cannot be generally considered truly an educational institution, preparing students armed with a diploma for a lifetime of work.

Senator Pell. You have some other aspects that are educational. Although it is not degree granting in athletics, yet it is one of the cycles to which the student is expected to go, and perhaps we should make sure every student before receiving a degree goes through this exposure.

Mr. Porter. Yes, but the museum role in this is an ancillary role, it is not a primary role, because the museum does not grant the degree.

Senator Pell. Mr. Humphrey.

Mr. Humphrey. I might comment on this series of remarks because at the University of Kansas Museum of Natural History it is a non-degree granting division of the
university. We nevertheless consider ourselves an educational resource in the town of Lawrence, Kansas, and I may say this has become increasingly important not only for our own museum of natural history but for many others throughout the country.

At the University of Kansas Natural History from fiscal year 1967 to this year we have had a 700 per cent increase in the school services programs, formal ones which we have offered to the local school children.

I think part of this is directly related to the increasing concern for environmental quality and increasing emphasis in the public schools on science education, and I think this is a matter where pressures of public expression are increasing throughout the country.

Senator Pell. I thank all of you very much indeed. If any of you have any further thoughts afterwards, feel free to submit them, and they will become part of the record.

Our next witness is Ewald Nyquist, Commissioner, Department of Education of New York State, an old friend of this committee and others who deal with education.

Would you introduce those who are accompanying you.
STATEMENT OF EWALD B. NYQUIST, PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION; ACCOMPANIED BY N.C. FRITZINGER, P. ALISTAIR MACKINNON AND CARROLL LINDSAY

Senator Pell. We are under considerable time constraints, so that if you would like to have your statement included in the record, it will appear in its entirety, and you may summarize.

Mr. Nyquist. I believe my statement will answer some of the questions that you have raised.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am Ewald B. Nyquist, President of the University of the State of New York and Commissioner of Education. I am grateful for the opportunity of appearing before your subcommittee to testify on the role of museums in the educational system, certain problems which they confront, and more particularly, the Museum Services Act, S. 796.

On June 19, 1956, when President Eisenhower signed the Library Services Act (Public Law 597, 84th Congress), he stated in part, "It shows promise of leading to a significant enrichment of the lives of millions of Americans . . ." This program, now called the Library Services and Construction Act, is serving us well. There is a need to view our educational resources as a macro-educational system extending far beyond the formal educational agencies of school and colleges. It includes, in addition to our
public libraries -- museums, performing arts centers, historical societies, research laboratories, radio, television, VISTA, the Peace Corps -- and much more. One believe of mine is that we must not confuse learning with education or education with schooling.

The majority of cultural institutions are victimized by their own success; they are faced by a rapidly rising clientele without a commensurate increase in financial support. In three decades, museum visits nationwide have increased 1400 per cent, from 50 million annually to 700 million. In fiscal year 1971, the over 100 museums in New York State received 27 million visits. In the same period, almost five million visits were made by students to museums as a part of organized school groups. Furthermore, these museums provided organized services to over 900,000 persons through their various adult education programs.

A recent study in New York entitled, "Arts and the People -- A Survey of Public Attitudes and Participation in the Arts and Culture in New York State", points out that not only the rich or the highly educated value and esteem our cultural institutions. But, these feelings are shared by many people up and down the economic scale and in every region of the state. According to the study, the public wants more cultural facilities in their neighborhoods and find their lack of such facilities a major problem,
outranking such highly publicized issues as inadequate housing, poor schools, and insufficient parks. The strongest dissatisfaction was expressed by non-white interviewees, a full 72 per cent of whom criticized this deficiency.

There are two purposes to education: one is to help young people learn a living, career preparation, if you will, and secondly, to help people learn how to live a life: a creative, sensitive, and humane life. Or, stated another way, as a famous man once said: The primary purpose of education is not to teach you to earn your bread, but to make every mouthful sweeter.

Just as the Hebrew sages have claimed that man does not live by bread alone -- thus emphasizing to us that we live by ideals and spiritual renewal and values -- so have they also remarked that were there is no bread there is no Torah -- thus reminding us that we must also be practical, that there are practicalities which must limit our idealists.

The recognition that museums are indeed so great an educational resource leads at once to concern for their present and future financial and program stability. Historically, museums have depended upon private philanthropy, but for a variety of reasons, this source of funds is no longer sufficient. Even the Smithsonian Institution, "The Nation's Attic" and one of the most diverse and
representative of our cultural institutions, was initiated by private philanthropy.

In New York State, and this is true throughout the United States, the greatest source of public funds available to museums is from local government, that is from towns, cities and counties. In proportion to the total budget of museums, state funds in New York, as elsewhere, are a small factor in their operations. This is the case in spite of the fact that New York State devotes more state money to museum support than any other state and has for several years been a recognized leader in the state support of cultural activities.

In New York State, local government funds cover about 20 per cent of the operating costs of museums. State funds distributed through the New York State Council on the Arts provide about three per cent of the total operating costs of the state's museums and the two national endowments contributed an additional two per cent. Thus, about three-quarters of the operating costs of museums must be met from private sources or from income derived from museum activities.

The bill, the Museum Services Act, points out a special need as did the Library Services Act. State and local government finances are being stretched to assist. Present federal mechanisms through the endowments and other
programs are being of little additional assistance. I must
question whether yet another Institute in the Department of
Health, Education and Welfare will help to achieve a co-
hesive approach to easing the financial burden borne by
museums. Rather, we need to make -- as I like to say -- a
"mesh" of things.

Albert Einstein said, Things should be as simple
as possible, but not one bit simpler.

Whatever the nature and amount of government
assistance to museums, the fact remains that museums must
have additional funds if they are to maintain an adequate
level of operational and program activity. The financial
support required to meet the need will have to come from
all levels of government as well as private sources.
Ideally, these additional funds should be directed first to
aiding museums to maintain or improve their basic operations.

A recent and exhaustive study of museums in New
York conducted by an affiliate of Louis Harris Associates
clearly shows that the first and most urgent need is for
larger and more qualified staffing; second is the need for
more space and physical facilities. In third place is the
need for more programs.

The New York State Education Department and the
Board of Regents have been aware for some time of the pro-
blems I have noted here, that is of the mismatch between the
public use and the public support of museums, and of the need to close the widening gap between operational requirements and the funds available. In January of this year, I described this problem to the New York State Commission on Cultural Resources and also directed the staff of the State Education Department to prepare a plan to help meet these museum needs. Such a plan has been developed in close cooperation with the New York State Association of Museums.

Essentially, this plan provides for state funds for properly registered and accredited museums in proportion to the amount of their net operating income exclusive of any local, state, or federal funds already received by the museum. The total sum involved in this plan ($5,000 annually) would amount to eight per cent of the total operating income of the museums raised from all private sources. This would be an important step forward, and has the unanimous support not surprisingly, of the museums in the state.

This plan to provide continuing operating support, as distinct from project aid, is similar to a system which in New York State has provided state funds for the operation of libraries for 23 years and a more recent plan of the same sort to provide operating aid to educational television stations. The library aid program has proved very successful, and there is every reason to anticipate success for
the museum plan if it were to be adopted by the state
government.

New York State, first through the Council on the
Arts and now in addition in the form of the Regents Pro-
posal, is striving to meet its obligation. However, broad
federal support will be required if museums are to play
their full educational role. We believe that the benefits
of museums are shared by all the people and by all levels
of government alike, and therefore, all must share in the
responsibility for their continued performance.

The aid programs of the National Endowments for
the Arts and for the Humanities, particularly the former,
are assisting museums to carry out specific programs. A
limited amount of National Endowments for the Arts support
does go toward projects which relate to basic museum
operational needs. The amounts available for this purpose
are however insufficient to the need.

Thus, I want to express my firm support of the
intent and general provisions of this proposed legislation,
at the federal level, as being directed toward an unsatis-
fied need. Speaking on behalf of the Regents and the State
Education Department, I have repeatedly expressed our con-
cern for the availability and quality of education ex-
periences that transcend formal learning. Because museums
are essential to a full and balanced education, ways and means
must be found to assist them to develop exhibit programs, professional staff and modern methods as well as sufficient facilities. We believe that the major current need is to improve the routine operational competence of museums through public financial support. S.796 can produce a significant and lasting benefit in this area.

I am going to skip the closing, but I would like to ask that a position paper entitled "Culture and Education," issued by the New York State Board of Regents in January of this year, be made a part of the record.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Pell. Thank you very much indeed. I am going to ask this question at the request of Senator Javits who regretted very much that he was not able to be here to welcome you as a fellow New Yorker to the hearing.

On page 4 of your testimony you question yet another institute in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare being created.

As you may know, I myself have some doubts about this being the logical place for it. Do you have any other thoughts as to where it could find/happy resting place.

Mr. Nyquist. Let me say this. I think it could become a part of the Education Division. You have the Library Services and Construction Act. You have the
National Institute of Education. It might become a part of the Cultural Council. This program could be added in that area.

Senator Pell. My question concerns your reaction to another idea that I advanced yesterday which is perhaps the logical place for it would be as a small division within the Smithsonian institution. What would be your reaction to that?

They have complete lack of enthusiasm for the idea, but it seemed to me there might be some logic behind it.

Mr. Nyquist. Let me take a look at your bill. I think related things ought to stick together.

The purpose of your bill is to encourage and assist museums in their educational role in conjunction with the formal systems of elementary, secondary and post secondary education, and with programs of formal education of all age groups.

I think my suggestion is much more logical than yours.

Senator Pell. Because it ties in with education?

Mr. Nyquist. Yes.

Museums are considered a frill and the first thing that goes in the school system is art and music in the elementary grades, and I think we are going to have to tie
them closer if we are really going to get the educational
benefit from them.

Senator Pell. What do you think of the idea of
making more use of the museums in the education processes
of our country, now making it as a matter of course that at
some point in high school students would go through museums?

Mr. Nyquist. Very much. I am going to get out
a position paper in the fall and have a large conference
with the elementary and secondary school system in our 750
districts in which we are going to talk about optional
learning environments, that is getting the kids out into
the community resources as part of their education.

Of course we do a lot of that now. I mentioned
we have five million kids coming to museums now. I do not
know what proportion comes into our state museum, but we
have an educational program in the state museum, and to
show how it is tied up with education, part of the funds
from Title V which come to the department to strengthen
state education go to the support of that educational pro-
gram in our state museum.

Senator Pell. Thank you very much.

Also, on behalf of Senator Javits, I have another
question that was submitted in connection with the state-
ment of a previous witness to the effect of the importance
of the state's playing a role. Do you see in our bill a
need for a provision officially directed toward the state's trying to cut this in more?

Mr. Nyquist. Yes, I can envisage an improvement there by making grants to states in designated agencies. I know very well our department could very well handle administration of such a program. It could be perhaps on a matching basis, although I would be generous with the states at first in order to get them off the ground.

Senator Pell. I thank you very much indeed.

Our next witness is Mr. Walter Robinson, Vice Chairman of the Board and Treasurer, Minneapolis Society of Fine Arts. Your statement may be put in the record in full if you care to digest it.

STATEMENT OF WALTER ROBINSON, VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, AND TREASURER, MINNEAPOLIS SOCIETY OF FINE ARTS

Mr. Robinson. Yes. I filed a written statement, and in view of some of the testimony I have heard here today, I would like to just focus on one or two points which I feel should be further emphasized.

I think the Minneapolis Institute of Arts serves as an example of a museum that has responded to public demands for educational programs. For example, last year 47 per cent of the budget was devoted to programs which I would term of an educational nature.

I outlined in the written statement the rather
broad spectrum of programs, and I would like to emphasize here that these programs are not token activities, but they are deeply involved in the fabric of the community.

However, the point I would like to make today is that there are great budget implications. I think most museums are deeply concerned in maintaining a significant educational thrust. However, they must weigh the priority programs against other vital concerns.

In our case I know we have to fund a great deal of the programs from private sources. There is a constant scrambling among corporate foundations, individual contributions to fund these programs.

When we elected this programatic thrust some years ago we had to come to a rather desperate decision about four years ago as to whether we would continue the programs at the expense of running deficit operations.

We felt that perhaps if we could erect a very strong fundamental development organization to raise funds to pay for these programs, we felt that we could take that course rather than to cut back, and we did run for several years rather large deficits which netted an invasion of the principal sum of our membership endowments.

We are now engaged in zero budgeting planning, which means we have to cut back on some of the programs. So that I feel in our own case it is an illustration that
museums really have a problem of meeting all the demands
that are made upon them.

Today as we know the major items are personnel
and services which are prime victims of inflation. Museum
salaries are not competitive with institutions of higher
learning, therefore the dollar must be spread rather thinly
among programs for proper facilities, scholarship, research,
conservation, and display of collections.

I think we all in this room realize that museums
are conditioned to operating on minimum budgets. However,
the increase in costs we witnessed recently have just
changed the whole plan for museums which is not fully
understood by the public who utilize the museums and sup-
port them.

However, I think the museums are probably to
blame themselves. I think they have been far too reticent
in communicating to the public and to others their deficit
operation problems.

Just very briefly I would like to touch on one
other matter which affects us at the moment, and that is
outmoded museum structures.

Our museum certainly, like many others, was erected,
constructed, in the early part of the century, and presents
problems of insufficient and inappropriate space. I say
inappropriate space today because today we have a whole new
set of environment to protect the works of art, we have a whole new set of problems from our vast educational programs. The buildings were never constructed with these in mind.

Increased attendance creates constant problems. In our case our museum attendance has tripled in the last nine years, and of course we all wish to adapt to the new technologies for the display of works of art.

I think in viewing the programs that I mentioned in the written report we must recognize one other thing, that there is a limit to the amount of activities that can take place outside the building.

We have a lot of activities conducted in this manner, but after all the art collection is the primary source, and many of us cannot thrive for very obvious reasons.

In our case we have an over 60 year old building. We had to keep pace with the community, and we have started a remodeling expansion program. I do not need to dwell on the subject of the high cost of building museum facilities and incorporating modern technology.

I am also sure that members of the committee are aware that most of major foundations are not interested in funding bricks and mortar, and therefore we have been facing this problem ourselves quite dramatically to us anyway.

Therefore it is in this context that the
Minneapolis Society of Fine Arts gives strong endorsement to the passage of the museum services act designed to furnish dollars to be translated into benefit far beyond the monetary value and benefits which we believe will enrich many generations to come.

Senator Pell. I thank you very much indeed. I must say the Minneapolis Society has taken a leading role in these works. Senator Mondale is a member of this sub-committee, and I am sure you have been in contact with the representative on the House side who is interested in the whole program.

I think we should move on to the next witness because of the exigencies of time, Mr. Robert Lunney, Director, New Jersey Historical Society.

I would like to extend to you on behalf of the chairman of our full committee, Senator Williams, a hearty welcome. We are delighted that you are here.

I would also like to ask Mr. Duncan Cameron and Mr. Joseph P. O'Doherty to come forward and sit at the table.
STATEMENT OF ROBERT M. LUNNEY, DIRECTOR, NEW JERSEY HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Mr. Lunney. Senator Pell and members of the Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities, the opportunity to appear before your committee as a representative of the New Jersey Historical Society to testify on behalf of the Museum Services Act, S.796, is greatly appreciated. It is particularly so at this time when the Society is about to reopen its renovated headquarters in Newark.

Through the generous gifts of members, trustees and friends -- individual and corporate -- and aided by substantial grants from foundations and one from the National Endowment for the Arts, the 42 year old building, constructed for our purposes, has been brought up to date with temperature and humidity control, other improvements and modern equipment at a cost of three quarters of a million dollars. With the new facilities, the Society now looks forward to establishing a far more effective museum program for far greater numbers than ever before.

Founded in 1845 as a private, non-profit organization, the New Jersey Historical Society still derives practically all of its support from private sources, like the other old-line societies along the Atlantic seaboard.

In 1845 and for many years thereafter, interest centered on collecting library materials, especially those
pertaining to the colonial period of the state's history. A publications program was similarly oriented. As time passed, however, the Society also acquired portraits, landscapes and fine furniture, mainly through gifts, among the first of which was a Gilbert Stuart portrait of Aaron Burr. These pieces composed the "cabinet," as the museum was then called, which for years was incidental to the library and the publications of the institution.

But now both our library and museum collections have grown to become the largest and most important anywhere devoted exclusively to New Jersey history. They are essential sources for any researcher specializing in this field of American history.

In 1931 the Society moved into its present home, after conducting a building campaign initiated -- fatefuly -- in January of 1929. This fine headquarters, especially designed for the Society's purpose, houses the Society's four substantive operations: the museum, the library and the publications and education departments. We are especially concerned here with the museum and its relationship to the other three departments.

Twenty years later -- in 1950 -- the trustees of the Society, recognizing that they could no longer continue the restricted activity of decades past if the Society was to become a truly statewide historical society, invited
Dr. Edward P. Alexander, past Vice President of Colonial Williamsburg, to survey the entire organization and recommend the direction it should take. One result among many was the appointment of the first professional director; another was the broadening of its appeal by holding popular annual historical conferences in conjunction with local societies throughout the state.

These additional activities would strengthen and translate into meaningful action the purposes set forth by the founders in the Society's constitution of 1845:

"... to discover, procure and preserve whatever relates to any department of the history of New Jersey, natural, civil, literary or ecclesiastical; and generally of other portions of the United States."

The new policy also embraced the dissemination of the Society's accumulated knowledge and interpretation of its collections to all citizens: the scholar, the layman and the school child.

The historical museum is one link with our past, and a great teacher. Nothing appeals more to man than to be recognized as a part of a group, both past and present. Especially in these difficult times, establishing and recognizing the roots and ties of all people is of greatest importance. Museums can play a decisive role in this effort.

The trustees of the Society, considering further
how best to serve the public, made two important decisions. One was to continue Society headquarters on in Newark. The other was to renovate this fine building to make it more efficient. That first period of recognition of greater responsibility is just now culminating in completion of the modernization of our headquarters, a four-story structure of which two-and-a-half stories are devoted to museum galleries, study rooms, storage areas, offices and workrooms.

As to its physical plant and equipment the museum is adequately served. Its collections can be properly stored. They can be researched by scholars and staff in new study rooms. They can be exhibited far more attractively in newly panelled exhibition galleries under fine lighting. The Society now has physical facilities leaving little if anything to be desired.

The late Katherine Coffey, for years the distinguished director of The Newark Museum, was serving briefly until her death as museum consultant to the Society. Regarding the renovation, Ms. Coffey remarked that the Society has a handsome shell for its museum; it must now have an equally fine and effective museum program.

One further element to put on a truly fine program is yet to be added: sufficient professionally trained personnel to mount a vigorous museum program, using the
museum collections to promote further interest and knowledge of New Jersey history. The present staff of the museum is woefully inadequate in number. The Society's hopes for its museum are not limited as to ideas, plans and goals. The hopes are limited only by lack of professional personnel. The lack of professional personnel is limited only by lack of funds. This inadequacy we hope can in some measure be filled by the Museum Services Act.

What could our museum program be if this department were adequately staffed? These next few years the American historical museum will naturally be busier than ever mounting exhibitions in celebration of the Bicentennial of Independence. The New Jersey Historical Society, joining forces with the New Jersey Historical Commission and the New Jersey State Museum will produce "New Jersey during the Revolution," to be taken to seven areas covering the entire state, being shown in museums and colleges, if funds are forthcoming. The Society Museum will also have a series of exhibits -- small, medium and large -- through these next few years on subjects to be selected from an already prepared list of persons, events, places and ideas showing New Jersey's contribution to the founding of the U.S.A.

Other shows we hope to produce soon, if funds can be obtained, include "Water in New Jersey History," a rather different approach to history, drawing upon both library and museum collections. Others include a series of
exchange exhibitions with county and local society museums
to show their collections dealing with their areas at our
museum while we show appropriate collections of our own in
theirs.

Another series of special exhibitions designed
to travel will be on various ethnic groups such as Russian,
Portuguese and black people from our own South. Each of
these shows would be available for showing in churches and
public halls in sections of cities where such groups pre­
dominate.

Too often the historical museum shows in period
rooms or house museums little more than the decorative arts
favored by the upper classes of a particular time. We are
intent on presenting exhibits illustrating all important
aspects of New Jersey history and its place in our national
history.

Development and achievements in commerce and in­
dustry, arts and the sciences, religion and education, rise
of the city and its problems, the automobile and the still
burgeoning suburbs; the ocean, the littoral and inland
waters and man’s regard from them in the past and at present,
can be shown to illustrate historical development in New
Jersey in its different aspects.

The museum of an historical society especially is
expected to publish not only the usual check list or
illustrated catalogue of an exhibition but a carefully re-
searched, written and edited piece, making a contribution
of permanent interest and value on the subject. We have,
for example, 100 drawings each by Robert Fulton and Benjamin
Henry Latrobe. Neither of these collections has yet been
shown in toto and neither has been published, yet one
represents a substantial contribution to American science
in canal construction, the other in waterworks.

Another publication of unique importance which
should be brought out under museum auspices is the icono-
graphy of New Jersey, a catalog of over 4,000 known views
of the state in paintings, drawings and prints dating from
1626 to 1876, located in our own and other collections here
and abroad. If this book were published now, it would be
the first iconography of any state in the union.

Museums should not attempt to be social service
agencies or institutions of social reform. They can, however,
without departing from their legitimate purposes, contri-
bute substantially towards an enriched life for those who
visit them whatever their background. Children especially
are receptive to a fine exhibition, well presented and in-
terpreted, or to its introduction by audio-visual means
into their classrooms, responding with wonder, surprise
and delight to a new experience in learning. Such a stimu-
lus can stretch their minds and imaginations, carrying them
beyond their often drab immediate surroundings.

Again, if funds become available, we propose to initiate as an experiment two 13 hour adult courses in New Jersey history, one a brief survey, the other on selected subjects such as paintings and painters, medicine and physicians, state government and legislators. Each would consist of lectures, readings and the use of source materials in the library and museum. If well received, they could be produced for television.

These are but some of the ways the public could come to know and appreciate the historical museum. However, much else on which these exhibitions and programs are based must be done behind the scenes. Caring for the collections by compiling and keeping complete records; doing the extensive research required; conducting a conservation program of paintings, prints and drawings; planning the exhibitions and publishing the catalogs -- all these and myriad others are enough to keep a large staff busy.

And yet, a museum operated by an historical society is often less adequately staffed than any other type museum. The reason is clear. Such an institution is busy operating a museum and also a library, a publishing house, both book and periodical and education and special events departments. Its financial resources must stretch over all these operations, a requirement increasingly difficult to manage under present conditions.
Each society must continue to derive from its present sources of support the fullest measure possible. Each must seek new sources. The society can only gain for its museum the increasingly large support it will require by concentrating on the expert preparation of its appeals to private donors, foundations, corporations and public funding agencies. These appeals must be based on the conviction that the historical museum is an important element in the preservation and development of American civilization. Given adequate support the historical museum can become a vigorous and growing cultural force.

Senator Pell. Thank you, Mr. Lunney.

I am a little concerned because the readers are taking more than the time we had hoped the witnesses would take. I feel very rude. I do not like these time pressures, but it is the way we operate. We have roll call votes and the whole hearing must be wound up before half past twelve or quarter to one.

Our next witness is Duncan F. Cameron, Director of the Brooklyn Museum.

STATEMENT OF DUNCAN F. CAMERON, DIRECTOR OF THE BROOKLYN MUSEUM

Mr. Cameron. Senator, thank you first of all for inviting me to appear here.

I do not think our museum is alone in our agony,
but the troubles and problems are there. One of my trustees
told me, on learning I was going to be director of the
museum, "It is very hard to get on with the business of
living when you have to use all of your energies to stay
alive."

That is what we are doing in Brooklyn.

I think you know certainly of the institution and
of the borough, but it should be pointed out it is one of
the six major art museums of America, an architecturally
grand and imposing and unbelievably rich museum in its
collections, which stands in the midst of one of the most
troubled urban areas in America.

That presents us with great opportunities, but
it leaves us with many problems. The problem of conser-
vation has been mentioned a number of times this morning.
It appears to be a concern of the committee.

I think it is important to point out when you
have a large old established institution as the Brooklyn
Institution, conservation must include in concept the main-
tenance of the building itself, the course of professional
environment control, but the leaking roof is as serious a
problem of conservation as the problems that can be solved
in the laboratory.

It is true that the Brooklyn Museum's annual
deterioration of its vast collections exceeds by a factor --
I am not sure how much -- the growth of the collection through purchases, gifts and requisitions.

I would have to put high on my list of priorities, if not at the top, the conservation needs of a museum including the maintenance of this fine but old building as well as the normal and technical conservation in the laboratory.

A number of interesting points that have been made about education and the question about all students going into a museum is one I want to speak to.

Simple arithmetic can show with the borough of Brooklyn's population of 2,600, if the museum provided equal opportunity to all the students in elementary and secondary schools, then we would see seven students less than two hours in the next 12 years of schooling.

What do you do in two hours during 12 years? If you look at statistics, and if statistics of school visitation become criteria in funding, there is the danger that museums will by means fair or foul try to build the figures in order to get the dollars.

At the present time we are experimenting with a selective education program where we work with newer students but for longer periods of time, so if you were to look at our visitation statistics over the years and see a sudden drop in the number of students; if on the other
hand we expressed ourselves in student days or student hours, you would see a great increase in the educational services being given.

When we work with the children in units of a half week over a period of six weeks, we can do a great deal with students who need desperately what we have, but there is no way we can serve all of the students in our borough. I think the same statistic holds true for most of our urban areas.

The questions that the committee asked some of us to apply to the appendices troubled me somewhat because they suggest a great interest in attendance growth. I would like to think we have passed the day when the effectiveness of the museum operation is being measured by the turnstile count.

For decades museums have played all kinds of ingenious games to try to show attendance growth, whether it was there or not. They expressed their growth in terms of visitors. I would only caution the committee that the reporting statistics from museums, including my own, does not always tell the story accurately nor fully.

I would like to comment on section 6 of the bill. This is in my view too broad in scope, and it includes a number of project items which I feel overlap the guidelines that presently stand for the endowments. I would like to see
section 6 more limited and address itself to problems of
the operating budget and to conservation, and to support of
education rather than traveling exhibitions, et cetera.

When we refer to operating budgets, let me say if
I see myself as administrator of the museum I have to
acknowledge budget as the first priority. If I put on my
other hat as art museum director, I have to say that the
deficit really is not my concern when I consider the problem
of conservation and public trust.

I think I have probably used my five minutes.

Thank you.

Senator Pell. Thank you, Mr. Cameron.

Mr. O'Doherty.

Mr. O'Doherty. I am director of a very small
museum in New York City known as the Museum of American
Folk Art.

The museum has four employees including myself.
Our annual budget is $180,000. We have an indebtedness of
$40,000 at the present time.

This year we received a grant from the National
Foundation for the Arts of $15,000, and from the New York
State Congress on the Arts for $10,000.

We are doing things that I think are a little
different from what is generally done in museums. We
operate out of two rooms in an old brownstone on 53rd Street
where we have a total space of about a thousand square feet
which is not very large for a museum.

We operate our offices out of a one bedroom
apartment, which is really illegal, but we do it anyway be-
cause this is the only place we can have an office.

As an example of the type of things we are doing,
we are presently doing a show in New York City called
Celebrate America through Folk Art, where because of the
fact we close the museum generally in the summer for lack
of air conditioning, we have gotten the people at Rocke-
feller, Exxon, McGraw-Hill and Time-Life to lend us their
facilities so we can take the museum right out into the
streets for the people of New York and the visitors to New
York from the United States and all over the world.

In this exhibit we charge no attendance fee. We
have a daily attendance of 1500 people, and the total ex-
hibition is going to last 30 days, which will give us an
attendance of approximately 450,000 persons.

The exhibition is costing our museum approximately
$60,000.

Not only are we just giving an exhibition to the
people, but what we have done is gone to other museums to
help us put this exhibition together, and gone to other
parts of the country, such as Pennsylvania, Connecticut,
New York state, Massachusetts, to bring crafts people from
those states into New York to show the people of New York and the country and world visiting New York how beautiful things such as the artifacts we are presently exhibiting were made originally by the artisans and artists.

Our particular problem is that we could do much more than we are presently doing if we had money for bricks and mortar, because they are quite expensive in New York, or if we had money for operating expenses, which are also very expensive in New York.

As an example of the type of things that we are also doing in regard to education, this fall we are sponsoring a 13 week course for the citizens of a city and the other surrounding states on the development of American folk art, and showing the people through this course, which is in conjunction with New York University, how they can learn something of their heritage in American folk art at NYU.

We also go into ghetto areas of this city and do shows there, bring the kids to our museum. We subsidize these out of our own pockets, and because of the situation we are involved in at the present time of having a $40,000 indebtedness, we need money for operating costs.

We would strongly suggest if possible, Senator, that in the introduction to the bill if possible be changed to include the following after the words "Scientific
Heritage", to add: "to provide funds for capital construction costs and operating expenses for museums."

I would hope that a museum would not be defined as one that has to be accredited by the American Association of Museums, because we presently are not, and I would hate to think that this would in any way take from us the possibility of getting funds under this Museum Act.

I feel very strongly that the act is very good and hope it will pass.

Senator Pell. I thank you very much indeed. I think we had better wind up the museum section now.

I would add here I know there are others who would like to speak. I see a gentleman in the back with whom we talked yesterday. What I am going to do is ask for a list of all the people here who are representing various museums, and if any of them care to submit statements for the record they will be printed in full in the record.

One thought has gone through my mind in connection with these hearings. Perhaps the bill should be redrafted a bit in one regard.

The reason we originally put in education, put it into HEW, is that we did not know quite where else it should go at the time. Maybe we should lower the emphasis on education and increase the emphasis on museums, have more reference in education legislation to the use of
museums, and then put the National Museum Institute into another branch of the government, be it the Smithsonian or the Endowment or wherever it might be.

This is the thought that is going through the minds of the members of the committee, and I just wanted the group here to be aware of it. Nothing is sacred about this bill. We just drafted it a few months ago along with conversations we had with many of you, and it can very easily be altered and changed.

One other point has come up this morning. We have been particularly impressed this morning with the real need for conservation and with what a really deplorable situation there is today in this regard. This brings me to the final event this morning, and that is the panel on conversation.

I would like to pay particular attention to Charles Olin, a private conservator who really started my thinking along these lines to try to develop a National Institute of Conservation, and now he has gone into private practice and I hope is doing very well. I am most appreciative to him for the effect he has had on our own thinking.

I am wondering if there are written statements that could be put in the record, and I would ask each of you to summarize your remarks.
I also understand that Mr. Keck has some very interesting photographs to display on conversation techniques, and I was wondering if he could show them to us at this time.

PANEL ON MUSEUM CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

Richard Buck, Director, Intermuseum Laboratory, Oberlin, Ohio; Sheldon Keck, President, American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works, Cooperstown, New York; Charles Olin, Private Conservator, Falls Church, Virginia; Robert Organ, Smithsonian Institution; Robert Feller, National Gallery of Art; Charles van Ravenswaay, Director, Winterthur Museum, Delaware.

Senator Pell. Mr. Keck, would you like to describe your pictures to us and your techniques.

Mr. Keck. Mr. Chairman, I have a few pictures here.

Senator Pell. I think it is more important for the spectators to see them because I will be able to savor them and enjoy them afterwards.

Mr. Keck. This photograph shows the damage done at the Corning Museum from the flood a year ago last August. Here are some of the pieces that were collected after the flood. Some 500 pieces of glass were damaged and/or broken in this flood.

I have photographs of some of the pieces that
appear in this photograph after treatment by the conservation staff. We had to bring extra help in because of the enormity of the damage.

You can see that these items were broken as well as covered with the kind of mud that is deposited in a flood of that type.

This is another piece that has been put together, very beautiful piece. I have the labels, but I am not going to try to identify them completely for you, but all of these pieces appearing in this photograph or other photographs we have, and you can see a few of them that have been restored.

The man who has been in charge of the project is extremely skillful. Here I am showing you the damaged object on the left and the restored object on the right.

The method is not to add pieces but to put together the pieces that are recovered. Here is an example.

I do not want to show you all the ones I have, but I do have photographs of some of the paintings that were also damaged in the flood.

The water came up to about this high (indicating), and the rest of the painting was affected, of course, by the humidity.

Here we see the painting after treatment. There was very little restoration that had to be done, but you
can see if the painting had been left the way it was, I
think you can see from this photograph right here that the
paint was ready to fall off as the picture dried out.

This is another picture that does not belong in
Corning, but I show it to you as an example of vandalism,
the kind of thing that we have to protect against in a
museum. This vandalism was done a long time ago; it was
not done in the museum.

It was done when the picture was in private hands,
perhaps in a descendant's hand. It was in an attic and
probably some child got up there with a sword or a knife
and did some radical damage.

Here we see the painting in its present condi-
tion. Perhaps all of you will have a chance to see these
later.

Senator Pell. Thank you very much, Mr. Keck.

Is there such a thing as a conservator's guild
or fraternity or association?

Mr. Keck. The American Institute for Conserva-
tion of Historic and Artistic Works is that.

Senator Pell. Is there a president?

Mr. Keck. I am the president.

Senator Pell. Then you are the spokesman. How
do you see a National Institute evolving, and what do you
think the government should do to help the general problem
of conservation?

Mr. Kecko. Senator, I am not absolutely certain what the national institute would be except that our meeting at Winterthur recently there was a consensus concerning a central reference point for conservation practice and established arrangement for interchange and for long range and careful planning on a national/perhaps international level in regard to training, research and the diffusion of knowledge in the field of art conservation.

It was unanimously agreed and recommended that an advisory board or institute be created, the membership of which would include but not be limited to those members of the International Center Committee of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, having a major interest in museum conservation.

I recommend as an attendee of that conference at Winterthur and as president of AIC that in its creation support be granted under the National Museum Act for expenses of meetings and a modest staff required to make the work of the board effective.

This is a very small approach that is envisaged here. I think that institute which you envisage is much larger in scope. What we really need is a central place through which information and knowledge can be diffused to people in conservation.
Senator Pell. There are really two thoughts here that we should separate. One is for the need of supporting conservation right across the country so that all the different museums are strengthened and they have adequate people to do their work. As was brought out in the hearing yesterday, in my own state the art works have to be sent to another state. Fortunately that is no great hardship because we are rather close, but it would be more of a hardship in other areas.

The other idea was that there should be developed a National Institute of Conservation possibly located at the Smithsonian which would be sort of a central point as is the Library of Congress for the care, cataloging, in this case for the conservation of works of art.

It has been suggested that there be 150 students, one-third of whom I would hope would always be foreign, for a period of time at graduate level, and with some association with degree-granting institutions.

I would now like to get the digested thoughts of each one of you. I will call on my friend Charles Olin. Do you find more business than you can handle as a private conservator? Do you find people are not using private conservators?

Mr. Olin. I do believe there is more business than I can handle. There always has been, including my nine
years at the Smithsonian. Now that I am in private prac-
tice I find the same situation: inadequate facilities,
equipment, places to go to find answers that are analytical
in nature.

Before I can proceed on the preservation problems
of paintings, I must be dependent upon a friend in industry
or somewhere for identification of the material that I
would like to know more of before I proceed.

I know others will testify in more detail con-
cerning education needs, but I would like to make a comment
with respect to education here that is not within the
museum but is actually in the universities themselves.

It was my observation as a graduate student at
New York University and in my experience working in the
museum field that curators, directors, art historians,
lack at first an awareness and a comprehensive understanding
of the needs of conservation and the actual implementation
of conservation.

On this point conservation has had a long hard
battle. First it had to make the staff aware of its needs,
and I think we have adequate testimony today, and I am sure
yesterday, that this need is now understood. But I feel
that in order to fully understand and to continue the use
of conservation in museums, to develop it, that a training
program in graduate schools should require perhaps three
semesters of exposure and study in the field of conservation so that when they do come to the museums they know what standards conservation must have and should have.

Senator Pell. I have some very specific questions that I think might be of interest for the record.

Washington is a fairly sophisticated city, but how many private conservators are there? Are you the only one?

Mr. Olin. No, sir. There are about seven or eight that I know fairly well. There are more in other fields. I am speaking specifically of conservation of paintings.

Senator Pell. How many would you say there are in the United States?

Mr. Olin. Several hundred, sir.

Senator Pell. Are you a member of the National Conservation Association of which Dr. Keck is the president?

Mr. Olin. That is correct.

Senator Pell. Private individuals as well as institution conservators are eligible for membership in the organization?

Mr. Olin. That is correct, sir.

Senator Pell. How do you handle the problem of passing on your knowledge? Do have apprentices?

Mr. Olin. I do at the present time. I have two
students studying with me, one for a year and a half, at
the present moment. It is not an adequate way to train
conservators, however. I feel they ought to be trained in
an academic environment.

The apprenticeship has had a long history and has
helped to this point, but I think we must get into the
academic field.

Senator Pell. How extensive is your equipment?

Mr. Olin. I feel my equipment is totally in-
adequate to do the conservation that I want, and I suppose
that equipment comes to around $11,000, but I would desire
and can utilize equipment that goes to maybe $20,000 to
$30,000 more.

Senator Pell. Briefly, what would be the most
expensive items that you consider absolutely basic in order
to do your work?

Mr. Olin. X-ray equipment, adequate microscopes
for detailed examination of documents, et cetera.

Senator Pell. Thank you very much.

Mr. Organ, do you have any specific thoughts
here?

Mr. Organ. On these specific points I have con-
siderable thoughts about the National Conservation Institute.

Senator Pell. Why don't you talk on that.

Mr. Organ. I have a written statement.
Senator Pell. That will be included in the record.

(Statement referred to follows:)

COMMITTEE INSERT
Senator Pell. I regret to say that I am going to have to close the hearing in approximately eight minutes.

Mr. Organ. I believe this new institute we are suggesting should include the activities of everything that Americans collect or excavate or create. It should be interested in all sorts of things.

Of the approximately 200 conservators we believe are available, probably 120 or 130 are involved with paintings, perhaps 50 with paper, perhaps 20 with objects, but I am sure nobody has ever been trained to conserve Shock's first transistor, so that the institute is going to have considerable problems.

I would like to comment on what a conservator is because this is very important to the nature of the institute. A conservator seems to be an alloy of three abilities.

First of all the person who actually works on the object and treats it; secondly, a person who is a scientist in effect and can recognize the nature of materials he is dealing with, what has happened to the object, what he can do to change it and to preserve it for the future; and he is also a curator with some art historical knowledge so he can see the significance of the object in front of him while he is treating it.

A conservator in a small museum differs from the
conservator in a large museum. In the large museum his materials scientist can be special museum scientists who do historical analysis for him. His art historical work can be done for him by curators who are already there in the collections, so in a large museum he is primarily the man who works treating the object.

He must have a feeling for the object so he knows when his brush touches it he is doing the right thing.

My concept of the institute very briefly is that we should keep the conservator at the bench working on his object. We should provide him with all the facilities he needs in the way of space and light, and we should in short keep him in the environment in which he is already surrounded by museum collections with the assistance of curators and possibly, if he is lucky, with scientists as well.

Senator Pell. I think this is so interesting I am going to call a recess in order to vote. I will be right back and then we can go on for another 15 minutes.

(Recess)

Senator Pell. The subcommittee will resume.

I think Mr. Organ was just winding up. I apologize for the pressures under which we operate, but that is the system unfortunately.

Mr. Organ. Thank you. I had reached the point
of mentioning that we should keep the conservators at the
bench inside the institute.

The institute should strengthen his work as much
as possible by giving him space, recognition, assistance.

The institute might also come in and look over
his shoulder with a camera and record some elements of his
work for posterity, for educational use later. But the
institute primarily would register the person as an insti-
tute conservator, as a scientist, which would give him
some of the recognition he needs, and the institute should
also place in his laboratory a data bank.

This would be really tangible evidence that he
belongs to the institute. It would be something like a
teletype with a television screen playback, or perhaps in
the early stages a facsimile machine.

The institute conservator would be expected to
use this at the completion of a particular job. He would be
expected to transmit his completed report, which he has to
produce anyway because of his professional code of ethics,
send it into that central institute data bank, including
his own report because he is responsible. The data bank
abstract would be prepared which would be of immense utility
to everybody else in the institute.

It would also be expected that when the conservator
was faced with a new problem he would call on the data bank
for information. He would use this if it were suitable, test it, and report back in his report his comments on whether it was successful or not.

The kind of information he would need would be methods of treatment, commercial materials that are suitable for use, and all these data which at the present moment the conservator has to discover for himself, and it takes up a great deal of his time.

The institute might also allow students to interrogate the data bank. Obviously if they did not agree to a code of ethics, he could only have access to something of local level. If a student expresses interest in a specific procedure, he could then be supplied with a tape slide lecture on one of these procedures viewed by the camera over the shoulder of the practicing conservator.

If the student needed specific expertise, more than he could gain from the general view shown by the picture, he would perhaps apprentice briefly with one of the conservators, proceeding with his own study with a minimum of obstruction to the general flow of the work of the conservator.

Finally, the conservation schools would naturally join in such a system because they would want to be kept abreast of the methods now in use which are constantly being refined.
If one adopts this plan, several advantages accrue. First of all, individual conservators would suddenly acquire much greater importance in the eyes of their directors. The data transmission machine would prove they are part of this great institute of people scattered over the whole country.

Local conservation would not be hindered at all by the sudden loss of its personnel to become teaching faculty. Teaching at lower levels would be largely self-teaching. It would not need skilled conservators who presently in teaching have to constantly repeat endlessly the quantity of data that could be taped and thus absorbed rapidly.

We would modern wires and electronic flow. Instead of the conservator being in one particular place, the flow could be to anywhere in the nation. Such an institute could very well begin in Washington where we already have so many different collections all in desperate need of attention.

We also have many active conservators in close contact with these collections, in close contact with curators, in close contact with scientists to help them.

Every member in such an institute would be an equal contributor, whether he is located in Washington, in Ohio or California.
Such an institute I believe has been envisaged here for the first time and would be a world first if it began. Clearly this sort of thing cannot happen immediately. It is only possible now because of the advances in technology.

There are several technical difficulties to be ironed out, and also the agreement of the professional fraternities necessary.

It seems to me that such institute might be studied very carefully. In fact one could almost begin implementation through this international center committee that has been suggested to take cognizance of the problem.

Senator Pell. Thank you, Mr. Organ. This is really a very exciting thought indeed, extremely exciting to use a computer together with some of the new devices. We developed the space program in Los Angeles and Pittsburgh. I think it would be a tremendous step forward.

I would like to make one observation. Amongst the group of friends who are here is there anybody here from the press?

(One hand was raised)

Senator Pell. This brings up what I am driving at. To us this is a very exciting field, the field of the arts and museums and so forth, and yet as you can see from the interest of the public, there is only one person from
the press here.

We have a real job to do in trying to sell the public as a whole on our interest. There is only one person present who does not have a particular subjective interest in museums, and we have to do something to interest the public in the plight of museums, the future of museums.

All I can ask is that we do the best we can so that if we have additional hearings on this subject, which we may have to have, or if we are successful in passing it, we have a reauthorization hearing at some point, we never again allow ourselves to be without the presence of others.

This is one of the battles we have been facing for many years. It is a little bit better in the arts and humanities than when it started out. Nobody would come down and listen when we began. Now that has become more established under the excellent leadership in the Endowments, but museums are still an esoteric subject.

May I ask which paper you represent?

Spectator: Senator Pell, I am a free lance writer. I am also associate editor of an antique monthly which is concerned with antiques.

Senator Pell. In other words, it is a specialized press. We still do not have the general press here at all.

I am going to have to go now, but there is one question I wanted to ask to Mr. van Ravenswaay. How do you
see a National Institute for Conservation evolving?

Mr. van Ravenswaay. Senator, I would like to follow on what Bob Organ has said in stressing the importance of having a major central agency that will coordinate research, collect information, disseminate it, establish standards, in other words, serve as the guiding hand for what I hope would be a much accelerated national activity. I feel that would be the major function it could serve.

Senator Pell. This is a very, very exciting thought. Would you agree with my view that the logical place would be under the roof of the Smithsonian?

Mr. van Ravenswaay. I would agree it ought to be in Washington. You have so many resources here for carrying on such an institute. Whether it would be at the Smithsonian or elsewhere I do not think I am in a position to say.

Senator Pell. I do not mean to be brief. We have two other people here, Mr. Feller, from the National Gallery of Art.

In raising this question of a national institute two or three years ago, as you know I tried to persuade Mr. Brown to give us the basement of that new building.

Mr. Feller. I was not a party to those discussions, Senator, but I heard there was some discussion about the matter.
Senator Pell. Do you see any possibility of space of that sort being made available eventually?

Mr. Feller. I think the space is pretty well committed. We have a large problem keeping our own conservation work in place, and we plan considerable expansion of our own facilities, and I suppose like every other museum, before the building is up there is a space limitation.

Senator Pell. Do you have any apprentices that you are teaching now?

Mr. Feller. Yes. We are able to take on one or two apprentices each year. We have an apprentice in the conservation department at the Gallery at the present time, and I have a man in Pittsburgh, a young chemist, working with me.

Senator Pell. Why cannot that equipment be brought here?

Mr. Feller. I think as the space opens up we are intending to bring it here.

Senator Pell. Would that equipment be made available to set up an Institute of Conservation?

Mr. Feller. Absolutely. It is available now to our professional colleagues. We are conducting research which we hope will be to the good of the profession, and when people have need for this special equipment, we
certainly welcome their coming to Pittsburgh and using it.

Senator Pell. Mr. Buck, do you have any particular thought regarding how we would move ahead in this area of conservation with regard to training?

Mr. Buck. In our experience we certainly do have need for analytical services. When we are investigating a painting, we need a sophisticated analysis. We must depend on such as the Winterthur Museum or Dr. Peller or a commercial laboratory for this kind of information.

I think there is a need for more basic research on materials used in conservation. I think there may be a need for eventual standardization of these materials to make them more available to the profession.

In our experience we have been limited by the lack of some national locus of authority in these fields, and in that respect I would favor the establishment of such an institute.

Senator Pell. I am delighted. Really out of these hearings some broad lines have emerged. One most exciting one is the general agreement on the need for concentration in the field of conservation, and the question has been left open as to who would have the responsibility, how it would be done, but the need is apparent.

The second great thread that has emerged is the need for both renovation and for operational support for the
museums. The question is how does the government help in that without finding a bottomless pit, taking on all the operating costs.

This is the question on which we have to work in the Congress with some hesitation, because once you accept responsibility for operating costs on the part of the general tax revenue, you are in for a very rapidly expanding appropriations.

While I personally would love to see those appropriations made, I do not think that wish will be shared by the Congress.

I thank you all for being here and, as I said earlier, any statements, any thoughts anybody has that they would like to put in the record, the record will be kept open for two weeks to give you ample time.

In addition we may submit questions we have in order to have a complete record following the August recess from which we can make our decision as to which direction to move, and also the decision as to where the National Institute of Museums should be if it should truly rest in HEW -- which we just arbitrarily put in the bill -- or whether we can find a more appropriate home for it.

This concludes this stage of the hearings.

(Thereupon at 1:05 p.m. the hearings were concluded.)