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March 3, 1992

Mrs. John L. Frothingham
32 Country Club Road
New Canaan, Connecticut 06840

Dear Tish:

Thank you for your recent note with your question about the National Endowment for the Arts.

I am sending along a copy of a letter that NEA Chairman John Frohnmayer wrote to John Whitehead at The Rutherford Institute in regard to the controversy over PERFORMANCE JOURNAL #3.

In 1990 the Congress responded to criticism of the NEA with a series of constructive legislative reforms. One of these requires the NEA Chairman to recoup funds that have been spent on purposes that are inconsistent with the original grant proposal.

While Chairman Frohnmayer acted quickly and properly, his actions are not reflected in the letter from John Whitehead.

I am hopeful that, given a chance, the reforms I helped draft will put the NEA back on an even keel.

With warm regards,

Ever sincerely,

Claiborne Pell
Chairman
Subcommittee on Education, Arts & Humanities

enclosure
February 5, 1992

Mr. John W. Whitehead
President
The Rutherford Institute
P.O. Box 7482
Charlottesville, VA 22906-7482

Dear Mr. Whitehead:

You recently sent a letter to potential donors, using as a fundraising gimmick allegations that the National Endowment for the Arts supported a publication entitled Performance Journal #3. That publication contained articles which you described as a "hate Christ text." What your letter misleadingly fails to state is that the Endowment has demanded the return of all NEA funds used to support that publication.

The facts are these: the journal came to our attention in late August, 1991. After investigating, on September 9, 1991, the Endowment demanded that all funds used for publication be returned because the material presented there was wholly inconsistent with the purpose for which the grant was solicited and given.

Endowment grantees are held fully accountable for their use of federal funds. Your staff failed to find out the truth about the Endowment's handling of this matter and your followers have been misled.

Sincerely,

John E. Frohnmayer
Chairman
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