Mr. Speaker, the Cultural Development Act originally was introduced in the House of Representatives on July 17, 1962. Since the introduction of this bill I have received such an abundance of support and encouragement from every section of the country that I am convinced more than ever before of the need, the rightness, the timelessness, and the potential contribution to the Nation's well-being of this proposed legislation. Because of this I have today reintroduced the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the Record at this time a partial list of the organizations and institutions, with the officer or representative of each, which have responded favorably to me as of this time:

Professor of art, Kansas State University.
President, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio.
President, Knoxville College, Knoxville, Tenn.
President, Lambuth College, Jackson, Tenn.
Acting president, Luther College, Decorah, Iowa.
President, Marymount College, Tarrytown, N.Y.
President, Montana State College.
Executive secretary, National Commission on Accrediting, Washington, D.C.
Dean, New Mexico Highlands University, Las Vegas, N.M.
Acting president, New Mexico Western College.
Chairman, fine arts department, Plymouth Teachers College, Plymouth, N.H.
President, Northeast Missouri State Teachers College.
Vice president for academic affairs, Ohio University.
Director, Olin Art Institute of Los Angeles County, Calif.
Dean, Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Assistant to the president, Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.
President, Regis College, Denver, Colo.
Provost and vice presidents, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.
President, St. Augustine's College, Raleigh, N.C.
President, St. Benedict's College, Atchison, Kan.
President, St. Mary's Dominican College, New Orleans, La.
Editor, "School Arts" magazine.
President, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.
President, State College of Iowa.
President and director, act education division, State University College, Buffalo, N.Y.
Acting president, Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove, Pa.
President, Trinity College, Washington, D.C.
Executive secretary, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
President, the Pennsylvania State University.
Dean, the University of Oklahoma.
Chancellor, University of California.
Dean, University of Illinois.
Vice chancellor and dean of faculties, University of Kansas.
Dean, Graduate School, University of Minnesota.
President, University of Oregon.
President, and dean of arts and sciences, University of South Carolina.
Dean, University of Tennessee.
President, Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pa.
Dean, Utah State University.

Chairman, Humanities Division, Washburn University of Topeka, Topeka, Kans.
Chairman, Department of Music, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.
President, Western Illinois University.
President, Westminster College, Fulton, Mo.
President, Wheelock College, Boston, Mass.
President, William Penn College, Oskaloosa, Iowa.
Dean, Yale University School of Art and Architecture, New Haven, Conn.
President, University of Arizona.
President and chancellor, the University of California.
Provost, the University of Rochester, Rochester, N.Y.
President, University of Texas.
President and chairman, English Department, East Texas State College.
President, Bethany College, Lindsborg, Kans.
Vice president, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio.
Vice president and dean, College of St. Teresa, Winona, Minn.
President, Delaware State College, Dover, Del.
President, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa.
President, Elmhurst College, Elmhurst, Ill.
President, Moorhead State College, Moorhead, Minn.
President, North Central College, Naperville, Ill.
President, University of Miami, Miami, Fla.
President, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.
President, Whitman College, Walla Walla, Wash.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that the response of the higher education community to the proposals contained in the bill has been overwhelmingly favorable. It is evident that the need for programs such as those contained in the legislation is very keenly felt by the heads of colleges and universities and other educators generally throughout the country. We are indeed facing the danger of a critical imbalance in our education programs unless we begin to give attention to the arts and humanities at least in some small measure comparable to that now being given to the sciences and technology.

I am reinforced in my conviction that this legislation is needed by the fact that, while some have suggested changes in emphasis, functions or organization, not a single dissenting voice has been raised as far as the primary objectives of the bill are concerned. It is also significant to note that coming as they do from all sections of the country and representing...
many facets of the education community, they are almost unanimous in emphasizing that the Federal Government must act to support the arts and humanities to a far greater degree than heretofore.

Among the foremost supporters of Federal government in the arts and humanities is Barnaby C. Keeney, president of Brown University. On February 7, 1962, Dr. Keeney wrote in as follows:

It has seemed to me for a long time that it would be well if we had a National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities to perform a function similar to that of the National Science Foundation, which has benefited the country greatly. There is no question but that advancements in science and technology have a greater immediate utility in the international and national situation in which we exist today. On the other hand, the whole shape of our lives in the future, and our whole attitude toward life will be strongly formed by our achievements or lack thereof in the arts and humanities.

It was President Keeney's letter that stimulated my interest to introduce the proposed Cultural Development Act of 1962:

Again in response to the proposed legislation, Dr. Keeney has advised me in his letter of October 7, 1962, as follows:

I am pleased to have taken the leadership in another important area and I hope very much that your efforts will succeed. If I can help, I should like to.

Another staunch supporter of the proposed legislation is John Nicholas Brown, president of the Bank of Providence, Rhode Island. Dr. Horn has written me in part as follows in his letter of August 16, 1962:

As I think you know, I have been concerned about the advancement of the arts and humanities for many years. * * * So all I can say is, keep fighting for this good cause. * * * In the end the logic of your position, and the need for the services which your legislation provides, will win the necessary support. * * * the possibility that the Office of Education will be working on a national scale in this area adds considerably to the attractiveness of the matter * * *.

Many other Rhode Islanders prominent in the arts and education have indicated their strong support. Among these are Francis M. O'Gorman, editor of The Providence Journal; and John Nicholas Brown, renowned Providence art patron and collector.

In an article in the Providence Journal, July 17, 1962, under the heading, "College Heads Praise Humanities Move," other outstanding Rhode Island educators voiced their support. William C. Gaige, president of Rhode Island College, quoted his predecessor in saying that more of the education of the State's children is maintained, as they are, on a level which is well above petty political considerations there because the most important reason why we have an equally excellent National Institute of the Arts and Humanities.

As Mr. Fossey pointed out, there is a growing concern among scientists and educators over the danger of the loss of intellectual freedom. The Soviet Union has abandoned what we know as the liberal democratic philosophically rooted dictatorship fears the liberating power of the humanities. An American institution devoted to cultural impulses would further mark the difference between tyranny and freedom in the nuclear age.

Mr. Speaker, a subsequent editorial from the Providence Journal, July 27, 1962, edition of the Visitor, which gives eloquent backing to the need for Federal support for the arts and humanities as proposed in this bill, is also submitted in its entirety for the Record:

[From the Providence (R.I.) Visitor, June 22, 1962]

SUPPORT FOR ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Speaking at the commencement exercises of Rhode Island College earlier this month, Congresswoman John E. Fossey proposed the establishment of a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities. As envisioned by Mr. Fossey, this Institute would stand on an equal footing with the National Science Foundation, and would include supporting research, providing a national clearinghouse for educational materials, and developing a program for students in the arts or the humanities. In addition, there would be established a Federal Advisory Council on Arts and Humanities. The members of this council would be chosen for their eminence and would advise the Government as to the ways in which it might encourage the development of the cultural life of the Nation.

We believe that this proposal has great merit, and we might question the advisability of Mr. Fossey's plan to set up a new Institute within the U.S. Office of Education, however, in that this office has undergone important structural changes. Under Commissioner Sterling M. McMurrin, a former professor of philosophy at Harvard, the U.S. Office of Education has widened considerably beyond the traditional function of compiling educational statistics. More and more in recent years we have seen a closer communication between the academic world of humanistic studies and the creative world of the various arts. The moment that one realizes that each art has its laws and its disciplines, the question of which the Committee on the Visual Arts of Harvard University put it, "The great artist is great both as an artist and as an intellectual." The relation between the various arts, music, poetry, and drama, and the world of education has also long been recognized. It is, of course, true that the history of the relations between Government and cultural pursuits has not been altogether without its share of difficulties. Yet the fact remains that this relation has taken on an official character. Recent discussions of the shortcomings of our own State legislature in this regard come immediately to mind. Yet we have many examples of Government activity in cultural matters that are most excellent illustrations of how such departments may be made to work in a manner consistent with its duties. The National Gallery of Art combines public and private efforts very well, and the Library of Congress has long been an important center of artistic and scholarly activity.

If the National Gallery of Art and the National Science Foundation can be maintained, as they are, on a level which is well above petty political considerations there is no reason why we cannot also have an equally excellent National Institute of the Arts and Humanities.

Mr. Speaker, a subsequent editorial from the July 7, 1962, edition of the Providence Journal, which gives eloquent backing to the need for Federal support for the arts and humanities as proposed in this bill, is also submitted in its entirety for the Record:

[From the Providence (R.I.) Visitor, July 27, 1962]

SUPPORT FOR AMERICAN CULTURE

Speaking at the commencement exercises of Rhode Island College last month, Congresswoman John F. Fossey proposed the establishment of a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities. Sharing Mr. Fossey's concern over the imbalance which has developed as a result of the $20 billion overemphasis on science, the Soviet Union has abandoned what we know as the liberal democratic philosophically rooted dictatorship fears the liberating power of the humanities. An American institution devoted to cultural impulses would further mark the difference between tyranny and freedom in the nuclear age.
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SUPPORT FOR ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Speaking at the commencement exercises of Rhode Island College earlier this month, Congresswoman John E. Fossey proposed the establishment of a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities. As envisioned by Mr. Fossey, this Institute would stand on an equal footing with the National Science Foundation, and would include supporting research, providing a national clearinghouse for educational materials, and developing a program for students in the arts or the humanities. In addition, there would be established a Federal Advisory Council on Arts and Humanities. The members of this council would be chosen for their eminence and would advise the Government as to the ways in which it might encourage the development of the cultural life of the Nation.

We believe that this proposal has great merit, and we might question the advisability of Mr. Fossey's plan to set up a new Institute within the U.S. Office of Education, however, in that this office has undergone important structural changes. Under Commissioner Sterling M. McMurrin, a former professor of philosophy at Harvard, the U.S. Office of Education has widened considerably beyond the traditional function of compiling educational statistics. More and more in recent years we have seen a closer communication between the academic world of humanistic studies and the creative world of the various arts. The moment that one realizes that each art has its laws and its disciplines, the question of which the Committee on the Visual Arts of Harvard University put it, "The great artist is great both as an artist and as an intellectual." The relation between the various arts, music, poetry, and drama, and the world of education has also long been recognized. It is, of course, true that the history of the relations between Government and cultural pursuits has not been altogether without its share of difficulties. Yet the fact remains that this relation has taken on an official character. Recent discussions of the shortcomings of our own State legislature in this regard come immediately to mind. Yet we have many examples of Government activity in cultural matters that are most excellent illustrations of how such departments may be made to work in a manner consistent with its duties. The National Gallery of Art combines public and private efforts very well, and the Library of Congress has long been an important center of artistic and scholarly activity.

If the National Gallery of Art and the National Science Foundation can be maintained, as they are, on a level which is well above petty political considerations there is no reason why we cannot also have an equally excellent National Institute of the Arts and Humanities.

Mr. Speaker, a subsequent editorial from the July 27, 1962, edition of the Visitor, which gives eloquent backing to the need for Federal support for the arts and humanities as proposed in this bill, is also submitted in its entirety for the Record:
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[From the Providence (R.I.) Visitor, July 27, 1962]
prizes are, however, finding that getting money to cover their operating expenses—so to say nothing of their expansion—is increasingly difficult. The time is long past when the world of the arts was the special preserve of wealthy patrons. Cities and universities alike, faced with the fact that many of our older arts are disproportionately underpaid and obsolete, cannot expect to meet the costs of the future with the help of private donors alone. A bill at least makes a start in facing these difficulties. More tax relief to wealthy art patrons, as proposed by the Providence Evening Bulletin is no solution. Museums and libraries which have been the special preserves of a few wealthy donors in the past are, in some instances, barely surviving today.

Mr. Fogarty's plan was criticized by the Evening Bulletin as an attempt to buy culture for the American people, without the Government setting the critical standards. Not only does the bill specifically prohibit Federal interference of any kind, but it assumes that we already have a culture which deserves public recognition and support.

These comments so far have focused on the idea that some part of this proposed legislation in behalf of the arts and humanities by key persons, organizations, and institutions within: the State of Rhode Island. However, support from the other side of the political argument the Nation has been equally enthusiastic.

Chancellor York, of the University of California, has put it this way:

"As for myself, I find your bill and the proposals for a national organization of arts and humanities a most encouraging step forward. It is important that the welfare of arts and humanities be taken seriously, for we must continually perpetuate and seek a high standard of excellence in the sciences to the exclusion of other areas of learning. I am convinced that a balance must be struck between the technical and the arts and humanities that will provide this country with well-rounded individuals whose abilities in any given area have only been enhanced by their knowledge of, and education in, the arts and humanities. Your bill also lends itself to the furtherance of the arts and humanities, by assuring, through scholarships and fellowships, the education of those persons pursuing study in these areas. This is a strong point in its favor."

Dean Peltona, of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences of the University of Illinois, has explained the existence and necessity of research support for the sciences, as much as it is welcomed, is forcing the universities to divert more and more of their own resources to the sciences at the expense of the other areas of our concern. Not only is this because we must divert university resources to cover the direct costs of Government-sponsored research, but since matching funds are available for science buildings, there is an unavoidable tendency to give these items high priorities.

In addition, research support for science is creating even greater disparities in the rewards to scientists in contrast to those working in fields where Federal funds are not available, which grants permit scientists to acquire equipment they need and to attend international conferences. Scientists are paid during summer months to do research. Scholars in other fields do not have these opportunities so that in effect the salary of almost every university scientist is at least two-ninths more than that of comparable ranks in the humanities.

The president of Trinity College, Washington, D.C., has pointed out that we must be concerned with "the development of a man as man, as a human person"; and further, that "our architecture, music, sculpture, literature and painting must represent the very best of which we are capable, just as our scientific development does."

President Hart of Duke University has written to me, stating:

"I think it is highly important for the student, the universities and the country as a whole that the humanities must not be neglected in our emphasis on the sciences.

Former Commissioner of Education, Dr. Sterling M. McMurrr, has responded to the presentation of my bill in the Congress in the following words:

"The need for superior attainment in the sciences to guarantee our national security in the face of grave international crises has long been recognized by American donors in their philanthropic activities. There is an equal need for superior attainment on a very broad scale in the arts and humanities if Americans generally are to gain a full understanding of their rich cultural heritage and a genuine commitment to their ideals of individual freedom and human dignity. Only with such understanding and such commitment on the part of all of its citizens will this Nation have the resources in personal and public creativeness and courage to meet successfully the continuing international struggle between freedom and tyranny."

Stanley A. Charles, president of the Eastern Arts Association, representing some 3,000 art educators in the northeastern part of the United States, has recorded that organization's support of my bill. He has called it "very realistic in its approach to the problem" and "in line with several developments which institutions and organizations working in the art field have been seeking to bring about."

On a broader scale, the National Council of the Arts in Education, representing over 150,000 persons concerned with the arts at all levels, has recently concluded the first National Conference on the Arts in Education at Lake Erie College in Painesville, Ohio. Dean Norman L. Rice, of the College of Fine Arts, Carnegie Institute of Technology, who served as chairman of this conference, has recently written to the U.S. Office of Education as follows:

"Of major importance to the conference was a realization of the urgent necessity for strong, enlightened Federal support in the arts. Indeed, this need may be said to have occupied the mind of the conference's survey of the arts today."

Dean Rice goes on to present specific recommendations from the Council in the areas of conferences, research, services of specialists, and publication in the field of the arts. He feels one of these needs would be met under the provision of this bill.

President Clark Kerr, of the University of California, has written to me in these words:

The purposes intended by your bill are of great importance to our national life which can most surely advance with security and strength only if we develop the full potential of our intellectual resources, both human and scientific.

Dean J. A. Burdine of the College of Arts and Sciences of the University of Texas has stated:

"Representative Fogarty's bill to create a National Institute of Arts and Humanities represents an excellent balance to the imbalance that has been created by the recent emphasis on science. It seems to me that the heart of the matter is the provision for scholarships and fellowships to be awarded to outstanding students."

Dean E. W. Doty, of the College of Fine Arts of the same university, has made the following comment concerning this proposed legislation:

"Of the bills which have been introduced which I have studied, this seems a more fruitful approach than trying to set up a separate national agency."

The chairman of the music department at Washington University in St. Louis, says it sums up his conviction this way:

"The arts are no longer a trifle or the preoccupation of a fringe group of eccentrics; rather, they are basic, fundamental to meaningful living in the modern world."

He further states that—

only the Federal Government can attack the problems of the arts on a scale large enough and at a level high enough to be meaningful and effective.

And of course, this is the fundamental need which my bill proposes to meet. However, while it is broad and flexible enough to attack the needs and problems in the arts at the Federal level, my bill provides specifically that there shall be no Federal control over the policies and the functions of the institutions, organizations, associations, and individuals which it seeks to assist.

For this point, I should like to submit for the Record a letter to the editor of the Providence Evening Bulletin which appeared on August 1, 1962. It was written by Dr. Gustav O. Arlt, president of the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, in reply to the Bulletin's editorial of July 20 entitled, "Buying Public Culture With Federal Subsidies."

This letter makes several facts abundantly clear. First, the enlightened scientist agrees that full value and support must be given to our artistic, literary, and scholarly efforts as a Nation if our science itself is to reach its fullest potential. Second, the gross disparity in relative support by our educational institutions of scientific programs on one hand, and of programs in the arts and humanities on the other, has been heightened by our own actions in the Congress in behalf of our defense, as suggested by these figures. And finally, the experience in recent years of educational institutions which have received substantial Federal support through agencies such as ABC, NIH, NSF, and NDEA proves beyond question that Federal assistance is possible without Federal control."
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To the Editor,
Providence Evening Bulletin,
Providence, R.I.

Your editorial of Friday, July 20, 1963, entitled "Buying Public Culture With Federal Subsidies," requires a reply, not so much to let you and your readers know that the universities and colleges of the country heartily titled "Buying Public Culture With Federal support Representative the President's Science Advisory Committee. Report of November 15, 1960, is going to buy these necessities when the ment of science must not be accomplished in cheek when you wrote that the remedy humanities has to be paid—not in science over the humanities. You yourself admit it. But I do wish to quote a few sentences from the now-famous Seaborg Report of November 16, 1960, a statement by the President's Science Advisory Committee.

"Much of the basic argument for the strengthening of American science applies equally to other fields of learning, but in the interest of science itself it is essential to give full value and support to the other great branches of man's artistic, literary, and scholarly activity. The advancement of science must not be sacrificed by the neglect of any field, and the life of the mind in our society needs to be nourished by the particular concerns which belong to this Committee and this report.

"These sentences were not written by Representative Fogarty or by a professor of arts or humanities, but by 14 of the most distinguished scientists of the Nation. Granted that the expenditure of vast sums in the advancement of the sciences is dictated by the needs of national defense, the fact remains that this advancement was accomplished by the government of anything else, and the life of the mind in our society needs which are not limited by the particular concerns which belong to this Committee and this report."

"Perhaps the most unfortunate consequence of Federal science programs has been the cleavage they have engendered between the status and rewards of faculty in the sciences and humanities. Surely this is the major problem posed for educational institutions by the unbalanced nature of present Federal policies and expenditures, and it suggests the desirability of either counterbalancing programs in the humanities or of broader forms of institutional aid."

"Faculty members in the 36 institutions were asked their opinion on the wide difference in Federal support between the sciences and humanities. Their response follows:"

"A small majority of scientists believe that the concentration of Federal funds in the natural sciences and relative neglect of the humanities is in the present national interest, but over two-thirds of the social scientists and a still larger proportion of humanists affirm that it is not. Some 70 percent of the scientists, however, state that the present trend is neither in the national interest nor in the best interest of their institution, and nine-tenths or more of their colleagues in the social sciences and humanities agree."

"Faculties members of the 36 institutions were asked their opinion on the wide difference in Federal support between the sciences and humanities. Their response follows:"

"In summary, I would say only this: Seldom, if ever, in my experience as a legislator, have I observed a more clearly stated, more frequently repeated, or more cogent plea for fair treatment of the humanities that is represented by the comments and convictions of these leaders in the fields of the arts, sciences, and the humanities which I have shared with you in part. I believe my bill, the Cultural Development Act of 1963, makes a comprehensive yet reasonable beginning of Federal support in this area. I feel certain the Congress will accept this national expression of united opinion as an unequivocal mandate for forthright action."