

support the performing arts as a part of their national cultural heritage, it seems to me unfortunate that the United States has been so slow in coming to a similar recognition.

I would like to review some of the highlights of the statements made here today by the distinguished witnesses before this committee.

Mrs. Jouett Shouse, chairman, President's Music Committee, people-to-people program, USIA, a trustee of the National Cultural Center, and a vice president, National Symphony Orchestra, thought there should be a Cabinet-level post for the arts, and supported the bills before your committee today as a step in that direction.

Such a Council on the Arts, she said—

could be very influential in influencing (art) programs and appropriations in the States, I would think, by showing the need for music education.

Mrs. Shouse, a member of the Board of the powerful American Symphony Orchestra League, said that—

some of the States are reducing the amount of their appropriation for the study of music.

She was rightly concerned about this development.

Herman Kenin, president, American Federation of Musicians AFL-CIO supported both H.R. 4172 and H.R. 4174 very strongly.

Said Mr. Kenin:

What, other than its physical safety, is more important to the survival of a nation than its culture? Why is it that America stands almost alone among the major powers in persistently ignoring this fact of life? We ignored it here at home even while our Marshall plan dollars were being used by beneficiary nations to nurture their own national arts. We continue to ignore it today when it has been demonstrated that our best ambassadors abroad have been from the thinning ranks of those who speak in the universal language of music.

Mr. Kenin called attention to a recent survey made by the Library of Congress of State support for the arts. Mr. Kenin declared, and I quote:

Forty-seven of the fifty States responded to the question of how much aid is given to the arts. The summary, printed in the February 2 Congressional Record, is shocking. In all of the 47 States only \$202,825 was devoted to music. Only six States made any contribution whatever specifically to music.

Mr. Kenin said part of the trouble was that the word "subsidy" engenders fear that Government dollars foreshadow Government control. He declared that this is a "strawman that history belies in this country and all other countries outside the Iron Curtain."

Mr. Kenin went on to say that:

Subsidy in some minds, conjures visions of a move toward something un-American. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Homestead Act did much to settle these United States; land grants to the railroads helped make us the greatest industrial Nation; airlines, merchant marine, and science subsidies contributed to this Nation's mighty sinews. In the field of commerce, subsidy is accepted as sound fundamental Government policy. But, in the cultural field, it is somehow transmuted into something evil.

When Government supports libraries, museums—even pays to preserve the whooping crane from extinction—why then is there objection to subsidy vitally needed to prevent the extinction of the career musician?

Dr. Thomas Gorton, president, National Association of Schools of Music, and director of the school of fine arts at the University of Kansas, made the point that:

Our composers do not generally receive remuneration sufficient for a livelihood, but must engage in their creative work in the hours after the day's bread and meat have been won through other jobs.