

cern can we as individuals possibly have than to enhance and strengthen the cultural aspects of our civilization. We are engaged in a great effort to strengthen our security. Surely it is also in the national interest to strengthen the arts. A country is not strong if its culture is neglected while other areas of human endeavor advance.

The extent to which we advance culturally directly bears on our international posture. The universal language of the arts knows no national boundaries and cultural exchanges between countries can establish a very healthy rapport between peoples.

The underlying question before this subcommittee is to what extent should government be concerned with the cultural well-being of its citizenry? In the United States, if you search through the pages of the Congressional Record back through the decades, you will not find a ready answer to this question. Since the 1870's, thousands of pages of hearings and floor discussions have been printed, debating the question of direct Federal subsidies to the arts. In the process, little by little, without the guidance of any master plan or general philosophy, the Congress has put the Federal Government in the art business. It has been a perfectly natural development. But it has not been systematic. Let's see how it happened.

In 1910, Congress created the Commission of Fine Arts as guardian of the L'Enfant plan for development of the District of Columbia. It deals with specific construction and decorative proposals. Long before, in 1846, the Smithsonian Institution was created to take advantage of a bequest of James Smithson to the United States. The Institution has expanded over the years and now includes no less than 10 bureaus, 4 of which are directly concerned with the arts: The U.S. National Museum, the National Collection of Fine Arts, the Freer Gallery (which operates only partly on Federal funds), and the well-known National Gallery of Art. The operation of the National Gallery, which came into existence as the result of the private generosity of Andrew W. Mellon and others, now requires an annual expense from the Federal funds in excess of \$1,500,000.

The Department of State has engaged in cultural enterprises, particularly since World War II. One such enterprise is the foreign building program under the Foreign Service Building Act of 1926, as amended, pursuant to which \$185 million has been appropriated. Twenty major facilities are presently under construction. Two of the best known as the magnificent Embassies in India, designed by Edward D. Stone, and in London, designed by Eero Saarinen. The Department is currently obligated to pay in architectural fees more than \$1,400,000 to more than 30 different architectural firms.

Under the National Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act, programs were established to send to remote corners of the world, such distinguished representatives of our culture as Marian Anderson, the Cleveland, Minneapolis, and Philadelphia Symphony Orchestras, Jose Limon, the cast of "Long Day's Journey Into Night," and the New York City Center Ballet Corps. Louis Armstrong, Benny Goodman, and other jazz greats have given renditions of unique Americana in areas where most of the population rarely hears the English language. Funds have been budgeted to the State Department for foreign information and exchange activities. Of this, more than \$23 million is being devoted to educational exchanges, of which a substantial part directly concerns the creative arts.