

John H. Barcroft

8/27/72

Leonard P. Oliver

Proposed Cut to Regional Projects Fund Request
For Fiscal Year 1973

When I learned that our budget request for doubling of the Regional Projects fund for the fiscal year 1973 had been cut back to the level of funding for Regional Projects in 1972, it gave me an opportunity to clarify my own thinking about the purposes and operational aspects of the Regional Projects program beyond the stipulations set out in the guidelines which we recently developed for the program.

First, let me delve into what I consider to be the (1) philosophical justification for the Regional Projects program and the additional monies requested for fiscal year 1973; our commitment in the Regional Projects program should reflect some degree of the commitment we have in the experimental state-based program if the Regional Projects program is to be truly complimentary and supplementary to the state effort. That is, that it must involve humanists and it must reach an adult public and it must to some degree concentrate on contemporary conditions in national life. The main point, however, is that the Regional Projects program can offer a flexibility so that as the state-based program grows to cover more states and with additional monies, the Regional Projects program can grow alongside the state-based program, stimulating and reinforcing state efforts as well as being stimulated by state efforts.

Specifically, I see the Regional Projects program as sort of a "quality control" mechanism to keep the state-based committees honest in the sense of continued generation and support of quality proposals and projects. Alongside the state-based effort, the Regional Projects program can stimulate innovative public activities in the humanities which could possibly serve as models or examples by programs

to be expanded and replicated in other areas. Even with the fullest development of the state-based program, I doubt whether in the next five to ten years any state-based group performing in a state with a major metropolitan area will be able to fund public activities in the humanities for that metropolitan area which can have impact without a large expenditure of funds. As state-based programs develop in these areas, therefore, it may be that we will see an increased need for regional project funds to meet the increased demand from organizations and institutions in major metropolitan areas to conduct public activities in the humanities.

The Senate recently passed S. 659, Education Amendments in 1971. Title I of the Higher Education Act, an analogous program to the state-based effort, would be amended under S. 659 to authorize a reservation of appropriation (10% of the total appropriation) for institutions of higher education which wished to carry out special programs and projects designed to seek solutions to national and regional problems relating to urbanization, technological and social changes, and environmental pollution. These would be direct grants from the federal government to these institutions for this purpose. In addition, Title I would also be amended under Title I, S. 659 to authorize a special appropriation of five million dollars for the next three fiscal years for institutions of higher education in standard metropolitan statistical areas which wished to plan, develop, and carry out programs specifically designed to apply the resources of higher education to the problems of urban communities within these areas. Both Sen. Pell, who introduced the bill and Senator Javitts are strong supporters of these two provisions for Title I (see Congressional Record, Wednesday, August 4, 1971, page S.13163). In other words, our own champions in the Senate have seen the ecstasy of giving the Title I people the very authorization for direct grants for regional problems and for metropolitan-wide problems that we are seeming to meet in the state-based program through the Regional Projects fund.