

prosperity meditation series, and *Here's to Your Health*—a 10-day health meditation series. She has written articles for the *Oakland Tribune* regarding the local clergy. Dr. Stortz served as a member of the Oakland Police and Clergy Together, and trained numerous assistant ministers.

Rev. Postolaki, originally from Romania, prior to coming to First Church, served the Santa Rosa Church, both as a Practitioner and as an Assistant Minister. In 1986 he became the assistant minister at First Church of Religious Science, Oakland. He conducted weekly circles of Prayer and headed the Pastoral Care.

Rev. Postolaki has brought his spiritual strength, his creativity, and his artistic talents to First Church. He created unique banners reflecting the world's religious beliefs and "The Season for Non-Violence" banner honoring the anniversaries of the deaths of Mahatma Gandhi and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Dr. Stortz and Rev. Postolaki have been pillars whose commitment has established First Church as a fifty-year-old Oakland spiritual institution.

BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN
INTEGRITY ACT OF 1997

SPEECH OF

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1998

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2183) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes:

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment by Mr. PAXTON to the bill being discussed on campaign finance reform. This amendment would require labor unions to report all financial activities under current labor laws by categories, such as organizing activities and strike activities and political activities. The amendment further requires that reports be posted on the Internet.

These provisions single out unions for special treatment. They would impose expensive, burdensome regulations upon the organizations that represent working people. Companies are not subject to such treatment. This would further tilt the political playing field towards corporations and against working families.

The amendment imposes a substantial accounting burden on union members. It is the responsibility of the Department of Labor to determine the appropriate level of accounting that is needed to fulfill the requirements of American labor laws. This measure amounts to harassment and discrimination against labor unions.

Also, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is clearly a "poison pill." It is part of a continuing effort to load up the major, bipartisan campaign finance reform proposal with provisions that will drive away certain categories of supporters. The attempt is NOT to further campaign finance reform for the good of the American people. The purpose is to obstruct the process. I therefore urge my colleagues to defeat this destructive amendment.

FUNDING OF THE NEA AND
CENSORSHIP

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1998

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have printed in the RECORD statements by high school students from my home State of Vermont, who were speaking at my recent town meeting on issues facing young people today.

FUNDING OF THE NEA AND CENSORSHIP

(By Daniel Luzer)

There has been a great deal of controversy lately about the National Endowment for the Arts. The Supreme Court is expected to rule in July in the case of National Endowment for the Arts versus Finley to decide if the federal law requiring the head of the Endowment to consider general standards of decency and respect for the diverse beliefs and views of the American public when considering whether or not to award a grant. In Congress last month, Senator John Ashcroft, together with Senator Jesse Helms, attempted, in an appropriations bill, to kill the endowment program entirely.

From the beginning, the National Endowment for the Arts has been a controversial program. Certainly the endowment is a valuable program. Before 1965, when the endowment was instituted, the arts were, to a great extent, still on the fringes of society and accessible only to the cultural elite. Since then, the arts have expanded greatly, and are now accessible to the masses and have thus begun to educate the majority, which was the point.

In the words of Maryanne Peters, the President of the Board of Directors of the National Campaign for Freedom of Expression, "In creating the NEA, Congress recognized that the arts are integral to fostering imaginative thinking in our culture." In the 33 years which the National Endowment for the Arts has existed, the role of art in our culture has greatly increased. One of the main contributions that the Endowment has made to our culture is to expand the American art world from a largely market-driven world to a system which allows artists to explore and to expose communities to new creative fields, without having to worry about how to purchase materials, or even purchase food.

It is important to remember, though, that money from the National Endowment for the Arts is a prize, bestowed upon artists whose work is either exceptionally good or greatly needed in a given community. Artists who receive money from the Endowment are singled out for the content of the work. Organizations like National Campaign for Freedom of Expression would like us to believe that the law requiring the head of the Endowment to consider standards of decency when awarding grants amounts to a violation of the rights to free speech.

This line of reasoning is flawed, however, in that The First Amendment to the Constitution states that "Congress shall make no law restricting freedom of speech." The fact of the matter is that the above-mentioned law is not a law restricting freedom of speech. The National Endowment for the Arts is not an organization which punishes artists for poor quality work; it is an organization which awards prizes to artists of first quality.

The law simply requires potential grant-givers to consider decency with respect to art. The law does not restrict the freedom to

speak in any way, since no artist is restricted from anything; they will simply find it slightly more difficult to receive federal money for offensive work, which seems a logical and acceptable state for an artist to be in. So the law is not unconstitutional.

That being said, the other issue that artists and artists' groups have brought up is the law's potentially harmful vagueness, which could lead to arbitrary and dangerous selection and rejection of an artist's work, which is absurd in a federal program, where standards are needed in order to determine an artistic piece's relevance in relation to the policies and purpose of the National Endowment for the Arts.

This is certainly a legitimate concern, and one which needs to be addressed in order for the National Endowment for the Arts to continue to function in a manner that benefits society. What the National Endowment for the Arts needs to continue in a way that benefits America are clearer laws and a stricter codification of the grant system. In this way, artists can be granted money based on whether and where their work is needed. If a given community was seriously lacking in, say, quality theater, then playwrights could be sent, with NEA grants, to the said community.

To a certain extent, the National Endowment for the Arts already works in this manner. However, greater clarity on this issue would lead to a better relationship between the art and political communities, which would decrease artists' frustration and improve the quality of the overall art program in the United States.

This plan does, to a certain extent, lead to discrimination against certain forms of art. While that is unfortunate, there is no way that the United States government could ever equally support all forms of art. But that was never the purpose of the National Endowment for the Arts. Another objection that could be raised for this plan for greater codification of the endowments program is that placing restrictions would adversely affect the quality of art. While that is a legitimate concern, as the arts are an expression of emotion, it is important to realize that, in order for the arts to flourish, they do not need to be unrestricted. Some of the greatest works of art were created under severe restrictions. The entire Renaissance, which for example, produced such masterpieces as Michelangelo's Sistine Chapel, Donatello's Madonna and Child, and Dante's Divine Comedy, was funded in large part by the Florentine banking families, not to mention the Vatican.

An additional argument against the idea of greater codification for the National Endowment for the Arts might be that the organization would therefore not be supporting the artistic community at all, since the award of grants would be based on the need for certain artists, rather than absolute support for artistic expression. One needs to realize, however, that the purpose of the National Endowment for the Arts should not be to encourage artistic expression among the artistic community. That would exist whether the National Endowment for the Arts does or not.

The purpose for the NEA ought to be to support the viewers of art, extending their horizon so as to foster the greater artistic understanding of the nation as a whole, not to support the ever-expanding imagination of the elite artistic community.

STATEMENT BY DAN WELCH REGARDING
VERMONT EDUCATION STANDARDS

My name is Dan Welch, and two years ago—well, last year, second semester, I was