

support. Its chairman shapes the bounds of that support. In a broad sense he sets standards that affect the tenor of textbooks and the content of curriculum. Though no chairman of the NEH can single-handedly direct the course of American education, he can nurture the nascent trends and take advantage of informal opportunities to signal department heads and deans. He can 'persuade' with the cudgel of Federal funding out of sight but hardly out of mind."

Then, finally, every time we debate this issue we are confronted by people who will say that we must do this, we must in fact provide money for the arts community, the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, because of the effect that the arts have on our spirit, the soul, the uplifting nature of the arts; that to provide public funding for this is a good because of the way it in fact changes the culture, and they would suggest, for the positive. Well, what if, Mr. Speaker, I came before the body and suggested that there was another kind of experience that does exactly that; that provides a tremendous amount of benefit to the Nation; that does amazing things for the soul, uplifting in nature; that it can change a person's attitude about life; that it can motivate you to do great things, all these things I have heard on the floor as to the reason why we have to fund the arts?

□ 2200

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that there is another argument I could make using exactly the same logic. What if I were to come before the body and say, I know something that we should be doing that does all of the things I have just said, is an incredible influence on our lives, that provides an outlet for emotional needs of millions of people, and it is called religion and I am going to ask this body to appropriate \$150 million this year for religion.

Now, the first thing that someone would say is we cannot do this because there is this wall of separation that exists in the minds of many, but nowhere in the Constitution, by the way, that separates church and State. But the real reason why we cannot do it and the reason I would never suggest it because the minute we decide to fund religion in this body, we will then begin to decide whose religion, what brand of religion. What about this particular denomination? Why should they not be funded as opposed to that denomination?

Someone somewhere would have to make a decision. So we would establish an Endowment for Religion, and we would appoint some people to it. We would say we will give them the money because Congress does not want to get into the battle about which religion to fund. We will give \$150 million to the National Endowment for Religion, and they will make the decision because they are the experts. They know what is best. If they give it all to the Bap-

tists, that is fine. If they split it up with the Jews, the Catholics, the Presbyterians, whatever, it is their decision to make. It is their \$150 million. They will make the decision. How many Members in this body would agree with such a thing? No one. I suggest that we would not get very many votes for such a proposal. And rightly so.

It is not our place because the minute that we start doing that, we are automatically discriminating if we pick one over another, which must be done. There is absolutely no difference, Mr. Speaker, none whatsoever, in the funding of the arts and the funding of religion. Each one of those things has its particular brand. It appeals to certain individuals and not others. Somebody has to make a decision about which one of these things gets funded, and then we will come to the House and hold up a list of things that has been funded by that organization and some people will be outraged by it, as I imagine there were some tonight as I was reading through the list of things that we have funded that the government has paid for. Some people will listen and say that is great stuff. I wish a billion dollars was put into it.

What happens is there is discrimination in this because every time somebody gets one, every one artist gets funded, some artist does not, and that means somebody is making a decision about which is better. I suggest that is an impossible decision to make for everyone. It is absolutely appropriate for me to do it for myself; it is not appropriate for me to do it for all of my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, the hypocrisy that rears its head here, certainly daily, but on this particular occasion when we debate the NEA, the National Endowment for the Arts, public broadcasting and all of the rest, this hypocrisy is overwhelming. It is so stark.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we are undeniably in the middle of a culture war. We have heard that term many times. It is a war of competing ideas and world views. On one side we have people who believe in living by a set of divinely moral absolutes; or the very least, they believe that following such a moral code represents the best way to avoid chaos and instability.

On the other side, we have people who insist that morality is a moral decision and any attempt to enforce it is viewed as oppression. That war is a real one which is carried out every single day in the halls of our schools, around the watercooler of our businesses, in the newspapers of the Nation, on television. In every form of communication, the culture war is ongoing. There is a battle for the soul, for the mind, for the actual personality, if you will, of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is pretty much accepted as being true. We know that there are these competing sets of values out there trying to grab us and get us on their side, whatever that might be.

Now, I happen to believe completely that there is such a thing as good art, good music. I believe that it can be all of the things that people say. I believe we can be inspired by it. We can be motivated by art to do wonderful things. But I also suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if there is such a thing as good art, good music, good literature, then there is such a thing as bad art, bad music and bad literature. And it has the opposite effect of the good art. I believe that is true. That is my personal observation, my personal belief.

I choose not to impose that belief on anyone by law, but I will make the case when I am allowed here on the House floor, allowed to debate this issue in any public forum, I will talk about the fact that I believe we are in the midst of a culture war and there are competing sides in that war that are actually grappling for the soul of the Nation. I will try my best to defend what I believe to be the good side as opposed to the bad side, but that is my decision to make. And it rests on my ability to convince my friends or relatives, as well as it does with any one of us here as to who is right and who is wrong.

Even as a Member of the Congress of the United States, it is not in my authority to force anyone out there to agree with it by the power that is vested in me as a Member of this House to vote for a tax to enforce my particular view of who should be helped in those culture wars. We have to do it through the power of persuasion.

This place, Mr. Speaker, is the place in which the battle occurs oftentimes, maybe even daily. Because this is the place in which we have determined that a great debate should go on about the nature of our society, about the kind of people we are. It is the place of ideas. It is certainly the free marketplace of ideas. And we are allowed to come before the body as I have tonight to express our opinions. I hope that we have to a certain extent, anyway, even a small extent tonight, made a case for allowing that debate to occur without the influence of the power of government to tax and help one side in it as opposed to another.

Let us simply talk about it here, but, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that there again is no more hypocritical thing that we do here in the Congress of the United States than to take money away from people in support of a particular brand of art or music and then argue about whether or not that should happen with regard to religion.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. THOMAS (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today after 2:00 p.m. on account of attending a funeral.