



Grantmakers in the Arts
2001 Conference

Culture Influencing Community Change

Proceedings from the Conference

November 5-7, 2001
Mohonk Mountain House
New Paltz, New York

After September 11: Dealing with a New Landscape for Arts and Culture

Moderator: Alberta Arthurs
Board member, National Video Resources

Panelists: Ronne Hartfield
Art Institute of Chicago
Frances Degen Horowitz
Graduate Center of the City University of New York
Anthony Romero
American Civil Liberties Union
Kenneth Prewitt
New School for Social Research

November 5, 2001, 12:30 p.m.

© 2002 Grantmakers in the Arts

Claudine Brown: We're going to start the panel immediately. Alberta Arthurs will be our moderator. Alberta was a founding member of this organization, Grantmakers In the Arts, and she was formerly the director for arts and humanities at the Rockefeller Foundation. She was also president of Chatham College, and she currently is senior associate at MEM Associates. I won't say any more. She's fabulous. She'll do this panel, and if you want to know more, stop her and ask her. Alberta Arthurs.

Arthurs: Thank you for being patient while we get ourselves settled here. I want to begin by thanking Ken Prewitt for giving us a stimulating analysis of the nexus between American democracy and American demographics. I think what we're going to do in the next little while will be to build on and comment on many of the things that he's said.

I also want to thank the conference organizers for bringing us to this beautiful place. It's a tribute to our need for each other, for renewal, our need for community to get back to the conference theme, that so many of us traveled so far to be here today. This place turns out to be a place for the soul, a place for wandering and for walking, and a wonderful place for talking. It is a place to be after September 11th, and a place to be together.

So the conference organizers, more than perhaps they knew in the beginning, have provided us a locus for the things we most need at this point in time. It is, as I say, a wonderful place for talking, and this is a group that is used to talking. But even talk has changed of late. Most of us have barely been in a conversation that hasn't ended in discussion of the events of September 11th. We have not, in New York City, had rubble before.

Most of us these days are thinking and reading and trying to comprehend what has happened. I think of the latest issue of *The New Yorker*, which shows a New York City Yellow Cab enveloped in flags, with a turbaned, fearful man in the driver's seat. It becomes a symbol of what we're trying to think through and how we're trying to deal with it.

We're turning to family and to friends. New Yorkers, at least, are now at this moment in time, unusually polite and unusually edgy. Some New Yorkers are not riding the subways. Some New Yorkers are giving up their seats on the subways to other people. Neither of these things is natural to New Yorkers.

Neither is common. Neither is normal. And "normal" is a word, I think, we worry about.

In the new Grantmakers in the Arts *Reader*, which just came out, the poet Bob Holman writes, "There's a new normal now." In a way, that's what we're here to talk about. Is there? What can we say about the environment that we are in now?

We have asked four very distinguished Americans to speak to this issue that overrides everything else today. After September 11th, where is America now? We have asked these people to speak out of the special areas of their expertise as precisely, as exactly as they can about how we are reacting today, how we are changing as a nation or, indeed, whether we are changing.

First, Ronne Hartfield to my left. Ronne is an arts educator and commentator. For the last decade, she has been executive director for museum education at the Art Institute of Chicago. Her biography is in your folders. She has a long and extensive career in programming for museums as an independent. She was executive director of the Chicago-based Urban Gateway Center for Arts in Education. She has been a winner of the Presidential Medal of the Arts. As I said, a distinguished American.

Frances Degen Horowitz, to my right, is president of the Graduate Center of the City University of New York, a nationally recognized psychologist, a fabulous administrator. Among her many leadership roles in education and civic organizations, she is a member of the board of directors of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, a member of the board of the American Committee for the Weizmann Institute, and of the Jewish Community Relations Council. She is a native New Yorker, although she has spent much of her career outside New York.

Anthony Romero, executive director of the American Civil Liberties Union. Certainly the youngest executive director of the American Civil Liberties Union, the sixth in that position, the first Latino, the first openly gay man to take the helm of the nation's most significant civil liberties organization. He is an attorney by training, was at the Rockefeller Foundation for a while, then went to the Ford Foundation before he took this very daunting job.

You've all met Ken Prewitt. I don't think we need to introduce Ken again, only to remind you that he is yet another distinguished American.

In the order in which I've introduced them, I'm going to ask each of these people to spend five minutes telling us from their different specialties what they think we're facing in the social landscape in which we are living today. To offer us explanations, if not answers. To offer us some vision into this landscape, some explorations of the place where we live today. What do we see?

I'm going to ask Ronne to start, then Frances, then Anthony, then Ken, who has the hardest job of all, because he has to think about how to respond on top of all the wonderful stuff he already gave us. If there's time, I'd like to ask these panelists then to respond to each other a little bit before we throw it open to you. Ronne, please.

Hartfield: My first comment has to do with the notion of binaries that was laid out before us earlier, and this whole idea of hyphenated identity. Coming from a multi-hyphenated background myself, I had to give some thought to this. I've often thought that if we could create a different kind of binary, which would simply be hybrid and pure, everybody would end up on one side of the equation and we would all stop fighting each other. We would all stop fighting over distribution of goods as well.

One of the things that happened on September 11th is that some binaries were dissolved. Out of all the things that have come out in the newspapers and magazines, I want to read just from one that captured for me the most of what has happened. This was by Frank Rich, and it was a column called, "The Day Before Tuesday." He said, "Being human, you first think of those you love. Then if you are lucky enough to find them safe, you grieve for those who are lost. Then you grieve for the city. After that, you think of your country, and another kind of shock sets in. Some things have been lost there, too. But not all of what's gone may be a cause for mourning. We live in a different America today than we did only the day before Tuesday."

I think that, as artists, part of what we have to look at is what has been lost that may not necessarily be a cause for mourning, as we look at it in the context of what might have been gained, as difficult as that is.

On the days before Tuesday, I was in Italy with my husband celebrating our wedding anniversary, and the completion, at last, of a book I had been writing over several years. We were with good friends, American artists and Italian friends, in a beautiful old house in a beautiful valley, eating wonderful food, of course, and drinking far too much wine.

All of us, except for two people in this crowd of eight, were monolingual; that is to say, we either spoke Italian or English. You'd think this would have stopped us from communicating, but it did not, and it was not necessarily the food or the wine that kept us going. Partly it was a desire to locate ourselves in some kind of unity in that place.

The day after Tuesday, the book I had been writing seemed an utter frivolity. I wondered what had ever possessed me to spend so much time walking through an irretrievable past, writing this biography of my mother's life that nearly spanned the twentieth century. What had I been after?

Well, in that golden pre-exilic time before Tuesday, I had hoped that one private story of survival, with all the complexities of twentieth century America, might offer some lessons in real history. By illuminating a whole number of truths that had been obscured, perhaps such a book might have a part in binding together generations and communities that had been ruptured. I hoped, ambitiously, that the telling of my mother's story, which is entitled *Another Way Home*, might enlighten some people along the path to see through the evidence of one decisional life that individual acts can bring us to home, wherever that may be.

When we finally got to our home in Chicago, after being detained for many days in a strange land in a time entirely absent of any golden carelessness, any private or intimate joy, I couldn't think of anything, any private endeavors, that might make me of any worth, except perhaps those of the policemen, the firemen, the New York City volunteers, the givers of blood. Anything else seemed frivolous.

What happened for me, I'm sure, happened for many people here. Certainly it happened for many artists with whom I've spoken since we returned. In a profound need to touch people I loved, I spent countless hours on the telephone connecting to people all over Chicago and at long distances, sorting our emotions and asking these questions about how people could continue to make art after such rupture.

Of course, even after that Tuesday, we *will* continue to make art. We are driven, even compelled, to continue. We cannot simply sit and contemplate, because artists are makers. Our grief will take concrete form in what we make. What we now know is that what we make, however intimate to us, cannot again be so personal, so self-indulgent, so solipsistic, so “this is about me and who cares if anybody else gets it?”

What we’re going to make now, I think, has to be at least equal to the enormity of what has been destroyed. After all, is it not the business of art and artists to make meaning from chaos? That’s what we’ve always done, not in a discursive cause-and-effect kind of way, but in a way that recognizes that past and present are really all bound up together. In religious terms, artists have always understood that it is only in a post-exilic world that we know the real meanings of Paradise.

I’ve talked to so many people about the symbols of the Trade Center that have become so internalized for them, who really had never consciously thought about it until they fell. Paradise itself is inseparable from exile, and terror is inseparable from its history, of course. Many people have been impugning the United States for its absences, its neglects, its excessive and terrible liaisons with all kinds of bad people and bad ideas. The terror that we’ve suffered is inseparable from that history, but as artists, we also know it’s inseparable from its healing.

Artmaking, as architectural historian James Young reminds us, is a mnemonic strategy. One individual act of one artist can create a monument of memory that can heal a community.

Another artist I like, who wrote in exile and about exile, Juan Munoz, wrote that “Art confirms the centrality of human presence in a manifestly transitional time.” Of course, this is such a time. What has been confirmed for me in just the last couple of weeks is that all time is transitional. My mother’s time was also transitional. I’ve come around to the hope that this story I’ve been writing about my mother’s life can be more than an idealized paean to a long-ago lost past. But it could also indeed create another way of thinking about home, wherever and however that may be.

I might say, in thinking about that, to doubly emphasize the fact that we’re not only all hybrid in terms of race and gender and religion, everybody in this country – that’s what being American means – we’re also

all bicultural, minimally, if not tricultural. I think of myself as a Chicagoan and an American, but also I’m half-Louisianian, and when the women from Louisiana started talking about that, my hand went up.

I’ve come back around to hope. I had a great conversation on the bus en route to this place with Arnie Aprill, one of the most eloquent artists I know. I asked him if a story like my mother’s, which is after all a story of survival and triumph and wholeness, might be frivolous in a time of crisis. Arnie answered by turning the question on its end, “Is it not the *failure* to imagine wholeness in a time of crisis that is frivolous?”

It just struck me that that was a much more accurate way to think about the work that we do as artists. Nothing we’re doing at this point can be frivolous. Everything we’re doing is about wholeness. I wrote my mother’s story, hoping it might have value as evidence of decisional survival. It seemed to me and to Arnie Aprill that the lives and works of artists must leave evidence of decisional survival. As Pablo Neruda said, “We come to speak for their dead mouths.”

Arthurs: Thank you, Ronne. From the artist’s view.

Frances, we’ve asked you to speak about the psychological framework within which we’re interacting these days. That’s a large order.

Horowitz: What I’m going to say is a modal response among many people, and that is reaching into an historical perspective.

I grew up and came of age in the era of the Second World War. Then, at a place like Antioch College, we were fighting the Cold War. Speaking of the notion of binaries, we all knew what was right, and we knew what was wrong, and we pursued those convictions.

As Alberta mentioned, I spent many years in the Midwest, in Kansas, during the ‘60s and ‘70s, where, again, the binaries were there. Many of us felt we knew what was right and we knew what was wrong as we fought on behalf of civil rights and against the Vietnam War.

I came back to New York, where it’s a little murkier about what’s wrong and what’s right.

It seems to me that the binaries that Ronne talked about were upended on September 11th. More was

destroyed than the tremendous loss of life. A lot of convictions were put on very shaky grounds.

In that context of stress and uncertainty – uncertainty itself is a stress – I think a lot of people reach back into their own core, to their own identity, not so much of who they are, but what they see as their mode of responding. Their strengths get strengthened, and their vulnerabilities get exacerbated.

In reaching back into that core, one looks for the responses that are comforting. We talk a lot about comfort food. I've been thinking recently about all the comfort activities that we gravitate toward, looking for the things that made us feel good in the past, and avoiding the things that we think will upset us. We reach into that core, and we reinforce it with those comfort activities, and respond with the modes of action that we feel are most comforting.

Those people who are, at the core, activists, have come out for and against the war, and will gravitate toward demonstrations. Those people whose core is instrumental, "I've got to do something," will find some things to do. I noticed that the claim of volunteerism is going way up, people who see that as a mode in their core. Those whose core is to beat a wary and frightened retreat stay close to home, don't venture out, don't go in those subways.

Whatever the individual reactions, there are a lot of new realities. In the days immediately after the attack, I decided to walk through, floor by floor, of the Graduate Center, and just poke my head in every open office and say, "How are you doing?" It was almost like a Rorschach of personality across the institution. What threaded through was the uncertainty, "What's going to happen now?" and a great deal of underlying sadness, that we had been so brutally violated as a society, and not knowing how we were going to overcome that.

As we think about September 11th, we have to think in terms of phases. Of the immediate aftermath, of the shock, of the sadness, and a realization of the enormity of the loss of life, and how many families have been torn apart by the action.

As we began to regain some sense of stability, then came the bioterrorism, if in fact that is what it is, and the anthrax scares. Then the repeating alerts of, in the next week there is going to be another terrorist attack. As that week ends and nothing major has happened, people move to get back to their patterns

of life, and then another warning comes, or another anthrax letter has arrived. People have been kept very much off-center, even as they are trying to return to some sense of normality.

It's a dynamic situation. Two to three months from now, if there has not been another major terrorist attack, if the anthrax scare subsides, if there's no more bioterrorism, I think we'll see a returning back to much more normal activities.

I've been very impressed by the fact that people who live alone, and singles, feel particularly vulnerable – no matter how broad their social networks, no matter how many phone calls they make to friends and family – because at the end of the day, when you turn off the light, you're alone. That is frightening to many people. I've noticed that there is much more of a lingering around an institution, staying at the office, staying with friends, trying to keep that social connection.

Some faculty have said to me, when I've asked how the semester is going, "You know, it's very hard to focus. The students are having a very hard time focusing." It's as if there's always a desire to have that side conversation off the topic that you're supposed to be on, because it's a way of exploring your own feelings and trying to get back to some sense of stability.

Two weeks ago, in the middle of the night, we found a folded paper in a classroom with a white substance. The ventilating systems were turned off. We got the substance to the police, and to the health department, which was so overwhelmed that it took them over a week to test that substance. We made the decision that we would keep the ventilating fans off in the zone where that piece of paper and substance had been found.

That week happened to be warm, and we have lots of interior offices so it got pretty stuffy. What was so amazing to me is in that week, even though we said to people, "You can relocate to another part of the building," most people did not. Not a single person complained. Now, for an academic institution, where the right to complain is in the Constitution, to me, that was amazing. Not one single complaint out of the entire community as we waited through the week, knowing that the probability that this was a toxic substance was very low, still there was anxiety. Again you could see the Rorschach quality of who was most anxious, and who was least anxious.

Coming up in the car from New York today, I was reading in *The New York Times* an editorial called, "Harnessing the Spirit of September 11th," and it refers to the fact that Judith Kay got a taste of the city's new civic spirit when she told about a hundred people who showed up for jury duty one day recently that they would not be needed, and instead of the customary cheering, New Yorkers, who not long ago viewed jury duty as a civic form of root canal, voiced disappointment at being excused. It goes on to talk about how this need to volunteer, to do something, is a different set of attitudes in New York City, and it is quite palpable.

I also think it's a need to be together. It's an activity where you join with other people, and you can talk about all of the anxieties that you've been feeling over the past several weeks, and touching base and reaching back again to your own core sense, and wanting the comfort activities that are going to allay the fears that this kind of uncertainty brings. We're looking at uncertainty not only about more terrorist attacks, perhaps bioterrorism, but about the economy, about the security of one's job, and about whether as a society we are going to ever return to this notion of normality, or will we have to redefine normality.

Realizing how many other people around the world live with those conditions – in Israel, in Peru, in Ireland, in all the places that have been rocked by terrorist violence for periods of time, sometimes very long periods of time – and I think we're seeing a kind of psychological readjustment. Though for some people, that psychological readjustment is brutally disturbing; for other people, you can see that it's much more easily handled.

It would be interesting to talk together a year from now and see where we are, how we've come through this, and where the sense of comfort activities and the need for those comfort activities has gone.

Arthurs: Thank you, Frances. Thank you, thank you. Anthony, I think you must be one of the busiest people in the United States post-September 11th. Because if there's one subject we know something about, and how to discuss it, it's civil liberties in the face of a threat of this magnitude. Anthony?

Romero: I started this new job on September 4th. Timing is everything. Obviously, I have it all wrong. Before that, I was sitting in audiences much like your own, I was a donor. Very often I'd come to meetings

like this to understand the state of play, to share time with colleagues, and to understand where the larger debates were going.

When I answer Alberta's question of, what do I see, I may surprise you a bit when you hear from the head of the ACLU that I start with notes of optimism. Because if we can allow ourselves to talk about good news amidst such tragedy, there is a lot of good news to take note of.

You would first have to take note of the acts of enormous courage by the firemen, by the policemen, by emergency service personnel. We would have to take note of the generosity of Americans all across this country, who dug into their hearts and their pocketbooks to help the victims and their families. You would have to take note of the defiance of the American spirit, of the flag-waving that shows that no matter what attack, American values will stand up.

There's also been good news which has surprised me, from some of the statements of our elected officials – individuals including President Bush and Mayor Giuliani, who warned all Americans that any attacks against our Arab, Muslim, or Sikh neighbors would not stand. Although that's precisely what you would expect a U.S. President to be saying during moments of national crisis, we know that's not always been the case. In fact, in other moments of such crises, these efforts have allowed our country to turn on individuals of different descents and different backgrounds, and to fuel the fires of xenophobia.

Often when I walk home from my office, seven blocks from Ground Zero, I think to myself, "Why is this particular instance different? Why are at least the public statements of elected officials more tolerant?" Perhaps we're more fortunate in the fact that our leaders understand this now.

Perhaps also, we've become more tolerant as a nation. Ken Prewitt just told us about the changing demographics in our country. We now know that people come to this country and that they do not, in fact, melt into this "melting pot," that many choose to keep their differences.

As many groups have retained those differences, I think we've seen also a growth in our tolerance and our respect for these different groups. The terrorists who attacked the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, and in Pennsylvania, took insidious advantage of these tolerances and of these freedoms. They lived

in our communities, they lived in our midst, they enjoyed our basic liberties and freedoms. Does that somehow mean that these liberties are at fault, or that respecting the rights of others who are different is somehow wrong?

The answer is clearly an emphatic “No.” The fundamental values established in our Constitution, in our Bill of Rights, are the bedrock of this country. They are what truly distinguish us. They are our legacy to the world. So there’s much good news.

But not all of it is good. After weeks of negotiation, the President signed into law last Friday a bill which gives a new definition to the word “terrorist.” It’s called the USA Patriot Act. Notwithstanding the rhetoric and the lip service of many of our officials, the new law simply cuts out the heart of those basic freedoms and those basic liberties. The new law gives government expanded power to invade our privacy, to imprison people without meaningful due process, and to punish dissent. There are many aspects of this long and complicated law that simply do not meet the basic test of maximizing our security while preserving our civil liberties. Three provisions, real quick.

One is an overly broad definition of “terrorism,” a definition that is so broad and so vague, it could include legitimate forms of protest and dissent.

Second provision, around the detention of immigrants. With even the existence of due process and judicial review, standards are so vague that you may have immigrants in detention for indefinite periods of time.

And third are the lowering of standards around surveillance and law enforcement efforts. Now, government can go into your home, search your basic rooms, look through your materials, and not provide you with notice of that search until after the fact. That applies not to terrorists, but to each of you in this room.

As we look at the legislation and we think about what’s ahead, we have to remind ourselves that cooler heads must prevail if we’re going to defend the country while at the same time defending our freedoms. The attack of September 11th was not only an attack on our lives and our property, it was an attack on the fundamental values of freedom and liberty that are the bedrock of our country.

Terror, by its very nature, is not only meant to destroy, but also to intimidate, to force a people to take actions that are not in their best interests. If we allow these attacks to erode our basic freedoms and our basic liberties, the terrorists will have won.

So what do we do? We have to remind our government that our eyes are on them. That as they debate these issues, the public is interested and involved. Many of the conversations surrounding the new legislation were done in Star Chamber room discussions, late at night, with little input or involvement of the American public. We must remind them that on issues as important as our way of life, and our basic liberties and values, we must also be involved and informed in that process.

Second, we need to establish better guidelines for evaluating any new proposals that would affect these liberties. At the very least, any changes to our laws should be debated and examined in public. They should be proven effective in increasing our safety and our security. It’s not enough that they make us feel better; they should be effective. These new measures should be applied in a fair and non-discriminatory way.

Third, we must ensure that our government continues to prosecute and to punish any of the bigoted and prejudiced attacks against our neighbors and friends who are of different backgrounds, religions, and ethnicities. We have over six million Muslims in this country, three and a half million Arab-Americans, half a million Sikhs. They are our friends, our neighbors. Not the enemy.

For donors interested in the arts, I think there are a couple of lessons that are particularly important. The arts are now more important than ever before. You nourish the spirit at a moment when the spirit is hurting. At the same time, the arts are the expression of human ideas and human events. Unfortunately, during moments of such crisis, we find an effort to shut down the exchange of ideas and the exchange of different points of view.

There are three ways in which these new laws might affect your basic work. One is that the new laws put enormous pressure on freedom of expression, whether it’s the definition of terrorism being too broad, or criminalizing behavior in certain groups, or extensions of certain groups, which might include arts and museums.

There is also an increase in political litmus tests, where the government can increasingly shut out of our country immigrants whom they deem to be inadmissible because they're a threat to our country. We've already seen these sorts of litmus tests used in the 1950s to shut out the arts and to shut out thinkers from Communist countries. We must make sure that it doesn't happen also in the Arab world and others representing different points of view.

This other way it might affect your work is the chilling effect on college campuses and universities. You see already that even good-hearted administrators are reluctant to encourage the wrath of students or parents by allowing teaching or discussions of alternative viewpoints.

Third, you'll find that government continues to extend pressure on media outlets with issues related to the terrorist attacks. It was unfortunate that one of the first acts coming out of the White House was pressure on the five media outlets to not run the videotapes of Osama bin Laden. There was no proof of secret messages. There was no proof of codes in those videotapes. In any event, those videotapes were openly accessible to every member of the public through videos coming through Europe, through the Internet, through cable TV, and yet our White House felt compelled to pressure the networks in not running those tapes.

We're going to find similar pressures to shut down the free exchange of ideas, and the free exchange of information. It's our work to make sure that doesn't happen. Thank you.

Arthurs: Ken Prewitt, political scientist and policy analyst, may have something more to contribute to this piece of the discussion. Ken?

Prewitt: Well, very little. If you think about the panel for a moment, it's been very eloquent on "What does 9-11 mean for us?" As Ronne spoke about what it means for our arts, or Frances spoke about what it means for our emotions and identities, and Anthony's speaking about what it means for our civil liberties, our constitutional values.

I only want to add that we also have to ask the really tough question, where did 9-11 come from? What does it mean for millions and millions of people who do not call it terrorism, but instead find emotional satisfaction and meaning in it?

It is a complicated struggle of values. Of values of tolerance, and ambiguity, and nuance, and subtlety, and all of the things that we associate with our democratic discourse, and our artistic discourse, against a set of values which are, if you will, messianic, which are capital "T" Truth, which are final-solution searches and so forth. But a very large number of people are going to have to become persuaded that there's a better way to deal with differences than terrorism.

I only conclude, Alberta, by saying that the reason we have to work hard at what kind of democracy we are, preserving the kinds of things that Anthony just talked about, is not just for us. It's also for us in a conversation with peoples everywhere who, if we're going to live together peacefully and justly in the world, not just in the United States but in the world, we're all going to have to learn to buy into these common values of tolerance and diversity, of acceptance, of nuance. Again, to go back to Meredith Monk, democracy is about argument, and argument means that you don't know the answer, but you're willing to work towards finding the answer. Thank you.

Arthurs: Thank you, panel. I think it's time to hear from all of you, and I'd like to invite you to address questions to individual members of the panel, to the panel as a whole, to give us your thoughts back on what we look like and what we see today.

Audience: This question is for Anthony. As someone who wrote a check to the ANC in the late '60s, early '70s, I wanted to know if you'd heard whether those lists of charities that were considered terrorists had been expanded.

Romero: Thank you for your question. That's exactly the example we use in our literature.

Government has now designated a series of new groups that it would consider, quote, "suspicious under the Terrorism Law." It doesn't even require informing the American public of what groups are on that list. It's also retroactive in some instances. The new efforts would make associational life in America a very perilous place.

The example I was using of an arts group from Ramallah, or an exhibit coming to you from Damascus, could be problematic for your institutions, if they can show back the ties to groups that they "have deemed to be terrorist" groups. If you harbor

a dancer in your home who later on is accused of terrorist activities, you yourself could be prosecuted under this terrorism bill for knowingly harboring a terrorist.

The examples are many. Throwing a brick through the window of WTO at one of these protests could be deemed as a terrorist act. I'm not saying this is a good thing; it's obviously a criminal act. We have laws against vandalism, we have laws in terms of peaceful protest. But do we really want to go that far and enable our law enforcement authorities to view all this as possible terrorist activity? The answer has got to be "No."

Audience: Hi. Thanks so much. I'm interested in the question of uncertainty. Dr. Horowitz, you talked about how that was precisely stressful, and Meredith Monk was also quoted about how we have to hang out with stress. I wonder if anyone would like to address the idea of how the arts can support a culture becoming comfortable with, or if not comfortable with, being able to tolerate, uncertainty.

Horowitz: That's a difficult question, because part of what is so important about the arts is that it pushes the envelope. It tries new forms, it tries to introduce different and new and sometimes shocking ideas. Yet if my feeling is correct, that what we want is comfort activities, that could be quite off-putting to people seeking their own sustenance.

I was shocked at my own response a week ago Saturday. I had the wonderful opportunity to hear Pete Seeger again. I said to my husband, it's just so good to be in the audience with the old hootenanny feelings. The last thing I wanted to do that evening was hear a new piece of music.

That's concerning, because the arts play a very vital role in our society in pushing that envelope. The whole issue of how one programs arts for that purpose is going to be quite a challenge. If we give up the role of the arts in pushing that envelope, we will have lost something. Yet people are generally looking for the familiar, for the comforting, for the reinforcing of their own historical context.

Arthurs: I'd like to pick up on that as well, because that's an interesting observation, Frances, and an undeniable one. One of the other things that has struck me about the arts in this time of crisis is how incredibly generous the arts communities have been

in reaching out to provide solace on the one hand, exploration on the other. Various ways in which they can help us to survive and even raise money in the face of this catastrophe.

Even beyond that, I've been struck – and this may be true in other communities as well – I've been struck by the extent to which the people are the artists in this crisis. New York is full of artmaking by ordinary citizens. New York is full of artmaking by people who don't usually think of themselves as part of the art community. On every street corner, there are poems and pictures. People are singing and gathering to sing. People are contributing photographs to two store fronts on Print Street, photos they've taken of what this has meant to them, what they've seen, what they've felt. The whole city seems to resonate with an art that is everyone's art.

That's something I hope we won't lose, because I think that it's extremely important, and that it's one of the most significant ways in which people are coming together. They're coming together with the professionals, so-called, in all of this. It's one art world. One set of sidewalks, one set of streets, one set of subways.

I was also struck – and you may want to pick up on your own thought on this one, Ronne – when you said you thought that artists would work, perhaps, in less personal or solipsistic or in wider ways as a result of this. Accountable!

Hartfield: I think that people make art out of themselves. One of the interesting aspects of my career is that I taught in a number of universities before I came to teach in the School of the Art Institute, where I later was a dean for seven years. I learned from students in standard academic institutions and students in arts schools that people made their work from themselves. Art is intrinsically expressive. As such, it is always going to reflect where people are, both privately and as members of a wider community.

I don't so much worry about art becoming a kind of seeking after comfort, when people are trying to deal within themselves with the chaos that they're living in and trying to restructure themselves within that. What I expect is a much more probing art. a subtle difference between saying art should not be personal, and saying that art should at once be profoundly personal, but also profoundly accountable. There is

in my mind a very large difference. The kind of flamboyant self-indulgence that has afflicted at least some of our artists in recent times, I think would not only find less of an audience, but I think would be less likely to be produced.

Arthurs: Maybe we have to believe that all these things are true, and that the opportunities for responding to artists and art communities in these dangerous and difficult times will be even greater than they've ever been. Do we have more questions?

Romero: Can I add one thing about the arts? When I talked about the rise of patriotism, there's a second wave which we're now also seeing across the country, which might also concern you, which is the rise of religious fervor.

We're getting calls from all across our state offices about mandatory school prayer; about the Ten Commandments being posted in schools; about the Ten Commandments being used in state legislative offices. Just as Americans are now rushing to embrace the flag, many are also rushing to openly embrace their religious beliefs. Of course, it's perfectly fine in the privacy of one's home and one's own personal life. It's quite another matter when you do it in public institutions and public places.

For the arts, we've seen that play out in other instances, when the largest effort to censor the arts came from pro-religious forces that tried to legislate what was appropriate, obscene, anti-religious, anti-Christian art. As you find greater growth of this fervor throughout the country, you might find some of these same battles that we waged with Mapplethorpe and others in years previous playing out again. Just musings.

Horowitz: If I could add, the other way to keep the arts from intruding on a seeming national agenda is in the funding area. Before September 11th, and after September 11th, we have lots of needs in this country. If every major issue is pushed off the agenda to fight terrorism, in the long term the terrorists will win. When you think of our needs in public education, and funding for the arts, and the needs for the infrastructure in this country, if the agenda becomes totally dominated by this fight against terrorism, we will then, de facto, be a very different society five and ten years from now.

Arthurs: Ken, do you want to comment on this area?

Prewitt: Just one thing, very quickly. Remember the old metaphor, "Make the world safe for democracy," and we created an international coalition around that principle? To take the battle to evildoers?

The new metaphor is, "Make the world safe from terrorism." It's a very different metaphor. To make the world safe for democracy means that you have to align yourself with democratic values. To make the world safe from terrorism is an invitation to align yourself with whatever values will protect you from terrorism.

Which is to say, we can align ourselves with other countries who don't believe in the rule of law, who don't believe in gender equality, who don't believe in the arts. That's quite all right, and that's part of what Tony was saying about the internal politics right now.

So the metaphor, "Make the world safe from terrorism," is a metaphor that allows political leadership to do almost anything if they're willing to say it will save us from terrorism. The art community, the intellectual community, has got to be alert to the implications of this metaphor change.

Hartfield: I want to say something about the power of the arts in these battles for the hearts and minds of people.

For those of you who have not seen the Brazil show at the Guggenheim, I recommend that everybody try to run there and stand in the lines if you have to. One of the wonderful things about the exhibition is how much it expresses both the tensions of a culture that is so textured with religious synchronism, and also the enormous joyfulness and beauty, if you want to use a word that large, that exists in the expressivity of both the Roman Catholic traditions in that culture and the African-based Caribbean synchronized Yoruba religion that lives there.

The expressions of that visually, artistically, are not only stunningly beautiful and stunningly intellectually challenging, but they're stunningly human. If we can keep that as a knowledge of what is present in artmaking, philanthropists, it would seem to me, would run to the line to fund that as a priority.

I've been a grantee, but now that I'm a grantor, I realize the tremendous responsibility and power that the philanthropic community has, to support this kind of human expressivity no matter how complicated it is.

Arthurs: In that same museum at this very moment, there is a show that's been traveling, of the work of Norman Rockwell. So at one and the same time, we have this paean to cosmopolitanism, and the many, many ways in which people in the world believe and act and make their art, and a paean to a nostalgic, mythic America that we all also share. The power of artmaking, perhaps, is that it provides us all of these ways of looking at ourselves.

It's a complicated time. All of us will remember, as long as we live, where we were and what we were doing on September 11th. I hope a year from now we'll look back on this moment again and see what the view from above is, after some time and some activity, some hopes, some dreams, and desires and fears have passed over those months.

Thank you so much for being here.

THIS IS ONE OF A SERIES OF PROCEEDINGS FROM THE GIA 2001 CONFERENCE, CULTURE INFLUENCING COMMUNITY CHANGE.

Transcriptions of proceedings from GIA's 2001 conference, *Culture Influencing Community Change*, are published as individual papers. These proceedings are also available on GIA's Web site at www.giarts.org.

ORDER FORM

Please indicate the number of copies requested for each individual sessions. Each GIA member organization may request one set of proceedings at no cost. For additional copies, please include a postage and handling fee of \$5.00 per session.

- ___ Creative Support for Individual Artists Preconference
- ___ Opening Event: An Evening with Meredith Monk
- ___ Keynote Address: Kenneth Prewitt
- ___ Keynote Address: Pepón Osorio
- ___ After September 11: Dealing with a New Landscape for Arts and Culture (*Monday session*)
- ___ Beyond "Art:" A Community Perspective
- ___ Member Report: Crossroads: Art and Religion in American Life
- ___ The Big Picture: Planning for the Future of Culture in Communities
- ___ Stabilizing Community-Based Arts Institutions
- ___ Universities and Communities Mentoring Young Artists
- ___ Young and Engaged: Youth in Community Arts Programs
- ___ Digital Workshop
- ___ Built to Last: Linking Communities of Grantees
- ___ Member Report: What We've Learned about Arts Marketing Collaboratives
- ___ Time and Space: Residencies and Retreats for Individual Artists
- ___ After September 11: Grantmakers in the Arts and the Future of Our Grantees (*Wednesday session*)

Name _____

Organization _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Phone _____ Fax _____ Email _____

___ Additional sessions requested @ \$5.00 each = \$ _____ enclosed.

Enclosed is my check payable to Grantmakers in the Arts.

Charge my bankcard # _____ Exp. date ____ / ____

Visa MasterCard American Express Name on card _____

Fax to: (206) 624-5568. Mail to: Grantmakers in the Arts, 604 West Galer Street, Seattle, WA 98119-3253, (206) 624-2312.