James Clifford and Guillermo Gómez-Peña: An Exchange

Scholar James Clifford and artist Guillermo Gómez-Peña engaged in a provocative discussion as part of a conference, New Geographies of Performance, held in Los Angeles from January 10-13, 1991 and co-sponsored by the Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities, the Los Angeles Festival, and UCLA. The conference brought together artists, ethnomusicologists, folklorists, curators, anthropologists, festival organizers, and other cultural leaders to discuss both the presentation of cross-cultural programs in the arts and the nature of audience response to these programs. The curatorial and presentational methods of the 1990 Los Angeles Festival served as one example within a continuum of possible institutional approaches to furthering cross-cultural projects.

The 1990 Los Angeles Festival — an international arts event that took place over 16 days in September 1990 — provided an important reference point for the conference. "This Festival is a 10-year project to introduce Los Angeles to itself and to reintroduce the world to Los Angeles," wrote the Festival’s Director Peter Sellars. Much of the Festival’s definition was drawn from Los Angeles itself where 85 languages are spoken in the school system, and as Sellars noted, "Every two blocks, it’s a new world." Norman Frisch, Associate Director, and Judy Mitoma, Festival Curator, described some of the characteristics of the Festival that set a context for the conference that followed:

Norman Frisch: “We looked for artists deeply engaged in the issues and process of community — in both major metropolitan and rural areas, in both emerging and disappearing cultures, and among those working in commercial, experimental, and traditional contexts.”

Judy Mitoma: “Many of this year’s individual Festival artists have never performed outside their own cultural context. Their dances and songs speak of specific aspects of their natural environment, of their ancestors, of their own personalized gods and spirits. All this presumes that the audience understands these images. There are those who believe work of this nature is difficult (if not impossible) to take out of context. Certainly the physical, cultural, and economic environment of Los Angeles is totally different from the indigenous context of these art forms. Many will ask then why we have curated so much of the Festival in this manner? What meaning can Los Angeles audiences possibly get out of this? Why have these people consented to come from remote places to our urban secular context? What long range impact will this have on our diverse society?”

The purposes of the conference New Geographies of Performance was to consider conceptual foundations for future cross-cultural projects, both for the Los Angeles Festival and for other presenters world-wide. Conference participants reflected an unusual and wide-ranging mix of disciplines and regions of the world. The conference organizers sought to draw from many different languages, both literally and figuratively, in structuring a discussion about culture and community. A working dialogue was initiated between practitioners and theorists in the arts — groups whose professional activities result in surprisingly few points of direct contact. Discussion topics ranged from “Local vs. Exported Identity” to “Expanding the Compass of Art: Cultural Ownership, Equity, and the Ethics of Intervention.”

The following text consists of abbreviated excerpts from an exchange between James Clifford and Guillermo Gómez-Peña, presented at the conference under the general heading, “The Art-Culture Dichotomy.” The excerpts are not literal transcriptions but, rather, are summary notes from a vigorous, roundtable conversation.
James Clifford

Uses of the words “art” and “culture” slide around a lot. During the 18th century, art meant skill, and culture was related to agriculture, as in the culture of potatoes.

During the 19th century, both terms came to be repositories of a special, higher value or order. These 19th century definitions developed in response to disorders having to do with class and industrialism and with the development of mass culture in contrast to “art” and “culture.”

During the 20th century, further transformations in the use of the word “culture” were associated with anthropology and ethnography as well as other fields of discourse. Here, the notion was that anything could be culture — not just the high culture of opera houses. “Culture” encompassed all meaningful human arrangements and could be treated as ethnographic. In principle, anything could be culture or considered to be art: Dada, surrealism, and Duchamp’s “urinal” serve as examples.

Art and culture, as they function in common and intellectual discourse today, are complexly interrelated and marked by history. With “culture” you have a domain of value. Using the word is often a way of saying, “this is my (or our) world.” It is a way of locating oneself within a particular way of life. If people claim a culture, they are participating in a strategy of localization and in the creation of aesthetic and political values.

To have a culture is powerful, even though the culture can be positively or negatively ascribed. Identification and authentication are built into the idea of culture.

The concept of “art” shares a lot with the concept of “culture.” While in principle, everything can be art, in fact, it isn’t. Art is selective. If everything is art, nothing is art. Lines are drawn. When does a range of bodily movements become “performance?” Merce Cunningham makes that very question a focus. The Los Angeles Festival adopts aesthetic assumptions when it asserts that the event collapses art and life, just as the Dadaists did. But the line between them doesn’t collapse. It can’t and doesn’t. The performance space is very clearly marked off, as are performances that get coded as art.

Notions of art and culture slide into each other. Art has culture in it, and one way of looking at cultures is to see them as works of art. The Los Angeles Festival was a complex mixture of arts and cultures. When I talk about culture in the context of the Festival, I specifically mean anything to do with religiousness, sacredness, ritual, cosmology, indigenous gesture vocabularies, and so on. I move over to the art side when I talk about aesthetic immediacy, formal beauty, or art’s ability to cut across troublesome differences brought up by the notion of different cultures, languages, and histories.

I am interested in various subversive strategies that somehow complicate, bring to crisis, or otherwise make the distinction between art and culture problematic. Many performances presented at the Festival tended to complicate the distinction, but it’s not because “art” is the same thing as “life” in these non-western cultures. I don’t believe art is the same as life in these cultures, assuming we know what they mean by either “art” or “life.”

Who gets to have art and who gets to have culture? I am interested in tracking the ways that institutions resist or complicate this process of sorting, classifying, and giving value.

In other focus groups [at this conference] there has been talk of “composite cultures” and “traveling” cultures. And Guillermo has articulated “borderland” culture in complicated ways. Notions of diaspora have been theorized and turned into powerful art/cultural works. Is “diaspora culture” the same thing as “borderland culture?” I’m interested in comparing these inter- or transcultural, or traveling-cultural paradigms. What specific histories of displacement generate these paradigms? Teshome [Gabriel], who came here from Ethiopia and now must stay, has said, “we are travelers in the west.”

What would be involved in looking at Festival participants as travelers in the west who have already been traveling along specific local and global itineraries? What about traveling performers who have a history of movement and migration? What are their stakes in coming to L.A.? What are the alliances and connections being made? How does the Festival avoid becoming a culture/art collector? How are different places in a world system of many centers and peripheries linked historically? Can we find ways to evaluate the Festival as a stop in these intersecting itineraries?

Guillermo Gómez-Peña

I would like to suggest different ways of operating in this space between art and culture. As a performance artist, I am seeking models other than those of art as spectacle.

1) The performance artist as cultural chronicler: Being a contemporary Mexican means being crucified by the East, the West, the North, and the South. We are a syncretic blend of Amer-Indian and European cultures, of folkways and imported technology, immersed in the past but always welcoming the new, the other, the foreign, no matter how dangerous it is. Didn’t we welcome Columbus, Cortés, and the American multi-nationals? Don’t we still welcome all tourists, impresarios, and burnouts from Europe and the U.S.? Our sensibilities are the sum of these contradictions. The “other” exists within us and multi-culturalism is the very spinal cord of
our personal and collective biography. It is only when we cross the border that we face the “other” outside, thus becoming the outside “other” for Anglo culture. When we cross the border, our art becomes the double mirror that reflects this painful dynamic.

2) The artist as border-croster: A child of the Mexican crises, I crossed the border in 78 and something broke inside of me, forever. Crossing the border meant much more than having to learn English. For the first time I had to confront Protestant ethics, pragmatism, hyper-individualism, cross-cultural deprivation, and racism on a daily basis. For the first time in my life, I was truly alone and scared, without a family, a community, or a language. This abrupt confrontation with otherness triggered many processes inside of me, the most obvious being the exploration of the conflicted relationship between my Mexican past and my U.S. present, my Latino-American identity and my new Chicano reality. This process found its most effective and organic format in performance. Performance gave me a vocabulary and a syntax to express the critical processes of rupture and deterritorialization that I was undergoing, and to connect with others who were experiencing a similar drama.

3) The artist as political activist: A collaborative work of the Border Arts Workshop titled, “End of the Line,” took place on October 12, 1986 at the intersection of Borderfield Park and Playas de Tijuana, right where the U.S. meets Mexico in the Pacific. Dressed as border stereotypes, members of the Workshop and friends sat at a huge bi-national table bisected by the borderline. The Mexicans were in Mexican territory and the Chicanos and Anglos were on the U.S. side. We began to illegally hold hands and exchange food across the line. At one point, we turned the table 180 degrees and entered illegally into each other's countries. Three caravels of Columbus made of flammable material were set on fire on the seascape. The national Mexican media reported the event as news, and we became aware of the political power of site-specific performance.

4) The artist as intercultural diplomat: In my solo pieces I speak about the most pertinent, the most delicate issues that pertain to my place in this world as a child of the Mexican diaspora, in search of the other Mexico. This country exists both beyond the national borders and inside my psyche. As I travel, I become a performance pilgrim, a migrant poet, diplomat, renegade. In trips from coast to coast and from one country to another, I inevitably reproduce the migratory patterns of my people, the Mexicans outside of Mexico. The places and communities I come across become part of the cartography of my next piece. Through violent juxtapositions of languages, characters, and props, I try to replicate the feeling of vertigo produced by my/our ongoing border crossings.

I am constantly looking for new models of making culture. Art models must be constantly redefined to respond to present conditions. For children of the Latin American diaspora, deterritorialization has become our quintessential condition. The major condition of contemporary Latin Americans is displacement, diaspora. There is another Latin America outside of Latin America.

This condition of crossing borders, of living and working outside your original context, outside your original language, is creating a different kind of art. Whenever and wherever two or more cultures meet, violently or peacefully, there is a border experience. Even though I don’t think border art is new, it is becoming a central discourse more and more. Mono-culturalism, static culture, closed-systems have been expelled to the margins. Recent historical incidents, from the Tianamen Square massacre to the Persian Gulf crisis, surpass our capability to digest them. We are faced with the shattering of many parameters, many metaphors, many symbols, and many models; and we are faced with the need to develop new ones that respond to the conditions of the '90s.

**Question:** Could you comment on “simultaneity,” on the “here and here” aspect of diaspora?

**Gómez-Peña**

My experience working in northern Mexico and the southwestern United States provides a specific example. One of the guiding principles of this work was the idea of simultaneity — every performance, exhibition, or cultural gesture had to take place simultaneously on both sides of the border. We wanted to create a fabric, a bi-national dialogue, a link that our government was unwilling to create. We publish a bi-lingual magazine; production takes place in Tijuana, distribution is from San Diego, and the magazine goes to both countries. We’ve learned that simultaneity is affected by context. One gesture means one thing in Mexico and another in the U.S. For example, writers are not respected in the U.S., but they are respected in Mexico. Performance artists are not respected in Mexico but are respected in the U.S. When I cross the border into Mexico, I become a writer so they will respect my voice. When I cross back to the U.S., I become a performance artist and put on banana necklaces to be respected.

What in Mexico is reported as political news, the U.S. reports as spectacle. A performance piece done on the border would be the center of national debates in Mexico, and in the U.S. it would be covered by the art section. By crossing borders, one automatically restructures one’s *modus operandi* and strategies to broadcast effectively to the other side. Simultaneity or “multi-contextuality” is an important characteristic of contemporary art. Artists can operate effectively in the context of politics, media, education, and art. This is exciting because it diversifies our opportunities to intervene and therefore, to have an impact upon society. Modernists didn’t have this possibility. They were confined to the “rarified” spaces of art,
and their voices never left the art world. Now, however, I can do performance radio and have my pieces broadcast through National Public Radio which gives me a different sense of belonging to society.

**Question:** What happens when words in a performance don’t get translated?

**Gómez-Peña**

A border-crosser develops a “multiplicity of voices.” I am not just Mexican, I am Mexican plus Chicano plus North American plus all the misconceptions and mythical selves that get projected on me by media, cinema, etc. When I perform in Mexico I perform 70% in Spanish and 30% in English. In the U.S., it’s 70% English, 30% Spanish, and in the Barrio, 50/50. This kind of linguistic mobility is very different and very contemporary. What is missing? Some narratives. But I don’t mind because new and more interesting ones are generated.

**Clifford**

I want a more precise vocabulary to talk about intercultural situations. “Border” and “diaspora” are in the air. The terms are used loosely, often interchangeably. We need to distinguish between them a bit. And we need to differentiate them from a certain “nomadology” — a post-modern, primitivist appropriation of the notion of free or unstructured movement, used as though real nomads actually lived that way, which they didn’t. What “diaspora” and “border” give me are rather specific maps or histories of intercultural movements. This is not a question of going back to Africa, despite the various “roots” trips. Rather, these words imply a sense of being in two places. If you’re black, British, and listening to reggae or soul, you’re listening to a music produced out of a whole set of North African travelling musics and cultural forms. For Guillermo, the sense of connection is formalized, 70/30, 50/50 — a routinized history of crossing this border with much difficulty and violence. Guillermo speaks loosely (and we all do), saying that every time there is contact between cultures, there is a border situation. A border sensibility can apply to anything that rejects binary opposition. The diaspora image, to me, implies different modes of cultural travel, proximities, and forms of nostalgia. The border story Guillermo tells is not a story of exile; with diaspora, you can’t go back.

**Gómez-Peña** We are not immigrants, really.

**Clifford**

Yes, and diaspora almost always implies exile, scattering. In the late 20th Century, however, diaspora also brings with it the sense that even if one can’t go back physically, the interconnection is there culturally, being renewed at many levels by further rounds of immigra-

...tion, by music, by all the cultural flows that connect people (for better and worse). Diaspora has affinities to a border paradigm, but I want to keep the two separate. I am interested in comparative theoretical models for culture, in trying to produce theoretical models that have a strong taint of the local, even as they universalize.

**Gómez-Peña**

We are trying to give the border a memory it doesn’t have, and in this process are developing languages. There is a Mexican obsession with memory and meta-history. You can find in Mexican literature and art the notion that we have to re-invent ourselves over and over again. My generation suffers from the same illness.

It is a task for intellectuals, artists, and theoreticians at the end of the century to develop more enlightened definitions of nationality and identity, identity not based in geo-politics. I am a citizen of this time and place, a citizen of this continent. My communities are multiplying logarithmically, especially since I came to North America. The Afro-Americans are my community, as well as the Asians, feminists, gay artists. Hopefully, we (because this is a collective project) are developing a new cartography, a new mapping of this continent not based in geo-politics. This will change everything — language, memory, identity, sexuality.

Edited by Claire Peep and Anne Focke

---

James Clifford is the Director of The Center for Cultural Studies at University of California - Santa Cruz and is the author of The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art.

Guillermo Gómez-Peña is a poet, performance artist, journalist, and warrior for Gringostroika. His work will be featured at the Brooklyn Academy of Music’s Next Wave Festival in October 1991.

(The editors apologize to the participants for any errors and omissions that may occur in the text.)

---

New Geographies of Performance: A Report

A comprehensive overview of the conference will be cooperatively published by the Los Angeles Festival, the Getty Center, and UCLA for release in mid-1992. This report will be based on the work of a team of note-takers and will include transcripts of keynote addresses and summary overviews of all group discussions, open forums, and the public symposium. Contact the Los Angeles Festival for more information, 315 West Ninth Street, Suite 210, Los Angeles, CA 90015, (213) 689-8800.
News...

State Arts Agencies
1992 Budget Projections

Based on a July 1991 survey, the research division of the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies (NASA) estimates that aggregate appropriations for state arts agencies will fall approximately 26% between 1991 and 1992, the largest decline in 23 years. While in many cases, 1992 budgets are still not final, 30 state arts agencies are expected to have their budgets cut (nine by 45% or more) for a possible aggregate reduction from $274 to $200 million. The research division reports, "In the past 22 years, state arts agency appropriations have declined three times, the last decrease, being the $18 million loss between fiscal years 1990 and 1991. In all three cases, the decreases in total appropriations were attributable to declines in a few states, and consequently did not reflect a lessening of state support nationwide." However, preliminary analyses indicate that the cuts in 1992 will be more widespread than in previous years, encompassing many parts of the country.

In the past, shifts in state arts appropriations tended to reflect regional variations in the economy. Commenting on 1991 budgets, NASAA reported, "The current economic problems in New England have had disastrous consequences for their state arts agencies. Conversely, Rocky Mountain and Plains states' strong economies have meant greater appropriations for some of their arts agencies." In many respects, this continues to hold true for 1992 projections, and most of the 17 states anticipating increases are found in the same central part of the country.

In an article in NASAA's quarterly journal, Art View, Jeffrey Love, NASAA's Director of Research, and Bramble Klipple, NASAA's National Standard Coordinator, suggest other factors that may contribute to reduced state arts agency budgets. "The growth in many SAA appropriations during the 1980s have made SAA budgets more inviting targets for administrations seeking to balance their budgets," Love and Klipple report. Reductions may also reflect state legislatures' unwillingness to appropriate funds "to areas they consider more discretionary or less politically important." And, finally, they point out, "In some states, such as Michigan and Ohio, governors have called for increased private, rather than public, support for the arts. These trends," they suggest, "call for renewed efforts to demonstrate the economic and cultural value of state support for the arts."

More information about the status of state arts agencies can be obtained from Kimber D. Craine, Communications Manager, National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, 1010 Vermont Avenue, N.W., Suite 920, Washington D.C. 20005, (202) 347-6352.

Freedom of Expression in the Arts
A Report from Arts Midwest

In September 1991, Arts Midwest, a regional arts organization for nine Midwestern states, published a report on Freedom of Expression in the Arts. The report is a result of a decision by Arts Midwest's Board to "assess the current state of free expression in the Midwest's arts community and ... in turn, suggest some creative, innovative responses to what [seems] to be a reenchantment, a reluctance on the part of artists and arts institutions to take artistic risks," wrote Jeanne Lakso, Arts Midwest Senior Program Director. To this end, Arts Midwest formed a task force and organized public meetings to gather relevant information from its constituency. The task force included Peter Jacob (journalism professor and Indiana Arts Commission Chair), Tom Nelson (Minneapolis attorney well-versed in First Amendment law), Alexis Pate (writer, curator, and performance artist), Beverly Suits (Arts Midwest board member), Helen Valdez (educator and Director, Mexican Fine Arts Center Museum, Chicago), and Dora Wilson (artist, Ohio Arts Council member, and Dean, College of Fine Arts, Ohio State University/Athens). Anne Pockey of Seattle served as consultant, facilitator, and author of the resulting report.

The report, Freedom of Expression in the Arts, has several sections: the first concentrates on understanding the First Amendment and its relationship to the arts; the second addresses censorship and the many ways that artistic freedom is suppressed; and the third delineates actions that can be taken to combat threats to freedom of expression in the arts. Also included are a selected bibliography and a listing of resources, specifically including organizations that can provide information and support to artists and arts organizations in crisis. Throughout the project, the task force worked to broaden the definition of censorship to include not only the outright removal of artworks from public view, but also the complex array of attitudes and actions that restrict and suppress expression. Through the First Amendment's protection of diversity, the task force linked the defense of controversial art to the need to respect many standards of quality and divergent cultural expressions.

Copies of the report are available from Arts Midwest, 528 Hennepin Ave. #310, Minneapolis, MN, 55403, (612) 341-0755.

LA Partnership Report
Multi-cultural Arts Working Group

The 2000 Partnership was established in 1989 following the publication of LA 2000: A City for the Future, the report of a citizen-based planning effort. The purposes of the LA 2000 Partnership are to educate the public about the LA 2000 strategic plan, develop action agendas, and implement the LA 2000 recommendations.

The Partnership's efforts are based on three premises. Quoting from the report of the Partnership's Multi-cultural Arts Working Group:
More News...

"First, Los Angeles and Southern California have resources and human potential to become a great 21st Century megalopolis. However, potential is not the same as destiny. We must make an effort to deal with serious issues if we are to achieve our goals. Second, our future will be shaped, in part, by external forces beyond our control and, in part, by our collective vision and will. Shaping the future is not just the responsibility of a few leaders and government institutions. Recognizing our diversity, all of us must build a community based on mutual trust and consensus about goals and strategies. Third, we have a window of opportunity to define our problems and to forge the civic will to solve them. We must seize this moment to think in new ways about complex, interrelated issues. We must also change governance and finance mechanisms and come up with innovative public and private programs so we can better manage these issues."

The Working Group's report, titled Our Many Voices: A New Composition, details its members' final consensus that "to achieve the goal of enriching diversity, two policy tracks must be addressed: (a) develop and strengthen culturally-specific organizations so they can better share the culture they preserve; and (b) broaden existing centralized arts organizations so they can become cultural common ground. These tracks are not mutually exclusive."

The report provides sample guidelines devised by the Task Force to show grantmakers how funding guidelines might be changed in order to better serve the policy goals it recommends. These guidelines reject as too restrictive the funding of arts organizations according to "the discipline system." Categorizing applicants according to arts discipline — theater, music, dance — "is well suited as a framework for decision-making in European art forms. However, it is not very useful for arts and practices of other cultures that fall outside this cultural frame of reference... and has led to raising the level of 'professionalism' but done nothing to encourage participation." Instead, the Task Force suggests broad guidelines for "The Creators, The Distributors, The Educators, and Institutional Advancement."

A copy of the 40-page booklet can be obtained from The 2000 Partnership, c/o Bank of America, 55 South Flower Street, No. 4001, Los Angeles, CA 90071. Gerald Yoshitomi, Executive Director of the Japanese American Cultural and Community Center, chaired the Multi-cultural Arts Working Group and Editorial Advisory Board. Serving on the 15-member group were representatives of corporate and foundation arts grantmakers, the Los Angeles City Council, the California Arts Council, cultural organizations, and arts service providers.

The Arts and Community-based Revitalization

The role of the arts in the community-based revitalization of Chicago's neighborhoods was the topic of a June 1991 symposium that brought together leaders of Chicago's community-based arts organizations with their peers in the city's community-based development and community service fields.

An introduction to the symposium's summary states: "Community-based arts groups and community-based development organizations, both having grown in capacity and numbers over the past decade, find they share interests and can be resources for each other. There is an emerging trend nation-wide to affirm the arts as a key element in what it takes to have a healthy community — along with health care, education, housing and other basic services — and this interest is part of a new perspective on community concerns that focuses not on pathologies, but on the strengths and positive values inherent in communities. Local cultural traditions can and are playing a critical role in multi-faceted physical, economic and human community development strategies."

Chicago projects featured during the symposium included: The Mexican Fine Arts Center Museum; the Neighborhood Institute's One Artist Row; Boulevard Arts Center; and the Looking Backward to Move Forward program of Bethel New Life. National projects also were featured, including: The Guadalupe Cultural Arts Center in San Antonio; East Liberty Development Corporation's Regent Theatre Arts Center in Pittsburgh; and Mississippi Action for Community Education's Delta Blues Festival in Greenville. Dudley Cocke of Roadside Theatre/Appalshop in Whitesburg, Kentucky, delivered the keynote address.

The symposium was organized by the Community-Based Arts and Development Working Group and was sponsored by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation in partnership with the Amoco Foundation, First National Bank of Chicago Foundation, Marshall Fields Foundation, Northern Trust Company, Prince Charitable Trusts, Robert R. McCormick Tribune Foundation and Woods Charitable Fund. For further information on the symposium, contact: Christine Vincent, symposium coordinator, Community & Cultural Resource Development, Box 818, Vinalhaven, ME, 04863 (207) 863-2752. To receive a copy of the symposium summary, write to the MacArthur Foundation, Community Initiatives Program, Arts and Culture, 140 South Dearborn, Chicago, IL 60603.

Funding for Media Arts "The Bottom Line"

The National Alliance of Media Arts Center has recently commissioned and published a study on the financial condition of media arts organizations in this country. The study was undertaken by Don Adams and Arlene
Goldbard and was based on a “Media Arts Organization Funding Survey” completed by forty-seven organizations across the United States. Other resources for the study included interviews with public and private funders and veteran media arts organizers, and a review of background materials on the field and its supporters.

The report includes a description of media arts organizations, sometimes called “media arts centers,” and is interspersed with ten profiles of specific groups. A central section of the report, entitled “The Funding Landscape,” describes and analyzes sources of support for this field. Final sections identify promising plans and priorities for development. Copies of the report can be obtained from the National Alliance of Media Arts Centers (NAMAC), 1212 Broadway, #816, Oakland, CA 94612, (415) 451-2717.

FEDAPT’s Annual Report
“The Quiet Crisis in the Arts”

The Workpapers: A Special Report is the title of a new publication from FEDAPT written by Nello McDaniel and George Thorn. Subtitled “The Quiet Crisis in the Arts,” the report was written in response to the authors’ experiences working with arts organizations during the past eighteen months. The report defines the difficult economic conditions in which the arts are operating and cites the authors’ analysis of the root causes of the arts economy’s downward cycle. The report also describes what Thorn and McDaniel consider the most characteristic problems being experienced by arts organizations and suggest ways of redesigning or restructuring organizations in order to succeed within what they call “the new givens.” The report has been circulated widely among arts organizations and is in its fourth printing. Copies may be obtained from FEDAPT, 270 Lafayette Street, Suite 810, New York, New York 10012. There is a $1 charge to cover postage and handling costs.

The Arts Forward Fund

The Arts Forward Fund has been established to address the long-term changes in the economic and social climate facing the arts. The Fund’s purpose is to encourage the exploration of new operating strategies for arts organizations by supporting a limited number of demonstration projects in New York City. The Fund will encourage organizations to reassess their missions and structures, and will be responsive to innovative, new approaches that may include creating partnerships, collaborations, mergers, adoptions, resource sharing, and new programs to meet artists’ needs.

The Fund has a minimum goal of raising one million dollars from private and corporate funding sources but hopes to raise substantially more. The Fund has received three grants to date: $200,000 from the Joyce Mertz-Gilmore Foundation, $100,000 from the Fan Fox and Leslie R. Samuels Foundation, and $100,000 from the Booth Ferris Foundation. The Fund will start operating once $500,000 is secured. Grants will be awarded in two cycles with the total life of the Fund being approximately three years. The first cycle will consist primarily of planning grants and the second of implementation grants to help launch the most promising ideas from the planning cycle. At the conclusion of the second stage, a written report documenting this process and its results will be prepared and made available nationwide.

The Fund will be established at the New York Community Trust which will also administer the fund. Staffing will be provided by Arts Matters, Inc. The grant review and selection committee will be comprised of all representatives of the foundations participating in the Fund who wish to serve. For more information, contact Robert Crane at the Joyce Mertz-Gilmore Foundation, 218 East 18th Street, New York, NY 10018.

Arts and Business Council
Publications Offer Help in Difficult Times

The Arts and Business Council of New York City has issued two new reports for organizations coping with difficult financial times. The first is “Critical Issues and the Arts: Status Report, May 1991.” This report documents the Council’s research and recommendations regarding major management problems facing arts organizations in the greater New York City area. The second is called “Helping Arts Organizations in Crisis: A Resource Guide for the Greater New York Metropolitan Area.” This booklet lists resources to help arts groups and includes sources of emergency loans, legal assistance, management consulting, and media contacts. Although both reports are aimed toward the New York region, grantmakers from other parts of the United States may find these reports interesting since they document conditions in New York and list addresses, telephone numbers, and descriptions of services provided by many New York organizations. Copies may be obtained from the Arts and Business Council, Inc., 25 West 45th Street, Suite 707, New York, New York, 10036, (212) 819-9287.

Report on Dance Documentation and Preservation

The National Endowment for the Arts and the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation have issued a report titled Images of American Dance: Documenting and Preserving a Cultural Heritage. According to an eight-month national study of dance preservation and documentation, researchers found “the current state of dance documentation and preservation—beset with financial, organizational, cultural, and legal problems—also threatens the next century of artistic creativity and public appreciation.” The study was directed by William Keens and was guided by an eight-person advisory committee. It was conducted by archivist Leslie Kopp and dance writer/historian Mindy Levine with a team of field researchers in Los Angeles, Minne-
And Still More News . . .

An Open Letter on Artists’ Communities

The MacArthur Fellows Program of the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation published An Open Letter on Artists’ Communities early in 1991. The purpose of the publication is to document and share the results of the Foundation’s research on these organizations. The research supported a new program initiative by the Foundation that is providing $2.5 million to eighteen artists’ communities in ten states. The publication includes a statement on behalf of artists’ communities by John Clauser of the Yellow Springs Institute and the Executive Summary of a report to the Foundation by project consultant Howard Klein. Klein’s report draws attention to the dramatic increase in the number of artists’ communities during the 1970s. Among them are urban artists’ communities and ones that emphasize collaboration among resident artists. Klein also notes that governmental funding has decreased in the past five years, and is now negligible relative to the needs of these organizations. The report also includes information about the artists’ communities selected for funding as well as addresses and telephone numbers of grantees. Copies of the publication can be obtained from the MacArthur Fellows Program, 140 South Dearborn Street, Suite 700, Chicago, IL 60603, (312) 726-8000.

Serving Black Audiences
A Pittsburgh/Heinz Study

Expanding Our Vision in the Arts: Building Multi-Cultural Programming and Multi-Cultural Audiences, is a report issued by The Pittsburgh Foundation/Howard Heinz Endowment. The report documents an initiative of the Foundations designed to identify ways of encouraging more multi-cultural programming and of developing, for both black and non-black arts organizations, a broader audience from the black community of the Greater Pittsburgh area. Underlying the project’s goals was a strong commitment to better serve the black community through the arts. The Foundations, with guidance from a project steering committee, determined to develop a profile of the interests and habits of the current black adult audience, to assess the programming direction and organizational viability of ten local arts organizations (both black and non-black), and to develop recommendations for encouraging more multi-cultural programming and audience development efforts. Primary consultants to the project were Mikki Shepard and Leonard Goines.

The 70-page report includes results of a market survey of the black adult audience in the region and a profile of selected black and non-black arts organizations. The report outlines these organizations’ strengths and weaknesses as well as their present capacity to “extend their reach” to the targeted audience. An extensive appendix includes descriptions of model programs and provides a resource list of artists, historians, and presenters. The resource list includes addresses and very brief biographies of arts administrators and individual artists. Readers of the Grantmakers in the Arts Newsletter whose jobs require developing peer panels for review of fellowship or other grant applications might find these lists especially useful. For copies, write to The Pittsburgh Foundation/Howard Heinz Endowment, 30 CNBC Tower, 625 Liberty Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA 15222, (412) 391-5122.

Librarian of Congress Describes Ideal U.S. Cultural Foreign Policy

The President’s Committee on the Arts and Humanities has issued the remarks presented by James H. Billington at its Plenary meeting XXII. Created by executive order in 1982, the President’s Committee on the Arts and Humanities analyzes and recommends ways to promote private support for the arts and humanities. Chair Donald J. Hall presides over a committee of 33 people, including John Frohnmayer, Lynne Cheney, and Roger Stevens.

Titled “Intellectual and Cultural Dimensions of International Relations: Present Ironies and Future Possibilities,” Billington’s remarks detail his concern that the U.S. has failed to find a proper role for culture in international relations. He explains his view that “the U.S. is hurt as a result of not having a more energetic international cultural policy,” and discusses the “controlling ideological trends in the world today by which any cultural and educational international policy has to be defined if it is not to become utopian or irrelevant.” He also presents his ideas on the key “ingredients of a more comprehensive, more effective overall cultural policy for the broad national interests of the United States.”

Billington has been the Librarian of Congress since 1987. Copies of his remarks can be obtained by writing to the Committee at 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Room 526, Washington, D.C. 20506.
Insights on AIDS

Minneapolis Star Tribune critic Mike Steele addressed the third annual community meeting of ARTS OVER AIDS, a Twin-Cities-based consortium of artists, arts organizations, and people affected by HIV infection. Titled "How Has HIV Changed Us and Our Art?" Steele's remarks were transcribed and are available by calling (612) 370-6650. Following is an excerpt from his address.

"As I've watched friends, people I've known and loved, struggle with AIDS, I've seen what I can only call the power of AIDS, the clarity of AIDS, the transcendence of AIDS. I've seen the courage and nobility, the emergence of superhuman virtue. I've seen self-revelation in depth. AIDS is such a heightened experience, an experience of first principles and fundamentals, one that compresses time and cuts away what's unnecessary. Great insights emerge — a reordering of priorities, a clarity of vision, a full and authentic account of one's mortality — leading, finally, not to a denial of death but to a transcendent awareness of living, of what is fundamentally worthwhile and meaningful in life. To tell this story is to create an art of worth, one that ennobles us, that expands our possibilities, an art of nurturing substance, not of absence. To do this, artists, coming out of this cycle of impotence and despair, must begin by rediscovering and once again believing in the transforming possibilities of art. Art has been marginalized to the periphery of society for so long, turning into a snappy commodity or empty aestheticism, that it must relearn its powers."

Native American Task Force Report on Program Development

The Native American Cultural Arts Program (NACAP) has issued a report on its program development. Sponsored by COMPAS, Inc., a St. Paul-based community arts agency, NACAP surveyed Native artists in the state of Minnesota to identify their needs and develop steps to be taken to address these needs. The study found that fewer than 25% of the 162 artists who responded to the survey had ever approached a funder for a grant or fellowship. These and other findings led to a proposal for an independent, Native-run community arts organization that will provide funding, technical assistance, and public education programs by, for, and about Native art. A Task Force representing more than a dozen tribes worked to develop the proposal. Appendices in the report provide summaries of the Task Force's discussion about "Who Is Indian?" "Working with Sacred Art" and "What Is Indian Art?" Copies of the 20-page booklet can be obtained from COMPAS, 305 Landmark Center, 75 West Fifth Street, St. Paul, MN 55102.

1990 West Coast Festivals
Seattle's Goodwill Arts Festival

In the summer and early fall of 1990, the West Coast was host to three major arts festivals: the Los Angeles Festival, Festival 2000 in San Francisco, and the Goodwill Arts Festival in Seattle. Each festival has been followed by analysis or documentation of some kind. The Los Angeles Festival collaborated with the Getty Center and UCLA on presenting a conference investigating cross-cultural presentation with the Los Angeles Festival as a point of reference (see the lead article in this issue). A formal inquiry into Festival 2000 is currently underway and a report is expected to be published in mid-1992. A report documenting the content and organization of the Goodwill Arts Festival was published in May 1991.

The Goodwill Arts Festival took place in Seattle and Tacoma in conjunction with the 1990 Goodwill Games. The festival highlighted the arts and artists of the Soviet Union and the United States, but also included art and artists from many other countries as well as from the Seattle/Tacoma region. Performances ranged from a new production of "War and Peace" by the Seattle Opera to the First National Gay and Lesbian Theatre Festival and an international computer music festival. Exhibitions included "Moscow: Treasures and Traditions" as well as "Between Spring and Summer: Soviet Conceptual Art in the Era of Late Communism." Many other performances and exhibitions were presented along with public art projects, two film festivals, a book of commissioned essays by Soviet and U.S. authors, and a gathering of Native American tribes.

Community-wide collaboration was a hallmark of this festival which was co-produced by over 35 regional organizations and individuals. The report describes the nature of this collaboration and gives a behind-the-scenes view of the festival organization. Copies of the report can be obtained from Jarlath Hume, 270 S. Hanford St., Suite 208, Seattle, WA 98134, (206) 682-8643.

Cultural Facilities Fund
A Feasibility Study

A consortium of seven public and private grantmakers is undertaking a nine-month study to assess the feasibility of a National Cultural Facilities Development Fund. The idea for the Fund is based on examples provided by financial intermediaries that have been used successfully to meet facility needs in other fields — historic preservation, open-space conservation, and community-based economic development. These intermediaries programs provide capital loans and grants and often help groups find technical assistance on real estate questions. The study will assess the possibility of developing a similar program to serve the facility needs of the arts community. If such a program is found feasible, the study will also include more specific plans for the development of the Fund.

The study will take place in four locations — Chicago, New England, Philadelphia, and San Francisco — with the participation of the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the James Irvine Foundation, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, the National Endowment for the Arts, New England Foundation for the Arts,
Pew Charitable Trusts, and the San Francisco Foundation.

Work begins in September and will take place under the auspices of the Nonprofit Facilities Fund, a New York-based financial intermediary that operates a $9.5 million loan fund serving the capital projects of New York City non-profits, including many cultural organizations. For further information, contact Christine Vincent, project director, Community & Cultural Resource Development, (207) 863-2752.

National Consulting Program Artspace Projects, Inc.

Artspace Projects, Inc., a nonprofit organization in Minneapolis, has initiated a national consulting program to support the development of space for artists — artists’ living and working space as well as space for exhibition, performance, rehearsal, and other support functions. The overall mission of Artspace Projects, Inc. is to assist in the location, development, and management of space for artists and to develop long-term, affordable, and safe live/work space for low and moderate income artists and their families. Artspace Projects promotes the understanding that artists’ participation in a community can play a very effective role in overall cultural and economic development. Over the past several years, Artspace has increased both its expertise and its reputation as a nonprofit developer for the arts.

The new consulting program responds to an increasing demand for Artspace’s services nationally. A “National Consulting Fund” will support Artspace staff time and travel costs associated with specific consulting projects outside the Minneapolis/St. Paul area and will also subsidize the costs of travel by others to the Twin Cities to study the projects that Artspace has developed there. The consulting program is supported by the Pew Charitable Trusts. Inquiries about the program should be directed to Kelley Lindquist, Artspace Projects, Inc., 400 First Ave. N., #518, Minneapolis, MN 55401, (612) 339- 4372.

AT&T New Art/New Visions

AT&T has just launched a new program for art museums that will support small, innovative exhibitions of recently created works by living artists. The program, titled “AT&T New Art/New Visions,” has a three-pronged approach and will support the costs of exhibition, education, and acquisition. Fifty museums — large and small, mainstream and culturally specific — have been invited to apply in the first year. Proposals will be reviewed and judged by distinguished professionals from the visual arts community who will serve as guest panelists. Five or six matching grants will be given in the first year.

Advance Notice Council on Foundations Conference

The 1992 Council on Foundation’s annual meeting will be held on April 27-29 at the Hilton Fontainebleau in Miami Beach. The program for this conference will be based on the Council’s annual theme for 1992, “effectiveness in philanthropy.” Each year the Council’s President, James A. Joseph, sets a theme that organizes all Council activities. The conference program committee is chaired by Cynthia Mayeda (Dayton Hudson Foundation) and includes other arts grantmakers, Marian A. Godfrey (Pew Charitable Trusts) and Suzanne Sato (Rockefeller Foundation). Terry O’Hara, Program Assistant for Planning and Education, reported that at its initial meeting the Committee posed several questions as beginning points in the development of a program: Are grantmakers at the heart of issues or at the margins? Since systems change, how can we avoid just looking at symptoms? Can we take a more holistic approach?
News from
Grantmakers in the Arts

Benchmark Study
Arts and Arts-related Philanthropy

Grantmakers in the Arts and The Foundation Center have entered into a contract to produce a benchmark study of arts and arts-related philanthropy. Substantial funding for the project was awarded by the Dayton Hudson Foundation, the Getty Grant Program, John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Fan Fox and Leslie R. Samuels Foundation, the AT&T Foundation, and the Pew Charitable Trusts. The Foundation Center’s Director of Research, Loren Renz, will act as Project Director. The Center will contract with Nathan Weber, Editor of Giving U.S.A., to undertake the study.

The study will concentrate on arts and arts-related grants in 1983, 1986, and 1989. Since 1989, The Foundation Center has used a classification system that greatly expands the coding system that had been used previously for philanthropy. The Center will undertake the significant task of re-coding all arts grants made in 1983 and 1986 so that data from all three years will be consistent. The project budget allows for a special study of corporate arts support given through channels other than corporate foundations. In this way, the study will present a more comprehensive picture of the true size and scope of corporate support for the arts.

Grantmakers in the Arts and The Foundation Center have appointed a National Advisory Committee to provide counsel to the staff undertaking the Study and to act as a review and interpretive body. The National Advisory Committee will first meet in Philadelphia on Tuesday, October 8, immediately prior to the 1991 National Conference of Grantmakers in the Arts. Members confirmed to date include Peter Hero, Executive Director, Community Foundation of Santa Clara County; Virginia Hodgkinson, Vice President Research, Independent Sector; Judith Jedlicka, President, Business Committee for the Arts; Stanley Katz, President, American Council of Learned Societies; John Kreidler of the San Francisco Foundation; Ruth Mayeles of the Arts Program at the Ford Foundation; Patricia Patrizi, Director of Evaluation for the Pew Charitable Trusts; Ella King Torrey, President of Grantmakers in the Arts and Executive Director of the Pew Fellowships in the Arts; and Margaret Wyzomirski, Director of Policy, Planning and Research, NEA. Cynthia Gehrig, President of the Jerome Foundation, will Chair the Committee. Grantmakers in the Arts expects that the study will be available for public distribution by the end of 1992.

The purpose of the benchmark study is to establish baseline data against which foundation and corporate arts grantmakers can measure their work and plan for the future. While the core of the analysis will consist of assessing quantitative data, additional information will be gathered through surveys, interviews, and discussions to provide a fuller description of the needs, priorities, and trends in this field. Through this study, G.I.A. intends to provide a valuable resource for grantmakers and grantseekers and to adopt a responsible and cooperative approach to data analysis within arts and arts-related philanthropy. Comments and questions about the study can be directed to Cynthia Gehrig, The Jerome Foundation, West 1050 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, MN 55101, (612) 224-9431.

Membership Plan

At its April 1991 meeting, the Board of Grantmakers in the Arts committed itself to becoming a legally-constituted membership organization. Membership will be open to all individuals and institutions active in grantmaking in the arts. A Membership Committee, chaired by Myra Millinger, has been established to consider membership benefits and an implementation schedule. It is anticipated that the membership structure will be in place and fully operational within the coming year. Anyone who has questions or concerns about membership should direct them to Myra at the Flinn Foundation, 3300 N. Central Avenue, #1730, Phoenix, AZ 85012, (602) 274-9000.

Grantmakers in the Arts
Board of Directors

The Board of Directors of Grantmakers in the Arts elected new officers and directors at its April 1991 meeting. The new officers are President, Ella King Torrey (Pew Fellowships in the Arts); Vice President, Sarah Lutman (Bush Foundation); Secretary, Tim McClone (AT&T Foundation); and Treasurer, John Kreidler (San Francisco Foundation). Newly elected Board members’ names are asterisked on the list that follows. Board members will serve three-year terms; officers will serve two-year terms.

Jessica Chao,*
Lila Wallace Reader’s Digest Fund
Patricia Doyle,
Cleveland Foundation
Cynthia Gehrig,
Jerome Foundation, Inc.
John Kreidler,
San Francisco Foundation
Sarah Lutman,
Bush Foundation
Tim McClone,
AT&T Foundation
Ruth Mayeles,
Ford Foundation
Myra Millinger,
The Flinn Foundation
John Orders,*
James L. Irvine Foundation
Janet Sarbaugh,*
Pittsburgh Foundation
Joan Shigekawa,*
The Nathan Cummings Foundation
Holly Sidford,*
New England Foundation for the Arts
Bruce Sievers,
Walter & Elise Haas Fund
Ella King Torrey,
Pew Fellowships in the Arts
Sam Yanes,
Polaroid Company

11
Broadening the Dialogue

Grantmakers in the Arts
Sixth Annual Conference

October 9-11, 1991
Philadelphia

The subtitle of the 1991 annual meeting of Grantmakers in the Arts, "Voices, Visions and Ideas to Challenge Arts Philanthropy Today," reflects a principal conference purpose: challenging grantmakers to assess the effectiveness of arts philanthropy. The conference intends to "broaden the dialogue" of this assessment by offering participants the chance to engage with organizations and ideas that lie beyond the boundaries of traditional arts activities and outside the guidelines of traditional arts philanthropy.

In a departure from conventional conference formats, the schedule will direct participants in small groups to one of twelve sites in the Philadelphia area. The sites include a major museum experimenting with original approaches to community outreach; a pre-school based on the work of Howard Gardner with the arts at the core of its curriculum; a Latino community cultural center whose programming is making an impact citywide; and a 30-year old community arts organization that has created a new standard of excellence for arts education for children. The site visits will offer participants the opportunity to engage directly in specific projects with the organizations they visit.

The conference program will also feature formal and informal discussions, workshop sessions, and presentations by representatives of the arts community, grantmakers, and national cultural leaders. Speakers will include Dr. George Otero, the founder and co-director of Las Palomas de Taos in New Mexico, and Thomas W. Langsfield, M.D., President of the Pew Charitable Trusts. The conference program is designed to challenge grantmakers to test assumptions used in funding decisions and identify gaps that may exist between the arts and arts philanthropy. Participants will be encouraged to exchange ideas and discover the common ground they share.

The conference will be held at the Sheraton Society Hill in the historic colonial district of Philadelphia. Registration will begin at 3:00 p.m. on Wednesday, October 9 and the conference will adjourn at 2:00 p.m. on Friday, October 11. Optional tours of selected places in Philadelphia will be offered both before and after the formal conference times. Interest in the conference is high and space is limited. Reservations will be taken on a first-come, first-served basis. For more information contact Pamela Carunchio, Carunchio & Associates, 573 Concourse Street, Philadelphia, PA 19128, (215) 482-7891.

---
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