



GRANTMAKERS IN THE ARTS

Volume 5, Number 1

Spring 1994

Notes toward a New Bohemia

Dana Gioia

Poet, translator, essayist, and provocateur Dana Gioia captured our imagination with this talk, delivered as part of a panel discussion on "The Future of Poetry Publishing," held in October at Poets House in New York City. To accompany the publication of his talk in this newsletter, Gioia has selected a small anthology of new poems recently published by independent presses. "These are some of the best poems that have come across my desk in the last few months among the many books published by nonprofit independent presses. I hope they give readers an idea of the vitality and diversity of literary activity that exists outside of academia, in what I have called the New Bohemia."

Although Gioia describes the trends that characterize contemporary poetry, we found that he also sparked our thinking about the relationship of grantmaking to artmaking. Gioia describes poetry's vitality (and no one can deny the spirited revival of poetry in the United States) as anti-institutional, fragmented, decentralized, and oral rather than written. These same characteristics are present in other arts disciplines. What kind of grantmaking would be needed in order to support poetry as a living art form, in all of its many and various manifestations? Trends in art appear to call for a freer, less institutional funding mode. We'd be curious to hear how any of our members support artmaking when and where it happens by working either outside traditional fellowship or artists' grants programs, or outside the structures of "classic" nonprofit organizations.

Twenty years ago, I started graduate school. I was a working-class kid from L.A. – half-Italian, half-Mexican. Entering Harvard Graduate School in Comparative Literature, I paid meticulous attention to the literary culture around me in the same spirit an anthropologist might observe the rituals of some newly discovered tribe. I wanted to understand how the literary world operated,

IN THIS ISSUE

Notes toward a New Bohemia Dana Gioia	1
Funding the Revolution bell hooks	6
Art and Democracy Bruce Sievers Penelope McPhee	9
What's Ahead for Arts Censorship Marjorie Heins	10
Friends in High Places An Overview of the Federal Cultural Bureaucracy	13
News	16
Studies and Reports Received	19
Cultural Policy Update	23
Arts Programming Council on Foundations Conference	26
News from Grantmakers in the Arts	27

especially its assumptions about contemporary poetry. The poetry world was well-defined back then, but during the last two decades it has changed in important and sometimes even astonishing ways that are still not well understood. Tonight I would like to provide a quick overview of the current state of American poetry by making a dozen observations. What these various trends have in common is that they represent significant changes in our literary culture that either would have been impossible to imagine twenty years ago or would have appeared too marginal to become influential. I am not

interested in judging most of these trends – only in observing and understanding them.

The first observation is that the primary means of publication for new American poetry is now oral. While books and journals continue to appear and remain crucially important in sustaining literary reputations, they no longer enjoy a monopoly on disseminating poetry, especially new poetry. For almost every living American poet, public readings, whether they are live or electronic (via radio, TV, or tape cassette), now constitute the major means of reaching an audience. This situation applies as equally to older academic poets like John Hollander or Daniel Hoffman as it does to younger poets of every school.

The return to oral performance represents an enormous paradigm shift away from print culture. Until quite recently, most poets didn't give readings until their work appeared in print, and even then public readings were generally few and infrequent. Robinson Jeffers, one of the few major twentieth century American poets who actually made a living off poetry, was fifty-four when he gave his first public reading; Wallace Stevens was nearly sixty. If you listen to their recordings, you will notice that neither man is comfortable reading his work aloud. The shift away from print culture to an audiovisual, electronic culture has had an enormous impact. Today the physical audience listening to live poetry vastly outnumbers the people who read it in books.

The shift from print to oral publication leads to my second observation: there has been a huge reemergence of populist oral poetry, largely among groups who were alienated from the dominant, academic, literary culture. The new schools of populist poetry include rap, cowboy

poetry, and poetry slams, which together command audiences in the millions. No one would have predicted this development twenty years ago. What was seen then was the increasing intellectualization and academicization of poetry. But history usually works dialectically, and one trend often creates its opposite. Nor would anyone twenty years ago have predicted that most of this oral poetry would be formal – in the then discredited and supposed elitist techniques of rhyme and meter. Rap is usually composed in a four-stress line (like Anglo-Saxon poetry without the alliteration) and mostly rhymed in couplets. Cowboy poetry is written mainly in a rhymed stress meter related to the English ballads. Interestingly, while their poetry is formal, neither school employs the kinds of accentual-syllabic meters we associate with academic poetry.

The importance of oral performance has led to another development. My third observation is that a new hybrid literary art form has emerged that is related to poetry but is equally rooted in experimental theater. I'm talking, of course, about performance poetry. Since the poet's social role has shifted primarily from the creator of texts to the creator of oral performance, it was predictable that this change would affect the art itself. Performance poetry represents the merger of certain poetic techniques with the forms of theater – sometimes live theater, sometimes film or video theater. Traditional poetry, even oral poetry like folk epics, focused on a creation of a text that could – in practice, if not in intention – be transcribed and transmitted independently of the author's physical presence. Even if the text changed slightly in its semi-improvised oral performance, it maintained a primarily verbal identity. Performance poetry works differently. It does not focus primarily on the verbal text; it recognizes and exploits the physical presence of the poet, the audience, and the performance space. It recognizes, in other words, the new medium in which it operates. A great deal of confusion in contemporary poetry criticism results from the fact that critics are unable to distinguish between these two types of literary art. Although poetry and performance poetry are intricately related, they follow two fundamentally different aesthetics.

The fourth observation I'd like to make is that popular culture now exerts as much or more influence on young poets of every school than does high culture. There is an immense split now in American culture between what has come to be called "high" and "low" culture. While most young poets continue to admire the literature of the past, they mostly lack the traditional grounding in literature and history that earlier generations took for granted. What young poets now know best is contemporary popular culture, and they recognize that the only common ground they share with the general audience is also popular culture. It seems that the one thing that almost every school of young poets now has in common is some attempt to use the forms and subjects of popular art. New Formalism, for example, which is sometimes misleadingly portrayed as an academic literary movement, is actually of a piece with rap and cowboy poetry in recognizing the

First Poem for You

I like to touch your tattoos in complete darkness, when I can't see them. I'm sure of where they are, know by heart the neat lines of lightning pulsing just above your nipple, can find, as if by instinct, the blue swirls of water on your shoulder where a serpent twists, facing a dragon. When I pull you to me, taking you until we're spent and quiet on the sheets, I love to kiss the pictures in your skin. They'll last until you're seared to ashes; whatever persists or turns to pain between us, they will still be there. Such permanence is terrifying. So I touch them in the dark; but touch them, trying.

Kim Addonizio

Redwing Blackbirds

This morning they came like the dying
reclaiming their old lives, delirious
with joy right on the seam of Spring,
streaming in by the tattered thousands
like black leaves blowing back onto the trees.

But the homeless know what's expected by now,
and when the farmer fired into their body,
they rose all around me like trembling
black wounds gaping red at the shoulders,
a river of pain draining into the sky.

Tonight as I look at the cold sky
and its flock of blue-white scars,
I can't yet turn from Orion's red star
whose trembling red light has travelled for years
to die now into any eyes that will hold it.

Fred Dings

auditory nature of poetry. Its ambition is to create a bridge between high and low culture.

The fifth point is that there still exists a huge audience for poetry in America, old and new, but it is now so segmented, that it shares almost no common ground. There is no longer a viable mainstream in American poetry, at least among poets under sixty. New American poetry instead is segmented by region, aesthetic, ideology, gender, race, and genre. The academic subculture of poetry represents only one small but highly visible part of this large, diverse, and atomized audience. Those poets who are read and discussed in lower Manhattan are not the same as those who are esteemed in Palo Alto and Seattle, or argued over in San Antonio and Charlotte. If there are half a million regular readers of poetry in America (and I would guess that the number is at least that), it usually seems as if no two are reading the same book.

Why is there no mainstream? The deterioration of the mainstream resulted at least partially from its inability to maintain a meaningful place in public discourse. This leads to my sixth observation – there is no longer much sustained or even modestly serious coverage of poetry in national media. The key word here is *sustained*. You might see an isolated article here or there on a poet, usually for reasons having little or nothing to do with his or her writing. The days when Robinson Jeffers, T.S. Eliot, or Robert Lowell could appear on the cover of *Time*, followed by a long, serious article written for the common reader, are over. Equally distant are the days when Edna St. Vincent Millay could be given a commercial radio show

or when famous poems of the past would be featured as standard programming on radio variety shows (which was true in America up until the late forties). Today neither poet nor publisher, neither reader nor editor expects poetry to have a regular place at the national media's table. Consequently this gap has been filled, to the degree that it has been filled at all, haphazardly by local programming or narrowly targeted reviewing, which differs by region, by journal, by aesthetic. There is more programming than ever before, but it serves to segment rather than unify the public.

The lack of coverage has been exacerbated by another development. My seventh observation is that poetry criticism, which was so influential twenty years ago, is now significantly declining in its reach and influence. While criticism still enjoys a certain prestige, it seems increasingly remote from the major developments in poetry. I'm not sure if its marginality is a cause or an effect, but I will make at least four uncomplimentary remarks about the current state of criticism. First, there are few truly distinguished critics who still write seriously about new poetry in a public idiom. Second, there are few general interest journals that still publish poetry criticism, even if you define criticism in the broadest sense to include features, interviews, as well as reviews and essays. Third, academic criticism today is so inwardly focused that it has generally abandoned the concerns and language of the general culture. Academic criticism mostly addresses a substantially different set of issues from what interests most artists, the public, and the media. Not surprisingly, it has virtually no audience outside the university. And fourth, the dominance of literary theory has made most academic criticism so pretentiously mannered that it seems dull or incomprehensible even to extremely intelligent general readers. The days are gone when we had informed regular poetry columnists in the major journals. In the late forties, you could expect to see Robert Fitzgerald in *The New Republic*, Louise Bogan in *The New Yorker*, John Ciardi in *The Saturday Review*, and Randall Jarrell in *The Nation*. Even twenty years ago an average issue of *The New York Times Book Review* regularly contained two or three long pieces on poetry or poetry criticism. What we have left of serious poetry coverage comes mainly from highly segmented publications (like *The Hudson Review*, *Poetry Flash*, *The New Criterion*, *The Exquisite Corpse*, or *Verse*) each addressing a small audience. Even *American Poetry Review*, the largest journal in the poetry subculture, has a minuscule circulation by the standards of commercial journalism, and despite its name, it publishes few reviews.

My eighth observation is that there is really no longer a vital, high-art avant-garde in American poetry. Modernism is irretrievably, inarguably dead. It has been dead as a profitable avenue for young poets for at least twenty years, and now almost all of its great practitioners have gone to meet their maker. The university, an institution better equipped to preserve old culture than to foster the creation of new art, has handsomely embalmed the corpse of Modernism – but no one should wait around for the

resurrection. If there is an avant-garde in American poetry right now, it is to be found outside of the university and most likely in oral poetry. But locating a true avant-garde anywhere seems problematic. Rap might have started as an avant-garde movement, but its quick assimilation into the corporate entertainment industry gradually turned it into another sort of commercial venture – a naughty one like *Penthouse* or *Hustler*, but a consumer commodity equally subject to market forces. Unless you want to define the two major contrarian movements of the eighties and nineties, New Formalism and Language poetry, as the avant-garde, I find it difficult to consider any new poetic school avant-garde – even performance art. The time has probably come to admit that the notion of an avant-garde is no longer useful in discussing contemporary literature. How can there be an avant-garde without a mainstream? *Avant-garde de quoi?* one must ask. Establishment institutions – universities, museums, foundations, commercial galleries, even the state – have embraced the idea of experimental art for so long that the avant-garde is now a safely domesticated concept, just another traditional style.

My ninth observation also explains the disappearance of the mainstream in poetry. New technology in printing and communication has destroyed the mainstream's ability to channel opinion. Computers, word processors, desktop publishing, electronic networks, xeroxing, tape cassette recordings, video technology, and all the related technology have brought publishing within the realm of most

This Will Be My Only

unfaithfulness.
I will take the man
you used to be and
remember him.
I will draw his lines
on your hands at night
while we lie awake
and speak to him
in dark places, even
while you sleep.
He will not leave me.
His turns will not be digressions,
nor will he place new feet on the sill
each day when he enters.
And his words will be few,
but I will know them the way
any woman knows the body
of her lover. I will hear them
every time we touch.

Andrea Hollander Budy

The X in My Name

the poor
signature
of my illiterate
and peasant
self
giving away
all rights
in a deceiving
contract for life

Francisco X. Alarcón

writers. For the first time in history it is now easier to publish your own book or magazine than to get your work published by somebody else. You also see this trend reflected in ethnic publishing. Minority groups are now more likely to create their own institutions – magazines, presses, conferences, reading venues – than to have their dissenting perspectives assimilated into an increasingly diffuse and disorganized mainstream. *Arte Publico* in Houston, for example, is the leading publisher of Latino literature in the United States. It sells millions of dollars of books through a network largely of its own creation. Although trade publishing still centers in New York and Boston, literary communication in the United States has become completely decentralized. Just as the proliferation of state universities and private colleges in the midcentury took writers out of compact, urban bohémias and scattered them across the United States, so have these new communications media completely atomized American literary life. Since there is no longer a geographic center in literary life, a critic in New York or San Francisco now has as much trouble following new developments in poetry as does a reader in Fargo or Tuscaloosa.

A tenth unexpected trend in American poetry is the broad revival of form and narrative among many younger writers. Twenty years ago no mainstream critic would have predicted this movement back to rhyme, meter, and story. (The emergence of Language poetry, by comparison, would have seemed more probable since it, despite certain radical differences, grew out of the Modernist enterprise.) What would have been particularly surprising about the so-called Expansive Poetry is that most of its practitioners work and write outside of the academy. The mixture of high culture and popular culture that characterizes New Formalism and New Narrative, therefore, is ironically at odds with the academic mainstream, which has abandoned form and narrative. Significantly, these dissenting poets – like ethnic writers – have also found it easier to create parallel institutions (magazines, presses, reading series, and conferences) than to merge into the mainstream.

Now I'd like to end with two points that constitute a classic good news/bad news situation. My eleventh point is the bad news, namely that the academic job market for writers has collapsed while academic programs have never been so productive in churning out degree-bearing graduates. Hardly a month goes by when someone doesn't announce a new graduate program. There are about 250 graduate writing programs in the United States. They produce somewhere in excess of 25,000 MFA's per decade, of whom perhaps 10% to 20% will find permanent, full-

time employment teaching in the academy. A young poet is more likely than ever to go through a graduate writing program, but MFA's are less likely than ever to stay there professionally. The question is where will these people go? What will they do with themselves?

The bad news in the academic job market leads to my final point, which is, I think, the unexpected good news. Over the last decade the groundwork has been unwittingly laid for a new bohemia. This will not be a bohemia in the classic sense of inexpensive urban areas where artists and intellectuals congregate, like San Francisco's North Beach, or New York's Greenwich Village. Those bohemias faded out of existence thirty years ago, as the real estate prices went up and the intelligentsia found it was easier to make a living in the university.

Now, however, there are a number of trends that suggest a new bohemia is emerging. The first is the growth of nonacademic literary institutions, like Poets House, San Francisco's Poetry Center, the Nicholas Roerich Museum, and the Nuyorican Cafe, that create new public venues for writers – places where artists and intellectuals can congregate, and where writers and their audience can meet. Congregation, discussion, and performance are what bohemia is about in human terms. Second, the proliferation of independent and chain literary bookstores have created local, nonacademic meeting and performance places for writers and intellectuals. There are an astonishing number of bookstores in America that provide poets with public platforms outside the university. Bookstores like Cody's in Berkeley or Chapters in Washington D.C. offer better literary programming than do most major universities. I sometimes think it is now possible for a poet to walk across the United States and be able to give a bookstore reading every evening. Third, computer networks, writers' conferences, independent literary presses and community writing centers, have either in the flesh or via fiber-optics created ways for writers to meet and exchange ideas that didn't exist twenty years ago. The growth of serious, nonprofit literary presses like Graywolf or Story Line – unaffiliated with any university and located outside the Northeastern publishing capitals – are proving as important to American culture as the proliferation of university presses did thirty years earlier. Fourth, there are now hundreds of specialized radio and video shows that bring literary programming to local and national audiences. Much of this new programming is dull or trivial, but some of it – especially the more expansive radio formats developed by commentators like Jack Foley, Terri Gross, Marty Moss-Coane, Tom Vitale, Colin Walters, and Wayne Pond – are serious and engaging. Radio can become a significant oral medium for literary criticism in a culture where written criticism of poetry no longer reaches even a modestly large audience. Fifth, finally, and best of all are the vast numbers of unemployed intellectuals and artists who will be damned if they're going to lead uninteresting lives. They will find it in their best interest to create something outside the closed shop of academia.

[Continued on page 8]

1-800

Credit cards out, pencil and notepad handy,
The insomniac sinks deeply in his chair,
Begging swift needles in his glass of brandy
To knit once more the raveled sleeve of care,
As with control, remotely, in one hand he
Summons bright visions from the midnight air:

The six-way drill! The eight-way folding ladder!
Knives that pierce coins or thin-slice loaves of bread!
Devices that will make one's tummy flatter,
Rout car thieves, or purge household taps of lead!
All made of stuff no earthly force can shatter!
Their lauds ascend Olympus in his head.

And yet how little will his days be brightened
By Opera Favorites or, if he feels lewd,
Even THE SWIMSUIT ISSUE. Briefly heightened,
His hopes, ephemeral as stir-fried food,
Vanish like screws his six-way drill has tightened,
Leaving him just like them – completely screwed.

"Buy houses and apartments with no money!
Discover how today! Write this address!"
Snapping alert and clicking with his gun, he
Draws a bead on the forehead of Success,
Whose orchid lei is fresh, whose teeth are sunny,
Whose tapes will soon arrive via UPS.

But anger, with succeeding sniffers, passes
And soon all softens in an amber hue;
As through a pair of UV/blue-block glasses,
Doubt fades before the testimony – true
Accounts of hair sprouting like jungle grasses!
Of lifeless penises lifting anew!

Of bags and wrinkles blotted out! Of dumber
Than average kids who, spared the wrath and rod,
Have learned to multiply! He fights off slumber
The moment that his head begins to nod
And resolutely punches the first number
Of what may be the area code of God.

R.S. Gwynn

Funding the Revolution

Changing Arts Practices in a Changing World

bell hooks

bell hooks was one of ten authors who were commissioned by Grantmakers in the Arts to write an essay in conjunction with GIA's 1993 annual conference. Like the other authors, hooks attended the conference and participated in a plenary panel discussion. This panel session, on the topic "Art and Democracy," quickly became one of the liveliest sessions of the conference (See article following on page 9.) While the discussion at hand was compelling, hooks had come prepared to make specific recommendations to the gathered grantmakers. Grantmakers in the Arts Newsletter invited her to put her ideas in the form of an article for this issue. We are very pleased that she accepted.

In a democratic society, art should be the place where everyone can witness the joy, pleasure, and power that emerges with freedom of expression, even when the work evokes pain, outrage, sorrow, or shame. Art should be, then, a place where boundaries can be transgressed and where visionary insights can be revealed within the context of the everyday, the familiar, the mundane. Art is and remains an uninhibited, unrestrained, cultural terrain, but only as all artists see their work inherently challenging institutionalized systems of domination. Imperialism, racism, sexism, and class elitism seek to limit, co-opt, exploit, and shut down possibilities for individual creative self-actualization. Regardless of subject matter, form, or content, and whether or not it is overtly political, artistic work that emerges from an unfettered imagination affirms the primacy of art as a space where we can find the deepest, most intimate understanding of what it means to be free.

In the marketplace, however, art is never simply a site for free expression; rather, it is an arena in which opportunistic forces interact to promote competition. Institutionalized systems of domination are mirrored in art practices on every level – in funding choices, in the production and dissemination of art criticism, in the development of canonical works with starring lineups of white males, in the dismissal of overtly political work especially when created by individuals from marginalized groups (particularly people of color and/or folks from poor backgrounds), and even in the seemingly "innocent" clinging to a fixed, static, overdetermined notion of "great" art.

Ironically, individuals who are most mired in perpetuating coercive hierarchies often see themselves as the sole champions of artistic freedom. True champions of artistic freedom must be committed to creating and sustaining an aesthetic culture where diverse artistic practices, standpoints, identities, and locations are nurtured and find

support and affirmation, and where the belief prevails that individual artists have the right to create as the spirit moves – freely, openly, provocatively. Until this expansive vision of the role of the artist in society is embraced as the necessary aesthetic groundwork for all artistic practice, freedom of expression will be continually undermined, its meaning and value lost.

Ideally, in a wealthy democratic society, government would recognize the importance of art, and would form the necessary offices of culture to both support artists on all levels and stimulate awareness of art, its meaning and significance. While all of us who celebrate the importance of art must continue to lobby for a government that responds fully to these needs, we must also work to garner the support of private funders.

If a progressive vision of artistic practice were shaping their work, funders would help create diverse contexts for the public, across class, to be educated about the importance of art and aesthetics. This education must take place on both a national and community level. Grant givers could invent cultural strategies that would seek to share with everyone our lived understanding that art enriches life. They could buy, barter, and when possible donate spots on television carrying this message. They could support more art education in the schools, funding programs in elementary schools and making sure really great artists have residencies in schools.

Gifted children, especially those from underprivileged marginalized groups, need to be supported while they are young, when their talent is first emerging. For too long, this society (and most often those classes who are materially privileged) has assumed that non-privileged folks who are gifted will somehow prove their mettle, will manage to triumph over limiting hardships and deprivations, and will still remain committed to doing art. Such thinking is a kind of false consciousness that covers up an informed understanding of the conditions under which any artist works freely. As long as these sentiments prevail, we will never see an abundance of truly significant great art emerging from marginalized groups. (Note the key word here is "abundance.") Continuous affirmation and support from all possible fronts is important for artistic development.

No artist deemed "great" by the art establishment has not known this affirmation, whether given by a family member, friend, or patron. Establishing a cultural climate of support at the onset of a young artist's commitment to doing art work greatly increases the likelihood that this work will develop and mature. We all know how many times funders and patrons approach the work of an aspiring adult artist from an underprivileged background only to make the critique that the work may be good but lacks maturity or needs to develop more slowly. Artists from marginalized groups, especially those who come to doing art in a committed way late in life, often feel they lack time to develop slowly. They create with stressful urgency and, of course, this affects the work. For this

reason alone, funders could have a tremendous impact by supporting the development of children who have reached a stage of disciplined commitment to art practice.

Funders could discover gifted children who lack the means to pursue their work by sending artists, paid as consultants, to schools. These artists could establish working contact with teachers and students, and then could act as liaisons between children and funding agencies. I am not talking here about giving large sums of money to the individual children. I am talking about buying paint and paper for a child for years. Growing up in a large working class household where I longed to develop as a painter, I confronted parents who felt they just could not take money from primary needs to buy paint and paper. Had a donor provided the materials, my parents would have supported me pursuing this passion. While many students from marginalized groups can apply for scholarships to attend graduate schools, or even some prestigious art schools, being a student making art is not the same as having long stretches of time to educate oneself fully about art and to practice it.

Whether disadvantaged and/or marginalized or not, artists from all groups need time. Across the United States, funding programs are in place that select a few talented artists and award them sufficient funds to take months or even a year and just do their work. Often, the same individuals enter the granting loop and are rewarded by several sources. This is one of the consequences of networking, yet it limits the number of individuals who can receive support. It would be exciting to see the birth of more diverse types of funding on a simpler scale, like grants that would provide rent and/or food and supplies. Big bucks can only be acquired by the few, but a granting process that is layered opens up the possibility that more folks can benefit.

Artistic production would be enriched in our culture if grantmakers would create a system of interart relations that would reward discussion and engagement – the sharing of knowledge, information, and skills across differences of race, class, gender, age, etc. Those of us who have developed a truly mature artistic practice often testify that meeting certain individuals and learning from them was crucial to our development. Often these meetings are serendipitous – happen quite by chance. When I was young, I had a boyfriend (later a partner of many years) who wrote his dissertation on poet Robert Duncan. Their working friendship led to my meeting one of the more influential role models for my life – the white male painter Jess, Duncan's lover. Both men were more than forty years old when we met them. Even though Robert died a few years ago and my contact with Jess ceased, during the years that we met regularly, I was able to talk with him about art practices and to learn from his wisdom. I mention his being white and his age because, given the nature of social relations in a white supremacist capitalist patriarchy, these two factors might have prevented us from ever making contact or establishing the kind of relationship where sharing of knowledge and information

could occur. Celebratory rhetoric about multiculturalism aside, it is not easy for folks to bond across differences in this society. From Jess I learned the art of being a disciplined artist. That was an invaluable lesson. Were it not for the wonder of chance, this meeting might never have happened.

Given the increasingly narrow nationalism and mounting xenophobia in our society, meetings that cross the boundaries of class, race, sexual preference, gender, and age are less likely to happen. Such meetings, arranged and funded by an organized body, would facilitate not only meaningful contact and exchange, but would spread the message that being an artist is not simply a matter of possessing the gift to create. To truly mature in one's artistic practice, one must learn about art, see art from everywhere and everyone, study, and dialogue with others. Currently, the emphasis on production, on the making and selling of art as a product, and on the packaging of careers, means that this way of nurturing artistic spirit is not promoted. And it is definitely not materially rewarded. Yet the development of organized artistic community is essential to making and sustaining a democratic artistic culture.

To create an aesthetic culture that promotes diversity, established artists from all backgrounds must be encouraged to expand the scope of their knowledge and interaction. It is tragic that so many mainstream artists, or folks seeking to enter the mainstream, wrongly imagine that they are keeping art pure when they devalue the importance of diversity, when they criticize policies of inclusion and programs of artistic support that prioritize marginalized groups. These artists should be able to undo the socialization that inhibits their capacity to see that "all" artists who believe in artistic freedom create work that challenges domination. They would benefit from grants that would allow them to interact with critics and artists so that they could develop a more expansive vision.

Much of our cultural emphasis on diversity to date has been narrowly orchestrated, and all too often creates divisiveness between artists who see themselves preserving art as a sacred sphere uncontaminated by politics, and artists (many of whom are from marginalized groups) who rightly understand that political critiques in various forms are needed if we are to disrupt and change the existing structure. We must face the reality that artists can create work within the existing structure without having a progressive vision for the development of artistic community or for more inclusive artistic practices. Only education for critical consciousness will create a climate where thinking can change and paradigms can shift.

The phrase "marginalized groups" is useful because it does not limit itself to one category. It can be used to refer to any group of individuals (including groups of white males) who have been systematically denied access to the resources that make artistic production possible. Members of some groups have been historically oppressed and/or exploited in ways that concretely deprive them of

resources – knowledge, information, access. These groups rightly deserve the support of everyone who would like to promote a truly democratic artistic culture in our society. Given the ongoing reality of sexism and the institutionalization of patriarchy, women certainly remain a marginalized group. Yet we have to add to that knowledge the understanding that race and class discrimination mean some groups of women are more marginalized than others who have greater access to spheres of power.

Anyone involved in the grantgiving process on any level can see that, irrespective of race or gender, individuals from privileged backgrounds (and here we must be willing to acknowledge that higher levels of education are a privilege) are often best able to utilize existing funding agencies. A major new agenda for funding agencies is and should be to formulate various ways both to share information and to give support that do not require massive amounts of paperwork. Many artists have not had the opportunity to develop the kind of critical literacy that is often needed to navigate one's journey through the funding process. Even someone with a PhD (like myself) might never apply for funding because the process seems awesome. The existing patterns assume that one knows not only how to apply for funding but how to fill out forms. Rather than rigidly holding to these assumptions, we could collectively begin to imagine and institutionalize simpler selection processes. What would it be like if all one needed was to have an oral interview with a board of select folks? Private funders willing to try a process as radical as this could serve as an example for other agencies. Failure to interrogate existing selection processes means that everyone, whether we want to or not, ends up reproducing the status quo, with only a few little differences that appear to integrate an unchanging same.

Lastly, working as both artist and critic, I know that the development of an insightful, sophisticated body of criticism addressing diverse art practices is necessary for work to be given sustained, serious regard. Open inclusive opportunities (the recent Whitney Biennial being a prime example) will never be fully successful if they do not coincide with the production of a body of critical written work that creates an intellectual climate where the importance of these interventions can be articulated and where the value of the art represented can be illuminated. As a member of a marginalized group who writes art criticism and who longs to see more work by African-American thinkers (especially women, but every other group), I am among the first to testify that this work brings in very little income, and, indeed, it helps to have a good job. Perhaps the day will soon come when grantgiving agencies will seek to establish constructive liaisons between critics and artists. Both artists and critics must be materially rewarded if the work of marginalized artists is to be given the critical attention needed to ensure that its value will be sustained through time, to ensure that the knowledge and appreciation of the significance of the work will not wane with passing trends.

Like artists, and like the mass public, funders also need education for critical consciousness. Funders need more

forums and small conferences that really create a context for dialogue, for the working through of differences and of ideas that are not fully understood. This will require that organizers have the will and imagination to break with the ways information has been traditionally shared. How many of us have attended a conference where there actually are small group sessions and one-on-one encounters with significant visionaries and thinkers? All too often we structure conferences in ways that prevent exploring and working through conflicting viewpoints (if that is possible at all.) We are desperately in need of new models. Ultimately, new agendas can be set and successfully implemented by funding agencies only if the individuals working within these spheres of power embrace the spirit of change that calls us all to deepen our awareness and to intensify our commitment to art as the practice of freedom.

bell hooks is a writer whose recent books include Sisters of the Yam, 1993, and YEARNING race gender and cultural politics, 1990. hooks is also professor of African-American and Women's Studies, Oberlin College.

Notes toward a New Bohemia

[Continued from page 5]

By the year 2000, for the first time in half a century, the vast majority of young American writers will live and work outside the university. This demographic and economic change has already created a significant cultural shift, and we have only witnessed the beginnings of a transformation in American poetry. The new bohemia will be atomized, decentralized, interdisciplinary, computerized, and anti-institutional. It will embrace oral culture without abandoning the written word. It will include academics without becoming itself academic. The complex shape the new bohemia will take is impossible to predict, but I can imagine some unemployed Ph.D. hacking away, even as we speak, at a millennial manifesto. "Writers of America, unite!," reads his computer screen. "You have nothing to lose except . . ."

Poem Bibliography

"First Poem for You" by Kim Addonizio from *The Philosopher's Club* (Brockport, NY: BOA Editions, Ltd., 1994)

"The X in My Name" by Francisco X. Alarcón from *No Golden Gate for Us* (Santa Fe: Pennywhistle Press, 1993)

"This Will Be My Only" by Andrea Hollander Budy from *House Without a Dreamer* (Brownsville, Oregon: Story Line Press, 1993)

"Redwing Blackbirds" by Fred Dings from *After the Solstice* (Alexandria: Orchises, 1992)

"1-800" by R.S. Gwynn from *The Area Code of God* (West Chester, Pennsylvania: Aralia Press, 1994)

Art and Democracy

Thoughts Inspired by a Session at the 1993 GIA Conference

The format of the 1993 Grantmakers in the Arts conference was designed to encourage in-depth conversations with the authors who had been commissioned to write essays on one of three questions. Each of the questions was also the focus of a plenary session that began with a panel discussion among the authors who addressed that particular question. One of the questions was: "What is the relationship between art and democracy, and how could this affect cultural philanthropy in the future?" The authors whose essays responded to this question included George Anastaplo, professor of law, Loyola University of Chicago; Andrei Codrescu, writer, contributor to National Public Radio, and film director of "Road Scholar;" and bell hooks, writer and professor of African-American and Women's Studies, Oberlin College. Discussion at this session, moderated by Joan Shigekawa of the Nathan Cummings Foundation, included both panelists and participants and became quite heated by the end. Two conference participants agreed to share with GIA Newsletter readers some of the thoughts that this session inspired.

Bruce Sievers

The "Art and Democracy" discussion confirmed my initial suspicion – that the two terms, while both representing admirable social enterprises, have in fact little to do with each other. This is because (so I would argue) democracy is mostly about power – how it is shared, divided, and exercised in a society committed to the resolution of its differences by a majority voting procedure. And art is mostly about creative vision and insight, which has only a tangential relationship with social decision-making. Only secondarily might both terms have to do with a common theme – a social commitment to freedom of thought. And on this common theme each plays a different role. Freedom of expression, essential to democratic choice, is also an important asset to the creation of art, while art helps provide an expressive voice for segments wishing to shape or reshape community consciousness. But these issues were hardly discussed.

Nevertheless, what was discussed was enormously illuminating and important, for other reasons. The session was illuminating not so much about the topic as about ourselves as funders – our assumptions about the role of the arts in the community, the connection between the arts and community values, and our relationship to both. What became clear from the three presentations was the paradox of supporting the arts under the rhetorical framework that many of us use – that the arts are elevating, humanizing, and pro-social. Codrescu exhibited the skeptical and even alienating stance that the arts often embody in modern (or more accurately, post-modern) society. Anastaplo argued that this very character prevents a significant portion of the arts community from relating to the larger society and

thus leaves the arts vulnerable to a public impression that they are at best frills or at worst dangerous. hooks suggested that there might be a new synthesis that could draw the public into a renewed positive relationship with the arts, but she did not offer much more than the promise.

The tension in the room generated by these topics was testimony to the power they exert over us, the more so because they are not often acknowledged. They go to the heart of why we think the arts are important (and how staffs and boards may differ on these issues), why philanthropic support is allocated to them, and what we assume their effect is and should be on the larger society. In a word, it allowed us to examine our deepest assumptions, and that does not happen very often in philanthropy.

Penelope McPhee

"When I use a word," Humpty Dumpty said, in a rather scornful tone, "it means just what I choose it to mean – neither more nor less."

"The question is," said Alice, "whether you can make words mean so many different things."

"The question is," said Humpty Dumpty, "which is to be the master – that's all."

Lewis Carroll
Through the Looking Glass

Words have been stolen, abducted from our language, held hostage, and, then, like Patty Hearst, returned as something other than they were. Now clad in camouflage, they're barely recognizable. We fear to embrace them, not knowing exactly how they'll respond; yet, we despair to abandon them, knowing what they have meant to us.

Layered with nuance and artificial meaning, politicized and codified, neutral words become laden with judgments, and judgmental words become weapons. Words contradict themselves, holding for each speaker a secret meaning, for each listener a message to be decoded.

In our new version of "Newspeak," we as grantmakers and artists are managing to express the most intolerant of ideas in the guise of political correctness. We, of all people, should be skeptical of this fraudulent language. After all, we deplored the conservative usurpation of words such as "values" and "liberal." But have we not been equally guilty of turning words such as "diversity," "multicultural" and "community" inside out with Humpty Dumpty license? In our distorted language, these three words now exclude as many individuals and groups as they include. For while they embrace all those who have customarily been left out, they reject those who have always been in. Can it be true diversity if it's non-inclusive? When we talk about "community," we're actually talking about very specific communities. Can we,

[Continued on page 15]

What's ahead for Arts Censorship?

1994 and Beyond

Marjorie Heins

In an average week, recently, at the ACLU Arts Censorship Project, we worked on a Colorado lawsuit against a cable television access center that had censored a gay rights program; a New York artist complained to us that her public art project had been denied a permit because city officials disagreed with its political viewpoint; the ACLU of Kansas called to consult about the removal of a controversial novel from three public school libraries; we received FAXes of six bills filed in Congress to censor images of violence on television; and we worked on a Pennsylvania case in which prize-winning photographs in an art show were removed because of nudity, then seized by police.

Plainly, the censorship wars are not over. If anything, they have become a way of life, spreading to local communities across the United States. And if the debates are now somewhat less volatile than in 1989 and 1990, when the National Endowment for the Arts was demagogically attacked for supporting artists such as Robert Mapplethorpe and Andres Serrano, they are nonetheless as important as ever for the future of artistic freedom in this nation.

Background: A Quick Review of the Eighties

Although the attacks on the NEA that began in 1989 were highly charged, the roots of our current censorship crisis stretch back at least to the early 1980s with the election of Ronald Reagan and the ascendancy of the radical right in U.S. politics. Prominent in the cultural baggage of this New Right was a sexually reactionary agenda that denied women's autonomy in many fields ranging from reproductive freedom to deviations from traditional sexual norms. From the beginning, the Reagan government waged an assault on sexually explicit art and entertainment, broadly encompassed by the loaded and subjective term "pornography."

This campaign culminated in 1987 with the notorious two-volume report of Attorney General Meese's Commission on Pornography. Although finding no causal connection between sexually explicit art or entertainment and antisocial behavior, the commissioners (over two dissents) nevertheless recommended a long list of censorship actions, ranging from new legislation to local pressure crusades.

The commission also, ingeniously, frosted its essentially reactionary analysis of sexual subject matter with a gloss of contemporary feminist rhetoric about words and images "degrading to women." Today, this odd-bedfellow coupling of radical right ideology with misguided pro-censorship feminism continues in campaigns against almost any art with sexual content. Such art is either pejoratively labeled "pornography" (even if created by women), or, increasingly, is accused of constituting "sexual harassment."

Another mid-1980s foretaste of the current censorship situation emerged with the Parents Music Resource Center, led by our current Second Lady Tipper Gore. The PMRC began – or, rather, revived – a dormant but hardly new antipathy to rock 'n roll music. Since its early days as an outgrowth of jazz and rhythm and blues, rock has been a target because of its troublesome themes: sexuality, violence, rebellion, anarchy, drugs, and other attributes of post-adolescent angst. The PMRC's complaints became the subject of Congressional hearings in 1985, and the premise of those hearings – blaming the musical messengers for the angry feelings and harsh social realities they articulate – began to take hold. This reductionist mentality – of using speech as a scapegoat for social ills – is the engine that drives censorship campaigns.

The ground was thus well-seeded, by 1989, for an assault on the federal arts funding agency, the NEA. Previous forays in this territory had been unsuccessful despite attempts by groups like the Moral Majority to make an issue of sexually explicit art. (The one objection to an NEA decision that made it to Congress in those years was a 1984 attack by Congressman Mario Biaggi on a production of Verdi's "Rigoletto" on the ground that it defamed Italians.) But the combined charges of "blasphemy" (Serrano's lyrical photograph, "Piss Christ") and "pornography" (Mapplethorpe's documentation of some outer reaches of homoeroticism) raised the temperature of public debate to the boiling point, beyond which reasoned argument was simply not heard. No amount of explanation of the NEA's many contributions or of the importance of keeping partisan politics out of arts grantmaking could deflate the simplistically appealing rhetoric that "taxpayers' money" should not and certainly need not be spent on art deemed (by whom?) to be politically controversial, sexually explicit, insulting to someone's religion, or sympathetic to gays.

1990-93: Ambivalence at the NEA and Victories in Court

By 1990, the NEA was in a state of profound schizophrenia. It was excruciating to watch John Frohnmayer, chair of the agency from late 1989 to early 1992, vacillate between eloquent defenses of artistic freedom on one day and disingenuous genuflections to political pressures on the next. The most notorious of his decisions in the latter mode was the rejection of recommended fellowships to four performance artists – Karen Finley, Holly Hughes,

Tim Miller, and John Fleck – which led the four to file a federal lawsuit, *Finley v. NEA*, in late 1990.

That case was amended early the following year to add a constitutional challenge to Congress's newly-enacted requirement that in awarding grants, the NEA consider "general standards of decency and respect for the diverse beliefs and values of the American public." The challenge had good legal precedent: a January 1991 federal court decision, *Bella Lewitzky Dance Foundation v. Frohnmayer*, had invalidated an earlier NEA requirement that grantees certify that none of the funds received would be used "to promote, disseminate, or produce materials which in the judgment of the NEA . . . may be obscene."

Then, in February 1992, while the *Finley* suit was pending, Frohnmayer was unceremoniously dismissed. His deputy, Anne-Imelda Radice, assumed the NEA helm, assured Congress that she would enforce the "decency and respect" standard, and rapidly demonstrated her resolve by rejecting recommended grants for three gay film festivals – the only projects with an explicitly gay focus out of fifty-three film festivals recommended for funding. The ACLU agreed to represent the three festivals in legal action, if necessary, to reverse Radice's decision.

Bill Clinton's election triggered Radice's departure, and during the extended interregnum of Ana Steele at the NEA a number of censorship controversies were settled, among them the gay film festivals dispute and the *Finley* plaintiffs' claims for their 1990 performance art fellowships. In both cases, the NEA approved the previously withheld grants.

The other half of the *Finley v. NEA* case, the constitutional challenge to the "decency and respect" law, was won in a resounding June 1992 federal court decision holding the requirement unconstitutionally vague and overbroad. But the Clinton Justice Department, to the dismay of many observers, pursued an appeal of the decision that had been originally filed, then delayed, by the Bush Administration attorneys. Throughout 1993, the Administration resisted urgings to drop the appeal and let the "decency and respect" limitations on arts funding die the quiet death that they deserve.

Optimism was nevertheless high when, at last, nine months after his inauguration, Clinton appointed actress Jane Alexander to chair the NEA. But the ever-present specter of another blowup over controversial grants – sparked by radical right politicians or pressure groups and fueled by most legislators' fear of being branded "soft on pornography" – continues to create a palpable air of anxiety about future NEA decisions.

The Spread of a Censorship Mentality

While litigation and political developments were engrossing NEA-watchers in Washington, censorship as a way of life was seeping inexorably down to the grass roots. If "not with my tax money" and anti-"pornography" rhetoric had proved so seductive during the

hottest days of the NEA debates, why not expand their use? Pressure groups and government officials began going after library books (bought, after all, with tax money), school curricula, local arts funding programs, and public exhibit spaces. I will give only a few examples, from the literally hundreds that fill the files of the Arts Censorship Project and other free-speech organizations.

In March 1992 the U.S. General Services Administration gave artist Dayton Claudio a permit to exhibit a painting in the lobby of a Raleigh, North Carolina federal building. Claudio obtained the permit because, under a 1976 law called the Public Buildings Cooperative Use Act, the GSA must make public areas of federal buildings available on a first-come first-served basis for educational and cultural activities. The painting, entitled "Sex, Laws, & Coat-hangers," was a graphic statement concerning abortion.

Within moments of the painting's unveiling, the GSA building administrator revoked Claudio's permit on the grounds that the painting was "political" and "controversial." Later that day he told an employee that he had been afraid the work would offend Senator Jesse Helms. Needless to say, neither "political" and "controversial" nor "offensive to Jesse Helms" are grounds for permit revocation under the Cooperative Use Act. Nevertheless, a federal court in September 1993 rejected Claudio's claims that the GSA's actions violated both the Act and the First Amendment. The ACLU is now appealing the case.

At the University of Michigan Law School in October 1992, students commissioned but then ordered the dismantling of an art exhibit designed to accompany a conference on prostitution. A speaker at the conference had complained that one of the videos in the show contained "pornography." The work in question, "Portrait of a Sexual Evolutionary," was made by a woman and told of sexual and personal liberation from a distinctly female point of view. The ACLU agreed to represent the artists. The university, fearing a First Amendment and breach of contract suit, finally agreed to settle the artists' claims for \$3,000 and to reinstate the censored exhibit in conjunction with a new conference on feminism, censorship, and sexual imagery in art.

Other pressures at Michigan cast a pall over the post-settlement arrangements, however: certain students' political opposition to the settlement, university administrators' own apparent discomfort with sexuality in art, and the brooding omnipresence of noted law professor and antipornography crusader Catharine MacKinnon, who had played a pivotal role in the students' decision to remove the exhibit. These pressures led to a series of acrimonious arguments over the costs of reinstallation, and to a smaller and less ambitious new conference than had been planned. The university never publicly acknowledged that the artists had been wronged or that censorship had taken place.

In the same year that the Michigan incident unfolded, students and administrators at the University of Pitts-

burgh refused to allow a surrealist painting with sexual symbolism into an otherwise-open student art show. Some students called it "sexual harassment." It was only after the ACLU filed suit on the student-artist's behalf that the painting was admitted. At Colgate University, similarly, the administration ordered removal of a traveling exhibit, organized by New York's Museum of Modern Art and consisting of nudes by renowned photographer Lee Friedlander; again the complaint was sexual harassment.

In Cleveland, Tennessee in the summer of 1993, the local leader of the radical right group Concerned Women for America checked eighteen books out of the public library and refused to return them. Her complaint: most of the books dealt with sex education for teens, and taxpayers should not be funding such trash. The local library board decided to resist these pressures for ideological purity in book selection and to support the librarian's refusal to remove the books from the library's collection. The county commission countered by nearly deciding to fire some members of the library board. It was heartening that, after a spirited debate of the issue including exchanges in local letters-to-the-editor columns, the books were returned, free speech prevailed, and the librarian kept his job.

The outcome was not so positive in suburban Cobb County, Georgia where, in August 1993, activists raised a ruckus over references to homosexuality in Terrence McNally's play, "Lips Together Teeth Apart," which had been staged at a local theater that received some county arts funds. The county commission thereupon resolved not to fund any future activities "which seek to contravene . . . current community standards . . . regarding gay life-styles," and nearly passed a specific ordinance directing that arts funds "be expended on programming which advances and supports strong community, family-oriented standards." The ACLU and People for the American Way put the commissioners on notice that such ideological discrimination in an arts funding program would run afoul of the constitutional principles announced in *Lewitzky* and *Finley*.

At this point, rather than continue its adherence to nonpartisan funding criteria, the commission decided to end arts support in the county. Some of those on the scene attributed the grim outcome, at least in part, to the failure of the local arts community to recognize the danger, support the theater in question, and work in coalition with gay rights groups to fight both homophobia and censorship.

What's ahead?

What conclusions can be drawn from this history?

First, a censorship mentality has set in. Using speech as a scapegoat for social ills is now common practice – and a convenient political distraction from our society's failure to address the myriad real-world problems that art and entertainment often so dramatically reflect.

Censorship comes in cycles, and this is hardly the first time in our history that scapegoats have been sought for social and economic anxieties or dilemmas. But the prospect of another witch-hunt era like the 1950s is not a pleasant one. Those who care about freedom must mobilize now to organize, educate, litigate where necessary – in short, to use every possible means to challenge the censorship mentality.

Second, the perennial focus of censorship efforts on art with themes of sexuality (even simply nudity), and particularly homosexuality, has become more pronounced. The rampant homophobia evident in the Cobb County episode is now a mainstay of radical right politics, and has fed not only resistance to ending discrimination against gays in the military, but enactment of anti-gay legislation in Colorado and about a dozen Oregon towns. Among other consequences, the Oregon ordinances require a purging of any books in school or public libraries that are deemed to approve of homosexuality.

A sad irony here is the alliance, for purposes of censoring expression on sexual themes, between the radical right and some on the left-liberal side of the political spectrum. Hence, the escalation in politically loaded language, as in the increasing attachment of monikers like "sexual harassment" to the display of art that some find offensive.

Not to be ignored when considering this amplification of censorship voices flowing from both left and right is the spillover from anti-"hate speech" crusades. Works (by artists of whatever race) that are deemed racist have also been attacked and censored. A paradigmatic incident took place last autumn at the University of Missouri, where Robert Colescott's painting, "Natural Rhythm: Thank You Jan van Eyck," was removed at the behest of African-Americans on campus who felt the work contained racial stereotypes. (The artist is also African-American.) The painting does reflect stereotypes; that's part of its point. But its ironies, multiple meanings, and art-historical jokes take the work well beyond one-dimensional propaganda of any sort. After protest, the university did agree to rehang the painting – in a different location, however, and this time alongside a reproduction of the van Eyck masterpiece that it parodies.

In the midst of all this clamor, the legal rules that apply to censorship of various sorts remain vague. Although the *Finley* and *Lewitzky* decisions were victories, it is still assumed in many quarters that it is perfectly permissible to attach ideological strings to government arts funding or other public benefit programs. Judicial application of constitutional principles to censorship in schools, libraries, and other public spaces is very much in flux.

What First Amendment rules *should* apply to the many public spaces that regularly – or occasionally – house art exhibits or theatrical works? What does, and should, the First Amendment require when government officials exclude or remove works from such areas because of nudity, gay subject matter, "blasphemous" themes, or

political "incorrectness"? And what are the legal ramifications when private institutions remove artworks from exhibition, especially when they are pushed into censorship by government officials or pressure groups?

Litigation over the next few years may not answer any of these questions definitively. But legal cases probably will begin to give us a sense about whether, and to what extent, the courts, so heavily affected by twelve years of Reagan and Bush judicial appointments, are willing to put the brakes on some of the more egregious instances of arts censorship that we see almost daily. And legal challenges do need to be brought in many of these cases, for in our democracy the courts continue to be a critical safeguard against majoritarian intolerance of unconventional, "offensive," or provocative expression.

To meet the formidable challenge that we now face from both the right and some portions of the liberal/left, we need to strengthen our capacity to organize and build effective coalitions, educate the public, and promote legal advocacy. This means we must find ways to bolster the resources of organizations that are leading the fight for artistic freedom. Arts funders often do not have programs that address censorship, while funders with progressive social agendas often don't have programs that address the arts. The result is that groups advocating for artistic freedom fall between the cracks – poorly funded, thinly stretched, with staffs particularly vulnerable to burnout. Much is at stake. If we are to succeed, we must galvanize these disparate elements of the philanthropic community to preserve the glories of both art and freedom.

Marjorie Heins is Director, American Civil Liberties Union Arts Censorship Project; author, Sex, Sin, and Blasphemy: A Guide to America's Censorship Wars (The New Press, 1993); co-counsel for the plaintiffs in Karen Finley et al. v. National Endowment for the Arts.

Resource Directory Available

The National Campaign for Freedom of Expression issued the *Free Expression Resource Directory* 1994. This publication is available for \$5 from NCFE, 918 F Street, N.W. #506, Washington, D.C. 20004. Included are 45 informational listings about the programs and services of members of the Free Expression Network, organizations that work toward First Amendment and free expression rights in the arts and humanities, in public broadcasting, in cable television, in campaign finance reform, in citizen advocacy, and on other fronts. This book is an excellent source of referral information for anyone working on grassroots advocacy relating to censorship and First Amendment rights.

Friends in High Places

An Overview of the Federal Cultural Bureaucracy

Following a decade of heightened tensions and reduced expectations, the Clinton administration has ushered in a new era for federal arts patronage, appointing a historian to direct the National Endowment for the Humanities, an actress to run the National Endowment for the Arts, and a museum director to head the Institute of Museum Services. In a town in which the proverbial "who you know" looms large, these what-you-know appointments are rather remarkable. Even more remarkable, the three political "outsiders" are still largely unscathed, having managed to avoid both the cultural skirmishes that marked the Reagan-Bush years, as well as the fierce budgetary battles that are currently being waged. Whether Congress continues to cooperate – always a dubious prospect in an election year – remains to be seen, but for now the mood in Washington, at least in regard to federal arts and humanities support, is cautiously optimistic.

Listed below are brief profiles of the key figures at the arts and humanities endowments and the museum institute, followed by a list of others in Washington who are also doing their part, however small, to make the climate for culture in the United States just a little more hospitable than it has been in recent years.

National Endowment for the Arts

Jane Alexander: Chair. Alexander is the sixth chairman of the 29-year-old agency, and the first to come from the arts world itself. With four Academy Award nominations plus Tony and Emmy honors to her credit, the 54-year-old actress may win the Nobel Peace Prize if she can put an end to the culture wars. If nothing else, her reign at the Endowment should serve to remind people that there's more to the NEA than naughty art. Alexander has already visited 20-odd states, and plans to hit all of them by the end of her first year, with a straightforward message that stresses bringing "the best art to the most people."

Ana Steele: Senior Deputy Chair. A longtime veteran of the agency, Steele now occupies the position imposed on the agency during the Frohnmayer years (largely as a lookout station for real and imagined controversy). Blessed with the respect of the field and the trust of the staff, Steele is most effective at keeping the Endowment trains running on time, even while Alexander completes her whistle-stop tour of the country.

Alexander D. "Sandy" Crary: Director of External Affairs and White House Liaison. After fifteen years on the staff of Sen. Claiborne Pell (D-RI), with experience at the Smithsonian before that, Crary knows the Washington landscape well. The position is a new one, but with Chairman Alexander's avowed interest in working with

other federal agencies, Crary could turn out to be the closest thing the Endowment has to a power broker.

Scott Sanders: Deputy Chair for Public Partnership. Sanders was executive director of the South Carolina Arts Commission for the past thirteen years, and has also served on the boards of the Southern Arts Federation and the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, so she's a natural for the public partnership position. Of course, "partnership" in this context has long been a euphemism for "tug-of-war," and depending upon which end of the rope one's on, Sanders promises to be a formidable partner/opponent. Right now, the states get an automatic 35 percent of the NEA budget, and Congress could be inclined to increase that share to 50 percent or more. It's not clear whether Sanders' own stock goes up or down in that fluctuating market, but she'll doubtless play a role in determining the outcome.

Susan Clampitt: Deputy Chairman for Programs. Although largely unheralded before her arrival, Clampitt brings three decades of experience to the Endowment, including stints as curator at the Montclair Art Museum in New Jersey, associate director of public information at the Museum of Modern Art in New York, and a number of consultancies. She was also founder and director of the graduate program in museum education at the Bank Street College of Education in New York. Only time will tell how she responds to the pressures of this key position at the Endowment.

Richard Woodruff: Congressional Liaison. A veteran of Jimmy Carter's 1976 and 1980 presidential campaigns, Woodruff spent the past thirteen years on the staff of Sen. Howard Metzenbaum (D-OH), where he developed and managed the policies and initiatives of the senator's overall legislative program and served as chief speechwriter. A difficult job in the best of times, Woodruff's current task has been made much easier by the style and grace of his boss, who thus far has been able to play Congress like a violin.

Karen Kay Christensen: General Counsel. A former trial lawyer in the Civil Rights Division of the Department of

Justice, Christensen spent eight years as assistant general counsel at National Public Radio. She has also worked with the Public Defender Service in Washington and with the American Civil Liberties Union. Unfortunately, Christensen inherits the Justice Department's ill-conceived determination to appeal the "NEA Four" decision, but there will surely be other instances in which the Endowment's presumably more enlightened First Amendment convictions – and Christensen's stewardship of those convictions – will be put to the test.

Jennifer Conovitz: Counselor to the Chairman. Formerly counsel to the Arts and Humanities Task Force for the Clinton-Gore transition team, Conovitz also has experience in politics (as deputy general counsel to the New York Democratic Coordinated Campaign) and private practice (as an associate with the New York firm of Paul Weiss, specializing in litigation involving intellectual property). Some observers have wondered why Alexander needs her own lawyer. That's the wrong question. The real question is, why didn't John Frohnmayer think of this?

Olive Mosier: Director, Office of Policy, Planning, and Research. Behind that catchall title is a flurry of activity, from long-range surveys of public participation in the arts, to short-term planning for the Art-21 conference (and despite appearances to the contrary, there actually has been planning for that conference). Mosier came to the Endowment from the Keens Company, where she was a free-lance program-and-planning consultant for such clients as the Ford Foundation, The Pew Charitable Trusts, and the Dance Exchange. But she is best known for the four years (1989-93) she served as executive vice president and chief operations officer of the National Assembly of Local Arts Agencies.

Cherie Simon: Director of Public Affairs. Simon, a veteran broadcast producer and bureau chief in national and local news, replaced Ginny Terzano (who left to become deputy press secretary to the President) in January. She spent seven years at ABC News, primarily as a broadcast producer for "World News Tonight with Peter Jennings," and also served as producer at several ABC affiliate stations, including WJLA-TV in Washington, where she won two Emmy awards. This new position might be Simon's biggest challenge yet: keeping the NEA in the news, but off the front page.

Noel Boxer: Special Assistant to the Chairman. Most recently the "director of events" for the White House (a position which presumably has something to do with *planned* events), Boxer has also worked on several Democratic campaigns, including Bob Kerrey's presidential bid. At the Endowment, Boxer handles the arrangements for Alexander's ambitious traveling schedule, sifting through hundreds of invitations.

Stephanie Madden: Staff Assistant to the Chairman. Another campaign veteran, Madden has also worked for Macy's, for Theatre of the Stars in Atlanta, and, as assistant director and actress, for the Riverside Shakespeare Company in New York City.

IF YOU FUND THE ARTS, YOU CAN FIGHT AIDS.

The arts are a powerful way to educate, to engage, to move people to action.

The Andy Warhol Foundation for the Visual Arts applied this power to the fight against AIDS by funding a national tour of photographs that awakened thousands to the emotional and social issues of the epidemic.

To find out how you can get involved, contact Funders Concerned About AIDS, 310 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10017.

AIDS. Something good must come of it.

FUNDERS CONCERNED ABOUT AIDS

National Endowment for the Humanities

Sheldon Hackney: Chairman. Hackney took a few lumps early on, a residue of the political correctness squabbles at the University of Pennsylvania, where he had been president for thirteen years. But now the sixty-year-old scholar (who had also been provost at Princeton and president of Tulane) appears to have the NEH back where it's been for most of its twenty-nine years – safely out of the headlines. His plans for a series of national town meetings – replacing what he calls the standard “drive-by debates” – may garner some positive publicity, as will his and Alexander's plans to collaborate – if they can pull off such a rare feat. (See “National Conversations on American Pluralism” on page 16.)

Institute of Museum Services

Diane B. Frankel: Director. Since its inception in 1976, the IMS has operated in the shadows of the two Endowments, and with a \$28.8 million budget devoted largely to general operating support, conservation programs, and museum assessment, that's unlikely to change. But Frankel, founding director of the Discovery Museum in Sausalito, California (with experience at the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, the Center for Museum Studies, and John F. Kennedy University before that), is no mere Friend of Bill. Like her colleagues Alexander and Hackney in the arts and humanities, Frankel has the potential to exert strong leadership in the museum community.

President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities

Ellen McCulloch-Lovell: Director. Perhaps the most interesting piece of the federal patronage puzzle is the President's Committee, largely moribund for the past year, but slated for a fresh infusion of Clinton appointees this spring. McCulloch-Lovell herself, who delivered a rousing speech to the National Council on the Arts in February, is something of a rarity, combining a stellar arts administration record (thirteen years at the Vermont Council on the Arts, including eight as executive director) with considerable political experience (eleven years as chief of staff to Vermont Senator Patrick Leahy). With support from the White House and the cooperation of the two Endowments, the McCulloch-Lovell show could turn out to be the biggest hit in Washington cultural circles since Nancy Hanks.

All four of these federal agencies share space in the historic Old Post Office building in downtown Washington, and that's surely where much of our attention will be focused over the next three years. But it would be a mistake to overlook other Washington sources of support, advice – inspiration, even – including the following:

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

Cathryn Buford Slater, Chairman
Robert D. Bush, Executive Director

Department of Commerce: National Telecommunications and Information Administration

Larry Irving: Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information

Department of Education

Sharon P. Robinson: Assistant Secretary for Educational Research and Improvement

Carrolyn N. Andrews: Education Programs Specialist, Arts in Education

Department of the Interior: National Park Service

Jerry L. Rogers: Associate Director, Cultural Resources Division

F. Ann Hitchcock: Chief, Curatorial Services Division

Robert J. Kapsch: Chief, Historic American Buildings Survey and Historic American Engineering Records Division

E. Blaine Cliver: Chief, Preservation Assistance Division

Indian Arts and Crafts Board:

Lloyd Kiva New, Chairman

Smithsonian Institution

Tom L. Freudenheim: Assistant Secretary for the Arts and the Humanities

Anna R. Cohn, Director: Smithsonian Institution Traveling Exhibition Service

United States Information Agency

Office of Arts America: Robin Berrington, Director

This article is based on information gathered from sources in Washington, D.C.

Art and Democracy

[Continued from page 9]

in fact, mean for democracy to include every culture except the historically dominant culture?

The very title of our session “Art and Democracy” embodies this dialectic. Art is the essence of individual expression. Democracy promises to protect the expression of every individual without regard for its value, its politics, its message. But for us, “Art and Democracy” aroused all of our liberal preconceptions about giving voice to those who have not traditionally been heard, about “broadening the dialogue” and “inclusiveness.” It would be tragic if in our enthusiasm to make room at the table for those new voices, we refused to hear, or, worse still, deliberately silenced some old ones.

For those of us who care about art, the tyranny of political correctness should be particularly frightening. For if art is the apogee of individual expression, political correctness is the epitome of “group think.” It judges each of us as a member of a clan, not as an individual. When art becomes the slave of group think, the servant of a particular political point of view – left or right – it's propaganda.

And what of “philanthropy?” Does the word connote an action or a spirit? When it provides sanctuary for intolerance is it still philanthropy?

News

National Arts Conference Sponsored by the NEA

ART-21: Art Reaches into the 21st Century is a three-day national conference being convened by the National Endowment for the Arts. The purpose of the conference is "to explore issues relating to art in the lives of Americans and to inform a Federal vision for the arts through policy and planning initiatives." A recent news release from the Endowment stated that ART-21 "will address major trends, priorities, and fresh ideas in the arts as changes in resources, demographics, and technologies take our nation in new directions." The conference will take place April 14-16, 1994 in Chicago.

"The Arts Endowment has operated under the same model for close to 30 years," said Chairman Jane Alexander in the release. "On the eve of a new millennium, we, as a complex and diverse nation, must ask ourselves where we need to go and how we can get there. We at the Endowment need to ask what role the arts will play in enriching the lives of our citizens, the spirit of our communities, and our character as a nation."

Following are the major conference themes with specific panel sessions for each:

The Artist in Society:

The Working Artist; Artist as Community Activist; Facing Society's Censure; and Funding the Individual Artist.

The Arts in Technology:

Virtual Arts Communities; Making the Transition - Analog to Digital; "State of the Art" Art; and The Endowment's Role in National Policy.

Expanding Resources for the Arts:

New Ideas for Federal Arts Funding; Government Partnerships at Federal, State and Local Levels; Private Sector Collaborations; and Ensuring Equitable Access to Resources.

Lifelong Learning through the Arts:

Arts in Education; Dynamic Duos: Artists and Teachers Working Together; The Role of the Arts Institution; and Reaching Special Constituencies.

Keynote speakers for three of these themes were announced as *GIA News-*

letter went to press: Richard Loveless (Arts in Technology), director of the Institute for Studies in the Arts, Arizona State University, and formerly director of the Center for Research in Art and Technology and the Center for Innovative Technology for Educational Future; Henry Cisneros (Expanding Resources), secretary of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; and Dr. Ernest L. Boyer (Lifelong Learning), author and president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Washington D.C.

Most of the panelists have also been announced. For more information about the conference, call the NEA at 1-800-632-7821.

"National Conversation on American Pluralism"

Sheldon Hackney, Chair of the National Endowment for the Humanities, addressed the National Press Club in November, 1993. Among salient points in his presentation was the announcement that the NEH seeks to stimulate a "national conversation on American pluralism." Later this year, the NEH will issue specific guidelines for projects supporting the conversation. However, it also seems likely that hundreds of public interest groups in the U.S. will participate in the NEH project whether or not funding is forthcoming. The following is an excerpt from Hackney's address. The entire transcript is available by writing to the NEH Office of Public Affairs, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

"We find ourselves caught in a dilemma. All of our legal rights are universal in nature and apply equally to all citizens as individuals. Yet, we know that racial, ethnic, gender, and religious discrimination exists, and that group identities are real factors in our lives. Ethnic politics has been a staple on the American political scene for more than a hundred years and is still very much present in our system. The dilemma is that our legal rights are for individuals, but our politics are for groups.

"That this is more than an academic argument is clear if one recalls the

hand-to-hand combat of school board battles involving such issues as bilingual education or Afrocentric curricula, the dispute over the literary canon at the college level, or the court decisions seeking to remedy past patterns of discrimination in voting rights cases by requiring redistricting or changes in the form of local government so as to guarantee the minority community representation on the legislative body. In each of these cases, and others you can probably think of, public authorities are being asked to confer some sort of official status on a particular cultural group. Large parts of the public sense that this form of particularism is a problem in a system based on universal values of individual rights. Simply saying that everyone must respect everyone else's ethnic identity therefore does not solve the problem.

"Yet, a solution must be found if we are to recapture a confident sense of shared values that will let us then deal with divisive public policy issues with a common goal in mind. What is needed in our country is nothing short of a national conversation about this difficult and troubling dilemma. All of our people - left, right and center - have a responsibility to examine and discuss what unites us as a country, about what we share as common American values in a nation comprised of so many divergent groups and beliefs. For too long, we have let that which divides us capture the headlines. Current public debate is little more than posturing. Bombarded by slogans and epithets, points and counterpoints, our thoughts are polarized in the rapid-fire exchange of sound bites. In this kind of argument, one is either right or wrong, for them or against them, a winner or a loser.

"Real answers are the casualties of such drive-by debates. In this kind of discussion, there is no room for complexity and ambiguity. There is no room in the middle. Only the opposite poles are given voice. This may be good entertainment, but it is a disservice to the American people. It only reinforces lines of division and does not build toward agreement. I want to change the rules of engagement for this national conversation.

"This is to be a national conversation

open to all Americans, a conversation in which all voices need to be heard and in which we must grapple seriously with the meaning of American pluralism. It is a conversation that is desperately needed, and I believe the National Endowment for the Humanities can stimulate and facilitate the discussion. The NEH will not bring answers, but we will bring questions.

"The subject is elusive, but it is very important. If the conversation works well, we will stake out some common ground, and by doing that we will make it possible to celebrate more fully the variations among us that play against each other and reinforce each other to produce a dynamic national identity. As President Clinton said in a different context at the dedication of the Holocaust Memorial Museum, 'We must find in our diversity our common humanity. We must reaffirm that common humanity, even in the darkest and deepest of our own disagreements.'

"In that spirit, I am looking forward to this conversation among the American people. In that spirit, I challenge you to help focus the attention of the American people on this quest for the meaning of *E Pluribus Unum*."

Earthquake Damage to L.A.'s Arts Community

Now, more than a month after the January 17 earthquake struck, the Los Angeles arts community continues to cautiously count its blessings. Although several institutions incurred significant structural damage to their physical plants, the consensus is that the damage could have been many times worse. A survey, conducted soon after the earthquake by the City of Los Angeles Cultural Affairs Department, estimates \$107 million in damage, but the bulk of this figure (\$89 million) is ascribed to buildings designated as Historic Cultural Monuments. Included in this category are Frank Lloyd Wright's famed Hollyhock House (major cracking, foundation damage, and the destruction of two of the unique ornamental spires that graced the roof) and the Watts Towers which were already undergoing conservation.

The survey also reported \$12.5 million in damage to visual arts organizations. This figure includes \$9 million in the combined value of damage sustained by the University of Judaism (which operates a gallery) and of asking-price estimates of damaged or destroyed work on display in for-profit art galleries.

What follows is a synopsis of major damages suffered by nonprofit organizations providing arts-related programming.

The well-publicized \$350*million in devastation at the California State University at Northridge (the quake's epicenter) is the largest disaster claim ever recorded by a college or university. Located in the north San Fernando Valley area, CSUN is one of the few arts presenters working in this heavily populated area. In addition to being a provider of college-level artistic training, CSUN has long operated a campus gallery and recently initiated a modest, yet promising, performing arts presenting series. CSUN is conducting spring semester classes in portable classrooms.

Although located in Valencia several miles northeast of the epicenter, California Institute of the Arts (Cal Arts) suffered major damage estimated at between \$12 and \$15 million. Administrative staff continues to operate out of the only part of the school's main facility (est. 1971) left inhabitable. Classes, however, are being held in temporary classrooms, storefronts, and a modified 100,000 square foot warehouse, the use of which has been donated by Lockheed, a major local employer. The pain of Cal Art's recovery will be tempered somewhat by a \$2 million relief award made by The J. Paul Getty Trust.

Damage to the famed twin-towers of UCLA's Royce Hall has temporarily sidelined one of the city's preeminent auditoriums. Royce Hall seats 1,850 and is the flagship venue for the UCLA Center for the Performing Arts, one of the country's largest cultural presenters. Renovation at Royce Hall is now underway and is expected to take three to six months. In the meantime, UCLA has been forced to relocate its

performing arts events to the 1,550-seat Wadsworth Auditorium on the grounds of a nearby VA hospital.

Actors Alley Repertory Theatre was just two weeks away from opening its new home, a historic vaudeville palace called the El Portal Theater, when the quake brought down the curtain – and the ceiling. Early damage estimates match the building's \$1.7 million value. Since the relocation of Actors Alley was part of a redevelopment project aimed at reviving the North Hollywood district, the Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency has the most to lose. The CRA and Actors Alley are currently exploring the possibility of resurrecting the El Portal, and the Theatre has applied to the Federal Emergency Management Agency for the maximum, a \$1.5 million loan. In the meantime, Actors Alley will present its season as the professional company-in-residence at Valley College.

Lula Washington's Los Angeles Contemporary Dance has been one of the few shining lights in the mid-city Crenshaw neighborhood where the company has programmed community-oriented dance classes for more than ten years. Five years ago, several funding sources partnered to help the company buy its building. Although the required earthquake retrofitting was completed, this wasn't enough to prevent damage to the back wall or to keep the roof from shifting off the building. The company is now investigating its options: relocating to a temporary space, rebuilding and/or rehabilitating the old building, and moving permanently.

Last year, East L.A.'s Plaza de la Raza instituted a series of revolving exhibitions in its Boathouse Gallery featuring the work of established and emerging Chicano artists. Memorable retrospectives of the work of Frank Romero and Patssi Valdez were among the highlights of the first year. Unfortunately, the Boathouse Gallery suffered significant damage from the quake, and the immediate future of the exhibition program is now in question.

One of the country's foremost practitioners of traditional dance and

music, the AMAN Folk Ensemble, will celebrate its 30th Anniversary in June with the premiere of a new work by choreographer Laura Dean. For some years, the company has had its offices, rehearsal space, and, most importantly, storage for its valuable collection of international costumes and instruments in the University of Southern California's Embassy Residential Hall, located in downtown Los Angeles. A former hotel, the building also houses an under-utilized theater that serves, among other things, as the rehearsal facility for the Los Angeles Chamber Orchestra. Although AMAN's equipment and costumes came through the earthquake without incident, the Ensemble was informed on February 17 that the Embassy's theater suffered structural damage and that AMAN had until February 28 to vacate premises. This gave AMAN less than two weeks to find temporary offices, storage facilities, and a rehearsal space.

This short summary only includes organizations that received substantial, dislocating damage to their facilities. The summary doesn't include the many miscellaneous reports of additional damage caused by the innumerable aftershocks. In general, the majority of the city's arts resources fared better than originally had been feared. According to the Los Angeles Times, the earthquake did not affect arts attendance as much as might have been expected; during the week after the quake, attendance at arts events seemed to show few ill effects. What has yet to be determined is what effect the quake has had on contributions; indeed, early indications show that arts and culture-related individual contributions could be down for the first quarter of calendar 1994.

Although most members of the local funding community are still assessing their response to the disaster, the city's Cultural Affairs Department has already implemented an Arts Recovery Plan similar to the one it instituted following the April 1992 civil unrest. Through a \$200,000 fund, individual artists who lost art work, materials, equipment, or work space can receive compensation. Another aspect of the C.A.D. program will help address the earthquake-related problems of arts

organizations by providing replacement equipment, marketing and audience development help, and temporary rehearsal space. In addition, the C.A.D. sponsored family-oriented programming at earthquake shelters to help victims pass the frustratingly long hours of waiting.

Both the NEA and the California Arts Council are considering various responses to the earthquake. Reportedly, these may involve the extension of deadlines, permission to redesignate awarded grants, and a waiver of matching requirements for organizations operating in affected areas.

— John Orders and Dan Miller
The James Irvine Foundation
February 28, 1994

Overdoing Reform: The Lobbying Disclosure Act

Congress has been working the past few months to overhaul the rules governing the reporting, or disclosure, of lobbying activities, including those activities undertaken by nonprofits. The Lobbying Disclosure Act responds to the general view, advanced most forcibly in recent years by Ross Perot, that "special interests" have too much influence over government. However, the Act goes too far. In an attempt to make paid lobbyists more accountable, the measure would strike at the very core of our participatory democracy by making it more difficult for nonprofit groups to express their views. Meanwhile, the measure would do little to address the abuses of the stated targets of this measure, "big business."

Why should the arts community, and nonprofits generally, care about this bill? Because this measure would discourage grassroots advocacy and education efforts just when these efforts have proven more essential than ever to advance the arts communities' top national priorities. The bill's very complicated requirements would overlay the obligations that the nonprofit sector already has to disclose its lobbying activities. Unlike other sectors, nonprofits are currently subject to a complex array of restrictions and reporting requirements under the Internal Revenue Code. (The Internal

Revenue Service needed thirty-nine pages just to explain these rules.) Significant differences exist between the definitions of lobbying under the new Lobbying Disclosure Act and the existing IRC code. Nonprofits would be required to comply with both if the new bill is passed in its current form. They would be subjected to multiple and inconsistent reporting and record-keeping requirements, and would face investigations and stiff fines if rules are found to have been broken. Responsible executives who head community organizations would have to think more than twice before they would communicate with their elected national officials on important issues.

Let's be clear. The nonprofit community supports the purposes of the Lobbying Disclosure Act, and is committed to the principle of public disclosure of lobbying activities, including our own. However, we have been urging Congress to permit nonprofits to continue to disclose under the existing IRS rules, and to not burden the sector with learning another set of rules and keeping another set of detailed records. This can only discourage nonprofits from interacting with their elected officials. We have been seeking this reasonable solution as the bill advances to the House Judiciary Committee. No one has alleged lobbying abuse on the part of nonprofits or has offered any evidence that nonprofits require a second reporting regime to disclose their lobbying activities.

The House Judiciary Committee could review this measure at any time (but will probably do so just after the Easter Recess) with a House floor vote expected to follow shortly afterwards. (The Senate already passed this measure, including nonprofits at the last moment.) We still have time to make a difference. The voices of the arts community, and the larger nonprofit community, should not be muffled by complicated, burdensome requirements. Congress needs to hear our voices loudly and clearly.

— Judith E. Golub
American Arts Alliance
March 12, 1994

Studies and Reports Received

The National Assembly of Local Arts Agencies issued *Jobs, the Arts, and the Economy*, a report which highlights findings from NALAA's "Arts in the Local Economy" study. The three-year study was aimed to analyze the economic impact of spending by non-profit arts organizations in thirty-three local communities across the country. According to NALAA, the study is the most comprehensive of its kind ever conducted; data from 789 nonprofits arts organizations for fiscal year 1990, 1991, and 1992 form the basis of the report. The study's objective was to document the experience of a cross-section of communities in the U.S. and demonstrate what they gain from investing in the arts.

Among the statistics compiled were these: the expenditures of nonprofit arts organizations totaled \$36.8 billion, and supported 1.3 million full-time equivalent jobs. Together these workers received more than \$25 billion in personal income, generating \$3.4 billion in federal income tax revenue. Analysis also showed that every \$100,000 in local spending by a non-profit arts organization results in an average of four full-time jobs, and generates an average of \$3,385 in local and \$4,544 in state government revenue. The study states, "this report has a critical message for those making difficult choices: When our communities invest in the arts, they are not opting for cultural benefits at the expense of economic benefits. Careful research shows that in addition to being a vital means of social enrichment, the arts are also an economically sound investment for communities of all sizes. Quite simply, the arts are an industry that generates jobs."

Copies of the Executive Summary and the Final Report are available from NALAA at 927 15th Street, N.W., 12th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005.

• • •

The Publications Office of the National Endowment for the Arts has been busy since the last issue of the *GIA News-*

letter. The editors received four reports on as many subjects.

A Generation of Fellows is a 64-page book that presents the history of individual artists' fellowships at the Arts Endowment, discusses the national impact of NEA fellows, and provides an artist's statement from each of several dozen NEA fellows, including Laurie Anderson, Michael Dorris, Nikki Giovanni, Luis Jiminéz, Pauline Oliveros, Roger Shimomura, and many others. The book also lists MacArthur Fellowships, Pulitzer Prizes, National Book Awards, National Medals of the Arts, and OBIE Awards that were granted to NEA Fellows, providing an unusual look at a cross-section of national awards programs. These listings include the year an award was given, making it possible to see, for example, whether a given artist received an NEA Fellowship before a Pulitzer Prize, or vice versa. For example, guess which came first:

- For Guillermo Gómez-Peña, a MacArthur or an NEA fellowship?
- For Gloria Naylor, the National Book Award or an Endowment fellowship?
- For Lee Breuer, an OBIE award or an Endowment fellowship?

Dancemakers was written by Dick Netzer and Ellen Parker, based on a survey conducted by Alyce Dissette and Richard J. Orend. This NEA publication describes the general working conditions, financial status, performance opportunities, funding, and work practices of choreographers in New York City, Chicago, San Francisco, and Washington, D.C. Completed mail questionnaires from more than 500 choreographers and telephone interviews with over 200 more provided the primary data. The book is organized under headings such as "Demographics," "Performance Opportunities," "Funding," and "Professional Issues."

Dancemakers is among the most comprehensive reports on any field of artistic activity in recent years. Grant-

makers will be particularly interested in Chapter 5, titled "Choreography: A Profession At Risk." This chapter highlights the authors' conclusions, and ends with a list of recommended topics for further research. Among the main findings were these:

"The physical and financial strains of pursuing a choreographic career are severe and impede the creative process. For example, incomes of choreographers are so low that many spend twice as much time working at non-dance jobs as they do in their choreographic work. On average, they have a 2-to-1 ratio of expenses to choreographic income. One in seven have expenses that exceed dance income by \$10,000 annually. After professional expenses, many are left in poverty.

"A significant percentage of the respondent choreographers feel excluded from the networks of artists, critics, producers, presenters, funders, and grant review panels who have an important influence on dance in America.

"There appear to be many choreographers who do not apply for grants. Study data do not provide the information necessary to explain this."

Arts in Schools: Perspectives from Four Nations is a commissioned study which made an international comparison of arts and education. The 24-page study, conducted by the Council for Basic Education, compares U.S. arts education policies with those of Japan, Germany, and England. The report briefly describes arts curricula and arts education policy in each country, and compares this to current and proposed U.S. policy. This report will provide a good overview of arts education policy for grantmakers entering the field. It may also provide a good tool for arts education advocacy efforts at the local level, since the three countries studied have more comprehensive policies than does the U.S.

The NEA also recently issued an updated *Guide to the National Endowment for the Arts: 1993-94*. This document provides an overview of each NEA program and the funding categories within each one. This is an

excellent quick reference to NEA programs. A telephone directory for the programs is included.

• • •

The *GIA Newsletter* was given a first draft of *Reinventing Federal Outreach to Corporate and Foundation Donors: A Report to the White House* by Craig Smith and Brad Warren, January 4, 1994. A preface to the report describes its purpose:

"Federal outreach to private sector donors is no longer peripheral to federal policy. In fact, it is already a preoccupation for federal policy makers grappling with a whole spectrum of issues – from the arts to welfare reform. As federal attention moves from an intensive focus on health care reform to other social programs, the question of private funding will rise higher on the governmental agenda.

"This report, based on more than 150 interviews with persons versed in government/philanthropy bridge-building, provides a framework for how the Clinton administration might appeal to private donors. This document was suggested by the Office of the First Lady as an outgrowth of discussions between Clinton transition policy makers and leaders in philanthropy and voluntary networks.

"Given President Clinton's dual commitments to social activism and deficit reduction, it was clear before he took office that his government would have to go further than previous administrations in finding suitable roles for private donors. To that end, the authors of this report conducted research to provide the new policy makers with an understanding of the historical experience in federal outreach to private donors."

After an introduction that includes a brief review of the history of previous federal efforts to build bridges to the philanthropic community, the authors make a series of recommendations to the White House. Briefly, the recommendations are:

- Be proactive.

- Learn the context of private sector funding initiatives.
- Develop an initial training session and create a networking system for liaisons.
- Consult with intermediaries.
- Take steps to avoid politicizing federal outreach efforts.
- Tap corporate volunteers to help reinvent government.
- Fit philanthropy and nonprofits more snugly into the policy-making process.
- Know the ethical and legal context of federal outreach efforts.
- Establish an infrastructure and policy for internal advocacy.

The balance of the report provides an overview of this topic from the perspective of nine fields, including the arts. Other fields are AIDS, community development, disabled, education/training/research, environment, health care, international aid, and welfare/hunger/homelessness.

The report notes that the arts are unusual among the fields covered in that government and philanthropic support are about equal. This has resulted in more than average interplay between the two, and in "models for public/private interaction." The best recent examples, the authors believe, are found "in the use of arts in education." Arts grantmakers may also find it interesting that matching grants, "a practice that has achieved its greatest test" at the NEA, were criticized by interviewees as not being effective means to stimulate philanthropic donations. Grantmakers in the Arts was included as one of four resource organizations in the arts field.

Craig Smith notes that the report is currently under discussion, but that no formal response has been made. For more information, contact Smith at Corporate Citizen, 206-329-0422.

• • •

The Aspen Institute's Communications and Society Program issued *Television for the 21st Century: The Next Wave* in early January. This 130-page book, edited by Charles M. Firestone, in-

cludes five commissioned papers, along with observations from guests who attended a two-day conference to discuss the papers. The result is an unusually thorough investigation of the future of television. Various chapters discuss the psychology of new media, the changing economic structures in the entertainment industry, programming in the 21st century, and broadcast policies in a multi-channel marketplace.

Grantmakers may find the essay titled, "Where Does the Public Interest Lie?" particularly stimulating. Author Ervin S. Duggan, new President of PBS, attempts to answer three questions: "Can television be high minded? Should government encourage 'higher' uses of television with taxpayer dollars? If the government has a legitimate interest in supporting some forms of video programming, how should it provide that support?" In the course of answering these questions, Duggan quotes and discusses a diverse group of thinkers, including Neil Postman, E.B. White, and George Will, among others. The result is a stimulating essay, worthy of wider distribution and discussion.

This book may be ordered from The Aspen Institute, Publications Office, P.O. Box 150, Queenstown, MD 21658.

• • •

Who's Behind the "Culture War"? – Contemporary Assaults on Freedom of Expression is a newly published report written by Mark Schapiro, an investigative reporter based in New York whose stories have appeared in *The New York Times*, *The Nation*, and *The New Republic*, among others. The following excerpt begins the report.

"The contemporary assault on the arts and freedom of expression arises primarily from a movement battling what it considers to be a profoundly meaningful war against moral decay in our society. It draws force from religious conviction; from long-standing anti-intellectual traditions in the United States; from class conflicts that counterpose 'elitist' support for the arts against the perceived interests of 'average' citizens; and from the inter-

ests of those who perceive themselves to be 'besieged' by social pressures beyond their control (economic recession, immigration, pornography, the 'hedonism' of Hollywood).

"This assault has its roots in both politics and aesthetics, and represents a struggle over the definitions of behavior and imagery that are to be considered publicly acceptable and worthy of government encouragement. This struggle has given rise to what is now commonly referred to as the 'culture war.' It is fueled at the national level by organizations of politically-motivated religious activists who utilize the arts as a powerful and lucrative stimulus for recruitment and funds. At the grassroots, it is fueled by a network of religiously-motivated activists protesting government funding of artworks they find offensive and thus unacceptable recipients of tax dollars. The religious basis for this 'war' has become a primary organizing principle; many new converts are drawn to the moral vision it offers as a solution to society's ills.

"The recruitment ground for such religiously-based political activism is quite fertile, as demonstrated by a dramatic shift in religious loyalties over the past thirty years. Mainstream (not explicitly political) Protestant denominations (Episcopal, Presbyterian, etc.) have lost an estimated 25% of their membership over the last 25 years. From an estimated 30-40% of the U.S. population in 1960, their membership has plunged to below 20% today, according to surveys conducted by Lyman Kellstedt, a professor of Political Science at Wheaton College. During the same period, according to Kellstedt, the membership in evangelical churches – those most likely to drive the public debate over cultural values – has remained steady at an estimated 26% of the population. Given a more than 40% rise in the U.S. population, this proportionate holding pattern represents a dramatic rise in sheer numbers of those involved in the evangelical movement. Evangelicals are also by far the most active and avid churchgoers of all denominations, according to Kellstedt's research. These numbers illustrate the rich vein

of church-affiliated potential activists who have helped propel the debate over public support for the arts into an unprecedentedly high profile. (Evangelicals, the heart of the loose amalgam of religiously motivated political groups that has come to be known as the 'religious right', includes an array of denominations, including Baptists, Free Methodists, Pentecostals, Evangelical Presbyterians, Adventists and nonaffiliated Protestants).

"When art is used as a galvanizing force in this political struggle, the aesthetic conflict becomes clear. At the heart of the conflict is a deeply felt disagreement over the very purpose of art. As James Davison Hunter, Professor of Sociology and Religious Studies at the University of Virginia, observes in his book, *Culture Wars: The Struggle to Define America*: 'For the orthodox and their conservative allies, artistic creativity is concerned to reflect a higher reality. For their opponents, art is concerned with the creation of reality itself.' For the latter, the search for truth is an ever-unfolding process by each individual; for the former, the truths, already found, reside in the religious doctrine of Jesus Christ. Whether through art or countless other forms of self-expression, the idea that the individual creates him or herself is at the philosophical core of the dispute over what constitutes an 'acceptable' form of expression.

"One encounters the religious right's vision of the individual's relationship to art and society most directly in the objections to new textbooks by groups like Citizens for Excellence in Education. Objections to *Pumsy: In Pursuit of Excellence; Developing Understanding of the Self and Others*, for example, revolve around the book's emphasis on a child's individual self-definition and on not finding that definition within a Christian context. As James Wilson is quoted by Heritage Foundation Fellow William Bennett, the book embraces 'an ethos that values self-expression over self-control.' These beliefs provide an aesthetic and philosophical base for the organizing tools of the new religiously-based political activists."

Research for the 35-page report was supported by a grant from the Nathan Cummings Foundation. The author is solely responsible for its content. Copies can be obtained by contacting the Foundation's art program at 1926 Broadway, Suite 600, New York, New York, 10023, 212-787-7300.

• • •

People for the American Way recently issued two reports. The first, titled *The Radical Right's Grassroots Agenda: Year-End Update* is a 70-page, state-by-state report on advocacy, legislative, and other activities of a variety of organizations, ranging from the American Family Association to Focus on the Family and the American Center for Law and Justice. This report includes grassroots activism against the teaching of evolution, against abortion, against gay rights, and against the arts, among other campaigns. States leading in the number of incidents reported are California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Virginia.

Hostile Climate: A State-by-State Report on Anti-Gay Activity covers the period from November 2, 1992 (Election Day) to September 30, 1993. People For the American Way's research included telephone interviews, secondary source materials such as newspapers, and newsletters and direct mail from gay rights groups and those opposing gay rights. The report documents a wide range of incidents in the public policy arena that were intended to restrict the rights of gay men and lesbians. The report includes efforts large and small, "waged before school boards, in city or county councils, local arts councils, state courts, state legislatures, as well as on the ballot." P.F.A.W. also identifies the strategies and tactics used by anti-gay activists, which include isolating gays from other minority groups, sweeping defamation of gay men and lesbians, the continuing criminalization of gays, and censorship as a tool of intolerance.

Both reports are available from People for the American Way, 2000 M Street, N.W., Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20036.

• • •

Shaking the Money Tree: How to Get Grants and Donations for Film and Video is a new book by Morrie Warshawski. This 180-page book is a lively, well-written guide to developing a practical fundraising plan for media makers. Warshawski makes no pretense that fundraising is easy, and notes, "This book aims to help long distance runners. The most effective strategies for fundraising are long-term strategies." He also stresses realism; "No one I have ever worked with makes a full-time living solely from creating their own noncommercial programs."

The book's chapters cover designing the project, preparing budgets, researching sources, the importance of personal contact, writing the proposal, and raising money from individuals. Grantmakers might be interested in Warshawski's list of funder prejudices against giving money to film and video. The appendix is a full third of the book and contains a bibliography, sample grant proposals, lists of information sources, sample letters, advice for soliciting individual donors, and more.

Warshawski is a consultant with specialties in long range planning, fundraising training, marketing, and distribution. The book can be obtained from Michael Wiese Productions, 4354 Laurel Canyon Blvd., Suite 234, Studio City, California 91604.

• • •

In 1989, 1991, and 1993, the Caribbean Cultural Center sponsored international conferences in New York City, "Cultural Diversity Based on Cultural Grounding." The first two conferences provided the foundation for a publication released in November 1993. *Voices from the Battlefield: Achieving Cultural Equity* is edited by Marta Morena Vega and Cheryll Y. Greene and is published by Africa World Press, Inc. The book's introduction states that the essays in *Voices from the Battlefield* "contain the voices of people on the front lines in the battle to ensure that our communities not only survive, but thrive in an environment of cultural equity." The essays are grouped under three headings:

"Frameworks," "Battle Stances," and "New Meanings." The authors include Dudley Cock, G. Peter Jemison, Margo Machida, Amalia Mesa-Bains, Peter Pennekamp, Bernice Johnson Reagon, and many others. Most of the essays in the book are based on presentations given at one or the other of the first two Cultural Diversity Based on Cultural Grounding Conferences.

Copies of the book can be purchased by contacting the Caribbean Cultural Center, 408 W. 58th Street, New York, New York, 10019, 212-307-7420.

• • •

Two Council on Foundations affinity groups, Native Americans in Philanthropy, and Women and Foundation/Corporate Philanthropy, have produced a *Report on the Proceedings* of a conference they co-sponsored, **Native American Women in their Communities: Building Partnerships for Survival**. The conference was held in July 1993 at the KwaTaqNuk Resort on the Salish Kootenai Reservation, Polson, Montana. A letter from the conference co-chairs included in the report states that conference planners intended to "show funders what Indian Country is really about. This meant holding the conference on a reservation, at a tribally owned center, and adhering to Native American values and customs by adopting a holistic, multi-generational approach. . . . At the end of the three-day conference, traditional walls between funder and grant-seeker, Indian and non-Indian, young and old, had fallen. In their place are the beginnings of newer, healthier relations, based on mutual trust and understanding."

The contents of the report are organized according to the major topics - economic development, environment, education, and health. Each section includes statements by the principal participants. The report also includes recommendations to funders and proposes strategies for cooperation between funders and Native communities.

The report can be obtained by contacting Shona Chakravartty at Women and Foundations/Corporate Philanthropy, 322 Eighth Avenue, Room 702, New York, New York, 10001.

• • •

Volume VII, Number 1 of *Philanthropy* includes portions of the proceedings of The Philanthropy Roundtable's 1993 Annual Meeting, held in November. The meeting's principal topic was "The Future of Philanthropy: Boom or Bust?" This topic was chosen so that Roundtable members could discuss the predicted \$8 trillion intergenerational transfer of wealth, expected to occur in the coming years as baby boomers inherit money. In an introduction to the journal, Kimberly O. Dennis states, "When the Roundtable decided to focus its 1993 annual meeting on the coming intergenerational transfer of wealth, it assumed the boom was on the way and that the question at hand was what form it would take. However, further reflection prompted the realization that a philanthropic boom is really more a hypothesis than an inevitability. A crash in the stock market, a change in tax regulations, a shift in economic policy, or any number of other factors could have major implications for philanthropy and for the ongoing creation of wealth generally."

Paul Gigot, a member of the editorial board and a weekly columnist for the *Wall Street Journal*, delivered the keynote address on, "Making Money and Giving It Away: Two Sides of the Same Coin." Gigot made several interesting points, among them the observation that, "entrepreneurs, whatever their faults, are capitalism's creative, hopeful side Yes, they want to make money; some of them want to make a lot of it. Some of them will behave badly doing so. But the act of creating a business is also an act of generosity. It is an act of philanthropy of its own sort toward the broader community, because it supplies the community with something that people want. George Gilder calls it 'the spirit of enterprise.' He calls it this because it requires a kind of spiritual commitment to make an enterprise a success."

Copies of the entire proceedings are available for \$25 from The Philanthropy Roundtable, 320 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, IN 46204.

Cultural Policy Update

The fall 1993 issue of Grantmakers in the Arts Newsletter contained articles and news stories about activities that demonstrate a growing interest in cultural policy. We noted that many activities during the previous year demonstrated this interest – conferences, retreats, papers, informal meetings, and plans for longer-term efforts like a research center, a “cultural summit,” and “think tanks.” Following are reports on the current status of some of these initiatives. (See News on page 16 for upcoming NEA and NEH activities related to cultural policy.)

New Center for Arts Culture

Over the past year, a group of foundation representatives met informally to discuss shared concerns about artistic expression, the economic well-being of cultural organizations, the political climate affecting public support for the arts and culture, and other issues that can best be termed “cultural policy.” Among the foundations with participating staff members are Nathan Cummings Foundation, Ford Foundation, Howard Gilman Foundation, Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, Kenan Institute for the Arts, Rockefeller Foundation, and Andy Warhol Foundation.

As the meetings progressed, this group began to consider the establishment of a center for cultural policy dedicated to fostering and contributing to the policy debate about the role of arts and culture in a democratic society. A briefing paper about the center provided the focus for a breakfast roundtable at the 1993 Grantmakers in the Arts conference. By the end of the year the group started to commit financial resources to a planning process, and in January 1994, they engaged a professional firm to conduct a search for a director. Current plans are to complete the search and enter the start-up phase of the center by mid-1994.

The following information about the new Center for Arts and Culture was included as background information for the director search.

“This independent, nonpartisan center for arts and cultural policy and research, is dedicated to informing the policy making process. It will contribute to and facilitate public discussion and debate, respond to the informational needs of policy-makers, and provide the media and the wider public with a better sense of the role of the arts and culture in our democratic society. The center will be housed in Washington D.C., and its work will be informed by the following principles:

- The arts and culture are central to our continuing democratic experiment; our cultural life, like our political life, is nurtured in many different arenas.
- Our nation’s cultural life is grounded in the basic principles of freedom of expression and, thus, we must work to protect the autonomy of the artist’s creative process.
- Cultural variety and pluralism must be respected and can enrich our society; indeed, they are central elements in the continuing search for values that will unify us as a nation.
- The nation’s cultural life has been shaped by the interrelationship between the commercial marketplace, private philanthropic patronage, and government at all levels; there is a role for all three in our cultural life and all three are important.”

The background information also noted that, “for each of the first three years, the center anticipates receiving underwriting for general operations from several foundations.”

ACA’s National Arts Policy Center

A story in the fall issue of the GIA Newsletter described the American Council for the Arts’ plans for a National Arts Policy Center. Bob Porter, ACA’s director of policy, planning,

and publishing, recently reported on the progress of the National Information Clearinghouse and Archive for Arts Policy Research, one of the Center’s two primary functions. About 5,000 documents have been catalogued and put on a computerized database. Most of these documents are in ACA’s own collection; between 10-20% are held in other collections. ACA now plans to move into the next phase for the clearinghouse – refining and building the collection. “Housecleaning” is underway, and research has begun on adding to the collection.

Launched last fall, the search for a director of the National Arts Policy Center is currently on hold. Milton Rhodes, President of ACA, resigned in November 1993, and ACA trustees decided to suspend the search for a Policy Center director until a new president is found. Further plans for research, the second primary function of ACA’s policy center, will wait until a director is hired.

Arts and Politics at the National Policy Center

The National Policy Center is a non-profit public policy organization based in Washington D.C. It is “dedicated to developing better understanding about major issues confronting the nation.” Through public symposiums, invitational “squaretable discussions,” off-the-record policy forums, and studies that combine polling with focus groups, the NPC works to be “a vehicle for new ideas and helps educate decision-makers and the public about critical national issues.” NPC Squaretables have included “Securing the Future: American Leadership and the Economy” and “Electability: Bush, Clinton & Congress.” Past symposiums have included “After the Thaw: American Leadership in a Post-cold War World,” with Senator Robert Kerrey of Massachusetts, and “Democrats and the American Idea: A Bicentennial Appraisal,” with Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.

Last summer (1993), the NPC took an interest in arts and cultural issues for the first time. The Center’s director, Maureen S. Steinbruner, observed that the National Policy Center has a very

open process for identifying the projects it adopts. In conversation with a wide range of people, staff and board members "scan the horizon" to see where help is needed. Michael D. Barnes, chair of NPC's board of directors, and John Brademas, chair of NPC's executive committee, were instrumental in drawing the Center's attention to the debate around art and politics. This interest led to a series of conversations with people in the foundation world, with artists, and with other arts-involved people in Washington D.C. Given its reputation in other fields, the NPC's activities in the world of art and politics bear watching.

"Public Culture: Arts Policy in the '90s"

The Visual Studies Workshop and *Afterimage* magazine are planning "Public Culture: Arts Policy in the '90s," a series of twelve commissioned essays followed by a public symposium. The essays will cover various aspects of arts policy and funding, and will be written by artists, arts administrators, journalists, and politicians from the United States and Great Britain. "The contributions of the British participants are designed to provide a context within which existing models and 'common sense' approaches in the U.S. can be challenged and reevaluated," writes Grant Kester, editor of *Afterimage*. Kester reports that confirmed participants include Margaret C. Ayers, Robert Sterling Clark Foundation; Amalia Mesa-Bains, artist and writer; Sandy Nairne, former director of the Visual Arts Program, Arts Council of Great Britain; and Ken Worpole, past policy advisor to the Greater London Council. The essays will be published in consecutive issues of the magazine beginning this fall. The symposium is expected to take place in May 1995. For more information contact Grant Kester at *Afterimage*, 716-442-8676.

Responses to the "Call to Reinvent Policy"

The section on Cultural Policy in our fall issue began with a "Call to Reinvent Policy" that was faxed to artists and oth-

ers around the U.S. Some of the responses to "The Call" were included in that issue, and since then, the GIA Newsletter has also received responses, two of which are included below.

• • •

I agree with the principle and spirit of the Call. However, several issues not discussed are troubling. Cultural policy in this country *does* exist, however it is, for the most part unwritten. It is the policy of the "melting pot" – a policy that denies the complex assimilation experience and the genocide upon which this country has been founded.

Examples of existing cultural policy include the National Historic Preservation Act, American Indian Religious Freedom Act, and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act. These are just three of dozens of laws that govern our cultural resources and, ultimately, our national cultural policy. Most of the topical discussion to date has revolved around "the arts." We need to expand this focus!

A National Cultural Policy would ideally create a full democratization of our cultural resources and institutions. . . . The concepts of a National Cultural Bill of Rights, a National Cultural Policy, and Cultural Democracy have been alive for quite some time. This is evidenced by the ongoing work of organizations such as the Alliance for Cultural Democracy, now in its 18th year. Concerns we have voiced over and over include: Could such a policy become a tool of the "Right?" How do we avoid this? What is the legacy of our unspoken cultural policy? What has been the role of cultural policies in other countries. What is the role of the community artist/cultural worker/ animator?

Any national move toward cultural policy would have to include an ongoing National Cultural Resource Assessment, that would parallel, if not exceed, assessments undertaken in anticipation of creating a National Health Policy. A cultural assessment should not only assess cultural resources, but also the relation of culture to environ-

mental, civil, and human rights. This process would take years, and, in fact, may never truly be completed.

What is vital is that we have begun this process.

Michael B. Schwartz
Minneapolis

Michael Schwartz is a painter and community arts animator. He is also a new board member of the Alliance for Cultural Democracy and editor of its newsletter Cultural Democracy.

• • •

Dear Editor/Friend/Sarah,

An idea has been battering around my head for several months that describes, I think, the current cultural moment in this country. The phrase I use to describe this idea is "post-European." I believe it captures feelings I pick up from my cultural peers and colleagues – a zeitgeist kind of thing. To expand:

A lot of folks at essentially European-based arts institutions seem to have become aware of the ethnic and social constrictions of their art, and also aware of the incredible disenfranchisement most people in this country, even those of European origin, feel towards it. The belief these people had in the art of their institutions has been shaken. Their confidence is low. The art being produced seems to lack urgency. Worst of all, they don't know what to do. They feel boxed in – guilty about being elitist, fearful of making inauthentic gestures, and unsure of their role and community responsibilities. They question if they should resolutely charge forward, sounding the trumpet for the tradition of European high art, while realizing that fewer and fewer people feel that thrill in their bones and understanding that with each passing day this country is less about Europe and more about something new and amazing.

All of the art historical epochs and "isms" that we've tended to use are based in European cultural history. Art in this country has been seen largely in relation to that history. So far, that has

made sense. For the past decade, however, the most compelling artwork has explored cultural identity and generally has been made by artists of color and seen in alternative cultural venues. This work raises several important questions. What are the traditional institutional arts about? What urgency, what inquiry is at their center? Who are they for? What emotional and intellectual interests do they serve? Is there a way to set aside their assumption of universality so that more institutions with more viewpoints can co-exist? Symphonies are glorious, but so are pow wows.

Culture in this country is new and just developing. It hasn't fully formed. The big lesson on earth these days is learning how to live with different kinds of people without killing each other. Where else will this lesson be learned but here? I believe that the arts are one of the most important and effective ways of doing this – they can make you love and be amazed by people that you don't know. If the arts can do this here, and if we all survive, our culture could be the basis for a changed world culture.

The landscape around the arts and their institutions has changed. Many institutions that have dominated U.S. culture for the past 100 years are adapting and making themselves make new sense. Others are up against walls and are defensive. If we can help the old institutions work again while also supporting the new ones, I think the arts in the next century are going to be more important than ever because they'll carry more meaning for more people.

So, "post-European," a cultural breakpoint, another threshold. Past post-modern. Pre-US culture? Pre-world? Anyway, it's been a long winter up here in Minnesota. Take care, hope this finds you well.

Your friend,
Neal

Neal Cuthbert is program officer at the McKnight Foundation in Minneapolis.

Reading Recommended by . . .

Recently, Peter Pennekamp (Humboldt Area Foundation) found himself returning to older texts. For one, he recommends *The Ethnic Myth: Race, Ethnicity, and Class in America* by Stephen Steinberg, recently updated and reprinted in 1989 by Beacon Press. "This is a brilliant little book," Pennekamp says. "I'm blown out by how relevant it still is. It challenges a lot of thinking held by people like me." It offers brilliant analyses of census material and, among other things, identifies culture as an important determinant.

Another older book that Pennekamp recommends is Lawrence W. Levine's *Highbrow/Lowbrow: The Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in America*, published by Harvard University Press in 1988. "I continue to be surprised at how many people haven't read it," Pennekamp exclaims. "Levine presents a challenging point of view. The first half of the book appears to be simply endless documentation, but the second half contains brilliant analyses. It's very strong work!" Pennekamp reports having just started reading Levine's newest book, *The Unpredictable Past: Exploration in American Cultural History*, Oxford University Press, 1993. The book revolves around a Russian saying, "The future is certain, it is only the past that is unpredictable." According to Pennekamp, "The first essay is really great!"

Finally, Pennekamp recommends *Dead Certainties: Unwarranted Speculation* by Simon Schama, published by Random House in 1992. Schama investigates historical views of reality through an analysis of two events in history – one being Wolf's storming of Quebec, "an event that was lionized through art," Pennekamp observes. Schama raises questions by posing alternative views of historical reality. "He reveals the contrast between the experience of history and its interpretation," Pennekamp notes.

Bruce Sievers (Walter and Elise Haas Fund) recommends the books and other writings of Amitai Etzioni,

chairman of the Communitarian Network and professor at George Washington University. Recent books by Etzioni include *The Spirit of Community: Rights, Responsibilities, and the Communitarian Agenda*, published in 1993 by Crown Publishers, and *Public Policy in a New Key*, Transaction Publishers, 1992. A further source of Etzioni's writings is the quarterly journal of The Communitarian Network, *The Responsive Community*. Etzioni will be one of two speakers in a program sponsored by GIA for the upcoming Council on Foundations conference (see page 26). Sievers recommends Etzioni to arts grant-makers because "he is raising crucial issues that are often overlooked in the identification of the arts with the strong individualist strain in U.S. society. In terms of broader social issues, he raises important questions about citizenship and community responsibility that are important but often forgotten."

In an interview with *USA Today*, Etzioni stated, "Our number one slogan is that strong rights presume strong responsibilities. The whole movement started with the finding that young Americans want the right to be tried before a jury of peers, but they don't want to serve on a jury. That's absurd." In response to a request by Edward Epstein of the *San Francisco Chronicle* (1/5/94) for a quick definition of communitarianism, Etzioni responded, "The movement is a group of people who want to restore the moral, social and political foundations of our country. We want to act together to restore civility to our society." Epstein reports, "To accomplish his goals, Etzioni says it is time to emphasize responsibilities over rights, to stress community over the individual and to reinvigorate spiritual values. He has called for a decade-long moratorium on the 'manufacturing of new rights.'"

The GIA session with Etzioni at the Council on Foundations should prove to be lively.

Arts Programming

at the 1994 Council on Foundations Conference

"Philanthropy and the Challenge of the City," the 1994 Council on Foundations Conference, will take place May 2-4 in New York City. For complete conference information, contact the Council on Foundations at 202-466-6512.

Activities sponsored by Grantmakers in the Arts

Funders Concerned About AIDS Annual Award Reception

5:00-7:00 p.m. Sunday, May 1

With the cosponsorship of Grantmakers in the Arts and eleven other Council on Foundation affinity groups, Funders Concerned About AIDS (FCAA) hosts a reception to honor the recipient of its 1994 Humanitarian Leadership Award. The award is presented each year by FCAA to an individual or group whose work has resulted in greater public understanding and compassion in response to the AIDS pandemic. Live musical entertainment and light refreshments will be provided. For more information, contact FCAA at 212-572-5533.

Complainers, Disdainers and Sustainers: American Culture in the Nineties

2:00-3:30 p.m. Monday, May 2

While funders seek to sustain faltering institutions, larger forces may be eroding the foundation upon which they rest. Are we becoming a "culture of complaint" in which social fragmentation, self-absorption and cultural myopia undermine the common bonds needed for civic action? Amitai Etzioni, a founder and the chairman of the Communitarian Network (see recommended reading on page 25) and Claudine Brown, deputy assistant secretary for museums at the Smithsonian Institution will join in a "firing line" conversation. Moderated by Kathy Halbreich, Director of the Walker Art Center in Minneapolis the session will explore ways that fundamental changes in values can profoundly affect the work of philanthropy.

Arts Education Is Basic Education: The Case of Inner City Schools

10:30 a.m.-noon Tuesday, May 3

Educational reform and arts education are often treated as if there were

separate issues. This session will bring them together and will demonstrate how the arts can be a transformative force in education, with particular relevance for at-risk students. Teachers with direct personal experience in inner-city schools and leaders in national education reform will describe how the arts can be integrated into the curriculum and how arts education is becoming part of the national reform agenda. A panel discussion will follow moderated by Molly White, director of the GAP Foundation. Participants will include Judith Burton, Coordinator of the Art Education Program at Columbia University Teachers' College; Graham Down, president of the Council for Basic Education; Dr. Daniel Lawson, formerly a principal of an urban middle school in Los Angeles; and Midora Mitchell, teacher at the Garden Villas Elementary School in Houston.

GIA Reception

5:00-7:30 p.m. Tuesday, May 3

The Grantmakers in the Arts reception and program, co-sponsored with Funders Concerned About AIDS, will be a double-header this year. Leading off, NEA Chair Jane Alexander will present her thoughts on the changing nature of public-private partnership in the next decade. Following a question-and-answer period, a reception will be held with Funders Concerned About AIDS. Then, at 6:30, playwright Tony Kushner and director George C. Wolfe will discuss the success of their production, *Angels in America*. Afterward, grantmakers who responded to the Funders Concerned About AIDS invitation to buy tickets to the production will depart for an 8:00 p.m. curtain. (Ticket deadline was early in March.) Reservations for the reception are not needed. Room location will be announced in the Council's program guide.

Other Programs of Interest

Anna Deavere Smith

11:30 a.m. Monday, May 2

Anna Deavere Smith will open the conference performing segments from "Fires in the Mirror" and "Twilight L.A." The performance will precede the opening luncheon, and a question and answer session with Smith will follow it.

Festivals in the City

4:00 p.m. Monday, May 2

This session will offer an opportunity to learn about ways festivals can be used for community development. Examples will come from both Europe and the U.S.

An Evening at the Metropolitan Museum of Art

6:00-9:30 p.m. Monday, May 2

Conference participants are invited to a private viewing of some of the Metropolitan's collections: the Nineteenth Century European Paintings and Sculpture Galleries; the Arts of Asia, Africa, Oceania and the Americas; and the Temple of Dendur. Food and music will add to this special evening.

Harlem: Historic Preservation as Community Renewal, a Site Visit

8:00 a.m.-noon Tuesday, May 3

This site visit will show how community renewal efforts are beginning to take hold in Harlem, and will provide evidence that the historic character of the neighborhood is an integral part of the rehabilitation process.

Arts Forward Fund, a Site Session

2:30-5:00 p.m. Tuesday, May 3

The historic St. Mark's Church-in-the-Bowery will be the site of presentations by Arts Forward Fund grantees. Projects described will include creative earned income plans, arts business-loan programs, and political/economic partnerships integrating arts and community organizations. The session will also include brief rehearsal visits with three resident companies who are Arts Forward Fund grantees.

News from Grantmakers in the Arts

Report from The Board of Directors

Beginning with this issue, the GIA Newsletter will contain a report from the Board of Directors. Grantmakers in the Arts operates as a volunteer working board with no full time staff support. Consequently, the parameters for most of the work of the organization are established at quarterly board meetings. This column will serve to inform members of the activities of the board and of actions taken at board meetings. Following is a brief summary of the main topics covered at our last two meetings – November 1993 in La Jolla, California, and February 1994 in St. Paul, Minnesota.

Nominating Committee

At the November meeting in La Jolla, board President Ella King Torrey thanked outgoing board members John Kreidler (San Francisco Foundation), Myra Millinger (Flinn Foundation), and Sam Yanes (Polaroid Corporation) for their more than five years of hard work and support. Ella also welcomed new board members Peter Pennekamp (Humboldt Area Foundation), Christine Vincent (Ford Foundation), and Eduardo Diaz (Department of Cultural Affairs, San Antonio). Having recently accepted Tim McClimon's resignation, the board also appointed Barbara Barclay (William and Flora Hewlett Foundation) to serve out the remainder of McClimon's term.

The Board elected four officers. Ella King Torrey will continue as President, with Holly Sidford serving as Vice President, Klare Shaw as Secretary, and John Orders as Treasurer.

There will be four vacancies on the board this fall (1994). Members are asked to forward nominations to Joan Shigekawa, chair of the nominating committee, at The Nathan Cummings Foundation, 1926 Broadway, Suite 600, New York, New York 10023.

Council on Foundations, 1994

This year's Council on Foundations conference agenda contains many

more arts activities than in previous years, due in part to the efforts of GIA. Both of GIA's program suggestions, developed and planned by Bruce Sievers, were accepted by conference planners. The two sessions are "Arts Education is Basic Education" and "American Culture in the Nineties." See page 26 for more information on these and other Council on Foundations Conference activities.

1994 and 1995 GIA Conferences

It was decided that the next GIA conference will be held in Baltimore, Maryland. Nick Rabkin and Peter Pennekamp have volunteered to provide leadership in developing the conference format.

At Peter Pennekamp's suggestion, the board decided to hold the 1995 conference in Northern California and to focus on rural arts issues.

Membership Committee

Penny McPhee has agreed to serve as chair of the Membership Committee, which is examining the following:

- the possibility of promoting membership to grantmakers who fund the arts but who do not have arts as a primary focus – for example, marketing GIA membership at the annual Conference of Community Foundations, the Family Foundations Conference, and similar events.
- using the newsletter as a membership recruitment tool – for example, putting a special cover on the newsletter and mailing it to prospective members.
- reexamining the issue of institutional versus affiliate membership, with a view to clarifying the differences to current and prospective members through the membership brochure.

Organizational Issues

The board discussed several aspects of long-range planning for the organizational and financial management of

GIA. Sarah Lutman and John Orders agreed to serve as an ad hoc committee to monitor these organizational issues and to report back to the board.

Newsletter

The board has decided to publish the newsletter three times per year. After a lengthy discussion, it also agreed to continue to self-publish rather than use an outside publisher or distribution service.

Next Meeting

The next board meeting will take place in New York City on May 4, 1994.

– Joan Shigekawa

Workbook of Ideas

Plans are underway for publication of the *Workbook of Ideas*, an anthology of the writings commissioned for the 1993 GIA conference. Edited by Andrew Patner, the anthology will include essays by George Anastaplo, M. Melanie Beene, Andrei Codrescu, Guillermo Gómez-Peña, bell hooks, Paul Mattick, Jr., Kathleen D. McCarthy, Michael Morgan, B. Ruby Rich, and Greg Tate.

Ninth Annual GIA Conference Mark Your Calendars!

Preliminary dates have been set for the ninth annual conference of Grantmakers in the Arts – November 15 and 16, 1994. Specific themes are still being developed, but the GIA board has agreed to focus on practical applications of concepts and ideas developed at the 1993 meeting in La Jolla. The conference will be held in Baltimore, and will dovetail with the Neighborhood Funders Group conference (the community development affinity group) scheduled to take place in Baltimore November 16-18. Participants in both affinity groups will be sent materials about both conferences in the hope that some participants will attend both. Joint programming is also being discussed.

Grantmakers in the Arts Newsletter

Spring 1994; Volume 5, Number 1
© 1994 Grantmakers in the Arts
Editors, Anne Focke and Sarah Lutman

The newsletter is now published twice a year. Beginning in 1995, three issues will be published each year. The submission deadline for the next issue is July 15, 1994. Send submissions to:

Anne Focke, 811 First Avenue #403,
Seattle, Washington 98104

Sarah Lutman, The Bush Foundation,
E-900 First National Bank Building, St.
Paul, Minnesota 55101

GIA Newsletter Committee

Sarah Lutman, Committee Chair

The Bush Foundation

Cynthia A. Gehrig

The Jerome Foundation

Ken Hope

Independent consultant

John Orders

James L. Irvine Foundation

Joan Shigekawa

The Nathan Cummings

Foundation

Bruce Sievers

Walter & Elise Haas Fund

Tomás Ybarra-Frausto

The Rockefeller Foundation

Grantmakers in the Arts Board of Directors

Ella King Torrey, President

Pew Fellowships in the Arts

Holly Sidford, Vice President

Lila Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund

John Orders, Treasurer

The James Irvine Foundation

Klare Shaw, Secretary

Boston Globe Foundation

Barbara Barclay

The William & Flora Hewlett

Foundation

Eduardo Diaz

Arts and Cultural Affairs,

San Antonio

Sarah Lutman

The Bush Foundation

Penelope McPhee

John S. and James L. Knight

Foundation

Peter Pennekamp

Humboldt Area Foundation

Nick Rabkin

MacArthur Foundation

Janet Sarbaugh

Heinz Endowments

Joan Shigekawa

The Nathan Cummings

Foundation, Inc.

Bruce Sievers

Walter & Elise Haas Fund

Christine Vincent

The Ford Foundation

Tomás Ybarra-Frausto

The Rockefeller Foundation

Grantmakers in the Arts (GIA) is a national membership organization of primarily private sector grantmakers interested in the arts and arts-related activities. GIA's purpose is to strengthen arts philanthropy and its role in contributing to a supportive environment for the arts nationwide. GIA is incorporated as a nonprofit 501(c)(3) organization and is an affinity group of the Council on Foundations.

Join Grantmakers in the Arts

Members of Grantmakers in the Arts help sustain GIA programs while enjoying the following benefits:

- Preferential registration and reduced fees to annual conferences and other GIA programs
- Subscription to the GIA newsletter
- Reduced rates for GIA-sponsored publications
- Access to reports generated by member organizations
- Membership directory
- Access to membership mailing labels at a nominal cost
- Voting privileges at the GIA annual meeting

Membership is open to both professional staff and trustees of organizations whose primary activity is grantmaking. Membership forms are available from the Membership Committee Chair, Penelope McPhee, at the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation, One Biscayne Tower, Suite 3800, 2 Biscayne Blvd., Miami, Florida 33131, 305-539-0009.

Grantmakers in the Arts Newsletter

c/o Pew Fellowships in the Arts
The University of the Arts
250 South Broad Street, Suite 400
Philadelphia, PA 19102