



# GRANTMAKERS IN THE ARTS

Volume 6, Number 1

Spring 1995

## Three Artists Consider Borders and Immigration



### The Border Patrol State

Leslie Marmon Silko

I used to travel the highways of New Mexico and Arizona with a wonderful sensation of absolute freedom as I cruised down the open road and across the vast desert plateaus. On the Laguna Pueblo reservation, where I was raised, the people were patriotic despite the way the U.S. government had treated Native Americans. As proud citizens, we grew up believing the freedom to travel was our inalienable right, a right that some Native Americans had been denied in the early twentieth century. Our cousin, old Bill Pratt, used to ride his horse 300 miles overland from Laguna, New Mexico, to Prescott, Arizona, every summer to work as a fire lookout.

In school in the 1950s, we were taught that our right to travel from state to state without special papers or threat of detainment was a right that citizens under communist and totalitarian governments did not possess. That wide open highway told us we were U.S. citizens; we were free. . . .

Not so long ago, my companion Gus and I were driving south from Albuquerque, returning to Tucson after a book promotion for the paperback edition of my novel *Almanac of the Dead*. I had settled back and gone to sleep while Gus drove, but I was awakened when I felt the car slowing to a stop. It was nearly midnight on New Mex-

## IN THIS ISSUE

<b>Borders and Immigration</b>	
<i>The Border Patrol State</i>	1
Leslie Marmon Silko	
<i>Notes of an Alien Son</i>	4
Andrei Codrescu	
<i>The 90s Culture of Xenophobia</i>	7
Guillermo Gómez-Peña	
<b>Art and the Folks</b>	9
Ann Klefstad	
<b>Time, Term Limits, and Job Continuity</b>	12
John Orders	
<b>The Lay of the Land</b>	13
James Davison Hunter	
<b>Regional Reports</b>	16
<b>News</b>	18
<b>Reports and Periodicals Received</b>	19
<b>News from Grantmakers in the Arts</b>	23

ico State Road 26, a dark, lonely stretch of two-lane highway between Hatch and Deming. When I sat up, I saw the headlights and emergency flashers of six vehicles – Border Patrol cars and a van were blocking both lanes of the highway. Gus stopped the car and rolled down the window to ask what was wrong. But the closest Border Patrolman and his companion did not reply; instead, the first agent ordered us to “step out of the car.” Gus asked why, but his question seemed to set them off. Two more Border Patrol agents immediately approached our car, and one of them snapped, “Are you looking for trouble?” as if he would relish it.

I will never forget that night beside the highway. There was an awful feeling of menace and violence straining to



break loose. It was clear that the uniformed men would be only too happy to drag us out of the car if we did not speedily comply with their request (asking a question is tantamount to resistance, it seems). So we stepped out of the car and they motioned for us to stand on the shoulder of the road. The night was very dark, and no other traffic had come down the road since we had been stopped. All I could think about was a book I had read – *Nunca Más* – the official report of a human rights commission that investigated and certified more than 12,000 “disappearances” during Argentina’s “dirty war” in the late 1970s.

The weird anger of these Border Patrolmen made me think about descriptions in the report of Argentine police and military officers who became addicted to interrogation, torture, and the murder that followed. When the military and police ran out of political suspects to torture and kill, they resorted to the random abduction of citizens off the streets. I thought how easy it would be for the Border Patrol to shoot us and leave our bodies and car beside the highway, like so many bodies found in these parts and ascribed to “drug runners.”

Two other Border Patrolmen stood by the white van. The one who had asked if we were looking for trouble ordered his partner to “get the dog,” and from the back of the van another patrolman brought a small female German shepherd on a leash. The dog apparently did not heel well enough to suit him, and the handler jerked the leash. They opened the doors of our car and pulled the dog’s head into it, but I saw immediately from the expression in her eyes that the dog hated them, and that she would not serve them. When she showed no interest in the inside of our car, they brought her around back to the trunk, near where we were standing. They half-dragged her up into the trunk, but still she did not indicate any stowed-away human beings or illegal drugs.

Their mood got uglier; the officers seemed outraged that the dog could not find any contraband, and they dragged her over to us and commanded her to sniff our legs and feet. To my relief, the strange violence the Border Patrol agents had focused on us now seemed shifted to the dog. I no longer felt so strongly that we would be murdered. We exchanged looks – the dog and I. She was afraid of what they might do, just as I was. The dog’s handler jerked the leash sharply as she sniffed us, as if to make her perform better, but the dog refused to accuse us: She had an innate dignity that did not permit her to serve the murderous impulses of those men. I can’t forget the expression in the dog’s eyes; it was as if she were embarrassed to be associated with them. I had a small amount of medicinal marijuana in my purse that night, but she refused to expose me. I am not partial to dogs, but I will always remember the small German shepherd that night.

Unfortunately, what happened to me is an everyday occurrence here now. Since the 1980s, on top of greatly expanding border checkpoints, the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Border Patrol have implemented policies that interfere with the rights of U.S. citizens to

travel freely within our borders. I.N.S. agents now patrol all interstate highways and roads that lead to or from the U.S.-Mexico border in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California. Now, when you drive east from Tucson on Interstate 10 toward El Paso, you encounter an I.N.S. check station outside Las Cruces, New Mexico. When you drive north from Las Cruces up Interstate 25, two miles north of the town of Truth or Consequences, the highway is blocked with orange emergency barriers, and all traffic is diverted into a two-lane Border Patrol checkpoint – ninety-five miles north of the U.S.-Mexico border.

I was detained once at Truth or Consequences, despite my and my companion’s Arizona driver’s licenses. Two men, both Chicanos, were detained at the same time, despite the fact that they too presented ID and spoke English without the thick Texas accents of the Border Patrol agents. While we were stopped, we watched as other vehicles – whose occupants were white – were waved through the checkpoint. White people traveling with brown people, however, can expect to be stopped on suspicion they work with the sanctuary movement, which shelters refugees. White people who appear to be clergy, those who wear ethnic clothing or jewelry, and women with very long hair or very short hair (they could be nuns) are also frequently detained; white men with beards or men with long hair are likely to be detained, too, because Border Patrol agents have “profiles” of “those sorts” of white people who may help political refugees. (Most of the political refugees from Guatemala and El Salvador are Native American or mestizo because the indigenous people of the Americas have continued to resist efforts by invaders to displace them from their ancestral lands.) Alleged increases in illegal immigration by people of Asian ancestry means that the Border Patrol now routinely detains anyone who appears to be Asian or part Asian, as well.

Once your car is diverted from the Interstate Highway into the checkpoint area, you are under the control of the Border Patrol, which in practical terms exercises a power that no highway patrol or city patrolman possesses: They are willing to detain anyone, for no apparent reason. Other law-enforcement officers need a shred of probable cause in order to detain someone. On the books, so does the Border Patrol; but on the road, it’s another matter. They’ll order you to stop your car and step out; then they’ll ask you to open the trunk. If you ask why or request a search warrant, you’ll be told that they’ll have to have a dog sniff the car before they can request a search warrant, and the dog might not get there for two or three hours. The search warrant might require an hour or two past that. They make it clear that if you force them to obtain a search warrant for the car, they will make you submit to a strip search as well.

Traveling in the open, though, the sense of violation can be even worse. Never mind high-profile cases like that of former Border Patrol agent Michael Elmer, acquitted of murder by claiming self-defense, despite admitting that as an officer he shot an “illegal” immigrant in the back



and then hid the body, which remained undiscovered until another Border Patrolman reported the event. (Last month, Elmer was convicted of reckless endangerment in a separate incident, for shooting at least ten rounds from his M-16 too close to a group of immigrants as they were crossing illegally into Nogales in March 1992.) Or that in El Paso, a high school football coach driving a vanload of his players in full uniform was pulled over on the freeway and a Border Patrol agent put a cocked revolver to his head. (The football coach was Mexican-American, as were most of the players in his van; the incident eventually caused a federal judge to issue a restraining order against the Border Patrol.) We've a mountain of personal experiences like that which never make the newspapers. A history professor at U.C.L.A. told me she had been traveling by train from Los Angeles to Albuquerque twice a month doing research. On each of her trips, she had noticed that the Border Patrol agents were at the station in Albuquerque scrutinizing the passengers. Since she is six feet tall and of Irish and German ancestry, she was not particularly concerned. Then one day when she stepped off the train in Albuquerque, two Border Patrolmen accosted her, wanting to know what she was doing, and why she was traveling between Los Angeles and Albuquerque twice a month. She presented identification and an explanation deemed "suitable" by the agents, and was allowed to go about her business.

Just the other day, I mentioned to a friend that I was writing this article and he told me about his 73-year-old father, who is half Chinese and had set out alone by car from Tucson to Albuquerque the week before. His father had become confused by road construction and missed a turnoff from Interstate 10 to Interstate 25; when he turned around and circled back, he missed the turnoff a second time. But when he looped back for yet another try, Border Patrol agents stopped him and forced him to open his trunk. After they satisfied themselves that he was not smuggling Chinese immigrants, they sent him on his way. He was so rattled by the event that he had to be driven home by this daughter.

This is the police state that has developed in the southwestern United States since the 1980s. No person, no citizen, is free to travel without the scrutiny of the Border Patrol. In the city of South Tucson, where 80 percent of the respondents were Chicano or Mexicano, a joint research project by the University of Wisconsin and the University of Arizona recently concluded that one out of every five people there had been detained, mistreated verbally or nonverbally, or questioned by I.N.S. agents in the past two years.

Manifest Destiny may lack its old grandeur of theft and blood – "lock the door" is what it means now, with racism a trump card to be played again and again, shamelessly, by both major political parties. "Immigration," like "street crime" and "welfare fraud," is a political euphemism that refers to people of color. Politicians and media people talk about "illegal aliens" to dehumanize and demonize undocumented immigrants, who are for the

most part people of color. Even in the days of Spanish and Mexican rule, no attempts were made to interfere with the flow of people and goods from south to north and north to south. It is the U.S. government that has continually attempted to sever contact between the tribal people north of the border and those to the south.<sup>1</sup>

Now that the "Iron Curtain" is gone, it is ironic that the U.S. government and its Border Patrol are constructing a steel wall ten feet high to span sections of the border with Mexico. While politicians and multinational corporations extol the virtues of NAFTA and "free trade" (in goods, not flesh), the ominous curtain is already up in a six-mile section at the border crossing at Mexicali; two miles are being erected but are not yet finished at Naco; and at Nogales, sixty miles south of Tucson, the steel wall has been all rubber-stamped and awaits construction likely to begin in March. Like the pathetic multimillion-dollar "antidrug" border surveillance balloons that were continually deflated by high winds and made only a couple of meager interceptions before they blew away, the fence along the border is a theatrical prop, a bit of pork for contractors. Border entrepreneurs have already used blowtorches to cut passageways through the fence to collect "tolls," and are doing a brisk business. Back in Washington, the I.N.S. announces a \$300 million computer contract to modernize its record-keeping and Congress passes a crime bill that shunts \$255 million to the I.N.S. for 1995, \$181 million earmarked for border control, which is to include 700 new partners for the men who stopped Gus and me in our travels, and the history professor, and my friend's father, and as many as they could from South Tucson.

It is no use; borders haven't worked, and they won't work, not now, as the indigenous people of the Americas reassert their kinship and solidarity with one another. A mass migration is already under way; its roots are not simply economic. The Uto-Aztecan languages are spoken as far north as Taos Pueblo near the Colorado border, all the way south to Mexico City. Before the arrival of the Europeans, the indigenous communities throughout this region not only conducted commerce, the people shared cosmologies, and oral narratives about the Maize Mother, the Twin Brothers and their Grandmother, Spider Woman, and Quetzalcoatl the benevolent snake. The great human migration within the Americas cannot be stopped; human beings are natural forces of the Earth, just as rivers and winds are natural forces.

Deep down the issue is simple: The so-called "Indian Wars" from the days of Sitting Bull and Red Cloud have never really ended in the Americas. The Indian people of southern Mexico, of Guatemala, and those left in El Salva-

<sup>1</sup>The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, signed in 1848, recognizes the right of the Tohono O'odam (Papago) people to move freely across the U.S.-Mexico border without documents. A treaty with Canada guarantees similar rights to those of the Iroquois nation in traversing the U.S.-Canada border.



dor, too, are still fighting for their lives and for their land against the "cavalry" patrols sent out by the governments of those lands. The Americas are Indian country, and the "Indian problem" is not about to go away.

One evening at sundown, we were stopped in traffic at a railroad crossing in downtown Tucson while a freight train passed us, slowly gaining speed as it headed north to Phoenix. In the twilight I saw the most amazing sight: Dozens of human beings, mostly young men, were riding the train; everywhere, on flat cars, inside open boxcars, perched on top of boxcars, hanging off ladders on tank cars and between boxcars. I couldn't count fast enough, but I saw fifty or sixty people headed north. They were dark young men, Indian and mestizo; they were smiling and a few of them waved at us in our cars. I was reminded of the ancient story of Aztlán, told by the Aztecs but known in other Uto-Aztec communities as well. Aztlán is the beautiful land to the north, the origin place of the Aztec people. I don't remember how or why the people left Aztlán to journey farther south, but the old story says that one day, they will return.

*Leslie Marmon Silko is the author, among other works, of Ceremony (Penguin) and Almanac of the Dead (Simon & Schuster). This article is reprinted with the permission of Leslie Marmon Silko. It also was published in The Nation on October 17, 1994.*



## Notes of an Alien Son

Andrei Codrescu

Whose woods these are I think I know.  
His house is in the village though;  
He will not see me stopping here  
To watch his woods fill up with snow.

Robert Frost

*Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening*

After having been in America for nearly thirty years, I am only an immigrant because people want me to talk about it. Paradoxically, it was a recent return to Romania, my native country, that has caused me to reevaluate my American experience. Until that time I considered myself a model American: drank Jim Beam, wore Converse high-tops, quit smoking on tax day. Of course, I may have been *too* perfect.

I went back to Romania in December 1989 to report on the so-called revolution over there but in truth I went back in order to smell things. I went there to recover my childhood. I touched the stones of the medieval tower under the Liars' Bridge where I used to lie still like a lizard in the summer. I put my cheek against the tall door of our old house, built in 1650, with its rusty smell of iron. I sniffed at people's windows to see what they were cooking. There were aromas of paprikash and strudel, and the eternal cabbage.

I made my way into the past through my nose, madeleinsing everything. My childhood, which had been kept locked and preserved in the crumbling city of Hermanstadt, in the centrum, was still there, untouched. It had outlasted my emigration. It was a thousand years old.

Considering, then, that childhood lasts for a thousand years, the past thirty years of adulthood in America do not seem like such a big deal. My old Romanian friends, now adults, had metamorphosed in those three decades into – mostly – fat survivors of a miserable and baroque system where material things were the supreme spiritual value. For them, America was the heavenly Wal-Mart. That's what God was during Communism because God was everything, and everything can be found at Wal-Mart. Forty years of so-called Communism had done no more than polish to perfection my grandmother's maxim, "In America dogs walk around with pretzels on their tails." Loose translation: In America the sidewalks are paved with gold.

I used to fantasize coming back to my country a celebrated author, envied by all the people who made my life hell in high school. But now I wished, more than anything, that I'd come back as a Wal-Mart. If only I were a Wal-Mart, I could have spread my beauteous aisles to the awestruck of Hermanstadt and fed them senseless with all the bounty of America.

When I returned to the United States, I reeled about for a few days in shock. Everything was so new, so carelessly abundant, so thoughtlessly shiny, so easily taken for granted. The little corner store with its wilted lettuce and the spotted apples was a hundred times more substantial than the biggest bare-shelf store in Romania.

My mother, ever a practical woman, started investing in furniture when she came to America. Not just any furniture. Sears furniture. Furniture that she kept the plastic on for fifteen years before she had to conclude, sadly, that Sears furniture wasn't such a great investment. In Romania, she would have been the richest woman on the block.

Which brings us to at least one paradox of immigration. Most people come here because they are sick of being poor. They want to eat and they want to show something for their industry. But soon enough it becomes evident to them that these things aren't enough. They have eaten and they are full, but they have eaten alone and there was no one with whom to make toasts and sing songs. They



have new furniture with plastic on it but the neighbors aren't coming over to ooh and ahhh. If American neighbors or less recent immigrants do come over, they smile condescendingly at the poor taste and the pathetic greed. And so, the greenhorns find themselves poor once more: This time they are lacking something more elusive than salami and furniture. They are bereft of a social and cultural milieu.

My mother, who was middle class by Romanian standards, found herself immensely impoverished after her first flush of material well-being. It wasn't just the disappearance of her milieu – that was obvious – but the feeling that she had, somehow, been had. The American supermarket tomatoes didn't taste at all like the rare genuine item back at home. American chicken was tasteless. Mass-produced furniture was built to fall apart. Her car, the crowning glory of her achievements in the eyes of folks back at home – was only three years old and was already beginning to wheeze and groan. It began to dawn on my mother that she had perhaps made a bad deal: she had traded in her friends and relatives for ersatz tomatoes, fake chicken, phony furniture.

Leaving behind your kin, your friends, your language, your smells, your childhood, is traumatic. It is a kind of death. You're dead for the home folk and they are dead to you. When you first arrive on these shores you are in mourning. The only consolation are these products, which had been imbued with religious significance back at home. But when these things turn out not to be the real things, you begin to experience a second death, brought about by betrayal. You begin to suspect that the religious significance you had attached to them was only possible back home, where these things did not exist. Here, where they are plentiful, they have no significance whatsoever. They are inanimate fetishes, somebody else's fetishes, no help to you at all. When this realization dawned on my mother, she began to rage against her new country. She deplored its rudeness, its insensitivity, its outright meanness, its indifference, the chase after the almighty buck, the social isolation of most Americans, their inability to partake in warm, genuine fellowships and, above all, their deplorable lack of awe before what they had made.

This was the second stage of grief for her old self. The first, leaving her country, was sharp and immediate, almost tonic in its violence. The second was more prolonged, more damaging, because no hope was attached to it. Certainly, not the hope of return.

And here, thinking of return, she began to reflect that perhaps there had been more to this deal than she'd first thought. True, she had left behind a lot that was good, but she had also left behind a vast range of daily humiliations. If she was ordered to move out of town, she had to comply. If a party member took a dislike to her, she had to go to extraordinary lengths to placate him because she was considered petit-bourgeois and could have easily lost her small photo shop. She lived in fear of being

denounced for something she had said. And worst of all, she was a Jew, which meant that she was structurally incapable of obtaining any justice in her native land. She had lived by the grace of an immensely complicated web of human relations, kept in place by a thousand small concessions, betrayals, indignities, bribes, little and big lies.

At this point, the ersatz tomato and the faux chicken did not appear all that important. An imponderable had made its appearance, a bracing, heady feeling of liberty. If she took that ersatz tomato and flung it at the head of the Agriculture Secretary of the United States, she would be making a statement about the disastrous effects of pesticides and mechanized farming. Flinging that faux chicken at Barbara Mandrell would be equally dramatic and perhaps even media-worthy. And she'd probably serve only a suspended sentence. What's more, she didn't have to eat those things, because she could buy organic tomatoes and free-range chicken. Of course, it would cost more, but that was one of the paradoxes of America: to eat as well as people in a third-world country eat (when they eat) costs more.

My mother was beginning to learn two things: one, that she had gotten a good deal after all because in addition to food and furniture they had thrown in freedom; and two, America is a place of paradoxes – one proceeds from paradox to paradox like a chicken from the pot into the fire.

And that's where I come in. My experience was not at all like that of my mother. I came here for freedom, not for food. I came here in the mid-sixties. Young people East and West at that time had a lot more in common with each other than with the older generations. The triple-chinned hogs of the *nomenklatura* who stared down from the walls of Bucharest were equal in our minds to the Dow Chemical pigs who gave us napalm and Vietnam. By the time I left Romania in 1966, the Iron Curtain was gone: A Hair Curtain fell between generations. Prague 1968 and Chicago 1968 were on the same axis. The end of the old world had begun.

Our anthems were the songs of Dylan, the Beatles, the Rolling Stones, all of whom were roundly despised by my mother because she was sure that such tastes would lead to our being thrown out of America. And she wasn't all that wrong: Her old don't-rock-the-boat instinct was an uncannily fine instrument. At that time, being anti-establishment in America was perilous. But this wasn't Romania. The difference, the massive difference, was the constitutional right to freedom of speech and assembly. True, for a moment or two – and for several long, scary moments since – those constitutional rights were in real danger. And if Americans were threatened, you can imagine that many niceties of those laws simply didn't apply to refugees.

Nonetheless, I was drunk with freedom and I wasn't about to temper my euphoria with the age-old wariness of European Jews. My mother's main pleasure and strate-



gy in those days was to overstuff me whenever I came to visit. She believed that food would keep me safe. Food keeps you from going out at night, it makes you sleepy, makes you think twice about hitchhiking, makes you, generally, less radical. The very things that alienated my mother – the speed, confusion, social unrest, absence of ceremony – exhilarated me. I had arrived here at an ecstatic moment in history and I was determined to make the most of it. And when, thanks to the marketing know-how of the C.I.A., I got to try LSD for the first time, I became convinced that freedom was infinitely vaster than was generally acknowledged. It was not just a right, it was an atmosphere. It was the air one needed to breathe. And one had to stay skinny.

In 1966, my generation welcomed me into its alienated and skinny arms with a generosity born of outsidership. Young people at that time had become outsiders to America's mainstream. Those who went to Vietnam were way outside even though, ostensibly, they served the inside. The others were in voluntary exile from the suburbs that immigrants hoped to live in one day. But what mattered is that we were all on the move. I happened to be a literal exile in a world of, mostly, metaphorical exiles. It was a match made in heaven. America was nineteen years-old and so was I. I lived in a country of exiles, a place that had its own pantheon of elders, exiled geniuses like Einstein and Nabokov, and whole nomad youth armies. Exile was a *place* in the mid-sixties, an international Idea-State, the only anarchist state in working order. It's not the kind of thing that comes around all that often in American immigrant history.

In the 400 years since Europeans first came here, there have been many immigrant visions of America, most of them a variation of *Ubi pretzel ibi patria*; the true, ineffable one was not a pretzel but a pear – Charles Fourier's pear to be exact. For Fourier, the pear was the perfect fruit. It was to be eaten in Paradise by lovers. This vision of a utopian New World was entirely about freedom. The freedoms granted by the Bill of Rights were only the steps leading to this new state of being.

The prophetic tradition maintains that America is chosen among nations to bring about the end of history. American utopian communities, which flourished here in the nineteenth century were reborn with a vengeance a hundred years later. The possibility of utopia is an ingrained American belief, one that, it can be argued, has kept America strong, vigorous, and young. Walt Whitman's America was done with the niceties of Europe because it was bigger, ruder, and had a greater destiny. This America was also a country of immigrants who gave it their raw muscle and imagination. Diversity and industry were its mainstays. Even Allen Ginsberg, a bitter prophet at the end of the 1950s, could say, "America, I put my queer shoulder to the wheel." Despite the irony, Ginsberg, the son of a Russian Jewish immigrant, really believes that his queer shoulder is needed, that America needs not just its bankers but also its queers.

But this sustaining vision of America is, paradoxically again, marginal. It is often confused with another, similar-sounding creed, which is in all the textbooks and is invoked by politicians on the Fourth of July. Immigrants are used as a rhetorical device to support the goals of the nation-state: America right or wrong. This is the official ideology, which, like the party line in Romania, is meant to drive underground the true and dangerous vision. Its faithful will admit to no contradiction between their love of freedom and their hatred of outsiders.

The history of public opinion on immigration shows mainly opposition to it. As the revolutionary ideas of the eighteenth century receded, compassion for the wretched and persecuted of the earth was dictated mainly by the interests of capitalists. Not that this was necessarily bad. Heartless capitalism in its ever-growing demand for cheap labor saved millions of people from the no-exit countries of the world. It was a deal that ended up yielding unexpected and imponderable benefits: vigor, energy, imagination, the remaking of cities, new culture. Restless capital, restless people, ever-expanding boundaries – the freedom to move, pick up, start again, shed the accursed identities of static native lands. The deal turned out to have the hidden benefit of liberty. The liberty my mother discovered in America *was* here: It was a by-product of the anarchic flow of capital, the vastness of the American space, *and* a struggle in the name of the original utopian vision. Of course, capitalism annexed the resulting moral capital and put on an idealistic face it never started out with, and which it quickly sheds whenever production is interrupted. Nonetheless, it is this capitalism with a human face that brought most of us here.

But capitalism with a human face is not the same as the original vision of America. The original American dream is religious, socialist, and anticapitalist. It was this utopianism – liberty in its pure, unalloyed state – that I experienced in nondenominational, ahistorical, uneconomical, transcendent flashes in the mid-sixties. It's not simple dialectical Manicheism we are talking about here. It's the mystery itself.

If somebody had asked my mother in the mid-sixties if she was a political refugee, she would have said, "Of course." But privately she would have scoffed at the idea. She was an economic refugee, a warrior in quest of Wal-Mart. In Romania she had been trained at battling lines for every necessity. In America, at last, her skills would come in handy. Alas. But if somebody had asked me, I would have said, "I'm a planetary refugee, a professional refugee, a permanent exile." Not on my citizenship application form, of course. That may have been a bit dramatic, but in truth I never felt like a refugee, either political or economic. What I felt was that it was incumbent upon me to manufacture difference, to make myself as distinct and unassimilable as possible. To increase my foreignness, if you will. That was my contribution to America: not the desire to melt in but the desire to embody an instructive difference.



To the question "Whose woods are these?" – which Robert Frost never asked because he thought that he already knew the answer – my mother would have said, without hesitation, "Somebody else's." My mother, like most immigrants, knew only too well that these were somebody else's woods. She only hoped that one day she might have a piece of them. My answer to that question would have been, and I think it still is, "Nobody's." These are nobody's woods and that's how they must be kept: open for everybody, owned by nobody. This is, in part at least, how Native Americans thought of them. It was a mistake, of course. Nobody's woods belong to the first marauding party who claims them. A better answer might be: "These woods belong to mystery; this is the forest of paradoxes; *un bosque oscuro*; we belong to them, not they to us."

*Andrei Codrescu is a poet and a commentator for National Public Radio. His latest books are Zombification: Essays from NPR and The Muse Is Always Half-Dressed in New Orleans, both published by St. Martin's. This essay was adapted from a talk at the Humphrey Institute Policy Forum at the University of Minnesota. It is reprinted here with permission from Codrescu and from The Nation, which published it in December, 1994.*



## The 90s Culture of Xenophobia

Guillermo Gómez-Peña

*"Americans never remember; Mexicans never forget."*

Popular Mexican saying

### I

#### The Capital of the American Crisis

From 1978 to 1991, I lived and worked in and among the cities of Tijuana, San Diego, and Los Angeles. Like hundreds of thousands of Mexicans living at the border, I was a binational commuter. I crossed that dangerous border back and forth, by plane, by car, and by foot. The border became my home, my base of operations and my laboratory of social and artistic experimentation. My art, my dreams my family and friends, and my psyche were literally and conceptually divided by the border. But the border was not a straight line. It was more like a Möbius strip. No matter where I was, I was always on "the other side," feeling ruptured and incomplete; ever longing for my other selves, my other home and tribe.

Thanks to my Chicano colleagues, I learned to perceive California as an extension of Mexico and the city of Los Angeles as the northernmost barrio of Mexico City. And in spite of many California residents' denial of the state's Mexican past, and their bittersweet relationship with contemporary Mexicans, I never quite felt like an immigrant. As a mestizo with a thick accent and an even thicker moustache, I knew I wasn't exactly welcome; but I also knew that millions of Latinos, "legal" and "illegal," shared that border experience with me. Then in 1991, I moved to New York City and my umbilical cord finally broke. For the first time in my life, I felt like a true immigrant. From my Brooklyn apartment, Mexico and Chicanolandia seemed a million light years away.

I decided to return to Southern Califas in 1993. Since the riots, Los Angeles had become the epicenter of America's social, racial, and cultural crisis. It was, unwillingly, the capital of a growing "Third World" within the shrinking "First World." I wanted to be both a witness and a chronicler of this wonderful madness.

I found a city at war with itself; a city gravely punished by natural and social forces; a city that is experiencing in a more concentrated manner what the rest of the country is undergoing in different degrees. Its political structures are dysfunctional and its economy is in shambles; cutbacks in the defense budget have resulted in increased unemployment; and racial tensions are the focus of daily news reports. Crime rates and poverty levels can be compared to those of a Third World city. All this coincides with an acute crisis of national identity. Post-Cold War America is having a very hard time shedding its imperial nostalgia, embracing its multiracial soul, and accepting its new status as the first "developed" country to become a member of the Third World.

Perhaps what scared me more than anything was to realize who was being blamed for all the turmoil. The Mexican/Latino immigrant community was the scapegoat and was being singled out by both Republican and Democratic politicians, fanatic citizen groups like SOS (Save Our State), and sectors of the mainstream media as the main cause of our social ills. California governor Pete Wilson, our home grown version of France's Jean Marie Le Pen, used Mexiphobia and fear of immigration as a means to build his constituencies and divert the attention of the citizenry away from their other problems. In fact, Wilson was reelected largely on the basis of his anti-immigrant proposals. And the racist Proposition 187, which denies non-emergency medical services and education to "illegal immigrants," passed with 60% of the vote on November 8, 1994, and turns every doctor, nurse, pharmacist, policeman, school teacher and "concerned citizen" into a de facto border patrolman. Furthermore, the very same people who supported Prop 187 were also against women's and gay rights, affirmative action, bilingual education, freedom of expression, and the existence of the NEA. Why? What does this mean? What are we all losing?



## II

*"You are the posse and 187 is the rope."*

Orange County rightwinger

### Godzilla with a Mariachi Hat

Despite the fact that the U.S. has always been a nation of immigrants and border crossers since its violent foundation, nativism has periodically reared its head. American identity has historically depended on opposing an "other," be it cultural, racial, or ideological. Americans need enemies against whom to define their personal and national boundaries. From the original indigenous inhabitants of this land to the former Soviets, an evil "other" has always been stalking and ready to strike.

Since the end of the Cold War, the list of mythical evil "others" threatening conservative notions of "American-ness" has grown. These have included Saddam Hussein (the terrestrial cousin of Darth Vader) and the ideological zombie Fidel Castro. There have also been Muslim "terrorists," Japanese businessmen, Colombian druglords, "controversial" artists, militant rappers, "un-American" multiculturalists, and "angry" feminists. At different times, we all have been accused of posing a threat to America's values, its cultural and educational institutions, its economy, or its national security. Now, in 1994, the "illegal aliens" are to blame for everything the frightened citizenry and the incompetent politicians were unable (or unwilling) to solve. Stripped of their humanity and individuality, undocumented immigrants become blank screens for the frustrated citizenry to project their fears, anxieties, and rage. And at the same time, opposition to them becomes the galvanizing force behind the resurgence of a phony form of patriotism.

## III

*"Illegal aliens are a category of criminal, not a category of ethnic group."*

Proposition 187 advocate Ron Prince

### The Blurring of the Border

Fear is at the core of xenophobia. This fear is particularly disturbing when directed at the most vulnerable victim: the migrant worker. S/he becomes the "invader" from the south, the human incarnation of the Mexican fly, the subhuman "wet-back," the "alien" from another (cultural) planet. S/he is always suspected of stealing "our jobs," of shrinking "our budget," of taking advantage of the welfare system, of not paying taxes, and of bringing disease, drugs, street violence, foreign thoughts, pagan rites, primitive customs, and alien sounds. Their indigenous features and rough clothes remind uninformed citizens of an unpleasant pre-European American past and of mythical lands to the south immersed in poverty

and political turmoil, where innocent gringos could be attacked for no apparent reason. Yet, they no longer inhabit the remote past, a banana republic, or a Hollywood film. They actually live down the block and their children go to the same schools as do the Anglo kids.

Nothing is scarier than the blurring of the border between them and us; between the Dantesque South and the prosperous North; between paganism and Christianity. For many Americans, the border has failed to stop chaos and crisis from creeping in (the origin of crisis and chaos is strangely always located outside). Their worst nightmare is finally coming true: The U.S. is no longer a fictional extension of Europe, or a wholesome suburb imagined by the screenwriter of *Lassie*. It is rapidly becoming a huge border zone, a hybrid society, a mestizo race, and worst of all, this process seems to be irreversible. America shrinks day by day, as the pungent smell of enchiladas and the volume of quebradita music rises.

Both the anti-immigration activists and the conservative media have utilized extremely charged metaphors to describe this process of "Mexicanization." The most revealing ones describe it as a Christian nightmare ("hell at our doorstep"), a natural disaster ("the brown wave"), a mortal disease or incurable virus, a form of demographic rape, a cultural invasion, or as the scary beginning of a process of secession or "quebequization" of the entire Southwest.

Paradoxically, the country allegedly responsible for all these anxieties is now an intimate business partner of the U.S. But this doesn't seem to worry the opponents of illegal immigration. After all, NAFTA only regulates the exchange of consumer products. Ideas, critical art, human and labor rights, and human beings are not part of the deal. Unlike the European version, our new economic community advocates open markets and closed borders. And as NAFTA is put into practice, the tortilla curtain is being replaced by a metallic wall that resembles the old Berlin Wall.

## IV

### Suicidal Measures and Enlightened Proposals

Authoritarian solutions to "the problem" of immigration can only make things worse. Further militarizing the border while dismantling the social, medical, and educational support systems that serve the immigrant population will only worsen existing social tensions. Denying medical services to undocumented immigrants will result in more disease and more teenage pregnancy. Throwing 300,000 kids out of the schools and into the streets will only contribute to crime and social disintegration. Not only do these proposals backfire, but they also contribute to a growing nationalism in the Latino and Asian communities, and re-politicize entire communities that were dormant in the past decade.



So, what to do then with "the problem" of immigration? First of all, we need to stop characterizing it as a unilateral "problem." Let's be honest. The end of the century appears scary to both Anglos and Latinos, to legal and illegal immigrants. Both sides feel threatened, uprooted, and displaced to different degrees and for different reasons. We all fear deep inside that there won't be enough jobs, food, air, and housing for everybody. Yet we cannot deny the processes of interdependence that define our contemporary experience as North Americans. In a post-NAFTA/post-Cold War America, the binary models of us/them, North/South, and Third World/First World are no longer useful to understand our complicated border dynamics, our transnational identities, and our multi-racial communities.

It is time to face the facts: Anglos won't go back to Europe, and Mexicans and Latinos (legal or illegal) won't go back to Latin America. We all are here to stay. For better or for worse, our destinies and aspirations are in one another's hands.

For me, the only solution lies in a paradigm shift: The recognition that we all are protagonists in the creation of a new cultural topography and a new social order, one in which we all are "others" and we need the other "others" to exist. Hybridity is no longer up for discussion. It is a demographic, racial, social, and cultural fact. The real tasks ahead of us are to embrace more fluid and tolerant notions of personal and national identity, and to develop models of peaceful coexistence and multilateral cooperation across nationality, race, gender, and religion. To this end, rather than more border patrolmen, border walls, and punitive laws, we need more and better information about one another. Culture and education are at the core of the solution. We need to learn each others' languages, histories, art and cultural traditions. We need to educate our children and teenagers about the dangers of racism and the complexities of living in a multiracial borderless society, the inevitable society of the next century.

The role that artists and cultural organizations can perform in this paradigm shift is crucial. Artists can function as community brokers, citizen diplomats, ombudsmen, and border translators. And our art spaces can perform

the multiple roles of sanctuaries, demilitarized zones, centers for activism against xenophobia, and places for intercultural and transnational dialogue. Our spaces can create conditions that nurture collaborative projects among artists from different communities and nationalities. These projects can send a strong message to the larger society. Yes, we can talk to one another. We can get along, despite our differences, our fear, and our rage.

---

*Guillermo Gómez-Peña is a writer and performance artist living in Los Angeles. His book, Warrior for Gringostroika, published by Graywolf Press, was released last year. He received a MacArthur Fellowship in 1992.*

## Art and the Folks

### Art and Its Discourse in Greater Minnesota

---

Ann Klefstad

---

When I attended grade school in Greenbush in northwestern Minnesota, we would have something called "lyceum," which, we were told, was "cultural enrichment" brought to us because our town had been designated a "culturally deprived area." Lyceums were shows or lectures. I remember an octopus in a jar of formaldehyde, a dog act, a lecture on volcanoes, dramatic readings of play excerpts, old vaudevillians. Lyceums still seem to typify the relation of urban to rural culture, and thus reflect the way "culture" is perceived in rural places. COMPAS<sup>1</sup> artists may not be octopi in jars, but they are emissaries from another place who carry "culture" with them.

Critical discourse in greater Minnesota still bears the mark of the "lyceum effect." Larger towns with a full range of media often attempt "proper" criticism, that is, criticism connected to a larger artworld's discourse and standards. Most often, such criticism consists simply of Roger Ebert clips that are connected to the larger cultural world but disconnected from the local. There are reviews, especially of drama, that are connected to the local. They usually rest on assumptions of naturalism and use as standards professionalism and verisimilitude. (I'll deal later with the necessary role of naturalism in art in rural Minnesota.) These reviews can range from respectful to enthusiastic to baffled or hostile. These last are wholly indigenous, and emerge in talk among residents. This talk arises from a bedrock of distrust of art, a distrust that the artist must overcome; if it is not overcome, every word spoken about art is tinted with an endemic suspicion.

Essential to any discussion of criticism in greater Minnesota is a knowledge of the region's cultures, the art they produce, and the relation of the art to language. So this essay will address the production of art (visual art, since that is what I know) in greater Minnesota, the relation(s) of the art to language, and, at last, the possibility of an indigenous generative criticism.

### Common Sense and Good Sense

Key concepts for me in understanding current regional art and its future possibilities are Antonio Gramsci's notions of "common sense," "good sense," and the "organic intellectual" or artist.<sup>2</sup> By "common sense" Gramsci meant the body of knowledge and belief that seems



utterly self-evident to those who profess it. To them, any action not encompassed by common sense seems evil or at least senseless. Gramsci contrasts common sense to "good sense." Good sense is common sense combined with critical thinking. The difference is self-consciousness, and the combination typifies Gramsci's "organic intellectual." The organic artist, then, is the indigenous artist possessed of good sense rather than simply common sense. As well as understanding local common sense, the organic artist can understand her position in terms of both history and the political structure. She can see herself and others not as "good" and "bad" or "familiar" and "strange," but as differently positioned individuals in a culture that is constructed, not given. Her thinking need not be determined by reaction against either the ("narrow") home culture or the ("evil" and dominant) urban culture.

Among the few organic artists or intellectuals in greater Minnesota at the moment are Native artists who are trying to reinvent a tradition. Reinventing tradition is an oxymoron that requires a sense of self as both rooted in and alienated from the tradition as well as the dominant culture. All rural artists might benefit from a similar syncretic consciousness of things to save from several cultures.

### The Small House of Language

So what is "common sense" in Minnesota? Local culture is constructed from local conditions as well as from history. The presence of the nonhuman world here is very important. The nonhuman world – what usually gets called "nature" – occupies a lot of room. As one consequence, people's experience of the humanly constructed world of language and meaning is narrow. In urban places, the space itself is humanized; the locus is constructed very largely of discourse, and language is a source of entertainment and change. Language is a kind of landscape. Here, the landscape may be humanly marked, but it is not primarily human. The landscape is big and other and powerful. Language is used to construct a sort of human dwelling amid the vast meaninglessness of the nonhuman world. For the most part, language is used not as entertainment but as protection. It is a small house, easier to heat than a large one. Sprawling and idiosyncratic constructions of language are not typical here. Repetition and familiarity are ways of keeping the great world, to which humanness is only marginally relevant, at bay a little. Language need not be entertaining since, in addition to being frightening, the natural world is various. People here dwell in it and on it and get up in the morning for it. And talk about the natural world is virtually irrelevant to experience of it. In fact, talk tends to banalize it. So people here live between human meaning and the living, breathing nonhuman world, to which meaning is irrelevant. A very different set of uses for art arises from this situation, and types of art very different from urban art tend to be made.

### The Several Arts

The historical background for artmaking in greater Minnesota is diverse. Several traditions of Native artmaking have some relation to current Native artists' ways of working<sup>3</sup>. Traditions of peasant artmaking in northern Europe have a peculiar survival in rural Minnesota. Structures of meaning in very ancient documentary traditions tend to survive in wildlife art and "duck-stamp" art and in various kinds of memorial documentation. The traditions of "professional" art (i.e., academically trained artists) and of "outsider" or "naive" art are present also, but are somewhat atypical here, as both involve individual expression primarily.

Let's look at an example of how one aspect of this diverse and disconnected picture has developed historically. *Rosemaling*, rose painting, is a tradition of decorative, discreetly expressive painting that has parallels in most European nations and in many other places as well (Anishinabe traditional motifs are not so very different, after all). In its nineteenth-century Norwegian version, rosemaling combined the painting of never-seen Mediterranean plants (acanthuses) that imitated big-city decorative art with styles and motifs of great antiquity and local relevance. The artist's role was that of an artisan among artisans; technical skill and the ability to match certain very slowly changing standards were the determinants of quality. Such peasant painting is a sensuous formalism with no access to language or the abstract, and with little mobility or room to change. It works by being itself, though it can slowly absorb a slowly changing surrounding. Upon immigration into the world of mass-produced images and assimilation, some rosemaling persisted, but it was pruned of the pagan roots, outgrowths, and intra-social connections that were the sources of change and that embodied meaning in the tradition. In Minnesota, the original tradition was largely lost, though a great nostalgia and longing for remembered sensuous form does exist. Sentimentality does its best to fill the void.

With duck-stamp or wildlife art, the relation between depiction and subject is rigorously mimetic and calls to mind the stasis and wordlessly understood meanings of folk art. This is art that has very little use for language. Duck-stamp art faces outward to the great nonhuman world, and through a set of community-sanctioned skills, both masters and delivers that world. It is no accident, I think, that the ability to count the feathers of a duck is related to the legal permission to kill one. You're not allowed to do some whoop-de-doodle "impression" of an animal if you have the power of life and death over it. Reading about a duck-stamp competition in *Art issues*, a wonderfully deft Los Angeles publication, I was struck by how little the writer could say about the art itself.<sup>4</sup> It simply isn't illuminated by language. The same tends to hold true of other art favored in deep country – sawblade landscapes, paintings of old barns, and so on. This art is not meant to be exploratory but to be confirming and consoling.



"Professional" art, that is, art done by art-school trained artists and that participates in a larger artworld dialogue, tends to be viewed with suspicion by the local populace. They greatly distrust the paternalism of big-city art types coming to tell regional people what they ought to like and how they ought to like it. The larger discourse of art is generally seen to be deliberately confusing, words generated to hide a lack of meaning. Art in general is distrusted as threatening, negative, destructive, and antisocial. (The distrust echoes much anti-avant garde rhetoric of Fascist parties in the early part of this century.) An artist in regional Minnesota is a member and a citizen of a region or a town, and here there is no such thing as an independent action, no such thing as random action. Everything is tied to everything else. André Breton's "ultimate surrealist act" – grabbing a pistol and shooting randomly on the street – reads as literal nightmare in places like this. Saying things you don't literally mean can be fraught with danger – usually psychic danger – anywhere. But in a small place, psychic messes can't be walked away from. Any act involves weighing consequences in all directions. Many time-honored precepts of modernist art practice, such as self-expression and iconoclasm, are sure social death for small places.

### The Organic Artist

So what is the role of an artist who values the community that forms her, who sees her community's (sometimes almost exhausted) ties to realms of embodied wisdom (tradition) that it is not possible to make fully explicit, and who sees also the tradition's narrowness, its frequent cruelty, and its own self-destruction through an inability to change? This is a world that modernism worked hard to destroy, and is a world, therefore, that distrusts anything "new" that doesn't offer immediate personal benefits. Oddly, the very multiculturalism that is so distrusted now by rural cultures as the latest godless offering of urban culture may be the way to link rural cultures in a generative way with more mainstream intellectual practices, and at the same time enable "the people" to develop their own specific regional politics and art.

Are there kinds of art that can have a participatory rather than a hostile relation with small-town culture while not succumbing to its laws of obedience to custom, of forced consensus, and of cruelty in the name of habit and sameness? Maybe. What might such art look like? Its qualities would probably include embodied meaning, craftsmanship for its own sake, and a certain sensual formalism. It would occupy a position between the cultural and the natural, between the individual and the social, between invention and tradition. It might well be mimetic, depicting things or beings the people hold dear. The art might also have a practical aspect – it might be landscaping or park architecture or town design. It might incorporate practical solutions to local economic and environmental problems. All these are aspects of art that regional people would understand and appreciate.

What might the criticism, the discourse accompanying such art, sound like? This is a very important question. One of the sources of small-town tyranny is the extreme narrowness of available language and, therefore, available thought. Developing the capacity to both understand local culture from the inside and introduce it to self-consciousness could make "good sense" possible and restore traditional rural cultures to generative status. Regional and rural cultures now tend to be imprisoned in their own preservation, in their own defensiveness. Organic artists with good sense, a sense of place and history, could foster the ability to change on one's own terms that is so needed by regional and rural culture. Through this ability to change, rural cultures could be broadened and opened, but only with the impetus and participation of local people speaking the local language and taking it into the broader world of discourse.

Now, after the breakdown of the Artworld (the source of language that has determined the course of modernism), the tribalisms of culture can perhaps create their own art. It is becoming urgent for artists to seize the language of the local before it becomes insular and polarized. The entire world is becoming a collection of local places, politically and culturally.<sup>5</sup> What happens in rural Minnesota is suddenly no longer marginal.

---

*Ann Klefstad is an artist and editor who grew up in Greenbush, a town of about eight hundred people in far northwest Minnesota. Over the last two decades she has lived in many other places. In July 1992, she moved back to northern Minnesota. This essay is published with the permission of Ann Klefstad. It has been published previously by the Center for Arts Criticism in St. Paul, Minnesota.*

---

<sup>1</sup>COMPAS is a Saint Paul-based arts organization that produces cultural programs throughout Minnesota.

<sup>2</sup>Antonio Gramsci (1891-1937) was an Italian Marxist political organizer and writer from Sardinia, a poor and isolated agricultural area, who wrote his primary text, *The Prison Notebooks* (New York: Columbia University Press 1991, originally published as *Quaderni del Carcere*, Turin: G. Einaudi, 1964) while he was in prison under Mussolini. He presents a practical and grounded approach to political thought that is divorced from monolithic theory – an approach useful right now.

<sup>3</sup>This is too large a question to deal with here, and I am not the person to do it.

<sup>4</sup>Bernard Welt, "Mythomania: Sitting Ducks," *Art issues* 27 (March/April 1993), pp. 10-12.

<sup>5</sup>Think of the upsurge of local seizures of power from the old dominant ideologies: Muslim fundamentalism, the Ba'ath party in Iraq, Ukrainian nationalism, Azerbaijani nationalism, the viciousness in Yugoslavia. Sometimes, as in Czechoslovakia, these seizures of power by local cultures have beautiful results; sometimes the results are a nightmare of Fascist terror. The local and the regional have become sites of political, cultural, and ecological action all over the world, and, as in Czechoslovakia, artists can impart saving insights.



---

# Time, Term Limits, and Job Continuity

---

John Orders

---

"Term limits" for foundation program officers are frequently alluded to but rarely instituted. Only the Ford and Hewlett Foundations have enforced such limits to any formal degree (usually for a period of six years), and, even here, exceptions and variations are frequently made to suit the exigencies of specific situations.

In theory, limiting the cycle of program officers' service to six or seven years keeps their impact on foundation programs fresh and insightful. Simultaneously, term limits reduce the potential for shortcuts that can settle in as intensive work becomes routine. Additionally, many foundation presidents are committed to bringing as many talented individuals as possible into the experience of the philanthropic world to keep the process – and the products – well honed.

Adjusting to philanthropic work takes time. Although many program officers enter the foundation world after having developed considerable expertise in specific fields, it usually takes two or three years to feel in possession of a true working knowledge of the complex dynamics of the work. It may take yet another year or two before a program officer is comfortable shaping policy that may affect where a given field is heading and what it might actually look like in five years. It is at just this point that term limits, if in effect, would come into play, and destabilizing thoughts of future employment could begin to creep onto his or her mental screen. Increasingly, seasoned program people who feel pressure from term limits seek moves to other foundations, since typically, the institutional context of their own positions does not offer strong opportunities for mobility.

"Burnout" may also come into play in thoughts of job changes. An individual program officer may begin to think about leaving philanthropy altogether because the work comes to seem repetitive, flat, or simply too complicated with a larger, invisible status quo – despite ample rhetoric about fostering meaningful change. The sheer volume of paperwork, phone calls, and meetings begins to generate thoughts about stepping out from behind the administrative eight-ball, usually to develop some new area of knowledge that the job doesn't allow. Impractically, certain exotic graduate programs may begin to acquire a wistful allure. At its most extreme, the term limit concept is thus internalized by a program officer who propels him/herself out of the world of philanthropy altogether.

Whether departure results from burnout or from the pressure (direct or indirect) of term limits, the practical and ethical question is one of renewal. How can excellent work in the field be rewarded with something other than self-induced or formally exerted termination? Perhaps most importantly, how can individuals who aren't actually subject to term limits and who choose to continue for longer periods in their jobs, avoid becoming routine and less responsive to the demands and expectations of the work? How can we, as individuals, develop a meaningful self-monitoring process that translates self-assessment into more productive actions for our grantees and our boards? How does all this cohere within the larger framework of accountability?

The often enviously whispered "s-word" – sabbatical – should be given greater scrutiny in coming years. As the field of philanthropy evolves and professionalizes itself, imaginative uses of released time could be an effective way to strengthen both personal engagement and organizational continuity. A few days per month for outside reading or a periodic one-to-three month time for field-related writing, traveling, or directed learning, could further a sense of the common good. Foundations willing to consider academically modelled, full-year sabbaticals for program officers would have an opportunity to bring in replacement or supplemental fellows and/or interns, thus adding new blood and thought to the field.

If more foundations followed a policy of fostering creative released time, curiosity and inquiry, so characteristic of new program officers and so central to the overall philanthropic endeavor, could come to better inform the entire system rather than remaining the fugitive, maverick qualities they often are at present. The rather arbitrary and expedient concept of formal term limits – never likely to serve a complex range of individual talents and organizational needs – will simply fade away. A more natural, case-by-case resolution of job continuation will evolve, based on mutual assessments of positive attributes and contributions.

---

*John Orders is program officer for The James Irvine Foundation.*



---

# The Lay of the Land

---

James Davison Hunter

---

*On March 21, 1995, James Davison Hunter, the William R. Kenan Professor of Sociology and Religious Studies at the University of Virginia, spoke to a Planning Advisory Panel for the Museum Program and the Visual Arts Program of the NEA. Through the leadership of program director Jennifer Dowley, the two programs have embarked on a planning process. The twelve-member advisory panel was appointed to assist the staff and the National Council on the Arts in "a review and analysis of the needs of the entire spectrum of the visual arts field from the artist's studio to the conservation lab, and all the public, educational, and scholarly activities that lie between." Members of the panel will meet three times through the year and, in November 1995, will make recommendations to the National Council "for how the NEA might structure its Visual Arts and Museum programs to play an effective and leadership role in assisting the field." The first meeting of the panel was held in mid-March and featured numerous presentations – some focussed on broad cultural, sociological, or political concerns, others on private philanthropy, and still others on the needs of the various "stakeholders" served by the two programs. A synthesis of the first three-day session will be circulated in early May for response. If you would like to receive the summary, please contact the Museum Program at 202-682-5442 or the Visual Arts Program at 202-682-5448.*

*Hunter opened the first day of presentations to the panel. His remarks responded to the question, "What is going on in our country today in social and political terms that affects work done by artists, artists' organizations, and museums?"*

Thank you for the opportunity to be here and to address you all.

I think I'm both a good pick and an odd pick to address you today and to begin the session. I'm not an artist. I'm not a critic. I'm not a professional advocate. I love museums, but I really know very little about the art world; I wish I did. But I do know something about the larger historical and societal context in which all of us – all of you – are struggling to make sense of our own vocations and the larger world to which we are committed. And it's this that I will address in the next ten to fifteen minutes.

Let me make one caveat before I begin. Listening to the past hour of discussion, it's clear to me that most of the discussion that's going to go around this room over the next three days is going to be within the institutionally specialized realm of the arts and of arts advocacy. It's going to be oriented towards planning. Because I know very little about this world, what I have to say may sound as though it is completely unrelated. Again, I'm dealing with issues of context. So be it. But let me remind you of the Old Testament story about the ancient Israelites who

were about to enter the Promised Land from their many years of being in the desert. Moses sent Joshua and Caleb and a number of other scouts into the Promised Land to scope things out. The goal was to get the lay of the land. That's basically the language that was used then. And so, my caveat is that you can plan all you want, but unless you get the lay of the land first, and unless your planning is in a kind of dialectical relationship with an understanding of the larger context in which you do what you do, it could be for naught. So, what I offer to you is a brief reconnaissance of the context in which you are working.

I am often asked, what is new about our particular historical moment? In fact, Jennifer asked me this over the telephone in preparation. There are three things I would like to mention quickly and a fourth I would like to discuss in a little greater length. Then, I want to address the question: If this is in fact the case, what do you do?

What is new? The first thing that is new about this particular moment, as opposed to, say, thirty years ago or twenty years ago, is a decline in the legitimacy of all public institutions – whether it's government, whether it's the media, whether it's religious institutions, whether it's the schools, whether it's the arts establishment. There has been a dramatic decline in the trust that people have in the leadership of institutions and in their legitimacy to do what they do. Again, this is not unique to the NEA. This is not unique to the arts establishment. The decline in the trust and legitimacy of our public institutions is a basic fixture of our political culture.

A second "novum," if you will, is that for all the conflict and all the diversity and all the troubles that we have had in the past, there was, nevertheless, a sense that we were still making progress, that we were moving forward, that there was, in fact, a direction in which we were all groping and struggling. But the sense of progress, the confidence that we are moving forward, is rapidly disappearing. This is true across the board ideologically and politically – left, right, conservative, liberal, Republican, Democratic. Our sense of confidence about the future is on the wane.

Third and related to the others is that there is a level – or I should say, an *intensity* – of fear in the general public or in the public imagination today that I believe did not exist before. The fear is not fabricated. Obviously, there are hucksters in the public culture who trade on fear, the direct mail industry builds on fear. But the fear is, in fact, real. And it is different and it is intense in ways that it was not before.

Against this backdrop is a fragmentation of the core public agreements about the nature of private life – our sense of personal meaning in life, our sense of identity, our sense of what constitutes intimacy, and our sense of the family. All of the public agreements that provided the parameters for our private life are now, as they say, deconstructed, splintered: they're up for grabs. This is not only true within *haute culture*, but it is also true within



the public imagination. There's a sense of uncertainty and uneasiness about the fragmentation that is taking place. Into the vacuum created by the loss of public consensus has come a politicized conflict to recreate a consensus. This is the culture war about which I've written a couple of books. Let me elaborate a few points for the record, so that we are absolutely clear about what we're dealing with here.

The culture war is not a political war over cultural matters. Let's abandon our preconceptions about this at the very start. The conflict over abortion, for example, is not simply the politics of reproduction. The controversies over textbooks are not simply the politics of writing textbooks and of education boards and the like. Affirmative action is not simply the politics of race. And so, too, the controversy over the arts is not simply about the politics of funding. The culture war takes place underneath all of this. Underneath the debate about abortion is, in fact, a deeper conflict over the meaning of motherhood, over the meaning of liberty, over the meaning of our obligations to each other. Underneath the debate about affirmative action is a deeper dispute over the standards of justice by which we will relate to one another. Underneath the textbook controversies is a deeper debate about the values that we will pass onto children, about the national identity that will be reproduced in the coming generation. And likewise, underneath the dispute over funding for the arts is a deeper debate over the nature of art itself and about the symbols through which the arts establishment communicates something about our national culture.

Cumulatively speaking, we have what is, in effect, a debate about the meaning of our public order: the terms by which we will live our lives together in a very diverse society. What we have, at root, is a debate over the meaning of America, and that is not reducible to politics. It is not simply a debate between Republicans and Democrats or a debate between conservatives and liberals. Underneath all of these disputes are competing moral visions about what is good and right and true. In other words, it is metaphysical and epistemological. I hate to use these large words, but, in fact, the debate cuts to the very philosophical core of how people understand themselves individually and collectively. In a very real sense, this is a conflict over competing understandings of what is sacred. And I use that word very carefully because I believe what is at stake, for each side of the culture war, is fundamentally non-negotiable, or at least is understood to be non-negotiable. Nothing else can explain the passion of the Clarence Thomas-Anita Hill fiasco, of the conflicts that take place over "rescues" at abortion clinics, the conflict that happened at the Cincinnati Contemporary Arts Center several years ago. Nothing else can explain the passion that we see, except that at stake are our most deeply held and most cherished ideals of what is right, what is good, and what is worthy of emulation.

I'm not going to go into the historical roots of this conflict except to say that they trace back at least 200 years. The conflict that we see now is not simply a phenomenon of

the Reagan years and their aftermath. Politics, again, is an artifact of something deeper – deeper culturally and deeper historically. I want to emphasize that a conflict that traces back this far into our history and that cuts this deeply into our public philosophy is going to be with us for a very long time. The first lesson, then, about the context within which we are working is that this conflict, this culture war, is not going away in our lifetimes. It's going to be around for a very long time. If you are a Republican, the events of last November will not change the conflict; they will change the political landscape, but they will not end the war. Likewise, if in 1996 there is a clean liberal Democratic sweep again, the war will not change – the political landscape will change, but the war will not end. It's going to be with us for a very long time.

I'm afraid to say there's more to the story because this is not simply a historical phenomenon and it's not simply a philosophical problem. If it were as academic as this, we could simply deepen the debate and all would be well. The problem is that the culture war takes place within a particular environment – an environment that we could call public culture, though this is too benign a way to describe what really is going on. The problem with our public culture is the way in which the public debate is institutionalized, and it is institutionalized first and foremost in the courtroom, in litigation. In a society where the unspoken rules, which Robert Bellows once called "the habits of the heart," disappear, the first recourse people take in solving disputes is litigation, and litigation immediately thrusts things into a zero sum conflict in which there are only winners and losers. There is no compromise. There is no real debate, no substantive debate. There is only winning and losing.

A second institutional feature of the debate that goes on at the highest, or at least most visible, levels of public culture is the role of the special interest organizations. Special agenda organizations have been around since Madison wrote the Federalist papers, but they have proliferated since the 1960s at an unprecedented rate. Not only have they proliferated, but their role in shaping the political parties and the larger public culture has increased accordingly. Special interest organizations have one mission and that is to win at all costs. They tend – again right or left, conservative or liberal – to operate with a take-no-prisoners policy. Fundraising within these special interest organizations is built on demonizing the opponent, and so on.

The third way in which this cultural conflict is institutionalized is in the technology of public discourse itself – the technology of direct mail, sound bites, paid political advertisements in newspapers, and so on. What we have with the newer technologies of public discourse is a truncated discourse. The very means by which we communicate with each other over the most central issues of our national life are by definition truncated, abbreviated, sloganized.

It is in this context that the NEA struggles to form an identity and to find its institutional mission and purpose.



Needless to say, the tasks are formidable enough on their own, but they are virtually impossible in the context that I've described just now. Mr. Rifkin [panel co-chair] earlier argued that we need to challenge our assumptions, and I believe that's something we need to do within all institutions, but certainly here. What does this mean? Certainly it means that we need to challenge our assumptions about what art is. Within our current cultural conflict, we can find a myriad definitions of what art is. But as art filters into public discourse – into the *rhetoric* of public discourse – we end up with basically two competing understandings.

On one side, art is defined by its capacity to elevate the public mind. Art, in brief, is a symbolic representation of higher metaphysical reality. This is true for evangelical Christians like Donald Wildmon just as it is true for secular platonists like Hilton Kramer. On the other side of the cultural divide, art is a statement of being. It's not so much a reflection of a higher reality, but is the creation of reality itself. Art is self-contained sovereignty – a concern to express one's quest to understand and to interpret experience in the world. Needless to say, when the two definitions manifest themselves in public rhetoric we end up with people talking past one another, each side saying to the other, "you just don't get it." And it's true.

I'm going to close by posing the question that all of you are going to be facing over the next three days: given this context, what to do? And I'm afraid I can't be very much help on this count. But let me mention two things very quickly. The first step is a reality check. The NEA must recognize that in the public imagination, the institution exists on and serves the interests of just one side of the cultural divide. Now, this reputation may not be just, it may not be accurate. One could trot out lots of data to demonstrate that this is, in fact, not the case. But the reality of the situation is that in the public imagination, the NEA and the arts establishment are perceived as being on one side. And that's very important. Reputations are very difficult to lose. I can give one example, and that is on the matter of diversity. The Harvard Law School boasts of its commitment to diversity, and yet perceives diversity primarily within ethnic and racial terms, and in terms of sexual orientation – but not in terms of, say, moral commitment. One could say, then, if the Harvard Law School really wanted to be diverse, well, why not hire a conservative Mormon, or a Shiite Muslim, or someone who graduated from Liberty University?

The second step is to realize just how fragile American democracy is now. When democracy is vibrant, democratic debate is substantive. When democracy is weak, democratic debate is shallow, words become weapons, debate becomes an opportunity to bludgeon one's opponent. When democracy is weak, its ideal becomes a veneer for power politics. We are right on the edge of this becoming the reality of our political culture. Quite frankly, in Washington D.C. it probably already is. So I sym-

pathize with what was said earlier, about being three thousand miles away. One can be much more hopeful at a distance, but in this town it's difficult.

It seems to me we have a choice here, and I'm not just speaking about this institution, I'm speaking about all of us as citizens. It's a choice that all of us have. I'll illustrate it with a quick story from a conference sponsored by The Nathan Cummings Foundation. Along with Sidney Blumenthal, then of *The New Republic*, now of *The New Yorker*, I was asked to address the problem of the arts. At the end of our speeches, we were both asked, "Well, if this is in fact the case, what do we do about it?" And I, having been at the University of Virginia for a decade and having heard all the jargon about Jefferson, answered this way: What you do is only half the question, the other question is how you do it. And in a democracy, how you do what you do is just as important as what you do. All right. Means matter. It's not just a matter of ends; it's a matter of means. In a democracy, the means are crucial.

Then, Blumenthal leaned over to the microphone and said, "What do we do? Seize power." And the transcript will bear me out: he electrified the group. All of a sudden everyone was chattering away, "How do we do it? What do we do?" and so on. The choice, it seems to me, for all of us and even for this institution, is to understand that our choice is between the way of Jefferson and the way of Nietzsche. This is where our political culture is right now. It's difficult as a sociologist to be optimistic about things, but as a citizen, of course, I'm hopeful. There's always the opportunity.

## Join Grantmakers in the Arts

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, Barbara Barclay. (See page 23.)



# Regional Reports

*Beginning with this issue, the newsletter will set aside space for Regional Reports from arts grantmakers in various parts of the country. The regional focus parallels an overall desire of the GIA board to reflect through all its programs the activities and participation of arts grantmakers from the many regions where they work. We have no expectation that the reports will provide comprehensive coverage in any region. Instead, we consider them more like snapshots of interesting ideas and activities in one part of the country that may be of interest to GIA members elsewhere. The editors are grateful to the grantmakers who agreed, on fairly short notice, to suggest items for this issue from their regions: Barbara Barclay, Northern California; Kathleen Cerveney, Central Midwest; Eduardo Díaz, Texas; and Adrian King, South. We expect this feature to develop over time. Please contact either of the two newsletter editors or Kathleen Cerveney, GIA Communications Committee Chair, if you're interested in being a source of items from your region. (See page 23.)*

## South

The **Metropolitan Atlanta Arts Fund (MAAF)** is a partnership between the Metropolitan Atlanta Community Foundation and the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce with support from private and public funders in the twenty-county Atlanta region. The Fund was created to assist small- and medium-sized arts organizations in its twenty-county region with annual operating budgets below one million dollars, by providing grants for "stabilization programs and projects." The Fund enters its third grant cycle this year (1995).

The original impetus for the Fund came from a townhall meeting called by the mayor of Atlanta in 1991. The resulting "Mayor's Blueprint for the Arts" set in motion a process that led to a \$500,000 challenge from the Coca-Cola Foundation. Following a feasibility study by the Chamber of Commerce, a committee from the business community raised \$2.5 million in matching funds, giving the new Fund initial assets of more than \$3 million.

An advisory committee, established by the Cultural Affairs Board of the Chamber, oversees the Fund and recommends policies and specific grant awards. The board of the community foundation reviews the recommendations and makes final approval of grants. A small number of grants in amounts up to \$50,000 are awarded annually, and technical assistance sometimes accompanies the grants. The Fund "pursues a 'balance sheet' strategy" and seeks proposals that are based on a serious self-assessment, that recognize the importance of institutional planning and financial management for artistic and operational objectives, and that illustrate a commitment to the long haul. The Fund describes successful applicants as ones that reflect "active and committed policymaking board members, administrators, artists, and volunteers: in short, arts organizations self-confident about who they are, what they do, and that have a clear vision of where they need to go."

In its first two grant cycles (1993 and 1994), MAAF awarded grants to Pandean Players (a wind chamber ensemble), Seven Stages (new plays, playwrights, and collaborations), Theatrical Outfit (original musical theater), Atlanta *Art Papers* (contemporary art magazine), Several Dancers Core (for the Atlanta Dance Initiative), A.R.T. Station (multidisciplinary, multicultural arts center), Jomandi Productions (theater that asserts African American artistic expression), Actor's Express (theater company with strong social voice), and Production Values (costumes for nonprofit arts groups).

"The grant made an immediate difference for *Art Papers*, even though we're only halfway through the program," said editor Glen Harper. He reported that funds were used to reduce a chronic debt. "Fundraising now goes for current expenses, and the printer gets paid on time." The way the program is administered also seems to be valuable to the constituent groups. Harper commented that the first year's site visit in itself was a big help.

More information about MAAF is available from Lisa Cremin, Director, The Hurt Building, Suite 449, Atlanta, GA 30303.

...

The **Atlanta Dance Initiative** is a two-year consulting program that serves twelve dance organizations in the Atlanta region and that received financial support from the MAAF through one of the companies, Several Dancers Core. Working with ARTS Action Research consultants Nello McDaniel and George Thorn, the twelve groups aim to take a "holistic approach to stabilizing individual dance companies within the larger performing arts community." In addition to group roundtable discussions and individual meetings with the consultants, the Initiative includes open community sessions and other means to involve individual choreographers in the process. Several Dancers Core can be reached at P.O. Box 2045, Decatur, GA 30031-2045.

## Central Midwest

**Community foundation to take a position on public funding.** At its most recent quarterly meeting (March 1995), the distribution committee of the Cleveland Foundation approved an action that permits the Foundation to take a public position in support of the National Endowments. The Foundation's board will sponsor an op-ed piece to be published in local newspapers and will write a letter to Ohio congressional members urging continued support of public funding for the arts and humanities at state and federal levels.

In addition to making key economic impact arguments, the Cleveland Foundation will make the appeal that public agencies are vital partners with the Foundation in helping the arts remain available and accessible to the whole community. The Foundation hopes to help legislators and the general public understand that private philanthropy cannot fill the gap that would result from dismantling the public funding structure.

Community foundations have more flexibility to take public positions on political issues than many other grant-



makers do. The GIA board would like to know of other foundation-initiated efforts to support public funding and of the results of such efforts, and invites you to share your experience with the communications committee. With enough responses, the committee, in turn, will report back to the membership. (See page 23 for committee contact.)

...

The **Columbus Stabilization Project** is the most recent of several projects launched since 1983 with the help of the National Arts Stabilization Fund (NASF). Joint leadership of the project is provided by the Nationwide Insurance Company, headquartered in Columbus, and the Greater Columbus Arts Council (GCAC). A \$6.9 million campaign is being conducted to retire debt and establish capital reserves for eight key cultural organizations. Of this amount, GCAC also has set aside over \$250,000 to establish capital reserves for the community's smaller organizations and to provide management/technical assistance. The goal is to have the entire cultural community debt free and with a minimum 10% cash reserve by the year 2000.

NASF has contributed \$2 million to the campaign and is providing in-depth technical assistance to Columbus arts organizations. Fundraising for the remaining \$4.9 million is about 85% complete. Payout of the funds raised will take place over the next four years as organizations meet the criteria established to qualify for stabilization funding. The Columbus Stabilization Project was nearly three years in the planning and initial implementation stages. Although the general risk and undercapitalization of the arts and their mounting debt were the central rationale for initiating this project, a strong motivator was the demise of Players Theatre, a prominent performing arts organization in Columbus that was forced to close its doors a few years ago.

An added benefit of this project, as reported by Steve Rish, president of Nationwide Insurance Enterprise Foundation, is the new, collegial relationship among the members of the

fundors' oversight committee that has been formed. Rish is hopeful that this group can continue local planning efforts to benefit the arts community in Columbus long after the fiscal stabilization phase is complete.

## **Texas**

The **Texas Cultural Endowment Fund** is a public-private endeavor to stabilize state arts funding by creating a \$200 million endowment. The Fund was established and seeded with \$2.2 million in 1993 by the Texas state legislature. Recently, state senator John Montford (D-Lubbock), chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and creator of the enabling legislation two years ago, introduced a bill to allocate certain tax revenues to the Fund. If the proposed legislation becomes law, one percent of the taxes imposed on "the sale, storage, or use of cultural services and related tangible personal property" (from SB 767) will be deposited to the Texas cultural endowment fund until the fund has a balance of \$200 million or until the year 2005. "Cultural services" are defined to mean "amusement services attributable to motion picture theaters, amusement-and-recreation services, art galleries, museums, and botanical and zoological gardens." The Texas Commission on the Arts (TCA) is currently developing investment guidelines to encourage private sector contributions to the fund, and is also preparing to release a special "State of the Arts" license plate, which will also generate revenues for the Fund. In addition to stabilizing state support for the arts, one of the goals of the Fund, according to TCA, is to remove the arts from the biennial appropriations cycle. For more information, contact John Paul Batiste or Ricardo Hernandez at the Texas Commission on the Arts, P.O. Box 13406, Austin, TX, 78711-3406.

...

**Texans for the Arts**, a relatively new state arts advocacy network, developed an advertising campaign that has been carried in newspapers and arts organization publications around the state. One memorable image put a cowboy hat on the Mona Lisa and carried the caption, "Deepen the Arts in

Texas." The campaign was developed pro bono by Graphic Concepts Group from Fort Worth, and recently swept the local Addy Awards. A thirty second TV spot will be airing soon on the Bravo cable television network.

...

**Amigos del Museo de Arte - ¡AMA!** - has recently been formed in San Antonio to support the concept of a National Museum of Mexican American Art. "The development needs to be seen in context with the Mexican Museum in San Francisco, a similar effort in Los Angeles, and the Mexican Fine Arts Museum in Chicago," noted Eduardo Diaz, Director of Arts and Cultural Affairs for the City of San Antonio. It will also need to be coordinated with the renovation of the **Alameda Theater**, a major architectural and cultural landmark in downtown San Antonio. The theater was built in the mid-forties as a Mexican American entertainment center and has recently been purchased by the City for renovation as a major arts and cultural center.

## **Northern California**

A recent "Year in Review" from the Northern California Grantmakers provided information about the **Arts Loan Fund**. The ALF was created to provide a resource to help small and mid-sized arts organizations survive temporary cash flow problems. Short-term low interest loans are provided to help organizations meet payroll and other expenses while awaiting contract reimbursement or provide for the upfront costs associated with an event or performance.

Through working with loan applicants, the ALF has recognized a growing need among some arts organizations for training and assistance in managing their finances. In 1993, the ALF cosponsored with and provided \$10,000 in funding for the Business Arts Council to develop a special financial technical assistance program. Through this program, six organizations participated in an intensive accounting and financial management training program in 1993. To follow up on the learning, business volunteers

[Continued on page 18, column 3]



# News

## Humphrey Institute Policy Forum

The Humphrey Institute Policy Forum at the University of Minnesota sponsored two public conferences during the 1995-96 academic year which addressed "the growing perception that the American community is breaking down and that Americans seem more aware of what separates them than what unites them." On October 7 and 8, 1994, the Institute hosted a two-day conference titled "The American Community: Melting Pot or Boiling Point?" The conference speakers presented papers on three themes following a keynote address by Brandeis University Professor Lawrence Fuchs. Fuch's address presented his historical perspective on "The American Community," and included thoughts on the ideological underpinnings that bind us together along with his list of threats to social cohesion. *Chicago Tribune* columnist Clarence Page, Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs Ada E. Deer, and Hennepin County District Court Judge Isabel Gómez spoke on "The Changing American Nation" (each from a personal point of view). "Religion and the American Community" was the topic of a talk by Michael Novak, Resident Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute. Harry Boyt, Director of the Reinventing Citizenship Project, and Amitai Etzioni, founder of the Communitarian Network, spoke on "Revitalizing the Civic Culture." Finally, poet Andrei Codrescu closed the conference with a luncheon address, much of which is included in the *GIA Newsletter's* cover story. The conference was sold out, and received extensive coverage in the regional media.

As this newsletter went to press, the second conference was being held, titled "The American Community: Culture Wars - Policy Battles." The conference schedule began with a panel discussion about national identity and education policy with Linda Chavez, President and John M. Olin, Fellow at the Center for Equal Opportunity; Representative Kweisi Mfume, former head of the Black Congressional Cauc-

us; and Sharon Sayles Belton, Mayor of Minneapolis. Peter Goldmark, President of the Rockefeller Foundation, was the scheduled luncheon keynote speaker; his address was titled "Groping Our Way to a New Social Contract." Speaking on immigration policy and American community were authors Julian Simon (*The Economic Consequences of Immigration Policy*) and Nathan Glazer (*Beyond the Melting Pot*). Journalist Gloria Berger (*U.S. News and World Report*) and Tony Snow (*The Detroit News*) were speakers at a dinner session on "Politics and the American Community." Finally, Abigail Thernstrom (coauthor, *America in Black and White*), Thomas Downey (former Democratic Congressman from New York), and Samuel Myers (Director, Roy Wilkins Center for Human Relations and Social Justice) conducted the final panel discussion on "The American Community: Implications for Social Policy."

Tape recordings of major presentations are available through the Humphrey Institute. For further information, contact Janna Wallin Haug, Associate Director, Humphrey Institute Policy Forum, University of Minnesota, 301 19th Avenue South, Minneapolis, MN 55455, (612) 625-2530.

## National Arts Policy Clearinghouse

Past issues of the *Grantmakers in the Arts Newsletter* have contained reports on various efforts to further research and thinking about cultural policy, one of which has been directed by the American Council for the Arts (ACA). In 1988, ACA began planning for a National Arts Policy Center, and in 1992 received startup funding from the Ford Foundation. With subsequent funding from The Pew Charitable Trusts and the AT&T Foundation, ACA began development of one part of its planned center, the National Arts Policy Clearinghouse. The William Randolph Hearst Foundation established an endowment fund to support the Arts Education Assessment Network, a component of the Clearinghouse. The goal of the Clearinghouse is "to organize and compile a database of arts policy statistics, monitor arts research, and make its data available to

other researchers, policymakers, managers, and the media."

In 1993, a coalition of foundations independently began planning a cultural policy center, now named the Center for Arts and Culture. In light of this development and in conversation with several of the foundations involved in the Center for Arts and Culture, ACA modified the original goals for its National Arts Policy Center. ACA's board of directors decided to eliminate original research from its goals and to expand the clearinghouse function under the name, National Arts Policy Clearinghouse. An objective of the change is to better complement the work of the new Center for Arts and Culture.

The Clearinghouse will store and disseminate information through print, broadcast, national conferences, and electronic media. One avenue for information dissemination will be ACA's new World Wide Web site (ARTsUSA) on the Internet (<http://199.222.60.120>). Another method of dissemination is the Visual Artist Information Hotline, a national toll-free telephone referral service for visual artists operated by ACA. In addition, Clearinghouse information will be distributed through ACA Books.

## Regional Reports: Northern California

[Continued from page 17]

were matched with each organization for a six-month period to help implement improved financial management systems. Among the concrete results the agencies achieved were improved cash flow, forecasting, improved internal controls, upgraded computer financial systems, and greater knowledge and understanding of current accounting standards for nonprofits. Based on the results of the initial year and on continued funding for the program, nine organizations were selected for participation in 1994. A third group will be selected in spring 1995. Upon completion of the third round, the program and the relationship between the Arts Loan Fund and the Business Arts Council will be reviewed.



## Reports and Periodicals Received

In January 1995, The New York Community Trust and the United Way of New York City issued a report prepared by The Conservation Company titled *Strengthening New York City Nonprofit Organizations: A Blueprint for Action*. The report discusses institution-building challenges facing New York City nonprofits and offers grantmakers a range of strategies to help their grantees.

The report finds that underfunding combined with escalating demands for service has eroded the infrastructure of nonprofit organizations. "Just as a city's physical infrastructure crumbles over time if it is not maintained," notes the report, "so it is with nonprofit infrastructures . . . And, as it is with physical infrastructure, the cost in both financial and human terms of halting this deterioration is far less than the cost of building new organizations to replace those that have been allowed to collapse."

Although the report focuses on New York City's nonprofit sector, its recommendations, which are based on interviews with grantmakers, technical assistance providers, and others, will be valuable to grantmakers nationwide. While it concentrates on strategies for technical assistance and operating support, the report emphasizes that these recommendations are not exclusively a matter of dollars. "Several of the most effective strategies require relatively little additional expense. Rather, they rely on the ability of grantmakers to use their leadership and position in the community to leverage existing and 'in-kind' resources to improve the capacity of nonprofit organizations."

Among the more intriguing strategies recommended are establishing a "peer mentoring" program for nonprofit managers; adding up to 20 percent to project grants for general support purposes; and creating a category of grants that target capacity-building projects, such as hiring a deputy director or fundraiser or establishing a pension fund.

For copies of the report contact Yolanda Lewi or Celine Quashie at The Conservation Company, 310 Madison Ave., New York, NY 10017. (Telephone 212 949-0990/fax 212 949-1672) Single copies are available to grantmakers at no cost.

• • •

*Arts: The Arts in Religious and Theological Studies* is a journal newly available by subscription. Although the newsletter is directed primarily toward the academic community, it contains thought-provoking material that may be of interest to arts grantmakers as they consider their work. For example, the summer 1993 issue included a cover story titled "Issues for Discussion in the Theology and the Arts Dialogue." The article closed with a series of questions for discussion such as: "How do the various theological disciplines define the importance of art for the exploration of their subject matter?" "In what fashion is a work of art religious art? Is the 'religious meaning' we 'find' in a work of art the fruit of a dialogue between the work and the one encountering it, or the fruit of our discovering what is intrinsic in the work itself?" and "In what sense can we speak of art as revelatory, prophetic, sacramental, incarnational?"

A 1992 issue included an article by Carolyn M. Jones, Assistant Professor of Religious Studies at Louisiana State University titled "Artists Who Test Boundaries." Jones presented a theological perspective on controversial artworks, including work by Andres Serrano, and looked for a role for such work in a theological setting. Another issue contained a lengthy essay by Doug Adams, Professor of Christianity and the Arts at the Pacific School of Religion, titled "Affirming Artist-in-Residence Programs as Messy." Subscription information is available from ARTS, 3000 Fifth Street Northwest, New Brighton, MN 55112. The cost is \$10 per year (three issues).

• • •

ARTS Action Research (AAR) recently published the results of its program examination of *Artists' Projects: The New York State Regional Initiative*. The New York Initiative was begun in 1990 and is one of several regional regranting programs across the country that have provided grants for artists' projects with support from The Rockefeller Foundation, the Andy Warhol Foundation for the Visual Arts, and the National Endowment for the Arts. (In 1994, the NEA declined to continue funding the program.) From the outset, the co-administrators of the New York Initiative – the Lower Manhattan Cultural Council and Pyramid Arts Center – departed from the traditional "open call" application format and designed a nomination process with the specific purpose of being more *inclusive*. An overarching aim of AAR's study was to examine this aspect of the New York program and to reconsider nomination as a selection process in grantmaking.

The two primary goals of the national regranting program are "to encourage the participation of artists of diverse cultural and aesthetic backgrounds" and "to assist in the creation and production of independent artists' projects that are innovative in form or content." AAR reports that the New York program has been successful in achieving the goals: "The recipient artists represent virtually every culture and community in the state, and the projects are as diverse as the pool of artists themselves." In interviewing panelists, AAR found that although all had served on review panels before, "none had been confronted by such a range of applications, first time applicants, or unknown artists and work." Among the questions addressed through the examination was "Is the program methodology as exceptional as it appears or merely an exception to the rule?"

The report describes the background and structure of the program and of the decision-making process, provides profiles of several artists supported, makes specific recommendations, and offers overall observations. AAR acknowledges the potential for misuse or abuse of a nomination process, but also questions the assumption that an open



call application process is always the fairest way to assure open access to funding resources. "While open call application programs give the appearance of openness and fairness, they can be full of obstacles and closed doors to many artists and communities . . . Ultimately, open call programs are passive approaches to addressing needs or problems regardless of how strong and assertive guideline language may be."

A copy of the report can be obtained by contacting the Lower Manhattan Cultural Council at 212-432-0900.

...

The second issue of *Nonprofit Research News* was published in fall 1994 by The Aspen Institute's Nonprofit Sector Research Fund. The publication provides summaries of funded research. Although this particular issue did not include any arts-specific research results, the Fund has supported several arts studies now underway that will be presented in future issues of the newsletter. Included in the fall *News* was a brief report on new research by Burton Weisbrod and Lewis Segal on "Donations versus commercial revenue sources in the nonprofit sector." Based on 1974-1987 data from federal tax form 990, their research suggests that "a decline in donations or a change in fundraising capabilities will cause nonprofits to increase their sales of goods and services, and that they will use increased profits to supplement lost donation revenue." Information about the Nonprofit Sector Research Fund may be obtained by writing to Elizabeth Boris, Director, 1333 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Suite 1070, Washington, D.C. 20036.

...

The American Council for the Arts released a report on *Arts Education for the 21st Century American Economy*, a conference held in Louisville, Kentucky in September 1994. The basic assertion of the conference was that "the arts teach what business needs." The conference program included testimony to the economic value of the arts to a community, and the portion of the report covering the economic argument will seem conventional to

most experienced arts administrators. Of more interest is the attempt to articulate the value of education in the arts to the skills needed by businesses now and in the future. The report includes many direct quotes from business executives about the value of the kind of thinking that is developed from artistic training. Those in need of some "quotable quotes" will find them in ACA's report. For copies contact ACA at 1-800-321-4510 or write to One East 53rd Street, New York, NY 10022.

...

The Getty Art History Information Program developed a booklet titled, *Education and Cultural Heritage: Solid Partners for the NII, Current and Emerging Projects and Approaches*. The booklet was prepared to complement a panel discussion held in January 1995 about projects and institutions that are currently using technology to expand educational programming "beyond the walls of traditional classrooms." The booklet describes seventeen arts and technology projects and includes information about how to contact the individuals who organized them. The booklet is available from the Getty at 401 Wilshire Boulevard Suite 1100, Santa Monica, CA 90401, or by visiting the Getty's World Wide Web site at <http://www.ahip.getty.edu/ahip/home.html>.

...

The California Arts Council (CAC) recently published a study of the economic impact of the arts in California, *The Arts: A Competitive Advantage for California*. The report documents the findings of a year-long study conducted by KPMG Peat Marwick with the assistance of several advisory and steering committees. At the core of the study is an economic impact analysis based on surveys of mostly nonprofit organizations and their audience. For the purposes of this analysis, the "arts industry" is defined as nonprofit institutions (from theaters and galleries to local arts agencies and arts education organizations), festivals, and selected commercial arts organizations such as presenters who provide space and technical support for touring arts programs (less than one percent of the

survey sample). Two surveys were conducted, one designed for the arts organizations and one for their audiences and patrons. The study examines the economic impact of the arts in three ways: total spending, total personal and business income, and total jobs created. It also estimates the state and local taxes generated. The findings reveal that nonprofit arts organizations added \$2.159 billion to the California economy in 1993, supported 115,000 jobs, and generated \$77 million in state and local tax revenues. About jobs, the study found that arts organizations provide 85,235 direct jobs, a large share of which are part-time or seasonal. The study reports that full-time employment in 1993 was 9,826, while part-time was 75,409, and notes, "This is a unique variety of labor intensity." Arts groups also report nearly 173,000 volunteers.

An interesting aspect of the California study is that it doesn't stop with the core research, but includes five case studies to provide additional context: "The Artist in Los Angeles," "The Motion Picture and Television Industry in California," "A Case Study of Seven California Festivals," "Art and Auto Design in California," and "Musical Instruments: A California Manufacturing Industry." While the report acknowledges that many economic effects of the arts remain unmeasured, the case studies provide the beginning of a multi-faceted picture of the arts from an economic standpoint. The study of individual artists, for example, identifies findings it calls "unexpected." It notes, "... many would be surprised to learn that the typical Los Angeles artist is more likely to possess an advanced degree, participate in politics, and earn a higher income than the average citizen." A few of the findings of the case study are:

- Los Angeles artists earn above-average incomes - an average of \$38,400 in 1992 - and 53% of this income was derived from arts activities.
- Artists employ other people: 35% employ more than ten people to assist them.
- Artists are more involved in the community than most people: 86%



vote, 50% actively work as volunteers, and 74% contribute to non-profit causes.

- Artists are not transitory: 59% have lived in Los Angeles for more than ten years.

It may be important to note that the "typical Los Angeles artist" was located through surveys (over 8,000 of them) mailed to members of the Screen Actors Guild, Musicians Union, and "artists at large." Over 2,000 responses were tabulated.

A complete copy of the CAC report costs \$10.00 and can be obtained by calling the California Arts Council at 800-201-6201. An executive summary is also available. For additional information about the Los Angeles study, call 213-974-1343.

...

*From the Heart of the Country* is the title of a new book documenting the United States-Japan Creative Artists Fellowship Program. In this program, five contemporary artists from the U.S. spend six months in Japan each year. To date, eighty artists have participated. Their stories and reflections form the basis of this beautifully produced report, edited by Fellow Tommer Peterson. In it are reminders of the profound impact that fellowship time and global travel can have on an individual artist's life work.

A companion volume, documenting the twentieth anniversary of the Japan-United States Friendship Commission, was written by Francis B. Tenny. Both books are available from the National Endowment for the Arts.

...

*The Charitable Nonprofits* was published in 1994 by Jossey-Bass Publishers. Written by William G. Bowen, Thomas I. Nygren, Sarah E. Turner, and Elizabeth A. Duffy, the book analyzes the contemporary condition of organized charitable activity in the United States. Particular attention has been paid to artistic and cultural organizations, making this must reading for grantmakers interested in historic

and recent trends in economic patterns affecting the field. The book is available through trade distributors at many local bookstores, or directly from the publisher at 350 Sansome Street, San Francisco, CA 94104.

...

*Voluntas, the International Journal of Voluntary and Non-Profit Organizations* is an interdisciplinary and international journal that aims to be the central forum for international research in the area between state, market, and household sectors. The journal is published by Manchester University Press (England) and edited by Helmut Anheier and Martin Knapp.

*Voluntas* frequently includes articles of interest to arts grantmakers. For example, the fall 1994 issue contained an article by Cyril F. Chang and Howard P. Tuckman that explores the effect of revenue diversification on nonprofits. The article provides comparative data across the nonprofit sector on the amount and types of revenues supporting nonprofit activity, and suggests the consequences of relatively low versus high levels of revenue diversification. The weight of the research suggests that diversified revenue sources are more likely to be associated with a strong financial position than are concentrated revenue sources. Tables are included showing how revenue diversification in arts, cultural, and humanities organizations compares to twenty-five other subcategories of nonprofits.

Subscriptions for *Voluntas* are \$60 per year. For information contact Journals Department, Manchester University Press, Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9NR, United Kingdom. *Voluntas* also is available in many university libraries.

...

The National Assembly of State Arts Agencies (NALAA) published a *Monograph* in December 1994 that contains the texts of the five keynote addresses at the 1994 NALAA conference. Speeches by federal government representatives Ellen McCulloch-Lovell, Jane Alexander, Sheldon Hackney, and by

NAMES-project director Anthony Turney and choreographer Liz Lerman are included. The *Monograph* could be useful to people who were unable to attend the conference but are curious to know what these keynote speakers said in their comments to NALAA's constituency. The publication is available from NALAA, 927 15th Street, N.W., 12th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005.

...

The National Endowment for the Humanities has released a *Resource Kit for the National Conversation on American Pluralism and Identity*. The *Resource Kit* is intended to serve as a starting point for salons, book club discussions, community meetings, and public humanities programs about "the diversity of race, ethnicity, and culture that enriches our country and about the values that we share as Americans." The *Kit* includes a 41 page set of commentaries by scholars in answer to eight questions. The commentaries were edited by Catharine R. Stimpson, Director of the MacArthur Fellows Program of the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. Scholar-participants include Henry Louis Gates, Jr., Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Nathan Glazer, Diane Ravitch, Michael Walzer, and Martha Minow, among others. Also included is a suggested reading and film list.

Copies of the *Kit* are available from the NEH main offices in Washington. Further information also may be obtained by calling 1-800-NEH-1121.

...

The Lila Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund released its study on *Domestic Dance Presenting* in February, 1995. The report is the result of a year-long analysis and survey of the engagement, attendance, and financial records of eighty-five dance presenters, and interviews with sixty representatives of presenters, dance companies, and arts grantmakers. Among the findings of the study were these:

- Dance presenting was less well funded from donated income than overall presenting operations, and there-



fore relied heavily on earned income to bolster the bottom line. Earned income for dance presenting declined in 1989/90.

- The average number of dance engagements reported by the sample of companies increased slowly over three years, but audiences per performance declined.
- Average fees to artists per engagement also declined.
- Time available for artists to interact with the community diminished over the period surveyed.
- A handful of companies and artists commanded most of the bookings for the presenters surveyed.

Both an executive summary and a full report are available from Dance/USA, 777 Fourteen Street, NW, Suite 540, Washington, D.C. 20005.

• • •

The Rockefeller Foundation commissioned *Communications as Engagement* as a component of The Common Enterprise, an initiative of the Foundation that aims to revitalize citizenship at a local level through collaborative problem-solving and conflict resolution. The purpose of the communications project is to identify the entities – organizations, groups of individuals, groups of organizations – involved in the “community revitalization movement,” to explore the role and potential of communications in revitalization, and to develop communications strategies for people involved in revitalization. The report, prepared by the Millennium Communications Group, states, “The excitement in completing this work has been the understanding that communications – far from being just another way to spotlight the accomplishments of revitalization – is the essence of revitalization.

In describing the “actors” of revitalization, the report identified fourteen general categories: urban partnerships, visioning and strategic planning, collaborative community problem solving, dispute/conflict resolution, leadership development, religious

institution initiatives, national/community/voluntary service, deliberative discussion, citizen participation, issue driven initiatives, civic journalism, civic networking, media production/distribution, and neighborhood and community organizations. A companion resource listing of 245 organizations and initiatives is provided both in a separate 50 page booklet and on computer diskette (both Macintosh and DOS versions). Although few in numbers, several arts and cultural activities are included, such as the National Conversation Project of the NEH, Appalshop’s media arts center, and Paper Tiger Television.

A center section of the report concentrates on significant new developments in communications within revitalization activities, including civic journalism, civic networking and computerized online services, “the resurgence of an intellectual debate” exemplified by the Communitarian Network and the Kettering Foundation’s National Issues Forum, and major national convenings such as an initiative of the Center for Policy Alternatives. According to the report, a notable characteristic of the practitioners in all these projects is, “Revitalization’s local leaders are energized and hopeful about what they are doing” – “far more so than the citizenry at large.”

The Millennium Communications Group can be contacted at 1150 18th Street, N.W. 8th Floor, Washington D.C. 20036 (mllninc@clark.net)

• • •

Artsave, a project of People for the American Way, has just released *Artistic Freedom under Attack, Volume III*. The 140 page report documents, on a state-by-state basis, 104 challenges to artistic expression in 1994. The report finds that censorship prevailed in 78 percent of the cases, a rise from the 63 percent rate in both 1992 and 1993. Copies of the report can be purchased for \$14.95 from People for the American Way, 2000 M Street N.W., Suite 400, Washington D.C. 20036.

## Grantmakers in the Arts Newsletter

Spring 1995; Volume 6, Number 1  
© 1995 Grantmakers in the Arts  
Editors, Anne Focke and Sarah Lutman

The newsletter is published twice a year. The submission deadline for the next issue is August 1, 1995. Send submissions to:

Anne Focke, 811 First Ave. #403, Seattle, WA 98104, afocke@tmn.com

Sarah Lutman, The Bush Foundation, E-900 First National Bank Bldg., St. Paul, MN 55101, lutman@tmn.com

## Grantmakers in the Arts Board of Directors

Penelope McPhee, President  
John S. and James L. Knight Foundation  
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  
Kathleen A. Cerveny  
The Cleveland Foundation  
Eduardo Diaz  
Arts and Cultural Affairs, San Antonio  
Marian A. Godfrey  
The Pew Charitable Trusts  
Peter Pennekamp  
Humboldt Area Foundation  
Nick Rabkin  
MacArthur Foundation  
Janet Sarbaugh  
Heinz Endowments  
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.

## GIA Newsletter Committee

Kathleen A. Cerveny  
Cynthia A. Gehrig  
Sarah Lutman  
John Orders  
Joan Shigekawa  
Bruce Sievers  
Tomás Ybarra-Frausto



# News from Grantmakers in the Arts

## News from the Board

Since the last newsletter was published, the following changes have been made in the board of Grantmakers in the Arts.

- **New Officers.** The new officers are: President, Penelope McPhee (John S. and James L. Knight Foundation); Vice President, Holly Sidford (Lila Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund); Treasurer, John Orders (The James Irvine Foundation); and Secretary, Janet Sarbaugh (Heinz Endowments).

- **New Board Members.** Kathleen A. Cervený (The Cleveland Foundation) and Marian A. Godfrey (The Pew Charitable Trusts) have been elected to serve on the board. Departing board members include Sarah Lutman (The Bush Foundation), Joan Shigekawa (now at The Rockefeller Foundation), Bruce Sievers (Walter & Elise Haas Fund), and Ella King Torrey (now president, San Francisco Art Institute).

- **New Board Positions.** The board has been expanded from fifteen to twenty members. Additional board members have not yet been approved.

- **New Committee Chairmen.** A board member serves as chair of each committee. The board eagerly encourages GIA members who are not on the board to serve on any and all of the committees. Interested members should contact specific committee chairmen.

**Nominating Committee:** Janet Sarbaugh, Heinz Endowments, 30 CNG Tower, 625 Liberty Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA 15222-3199.

**Membership Committee:** Barbara Barclay, The William & Flora Hewlett Foundation, 525 Middlefield Road, Ste. 200, Menlo Park, CA 94025.

**Communications Committee:** Kathleen Cervený, The Cleveland Foundation, 1422 Euclid Avenue, Ste. 1400, Cleveland, OH 44115.

**Conference Committee:** Peter Pennekamp, Humboldt Area Foundation, P.O. Box 99, Bayside, CA 95524-0099.

**Development Committee:** Holly Sidford, Lila Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund, Two Park Avenue, 23rd Floor, New York, NY 10016.

## Communications Committee

The new Communications Committee grew from board interest in increasing the lines of communication with GIA members. Throughout the next year, committee chair Kathleen Cervený will assess ways that information might be shared in addition to the semiannual *GIA Newsletter*, including more frequent and less formal vehicles. The existing Newsletter Committee will function as a subcommittee of the Communications Committee. The new Regional Reports section of the newsletter is a first step in broadening the flow of information among members.

The Communications Committee seeks participation from the membership. If you are willing to devote time and energy to help shape a communications strategy among arts grantmakers and between arts grantmakers and the public, and especially if you are willing to help implement the plans, we would like to hear your ideas. Please send communications regarding regional news, GIA's emerging communications agenda, and your interest in providing service to this committee to Kathleen Cervený.

## 1995 GIA Conference

The 1995 Grantmakers in the Arts conference will be held on October 9, 10, and 11 at the Eureka Inn in Humboldt County (Northern California). The task of the 1995 conference is to offer grantmakers the opportunity to gain both insight and practical knowledge. The objective of the conference is to advance practice, both national and local, through sound analysis, perspectives from both inside and outside the field, and the exploration of concrete examples. Additional information about the conference will be mailed to GIA members later in the spring.

Over the past four months, the conference planning committee has conducted interviews and held informal conversations with GIA members to tease out the substance of the conference. Framing the discussions are questions about the changing role of arts philanthropy in light of recent experience and established trends. Among the questions are: Are certain practices in the current system of arts support and delivery responsible for the instability of many organizations that GIA members fund? Can the replication of certain institutional forms be maintained at current levels, or has the system expanded too far? Do our political and economic systems intrinsically favor supporting delivery systems instead of the actual creation of art? Do grantmakers' funding policies amount to coercion or are all funding practices in some sense coercive? Why is "diversity" blamed for obstacles facing the arts that more appropriately might be attributed to changes in the economy, technology, society, and politics? Can we adequately respond to art that speaks from and to a specific, often local or rural, community? What is the relationship or partnership between public and private funders? How should private arts philanthropy respond to an embattled NEA?

The conference location was chosen to facilitate in-depth discussion among grantmakers in a retreat setting. Humboldt County is culturally rich. It is home to the Institute of Native Knowledge, The Seventh Generation Fund, artists Julian Lang and Mel Schuler, and the Dell-Arte School of Physical Theatre. Morris Graves, a Humboldt County resident still painting at age eighty-five, made this area a retreat for John Cage, Lou Harrison, and others of their generation. Located by the Pacific Ocean in redwood country, the conference will be an excellent one for GIA members who wish to bring children and families, or who need to be refreshed by a place of beauty. Among other pre-conference opportunities, an immersion in Native culture is being organized by Native American cultural leaders.



# Arts Programming

## at the 1995 Council on Foundations Conference

"Evolving Visions of Philanthropy and the Public Good," the 1995 Council on Foundations Conference, will be held May 1-3 in San Francisco. For complete conference information, contact the Council on Foundations, 1828 L Street, N.W., Suite 300, Washington D.C. 20036, 202-466-6512.

### **Grantmakers in the Arts Reception**

5:30-7:30 p.m., Tuesday, May 2

The reception will be an opportunity for arts grantmakers to meet each other informally and to learn about GIA activities. A short performance as well as food and drink will be part of the festivities. Specific details about the location and program will be mailed to GIA members and also available upon registration.

### **Other programs of interest to Arts Grantmakers**

#### **Guideline Art**

4:00-5:30 p.m., Monday, May 1

A program session designed to consider the responsibility grantmakers

have, not only to their own goals, but to the creative integrity and vitality of the arts. The session will address the balance between requiring artists and arts organizations to address community needs and nurturing the autonomy of the creative process.

#### **Host Event:**

##### **Evolving Visions of the Arts**

6:30-9:30 p.m., Monday, May 1

This year's Host Event will take conference participants to two of San Francisco's newest cultural facilities – the Yerba Buena Center for the Arts and adjacent gardens, and the new San Francisco Museum of Modern Art. Food from the diverse culinary traditions of the Bay Area and California wines will add to the occasion.

#### **The Colors of Desire**

8:00-10:00 a.m., Wednesday, May 3

A multimedia, multicultural performance written and performed by Alexs Pate and David Mura. The piece is about the lives and friendship of two men of color and, more universally,

about African American-Asian American relations.

### **Site Sessions**

Several site sessions encompass the arts. Even though the registration deadline for site sessions has passed, arts grantmakers might be interested to know that the following sessions are included in the conference program:

#### *The Arts as Catalyst for Center City Revitalization*

An exploration of the role of the arts in the redevelopment of San Francisco's South of Market/Yerba Buena neighborhood.

#### *Arts and Economic Development in San Francisco's Mission District*

A tour of a neighborhood where the arts have been deeply integrated into daily life and have played a central role in revitalization.

#### *From Artillery to Arts and Environment*

A tour of the Marin Headlands including the Bay Area Discovery Museum, the Headlands Center for the Arts, and the Home Away from Homelessness.

### **Grantmakers in the Arts Newsletter**

John S. and James L. Knight Foundation  
2 South Biscayne Blvd., Suite 3800  
Miami, FL 33131