A Newsletter of Ideas and Items of Interest to Arts Grantmakers

GRANTMAKERS IN THE ARTS

Volume 7, Number 2 Autumn 1996

The Tended Earth

Ann Hamilton and Wes Jackson

The following is an edited transcript of at talk given by Ann Hamilton and Wes Jackson at Headlands Center for the Arts on March 8, 1990. The Center is located in the Marin Headlands just north of San Francisco and offers artist residencies and public programs. Hamilton is an artist who was commissioned by the Center to guide the renovation of a mess hall and kitchen in one of the historic army buildings in the Center's care. Work by Hamilton will be on view in Pittsburgh during the annual GIA conference this year. Jackson has been director of the Land Institute in Salina, Kansas, since 1978. The Institute investigates sustainable alternatives in agriculture, energy, waste management, and shelter. The talks are published here with the permission of both Hamilton and Jackson.

Ann Hamilton

Usually when I talk about my work I get caught up in a description of the particular elements and the overt content of the materials. This seemed to be an opportunity to try to synthesize the process and underlying beliefs that are embodied in the metaphors of the installations. I usually begin a project with very specific materials—maybe paprika or human teeth—things that already exist in the world. They sit on my table, on my floor. They surround me. I push them around. I think about the social systems they come from, the metaphors they contain, and in what possible relationships the metaphors can be brought out. The process is slow—it's one of developing a relationship.

From particular parts my process moves toward making a whole—like cloth in which individual threads retain their identity while joining to become a larger membrane. The "threads" in my case are the individual objects and materials. "How" they are positioned in space and with each other creates an experience where smell and touch are as important as sight is. The voice in my work is contained in the "how"—in the relationships between parts. The voice comes from an understanding of materials and from tactile visceral experience, and it comes more easily through my hands than through my tongue and spoken words.

So tonight, to keep track of the words while my slides are projected, I have made a list of the underlying beliefs that precede and guide a work's making.

For one, I believe in the importance of information that comes in through our skin. We forget that the border of our body is a membrane which mediates between an interior and an exterior. Living in an environment dominated by written and pictorial information, we forget the value of paying attention to the way things feel, to the emotional intelligence absorbed through our skin. My work is an attempt to articulate the language of that wisdom; it makes a place to experience and trust knowledge that is felt.

IN THIS ISSUE

A second strong belief underlying my work is the value of hand labor and the value of laboring together. There's a certain way that you know somebody when you sit and chop onions and cry together, or when you scrub teeth, or put paprika on the walls, or lay linotype, or any of the many processes that are involved in the installation work I do. An easy conversation and community evolves out of the labor along with a satisfaction in touching things. Annie Albers wrote that much schizophrenic behavior comes because people don't have contact with materials from their raw state through a whole process. We're "mid-slot" in so many ways. But in my work I go through a whole process. There is something fundamentally satisfying about it. The process of making the work and transforming materials establishes a living relationship with the things being touched.

Another value behind my work is the importance of the *relationships between* rather than the *characteristics of* the particular objects. The work is structured so that each element is meaningful in its relationship to all of the other elements, and not as an isolated thing. If one is taken out, the relationship collapses. The elements include materials from a natural system or process—often materials that already exist, gathered leaves, for instance. Other elements may be mechanical, like machines or pumps. Often an "image tender," an actual person, occupies the work for long periods of time and keeps it alive. All the elements in the piece are interdependent. It's through the relationship among all these parts that I pose a question or an attitude, and one that, I hope, is non-hierarchical.

Sometimes my work speaks to the losses in seeing things as "human-centered." The systems we use to orient ourselves are human-dominated. I try to give voice to the knowledge that comes through systems and materials that are not culturally constructed.

Maybe the most important value on my list is the importance of knowing where our feet are. We spend most of our time up in our heads. So much information enters and exits through our eyes and ears and mouths that everything gets focussed high up in the body and we lose track of where our feet are, where the ground is. In my work I often place materials under foot, on the floor. For example, ten tons of linotype became a bed of language under your feet as you walked across the gallery space. Things that seep in through our feet have a voice and an intelligence that we can't know when we're all centered towards the top. One thing I've found in actually being in my work is the value of standing still. It's very hard to stop acting and stand still and feel where our feet are. Thinking about our feet acknowledges personal and private experience. We each feel through our skin very individually. We live in a time when rapidly changing events surround us in the news, so much of which is factual. An individual voice is lost. Maybe one way to get it back is through the skin and through the feet.

My list seems so simple. But the simplest concerns can contain the most important ideas about a way of being in the world.

Next on my list is something I heard over and over as a kid—the way something occurs is as important, or more important, than what actually gets produced. When I think back on past projects, I often don't remember the images as well as I remember the relationships, which is sort of ironic, because at the time I work so hard to give a piece life, to make the image alive. In retrospect, though, what survives besides the snapshots are the stories of how the piece was made. In one piece, I remember the satisfaction of tending sheep—going in everyday, naming them, and in naming them creating a relationship with and responsibility to them. I remember the stories of all the individual people who participated in the process and all the time they contributed to make the piece possible. I think the power wasn't really in the image but in the felt presence of all the energy that was concentrated in the place.

These are the underlying values and ethics that motivate my work. I've learned them by watching how the work operates, by paying attention to when things seem to work and when they don't. My best barometer has been my stomach. When the relationship's wrong or I'm too willful or too forceful, I get a big knot in my stomach, and then I know I need to stop. So, maybe it's appropriate for me to be doing this Kitchen Project.

The images in my work are of whole systems that contain the animal and the human and the mechanical. A piece is not just what is presented at the opening. A piece is the all of the process, where materials come from, how the piece is taken care of when it's on public view, and how the materials are recirculated or recycled when it's taken down. At the same time, I've felt a frustration that the systems don't go beyond the frame of an art context. Even though the work engages real systems, it still exists within the frame of the art gallery or the museum, which comes with a set of assumptions and habits of viewing. How do the metaphors inside a piece, inside a museum affect what is outside. With the Kitchen Project, I'm interested in how to move toward a more concrete interaction with existing systems.

When I was growing up, my father worked hard in a corporation where much of his day was spent shuffling papers and talking on the phone—managing production, but not directly making. It was hard to understand what he did. In contrast, I remember how I would attach myself to the stone masons, wallpaper hangers, and painters who came to work in our home. What they did was real and tangible to me. I was led to installation work by a need to participate in the world through directly making, touching, transforming material. To enter into an installation is to become part of it. It is an inclusive form. Increasingly, I have been frustrated by the frame and structure of art institutions. Being at the Headlands is part of pushing at that frame and moving ideas into a larger context. I have absolutely no answers, but a lot of hunches. I am going on the barometer of my stomach.

This brings me to the Kitchen Project. The first thing that brought me to this project was the community that is so

important at the Headlands, and, indeed, the community here has formed the most satisfying part of working on the project.

The second thing that brought me here, though, was my interest in extending beyond metaphor and into real systems—a desire to make things functional. I'm concerned with the economics of how things are consumed and how they are produced. Many systems—water, heating—come together in a kitchen. All of a sudden I had very real questions. What would we do about water? What are we going to do with gray water? How do we get rid of wastes? What about composting? How will this place be heated? Normally it's very cold here. For me it's essential that in any kitchen you be able to lie on the floor comfortably, and not be huddled up and contained physically. The Kitchen Project is not a *picture* of a functioning environment, it has to really function. It has a real economy. It allows me to extend the thinking that is at work metaphorically in my installations into something with a real concrete process.

Working on the Kitchen Project has spoiled me by giving me an opportunity to respond to a place through all four seasons. I decided that it only made sense to work with food through all the cycles. Being here through a whole year, allowed me to delve into the history of this place. The military that brought these buildings into existence is only a small part of the history. I asked, how could the Kitchen Project bring back some of the other history that you feel when you walk on the land. How did the Miwok Indians live and survive here? What are the other histories of this land?

The first step in my process here was to spend time walking. The first three months I walked over the landscape, and I went to the Farmers Market in San Rafael twice a week. Normally, when I get up in the morning, I do all the organizational stuff we all do—talk on the phone, work on the computer—and I know how I feel by about noon. When I switched all that around and started by going to the market, I had a completely different attitude toward the day. All this seemed important to the Kitchen Project because it is about making a place that encourages us to take time. So, I allowed myself to take time for that kind of research. (Of course, I felt incredibly guilty about it because I wasn't producing anything.) I spent time attending to the kind of will I would employ in the work. One kind of will gets things done with real commitment and vision; another kind forces things and, in the end, is very destructive. The feeling that came through my feet with all the walking is a conviction that if there's art in this project, it is in the activity and the life and the conversation the project can foster. What I want to embed in the space is something invisible. It's not necessarily the design of the benches or the tables; I don't necessarily want your attention on the physical details. What's really important in the Mess Hall is what it allows and how it makes you feel.

The task has been a big one for me because it is trusting and inviting the invisible. How can a place be made that encourages and allows people to come together. How does the design of a space fulfill the simultaneous and often contradictory needs for chaos and order ... for the need to be alone and the need to be together. What kind of spaces are comfortable to be in?

Initially, one question dominated my thoughts: how could I establish a living system in a kitchen that serves a transient population, a population that doesn't have time to be tending things all the time. No one actually lives in this building. In fact, during the hundred years of the military history of this place, people didn't necessarily come to live here by choice—they were assigned here. To some extent, my project has to counteract that influence. Taking care of a kitchen will probably mean some structural changes in the Headlands as an organization. When artists come here now, we're all incredibly spoiled. We come, we have all this space, and we do whatever we want. But, what do we give back? That's where the real relationship begins. Part of making a kitchen is making systems that need to be tended. When you live with a kitchen you have to maintain its systems; you can't just go in, use it, and leave. Other questions I've had while working on the kitchen are: What kind of seating? What kind of tables? What kind of lighting will allow one to retain a sense of individuality within a group? How can the space be allowing rather than determining? How can it invite rather than instruct? And how can it provide information without telling information?

The project took a real turn for me when I met Allen Scott who builds brick ovens and bakes bread. As I faced concrete questions like how to heat the space and how to meet both commercial restaurant and historical codes, I began looking at existing restaurant equipment. Most of it is stainless steel, and it just felt wrong. We didn't need just a restaurant kitchen, though it needed to function for restaurant chefs at various times. We needed smells and surfaces that are alive, porous, and responsive. I visited Allen's place several times, and one time had the opportunity to help make bread. There I found an environment far from stainless steel. I had the same feeling I had about going to the Farmers Market. I knew I was on to something. It felt right. So at that point the plans for the kitchen began to include having a brick oven at one end where a real economy may grow, a bakery. From the oven, the smell of bread will circulate up the stairway to reach the offices and studios above.

Work on the Mess Hall is proceeding in the belief that if one touches things enough times with an appropriate and tending attitude, a transformation occurs. The effect is cumulative. Right now a lot of people inside and outside the immediate Headlands community are working to give the space a new life. It happens one gesture at a time. One small decision . . . of paint color, of material, of hardware . . . follows another to slowly form the whole. There are many invisible factors—ineffable or magic. You can intend to make a community, you can bring people into a room, and say "we want to have a community." But that doesn't make it happen. There are always gaps between intention and hope and value. How do you nur-

ture or tend something into being? For me, now, the project is just about working. It's being here and working.

Wes Jackson

They say that every speech ought to have a story, so I've got a couple of stories. Did you all read in *Time Magazine* about the thirteen-year olds from six different countries who were given a math test? The Koreans scored highest on the test, and our kids came in last. Well, that was the good news. Each was also asked to agree or disagree with the statement: "I am good in mathematics." This time, 23% of the Koreans agreed, and 68% of our kids did. Now, there's nothing like doing bad and feeling good about it. They're not alone, these thirteen year olds. I think the story describes where our culture is—that is, we're doing bad in about every way you can imagine, and, somehow or another, we keep feeling good about ourselves. Part of my job is to reverse that feeling.

It's not all bad to be unhappy with our nation, an empire in decline. If we could become sufficiently humble, it would be all right. But I'm afraid we won't. We'll probably just keep on saying that we're OK.

The other day I was talking with a fellow, a geophysicist at the Environmental Protection Agency, who is studying global warming. For some three or four hours I quizzed him on how we will know if the sea level rises. How will we know that carbon is accumulating in the atmosphere and is causing the world to get warmer? Where are your probes? How do you calibrate your instruments? He said it's really tough. We really don't know. For instance, the entire northeastern part of the United States is still rebounding from the last glacier. The glacier 15,000 years ago retreated, and all those places—Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont—are on a rebound. On the other hand, down in the southeastern part of the United States, the ocean level is subsiding. Sea level at the equator in the Pacific is higher than it is on the Atlantic side because of the coriolis effect, that is, the earth turning and piling up against the continents. So, we really don't know what sea level is. Furthermore, we don't know what's happening to the ice at the poles. Ice at the poles could actually be accumulating at the very time that the globe is warming. So, defining sea level becomes an extremely complicated problem, which makes me come to the conclusion that the only laws that are constant are moral laws.

It seems to me that we have to come to terms with the basis of our knowledge in the modern world. Back in the early 1600s Francis Bacon said that we must bend nature to our will. And Rene Descartes agreed, saying that the way to bend nature to our will is to place priority on the parts of things over the whole. In other words, if you really want to know something, ignore the whole and get to the subunits. This became the modern world view on how to understand the world, the beginning of modern science. Descartes went on to say, in his *Discourse on Method*, that the more he sought to inform himself, the more he realized how ignorant he was. Now, rather than regard this as an apt description of the human condition, and a very proper result of a good education, Descartes thought it was correct. The modern world view is that what we know through our ignorance is correct.

Now what does it mean for us, in the modern world, to acknowledge that we're fundamentally ignorant? First, I'll digress a little. In Salina, Kansas, the usual Chamber of Commerce boys wanted to foist on us prairie-billies a lead smelter. And, of course, they told us they knew how to handle lead, and there's nothing wrong with a lead smelter. But we managed to beat them back, partly because we pointed out that there's no known *safe* level of lead, and, besides, we don't know what the consequences might be. Afterward, I wrote a letter to the *Salina Journal*, told them about Bacon and Descartes, and suggested that we put a sign up on Interstate 70 coming into Salina: "Salina, population 40,000. A good place to live because we are ignorant and we know it."

Now, imagine if we were to do that all over the country. Good places to live because everybody acknowledges that they're ignorant. Wouldn't that be lovely? Think of the possibilities. Why can we not admit it? What would it do to our sense of who we are if we were to admit that kind of ignorance to ourselves?

Now, I want to back up. A damaging aspect of placing a priority on part over whole is the accompanying belief that the world is like the method. If you practice modern science and you want to get down to the parts, you believe that the world is like the method you're using to understand the world.

Let me back up again. We have atoms, molecules, cells, tissues, organs, organ systems, organisms, ecosystems—a hierarchy of structure. Among scientists, too, we have given high standing to physicists, and then to chemists, and then biologists, and, finally, you get all the way down to the scientists who have the lowest standing, those who study ecosystems. That's a pecking order. Think about it. A physicist from Harvard? Whew! That's the top. And, how about the person who studies ecosystems—what else does *he* do, maybe work at MacDonald's? So, here we have the belief that the world is like the method.

An alternative view, proposed by Levins and Lewontin at Harvard (*The Dialectical Biologist*), takes a dialectical approach, and assumes an interpenetration between part and whole: whole affects part, and part affects whole. Lewontin and Levins are careful not to say the world is like the method. For the world to be like their method, they would have to have the mind of God. We will never have a method that's like the world. We're mortals.

Now my friend Wendell Berry has carried this thinking beyond the dialectical, to what he calls the "conversationalist." He talks about a conversation with nature. In his words, a conversationalist approach

> ...would not impose its vision and its demands upon a world that it conceives of as a stockpile of

raw material, inert and indifferent to any use that may be made of it. It would not proceed directly or soon to some supposedly ideal state of things.

A conversationalist would not assume that there is an ideal state of things. A conversationalist

> . . . *would* proceed directly and soon to serious thought about our condition and our predicament. On all farms, farmers would undertake to know responsibly where they are and to "consult the genius of the place." They would ask what nature would be doing there if no one were farming there. They would ask what nature would permit them to do there, and what they could do there with the least harm to the place and to their natural and human neighbors. And they would ask what nature would *help* them to do there. And after each asking, knowing that nature will respond, they would attend carefully to her response. The use of the place would necessarily change, and the response of the place to that use would necessarily change the user.

You see how he goes beyond the merely brittle dialectical? And the view is a total repudiation of the Baconian-Cartesian view.

> The conversation itself would thus assume a kind of creaturely life, binding the place and its inhabitants together, changing and growing to no end, no final accomplishment that can be conceived or foreseen.
>
> Farming in this way, though it certainly would proceed by desire, is not visionary in the political or utopian sense. In a conversation, you always expect a reply. And if you honor the other party to the conversation, if you honor the *otherness* of the other party, you understand that you must not expect always to receive a reply that you foresee or a reply that you will like. A conversation is immitigably two-sided and always to some degree mysterious; it requires faith.

So, to move from subjugation of nature, which is what Bacon proposed, to a dialectical relationship, and finally to a conversation with nature is progress of the highest order. Berry makes no assumption that our knowledge is adequate, but, rather, that all that is available is a continuing conversation.

What impresses me about Ann's work, based on the discussions I've had with her and what I've seen so far, is its sense of continuing conversation.

An attitude of conversation is also what stands behind the work at the Land Institute, where we are building an agriculture based on the prairie as an analogy. We are working to develop perennial grain crops grown in mixtures that use the native prairie as the analogy. On our place we have a hundred acres of native prairie that has never been plowed, that has been there since the retreat of the ice. We make the assumption that the vegetative structure on that prairie is the best suggestion for the possibilities of a sustainable agriculture. That prairie runs on sunlight. That prairie actually accumulates soil, or ecological capital. That prairie has legumes and grasses, most of which fix nitrogen [*Editor's note: to "fix nitrogen" is to convert it into stable, biologically assimilable compounds.*] Seventy-eight percent of the atmosphere is nitrogen, but nitrogen has one of the strongest bonds in nature, and a lot of energy is needed to make it available. In fact, in America's fields, 1.8 times as much energy is used to make nitrogen available as is used to run our tractors. Because there is species diversity on that prairie there is chemical diversity, and an insect or pathogen would have to have a tremendous enzyme system to be able to mow down all that chemical diversity.

What we do at the Institute is clip the above-ground plant material and sort it into grasses and legume family-ness and sunflower family-ness and others. We try to plan perennials that are isomorphic with the vegetative structure of that native prairie.

Jack Ewell, a friend of mine at the University of Florida, is working on tropical forests and is looking at succession after the "slash and burn" clearing that is used down there. In an area that has been cleared, a certain succession is characteristic as the vegetation comes back—some weedy type things first, and very quickly the vegetation gets back to what you might call almost a climax community. For ten years Jack and his colleagues studied that succession. Then they cleared an area for themselves, not far from another cleared place. Then, in their area, they planted an analog to what nature was doing in the other. They mimicked nature tree for tree, vine for vine, shrub for shrub. And, by the way, one rule was that they had to include a plant in their mimic even if it could not have got there on its own. What the team found was that they were almost always, not always, but almost always rewarded with the functions needed for productivity—resistance to insects and pathogens, soil-holding capability, an ability to get rid of water.

Jack's work is similar to the kind of work we're doing on the prairie, and both satisfy the three criteria: What was here? What will nature require of us here? And what will nature help us to do here? The work requires a conversation.

What is needed in agriculturists of the future is minds like Gilbert White, an 18th Century British naturalist who had a constant interaction with the environment. I imagine a thought-intensive agriculture, rather than a chemical- or energy-intensive agriculture.

The Wendell Berry quotation is from his essay, "Nature as Measure," published in What Are People For, *North Point Press, 1990.*

A Savings Bank for the Soul

Elaine Heumann Gurian

The following remarks were prepared for a keynote speech at the Museums Australia Inc. 1996 Conference, Thursday, October 30, 1996. They are published here with permission from Elaine Heumann Gurian.

Within widely divergent parts of our society a feeling is growing that we, as citizens, must balance individualism with group adherence and independence with compliance. In order for civility to prevail—and it must—we must celebrate diligence and discipline as we celebrate spontaneity and individual creativity. We must not allow repression but neither can we condone chaos. We must ascribe to some core orderliness in our families, our cities, and our society.

Excessive individualism is a danger for the society as a whole and for each of us within it. We seem to have upset an important balance needed to ensure a safe society—one that celebrates the contribution and creativity of the individual while remaining respectful of the past and the customs that provide a necessary anchor and stability in our land. The loss of respect for authority and for adherence (within some deviation) to expected norms, leads individuals to act on whim with no attendant responsibility for the consequences of their actions.

In response, many of us are revaluing the collective in all its forms—organizations, families, neighborhoods, and even ad hoc groups. While not always benign (such groups can, by repression, coercion, and fear, cause widespread violence and destruction), they nonetheless—and for better or worse—shape our lives and our society.

Institutions of Memory

Some institutions, by their very existence, add to the stability of our society. The ones that store, collect, house, and pass along our past I call "institutions of memory." They include libraries, archives, religious organizations, sacred places, elders (especially in societies that value the passing of information in oral form), schools of all kinds, guilds and societies, courts and canons of law, historic houses, and museums.

Institutions of memory may not relate to one another in kind, history, structure, or use. What they have in common is that they represent or store the collective holdings of the past. They do so either for select groups or for society as a whole. Neither the method of storage nor the material stored (objects, buildings, words, sounds, music, places, images, etc.) is their common denominator. What unites these organizations is the responsibility to care for the memories of the past and make them available for our use.

Evidence indicates that we do not need to use the organization in question to value its existence and wish for its continuity. We believe, for example, that any church is an important institution even if we are nonbelievers or lapsed attendees. While not blinded by their imperfections, still we want them around and in good working order so that we can call upon them when we are in need. You might think of institutions of memory as savings banks for our souls.

Disturbing incidents exemplify the importance people ascribe to repositories of history. Why did the Muslims and the Croats, with their limited resources, choose to destroy historic places of their enemies? Surely these sites were not military targets. Why did the Russians on the second day of the socialist revolution declare that all historic places and religious buildings were to be preserved and not damaged by those who were overthrowing the government even though the revolutionaries did not approve of religious practice and hated the czar's buildings? Why did we force native children to separate from their families and give up all recognizable tribal forms in boarding schools of the early twentieth century?

More positive circumstances also reveal the value we place on these institutions. Why do some native communities use drumming circles in conjunction with alcohol rehabilitation? Why does a majority of the U.S. electorate approve of funding for the arts and humanities despite being upset by specific examples of artistic excess? Why does a current survey of the Detroit metropolitan community show that the public approves of the African American Museum and believes it should receive municipal funding when, at the same time, most respondents say that they are unlikely to visit? Why does a recent survey show that minority tourist travelers in this country chose historic venues as a highly valued destination even when the places visited do not relate specifically to their history?

These examples tell us that, implicitly, we understand that institutions of memory are important to our collective well-being. Accordingly, we must begin to discuss the preservation of these organizations not because they add to the "quality of life," or to "lifelong learning" opportunities or to "informal education" venues (though they do all that), but because without them, we come apart.

"Congregant Behavior"

Ensuring the continuity of our institutions of memory by strengthening their core functions of preservation and education is still not enough to guarantee civility or our collective safety. These enterprises can also purposefully create safe spaces for congregating and, by encouraging

the active use of these spaces, can foster the rebuilding of community.

We, as human beings, like and even need to be in the presence of others. This does not mean we have to know the other people or interact directly with them. Just being in their proximity gives us comfort and something to watch. Further, we will travel to places where other people gather. Being with others is an antidote to loneliness. Human beings get lonely. Many other animals do too. I call this going-to-be-with-others activity "congregant behavior."

Consider the many group activities we participate in. At some, the actions of the group are coordinated and synchronous such as pep and political rallies, athletic and music events, religious observances, performances and movies. At other times, we expect the people we encounter to be mostly peaceable strangers. The actions of the participants are uncoordinated and independent one from another. Occasions like visiting museums, going shopping and browsing at shopping malls, markets, carnivals and fairs fall into this category. However, in each case, the expectation that others will be present contributes to the pleasurable anticipation.

Yet while some congregant behavior is mild mannered and peaceable, some leads to violence. People in crowds can egg each other on. Crowd behavior can be more dramatic and more volatile than the individual might wish. Group activity has inherent within it the risk that it might devolve into violence, riots, or stampedes.

Our current American society still evidences some sense of responsibility toward the collective whole and to individual strangers. Witness how Americans continue to respond to emergencies and tragedies, where most, but not all, of the time strangers help each other. Think also of "line" or "queue" etiquette in America where strangers hold each other's place.

Reclaiming Community

Encouraging places for peaceful congregant behavior is one of the essential elements of reestablishing community. Various trends point to a growing public interest in the reestablishment of functioning communities that include opportunities for enhanced congregant behavior.

- Development moguls are building planned communities that encourage foot traffic and look like the reconstruction of a village of our memories.
- Front porches are being brought back, and whole neighborhoods are adding them to their existing homes.
- Shopping malls have (both intentionally and inadvertently) been adding physical amenities such as play spaces, stages, and "outdoor" cafes. Malls are the places where moms go in the winter to let their homebound children run around, where heart patients walk to improve their cardiovascular activity, where health and voter organizations set up information booths, and where local arts groups perform.
- It is increasingly common for eating establishments to attract customers by putting porch furniture on the sidewalk (sometimes in unlikely and unattractive locations) during good weather.
- Bars have been upgraded from less savory institutions to havens for everyone, drinkers or not. They have been memorialized by TV series to underscore their neighborliness.
- Coffee bars have appeared in the midst of every social gathering place. They serve as an anchor for new mega-bookshops, transforming the activity of book-buying into a new way to interact with friends, families, and strangers.
- Towns and cities are holding annual invented happenings that take on new public celebratory dimensions. For example, Boston's First Night—a series of free events in the city's core that provides multigenerational groups a safe and entertaining New Year's Eve—is being replicated in many places.

At the same time that new opportunities for congregant activity are being created, isolation and a feeling of personal danger is increasing.

- The gulf between the rich and the poor is growing. The poor are less able to survive unaided, and the evidence of their poverty (homelessness and begging) is more apparent for all to see.
- The rise of technological systems (the virtual world) is making it possible for more and more people to work by themselves, connected to others only electronically.
- The population of the country is getting older, and the elderly are becoming more isolated.
- Chain stores are homogenizing most retail experiences with a loss of local or regional particularity.
- Loyalty to one's employees and employers is eroding, and people are changing jobs more frequently than before.
- Certain areas of our cities are unsafe for everyone, especially their inhabitants.
- News agencies focus on sensational, pessimistic, disillusioning, or tragic matters over which we have no personal power. We feel less in control of our destiny than ever.

In revaluing community, we seek environments that we can personally affect. We wish to be known to our neighbors and service providers. We wish to be free of personal danger, and during some of our time we wish to be in the safe company of others.

Many people are choosing to move their office/home to smaller communities because, with technological ad-

vances, they can do their work anywhere. So many workers are moving that they are affecting secondary markets—the rise of mail order, the decline of the clothing industry, the creation of specialized magazines, and changing real estate values.

The Internet has encouraged many interest-based bulletin boards that function as a new community form with an emphasis on helpfulness. New communities are created technologically by virtual members who sit home alone working.

In 1969, Alistair Cooke said in a radio broadcast,

> "...middle-class standards, as they were planted and have grown everywhere in this country, are the ones that have kept America a going concern. It is time to grit the teeth slightly, prepare for a shower of eggs, and say what those standards are: Fair wages for good work. Concern for the family and its good name. A distrust of extremes and often, perhaps, a lazy willingness to compromise. The hope of owning your own house and improving it. The belief that the mother and father are the bosses, however easygoing, of the household and not simply pals. A pride in the whole country, often as canting and unreasonable as such patriotism can be. Vague but stubborn ideas about decency. An equally vague but untroubled belief in God. A natural sense of neighborliness, fed by the assumption that your neighbor is much like you and is willing to share the same laws . . . or lend you a mower, a hammer, or a bottle of milk."[1]

Cooke may have been talking about middle class values or, as I suspect, he may have been speaking about a core set of American values that many aspired to regardless of economic status. In any case, it may be the reassertion of these values, with all their imperfections, that is emerging nationwide again.

Possible Next Steps

Now what does all of this have to do with those long-established institutions of memory? If we believe that congregant behavior is a human need and also that all civic locations offer opportunities for people to be with and see other people, then why not challenge institutions not previously interested in communal activity to build programs that encourage more civil interaction.

Civic institutions can aspire to become one of the community's few safe and neutral congregant spaces. If we, in institutions of memory, do our work well, all members of society—no matter what ethnic, racial, or economic group they belong to—could be made to feel welcome. In order to create such a safe environment we must look at the most subtle aspects of our presentations. Do the building guards think all people are equally welcome? Does the signage use words that assume a certain education level or specialized knowledge. Can a non-English speaker decode the message? Are staff members sufficiently representative so the public has a sense that everyone is not only welcome but potentially understood. Are employees sensitized to the many acceptable, though culturally specific, ways of acting when in a public space?

Many churches, museums, schools, and libraries, are serving as forums and umbrellas for debate that foster balanced conversations on issues of the day. These places create an atmosphere that allows colloquies to take place. Sometimes the debate shows up in physical form, such as a bulletin board or exhibition; sometimes it is transient and oral. The programs stem from a belief that "town hall" is an appropriate role for all institutions of memory.

We could, if we wished, create in our institutions occasions that turn strangers into acquaintances. Robert D. Putnam, in his piece "Bowling Alone," tells us that today more people than ever go to bowling alleys but fewer go as members of bowling teams. Putnam uses this example to maintain that people today choose individualism over group camaraderie. Using his analogy, could we redefine the meaning of "group" to include all who go to the bowling alley at any particular time? Then we could begin to program activities for transient and even unintentional aggregations, but groups nevertheless. What if the bowling alley owner encouraged group cohesion by setting up teams for an evening, giving out team clothing, giving all players name tags, changing playing partners every once in a while, etc.? (He might even find his business' bottom line enhanced.)

What if our organizations intentionally enhanced the formation of group cohesion and responsibility? Docent-led groups in historic houses could begin by having the unrelated individuals introduce themselves to each other. We could locate our cafes in the heart of the functioning institution rather than on the periphery. The Walker Museum of Art in Minneapolis, for example, embedded a period café within an exhibition and found that strangers began to discuss the exhibition. In all our eating establishments we could set up a table reserved for single strangers to share a meal, as they do in private clubs.

Let us examine our "company culture"—the internal climate of our public enterprise—as another approach to building safer spaces for the public. It is probable that the public intuits the internal climate. Simplistically, if the staff cares for each other, visitors will feel the staff loves them. If the internal administrative process is arbitrary and biased, if respect for the value of each employee is not the norm, if the internal discourse is allowed to be abusive, then no matter what we do with our program, the public will remain cynical and on edge.

The converse is also true. If our program is a little ragged but our spirit is enthusiastic; if we are really happy to

Continued on page 23

[1]Cooke, Alistair, "'Eternal Vigilance'—By Whom?", The Americans, Berkeley Books, New York, 1979, p. 30.

A Grantmaker's Goodbye

June 11, 1996

Alberta Arthurs

After fourteen years as director for arts and humanities, Alberta Arthurs left the Rockefeller Foundation on August 30, 1996. During her tenure at the foundation, she oversaw its national and international programming in culture and scholarship. At her last presentation to the foundation's board of trustees, Arthurs made the following remarks. They are published here with her permission.

•

I'm going to talk about three things.

First, I want to remind you about what we do in the arts and humanities division, a brief and proud update of what we stand for.

Second, I'll sketch the environment in the arts and humanities as we are experiencing it today—from attacks to ovations, the best and the worst of what we face in the disciplines.

Third, I want to sound an alert about the future.

•

First: What we do in the arts and humanities division:

Many of you will remember the presentation with slides that we made last March about the history of arts and humanities funding at the Foundation. We showed you the continuities across time in the work we do, and located our current guidelines within that history. We described three enduring tenets of Rockefeller's work in the arts and humanities.

Our work in culture is grounded in what Abraham Flexner called an "assertive humanism." That is, arts and humanities funding has consistently been tied to contemporary issues and ideas and events. And so it is today.

An animating concern in arts and humanities funding has been the discovery of American values and the American imagination. That is true today.

And, another animating concern has been the crossing of global divides through the arts and humanities. And that, also, animates us in the 1990s.

The funding we do today fits our history and reflects realities of our own time. The current strategy in the division is merely a modern manifestation of what we do over time at the Rockefeller Foundation. The strategy—"understanding and engaging difference across changing societies through the arts and humanities"—targets efforts that address difference and foster understanding across divides of culture, class, ethnicity, and tradition. These are dividing times, and this is the right address for us now. As the Foundation's 1995 annual report states, "In times of transition or upheaval, when governments, scientists, and economists have struggled to make sense of fragile social connections and institutions, societies have ultimately looked to their artists and scholars to understand the past, critique the present, and imagine what might lie ahead."

These ideas characterize all our programs. We fund cultural institutions in Africa that fortify the civil society—publishers, independent radio, museums, the expressive arts. Domestically, we fund cultural initiatives that probe difference and mobilize it for community building—programs such as our Multi-Arts Program (MAP) and Partnerships Affirming Community Transformation (PACT), as well as through programs for festivals and museums. We fund scholars who are developing new knowledge about difference; about the past, about policy, about current practice. We fund Muslim thinkers and artists who are reaching across and outside their own transforming societies.

Through it all, it occurs to me, we are struggling to express ourselves in the limited language of grantmakers, the jargon of philanthropy. The scholar/critic Robert Hughes recently offered these words, which say it better. He is talking about the arts—but what he says is equally true of the humanities. He writes, this is "the field on which we place our own dreams, thoughts, and desires alongside those of others, so that solitudes can meet, to their joy sometimes, or to their surprise, and sometimes to their disgust. When you boil it all down, that is the social purpose of art: the creation of mutuality, the passage from feeling into shared meaning."

When you boil it all down, I think that's what we're after in the arts and humanities division.

•

Let me now try to carry this description of what we do into a description of the current environment of the arts and humanities today. Small as we are, this Foundation is perceived as a key player in the arts and humanities, both in the U.S. and abroad. We are not passive grantmakers; we work aggressively within the climate of the arts and humanities. We are affected by it; we also influence it. We breathe the same air as the artists and the scholars that we fund.

In the United States, the infrastructure that has nurtured and supported the arts and humanities for the last thirty years is changing dramatically. The framework of service organizations, advocacy initiatives, and grantmakers—the vast national network of support for the arts and humanities that has been in place, is threatened and wearing thin. Until recently, we have maintained a well inte-

grated, highly complex cultural structure, a delicate balance of private and public interests. During that thirty-year span, dance and opera companies, regional theaters and symphony orchestras, were created; museum attendance soared; public education programs, television and media programming, literature and history initiatives, research institutes, and fellowship opportunities grew. Public leadership roles were assumed by the National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities, and by state, regional, and local public agencies. The Rockefeller Foundation played a significant role in all of this.

But both the priority for culture and the infrastructure that supports it have been shaken in recent upheavals. The National Endowments have lost half of their staffs and forty percent of their budgets. Many state and other public agencies are reducing their arts funding. A recent study commissioned by the Rockefeller Foundation shows that private funding will not increase; it may diminish, in fact. Many of the institutions that stabilize the arts and humanities are without leaders, or they are reorganizing. Advocacy efforts have been dispirited. Confidence is low; the culture-suspicious right seems to make gain after gain.

We speak in cliché about "culture wars," and hoist Mapplethorpe, Serrano, the history standards, the Enola Gay emblematically. But those of us close to these skirmishes believe that the condition of the arts and humanities today has much less to do with the economy, or the appropriate dispersal of tax money, or with charges of obscenity, or with standards of selection, than it does with the fear that creative people often engender when they raise questions, exemplify fresh ideas, or when they speak to issues of diversity. Artists and scholars probe as a profession. Many others find such probes discomforting, especially in uncertain times.

The Foundation's stance through these difficult times has been to stand firm. We have maintained our commitment to new—and often controversial—work by artists and scholars. We fund the development of new ideas and new scholarly specialities; we invite proposals that cut the edge and escape the envelope. We have defended the rights of artists and scholars to express themselves without legal or political restriction. We work with other grantmakers and a range of other agencies to improve the climate for the arts and humanities, and to try to increase funding for them. We support freedom of opinion, the diversity of voices and modes of expression; we support difference, as our guidelines say.

We would be a sad and inconsistent institution if we didn't do these things at home, because they are precisely the values and goals that define our arts and humanities work abroad, in countries and regions of Africa, Latin America, and the Muslim world. It is still true that in many of the places where we work, artists and intellectuals and their institutions revere and even envy the funding support and freedom from interference that they know their American peers enjoy. And our programs abroad are precisely intended to provide such support for such striving artists and scholars and their institutions. We provide financial support, and we find funding partners to increase that support. But, more critically, our programs abroad are meant to support the often fragile civil societies within which these artists and intellectuals function. Ironically, even as we face ignorance and cutbacks and intolerance at home, the U.S. continues to set the standard in much of the third world for cultural freedom, creative independence, and respect for diversity. We forget that standard at our peril, as a country and also as a foundation.

It may seem as though I just slipped rather easily in these remarks from a description of support for the arts and humanities to a defense of freedom of expression and diversity. But, in fact, the two are quite closely related. When funding is tight, free expression is expensive; when federal funding is restricted (both in amount and in its conditionalities, as it is right now), full expression has to be ensured by the larger society. Free expression or full expression, is—very simply—the provision of a range of voices, of diverse opinion and experience. It is diversity that is at risk when support is restricted.

This seems to be a time when we'll be tested on these values, as a country and as a foundation. But it is a time among many; that is, time and again, the United States seems to have moved from periods of expansion and openness, to periods of closure and consolidation, or conservatism. In this period of conservatism, the best course for the Rockefeller Foundation is surely to be steady and undeviating in our attention to the kinds of artists and scholars that our programs identify—those who are quizzing contemporary systems vigorously, using their talents to interpret inherited ideas, and struggling to understand and to engage diversity. This is also the right course for us abroad. And by staying on this course, I'd say that we are simply being staunch. More than this is required of the people we fund; some of whom, just in doing their work, are being heroic.

And, also, hopeful. Many us are actually being hopeful; a state of mind which, surprisingly, is also caused by the current environment in the arts and humanities. For despite funding shortfalls, conservative assaults, structural difficulties, both in the United States and in the other places we work, it is impossible to support the arts and humanities without feeling privileged, gratified, and even hopeful.

First of all is the quality of the product. The arts and humanities are at a level of activity and accomplishment throughout this country and in other places that is continually inspiring, illuminating—and relevant. One week recently in New York I saw a new dance-piece by Donald Byrd and his company called "The Beast," a wrenching, brutal, heart-stopping piece about domestic violence. The same week I saw a workshop of a new opera by composer John Duffy and writer Joyce Carol Oates based on the accidental killing of a young woman by a famous U.S.

senator; the opera is about fame in America, about the limits of democratic idealism, the loss of the heroic. Last week we had a dozen humanist scholars at the foundation discussing the situation of the humanities in the U.S. today; they agreed on the vital relationship of the humanities to American citizenship, on the need to inspire "ethical intelligence" to meet the country's challenges. They agreed that historians, philosophers, and other scholars are critical to achieving new relationships in a changing world and must expand their roles as public intellectuals.

The scholars' intensity is replicated in Wole Soyinka's new play about ambition in Nigeria (which we hope to help bring to the States in the fall). Or in the sixty artistic and scholarly collaborations that will be selected for binational funding by the U.S.-Mexico Fund for Culture panels meeting in Mexico City next month; or in a traveling exhibition of contemporary artists of Islam which is being proposed under our Muslim initiative.

This is a wondrously productive time for artists and humanists. Wherever we fund, the artists and scholars lift us with their insights, their reciprocal spirit of learning and living, the light they shed on the darkness.

Another reason for hopefulness is the rising acknowledgment of the importance of cultural factors in political and economic sectors. I observe this evidence: a new report on culture and development released by UNESCO; a series at the Council on Foreign Relations on "culture and foreign affairs;" Sam Huntington's famously controversial article on the clash of civilizations as a defining characteristic of our time; a World Bank publication, *Culture and Development in Africa*; the advancing of "social capital" by Robert Putnam and others as a measure of success in community building . . . and there is more. Add it together, and what can be seen emerging is a new comprehension of culture and the importance of cultural considerations in the world today.

It remains to be seen what will be the most precise and useful contributions, of cultural specialists, historians and philosophers, interpretive social scientists and artists in development and community-building efforts. But we can only gain, I think, if social and cultural, religious and values orientations are more widely acknowledged in our efforts.

So the two fundamental ideas I would like to leave with you concerning the current condition of the arts and humanities are these: First, their perilous situation in terms of funding, advocacy, and administrative structures, both in this country and abroad. To this, Rockefeller's response must be ongoing, steady support, and leadership. Second, we must observe with wonder and admiration the vibrancy of the arts and humanities today, here and abroad. Here, Rockefeller's response must be to explore, as the artists and intellectuals themselves are, the contributions that culture can make to the emerging redefinitions of development and social change in our own country.

•

These observations bring me to the third topic I want to raise with you; that is, the future. Beyond what I've already said, I'd like to specify two particular challenges I see for the arts and humanities and for Rockefeller.

First, I believe that we can achieve much more impact from arts and humanities programming, indeed from all of our programming, if we can improve its distribution. There is new hope for achieving this through the new technologies if we investigate carefully and make appropriate investments in them. Traditionally, new ideas move slowly through scholarly journals and conferences and academic connections. It is certainly likely that many of the same new ideas and insights can be published, disseminated, and aggregated more effectively through electronic communication. It's time to try. Stage by stage by stage, the influence of even our most expressive artists infiltrate the society more slowly than they might on cable, the Internet, CD-ROMs, through media distribution. So far, too many of us alternate—as one scholar described it recently—between technophobia and cyber-euphoria. Somewhere between the two extremes lies a realm for us—the reasoned exploration of new distribution opportunities, a challenge to which we should commit ourselves soon as a Foundation.

Finally, I fear that we are slipping out of our real place in the world as the independent sector. By "we," I mean the not-for-profit sector, the nongovernmental sector generally, and the Rockefeller Foundation in particular. Looking for models for change, we are always tempted to look to the private sector for ideas; today the private sector is dazzling us with sound-bites about marketing, merging, downsizing, globalization, centralization, accountability. The private sector's vocabulary seeps into ours when we hear talk about "privatizing" cultural and social systems, for instance; or about industry being partners in science, social change, and higher education; or when we worry about the importance of public relations in the not-for-profit world. Borrowing ideas and inspiration is all well and good, and in difficult times like these we can use all the ideas and inspiration we can find. But business is, finally, present-minded, profit-minded, and dedicated to efficiency. And the independent sector, by contrast, exists to think long-term, to probe the unknown and reward the daring, to strengthen human dignity more than human efficiency. I think that the challenge for institutions like this one is to fly our standards in an increasingly corporatizing world, to be truly the alternative, the independent, sector, in the values we offer and the examples we set. We should say, loud and clear, what the best hopes are for mankind. We should resist ready influence and lesser challenge.

In my view, no institution in the not-for-profit world has the history that Rockefeller has in doing just this, and—therefore—no institution in the not-for-profit world has

Continued on page 27

Information on Arts Organizations

Why There Isn't Enough, a Plan for Getting More, and a Report on How Methodological Dilemmas Turned into Philosophical Questions before the Researchers' Eyes

Paul DiMaggio and Deborah Kaple

The Princeton University Center for Arts and Cultural Policy Studies began operations two years ago with start-up support from the Nathan Cummings Foundation and Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, and with Stanley Katz and Paul DiMaggio as Co-Chairs. Although our ambitions are more substantial—we plan to begin full-scale operations in fall 1997, when Katz returns to Princeton from his term as President of the American Council of Learned Societies—we decided to begin slowly, offering a few courses and working with graduate students at Princeton, organizing a series of seminars in Princeton and New York, and doing two small-scale studies aimed at assessing the resources available to people interested in asking, and answering with hard data, questions about the state of the arts in the contemporary United States. One study, an inventory of publicly available data sets containing information on individuals' attitudes towards and participation in the arts, was completed at the modest level intended.

The other—originally intended as a parallel assessment of data resources on arts organizations—took on a life of its own. With additional funding under a cooperative agreement with the NEA Research Division (which had conceived of a very similar project independently), the project developed into a report of more than 200 pages entitled *Data on Arts Organizations: A Review and Needs Assessment, with Design Implications*. The report discusses the strengths and weaknesses of existing sources of information and describes what more than sixty grantmakers, arts managers, and academic researchers told project interviewers about the ways in which they use such data and the information they wish they had. It also reports the results of a study that created lists of arts organizations in three metropolitan areas (Dallas/Fort Worth, Minneapolis/St. Paul, and Philadelphia) that were as comprehensive as possible, and then examined which organizations would be included in and excluded from hypothetical studies that rely on different sources of information to compile samples. Finally, our report develops recommendations and discusses alternatives for a unified data base on U.S. arts organizations that could serve as a source of reliable descriptive information, an early-warning system for trends, and a platform for more specialized research efforts on specific disciplines and on the arts in particular communities.

If we tried to summarize all this, we would quickly exhaust this newsletter's page constraints and, quite possibly, our readers' patience. Instead, we will use this opportunity to share a few results of our second study, reflect on some of the issues raised but not resolved in the course of our work, and discuss what we think is an opportunity in which private grantmakers can be key participants.

The Chronic Insufficiency of Information on the Arts

People involved in policy making and program design in such fields as health care or education are accustomed to having at their disposal extensive bodies of information on service-delivering organizations. By contrast, the data available to those of us who care about the arts is limited and of uneven quality. This problem is not a new one. When Frederick Keppel, head of the Carnegie Corporation (the foundation that was the original "fat boy in the canoe" of cultural philanthropy), was asked in 1930 to write a chapter on the arts for the report of President Hoover's Research Committee on Social Trends, the Committee's chair wrote to his presidential liaison that Keppel "has an exceedingly difficult subject to deal with, one where statistical evidence is extremely rare. I think therefore that not as much can be expected from . . . this subject as from others." Some thirty-five years later, when William Baumol and William Bowen published their classic study, *Performing Arts: The Economic Dilemma*, they reported that assembling data on arts organizations "turned out to be a task of enormous proportions. Seldom were the pertinent data readily available, and investigation showed that such figures as did exist were often unreliable. We had no choice, therefore, but to seek many of the requisite materials from primary materials wherever these could be found." Almost thirty years later, when Bowen and colleagues revisited the arts in research for their book *The Charitable Nonprofits*, they found that "it is virtually impossible to find consistent time-series data" of sufficient scope. "In the end, we concluded that the only alternative was to assemble the data ourselves."[1]

Both researchers and policy makers agree that information should be relevant to policy. So what do we mean when we speak of "policy-relevant" data? Several things: data must be reliably accurate (the *sine qua non*), compar-

[1]Quotations are fromWilliam A. Tobin, 1995, "Studying Society: The Making of *Recent Social Trends in the United States, 1929-1933*," *Theory and Society* 24: 537-65, p. 549; William J. Baumol and William G. Bowen, 1968 [1966], *Performing Arts: The Economic Dilemma*, Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, pp. 4-5; Bowen, William G., Thomas I. Nygren, Sarah E. Turner, and Elizabeth A. Duffy, 1994, *The Charitable Nonprofits*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, p. 235.

able across organizations (so we can assess developments in different fields), and comparable over time (so we can detect change). They must measure things that are important to managers, grantmakers, and policy makers. And they must be widely accessible and widely used, so that the payoff of having the data equals or exceeds the cost of collecting them. (It just isn't cost-efficient to invest a lot of money in collecting data that yield a single set of published tables. In this age of electronic communication, data can, and should, be made accessible to a wide range of potential users.)

We don't have such policy-relevant data on arts organizations today. (The NEA's *Survey of Public Participation in the Arts* does satisfy this standard for information on individual arts participation.) And the lack of reliable, generalizable information places arts policy makers and advocates at a great disadvantage, unable to answer many questions that fair-minded skeptics might pose. Are theaters growing or declining in number and level of activity? We can only guess on the basis on incomplete data. Have new dance companies been created at a faster rate than they have been disbanded in recent years? We don't know. How have trends in corporate (or government or individual) donations differed from discipline to discipline? We have partial information from some disciplines but not others. How have such trends differed between large and small organizations? We know virtually nothing about small organizations in most fields. How have the kinds of programs offered by nonprofit arts organizations changed? We know even less about what arts organizations do than about their finances. How many community organizations provide significant programs of training in visual arts or performance disciplines? We know virtually nothing about arts organizations outside the major disciplines except that there are a lot of them.

And because we have to answer such descriptive questions before we can answer more complicated questions of cause and effect, policy makers—both public and private—have little factual basis for anticipating the effects of their grants, or planning ways to use their resources as leverage. What is the relationship between the number and activity of arts organizations and the number of artists and rates of participation in the arts of different segments of the community? What strategic approaches are shared by arts organizations that succeed in reaching financial stability, or in broadening their audience? What is the long-term relationship between neighborhood arts resources and professional activity? Existing information provides little guidance.

Currently Available Data: A Very Partial View

Ironically, the problem is not too little data, or even poor data, but rather lots of information that is scattered, not comparable, and not very policy-relevant. What we concluded after many conversations with grantmakers and others about the data they need in their own work, and after interviewing staff involved in major ongoing data-collection efforts, is that there is a poor fit between the purposes for which data are now collected and the kinds of information needed to plan programs, make policies, and make convincing arguments on behalf of those policies.

Most data collection on arts organizations is undertaken by service organizations that represent the various arts disciplines. Most service organizations collect information from their members on a regular basis and some of them—the American Symphony Orchestra League, the Association of Art Museum Directors, the Theatre Communications Group, and one or two others—are very sophisticated about research. Such service organizations will play a central role in any overall research strategy, but as sole-source providers of information, their capacity is sharply limited by their missions. Because service organizations' research efforts appropriately focus on their members, and because their membership lists ordinarily are biased towards the larger organizations in their fields, the results cannot readily be generalized. (If we knew what the "universe" of such organizations looked like, we could adjust for the bias, but we don't.) Moreover, because data are collected primarily for internal use—often for such concrete purposes as networking, establishing benchmarks, and other forms of technical assistance—they do not yield extensive public reports, nor are they routinely documented and archived for use by researchers.

The most serious problem with placing data-collection responsibility in the hands of service organizations is that we know virtually nothing about the types of arts organizations that don't have service organizations with a strong data-gathering capacity. We have no information over time on jazz organizations, neighborhood arts centers, multidisciplinary organizations, choruses, folk art organizations, and many others, not because they are not important, but because no one has taken consistent responsibility for doing systematic research on them. (The project's work in Texas, Minnesota, and Philadelphia revealed that a researcher who relied on service-organization lists to compile a sample would miss about 80 percent of the arts organizations in active operation in those places, and almost 90 percent of those with budgets less than $100,000.)

This would be bad enough in normal times, but in the midst of the significant institutional changes that the arts are now undergoing, our failure to collect reliable information about organizations outside the typical disciplinary mold is particularly troublesome. Arts organizations in new and unconventional forms, artists working under the auspices of organizations that are not officially "arts organizations," many racially and ethnically specific artists and organizations, fall outside our data-gathering net. In attempting to use existing data systems to track critical ongoing transformations in the arts, we are like the drunk who looks for his lost wallet under the lamppost because "that's where the light is best."

A Census for Arts Organizations?

What is the solution? We propose a three-part information system: a unified data base providing limited information on a comprehensive list of arts organizations, supplemented by continuing programs of research on arts disciplines by the major service organizations and by research on the arts in local communities (from large cities to small rural areas) designed and undertaken by grassroots coalitions of private and public grantmakers, service organizations, and academic institutions.

The core of the plan, and the part that will take concerted action to implement, is the unified data base (affectionately known as "UDB" hereafter): as complete as possible an enumeration of arts organizations, updated annually, with a limited amount of information on each—for example, name, location, discipline, major program activities, operating expenditures, revenues (if possible, by source), staff size, and perhaps one or two other items. (We explicitly reject the alternative—pursued in fields like health care and higher education—of conducting massive annual surveys of all organizations, because respondent burden would be too high and because no one best system can meet the diverse needs of the field. Far better to create a tool that many users can employ—and extend with focussed, small-scale research—for their own purposes.) We would anticipate that the NEA Research Division would take the lead in developing such a resource, but that a broad public-private partnership, including private-sector grantmakers, would be actively engaged in the system's planning and design.

The UDB would have several significant payoffs:

1. Because it would be based on a comprehensive definition of the population of arts organizations, it would provide *the first reliable information on the composition of the formally organized portions of the arts sector*, illustrating the diversity and richness of the arts in the U.S.
2. It would provide *reliable trend data on the size of the arts sector and on rates of incorporation and death* by type of arts organization. This would enable us, for the first time, to observe change over time in the composition of the arts sector.
3. It would provide information on *change over time* in the basic data elements included in the system, for the sector as a whole and for subsectors.
4. Data would be made available electronically so that *even users with minimal research experience could quickly and easily answer simple questions online*, while more sophisticated users could download data for more complex analyses.
5. The data base would provide *a versatile platform for additional work*, enabling researchers in disciplinary service organizations or local communities to identify, stratify, and draw random samples of populations of arts organizations on the basis of any of the data elements included in the system. (Though technical and unglamorous, this last benefit may be the most important, for without the capacity to draw samples, no research can be generalized beyond the organizations contacted. An infrastructure of this kind will empower people in communities—geographic or artistic—that have not been able to afford research.)

Tools for Building a Unified Data Base

It would be impractical to create such a system from scratch, but fortunately we have resources upon which a comprehensive data base can build. As usual, these resources are flawed because they were created for other purposes. They have the potential, however, of permitting us to identify and even compile some information on most arts organizations, even relatively small ones.

The first of these sources is the IRS Exempt Organizations Business Master File (BMF), which contains information on all organizations that have received tax-exempt status under section 501(c)(3) of the IRS code. As the only national data base containing financial data on large numbers of nonprofit organizations, the BMF is a key building block for any comprehensive study. In our research on the three metropolitan areas, the BMF included almost half of the arts organizations we found (and was the only source with information on almost one in ten), comparing favorably in inclusiveness to other non-local sources.

The BMF has been hard to use because organizations were often misclassified and many defunct organizations remained in the data base. (These were minor flaws given the IRS's use of the information, but major ones for researchers.) Recently, however, the IRS has been working with the National Center for Charitable Statistics to adopt the National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities (the classification scheme developed by NCCS and the Foundation Center), to train its field agents to use this taxonomy properly, and to detect defunct organizations more quickly. Starting in 1996, the data quality is likely to be much improved.

The BMF will continue to be limited by the fact that nonprofits with annual revenues of $25,000 or less for three consecutive years need not file. This is not a comparative disadvantage, as coverage of such tiny organizations in other sources is almost as bad. In fact, our three-city study suggests that the BMF data base, even in its pre-1996 form, captures small organizations more effectively than other national sources. A more serious problem is that the BMF does not include arts organizations that are part of larger non-arts organizations, such as university art museums, or arts education programs within community organizations that are not primarily devoted to the arts.

For this reason, it would be desirable to supplement the BMF list of arts organizations with information from the National Standard for Arts Information that the National

Assembly of State Arts Agencies (NASAA) administers in cooperation with the NEA. The National Standard grants management system reports information on arts activities according to a sophisticated multi-field taxonomy—by far the most flexible such system available—and includes data on all arts organizations that apply to state arts agencies for grants. (Although the "cases" are projects, NASAA can configure the system as a data base on organizations, with a few key items of information on each one.)

The disadvantage of the National Standard is that organizations that do not apply for state arts agency grants aren't in it. Consequently it is far less complete in its coverage than is the BMF (though better than service organization membership lists), and more biased towards organizations with larger budgets. On the other hand, these problems reflect the fact that it has not, until now, been designed as an organizational data base. Given the sophistication of the system, the high quality of the data, and NASAA's track record in working with the NEA and the state arts agencies, its potential contribution would appear substantial.

From Methodological Enigmas to Philosophical Dilemmas

The grave need for policy-relevant data on arts organizations, and our enthusiasm for the potential of a UDB, does not belie the fact that there are tricky problems confronting anyone attempting to collect information on the universe of arts organizations. Although one could gloss these difficulties as "methodological," they are matters of philosophy more than technique, going directly to the question of what "the arts" are today. The accepted working definition of "arts organization"—as a professionally staffed nonprofit corporation devoted to the display or performance of artistic work consensually judged to be serious in intent—does not work so well any more, and it is not obvious what criteria should stand in its place.

Researchers on our project became painfully aware of the philosophical dilemmas when they arrived in Dallas, the Twin Cities, and Philadelphia with a mandate to find all the arts organizations they could.[2] Despite every effort to foresee and develop rules for dealing with every possible difficulty in advance, they returned with several complaints:

1. It is difficult to find arts producers that operate informally without benefit of incorporation as 501(c)(3) nonprofits. In dance, for example, choreographers may assemble performing companies around themselves with or without formal incorporation. Or significant neighborhood arts activity may emanate from churches or community centers.
2. Related to this, it is difficult to identify organizations within organizations, or to know what to do with them once they are identified. An arts center may have a dance program, theater program, and music program, with shared support staff but separate program directors. Is it one "arts organization," or three?
3. Identifying arts activities associated with particular ethnic or racial communities poses special problems, as such activities may be sponsored by "non-arts" community organizations that do little media advertising. Such activities may also be particularly likely to be sponsored by presenting organizations on an occasional basis.
4. The line between nonprofit and commercial activity is not a clear one. Commercial art galleries are meant to sell art for a profit, but many members of the public use them in the same way that they use public exhibitions. Should they be included? (We didn't.) Corporate galleries are part of "for-profit" firms, but their exhibition programs aren't proprietary. (We included those open to the public.) We found much more classical music than jazz activity, but that was partly because we did not include nightclubs and other commercial jazz presenters in our lists. (If we had, it would have been hard to distinguish between jazz, on the one hand, and rock or rap on the other. Should genre be a criterion for inclusion in "the arts"?)
5. We included only "professional" arts organizations in our populations, but it was difficult to define "professional." We included organizations that employed at least one full-time equivalent artist or curator; but thereby we may have overestimated activity in art forms prosperous enough to pay wages, and underestimated it in forms in which skilled artists of serious intent work for at least part of their career on a voluntary or "pay-when-able" basis.

At one level, these questions are moot, because the only cost-efficient, economically feasible way to create a UDB under current conditions is to build on existing data bases that settle such questions in their own way, adhering for the most part to relatively conventional definitions of "arts organization." And we would argue that this is a small problem, for the advantages of even an imperfect UDB over what we now have are so dramatic as to make questions of inclusion at the margins seem "academic" even to us academics.

At the same time, these issues are much too important to ignore in the long run. For now, we believe that they can be addressed most productively through research at the local level. That is why we regard community studies—the third part of our tripartite proposal—as being of such central significance.

[2]The task would not have been possible at all, had it not been for the gracious assistance of local experts, especially staff of the Pew Charitable Trusts in Philadelphia, the Bush Foundation in the Twin Cities, and, for Dallas/Fort Worth, the Texas Commission on the Arts and the Fort Worth Arts Council.

Why the Most Interesting Research Will Occur at the Community Level

In our field research, we found that the largest number of arts organizations could be identified by sampling newspaper entertainment pages at relevant intervals; and that the most diverse set of organizations could be found in lists compiled by local service organizations, grantmakers, and arts councils. To use such sources for a national census would be prohibitively expensive, both because they are time-consuming to acquire and because "outsiders" in a given community must rely on insider informants, as we did, to learn enough about particular organizations to include them.

Researchers with a long-term commitment to a given community face few of these obstacles. If key stakeholders in local arts communities—for example, major private and public grantmakers, arts service organizations, and academic researchers prepared to contribute their methodological expertise—make a long-term commitment to ongoing research on the health of the arts and cultural sector in their community, they can summon much more expertise and know-how than any outsider possibly could. We suspect that this level of local knowledge—what we might call "contextual" or "tacit" knowledge—will be necessary if we are to develop new definitions of "arts organization" appropriate to the cultural landscape our children will inherit. It is not that questions of definition or philosophy can be resolved by research as matters of fact can be. Rather the process of collectively deciding the place of commercial or neighborhood-based cultural organizations in a community inventory will raise such questions more crisply and—because decisions must be made—will lead to particularly fruitful conversations.

Interestingly, many of the people we interviewed about arts data tried in two ways to articulate a vision that went beyond the standard quantitative, financial data that formal surveys provide. First, they emphasized the importance of local, qualitative knowledge that goes beyond apprehending facts to integrating them into meaningful narratives. "We do not know the landscape on the most basic level," reported one program officer with whom we spoke. We need to use the tools of the interpretive social sciences. "Those social sciences don't give you just fact and figures, they try to find the meaning."

Second, they wanted to see arts organizations not as independent entities, but as part of a wider system, to understand the connections and interdependency among arts organizations, and to go beyond even this to explore the complex interrelationships between arts organizations, artists, and audiences. As observed by several participants in a mini-conference hosted by the NEA Research Division in June 1996 to discuss an early draft of parts of our report, studying arts organizations isn't an end in itself. Rather it is a way to get to what is really of interest—the arts activities in which Americans participate, many but not all of which are sponsored by formal organizations. According to many of the people we interviewed, the challenge for grantmakers and policy makers is to understand the mix of activities in which different parts of the community participate, and also to understand the ways in which such activities compete with and build upon one another. Through such understanding of process and interdependence, it may be possible to identify the points of leverage at which program and policy initiatives can be most effective.

These are precisely the questions that local, community-based research, designed and conducted by teams combining deep local knowledge with research expertise, can address better than national studies can. Social scientists have learned a lot about studying relationships, and have developed ways to study "networks" of cooperating and competing organizations in many fields. They have also developed techniques to compile inclusive lists of organizations and estimate their size by surveying individuals. These methods have been used to identify employers and their labor forces, but could be used locally to study arts organizations and their audiences. Researchers have learned how to locate and reach groups of people who are difficult to find—the homeless, people with rare medical conditions, and so on—and the methods they have developed may be useful in identifying populations of artists. All of these social science research techniques can be applied profitably to the arts, but to realize their potential, they will have to be tested at the local level in research initiatives that bring researchers together with people with deep substantive, contextual knowledge.

• • •

If such community research coalitions are to be built, private foundations are in many places well positioned to take the initiative in bringing the partners to the table. Not every community will be able to sustain such efforts. But if a few diverse places—large cities, mid-sized urban areas, and rural places in different regions—can carry out such programs, they can teach us a great deal. If the Unified Data Base we propose can provide the meat-and-potatoes information to tell us where the arts are today and where they seem to be going, then community-based studies, building on the UDB, can provide the R&D component necessary to understand—and possibly to guide—the processes of change that swirl around us.

Paul DiMaggio is Co-Chair, Princeton University Center for Arts and Cultural Policy Studies, and Chair, Princeton University Sociology Department. He will participate in the 1996 GIA conference as a respondent to a session titled "Dimensions of Cultural Citizenship: How Cultural Institutions Engage Audiences." Deborah Kaple is Associate Director, Princeton University Center for Arts and Cultural Policy Studies, and is also a nonfiction author and novelist.

Readers wishing to receive copies of the the two reports by DiMaggio and Kaple should see the box on page 37 of this newsletter.

Nothing Substitutes for the Living Link between Artist and Audience

S. Frederick Starr

The following article was written in response to an article published in the spring 1996 issue of Grantmakers in the Arts Newsletter.

Neil Harris' essay on "Public Subsidies and American Art" is on target: public support for the arts in America is a late comer, has been episodic, and even in the last thirty years has had to contend with hostile attitudes that can be traced deep into our history. But the essay falls short in one important respect: namely, it dramatically undervalues the achievement of American artists working without the support of government, or even private foundations. Since this touches on the very heart of the grantmaker's work, I would like briefly to redress the balance.

In so doing, I would like also to suggest a standard by which the grantmaker's work might appropriately be evaluated.

The essence of Harris' argument is that Americans' coolness toward public subsidies for the arts reflects our core political philosophy:

> A sense of government as small, decentralized, non-interfering, non-controlling, deliberately avoiding the traditional props of wealth and artistic greatness; this was part of the Republicanism that dominated America in the age of Jefferson and Jackson.

To some extent, such views continue today. Viewed in this light, the question is not whether government supports art that is good or bad, popular or distasteful, but whether government should be involved in the enterprise at all. This, at least, is how most Americans viewed the issue during the first century of our existence.

It is also worth noting that down to the Civil War not only was governmental support lacking but also there were few great private patrons of the arts as well. In fact, if a wealthy grandee proposed to dip into his own wallet to provide large-scale backing to artists he was often viewed with suspicion; the use of great private fortunes to provide "art for the people" was deemed condescending, manipulative, and incompatible with republic virtue. Thus, when New Orleans magnate James Robb tried to create a national museum in the 1850s the public reacted coolly and the project died.

Thus, even private patronage by the wealthy came up against the old Jeffersonian-Jacksonian criticism. This tendency gained momentum during the first decades after the Civil War.

The task of equipping and provisioning the Union Army put tens of millions of dollars into the hands of private manufacturers throughout the North. The new captains of industry were generally self-made men with limited formal schooling but fierce dedication to their businesses. After the Civil War these merchant princes set out to conquer the world of culture as they had earlier mastered the economy. They built the palazzos that still adorn older American cities, hauled tons of paintings back from Europe, and used their money to patronize symphony orchestras and museums. When their successors amassed even greater fortunes, they set up foundations to give permanence to this "civilizing" mission.

Some of these wealthy patrons were impelled by an unselfish interest in the arts. Far more, however, used the arts as a means of validating their arrival in polite society. The fact that they founded libraries and universities does not hide a deeper truth, namely, that the advent of great private patrons imparted an elitism to the arts in America that had heretofore been strikingly absent. It is no accident that philosopher George Santayana coined the terms "high-brow" and "low-brow" precisely in the years when these swaggering merchant-princes were co-opting some of our best musicians and artists to serve their own social advancements.

Thanks to this, the word "taste" in the late nineteenth century gained an aura of social exclusivity that had been largely absent from American culture over the previous century. "Taste" was what these new patrons either possessed outright or had hired in the form of subsidized artists, musicians, or sculptors. As such, it was always to be contrasted to those poor souls who lacked both wealth and taste. And with such few exceptions as Mrs. Gardiner in Boston, the taste in question was largely male. Prior to the Civil War women played a far greater role in setting taste than they did in the decades that followed, when a new razzle-dazzle male boosterism entered the arts scene. Weighed down by this new patronage, with its ponderous social agenda and pompous claims, American art became pretentious and shallow. In the process, American patronage in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries came to resemble precisely the aristocratic culture of old Europe that the Jeffersonians and Jacksonians had so disdained.

The common assumption of both public subsidies and the patronage of wealthy individuals and foundations is that the arts cannot exist without their enlightened support. There is much truth in this, but it is a truth that easily becomes self-fulfilling. For as artists and musicians grow dependent upon such subsidies they adjust their activities in such a way as to assure that support continues. Step by step, cultural values come to be shaped more by the patron than the public, more from above than from

below. Art, in short, becomes a "producer good" and ceases to exist for the audience. As the old maxim holds, "whoever pays the fiddler calls the tune."

Informed by a keen sense of history, Neil Harris places today's crusades and counter-crusades regarding the national endowments in a rich historical perspective. The one shortcoming of his essay, to repeat, is that it does not address the question of how the arts in America have done at those times when they have had access neither to public funds nor to the patronage of wealthy donors and foundations.

Harris acknowledges that "a bewildering variety of financial arrangements underwrote arts organizations" in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. He also notes that market-based "for profit" arts activities abounded, although he implies that these were somehow not up to the mark. Thus, for example, he claims that until the 1920s Americans heard mainly brass band music and had no access to the European classics unless they were belted out from a town bandstand by a local ensemble "with plenty of woodwinds, if the listeners were lucky." The author of a fine biography of P.T. Barnum, Harris points rather archly that Barnum's New York exhibition of oddities was the most popular museum of the era.

This understates the achievements of music and the arts in America prior to the era of institutionalized patronage, both governmental and private. By doing so, it closes the door to a hypothesis that holds important implications for every arts vendor today: namely, that America's greatest contributions to music and the arts have occurred precisely when artists have had to respond directly to the ticket-buying public rather than to a limited number of institutionalized patrons, whether public or private. Stated differently, the need to engage with, and respond to, the general public has been a far truer stimulus to American creativity than dependence upon patrons who disdain the market in order to pursue their self-assigned mission of education and uplift.

Take, for example, those brass bands. Self-financed or subsidized by town merchants, such ensembles introduced Americans to the entire range of classical music. When Civil War bands serenaded the troupes they played Verdi, Donizetti, and Meyerbeer, not *Turkey in the Straw*. America's greatest composer, Charles Ives, grew up in this milieu.

Whence this popular taste for classical opera? In the decades before the Civil War, well-organized touring circuits extended to virtually every town in the land. The greatest classical performers from Europe and America did not disdain to appear in concert in Oneida, New York or Zanesville, Ohio, and to be paid by ticket-buying farmers and tradesmen. Soprano Henriette Sontag, who premiered Beethoven's Ninth in Austria, toured the land without subsidy, as did Verdi's preferred conductor, Emmanuelle Muzio, not to mention America's own great composer and piano virtuoso, Louis-Moreau Gottschalk.

The same can be said of theater. When actor John Wilkes Booth shouted *"sic senter tyrannes"* after assassinating Lincoln in Ford's Theater, he knew the public would understand him, for he had been part of many small touring companies that had been offering Shakespeare to small town America for a generation. Indeed, there were more companies performing Shakespeare on a for-profit basis in the 1850s than there are today, with all the subsidies. Producers of popular minstrel shows of the day could expect laughs for their parodies of Shakespearean dramas with ridiculous titles like "Hamlet, or Little Ham" precisely because they knew members of their rough-hewn audience had seen the real thing.

It takes a tremendous stretch of the imagination to conceive the vitality of American performing arts in the days before high-brow patronage stifled the enterprise "from above." Fortunately, historian Vera Brodsky Lawrence, in her splendid three volume study of New York musical life before the Civil War (*Strong on Music*, University of Chicago Press, 1995-96) has detailed the intense, heady, pell-mell, boom-and-bust Manhattan musical scene in the nineteenth century. Forced to respond to the ticket-buying public, the impresarios and performers conceived imaginative and diverse programming that reached every segment of the audience. Similar stratagems were employed in every other city in the land. These old impresarios and artists have much to teach us today.

Nor was the situation different in painting. Earlier, members of the Hudson River School had rhapsodized over the American landscape without benefit of grants or sabbaticals. Building on their success, Frederic E. Church conceived vast panoramas of the Andes and the Polar North and exhibited them before ticket-buying viewers in city after city. In their same spirit, philosopher Ralph Waldo Emerson lived off the receipts from lectures he gave on the Lyceum circuit in Indianapolis, Harrisburg, or Buffalo, and Mark Twain maintained his large Hartford household in part from receipts from reading tours with novelist George Washington Cable.

What separates these diverse artists and performers from their successors today is not their talent, however great it may have been. Rather, it is their willingness—born of necessity—to reach out to the common citizen without condescension, and to recast their presentation as necessary in order to assure that the audience was engaged and entertained, as well as uplifted. Government subsidies, foundation grants, and tenured academic posts do not prevent this, of course. But there is something fundamentally different when one must appeal to a program officer or peer review panel as opposed to the real men and women in the hall. "Whoever pays the fiddler calls the tune."

It might be objected that what worked in nineteenth century America would be impossible today, with our need to sustain complex arts organizations. Also, in that simpler age the artists did not have to compete with television, film, video, and the great museums of the

world on CD-ROM. But that is just the point. The only way to compete is to compete, which means knowing one's audience and responding to it.

Nowadays, the notion of reaching out to the paying public conjures up images of artistic compromise, conservatism, and sterility. America's historical experience amply refutes this charge. Few opera companies today mount as many new works as did America's first two opera companies, both for-profit troupes based in early nineteenth century New Orleans. In the 1920s and 1930s, the fierce competition for audiences provided a constant stimulus for jazz musicians to innovate, just as the post-World War II competition among private galleries in New York fostered the restless search for the new among American abstract expressionist painters. Is it an accident that jazz has sunk into a backward-looking torpor of stereotyped performance at precisely the time it has benefited from tens of millions of dollars of well-intentioned grants from public arts agencies and foundations? Or that American painting in an era of foundation grants and corporate patronage has yet to attain the vitality of the bumptious post-World War II decades?

In sketching the broad contours of American art in an era before subsidies it is not possible to anticipate, let alone respond to, all the objections that might be raised. Surely, the modern museum, with its large staff of curators and educators, requires ample subsidy from some quarter? What symphony orchestra today, with its extended season, can cover more than forty percent of its costs from tickets? And do not theater companies, faced with the onerous demands of stage hands, unions, and scenery builders, require major grants to stay afloat? Above all, how high can ticket prices be pushed without killing the market or driving all but the most affluent members of the public from the hall?

Such concerns are valid, of course. Yet the fact remains that teenagers regularly pay two and three times more for rock concerts than their parents are willing to pay for tickets to any more serious performance or museum exhibition. Nor should one blame the public for the economic choices it makes. Instead, it would be worth asking what aspects of a given performance or exhibition keeps the ticket-buying public away and what might be done to rectify this. These are the questions arts presenters in the nineteenth century regularly put to themselves. This, is scarcely surprising, given their sure knowledge that if they failed to do so they would have no recourse to outside support.

However vital and attractive this older tradition of arts patronage, it cannot and should not be used as an argument for turning back the clock. Nor should it be used as an argument for abandoning public or foundation subsidies and throwing the entire arts enterprise onto the free market, with all its fickleness and insecurity. Rather, it should serve to remind us of an old truth that is as valid today as in the age of Jefferson and Jackson, namely, that there is no substitute for the living link between the artist and audience in any sphere of culture. Americans have always been willing to pay for what they like, what they enjoy, and what they value. Conversely, they have always been quick to detect when they are being treated as if they are in need of improvement or enlightenment as defined by some sage expert. If more arts funding focused squarely on the relationship between the art and the public rather than on the narcissistic interests of artists or arts organizations, the atmosphere would quickly change. The success of numerous recent attempts in this vein confirms the validity of such an approach.

Neil Harris wisely cautions against the dangers of moralizing didacticism in the arts. This can take such overt forms as the claim that true art should confound, perplex, or shock the public. It can also take subtler forms, such as the absurd conceit that art which "merely" diverts or entertains falls short of its true vocation. This was not Bach's view when he performed at Zimmermann's Cafe in Leipzig, or of Mozart when he performed the divertimenti that still charm us today. Nor, for that matter was it the view of Frederic Church when he painted the Heart of the Andes, or of Louis Armstrong when he chose to view himself as an entertainer rather than as an "artist."

The task of arts funders in the 1990s should be to remind American artists and arts organizations of this truth. By doing so they can bring the arts back into direct contact with their audience, a development that would reinvigorate and inspire both parties and help make performing arts organizations self-sustaining. This is the deeper truth that lies just beyond the horizon of Neil Harris' otherwise cogent and thought-provoking essay.

The Aspen Institute
April 1996

S. Frederick Starr is Chairman of the Central Asia Institute, School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University, and is also Distinguished Fellow at the Aspen Institute.

❖

Readers interested in the history of arts and philanthropy might want to read "Twentieth-Century Cultural Patronage" by Kathleen D. McCarthy which was commissioned by Grantmakers in the Arts and published in *Alternative Futures: Challenging Designs for Arts Philanthropy. Alternative Futures* is an anthology of papers commissioned by GIA that explore arts and philanthropy in the United States today. Copies are available for $15.45 from Art Resources International, 5813 Nevada Avenue N.W., Washington D.C. 20015.

From Evaluation to Program Design

Marian A. Godfrey

The following is Part II of a two-part article that discusses the way The Pew Charitable Trusts restructured their local cultural grantmaking program. Part I, published in the fall, 1995 edition of the Grantmakers in the Arts Newsletter, *dealt with an evaluation of the Trusts' cultural grantmaking in Philadelphia, describing the evaluation process, findings, and recommendations. Part I then provided a preliminary outline of the program restructuring that resulted. Part II discusses the new program in more detail, with emphasis on the major redesign of the Trusts' multiyear operating support program.*

The Pew Charitable Trusts will celebrate their 50th anniversary in 1998. During most of that time the Trusts have provided significant support to cultural organizations and activities in the Philadelphia area in the form of grants for operations, capital programs, and special projects. In 1995, as part of an institution-wide commitment to increase the accountability and effectiveness of the Trusts' grantmaking, an external evaluation of local cultural grantmaking was commissioned and conducted under the supervision of the Evaluation program and with the participation of the Culture program.

Developing a New Grantmaking Approach

As detailed in Part I of this article, the evaluation resulted in several key findings, some positive, others critical of the Trusts' past policies. However, the evaluation was conceived not only as a critique of past practice, but also as a means to identify and develop new grantmaking strategies. In responding to the observations and recommendations of the evaluators, the Culture program decided to focus on three program objectives and to develop a series of corresponding strategies.

The needs we identified are certainly not the only ones facing the local cultural community, but we believe they are among the very most important. Not surprisingly, much of the Trusts' previous grantmaking had already been directed to them. Our new approach differs from the old in two ways: first, going forward we decided to direct virtually all our resources to the three identified strategies, rather than continuing to support a broad portfolio of other programs; second, we have restructured our grantmaking to more effectively address our central objectives.

Program Objectives and Strategies

Both the evaluation and our general observation of the current environment for culture in Philadelphia led us to believe that maintenance of the status quo, including enhancement of organizational stability (itself a concept undergoing continual redefinition) was no longer sufficient to help the cultural community sustain its artistic and organizational vitality. The community could benefit from further development in three important areas: stronger institutional and individual leadership devoted to the well-being of the cultural community as a whole as well as to the survival of individual organizations; continued enhancement of the artistic contributions of area artists and organizations; and strengthened support of culture from a diversity of sources but especially from individuals, and from local and regional government. We developed specific objectives and strategies to address each of these three areas:

- *To stimulate leadership and "best practice" within the cultural community.* The Trusts' previously existing multiyear operating support program has been restructured to make it competitive and open to the larger cultural community (rather than by invitation) and to shift the emphasis toward recognition of organizational health and leadership. The Philadelphia Cultural Leadership Program (PCLP) has two components: the grants program, which provides three years of unrestricted operating support to successful applicants; and a comprehensive capacity-building initiative that will serve the broader cultural community. The initiative will provide organizational development tools to assist cultural organizations to compete successfully for the PCLP grants. The components of PCLP are described in detail later in this article.

- *To promote increased artistic excellence.* The Culture program's artistic enhancement efforts have been consolidated into a more focused Artistic Development Program which supports a portfolio of competitive regrant initiatives, each of which addresses a specific discipline. These initiatives combine targeted support for organizational artistic development activities with professional development opportunities for the artistic leaders of the participating organizations. The intent of this strategy is to strengthen the existing artistic resources of the community, with the goal of helping Philadelphia to reach its potential as a first class regional arts center. Through this strategy the Trusts will invest in artistic innovation and risktaking, which are key to the continued vitality of the cultural community. The Philadelphia Music Project, Philadelphia Repertory Development Initiative, and Philadelphia Theater Initiative are now in place and are expected to continue. A similar initiative that would serve visual arts organizations and museums is currently in the planning stage. Pew's ongoing support for working artists in the Philadelphia region, primarily through the Pew Fellowships in the Arts, is a complementary part of this strategy.

• *To increase public and individual support for the region's cultural system.* A program of Convening, Research, and Advocacy will be pursued both directly by the Trusts and through grantmaking to external partners. The evaluators commented on the relatively low levels of support for culture from local and regional public agencies and from individuals compared with other cities. They noted the Trusts' capacity as convener to bring both cultural organizations and potential funding partners together to discuss shared concerns such as advocacy and case-making. They urged the Trusts to play a leadership role in the community beyond simply grantmaking.

Program Transition

After discussion and board approval of the objectives and strategies, we began to design the PCLP in detail and to plan the staging of the other program strategies. The creation of PCLP and its key components were announced in a meeting with the local cultural community in December 1995, at which time we spelled out plans for a transitional phase from the old program to the new. Our intent was to give cultural organizations as much lead time as we could to prepare for the changes in the program. Beginning in 1997, PCLP will provide multiyear operating support on a fully competitive basis: organizations not previously receiving operating support will now be eligible, and others that received such support in the past can no longer be assured of its continuance unless they meet the demanding requirements of the new program. PCLP expectations for programmatic, management, leadership, and fiscal performance will be more rigorous than the Trusts' previous operating support program had been. Beginning in 1997, expectations will include a no-deficit requirement and a stipulation that organizations must have and use a comprehensive strategic plan.

We believe that it is important to give cultural organizations time to strengthen their balance sheets, management, and planning. PCLP therefore began with a round of one- and two-year transitional grants in 1996, and continues to communicate with current grantees and the cultural community at large to make sure the new program is fully understood. Implementation of the capacity-building initiative is slated for late 1996 with full implementation of PCLP's grants program scheduled for 1997. Renewed and new artistic development initiatives are also scheduled for 1997.

Philadelphia Cultural Leadership Program

One of the most disturbing findings of the evaluation was that, through our past grantmaking practices and particularly through our operating support program, the Trusts had unwittingly fostered an unhealthy dependency among some cultural organizations. Recognizing that all nonprofit cultural organizations will always be dependent to some degree upon contributions, the evaluators pointed out that a distinction must be made between this general dependency on subsidy and the more troublesome sense among some organizations that their very survival depended upon continued support from one institution—the Trusts. The evaluators further speculated that the generosity of the Trusts may have unintentionally inhibited the development of a strong local funding base by discouraging organizations from aggressively seeking funding from other sources. We are quite mindful of how important the Trusts' commitment is to the well-being of the Philadelphia cultural community, but were made deeply uneasy by the realization that our actions might have weakened, rather than fortified it. We also continue to believe in the importance and value of multiyear unrestricted operating support to cultural organizations, but recognize that the Trusts' existing program has had only partial success in fostering strong, self-reliant organizations.

Our challenge was how to restructure the operating support program to maximize its effectiveness and to discourage undue dependency. Through PCLP, we have sought to develop a new approach that will both recognize strength and leadership where it exists, and empower the community to develop new strengths and capacities at the individual, organizational, and system-wide levels. Our ultimate goal is to ensure that sufficient organizational capacity and leadership resides within the community, so that both individual organizations, and the community as a whole, can take charge of their own destiny and operate with a greater sense of self-assurance.

To assist us in thinking through the challenge of restructuring our operating support program, we recruited Laurel Jones and Richard Evans of Bay Group International. They brought considerable experience and expertise in organizational assessment and development, particularly through their work with the NEA Advancement Program. Over a nine-month period, Jones and Evans met with our Culture and Evaluation staff to clarify goals and objectives for a restructured program and to help us shape its specifics. They also prepared a contextual background paper on operating support and organizational development activities.

Based on this work we developed a program with two components: 1) three-year unrestricted operating support grants, made available annually on a competitive basis to visual arts, performing arts, literary, media, and service organizations in the five-county Philadelphia area that are able to demonstrate a high level of programmatic, management, and fiscal performance; and 2) a capacity-building initiative open to all cultural organizations in the region that will strengthen both individual organi-

zations and, through collaborations and network-building, the cultural community as a whole. Guidelines for the PCLP grant program are available now from The Pew Charitable Trusts and can be obtained by phoning or writing the Culture program. Copies of the Bay Group's background paper should be available through the Trusts' Culture program in late 1996.

An early and important program design decision was that the operating grants themselves should be used to reward effective organizational practice – wherever it exists within the local cultural community – thus allowing a "landscape of leadership" to define itself. We rejected the alternative, pursued by the Trusts in the past, of attempting to reshape the cultural landscape by using operating support grants to shore up fragile organizations or sectors. Instead, interventions to help strengthen organizations would be implemented through the capacity-building initiative as well as through the professional development component of the Artistic Development Program.

A Template for Organizational Health

Our work with the Bay Group also moved us away from a fairly static notion of "organizational health and best practice" toward a more dynamic understanding that is based not on growth but on an organization's ability to adapt to ongoing change through self-awareness and self-reflection. Working with Evans and Jones, we adapted the model for organizational assessment developed by the Bay Group for its work with the NEA Advancement Program and developed a template specifically tailored to the PCLP. The PCLP Index of Organizational Health looks at nine criteria for organizational health and development within four broad areas, and identifies indicators through which organizations' performance can be measured. The four broad areas and nine criteria are:

Identity and Purpose

- The organization is clear about who and what it is;
- The organization can demonstrate that its mission is one that is important to a community that it has identified;

Current Organizational Realities

- The organization has the leadership and capacity to implement and carry through the necessary tasks;
- The organization demonstrates responsible financial operations in which budget projections reflect future operating assumptions as well as past performance;
- The organization's record keeping and data analysis are adequate to support planning and can demonstrate that the organization is meeting its goals;
- The organization has established artistic/programmatic standards and exhibits concern for maintaining programmatic quality;

Future Plans and Resources

- The organization has a comprehensive approach to planning that includes ongoing assessment of artistic, human, and financial resources;

Cultural Citizenship

- The organization is engaged in information flow and exchange across the local cultural system and contributes to the identification and sharing of exemplary practices;
- The organization and/or its artistic and management leaders contribute regionally or nationally to the development and strengthening of its field or discipline.

Indicators of organizational performance are also identified for each criterion. For the most part these can be drawn from existing documents and working tools used by organizations. For example, an organization's identity and purpose could be reflected in and assessed through review of its mission statement, documentation showing that the organization's mission is broadly owned by staff and volunteers, and has been approved by its board. Identity and purpose are also revealed in descriptions of programs and relevant promotional materials that show consistency between the organization's mission and its programming. More difficult to determine were indicators of artistic/programmatic quality. For now, we have defined these as the existence of written goals and objectives for program development and enhancement; descriptions of how the organization assesses progress toward its goals and improves the quality of its programs; information on how the organization sets benchmarks for its own programmatic performance activities relative to peer groups and competitors; and descriptions of external awards and grants received in recognition of program quality.

This nine-point index is at the heart of PCLP. Applicants for grant support must address each of the nine criteria, providing where possible materials identified in the list of indicators. They will be assessed and rated by both staff and external reviewers according to their performance in relationship to the indicators. We have been repeatedly reminded by both internal and external advisors that this index defines an ideal state of organizational health, and that very few nonprofit organizations of any type are likely to measure up to it fully. Rather, we will need to look for a combination of high performance in some areas and positive trends in others. It will be important that we use this index both to measure a dynamic process of organizational development on the part of participating organizations, and to assist us and the cultural community in determining capacity-building needs within the community.

Providing Support for Capacity-Building

It became clear to us as we developed this index that just setting the bar high for organizational performance would not be sufficient to have a positive impact on the organizational health of the region's cultural community. As a result, we have developed a companion initiative as part of PCLP that will offer a range of learning opportunities aimed at encouraging leadership and organizational health more broadly in the community. The initiative will have three related goals: 1) to recognize, communicate, and strengthen existing examples of leadership; 2) to develop leadership potential; and 3) to strengthen the community as a whole by engaging its broad participation in a range of network- and community-building activities. Capacity-building activities will be open to the broader cultural community and will include:

- *Setting benchmarks*: Training will be available to PCLP grantees and applicants interested in understanding how to create benchmarks for aspects of their performance on a regional or national basis. Using benchmarks is a way to measure an organization's performance against that of the best practitioners in relevant fields of activity. This kind of "best practice" analysis is a generally accepted method for assessing artistic and programmatic quality. An analysis based on "best practices" can also be used to determine the effectiveness of an organization's marketing, fund raising, staff and board development, and strategic planning. In these operational areas, cultural organizations can set their own benchmarks against groups in their field, in other nonprofit fields, or in the private sector.
- *Workshops*: Shared learning will play an important role in building organizational health and leadership throughout the community. Workshops will be convened on subjects including strategic planning, environmental scanning, and data gathering/trend analysis, as well as on traditional subjects such as marketing and fund raising.
- *Innovation Fund*: This fund will provide modest one-time project grants to explore exceptional entrepreneurial opportunities, collaborative ventures, and/or strategic planning. The fund will provide risk capital that is rarely available to cultural organizations. For example, organizations will be able to undertake feasibility studies for income-generating activities or for shared administrative services or mergers.
- *Convening*: Annual retreats will be convened for all PCLP grantees. The initiative will also convene the broader cultural community to discuss issues of shared interest such as cultural planning.

Through the learning and experiences shared by organizations participating in the capacity-building initiative, we hope to see the emergence of a stronger, more closely knit cultural community. We hope to strengthen this community's ability to set its own agendas, and to act powerfully on its own behalf and on behalf of the broader community to whose well-being we are all dedicated.

Marian A. Godfrey is program director, Culture, The Pew Charitable Trusts.

❖

A Savings Bank for the Soul
Continued from page 8

see our visitors, they will forgive us and will get on with the business at hand, while exuding a palpable sense of well being.

Summary

Most of our halls of memory will have to change a great deal if they are to be truly welcoming to all. Yet, change or not, they all have a core purpose inherently important to our joint survival. We all need to be rooted in our collective past in order to face our collective future.

Additionally these institutions can enhance their role in the community. They can, if they wish, foster and celebrate congregant behavior within their walls. In so doing, they will encourage civility more generally. Institutions of memory, in making a safe space for all who enter, can add to the safety of the whole community.

Elaine Heumann Gurian is a consultant and advisor to museums and visitor centers that are beginning, building, or reinventing themselves, including the National Museum of New Zealand, the Baltimore Children's Museum, the Cranbrook Institute of Science, and the Detroit African American Museum. In the past, she has held staff positions with several museums including the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum and the National Museum of the American Indian. Among other publishing efforts, she was editor of Institutional Trauma: The Effect of Major Change on Museum Staff, *published by the American Association of Museums in 1995.*

Arts Education
Partnerships for Change

Over the past five years, twenty or more collaborations to further arts education have been developed among grantmakers in communities throughout the United States. Several others are in early planning phases, such as ones in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and Oakland, California.

The four projects profiled briefly below vary in structure, project design, and the degree to which they combine public and private funds. While the availability of credentialed arts teachers working in the schools differs (North Carolina still has music and visual arts teachers in all elementary schools; Chicago has one half-time specialist for every 750 children), throughout the country arts education has increasingly depended upon schools' abilities to contract for the services of outside artists and organizations. The quality of the arts experiences delivered through these contracts is often very high, but consistency, integration, and assessment of arts in the schools have been weak. The collaborations described here were formed in response to the chaos that emerged as arts education became dependent on private rather than public funding, and as it was increasingly managed by nonprofit groups rather than public schools. Site-based planning as well as partnerships among existing resources are critically important to all of the collaborations included in this profile.

Why do we see grantmakers convening around the subject of arts education now? Perhaps we have come to recognize that funds cut from public school budgets are not coming back (California's drastic Proposition 13 was eighteen years ago); perhaps research conducted by Project Zero, the Getty Center, and others has brought new importance to the arts in the eyes of educators; perhaps the remarkable success stories of arts magnet schools have given arts education advocates renewed purpose and opportunity. All of us believe we can achieve through this effort what Ralph Burgard in North Carolina describes: "Happy children making good grades."

Frances Phillips
Walter & Elise Haas Fund

Cleveland's Initiative for Cultural Arts in Education

The Initiative for Cultural Arts in Education for the Cleveland Public Schools (ICARE) is built on a grantmaker's challenge for schools to use more effectively the cultural resources of Greater Cleveland in the curriculum. ICARE is designed to improve student achievement by the infusion of strong instruction and participation in cultural arts as part of the daily education of children. It calls for the formation of intensive educational partnerships between cultural organizations and up to fifty schools within the next five years.

Sensing that other local grantmakers shared our concern about the lack of focus and the uneven quality of arts education efforts in Cleveland, the George Gund Foundation convened a group of colleagues to discuss the matter in late 1992.

At the first meeting, it became apparent that collectively we were spending a substantial amount of money to bring arts education programs to the Cleveland Public Schools, but that we had little sense of what impact the programs were actually having. We continued to meet, sometimes by ourselves and other times with local or national resource people who provided information about what was happening in the field and helped us to think about future directions.

In mid-1993, six of the grantmakers—the Gund, Cleveland, Thomas White, John J. Murphy, Kulas, and Martha Holden Jennings Foundations—decided to hire a consultant to provide an assessment of arts education programs offered by local arts organizations and of arts programming in the Cleveland Public Schools. We also asked for recommendations for future action. Louise Stevens of Arts Market Consulting held focus groups with teachers and principals, interviewed several dozen arts organizations, and reviewed available written materials. An initial meeting she held with arts organizations to explain the process was telling: many in the room did not know each other, let alone know what others in the same field were doing.

The report was completed in late 1993 and released in early 1994. Its results confirmed what we had suspected: arts education efforts were uncoordinated, of uneven quality, and generally unrelated to anything else that was happening in the schools. For example, several music teachers had not even known that children in their schools were attending the Cleveland Orchestra. Some of the programs had been unchanged for two decades or more.

Among key recommendations was hiring two new people: a community-based arts education coordinator who would work with arts organizations to develop and improve their arts education programming, and a similar person within the school district. The report stressed the need for true partnerships between schools and arts organizations, and for the development of programs linked to school curriculum.

Fast-forward to 1996, skipping many, many meetings with school officials, grantmakers, arts organizations, and the Cleveland Cultural Coalition, the organization that grantmakers selected to house the community-based coordinator. Getting "buy-in" from the schools and from the arts organizations has been slow, not always easy, and ongoing. Many arts organizations feel threatened. Turf issues abound. Teachers and principals are jaded by waves of school reform efforts, and the superintendent has changed twice during the process.

However, there is now an arts education partnership coordinator in the Cleveland Public Schools, and the

Coalition has launched the Initiative for Cultural Arts in Education. A thirty-three member planning committee developed eight ICARE partnership principles, an application form, and funding guidelines. Grantmakers did not serve on the planning committee, but were consulted frequently during the process. This fall the first ICARE grants will be awarded. The distribution committee will include grantmakers who have contributed to the ICARE funding pool, two Coalition representatives, two Cleveland school representatives, and two experts in arts and culture education from outside the district. Programs will actually start in January—more than four years after the initial grantmaker meeting.

Information about ICARE can be obtained from Mark George at the Cleveland Cultural Coalition, 1422 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio, 44115 or at 216-694-2787. For copies of the Arts Market report and additional information about grantmaker involvement, contact Deena Epstein at the George Gund Foundation, 45 W. Prospect, Cleveland, Ohio, 44115.

Deena Epstein
The George Gund Foundation

Chicago Arts Partnerships in Education

The Chicago Arts Partnerships in Education (CAPE) initiative is composed of eleven neighborhood-based partnerships involving thirty Chicago public schools, fifty-two arts and twenty-seven community organizations. These partnerships are committed to jointly planning arts-integrated curricula and developing innovative approaches to teaching, learning, and school improvement through the arts. CAPE works to improve Chicago public schools by making quality arts education a central part of the daily learning experience. It seeks to integrate the arts with the overall educational program of schools, recognizing the cultural diversity of the city, and creating for every child sequential and comprehensive arts experiences that connect to the curriculum and to learning in the broader school community.

Currently beginning its fourth year, CAPE is the result of a collaboration, begun in 1991 by eight foundations and corporations. We shared a concern that the arts education programs they were funding were not meeting the needs of the Chicago Public Schools or contributing to the Chicago school-reform movement, initiated with site-based management in 1989.

Chicago's public school budget constraints allowed for a half-time arts specialist for every 750 students at the elementary level. Schools were using their Chapter I discretionary funds to "purchase" arts programming that in many instances was not related to the school curriculum.

Marshall Field's commissioned Mitchell Korn from Artsvision to do an assessment of arts education in the Chicago Public Schools in September 1991. Interviews with 135 people from fifty-nine arts organizations, schools, and grantmakers provided background for the CAPE model. In September 1992, the results were presented to the community and a request for proposals was issued for partnerships among schools, arts groups, and community organizations to apply for one-year planning grants of $25,000 to $30,000.

As potential partnerships prepared proposals, the CAPE funders established a central office to provide the partnerships with technical assistance. The central office monitored the partnerships, identified technical assistance providers, offered workshops in school change through the arts, and assumed responsibility for arts education advocacy.

CAPE received sixty-four applications for planning grants and funded fourteen in April 1993. At that time the CAPE funders decided to use a fiscal agent for the first year, postponing the decision to apply for 501(c)(3) status until the partnerships began their first year of implementation.

After reviewing the results of the planning year in May 1994, the collaborating grantmakers awarded thirteen Year I implementation grants of $30,000 to $70,000. The review process has continued annually, and five years of implementation are planned. Currently twenty-five foundations and corporations are funding CAPE, which has an annual budget of over $960,000.

The partnerships are reviewed on the following criteria:

1) significant and ongoing collaboration between artists and teachers,
2) changed learning experiences for students,
3) cultural diversity in artistic content and representation,
4) rigorous assessment of student learning,
5) equitable growth strategies for spreading arts learning to all students,
6) community involvement,
7) increasing financial contributions from the schools (currently about $15,000 annually), and
8) regularly scheduled planning and professional development time for teachers.

A longitudinal evaluation of CAPE is being conducted over five years by the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. Areas being measured include: student outcomes, changes in school climate for teachers, shifts in educational focus in arts organizations, arts inclusion in community organizations, shifts in school-community relations, and impact on arts education policy.

The most difficult challenges to the collaborative process have been time-related: time for teachers and artists to plan and reflect on their work, time to document and disseminate new curricula across and among partner-

ships, and time for grantmakers to participate in board and committee meetings, attend site visits, and prepare for the annual review process.

CAPE's major challenge for the future is determining what will happen at the end of the six-year initiative. The CAPE board of directors recently retained a consultant to assist with a strategic plan that will answer the question. CAPE also added several nonfunders to its board in December 1995. A board development committee is currently studying further expansion and diversification of the board.

For additional information about CAPE or the partnerships, contact Arnold Aprill, executive director at 312-781-4056.

Kassie Davis
Marshall Field's

North Carolina's A+ Schools Program

The North Carolina A+ Schools program is being initiated by the Kenan Institute for the Arts, assisted by the firm of Burgard Associates, and working closely with community committees. The first phase of the project will last six years. The A+ approach combines regular arts instruction (one hour each day in dance, drama, music, or visual arts) with interdisciplinary teaching. Intensive summer institutes bring together all participating teachers for instruction in arts and in interdisciplinary curriculum design.

In November 1993, the Kenan Institute for the Arts invited a group of North Carolina leaders to consider how a school reform program that had demonstrated early success in individual schools could become part of statewide school improvement efforts. The program was the A+ Schools program, an approach to learning that combines daily arts instruction with interdisciplinary teaching. The central question was whether a statewide demonstration program in a representative sample of public schools, rigorously evaluated over a minimum of four years, could effectively persuade policy makers that an art-intensive approach merited a place on the state's education agenda. The meeting concluded that this was possible and worth attempting.

Over the next eighteen months, a two-tier planning process took place, across the state at the grassroots level in schools and county school districts, and at the state level through the governor's office, the state department of public instruction, and the state arts council. The Kenan Institute invested substantially in the program and created a partnership with eleven other grantmakers, including leading foundations and corporations. Public sector support came from the department of public instruction and the state arts council, with additional support from the NEA. Implementation of the A+ program began in September 1995. Public funding to accomplish this came from the general assembly at the state level and from the schools and their school districts at the local level.

From the beginning, it has been the position of the funding partners that the A+ program is a reform initiative originating in the private sector with strong grassroots support, but operating within the publicly funded school system. For this reason, the program has tried to maintain a distinction between what the private sector supports and what rightly should remain the domain of public funding. In short, public funding pays for the costs of the program within the schools; private sector funding pays for planning and start-up, for the four-year evaluation, and for creating a team of consultants to provide professional development for the faculty and staff of the schools.

The program is beginning its second year of implementation in the schools this fall, with renewed funding from the state general assembly. Local public funding remains strong and the private sector partners continue to underwrite the evaluation and further development of the program.

For more information about the North Carolina A+ Schools Program, please contact: Vincent Marron, Associate Director, Kenan Institute for the Arts, P.O. Box 10610, Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27018. Telephone: 91-722-0338, email <kenanarts@aol.com>.

Vincent Marron
Kenan Institute for the Arts

San Francisco's Arts Education Funders' Collaborative

San Francisco's Arts Education Funders' Collaborative supports the efforts of elementary school principals and teachers to integrate the arts into education in accordance with new national, state, and school district guidelines. The project provides information about arts resources, professional development for principals and teachers, a structure for school-based planning, and small grants for implementing the schools' arts plans.

Four years ago in San Francisco a small group of foundation officers began discussions of a more comprehensive approach to arts education in public schools. San Francisco's seventy-five public elementary schools are served by only sixteen credentialed music teachers and have no faculty for visual arts, dance, drama, or creative writing. The vacuum in public school arts education has been partially filled by some eighty large and small nonprofit arts organizations. Over the years tensions have arisen around the definition and implementation of standards, and around competing approaches to integration and assessment. As in many systems suffering budget cuts, there have been territorial feuds. Some schools had been able to piece together substantive, vibrant arts programs and others had nothing.

While a narrowly defined, intensive program is easier to perfect and evaluate, the collaborating grantmakers—who became the Arts Education Funders Collaborative or

AEFC—chose to forge a broad, less intrusive path and to serve each of the city's elementary schools equally. A directory, *Inside/Out*, was published that outlined the services of arts providers. Using focus groups with teachers and principals, and with help from a steering committee of teachers, parents, school administrators, and arts providers, the grantmakers designed a Professional Development Project.

The project has a straightforward structure. Over a three-year period, each San Francisco school had a turn to send six teachers and a principal to a day of professional development workshops, to develop a plan specific to their school's needs (with the assistance of a consultant), and to receive a one-year $3,000 grant (which had to be matched with $1,500) to implement that plan. According to the project's coordinator Ann Wettrich (San Francisco Art Commission) and consultant Keith Archuleta (Emerald Consulting), "The project seemed at times exhaustively inclusive . . . it employed a flexible, user-friendly structure that engaged, encouraged, and sustained participation."

The Professional Development Project's steering committee was sustained as an advisory board while the AEFC has continued to review policy, plan for next steps, provide fiscal oversight, and raise funds. Participating grantmakers have seen old frictions among arts organizations, the art commission, and school district representatives diminish; teachers and principals express an increased awareness of what the arts can bring to their schools; and cooperative efforts develop among schools. The arts providers formed an informal professional organization to coordinate advocacy. Entering its final year, the project is close to serving all of the city's elementary schools. (Seventy-three of seventy-five chose to participate.) Grantees have exceeded the matching fund requirements.

New grantmakers have become involved and most of the long-time members have sustained their commitment. In all, seventeen individuals, corporations, foundations, and city agencies have contributed. The spirit within the collaborative is generally very good. Pressure points have been the time required of grantmakers to actively manage the project, and the needs of foundations to preserve confidentiality yet to work as peers with professionals from other fields.

As the AEFC plans for the future, it is fortunate that the current superintendent of schools and several school board members are advocates for arts education. Last year the school district made its first financial contribution to the AEFC. It commissioned a plan from Mitchell Korn of Artsvision for an enlarged arts magnet high school that includes a Center for Arts Education, and it committed resources to hire sixteen new visual arts teachers for the elementary schools. The Artsvision plan asks the grantmakers to increase their financial commitment and to direct their attention toward assessment. The AEFC also finds educational philosophy and space in flux: the district is experimenting with multiple, comprehensive school reform programs, and since last spring it cut the size of K-3 classrooms from twenty-seven to twenty students.

The adage of being careful about what you wish for because you might get it comes to mind: the cost of the long hoped-for school district interest in arts education could undermine the economics of arts presenters who continue to play an important role in the delivery of arts education. Education reform efforts tend to integrate the arts into the teaching of other subjects or to ignore them. Smaller classrooms are critically important, but the rapid change in class size brings hundreds of new teachers to the district, and creates facility management problems for schools (in many cases resulting in a loss of space for arts activities). The AEFC's challenges in this context of change are to keep the needs of teachers and students at the center of its vision, and to accomplish breadth yet create something lasting.

For further information, contact: Ann Wettrich, San Francisco Art Commission, 25 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, California, 94102, 415-252-2597.

Frances Phillips
Walter and Elise Haas Fund

❖

A Grantmaker's Goodbye

Continued from page 11

the obligation that Rockefeller does to think big, to dig deep, and to look far, far out.

It has been an enormous privilege to be part of this place, with precisely this tradition of innovation, imagination, and idealism. Especially, it's been a privilege to have been here in the arts and humanities. Finally, I do believe that our artists and thinkers matter most as we struggle to define our values and find our assets for these challenging and changing times.

Currently, Alberta Arthurs is a senior researcher working for the Rockefeller Foundation on a study of culture and development situated at the Council of Foreign Relations. She is also a University Fellow at the New School for Social Research. Prior to taking a position with the Rockefeller Foundation, Arthurs was president and professor of English at Chatham College, and held teaching and administrative positions at Harvard, Rutgers, and Tufts Universities. She has served on a number of corporate and not-for-profit boards and advisory committees which, at the present time, include The Alliance Portfolio, Technoserve, The Kenan Institute for the Arts, and National Video Resources.

Regional Reports

The Southeast

Market Research Study Released in North Carolina

The Durham Arts Council and United Arts Council of Raleigh and Wake County released a study this spring titled, *Cultural Attendance in the Triangle: A Market Study.* The research and analysis was conducted by Arts Market Consulting, Inc. of Marion, Massachusetts. The study included thirty-four arts and cultural organizations of every size and discipline. The joint initiative enabled the arts groups to take advantage of state-of-the-art research and database analysis, far beyond what the individual organizations could accomplish alone.

The research included focus groups of donors, attendees, non-attendees, and subscribers, a 900-respondent telephone survey, and analysis of a universal database of 184,000 constituents. A four-volume report was issued as well as an executive summary. Robert Bush, executive director of the United Arts Council says, "Building audiences, increasing the frequency of attendance and participation, developing new donors and subscribers are real challenges that face the entire arts community. Our efforts to accomplish them must be based on sound information." Bush also indicated that they have received quite a bit of attention from state and local arts councils and from one regional arts organization; all were interested in commissioning similar studies. Locally, conversations are taking place regarding the development of a stabilization program based on market/audience development that includes specialized training and joint marketing efforts. Bush reports that United Arts is using the data to help create a new public image (including a new logo) and a marketing plan for fund raising and for grant programs and services.

Arts Festival of Atlanta: Conversations at the Castle

For many people in the Southeast, the entire summer revolved around the Olympic Games in Atlanta. But the summer was about more than sports. Since their beginning in ancient Greece, the games have celebrated arts and culture as well as achievements of the body, mind, and spirit. The most expansive Cultural Olympiad in history, a three-year arts and culture festival culminated in the 1996 Olympic Arts Festival, June 1 - August 4.

Among the many events in the official Olympic Arts Festival and the broad array of other cultural events surrounding it, one particular program stands out: Conversations at the Castle. Organized by curator Mary Jane Jacob and presented by the Arts Festival of Atlanta (an annual festival that overlapped the Olympics this year), the program ran from June 28 - September 29 and was sponsored by AT&T with major support from Joseph B. Whitehead Foundation and Coca-Cola Company. The program was held at The Castle, an historic building in midtown Atlanta. It had two parts—"Conversations as a Visual Experience" and "Conversations as a Social Experience"—and explored expanded concepts of contemporary art in public spaces and modes of personal and cultural communication. Participating artists came from outside the United States and had extended residencies in Atlanta during the summer. The artists used their art as a tool to communicate and to stimulate dialogue and international exchange. They alternated between using direct human contact and the Internet.

According the Jacob, while "conversations" serve as metaphor and methodology for the artists' projects, discussions will also be held among small groups of community members and arts professionals to consider the cultural perceptions embedded in art and its presentation today. For Jacob, the audience was the focus. The program received many positive reviews. One reviewer, Jerry Cullum for the Atlanta Journal-Constitution, praised it saying, "Thanks to the several institutions that have taken the 'Southern and international' theme seriously, we have a well-nigh magical chance to begin a long overdue global discussion."

Jeanne F. Butler
Kenan Institute for the Arts

Atlanta

The Summer of 1996 from the Perspective of an Atlantan

The Olympic summer of 1996 was a complex, exhausting, exhilarating, and unpredictable experience for most Atlantans. Anticipating the estimated 1.2 million visitors (with an estimated 800,000 from out of state) who purchased 11 million event tickets to watch athletes from 197 participating countries win 1,933 Olympic medals was mind-boggling and unprecedented, even in Olympic history. And what about being the geographic center of attention for an army of media representatives and an estimated 3.8 billion television spectators? Nobody knew what it would really be like.

When it was announced that the Olympics were coming to Atlanta, many artists and organizations had the expectation that the Atlanta Committee for the Olympic Games (ACOG) would be an enormous source of support, funds, and opportunities. Dr. Jeffrey Babcock, director of the Cultural Olympiad, went through many different stages in his relationship with the local art community—from having his own predetermined vision, to creating extensive community panels for determining programs, and ultimately to organizing, with his talented staff, an Olympic Arts Festival designed "to link the artistic and cultural traditions of the world with the artistic and cultural traditions of the American South."

The Festival's impressive program included 200 ticketed performances to classical music and jazz, dance, puppetry, and theater: twenty-one exhibitions and special programs; and many public art projects—twelve of which are permanent—including Siah Armajani's controversial Olympic cauldron and tower. Most of these programs were located in the Olympic Ring, an imaginary circle with a 1.5 mile radius extending from Atlanta's center. Ac-

cessibility to MARTA (Atlanta's mass transit) was a key factor for inclusion in the Festival. Consequently, many of Atlanta's arts organizations did not receive official Festival designation or its related visibility.

Olympic Arts Festival tickets events were available for purchase through the official ACOG Olympic ticket brochures (distributed hundreds of thousands globally), ACOG ticket offices, and on the one (!) phone line that served all Olympic events and that, reportedly, was always busy. The Festival also included free events, such as "Southern Crossroads," a cultural celebration located in Centennial Olympic Park, and AT&T's Global Olympic Village stage, which highlighted international headliner performances (and received enormous publicity due to the Park bombing which took place during one of the concerts.)

The Festival's impressive and generally acclaimed theater, dance, and music productions reported many sold out houses but observed empty seats. Most attributed this to audiences too exhausted to go out again after a day of attending Olympic events in the humidity and heat, or to sponsors not using allotted tickets. Just before the end of the Games, the Festival reported the following attendance capacity at performance venues: classical/jazz, 84%; theater, 78%; dance, 40% (due to the large size of the 4,600-seat Civic Center dance venue); and puppetry, 92%.

While Atlanta's arts organizations and presenters had vastly different experiences, most agreed that they produced their finest-ever and most ambitious programming.

Nexus Contemporary Art Center produced *Out of Bounds: Eight Southeast Artists* that showcased new works by vanguard southeast artists. Although located near the Olympic Aquatics venue and Centennial Olympic Park, Nexus was sparsely attended. Louise Shaw, Executive Director, said, "I think we did our very best work, and the Nexus Press Olympics artists' books will be an important legacy. But, during the Games, ACOG either didn't or couldn't deal with certain accessibility concerns. Although we were so close to a premiere competition venue, there was no signage to link our official Olympic Arts Festival programming with the competition programming." To produce the exhibition and artists' books, Nexus received a "very fair" amount of ACOG financial support and additional support from the Coca-Cola Corporation (which, in 1996, gave a total of $715,000 to thirty-two organizations that produced cultural programs during the Olympics period).

Down the road in Centennial Olympic Park, in the midst of corporate pavilions, the Olympic Superstore, and hundreds of thousands of roaming pin-trading visitors, was "Southern Crossroads," a collaboration of the Smithsonian Institution and the Southern Arts Federation (SAF). This outdoor festival featured programming on three stages, crafts demonstrations and exhibitions, and a "Southern Market" of crafts, music, books, etc. "It was accessible," said Phyllis Weiss of AT&T corporate affairs, the presenting sponsor of Centennial Olympic Park; "For the people who came to the Park, it was an opportunity to see free art, and it was the only free art programming on such a public scale." However, Peggy Bulger of the SAF added, "I think we overestimated this crowd's interest in culture. People were in Atlanta with a one-track mind: to go to a sports event. Our attendance ranged from 150,000 to 360,000 a day, and although nineteen days of twelve-hour programming was a big deal for us, it was small potatoes for ACOG."

The High Museum of Art was still enjoying capacity crowds five weeks after the close of the Games. "I think we enabled people who came to Atlanta for a sporting event to better appreciate the power of art," reflected the museum's director Dr. Ned Rifkin speaking of the High's "Rings: Five Passions in World Art." Curated by J. Carter Brown, director emeritus of the National Gallery of Art in Washington D.C., the exhibition featured objects borrowed from museums around the world that "embody the Olympic ideals and evoke five universal human emotions: love, anguish, awe, triumph, and joy." The ambitious exhibition, which received mixed reviews in the national press, set museum attendance records (admission $10) that exceeded projections with over 160,000 visitors before the show's close. The exhibition catalogue was a Book-of-the-Month selection. The museum's membership rose to more than 25,000 from an annual 14,000 before the Olympics. "The Rings project represents tremendous growth for us. The $3.5 million budget for the exhibition represents one-half of the museum's entire operating budget five years ago," noted Rifkin. "We had never done a show of this magnitude—this scale—and it was a great success. It speaks well for what we can do in the future. It will allow us to take greater risks."

Seven Stages Theater had two contrasting experiences during the Games. It produced two successful plays as part of the official Festival (including the premiere of Sam Shepard's *When the World Was Green*) on a stage inside the geographic Ring. At their own recently renovated theater in Little Five Points (a neighborhood *outside* the Ring), they collaborated with the Arts Festival of Atlanta to host the nonofficial "Free Zone for Artists" a day-and-night opportunity for artists and audiences from around the world to share ideas and new work. "The work was extraordinary. We hosted the first Bosnian theater performance in the U.S. in thirty years and . . . nobody came," said Seven Stages Managing Director Lisa Mount. The nearby Horizon Theater had a similar experience with low attendance, forcing it to close its show early during the Olympics.

Nearby, Alternate ROOTS collaborated with Seven Stages to produce the Bizzoso Arts Park, an extraordinary free daily festival featuring music, readings, performance, storytelling, and circus arts for all ages. "Attendance was very disappointing," according to Kathie DeNobriga, ROOTS' director. "Olympics visitors had a 'security' mentality that Atlanta was not safe outside the Ring . . . especially after the bombing. Even so, the Arts Park was a very positive experience for all of us. We put together a demanding schedule that everyone met, and it strengthened the community of artists."

For these and other arts productions, the unknowns were *so* great that planning was difficult. Other factors that contributed to low participation included poor arts and culture coverage in the popular press, traffic (or rumors of it), overwhelming competition for attention, addiction to NBC Olympic television coverage, and loyal arts audiences who were either too busy or out of town.

Many people in the art community, however, feel that they have grown profoundly because of the experience. There were many stories of exciting ground-breaking programs throughout the sprawling metropolitan Atlanta area. Many organizations report the same experience: best-ever arts programs with capacity audiences . . . until the Games opened, and again after the Games were over.

What else did the community gain? Early on, a group of independent visual artists united to insure representation during the Olympics and formed IVAC (Individual Visual Artists' Coalition); it is thriving five years later and has a committed and growing fee-paying membership. The Michael C. Carlos Museum ventured off the Emory University Campus and mounted *Souls Grown Deep: African American Vernacular Art of the South*, an enormous exhibition which tapped the African American experience to its mythic roots. Atlanta's first ever map of public art was produced by a group of five organizations (who had never collaborated before) and was picked up by the Olympic Arts Festival, reprinted, and distributed. The Atlanta Symphony Orchestra saw full houses with audiences in both concert dress and shorts, and further broadened its audience through its key role in the televised Opening and Closing Ceremonies. For many in business, it has been a very good year, resulting in increased charitable contributions to all nonprofits.

A recent headline in the *Atlanta Journal Constitution* read, "Invisible triumph . . . Art, apathy, sport converge in Olympic Festival's talent showcase that enthralled despite low profile." With what can this be compared? The Los Angeles Olympic Arts Festival was held twelve years ago during the boom-boom economics of the 1980s, and it enjoyed the media and marketing power of $5 million from the Times-Mirror Corporation. It is now the 1990s, and we see more financial stress and greater pressure to be socially, politically, and artistically diplomatic. Risk does not come easily. Things are different now.

"Once they realized that ACOG was not going to be their savior, many arts organizations came together to become a more cohesive community. Bonding together helped the creative community to think 'outside the box' —which contributed to new collaborations and programming," reflected Adrian King of The Coca-Cola Foundation. "And I think the Olympic Arts Festival 'raises the bar' for all of us. We had superb art, theater, dance, and music during the Olympics. It was a great inspiration."

Lisa M. Cremin
Metropolitan Atlanta Arts Fund

Arizona

Arizona's Legislature Creates Arts Endowment Fund

On April 15, 1996, legislation establishing the Arizona Arts Endowment Fund was signed by the Governor. This measure, which passed by wide margins in both the House of Representatives and the Senate, creates the public-sector component of a public-private partnership to ensure the stabilization and advancement of the arts in Arizona.

Beginning July 1, 1997, the State of Arizona will deposit up to $2 million per year for the next ten years in a state treasury account. These funds will accrue from an increment in the existing commercial amusement tax, principally on tickets to sporting events and movies. The $20 million fund will remain in perpetuity, with interest income available for distribution to arts organizations through the Arizona Commission on the Arts. Private sector funds, administered by the Arizona Community Foundation, will match the public endowment fund, making for an endowment of, potentially, $40 million at the end of the ten-year period. Private funds will include: arts organization endowment funds committed after April 15, 1996, and both designated and undesignated corporate, foundation, and individual funds held at the Arizona Community Foundation.

This historic, for Arizona, public-private partnership for the arts was initiated through the collaborative leadership, vision, and commitment of Arizonans for Cultural Development, the Arizona Commission on the Arts, key corporate leaders, tax attorneys, major lobbyists, chambers of commerce, and the dedication of several Republican and Democratic legislators who persisted in encouraging passage of the legislation against formidable odds.

Its genesis was a combination of a concern for the future of the arts given the new reality of reduced funding streams, and the conclusion that the most productive channel for that concern was to focus on resource development rather than resource loss. Arizona ten years ago was at the bottom of the states in per capita public support for the arts. As a young state with a highly transient population, a small corporate base, and a tradition of fiscal and social conservatism in state and local government, the arts remained a low funding priority, even for those dedicated to the cultural fabric of the state.

In the mid-1980s, a first innovative step towards a new future was taken with the launching of the Arizona Arts Stabilization Fund in partnership with National Arts Stabilization (NAS). That initiative, which continues, has had visible impact on the strategic planning and fiscal management capacities of the nine major organizations selected for participation. As a solely private fundraising effort, the $5.7 million project included $3.8 million in matching funds committed by the philanthropic and corporate community, and by over 150 individual donors. A pilot project of technical assis-

tance provided by NAS has just begun for three mid-sized organizations.

On the public side, in 1989 the legislature created the Arizona Arts Trust Fund, a set-aside of $15 of the filing fees required of for-profit corporations. This fund generates about $1 million a year, and provides supplemental annual support for arts organizations funded by the Arizona Commission on the Arts.

The success of the NAS/Arizona initiative played a critical role in shaping the new Arts Endowment Fund: the corporate chair of the Arizona Stabilization Committee led the effort to draft, introduce, and advocate passage of the legislation; the breadth of private funding for the Arizona Arts Stabilization Project proved that private dollars, properly targeted, could be identified to match the proposed new state endowment; and, the concept and importance of the NAS strategy has emerged as a fundamental component of the legislation.

Although still in draft form, the Endowment will be used for two initiatives: a multilevel stabilization program that will be directed to emerging and mid-sized organizations as well as to the major arts organizations already participating in the Arizona Arts Stabilization Program; and the implementation of VISION 2000, a statewide plan for arts education developed under the auspices of the Arizona Commission on the Arts, the Arizona Alliance for Arts Education, and the Arizona Department of Education.

Achievements of recent years notwithstanding, Arizonans committed to the future of the arts in this state know that the successes of today remain fragile. Each year since the enactment of the Arts Trust Fund in 1989, some legislators have come forward to try to eliminate it. Annual state allocations for the Arizona Commission on the Arts must be justified and debated. At least one attempt has been made to "trade" the new Arts Endowment for the Arts Trust Fund. The private sector must come forward quickly to match public funds in order to prevent a

Continued on page 32

In Memoriam
C. Bernard Jackson

On July 16, 1996 the arts world of Los Angeles lost a key figure, C. Bernard Jackson, founder and director of Inner City Cultural Center (ICCC). "Jack," as he was fondly known, influenced several generations of artists and community organizers as he helped them to realize the positive social potential to be derived from linking cultural and artistic concerns. It is fair to say that Jack reigned as one of the most respected and beloved individuals in the community arts field that he had been so instrumental in defining.

As early as 1959, Jackson dreamed of bringing pluralistic insights into theatrical production and, as a graduate student at UCLA, he co-created, with James V. Hatch, a civil rights agitprop musical, "Fly Blackbird," with a multiethnic cast. When the show went to New York, it won an Obie as best musical. A few years later, with the backing of actor Gregory Peck and UCLA neuropsychiatrist, J. Alfred Cannon, among others, Jackson tried to found an ideal multicultural center in racially mixed Central Los Angeles. "We couldn't get anyone interested," Jackson said. "Then came the Watts uprising [of 1965] and everybody was interested."

Rising from the ashes of Watts, the creative center set up shop in an old theater and won national prominence through a pilot Educational Laboratory Theater project sponsored by the National Endowment for the Arts, the U.S. Office of Education, and Los Angeles Unified School District. The growing center converted the Masonic building into four theaters, a library, offices, and studios and in 1989 added the Ivar Theater in Hollywood.

As Jackson worked to bridge cultures and communities, he also encouraged the burgeoning careers of several performers, among them Beah Richards, Paul Winfield, Lou Gosset, Jr., George Takei, Pat Morita, Bonnie Bedelia, Edward James Olmos, and Glynn Turman. By presenting their early work, he also boosted the careers of playwrights George C. Wolfe, August Wilson, and Luis Valdéz.

Jackson encouraged artists in all aspects of theater by staging annual competitions for acting, playwrighting, dancing, and music. He published books under the Inner City Press banner and created a magazine called Neworld, which chronicled developments in the multicultural arts. In 1993, a University of California at Santa Barbara scholar wrote a history of Jackson's creation, titled *The Autobiography of the ICCC: the Life and Times of America's First Multicultural Arts Institution.* Jackson made the complex a cultural center and at the same time, an educational and social service organization. And he wanted to make it last.

Jackson grew up in the tough Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn, New York. Because he already spoke Spanish, he became a sort of diplomat between racial groups. "Somehow, I ended up in the High School of Music and Art," Jackson said. "That changed my life. It got me out of the neighborhood and it certainly convinced me that art was a valuable tool for changing ways of perceiving the world."

Jackson served in the armed forces and graduated from Brooklyn College, then moved to UCLA to work on a master's degree in music. Among his awards were a Dramalogue award, the *LA Weekly* Award, and the NAACP Trailblazer and Image awards. The Alliance of Los Angeles Playwrights named its annual award for him.

While dealing with heart disease over the past five years, Jack did not "go gently into that dark night." He actively participated in conferences and in the ongoing search for support for his magnificent obsession, ICCC, until a few weeks before his death. To the end, he demonstrated a wry, enlightened crankiness that could drive others to do their best work.

John Orders
The James Irvine Foundation

News

Update: Center for Arts and Culture

Past issues of the *GIA Newsletter* have reported on the conception and founding of the Center for Arts and Culture. With an office in Washington D.C., the Center's mission is "to conduct nonpartisan, scholarly-based research and analysis about public policy issues affecting the arts and humanities." In the past several months, the Center has launched three benchmark studies.

The first study examines the relationship of tax policy in the United States to the nation's cultural sector. This study will include an analysis of existing tax policy provisions for the cultural sector; identify possible changes to the tax code and assess the potential impact of the changes; review motivational studies on giving to the cultural sector and analyze the relationship between the motivations for giving and specific tax changes; and thoroughly examine the public policy implications of possible changes, discussing why society might or might not wish to preserve or enhance existing tax structures that favor the cultural sector. Based on these findings, the Center will propose new changes to the tax code that would benefit the public and ensure a healthy cultural sector. The Center expects to publish findings of this study by the end of 1996.

The second project examines the economic and political viability of taxing various forms of income from the entertainment industry for the benefit of the nonprofit arts sector. This study will examine a variety of potential sources including taxes on videos, film production, or attendance, and cable television or spectrum fees, and the likely income expected from each source. The project will also include a study assessing the rationales for such new funding methods and the legal and public policy implications each may pose.

The Center is also working on an in-depth project that will analyze the American public's perspectives, concerns, and basic understandings of "culture." This study will identify those aspects of culture that the public values, fears, or fails to understand, and will map the connections between the public's perception of culture and its vision for a better society. These findings will enable the Center to lay the groundwork for developing broadly endorsed public policies of support for the arts and humanities, and for further developing the Center's own program agenda.

In addition to managing these projects and developing new ones, the Center is creating a comprehensive database of scholars, policy makers, artists, philanthropists, and policy analysts who can contribute to cultural policy studies and is compiling a catalogue of their research. As part of the organization's ongoing mission, the Center is tracking cultural policy research and activities taking place throughout the United States, and will make this information available in the form of directories and reports. To assist the Center in this task, please send any information you might have about cultural policy research, scholars, conferences, academic programs, articles, reports, legislation, or projects to: Andrea T. Sanseverino Galan, Center for Arts and Culture, 1755 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Suite 416, Washington D.C. 20036, 202-588-5277, fax: 202-588-9602, email <ctrartcult@aol.com>.

ACA and NALAA Merge

Americans for the Arts is a new national organization created by the merger of the American Council for the Arts (ACA) and the National Assembly of Local Arts Agencies (NALAA). The two organizations began operating under a joint-management agreement on July 1, 1996 and officially became a single entity in October.

NALAA, based in Washington D.C., has been an advocate and source of information and training for 3,800 local arts councils and organizations across the country. ACA, based in New York City and founded in 1960, is one of the oldest continuously operating arts service organizations; its board members included business leaders, foundation officials, and arts patrons. Fred Lazarus IV, past chairman of ACA, will be chairman of the board of the new organization. Robert L. Lynch, president and CEO of NALAA, will serve as its chief executive. Prior to the merger, each organization had an annual budget of about $1.5 million.

A key goal of Americans for the Arts is to attract more private and public resources to the arts in the U.S. A press release announcing the merger stated, "By uniting the funding potential of the private sector with a strong grassroots network of nearly 4,000 local arts agencies, the new organization intends to provide the strength in numbers and the funding that can enhance advocacy and influence cultural policy and support at all levels." Two other organizations are encompassed by the new structure: the National Coalition of United Arts Funds (over one hundred organizations and individuals dedicated to united arts fundraising), and the Urban Arts Federation (arts agencies in the fifty largest U.S. cities).

Representatives of both ACE and NALAA said that the merger would help them avoid duplication of effort, save money on operating costs, and create a more effective and unified voice for the arts. More information is available from Jennifer Neiman, Americans for the Arts, 202-371-2830 or Kim Airhart, Devillier Communications, 202-833-8121. Interested readers can also visit the ACA web site, <http//www.artsusa.org>.

Regional Reports

Continued from page 31

weakening of the case for the amusement tax set-aside. Challenges can be expected in each of the ten years during which the legislation commits funds to build the Endowment's principal.

But for the moment, there is cause to celebrate what can happen when the will to act is there and when leadership comes forward to make it happen.

Myra H. Millinger
The Flinn Foundation

Recommended Reading

Building Communities from the Inside Out

In the course of listening to John McKnight when he lectures, or reading his book, *Building Communities from the Inside Out: A Path toward Finding and Mobilizing a Community's Assets*, it is difficult to avoid pondering the failure of centralized efforts to revitalize America's cities, beginning with the massive housing projects of the postwar era. McKnight is an optimistic and often humorous person who earned his community development credentials in the Saul Alinsky school of confrontational organizing. Over the years, however, he has come to see angry marches aimed at convincing government officials to fund favored neighborhood projects as a relatively ineffectual tactic. Rather, McKnight would prefer to identify and mobilize community-based resources, including artists and arts associations, long before seeking outside support from foundations and government in the arduous process of neighborhood building.

Coauthored by John P. Kretzmann, *Building Communities* is not an academic text, but rather a step-by-step work manual designed for community development practitioners of various persuasions, including grantmakers. The central thesis is that communities must be understood as aggregations of assets: individuals, associations, institutions, physical assets (land and buildings), and "capacity finders and developers." The first step in an effective neighborhood advancement effort is to "map" these assets, a process that will yield varying results depending on the age and character of each community. Throughout the book, however, the authors note that artists (both professional and amateur), local cultural associations, and formal arts institutions are key assets in all communities, even in impoverished urban neighborhoods. Indeed, significant sections of the book are devoted to "Local Artists" and "Cultural Institutions."

Whereas outsiders often regard urban neighborhoods as collections of pathologies, *Building Communities* provides scores of examples of how artists and cultural associations build communities by preserving traditions, formulating visions, inspiring youth, generating economic development, and enhancing social cohesion. The authors suggest that artists themselves are often a caste of marginalized people, along with youth, seniors, welfare recipients, and the disabled—undiscovered within their own neighborhoods. And yet " . . . local artists can help to create a revivified perspective from which can be derived the strength and vision that are required in order to heal sick, fragmented, internally divided neighborhoods and reconnect them with their genuine roots and uncompromised futures."[1]

Building Communities provides useful techniques for grantmakers with an interest in connecting the arts to an asset-based approach to community development. It even provides sample guidelines from three community foundations (Tucson, Greater Memphis, and Southwest Washington) that have incorporated asset-based strategies into their routine grantmaking. The Chicago Community Trust was instrumental in funding *Building Communities*, and many of the case histories contained in the book derive from Chicago neighborhoods.

John Kreidler
San Francisco Foundation

[1]Pg. 95, *Building Communities from the Inside Out: A Path Toward Finding and Mobilizing a Community's Assets*, by John P. Kretzmann and John L. McKnight, Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, 1993, 376 pages. Phone orders: 1-800-397-2282.

Grantmakers in the Arts Newsletter

Autumn 1996; Volume 7, Number 2

Editors, Anne Focke and Sarah Lutman

The newsletter is published twice a year. The submission deadline for the next issue is February 1, 1997. Send submissions to:

Anne Focke, P.O. Box 21487, Seattle, Washington 98111-3487, 206-343-0769, afocke @artswire.org

Sarah Lutman, The Bush Foundation, E-900 First Nat'l Bank Bldg., St. Paul, Minnesota 55101, lutman@artswire.org

Grantmakers in the Arts (GIA) is a national membership organization of primarily private sector grantmakers interested in the arts and arts-related activities. Its 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.

Reports Received

• • •

Grant Giving American Indian Foundations and Organizations

Native Americans in Philanthropy has released a "Survey of Grant Giving American Indian Foundations and Organizations." The survey documents the twenty-two foundations and ten funds that are organized and managed by American Indians, and that made charitable donations to Native causes in the United States in 1994. The report is the first of its kind, and provides an introductory essay on the state of philanthropy among American Indians (including a section on tribal gaming). Among the $7.6 million in grants given by these philanthropic entities in 1994, fifty-one percent were made for education; about ten percent supported cultural preservation; seventeen percent supported economic development; and twenty-two percent supported environment, media, human services, and "other." Grantmakers interested in working with American Indian communities will find this report helpful. Copies are available for $15 from Native Americans in Philanthropy, P.O. Drawer 1429, 1102½ East Second Street, Lumberton, North Carolina 28359. *S.L.*

• • •

Coming Up Taller

Coming Up Taller, a report on arts and humanities programs for children and youth at risk, includes everything from an environmental scan on the lives of children in today's society to a detailed look at 218 programs which are making a difference in those young lives. The comprehensive report, which presents its information in an easy-to-read, format, was commissioned by the President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities and prepared with assistance from the National Assembly of Local Arts Agencies.

The 164-page report, which documents arts and humanities programs that are changing children's lives, includes a summary of findings in its introduction, and is then divided into six chapters. The first chapter, "A Changed Environment for Children," documents the reality of life for children in everything from their relationships with community institutions to the violence surrounding them. The second chapter reviews the impact the arts and humanities can have on children and is followed by a chapter providing an overview of programs which have worked. The next two chapters summarize the principles, policies and practices which are part of successful projects and then take a look at what is needed, such as financial support and technical assistance, to insure that programs are effective.

The last section provides half-page summaries of 218 programs operated by organizations which were interviewed in detail about everything from staff training to evaluation methods. Phone numbers and addresses also are included for each project for readers wanting more information. The report includes the requisite number of charts and statistics but they are interspersed with photographs, graphics and clear, concise text. Copies of the report may be obtained from the President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 526. Washington, D.C., 20506 or by calling 202 682-5409. *D.E.*

• • •

Gallup Omnibus Study

The Council on Foundations commissioned The Gallup Organization of Princeton, New Jersey to conduct a national public opinion study of adults in the United States on their perceptions of foundations. The study was conducted in February, 1996. More than 1,000 adults from across the United States were contacted by telephone from randomly generated telephone lists. Among the study highlights were these:

- About half of respondents (51%) thought that foundation grants were given mostly to established organizations like museums, hospitals, and universities.
- A majority of respondents (59%) perceived that a large part of foundation giving went to community organizations providing basic services.
- Opinions varied about whether foundations provide money to test new ways of solving social problems. Roughly one-third thought that foundations do serve this purpose, another third disagreed, and a third neither agreed or disagreed.
- Respondents were asked whether they thought foundation or individual giving represented more total dollars. Fifty-nine percent thought that foundation giving adds up to either "much more" or "about the same" as the amount given by individuals.

The Council on Foundations intends to use the report to develop its public information efforts. Questions may be directed to Sunshine Overkamp at the Council's Washington headquarters. *S.L.*

• • •

Artists' Communities

Artists' Communities—A Directory of Residencies in the United States Offering Time and Space for Creativity is published by the Alliance of Artists' Communities and will be released in October 1996. The directory includes detailed information on each of seventy organizations offering residence opportunities in the United States for visual artists, writers, composers, and performing artists. Photographs of each community are accompanied by information about facilities, length of residency, application deadlines, fees, selection process, programs, and institutional history. The guide also includes a list of other organizations offering related programs and a list of international artists' communities. Several essays complete the volume: an introduction by poet Stanley Kunitz, a description and an overview of the artists' communities as a whole, and four essays by artists about their

experiences in residence. The guide costs $16.95 and is being distributed by Consortium. For more information contact the Alliance of Artists' Communities, 210 SE 50th Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97215, email<aac@teleport.com>. *A.F.*

• • •

Here + Now

Here + Now, a report on the arts in Minnesota prepared by Minneapolis McKnight Foundation is the size of a small paperback book but it is big in scope and ideas. And although the report is focused on a particular state—one very rich in artistic resources—many of the issues facing organizations, artistic disciplines, individual artists and communities in that state are universal.

In the book's preface, Cynthia Boynton, the foundation president, very effectively makes the case for support of the arts and the critical role the arts and culture play in creating, building and sustaining communities. The book's introduction, which provides an overview of the arts in Minnesota, is followed by chapters dealing with five individual artistic disciplines—theater, literature, visual arts, music and dance—as well as rural arts and neighborhood arts.

Each of the discipline chapters is preceded by two pages of statistics which cover everything from to percent of earned income to the number of organizations which still have the founder actively involved. A chilling statistic in each section: the percent of organizations which say economic circumstances will make them less willing to take economic risk. Each essay is written by an artist who provides some history, a quick overview of the field, interpretation of the statistics and personal observations on what they see happening and why. Most also list the problems, challenges and issues Minnesota artists and organizations face. The section on neighborhood arts includes a thought-provoking "Letter to My Mother" from visual artist Seitu Jones who analyzes why current outreach efforts and attempts to increase diversity in mainstream arts organizations are not working and what the future might look like. The report ends with a chapter written by William Cleveland, who did the statewide evaluation for the foundation, interviewing more than 250 people over a four-month period. Among his observations: Some grantmakers are operating in ways that are contrary to the needs of the field. A rapidly changing social and economic environment is affecting what art is being seen. Technology is neither understood nor used to best advantage.

Copies of *Here + Now* may be obtained from the McKnight Foundation, 600 TCF Tower, 121 South Eighth Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota. 55402. *D.E.*

• • •

Artistic Freedom under Attack

People for the American Way recently released the fourth edition of its Annual report titled, *Artistic Freedom Under Attack*. The report documents 137 challenges to artistic expression in forty-one states and the District of Columbia. The report also includes information and assistance for those who need help facing a debate in their local community. This "Action Kit" is comprised of sample letters, news releases, letters to the editor, and other tools for informing public opinion. Copies of the report may be obtained from People for the American Way, 2000 M Street NW, Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20036. (http://www.pfaw.org) *S.L.*

• • •

How Democracy Works

The Blue Mountain Working Group has published a twenty-eight page booklet *How Democracy Works: A New Civil Rights & Civil Liberties Handbook*. Using the U.S. Constitution as a reference point, the authors pose and answer eighteen questions about the Constitution, civil rights, and civil liberties. The booklet is being distributed free of charge through independent bookstores and nonprofit labor and social justice organizations, and by people willing to take camera-ready copy and reprint copies for their own organizations. Call 800-477-6233 for copies or 206-622-3486 for reprinting information. Information is also available by email: <bluemnt@nwlink.com>. *A.F.*

• • •

The Status and Future of Public Arts Funding

Most of us did not have the good fortune to attend a symposium on "The Status and Future of Public Arts Funding" which was presented by the Mid-America Arts Alliance in St. Louis in late 1995. However, thanks to publication of the proceedings of that symposium, anyone who is interested in the issue can read the provocative presentations made by eleven insightful individuals, each offering a unique personal perspective. The publication also includes transcripts of the lively question and answer sessions which followed each speech.

Presenters included Dean Amhaus, executive director of the Wisconsin Arts Board; Arlene Goldbard, a writer and consultant; Wisconsin Congressman Steve Gunderson; Frank Hodsoll, former NEA chair; Jonathan Katz, chief executive of the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies; John Kreidler, senior program office for arts and humanities at the San Francisco Foundation; Robert Lynch, president of the National Assembly of Local Arts Agencies; Alice Goldfarb Marquis, visiting scholar at the University of California at San Diego who has written extensively about the arts; Daniel Ritter, executive director of the Center for Arts and Culture; Constance Ware, chair of the Texas Commission on the Arts; and Margaret Wyszomirski, professor at the Weatherhead School of Nonprofit Management at Case Western Reserve University.

As expected, each discussed the policy issues involved in public funding of the arts from his or her particular vantage point, making for interesting reading which clearly delineated some of the philosophical issues at stake in

the current debate as well providing an interesting historical perspective. Copies of the report are limited in number. For information contact the Mid-America Arts Alliance, 912 Baltimore Ave. #700, Kansas City, Missouri, 64105 or by calling 816-421-1388. *D.E.*

• • •

Keeping the Books

Keeping the Books: Developing Financial Capacity of Your Nonprofit Press is a new publication from The Stevens Group, a consulting form based in Saint Paul, Minnesota. The book is one product of The Stevens Group involvement with nine small presses which participated in the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation's Small Press Loan and Technical Assistance Program. The book provides an excellent nuts-and-bolts guide to the unique financial situation of the small publisher, while also providing a useful outlook on budgeting, cash flow, and accounting that is transferable to most nonprofits. Grantmakers whose jobs include analyzing the financial condition of nonprofit publishers will find this guide helpful. Copies of the 136-page book may be obtained for a nominal fee from: The Stevens Group, 570 Asbury Street, Suite 206, Saint Paul, Minnesota 55104. *S.L.*

• • •

CLMP Monographs

The Council of Literary Magazines and Presses (CLMP) has published a series of monographs on marketing strategies for literary magazines and presses. The series is likely to hold special interest for readers interested in programs in various disciplines that aim to expand audiences and increase earned income. The monographs were developed through CLMP's Literary Publishers Marketing Development Program that began in 1991 and was funded by the Lila Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund. Thirty-six magazines and presses participated in the program and received marketing training as well as assistance in developing comprehensive marketing plans. The monographs were developed to disseminate marketing information to other publishers who might benefit from the same information. Seven monographs have been published since the series began in 1994. They include "Planning for Marketing (and Other Exotic, Quixotic Notions), An Introduction to Goals, Objectives and Strategies" by Laurie MacDougall; "Getting the Word Out—The Power of Publicity" by Mary Bisbee-Beek; "Readers Surveys: Getting to Know Your Audience" by George Dillehay; "The Perfect Fulfillment System: One Magazine's Search" by Charlotte Mealor; "From Doughnuts to Champagne: The Art of Bookstore Promotions" by Tom Bielenberg and Allan Kornblum; "Textbook Adoptions: A Promising Market for Literary Presses" by Nicolás Kanellos; and "Circulation Development for Literary Magazines" by Rebecca Sterner. CLMP also holds marketing workshops throughout the country. Copies of the monographs are available for $10 each, or $6 each if more than two are ordered. Contact CLMP, 154 Christopher Street, Suite 3C, New York, NY 10014-2839.

A.F.

• • •

An Arts Guide to the World Wide Web

Published by Art in the Public Interest (API) for its charter members, *An Arts Guide to the World Wide Web* is a helpful introduction to the Web that is written in lay terms. The authors, Linda Burnham and Steven Durland, have designed the guide to reach a broad spectrum of readers, "even if you think you're technologically challenged." The 24-page publication describes what the World Wide Web is, outlines what is needed to use the Web, and briefly describes what information is available there, how the information got there, and how to add one's own information. Appendices include a discussion of email, and a selective list of forty-two addresses for Websites of interest to people in the arts—including sites that provide reference and technical support, general interest sites such as Congress and the Foundation Center, and a broad sampling of specific arts sites. API is a nonprofit organization "committed to providing information and resources in support of art that is culturally engaged and serving our neighborhoods, schools, and communities." For more information contact: Art in the Public Interest, P.O. Box 68, Saxapahaw, North Carolina 27340, <highperf@artswire.org>, <http//www.artswire.org/high/perf/APIhome.html>. *A.F.*

• • •

Research Agenda for a Networked Cultural Heritage

The Getty Art History Information Program released *Research Agenda for a Networked Cultural Heritage* in July, 1996. The report is the culmination of a year-long effort to build consensus among humanists and technology experts on the most needed research efforts in the field of arts and humanities computing. The report consists of eight papers describing research needs in thematic areas such as "Tools for Creating and Exploiting Content," and "New Social and Economic Mechanisms to Encourage Access." These papers were released on the Internet in 1995, where more than 500 scholars discussed them. This volume continues the Getty's AHIP program investigation of the implications of the digital age on libraries, universities, museums, and other repositories of cultural material. Copies may be obtained from The Getty Art History Information Program, 401 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1100, Santa Monica, CA 90401. (http://www.ahip.getty.edu/ahip/home.html) *S.L.*

• • •

Bush Artist Fellowships

The Bush Foundation has supported individual artists since 1976 through the **Bush Artist Fellowships**, but in 1993 undertook a review of the program to examine its purpose and structure in light of the increased breadth of arts activity and arts funding in the region and in consideration of any changes in the thinking about ways a foundation can make a difference in the lives of artists.

The thorough review, prepared by consultant Anne Focke, involved more than 70 interviews, a review of lit-

erature and materials on other artist support programs and analysis of historical data on the Bush program. The report calls for continuing the program, but shifting the purpose and emphasis to more explicitly stating the intention to foster community benefit as opposed to focusing solely on artist benefit. Although the report focuses on the Bush program, it provides useful insights into issues, such as the compo-sition of funding panels and the gathering of information about artists, which should be helpful to funders interested in individual artist programs.

Copies of the report may be obtained from the Bush Foundation, E-900 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101. *D.E.*

• • •

Toward a Stronger Voluntary Sector

The Indiana Center on Philanthropy published the proceedings of a meeting of its National Board of Visitors. The report is titled, "Toward a Stronger Voluntary Sector: The 'Filer Commission' and the State of Philanthropy." The occasion was the twentieth anniversary of the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs (the Filer Commission). Participants in the 1995 meeting included former members of the Filer Commission, journalists, scholars, fundraisers, and foundation executives.

Papers presented at the meeting are contained in the report. These were authored by Eleanor Brilliant, Professor of Social Work at Rutgers University; Virginia Hodgkinson, Vice President for Research at Independent Sector; and Robert Payton, Professor of Philanthropy Studies at Indiana University. Brilliant's paper traces the evolution and history of the Filer Commission, as well as the Commission's accomplishments. Hodgkinson's paper focuses on the impact of the Commission, especially in the areas of research and public policy. Payton's paper sets forth his ideas for what work a future Filer Commission might undertake.

Those interested in broader concerns of philanthropy and the nonprofit sector, and, in particular, those new enough to the field to be unfamiliar with the work and consequences of the Filer Commission, will find this report an unusually helpful piece of reading. Copies may be obtained from the Indiana University Center on Philanthropy, 550 West North Street, Suite 301, Indianapolis, IN 46202. *S.L.*

• • •

Harmony

Harmony is a semi-annual publication of the Symphony Orchestra Institute, P.O. Box 67, Deerfield, Illinois. The *GIA Newsletter* received a copy of the April, 1996 edition of Harmony for review. The journal is substantive, offering a series of essays on topics such as "Why They're Not Smiling: Stress and Discontent in the Orchestral Workplace," by Seymour and Robert Levine, and "Symphony Orchestra Economics: The Fundamental Challenge," by William Baumol. Grantmakers with responsibilities in the performing arts will wish to become familiar with this new journal, a welcome addition to current discussion of classical music organizations. *S.L.*

• • •

Why the Arts?

The University of Richmond's Winter 1996 magazine featured a story called "Why the Arts?" which aimed to provide multiple points of view about the importance of art in a liberal education. Among essays by students and faculty was one by Assistant Professor of Physics Dr. Philip Rubin. Rubin says:

"No surprise that art and science flourish together . . . This is because, in the words of Cyril Stanley Smith, 'Discovery derives from aesthetically motivated curiosity and is rarely a result of practical purposefulness.' Artists and scientists alike seek patterns. They look at things, and, most significantly, they interpret what they perceive. Victor Weisskopf wrote, 'What's beautiful in science is the same thing that's beautiful in Beethoven. There's a fog of events and suddenly you see a connection.' In order to do so requires imagination. The creative artist and the scientist break with the past by visualizing some aspect of the world in a different way . . . The separation of the disciplines is to some extent artificial. No doubt the increasing bulk of knowledge demands some reasonable sorting. But a fundamental understanding of, and thereby the ability to think critically about, even a portion of our collective store of wisdom depends on a certain level of literacy beyond that minimally expected in the field to which a subject is consigned. A liberal education truly consists of the arts and the sciences. A progressive society fosters and cherishes both."

Copies of the magazine may be obtained from the Editorial Offices at Maryland Hall, University of Richmond, Richmond, VA 23173. *S.L.*

• • •

Data on Organizations: A Review and Needs Assessment, with Design Implications by Paul DiMaggio and Deborah Kaple (see article on page 12) is available for $20 from the Princeton Center for Arts and Cultural Policy Studies (Attn: Deborah Kaple), 2-N-2 Green Hall, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544. The executive summary of the report is available at the Center's site on the World Wide Web at: http://www.princeton.edu/~artspol/ The Center's other study, an inventory of available information on attitudes toward and participation in the arts, will be available by late fall.

The newsletter editors are grateful to Deena Epstein (George Gund Foundation) for her help reviewing and summarizing reports in this issue. Anyone interested in helping with reports in the future is welcome to contact us. More importantly, we encourage you to send us copies of research, studies, and reports prepared or supported by your organization and to let us know about reports by others that you find stimulating.

Profiles of GIA Members

With this issue, the newsletter begins to include short profiles of a few GIA members. Our emphasis this time is on members who have joined fairly recently.

Behnke Foundation

The Behnke Foundation is a private family foundation with offices in Seattle, Washington. "Its purpose is to help improve the quality of life in the communities where the Behnke families live and work through focused, innovative grantmaking." Basic giving areas include the arts, education, health and human services, and environmental organizations.

Not only is the Behnke Foundation a new member of GIA (November 1995), it is also a new foundation—its first year of giving was 1995. All living Behnke family members over the age of twenty serve as trustees; currently the foundation has six trustees. Board chair Shari Behnke believes that, although the trustees do not have a large amount to spend now ($50,000 last year), they are building a framework for the future.

Most of the foundation's grant funds are directed to nonprofit organizations in the Pacific Northwest. It has one annual funding cycle and the guidelines indicate that priority is given to start-up grants, research, pilot projects, single-year funding, and technical assistance. The foundation also offers an annual artist fellowship, "The Neddy," which is given in memory of Robert E. ("Ned") Behnke in celebration of his life as an artist. An unrestricted $10,000 fellowship is awarded each year to an artist selected with the participation of knowledgeable nominators from the community.

CERF (Craft Emergency Relief Fund)

CERF is a nonprofit organization that "provides immediate support to professional craftspeople suffering career threatening emergencies such as fire, theft, illness, and natural disaster." The board of directors includes craftspeople and others from many regions of the country; its office is located in Montpelior, Vermont. CERF executive director, Cornelia Carey, joined GIA as an affiliate member in the spring of 1996.

Established in 1985, CERF offers several programs including interest free loans, a booth fee waiver program, and a supplier discount program. CERF also has a "special funds program" through which other groups, such as the Glass Art Society or the Tennessee Association of Craft Artists, create separate funds for specific purposes. Examples include the Elaine Potter Fund for craftspeople with cancer, and a Natural Disaster Fund that has provided support during such disasters as the California earthquakes and the midwest floods. In its autumn 1992 issue, the *GIA Newsletter* reported on a special fund that CERF established for craft artists affected by Hurricane Andrew. Special funds have also been created to assist craftspeople living with HIV/AIDS and those risking homelessness.

CERF raises its funds from craftspeople, craft show producers, story and gallery owners, suppliers, collectors, foundations, and the NEA. Carey relayed a craft artist's comment: "Supporting CERF is helping our own community, it's like having our own insurance company."

Open Society Institute–New York

The Open Society Institute–New York is "a private operating and grantmaking foundation that promotes the development of open societies around the world." An annual report explains: "The concept of open society is based on the recognition that people act on imperfect knowledge and nobody is in possession of the ultimate truth. Unlike closed societies dominated by the state, open societies are characterized by a reliance on the rule of law, the existence of a democratically elected government, a diverse and vigorous civil society, respect for minorities and minority opinions, and a free market economy."

OSI-New York is part of a network of more than two dozen independent nonprofit foundations created and supported by George Soros in Central and Eastern Europe, the former Soviet Union, Haiti, South Africa, and the United States. OSI-New York provides assistance to the foundations in other countries by providing them technical assistance and other services, and by operating regional programs on common themes.

The Arts and Culture Regional Program of OSI-New York is a member of GIA. The Soros Foundations believe that "nurturing the diverse voices of a country's culture, from the artists to the audiences, is as important to the creation of a strong and vibrant open society as, for example, the building of market economies and independent media." With the emergence of free market economies in Central and Eastern Europe, people in the arts there are faced with creating new structures for fundraising, marketing, audience development, education, and so on. The arts and culture program promotes the sharing of information and resources among arts institutions, supports training programs, develops programs for the performing arts and cinema, and encourages the visual arts through the Soros Centers for Contemporary Arts. Another initiative with possible impact on U.S. arts and culture is the establishment of the Center on Crime, Communities and Culture, part of George Soros' new plans to increase giving in the United States.

Fundación Angel Ramos

"Desde su establecimiento el propósito principal de la Fundación Angel Ramos ha sido facilitar el camino para mejorar la calidad de vida de Puerto Rico. Al presente, la Junta de Directores de la Fundación orienta sus esfuerzos hacia cuatro sectores principales de interés: educación, cultura, salud, y civismo, por entender que alrededor de ellos se concentran las necesidades fundamentales de la comunidad que merecen atención preferente . . . Por motivo de las fuentes de sus recursos y de la intención del Fundador, [los proyectos que apoyan la Fundación] incluyen actividades que

promuevan la libertad de prensa y las buenas relaciones en el hemisferio."

The Angel Ramos Foundation, located in San Juan, Puerto Rico, is one of GIA's newest members having joined in July 1996. Founded by the late Angel Ramos, president of El Mundo Enterprises, the foundation began operation in 1966. The foundation's overall purpose is to improve the quality of life in Puerto Rico through giving in four areas—education, culture, health, and civic life. Reflecting the interests of its founder, the Ramos Foundation places a high priority on activities that promote freedom of the press, free public expression, and good relations throughout the hemisphere. Almost half of its resources are directed to education and to helping students who need economic support to pursue their education. Since it began, the foundation has directed almost $4 million to cultural development with two broad objectives: to nurture and support Puerto Rico's own artistic and cultural creativity, and to stay current with international cultural developments.

The Helen F. Whitaker Fund

The mission of the Helen F. Whitaker Fund is "to enhance the status of western classical music in the United States." Based in Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, the fund was established in 1982 upon the death of Helen F. Whitaker, businesswoman, community volunteer, and philanthropist. The fund has been a member of GIA since 1995.

The orientation and programs of the fund reflect Helen Whitaker's deep interest in western classical music and her desire to provide opportunities for young people. The fund currently has seven grant programs: 1) career development programs for classical musicians, 2) training programs for administrative personnel of classical music organizations, 3) music service organizations, 4) advanced training programs for orchestra musicians, and three regional programs, one each in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania; Naples, Florida; and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Except for the regional programs, the scope of the grant programs is national.

News from the GIA Board

Administrator

At its May meeting, the board of GIA voted to create a new part-time paid administrative position to manage GIA's growing, and increasingly complex, membership relations. Anne Focke, already known to the membership as a coeditor of the *GIA Newsletter*, was hired to take on the additional role of administrator. The responsibilities of this position are defined to give GIA a central point for administrative services, while allowing the organization to remain volunteer-driven and focused on the needs of the membership. The new administrative structure also gives GIA a permanent address: P.O. Box 21487, Seattle, Washington 98111-3487.

Membership Survey

A survey of the GIA membership is underway as one step in enhancing membership services. The survey will help the board determine what the members value most about the organization and how to set priorities for the next few years. Preliminary survey findings will be reported at the annual membership meeting held during the GIA conference in Pittsburgh.

Membership Renewal

Invitations to renew GIA memberships were sent to all 1995/96 members in late July. Now would be a good time to renew if you or your organization has not done so yet. If you were a member last year and did not receive a brochure and renewal invitation, please call Anne Focke at 206-343-0769, or write to her care of GIA's post office box (see above).

Listening, Leading, Responding

Annual GIA Conference

The 1996 GIA Conference will take place October 27-30 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. The conference will provide arts grantmakers an opportunity to reflect on their roles, increase their knowledge, make connections, and examine the ways they do their work.

Breakfast Roundtable Discussions

Informal roundtable discussions are scheduled at the GIA conference on Tuesday morning, October 29, from 8:00 to 9:30 a.m. As the newsletter went to press, the following topics were confirmed.

- Lessons learned in the restructuring of the NEA: Jennifer Dowley (NEA) and Diane Mataraza (NEA).
- Trends in technology and the impact of technology on philanthropy: Dan Martin (Arts Management Program, Carnegie Mellon University).
- Starting and managing grantmaker collaborations: Kassie Davis (Marshall Field's)
- Future financial support for artists: Pamela Clapp (Warhol Foundation), Anne Focke (author, artist support study), and Cynthia Gehrig (Jerome Foundation).
- Arts education: a session especially designed for grantmakers who are skeptical about arts education or who don't currently fund it: Ellen Rudolph (Surdna Foundation).
- Considering artistic quality in a decade of diminishing resources: Sarah Lutman (Bush Foundation).
- A opportunity for family foundation grantmakers to share common concerns, and to learn about activities underway to begin a dialogue about the arts and artists among family foundations nationally: Mercy Pavelić (Heathcote Art Foundation).

Grantmakers in the Arts Newsletter

P.O. Box 21487
Seattle, WA 98111-3487

FIRST-CLASS MAIL
U. S. POSTAGE
P A I D
SEATTLE, WA
PERMIT NO. 210