

4

Into the Eighties

THE NATIONAL GROUPS AND COMMITTEES

What were mere words in the original federal legislation creating the National Endowment for the Arts have become recognized as much more than that today. Local initiative is what it is all about; the rest would be folly without it. In some sense, everything is local – all arts institutions, artists, arts activities. Federal legislation usually reflects what has been happening in our communities, and how people feel about it; the arts are no different from any other area of human need when it comes to this aspect of government response. Thus when, in the 1960s, there was official federal legislation having to do with the arts, it evolved from community activity. The mandate was to “assist America’s artists and arts organizations and to bring art to as many citizens as possible.” By the 1980s, what had begun as a small government concern had become accepted as an appropriate part of government policy. Through the impact of the many programs carried out by agencies on all levels of government, changing the attitudes of legislators and affecting legislation, the role of the arts in government had been validated.¹

At the time the Endowment came into being, there were 18 state arts agencies and over 100 local arts councils. By the end of 1967, all 50 states and three special jurisdictions had established state arts agencies. “The mood reflected was a new optimism, but there was by no means a common

currency and/or program, and the fledging organizations on all levels had to have the zeal and the commitment of missionaries.”²

On the local level, the present trend could be characterized as one in which the local agency is realizing its role in completing the jurisdictional network, which up to this time has been preponderantly state and national. This means that attention has become more and more focused on those public or publicly designated arts agencies at the local level. The private agency, as well, has become public oriented in its services – to such an extent that activities such as coordinating arts organizations’ schedules and calendars only scratch the surface of available services to arts organizations and the public.

With the federal government agency, the states’ agencies, and the local organizations developing simultaneously, it was a matter of first things first, though.

The first mention of community arts councils by NEA occurs in the justification for the first appropriations made to the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities in October 1965 by Roger L. Stevens, then Chairman of the National Council on the Arts and the new Chairman of the just-established National Endowment for the Arts, and the others present:

The heart of the program is a partnership between the federal government and private resources, state and local governments, and institutions responsible for the arts and humanities. The objectives are . . . to support programs and projects of artistic and cultural significance, encourage creativity, and make the arts more broadly available across the nation. . . . Since 1949, nearly 100 cities across the country have formed community arts councils. The effectiveness and efficiency of these councils [have] been amply demonstrated in the past. It is planned to provide assistance through small matching grants for special projects in order to strengthen and encourage efforts in these progressive cities.³

So far as anyone is able to determine, the program was not undertaken. In a prepared statement that repeated to a large extent the contents of the budget justification, Stevens does not repeat the reference, which seems interesting in retrospect.⁴

The interests of keeping the communities issue before the Endowment and Congress was not a new thing. When the Endowment first came into being, the present Office of Partnership was the State-Community Office. In a description and evaluation of one of the first grants for the arts in small communities ever given by the Endowment in 1966 (awarded to the Office of Community Arts Development, Wisconsin Idea Theater, Extension Arts, University Extension, the University of Wisconsin, Madison), the assumption was made that democratic, grassroots arts are a basic goal of arts developers and community arts leaders.⁵

The arts council was, in this project, the vehicle seen for the propagation of new ideas and the organization of arts in the experimental communities. Councils were seen as the mediators of change in their communities — groups that could see both the past and future. They were seen as meeting grounds for those concerned with community welfare and interest in the arts, as well as those from disciplined arts commitments. The councils were advised to define their areas of influence according to the subtle human relations considerations unique to each situation.⁶ The process for assessing the arts needs of the community was almost the same as that laid out by Virginia Lee Comer for the cities in the 1940s⁷:

As the community is awakened to its opportunity in the arts, it becomes a laboratory through which the vision of the region is reformulated and extended. And as the small community discovers its role, as the small community generates freshness of aesthetic response across the changing American scene, American life and arts are enhanced.⁸

The research study later done on this program points to some interesting and prophetic materials for arts administration and arts councils. The organization (or individual) whose goal is community arts development must define the role clearly. "It is to create an additudinal readiness for the arts in a democratic framework — it cannot expect to bring about the grass-roots changes alone."⁹

But the Endowment, in those same years, was assisting in the development of all the state councils, and this community portion of the network was out there developing and proliferating — *mostly* on its own. There was just not enough money for everything, and at the Endowment, the program was changed in the early 1970s to reflect more accurately the federal-state programming. "Community" was deleted from the title.

It was in other areas of the Endowment's work that the major contributions would be made over the 1970s. Through programs known as Expansion Arts, City Spirit, and Architecture and Environmental Arts, cities and communities throughout the United States began to feel the impact of the Endowment's community effort.

NACAA was founded in 1971, under the umbrella of ACA, to give community councils, commissions, arts centers, and united arts fund organizations a national voice (much in the same way CACI had earlier developed under ASOL — and then into the Arts Councils of America in 1965). It has maintained a continuing relationship with the Endowment as an advocate for the community councils and agencies as direct client in much the same way as the states' agency has.

Until 1974, when NASAA opened an independent office and established itself as a professional national organization, it too was under the

aegis of ACA. The North American Assembly of State and Provincial Arts Agencies (originally including Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, the Canadian provinces, and Mexico) was organized in 1968 within the framework of ACA. Now known as NASAA, it is an association of state government arts agencies. The assembly provides a forum for discussion and exchange of information and experience pertinent to its membership, and seeks to develop and recommend policy in the field of arts and government. By 1967, all of the state arts councils had developed, and by 1969–70, when the first directory of state arts councils was published, there was a clear record of how far they had come in the five years since the establishment of the National Endowment for the Arts.

In short, the congressional belief in 1965 that “public support of the arts is in the public interest” was then unanimous. . . . Indeed this universal acceptance and ratification by all the states is strong testimony . . . of the permanent enactment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965.¹⁰

Several state arts agencies expressed at that time the fact that they owed their existence to the Endowment — the “stroke of genius in providing \$25,000 nonmatching grants to the states to conduct arts surveys.”¹¹ Eighteen states already had councils when this was done, but those that rallied around this point got on with it then. Charles C. Mark, current consultant and editor for *Arts Reporting Service*, was the first person behind the desk in the State-Community-Operations Office (later the Federal-State Office, then the Office of Partnership) at the Endowment, and it was his job to counsel the emerging state councils in the years between 1965 and 1967 — those developmental years. His was substantial and important work.* In 1974, as noted, NASAA incorporated as a professional national organization and set up a Washington office that serves as a liaison between the state art agencies, federal agencies, the National Endowment for the Arts, the Congress of the United States, and other arts service organizations. It provides a reporting service to all members on Endowment policies, procedures, and programs, and coverage of legislative matters dealing with the arts. It also serves as an initiator and clearinghouse for research and information on the state agencies.

When NACAA was considering a move in the direction of establishing a professional national organization apart from ACA in 1978, John Everitt, now Director of the Arts and Humanities Council of Tulsa, wrote to John Blaine regarding its future: “The time has come for community arts agen-

*In the framework of diminished federal emphasis in the 1980s, the building of the state network gains impact and importance beyond that originally imagined.

cies to stake their claim to their rightful future in the American Arts Community.”¹² That probably accurately summarizes the mood of the state arts agencies in a similar situation in 1973. In the same month that Everitt wrote to Blaine, ACA members received a letter from Michael Newton, the group’s President, reflecting on 1973 when NASAA developed its own independent status, and the fact that NACAA was considering the same step. He favored the direction: “ACA can best devote itself to identifying and serving those needs of the arts that cut across the traditional arts disciplines.”¹³ (The director of NASAA at the beginning of the 1980s had a background with the performing arts, with the Arts Council of New Orleans, and with the Board of Directors of NACAA as Vice-President. If ever there was a moment of potential focus on mutual progress and understanding, it could be expected at this point.)

The frustration on all levels about how to recognize the local development — its pace and dimension — is nowhere better exhibited than in the Endowment’s own deliberations on communities. Although the Endowment from the start was to make 20 percent or more of its funds available to state arts councils (three-fourths of the total to be distributed in equal amounts to all, and one-fourth to be at the Endowment’s discretion), there was no clear mandate about communities. However, local groups have had access to the individual arts discipline program grants on a merit basis, equal to that of other applicants for support programs and services. In 1980 it was possible for a community council or city department of cultural affairs to apply for appropriate program, project, production, and service funds from 39 Endowment programs. (Of course, they would be considered on a merit basis in competition with all others.)¹⁴

The question has been one of recognizing the federal-state-local partnership and enabling it to become a reality. At its meeting in September 1980, NASAA issued a position paper that urged the Endowment to recognize the substantial evidence warranting its full attention to communities. When asked for support for the idea, the state arts agencies could themselves recognize this goal only after most of their own priorities had become better defined. Most of their budgets were over \$1 million at this point, and it had taken this time for them to mature to the point of acknowledging their direct responsibility for the organizational growth and development of the community arts agencies. In a few states this has long been a priority, but 36 states (twice the number of the years before) attended the session at which the statement was formulated.

The National Endowment for the Arts has commissioned three studies to look at the community issue since 1976. Most have been politely or summarily shelved. In 1980, though, pressure for action was coming from another source — the Congress of the United States. In passing the reauthorization bill that would assure the Endowment of its existence from 1981 to

1985, Congress was for the first time specific about encouraging the Endowment to be more responsive to arts activities at the local level. The law, which establishes the agency and sets down its general operations mandate, asks for the involvement of state governments in the local efforts so that state and local arts activities will be coordinated. Even though this really only legitimizes the efforts made over the past years by NACAA, and in 1980 by NASAA (as well as by the Endowment's Office of Partnership itself), it also pushes for some response by the National Council.

The National Council on the Arts had been faced with policy decisions on behalf of communities before, but had deferred actions to new task forces or study developments through the years.¹⁵ In asking why, one finds as many answers as there are individuals questioned, but some attributions include the following:

1. The lack of a handle on the who-what-where of the local arts agencies who were asking to be served directly. The sheer growing numbers were scary to a federal agency. NACAA was seen as representing them. But the community arts agencies are greater in number than any single-discipline group, and even the task forces appointed by the Endowment to represent them had consensus troubles.

2. Lack of support from within the Endowment staff itself. Through the years, many of the disciplines have included direct access to Endowment programs competitively, and the staff (and almost anyone who was asked) didn't see a need for additional and separate access. Early tensions existed between such programs as CityArts of Expansion Arts, which hadn't proved itself, and the Office of Partnership.

3. Confusion and power plays among the Endowment staff members, and tensions in the field causing the rejection of some possibilities that might have become a beginning point.

Example: Taking the 1977 Endowment in-house study commissioned through the Chairman's office, James Backas had been appointed to "think through the whole range of community arts activity from the point of view of fundamental policy. It is Endowment-wide in scope and of first-magnitude importance to the Endowment."¹⁶ Among its recommendations, the study called for the possibility that state arts agencies, the community arts agencies within the states, and the local governments would develop a state-wide plan that would be funded through a second-tier block grant program. Planning grants would be available to stimulate the planning process. The program would work with agencies in SMSAs (standard metropolitan statistical areas). At the time (fiscal year 1976), 36 state arts agencies assisted 669 community arts agencies with Endowment Federal-State Community Development Grants, matched by state funds. All other Endowment pro-

grams reached 98 community arts agencies directly. Of these, 41 were City Spirit facilitator programs, Expansion Arts programs, special projects, and grants from other programs of the Endowment.¹⁷

Example: A 1978 Federal-State Panel recommended that staff members develop a pilot program of direct grants to community arts agencies (\$250,000) on an invitational basis.

The reasons cited prevented these recommendations and/or programs to progress. This period, between mid-1977 and mid-1978, was especially chaotic, with the first shift in top-level administration at the Endowment since 1969.

The period of the transition between Nancy Hanks' and Livingston Biddle's leadership was an uneasy time at the Endowment. There were the natural power plays, the old and the new, the reorganization. And in that reorganization, something happened to some of the city programs. Although the City Spirit program director's contract was to expire anyway, and it was easy just to let the program go, the fact is that it had no great support and in many places was not understood, except in the cities and communities that had gotten some funding to implement a planning process. There was never a clear communication about the value of the program to the program offices at the Endowment itself, even though the City Spirit staff tried hard to explain it. The small amount of money in cities and communities was spent on a process that isn't always definable in the same terms as performances and exhibits. The fruits of labor in many of those cases has come later, and built from the City Spirit opportunity.

4. NACAA's immaturity and lack of focus until 1980.

5. NASAA's immaturity and lack of focus on community arts agencies until 1980.

6. Lack of real support for community arts at the National Council level (exceptions, of course, such as Lawrence Halprin and Gunther Schuller, exist). The voices for the major institutions and the professional artist have been stronger and steadier.

7. Deterrents that focused attention on some Housing and Urban Development (HUD) programs, such as Livable Cities, which might have generated many times the amount of money, using the Endowment itself as a cosponsor.

The idea of linking up the arts and urban revitalization grew out of the work done by the Endowment, specifically the Expansion Arts program, the Livable Cities category (not to be confused with the HUD program) in the Architecture and Environmental Arts program, and City Spirit—in all of which there had been experience involving the arts and community revitalization. Thus when HUD, in 1978, as part of President Carter's national urban policy, seemed enthusiastic about a proposal called

Livable Cities, it was not surprising. On Capitol Hill, the item, one of the first initiatives to get a hearing, was proposed at \$20 million for three years; it dwindled to a \$5 million authorization, but never got funded. The fact that it would have been guided by criteria drawn up by the Endowment and applicants selected by a jointly appointed panel is important in the movement that makes connections among federal agencies for the benefit of communities.¹⁸

8. Pressure from the media, such as a New York *Times* article and following editorial in late 1980 (the accusation was that the large institutions and individual artists had been getting less money year by year). There has never yet been a media spokesperson for the community arts' side. With the support and initiative of such council persons as Charles Eames and Larry Halprin, Nancy Hanks had some support for community programs, such as City Spirit and the Architecture and Environmental Arts program. In fact, some were generated at the Council level. Livingston Biddle, a libertarian, had wanted to do something for communities. He saw to it that the communities had at least one formal representative and one spokesperson at the National Council level with the appointment of Jessie A. Woods, former director of the Urban Arts program in Chicago. After the NACAA presentation to the National Council in December 1979, he announced that "we are committing ourselves to a decision."¹⁹

This was done through the Office of Partnership. But the search for options, done through an exhaustive outside study of the Endowment's history of policy making for communities, proved ill-focused for the charge and purpose and unproductive in the end.

Succumbing to the pressures described, Mr. Biddle's tenure was marked by more delay. The only new community program came from the Office for Special Constituencies — an advocacy program to make the arts more accessible to handicapped persons, older adults, veterans, and people in hospitals, nursing homes, mental institutions, and prisons. With about a \$400,000 budget, it supported model demonstration projects.

In February 1981, the National Council Policy Committee reviewed the report of Henry Putsch, Director for Partnership, to be discussed more fully in a later section of this chapter (see pp. 91–95).

The question of assisting the local community arts agencies (both "community arts agency" and "local arts agency" are used by the states to designate the public, private, and publicly designated private organization options) by fostering their arts support function, and of encouraging an effective state-local support partnership, is complex; the states see it working through successful state-local planning. In each case, distribution of state-wide funds would necessitate the establishment of a procedure defining eli-

gible community arts agencies and appropriate evaluation criteria. The more militant NACAA view through the years, however, had been to request direct access to the Endowment. In 1980–81 the realistic view was that access for these types of funds probably would be developed only with joint state-local planning and become implemented through the states. NACAA, more mature and realistic in the 1980s, will probably live with that reality if, in addition, a new program of assistance is developed within the Endowment's Office of Partnership. The purpose would be to foster the development of a state-local arts support partnership characterized by strengthened support for the arts at both the state and local levels.²⁰

By 1982, Frank Hodsoll had become the new Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts and was expressing interest in the Endowment's relationship to local arts agencies. In speeches at meetings in Racine, Wisconsin on CityArts and at the mid-June NACAA convention in San Antonio, Texas he reported this to the field. He indicated that in 1983 some pilot programs for local arts agencies might be developed based on three options, which would include a combination of the CityArts approach: direct negotiations, competitive applications from states for grants to support local arts agencies, and state-local challenge grants on a 3-to-1 match basis. This last incentive program would have to be matched by a combination of new state-local dollars.

As recently as 1976, in an Endowment Community Arts Project Steering Group meeting, one member stated the consensus opinion of many over the years: "A discouraging part is that we have no feel as yet about what has actually resulted other than the setting up of councils and the budgets of councils. What have those councils done? You cannot look down there and see what happened."²¹ The question of sheer numbers has always been a problem, but it is the diversity of profile that has made it difficult for those who want definitions.

The issue of community program policy is described as being "like the cat who was pushed from the top of the World Trade Center eight times only to crawl back up again."²² It has surfaced and resurfaced for 15 years. The high point for communities probably was the day in December 1979 when the National Assembly of Community Arts Agencies made a presentation on community arts agencies to the National Council on the Arts, which was hailed as one of the best presentations ever and certainly the clearest one on community arts agencies. With focus on three representative councils — San Antonio, Texas; Bassett, Nebraska; and Syracuse, New York — a positive image was created.

In summary, there have been many sheafs of paper and many tapes of discussion devoted to the subject. A program of direct and sustained support is yet to be determined.

What the presentation did, however, was to point out that if one begged the figure of 2,000 councils, one could rely on the fact that local arts agencies exist in most major cities as well as in towns of 1,500 people. They are city, county, regional, and rural. Some operate with multimillion dollar budgets; others are run by volunteers “who reach into their own pockets for postage stamps to send notices of coming events to their neighbors.” “The word has spread from city to city and county to county that the best way for the arts to thrive in the community is to form an arts commission.” The same report, hailed especially by Gunther Schuller, the celebrated composer and conductor, one of the National Council members listening to the presentation, attributes this growth to the fact that “they’ve worked.”²³ Discussion among Council members showed greater understanding and enthusiasm, although not without caution on the part of some. The caution about numbers and impact was expected; the enthusiasm was a breakthrough.

But at least there was a fair look at the catalyst agency that has generated new and more monies for the arts on the local levels and developed new and diverse audiences. Some arts councils have championed the needs of individual artists when no other local organizations have given it any priority (this is not to diminish the role of artist associations and galleries, etc.), and they have caused communities to improve their arts attitude through high-visibility activities that have caused greater understanding and participation. It is a short step from these goals to cities’ viewing the arts as vital, points of pride, revitalization tools, components in economic development, and images for good living. From the pictures of the opening of the Civic Center managed by the Cultural Resources Council of Syracuse and Onondaga County, through the downtown events in San Antonio showing thousands of people enjoying the work of outstanding American performers, to the efforts of the inhabitants of Bassett, Nebraska to see that equally fine opportunity become a part of their lives, the story was shown clearly and graphically – and could be projected in comparable settings throughout the United States.

From 1974 to this year, NACAA’s opinions, recommendations, and pressures have been sought and felt in different degrees and for a variety of reasons. As early as 1974, there was a recommendation for a pilot demonstration program of monies to community agencies to administer to the arts. A year later, the united arts funds requested an Endowment matching grants program (monies requested must be matched by equal amounts of local monies – a common procedure) and got it. And if one were to examine the interests and priorities of NACAA after it became a national professional service organization in 1978, it is clear that the agenda has been a similar one – to gain access to direct Endowment funding for communities in order to complete the full partnership. The Office of Partnership replaced the Federal-State program to clarify more specifically the particular concern.

NACAA also played a role in assisting the 1980 Congress to strengthen the community position through stronger wording in the reauthorizations bills for the Endowment affecting the 1981–83 budget.

Response from everyone who had a handle on community arts to a piece of proposed legislation in 1977 for “small groups and struggling artists” sums up the problem and the inclinations. The pleas were to acknowledge the local networks more strongly and to use state and local agencies to help reach those goals of nurturing every group’s emerging potential, rather than to ask the Endowment to grant monies to some estimated 10,000 groups ineligible for direct Endowment support. Decisions by Congress on the 1980 reauthorization and by NEA finally created the possibility of a process of direct access for community or local arts agencies to complete the network. It would take more time for the wheels to be greased, but with states such as California, North Carolina, New York, Minnesota, and Maryland in some sort of gear, there certainly would be a place to start. The program characteristics were spelled out in the NASAA and NACAA recommendations to Congress and the Endowment in the fall of 1980; they include planning and evaluation built into the process of determining criteria and eligibility.

With the responsibility for developing the public link thrust upon state and community councils, the opportunity to develop a strong network exists as never before. The community arts councils have been saying through the years, “We can go it alone—don’t blunt the local initiative,” but with maturity and common interests identified, they and the state arts agencies can work through to strengthen the partnership concept. No one group is really independent of the others in the support fabric.

This struggle, which has consumed a great deal of NACAA’s attention, has been important. When one knows that in 1978 there were some 1,500 community orchestras, 800 community opera companies and college/university opera workshops, 490 contemporary music ensembles, thousands of choral groups, and numerous chamber orchestras and music festivals that did not have direct access within one discipline (Music and Opera) at the Endowment, one realizes that a clarification has been needed. In this discussion of direct access, the reference is only to the service councils and commissions who would give assistance to others, distribute monies, and complete the support group network. These discipline groups are indeed community arts groups, and the councils would encourage their development.

There has been some mention earlier of the Endowment programs that community councils have had access to all along. Arts councils, functioning as catalysts for the arts that combine the talents and resources in a community, have had accessibility to three design programs, five dance programs, four media programs, and many others that are included in the

Civic Handbook of Grants Programs offered by the Endowment (1980). Among them, there are a few that should be singled out for their special place in bringing the arts to the attention of cities. In many instances, such programs have caused local arts councils or agencies to develop. Often the local arts agency has been an applicant.

The Expansion Arts program of the Endowment, seeking to assure that every American will have access to the arts, has, since its inception in 1971, addressed more closely than any other Endowment program the question of how the Endowment will provide for the “cultural needs of all of those Americans whose aesthetic viewpoints are unique to their own richly diverse cultural roots and are not served by the other more recognized arts organizations.”²⁴

Complementing an ongoing neighborhood arts programming effort has been the CityArts program, under Expansion Arts, *providing support in cities in partnership with local municipal governments*. This program, applied for by invitation only, was envisioned to *stimulate new local tax dollars in support of the developing arts organizations*. The maximum request was \$50,000. In the first year, arts councils or city arts agencies in Atlanta, Buffalo, Charlotte, Dallas, Miami, San Antonio, and Seattle matched their Endowment monies and further distributed the total dollars to local groups through a system of public review. In Cleveland, one of the second-year cities, the monies stimulated the first tax funding the arts had ever had there. (Because the city was at the time in financial default, Cuyahoga County, which was interested in developing an arts policy, matched the monies.)

The Expansion Arts philosophy was that this was a beginning of “a relatively young movement within the Arts Endowment — to develop creative relationships between the federal government and municipal agencies. There is a logical, though not formal, relationship between CityArts and other programs such as Livable Cities, City Spirit, Federal-State, and the advocacy effort of other NEA offices.”²⁵ This is a direct-access program. The monies have been given to arts councils or commissions for redistribution for “developing and neighborhood groups.” The purpose was to create incentives for new local tax monies for these groups.

President Richard Nixon was perhaps the first to promote the Endowment image as a valued resource when in 1972 he requested some 80 federal agencies to consider how they might support the arts and how the arts could contribute to a more effective accomplishment of their own missions. By directive, the Endowment was to receive their replies.

In 1967, the Endowment’s Architecture and Environmental Arts program was initiated, and in its first few years worked with a small staff and budget. William Lacy and Robert P. McNulty in 1973 designed a more effective way of delivering the services, guidance, and expertise that have be-

come expected over the years. A *White Paper* articulated what was proposed.

A large number of the agencies sought assistance in their use of design, and the Endowment developed a strong assistance program in response. Concurrent requests emphasizing cultural facility planning, percent laws for arts purchases in city and state construction, and adaptive use of buildings were pinpointed as areas where Endowment advice and counsel were more often sought than grant support was. National theme programs such as City Edges, City Options, and Livable Cities encouraged cities to look at their local environment. The *White Paper*, backed by National Council members Charles Eames and Lawrence Halprin especially, and most importantly by Nancy Hanks, then Chairman of the Endowment, proposed that the Architecture and Environmental Arts program be allowed to use flexible methods of giving the assistance that was being requested — such as consultants and contacts, in addition to grant making.

The *White Paper* clearly identifies its prime client as a city or a public body vested by its citizens with authority over design and capital expenditures, and whose designs in turn affect the design quality of the citizens' surroundings. The gap in funding to localities from other federal grantors has been in the planning areas, because such agencies as HUD, Health, Education and Welfare (HEW; now Health and Human Services, or HHS), Transportation, and the Economic Development Administration (EDA) of the Commerce Department use the categorical grant approach — funds available for certain stated reasons only. The conceptualization and planning funds are usually not provided. The reason, then, is clear for the interest on the part of those other federal agencies in City Edges and City Options. The Endowment was acting more and more as a resource in the design and development of capital programs. And because the requests always outnumbered the possibilities of acceptance and assistance, the Architecture and Environmental Arts program moved to prepare materials that would help cities make decisions.²⁶ Architecture and Environmental Arts was devoting more and more staff time to nongranteeing matters that would affect a range of urban issues, ranging from preservation of usable spaces to city planning responsibility.

All of these activities tend to emphasize the importance of arts and arts-related activities in the city. The program has tried to be effective in pinpointing communities where the dollars available would influence quality of design, aesthetic planning, and conceptualization, as well as heighten consumer awareness of the values of good design.

These are subtle things, and in themselves might fall on deaf ears. But more and more, with the decay of our cities and blighted lands everywhere, they are beginning to cause notice.

In a recent book, *How Small Grants Make a Difference*, neighbor-

hood programs in Pittsburgh, Savannah, Milwaukee, Jersey City, and Boston, and programs in the downtowns of Fernandina Beach, Florida; Troy, New York; and Galveston, Texas are profiled. A little money (the range was \$8,000 to \$50,000), in each case, was made to go a long way. The Endowment support “enabled these groups to think through their projects before they were launched, and made it easier for them to raise money from other sources once they had had a chance to show their seriousness of purpose.”²⁷ These particular grantees told their own stories in hearings before the U.S. House of Representatives Subcommittee on the City,²⁸ and showed how they were assisted by the federal agency to help themselves. The hearing highlighted community initiative, the Endowment’s sensitivity to local conditions, its minimum red tape, and its willingness to take risks.²⁹

Fernandina Beach had lots of plans, a lot of dreams awaiting a great windfall, which came in the form of an Economic Development Administration grant (to implement the downtown master plan). We feel, however, that the grant behind the grant – the National Endowment for the Arts grant for redesign of our downtown public spaces – was most effective in bringing our dreams to reality.³⁰

A spin-off of the Architecture and Environmental Arts program is an organization called Partners for Livable Cities, now directed by Robert McNulty, who put much of the advocacy program at the Endowment in place from 1972 to 1978. Partners for Livable Cities, like several other service organizations rooted from Endowment activities, is now under cooperative agreement and has a yearly “goods and services” contract. Publications such as *The City and the Arts: The Civic Handbook of Grant Programs* and *Reviving the Urban Waterfront* are included in recent services.

Over the years, program areas at the National Endowment for the Arts have changed names to clarify current function. The Architecture and Environmental Arts program has become the Design Arts program to focus on its primary role in promoting excellence in design. Total funds obligated by the Design Arts program (fiscal years 1966–80) came to \$29,782,367. In 1982, the figure was about \$5 million.

Another source of impact for the idea of arts and the cities is the Endowment’s City Spirit program. When arts organizations talk of “weaving the arts into the fabric of everyday life,” often they do not have an idea of how this might be done for more than the duration of a festival. City Spirit, under the Special Projects division of the Endowment, existed from 1975 to 1978 and taught communities how to start to do this. In that time, a few arts councils were stimulated into life, and many communities – large and small – were aroused to arts action. Altogether, 180 grants were made.

City Spirit saw “the artists as animators to facilitate artists as commu-

nity leaders or activists.”³¹ In 1974, when people were not oriented to the notion of process, the program suffered from difficult and frustrating descriptions and interpretations. Confused communities were not able to understand what the Endowment really wanted from an applicant. The purpose was to stimulate interaction among people, and it really didn’t matter what type of organization the catalyst was—arts councils, parks and recreation divisions, or even, as in one town, a drop-in center. The program was about bringing people together to interact in defining projects and long-term relationships—the projects were merely a rallying point. City Spirit was societal; Architecture and Environmental Arts was physical and environmental.

The program, although it went through several phases in defining its intent, basically was able to respond when cities as diverse as Durham, North Carolina; Keene, New Hampshire; Cambridge, Massachusetts; San Antonio, Texas; and North Tahoe, California were ready to plan with their communities. In these and other places, arts councils did develop or become strengthened and have been going strong; City Spirit was part of a process that took hold. The grants were never large, and ultimately a pool of resource people and facilitators assisted communities with these processes. New people were brought into the field through the strength gained by local leadership, one notable example being the present Director of the San Antonio Arts Council. Others who were involved were influenced by the process, probably identifiable as a brainchild of Lawrence Halprin, who served on the National Council in the 1970s.

In closing the Endowment City Spirit program, its Director, Burton Woolf, made an attempt to transfer the best of City Spirit to coordinators of community arts from the state arts councils. Three sessions on facilitation of diverse groups and community process were given for about 60 persons.

The City Spirit program and the advocacy program from Architecture and Environmental Arts were among the least well-financed programs of the Endowment. Perhaps, in their influence, they have had impact far beyond the dollars spent. Conceptualization and process are not always highly visible, but cities and communities from the smallest to the largest have felt their influence.

The final report of the City Spirit program in San Antonio capsulizes this influence:

City Spirit has been instrumental in developing new relationships which have important implications for the future. The relationship established between the city and the Arts Council under City Spirit has had the effect of establishing a major public agency for the arts. Our budget increased from \$16,000 in [fiscal year] ’75 to \$140,000 in [fiscal year] ’76. City funds are now being used for basic operating cost, and the major institutions have developed

a stronger sense of public responsibility and service. There has been a noticeable increase in cooperation among all arts organizations. City agencies are working together in coordinated programs. The arts are now being included in the overall masterplan for the city. The importance of the arts to the economic and social development of San Antonio is now recognized by every responsible political and business leader in the city. A dialogue has been established between struggling neighborhood arts programs and established institutions. . . . Perhaps most important, the arts in San Antonio have been significantly strengthened through increased community awareness and participation, and a number of new public programs have been created reaching new audiences and involving new segments of the community.³²

Another rational influence on cities during the 1960s and 1970s was ACA. First, it worked hand in hand with the U.S. Conference of Mayors on the resolutions on the arts that set forth principles as guidelines for city action. It was the only group that could, as it did in Seattle in 1976, bring together city and county officials with officials from the National Endowment for the Arts and the staffs of the national organizations that represent the arts to exchange thoughts, meet and greet socially, and simply set the stage for working together. This was at a time when the ways of accomplishing this were not yet solidified. As time went by, and the local public sector, led by the mayors of New Haven (Frank Logue, Jr.), Atlanta (Maynard Jackson), and Seattle (Wes Uhlman), focused its thoughts, it became clearer how important that ACA annual meeting was when 500 representatives met to discuss needs and the priorities of community arts councils.

ACA has always been "the gatherer of people" through its many workshops, seminars, and large annual meetings—a total of over 70 between 1960 and 1981. However, there had been an enormous effort made to study the state of the community council for the Seattle meeting. ACA (then still the umbrella agency for communities) had been commissioned by the Community Arts Agency Project Steering Group of the Endowment to coordinate the exploration of issues and the development of background materials concerning community arts agencies. NASAA, NACAA, ACA, and the Endowment all produced papers, which were discussed at the ACA and NACAA meetings in Seattle and the NASAA meeting in Atlanta immediately following. The future leadership among officials of the local public sector heard the deliberations, and later developed *action* task forces on the arts at the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors.

Michael Newton was president; David Rockefeller, Jr. and Louis Harris were chairmen during this era of ACA when so much of this kind of ACA activity was being sponsored. It was at the Seattle meeting that the community councils first felt the need for an independent professional organization, which was accomplished three years later.

It was something about the makeup of ACA — its board image (well-heeled and glamorous), its New York City office (far from the rest of the country), its unfocused image — that caused the community field to feel unserved. However, a review of their seminars, meetings, and publications attests to ACA's being at the forefront of ideas and able to bring disparate resources to focus on common arts and city issues. One example was an Arts and City Planning Conference, where "The Arts and City Livability," "Arts Amenities in Comprehensive Plans," "The Arts and Economic Development," "The Arts and Urban Design," "The Arts and Transportation," and "The Arts and Social Services" were discussion topics.³³

ACA publications should also be given special notice. Some were significant in simply gathering all the speeches at the national meetings of the mid-1960s — Marya Mannes, William Schumann, Harold Taylor, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Samuel B. Gould, Erich Leinsdorf, and W. Willard Wirtz, among others, discussed their views on the arts in relation to corporations, government, labor, education, and industry. These and others talked of art center management, arts leadership, the changes in the wind, and the realities of the day. There were the ACA *Cultural Affairs* magazines of the late 1960s and early 1970s, packed with the same kind of thoughtful material. Michael Newton's ACA-sponsored publication, *Persuade and Provide*, was the story of the St. Louis Arts and Humanities Council, told so that other communities might follow the model. There were the guidebooks and cookbooks for community arts councils, starting with Ralph Burgard's *Arts in the City* of 1968.

But the Louis Harris surveys of public opinion on the arts in 1973, 1975, and 1980 called *Americans and the Arts*, have had greater distribution and have served to provide facts in favor of support for the arts more widely perhaps than any other published material. Many speeches and publications since that time have used the quotable facts as support data. This ACA influence cannot easily be forgotten.

ACA has taken the initiative in developing new possibilities for art involvement and working on expanding the resources available to the arts. That it would hold the Arts and City Planning Conference discussed above at the same time as it held one on Rural Communities shows the span and range of its concern.

It could be said that there would have been no ACA if, in 1955 at the ASOL conference, a plenary session on arts councils and a well-attended workshop, scheduled for two hours but lasting until well after midnight, had not excited those in attendance. Thus began the first national conference of arts councils. Ten people represented seven of about 20 councils then in North America. With foster parents in the Junior League, the ASOL, and the Rockefeller Foundation (for the study including community arts agencies), the first five years were a period of growth and nurturing. In

1960, there were enough arts councils to support a national organization; CACI was born, and George Irwin of Quincy, Illinois, was elected president. With arts councils popping up like mushrooms after a summer rain, CACI was called upon for help in developing plans for capital fund drives, budgeting, the general administration of cultural centers. As CACI began to advise in this very complex field, and state arts councils began to develop as well, the name was changed (1965). The first office of ACA, with a former Director of the St. Paul Council of Arts and Sciences, Ralph Burgard, as full-time executive director, was established in space provided at the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, one of the first funding sources for the group. Even at this time, the ASOL was helping by providing the convention staff and allowing community arts council news to go out in the ASOL newsletter. Board members of this group included R. Philip Hanes, Jr. (then President of the North Carolina State Arts Council), Nancy Hanks (then Executive Secretary, Special Studies Project, Rockefeller Brothers Fund), Charles C. Mark (then a consultant to the National Council on the Arts), and others whose combined energy and concern for communities was important throughout the next decades.

The future of ACA in 1965 was seen as an opportunity "to build a private counterbalance to the federal body which had just been created"; "we must not let this chance pass us by," said R. Philip Hanes, Jr., in his speech as President of ACA at the annual meeting in 1965.³⁴ He was addressing the joint conference of ASOL and ACA. The conference convened at a time when public concern for the arts had reached a new peak as a result of several related but independent developments. During the months preceding the meeting in Washington, the long-awaited Rockefeller Panel report on the performing arts was published, the National Council on the Arts was established, legislation establishing a National Arts and Humanities Foundation was passed by the Senate and debated in the House, and at the beginning of the week in which the conference was held, the White House hosted a festival of the arts that attracted nationwide attention.

A total of 900 delegates from 40 states assembled for the meeting to which Hanes addressed his remarks. The mandate for ACA stated by Hanes was indeed important. It was overlooked too many times by the very constituency ACA was serving. Could the states and community constituency be served well if ACA were to be a "private counterbalance" to the Endowment? The dilemma of what those services should be and how they should manifest themselves brought many tense discussions in a field trying to define itself in all aspects of its being. When the state councils organized professionally, the act only culminated many years of rather unfocused discussion on what ACA should and might do specifically for the states. The same was true for communities; it may be a natural evolution that the clientele saw reasons to want independent service groups.

ACA was and is today a resource for information and contact. Its

seminar schedule is enviable; its publications are of professional value; its constituency is loosely defined. This is much the way it has been over the years. The arts field has wanted to know what ACA really stood for — not that it stood for everything and everyone.

During the intense period of determining how to coalesce around the budget cuts recommended in 1981 on the national level, ACA, guided by a Special Counsel on National Policy, emerged with new strength and leadership *because* it became identified with a broad range of leadership for the arts, not just state or community or institutional arts. During this period, with ACA in some leadership role, the Coalition for the Arts created a unified voice and worked together as an arts lobby. ACA has also been oriented over the years toward leadership from the private sector especially, and it could gather some important testimony for the arts from the presidents of prestigious corporations as well as foundation leaders. Milton Rhodes, Executive Director of the arts council of Winston-Salem, North Carolina, was made president of ACA in 1982.

The development of community arts councils and local arts agencies is so interwoven with the threads of influence discussed in this section of the chapter that at times such groups are both the cause and the effect of action. Does a council grow from a City Spirit experience, or is the council the applicant for the program so that the community can develop and expand? Both can be true, and are.

The discussion has been about the ways in which cities and communities of all sizes have become aware of the arts so that the role of a community council can be better understood. The councils themselves have been making some communities aware, since they were there long before any public sector was seriously interested.

What has come first, second, or third is not as important as the fact that the message has been the same — that the arts are central to a good life and a good community image, and may be the key to success in some civic endeavors as well.

Those who run our communities — our elected officials — began responding to this realization in 1974. The Resolution of the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors in that year set forth these guidelines for city action:

1. Arts are essential services — equal in importance to other central services.
2. Every city ought to encourage a public agency specifically concerned with the arts.
3. The physical appearance of the city, its architectural heritage, and its amenities should be acknowledged as a resource to be nurtured.
4. Cities should be encouraged to establish a percentage of the total

cost of every municipal construction budget to be set aside for purchase or commission of works of art.

5. No American should be deprived of the opportunity to experience or to respond artistically to the beauty of life by barrier of circumstance, income, background, remoteness, or race.*

In 1975, there were more specific guidelines giving attention to the employment of artists, and by 1978, there had been developed fuller identification of the specific problems of accomplishing these guidelines, as set down in the 1978 Cultural Resources Policy of the National League of Cities. Also, by that time, the National Conference of State Legislators, the National Governors' Conference, and the National Association of Counties had made similar statements.

Resolutions don't always mean very much, but the concentration of these resolutions and the action committees that followed their declaration are impressive. Leadership in these efforts was given by several who believed that what they were doing in their cities in the arts was important for other cities. Wes Uhlman, who as mayor of Seattle had spearheaded his own local efforts by using the arts to revitalize a severely depressed city, had introduced the "Quality of Life in Our Cities" resolution at the 1974 meetings. It was the first of such documents and the one that influenced all of the others. The former mayor of New Haven, Frank Logue, Jr. (at the request of Phyllis Lamphere, Councilwoman from Seattle and President of the National League of Cities), chaired a Task Force on the Arts, with the responsibility of having the arts "permeate city government: transportation, housing, human resources, CETA, etc." The task force "heightened the awareness of mayors and city council people on the potential role of the arts as a cultural force, as an economic development force, and as an educational tool, particularly useful for children who resist the usual educational channels."³⁵

Beginning in 1977, the arts played a prominent part in the National League of Cities conventions, not only in the resolutions that were adopted, but in visual arts, music, and dance presentations in and around the conference, and in their use in emphasizing the cultural attractions of the cities in which the conventions were held. Through these meetings a questionnaire was developed and distributed, which in and of itself brought the arts to the attention of local elected officials throughout the country.

Six months after the National League of Cities Task Force began to

*All resolutions on the arts passed by the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, National Conference of State Legislatures, and National Association of Counties between 1974 and 1978 can be seen in their entirety in Luisa Kreisberg, *Local Government and the Arts*, (New York: American Council for the Arts, 1979), pp. 191-96.

function, Mayor Maynard Jackson of Atlanta introduced a resolution creating an arts task force in the U.S. Conference of Mayors. If Uhlman, Logue, and Jackson had not been increasing community consciousness of the arts in their own communities, they might not have been able to convey the message so successfully to their peers in these national settings. "Within New Haven, Frank Logue sought to increase community consciousness of the arts and expand the arts audience and to take the arts to the places (murals in the welfare department and schools, dances and musical performances in libraries and other public buildings, etc.) where they would be seen."³⁶

The U.S. Conference of Mayors moved to create a Standing Committee on the Arts in 1978 in Atlanta. Jackson, who has successfully chaired the Arts Task Force, was its first chairman. The publication *Local Government and the Arts* is an outcome of his efforts. Working with its own board members such as Maynard Jackson, ACA, with assistance from the Ford Foundation and the Task Forces of the National League of Cities and U.S. Conference of Mayors, could generate the resource material. The book is arranged in terms of the arts' relation to the following: economic development, real estate and construction, tourism, public image, employment, transportation, public safety, and human resources. Those subjects are on the priority list of every mayor. Reinforcement and repetition lead to belief.

The survey of over 450 cities' definitions of their cultural needs formed the data base for the "Cities and the Arts" questionnaire circulated by the National League of Cities in the fall of 1977, and culminated the attempt to document statistics and attitudes. There were four major conclusions:

1. Cities have given steadily increasing support to the arts in a multitude of ways, largely unrecognized.
2. Before the WPA and large-scale federal support, municipal support was the largest support and was most consistent.
3. City support has taken a multitude of forms.
4. Grants of city money have also meant pressure to "bring the arts to the people."³⁷

The themes laid out and documented in this resource continue to develop. But what has been the role of the local arts council or commission?

It seems clear that the most successful instances of municipal agencies have occurred in the largest urban areas of the country, and that smaller and medium-sized cities usually rely on privately incorporated arts councils that were founded to serve the needs of those communities; the local governments are usually apathetic. Once the population rises above 500,000, the issues become too large for local government to ignore, and

the need for a public commission to represent the arts' interests becomes apparent. Both public and private local arts agencies can exist side by side in larger cities, each with their own complementary agendas, as we know. This is discussed in a later chapter. It is interesting in the light of this that almost all of the 50 largest cities are receiving some sort of municipal arts support (see Table 1). These municipal agencies, stimulated by a need to focus on the common problems and interests of larger cities, formed the Municipal Arts Federation in 1981. The organization works with NALAA and has evolved from an urban symposium sponsored by the Cultural Commission of the City of New York in 1978.

The public interest groups, such as the U.S. Conference of Mayors, National League of Cities, City Managers' Association, Association of State Governments, National Governors' Conference, International City Managers Association, and the National Association of Counties were of interest to the National Endowment for the Arts for their broader constituent representation and testifying base. The Endowment urged the development of the task forces and staff officers and gave some dollars to help them become reality. The resolutions could be useful as evidence of support, and the key also to keeping the arts before the cities.

But the articulation is only a beginning — the easiest part. The stimulation of a well-planned policy would be the ultimate that one could hope for; unfortunately, too few localities have really accomplished this.

STATES AND COMMUNITIES

The state arts agencies are important to the development of community arts services, and at the same time community agencies can greatly strengthen the programming of and support for state arts agencies.

The National Endowment, therefore, urges state arts agencies to provide encouragement and the means for the growth of community arts agencies. In addition to research, publications, consultants, and other technical assistance, efforts might well encompass imaginative program ideas.

The Endowment recognizes that many state agencies support community arts services through state legislative funds and the Federal-State block grant. However, within its ability to do so, in fiscal 1974, the Endowment on a pilot basis will consider grants to state agencies to augment programs for community service improvement.³⁸

Just as it might be said that "very few of the state agencies were active until the Endowment began its block grant program to the states in 1966,"³⁹ the Endowment's program called Strengthening Community Services (1974–76), urging state arts agencies to work cooperatively with community arts agencies to develop plans that provide encouragement and the

TABLE 1
Municipal Art Appropriations^a in Fifty Largest U.S. Cities

City	1975		1980		1980		FY 1980	FY 1979	Percent Change
	Population Rank	Per Capita Rank	Population Rank	Per Capita Rank	Expenditure Per Capita ^b				
Atlanta	30	20			\$1.25	\$	546,000	\$ 505,000	8.1
Austin	47	22			1.11		334,000	358,000	-6.7
Baltimore	7	11			3.23		2,835,193	2,631,568	7.7
Baton Rouge ^c	46	21			1.13		350,000	350,000	0
Boston	19	27			.73		465,000	465,000	0
Buffalo ^c	32	4			7.37		3,000,161	2,846,028	5.4
Charlotte ^c	50	14			2.72		1,015,192	797,021	27.4
Chicago	2	38			.19		578,450	123,772	367.4
Cincinnati	31	34			.36		149,850	174,850	-14.3
Cleveland [*]	18	—			—		—	—	—
Columbus	23	30			.47		250,000	150,000	66.7
Dallas	8	15			2.42		1,968,210	2,400,000	-17.9
Denver ^{c*}	26	2			8.26		4,000,026	3,801,000	5.2
Detroit	5	39			.18		245,377	832,463	-70.5
El Paso	33	37			.31		121,000	96,000	26.1
Fort Worth	39	16			2.27		819,354	503,484	62.7
Honolulu ^c	13	39			.18		126,500	108,000	17.1
Houston	6	18			1.38		1,830,627	1,611,318	13.6
Indianapolis	9	29			.55		433,000	350,000	23.7
Jacksonville	20	32			.44		248,500	264,300	-5.9

(continued)

TABLE 1 (continued)

City	1975		1980		FY 1980	FY 1979	Percent Change
	Population Rank	Per Capita Rank	Expenditure Per Capita ^b				
Kansas City	27	42	.06	28,080	27,614	1.7	
Long Beach	43	43	.02	5,000	5,000	0	
Los Angeles	3	31	.45	1,218,577	1,226,963	-7	
Louisville ^c	42	12	2.87	964,250	940,000	2.6	
Memphis ^c	17	19	1.28	941,726	822,528	14.5	
Miami ^c	38	25	.80	1,150,000	945,000	21.7	
Milwaukee ^c	14	1	8.77	8,875,402	7,215,399	23	
Minneapolis	34	36	.32	120,000	90,000	33.3	
Nashville	29	38	.19	87,000	55,000	58.2	
Newark [*]	41	—	—	—	—	—	
New Orleans	21	7	3.57	2,000,000	2,100,000	-4.8	
New York	1	8	3.54	26,500,000	24,203,000	9.5	
Norfolk	49	9	3.49	1,000,000	900,000	11.1	
Oakland ^c	45	3	8.20	2,710,127	2,462,133	10.1	
Oklahoma City	37	44	0	0	0	0	
Omaha	35	41	.07	25,000	25,000	0	
Philadelphia	4	6	5.50	9,980,000	9,750,000	2.4	
Phoenix	15	35	.34	222,594	203,515	9.4	
Pittsburgh [*]	28	—	—	—	—	—	
Portland	40	23	.92	328,741	226,277	45.3	
St. Louis ^c	24	13	2.86	2,745,000	2,545,000	7.9	

San Antonio	11	17	1.47	1,143,271	1,082,782	5.6
San Diego ^c	10	24	.88	681,799	686,799	-.7
San Francisco	16	28	.59	390,777	354,943	10.1
San Jose	22	26	.75	418,000	378,000	10.6
Seattle	25	10	3.25	1,584,000	1,310,000	20.9
Toledo	36	40	.08	30,000	27,000	11.1
Tucson	48	33	.42	125,000	78,000	60.3
Tulsa	44	5	6.03	2,000,000	1,750,000	14.3
Washington, D.C. ^d	12	—	—	—	—	—
Totals				\$84,590,784	\$77,777,757	8.8

Source: Appropriations figures provided by the Municipal Arts Federation of San Antonio. Reprinted by permission.

Note: This is a list that includes only direct subsidy; therefore, convention centers that may be used for arts activities in many cities are not included.

^a"Municipal appropriation" is defined as local tax-based financial contributions by city and/or county governments to support organizations and facilities in the arts within a municipality. Except where noted, all support is derived solely from city government sources. Capital funds for construction of facilities are not included. Also not included are funds to support zoos, libraries, parks and recreation programs, or arts programs by school districts.

^bPer capita funding is based upon 1975 U.S. Census population estimates. Where both city and county funds are included, the county population is used as the basis for determination.

^cCertain cities, by agreement, share support for the arts with county government. Where both city and county funds are used, the cities are [listed].

^dWashington, D.C., receives its primary support through the District of Columbia Commission on the Arts and Humanities, which is included in state agency appropriations by the Endowment.

*Information not presently available. As of June 15, 1978, there were no functioning municipal arts agencies in Cleveland, Denver, Newark, or Pittsburgh.

[Author's Note: David Cwi, who heads the Cultural Policy Institute, Baltimore, Maryland, suggests in a 1982 survey that includes data from among America's cities that local public support of the arts is at least \$300 million annually. Refer to "City Arts Support: Status and Issues," Cultural Policy Institute, Baltimore, Maryland.]

means for the growth of community arts agencies, served as an "incentive for the state agencies to move into a more active and direct involvement with their communities." It caused many states to "define their community development programs, and, in so doing, to develop more concrete approaches to assisting their communities," according to a study on the subject done in 1976 called *Community Development through the Endowment*.⁴⁰

In April 1982, in *Completing the Circle: State/Local Cultural Partnerships*, Ralph Burgard points out: "With much national attention focused on the issue of decentralization, twelve [state] arts councils have quietly established, particularly in the past three years, decentralized grant-giving programs in partnership with their local arts agencies. The local matching requirements often attached to these grants are also generating millions of new dollars for the arts."⁴¹ Those states are Alaska, California, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Texas. However, seven of these programs have only been established in the last few years.

"No reliable statistics are available at this time concerning the amount of new funds generated at the local level by state regranteeing programs, but . . . it has been estimated that between \$6,000,000 to \$8,000,000 of additional funds has been generated [in 1982] at the local level through state/local partnership programs." In his study, commissioned by NASAA in 1981-82, Burgard discusses the details of some of the partnership programs; the pros and cons, reservations, benefits, and major features of successful programs; and issues that surface. In the study, he also says that two state legislatures, those of Minnesota and New York, "either ordered their state arts agency to produce a partnership plan, or took a strong stand for more local partnership in decision making." The other plans were stimulated either by the Endowment's Community Development program, or initiated by the state arts agencies themselves.⁴²

The states that applied earliest for those first Endowment funds were those that already had well-developed systems for community arts agencies. The funds were used in multiple ways, ranging from the specialized assistance of the staff person hired with this money in New York State to work in community development (with special emphasis on per capita funding and the decentralization of the grant-making process) and in Michigan to help the one-project Artrain committees turn into continuing multifunction organizations, to funds for the state associations of community arts agencies — unions of community arts agencies within a given state that sponsor statewide conferences and meetings, and improve communication. Of the 34 states that used these funds, 19 regranted some of the funds for salaries; in these cases, administrative positions have been funded on a declining scale while the local organization takes over total funding of the position.⁴³

Alaska and North Carolina targeted their development programs at stimulating local government monies. Both required that matching funds be in cash drawn from local government units. This assumed that the community arts councils were well enough developed to sensitize their public officials to the arts. It also caused

much increased public awareness of the arts and a special kind of credibility as news coverage shifted from the arts columns to other pages of the paper. Perhaps greatest of all, it showed that local governments were willing to contribute to the arts if properly approached, and could see the direct benefit to the community.⁴⁴

In Maryland also, local governments responded to a matching grants program. (In fact, the Maryland State Arts Council was the first to begin a statewide decentralization program through 24 country arts councils.)

The 1976 report recognized some of the potential problems:

- When dealing with relatively new arts councils, there is a danger of giving (and expecting) too much too soon. States and communities should first develop the expertise necessary to carry out the programs and should base the programs on thorough, well-developed plans.
- Government money is not necessarily a good thing. Many communities are leery of the multiple strings attached.
- These programs have opened up many new private and public funding sources. In doing so, they have challenged community arts agencies to professionalize themselves and to make themselves financially accountable to these new local sources of funding.

The report also warns that

most importantly, community development is a slow process. The groundwork being laid this year may not show concrete achievements for many years. Or, as one person said, "Getting a community arts agency *really* ready takes a long, long time."⁴⁵

There are several states that historically have encouraged community council development. Today, the importance of a state-community relationship has been discussed a great deal over the past several years; most states recognize that if they have not looked at the importance of such a relationship, it will be incumbent upon them to do so in the future.

The Minnesota State Arts Board distributes one-third of its budget to regional arts councils, which distribute the money they receive. This one-third is allocated on a per capita basis to those 11 councils who only function for this process.

The Arts Service Organizations Program of New York State and many

others are directed toward “local arts agencies that provide community arts programs and services to cultural groups, individual artists and the general public of the state. It also supports multiarts service organizations,” while recognizing the diversity of both service organizations and community arts agencies.⁴⁶

In discussing the community development aspect of the New York State Council’s work, the staff person during the 1973 period indicated that there was a feeling that the impetus for development must come from the local community and that it was only effective when it did. The ownership was built in, and in the successful council situations, he felt that this was easily discernible. The state council played a nurturing role. It could be encouraging, could help with planning, could give technical assistance, and could also provide some funding. The stages of development were important, he felt. He remembered also that 1973–74 was a “good” time at the New York State Council; it was the time of the big increase from \$18 million to \$34 million, an unprecedented amount for a state budget.

Therefore the philosophy of nurturing was well in place when, in 1975, New York State passed its per capita law. The groundwork had been laid, and the state had already made some commitment to local growth. Those close to the situation admit that the local development picture is not necessarily smooth or settled. In 62 counties, there has been at least one council – sometimes many more than one – and the total is about 125. The sense of complication might be illustrated by the fact that the East End Arts and Humanities Council covers five of ten small townships in Suffolk County, and that the other five have local arts councils – or the fact that within New York City there are a half dozen ethnic councils; numerous neighborhood councils; huge councils for Queens, Staten Island, the Bronx, and Brooklyn; and some countercouncils.

Until 1982 in New York State, decentralization had been a pilot multidisciplinary program, unlike the situation in North Carolina, where the Grassroots Arts program provides a system through which state funds can be distributed among its counties on a per capita basis. (Grassroots Arts monies are the only portion of the money that is distributed per capita.)

In New York State, the development of community councils – and there are strong ones in big cities (Buffalo), ones that manage county facilities (Syracuse), and ones that are countywide organizations (Chautauqua and Westchester) – was encouraged by the State Council, but it was not the first priority of the Council. Given New York City and the rest of the state to contend with, the strength of major international organizations and all of the traditional support mechanisms surrounding them, New York’s situation is unique among states. One is reminded of some of the problems that affect all New York State affairs – large cities versus rural communities (New York has vast rural communities far beyond the state’s usual image);

upstate versus downstate; major organizations and community organizations; big cities, smaller cities, towns, counties. The configuration is mind-boggling. The Decentralization program has been in its pilot stage, and was available in 1981 only in limited areas of the state. Through the Decentralization program, local regranteeing agencies (arts councils, county governments, or regional advisory panels) administer on behalf of the State Council the local regranteeing of some state funds. Nonprofit organizations requesting \$3,000 or less for cultural projects may apply either to the Council or to the appropriate regranteeing agency, but not to both. What is interesting is that while most of the local regranteeing agencies are local arts councils, other entities, such as library systems, are also doing the regranteeing.

Julianna Sciolla of the New York State Council reports in the Spring 1982 *NACAA Connections* that "Decentralization is now understood and accepted as a small but important part of the Council's funding program. . . . the Council promoted the program from pilot status to a formal department, and the chairman of the Senate's Special Committee on the Culture Industry of the New York State Legislature issued a supportive and encouraging report on the program."

Some states envision decentralization through the strong statewide organizations that have developed, such as the state alliances of community arts agencies. Equivalent service groups include those for orchestras, dance, theater, and crafts.

In New York State, the residents of each county receive arts funds on a per capita basis (55¢ in 1981), which come from a portion of the total state monies. The issues involved in per capita distribution are important ones, for every state has its populous and less populated areas. Bringing all of those issues around democratization of the arts, access for whom and where, and major institutions versus community arts to the fore, those in community arts believe that it has been very important for New York State to distribute some of the money outside New York City itself, for instance. In all cases, the per capita funding comes from a *portion* of the funds available, not the *total* amount.

An interesting reflection concerns the beginnings of the Arts Development Services, the Arts Council in Buffalo, New York, in relationship to the per capita funding requirement. The State Council, particularly interested in distributing the newly legislated monies in the western part of New York State, urged Buffalo to undertake a voucher program that would be a good mechanism for distribution. While the voucher program itself is discussed in Chapter 20, it was this initial and continuing state interest in the program that helped that local council gain its first momentum.

Important statewide trends for the future center around such new ideas as the Massachusetts Arts Lottery and California's State-Local Partnership program. Understanding the philosophy of development that char-

acterizes such states as North Carolina will also be important. Although the Massachusetts Arts Lottery has had a short life of a little over one year, it is worth noting some of the plan's features. Max Friedli, first Director of the Massachusetts Arts Lottery Council, states:

The experiment of blanketing is an entire state with community arts councils is unique worldwide, and its significance goes far beyond the Arts Lottery scheme. . . . Regardless of how much money the Arts Lottery generates . . . the new arts councils have a viability and independence of their own. They have the option to solicit other public and private funds and, just like any other full-fledged community arts agency, they may not only regrant, but may also run their own arts programs and provide services locally.⁴⁷

Even though a special Arts Lottery Council (a new overseeing state arts agency) was established and given the responsibility of administering the Arts Lottery program, many of the local councils were born overnight, which is anathema to every planning process known and promoted by those who hope for the deeper indigenous roots in such development.

Friedl continues to explain:

The Arts Lottery Council is funded with 3 percent of the Lottery's proceeds, and its relationship with the local arts councils is also fashioned after the Federal-State Partnership program [of the National Endowment for the Arts]. Twice a year, after the local arts councils have received a projection from the State Treasury of approximately how much they can expect in Arts Lottery funds, they will forward a spending proposal to the state-level Arts Lottery Council. The Council, in turn, will compare each summary proposal with its guidelines, certifying payment if acceptable or returning the application for review if something is amiss. . . . Arts Lottery proceeds may be used, without any matching requirements, for seed money, grants to individual artists, capital outlay or operating expenses.⁴⁸

In the article, Friedl detailed the six-year development of the lottery idea, which was modeled after the lottery for the arts in New South Wales, Australia, where the proceeds had paid for the construction of the Sydney Opera House.

The Arts Lottery of Massachusetts has been completely separate from the State Council on the Arts and Humanities, which has its own programs and services.

The California Arts Council and the California state legislature have established a State-Local Partnership program designed to encourage local cultural planning and decision making and to reach previously underserved constituencies. The objectives of the State-Local Partnership program are to achieve the following:

- A. provide a mechanism for more effective local arts planning and to coordinate such planning with state programs;
- B. develop rural and suburban areas which have not fully participated in arts programs;
- C. expand the private sector support for arts at the local level;
- D. give local government agencies the opportunity to assist the California Arts Council in improving the efficiency of arts programming;
- E. provide a more stable base of support for the arts at the local level;
- F. provide a potential decentralization mechanism for other California Arts Council programs;
- G. prevent duplication and overlap between federal (administered through California Arts Council), state and local program funds;
- H. provide for increased employment of artists;
- I. stimulate the local economy.⁴⁹

A block planning grant of \$12,000 (nonmatched) has been made available to every county (57 of 58 have accepted the grant) to help them do the following:

- develop a plan for the county or city for arts programming.
- develop a review mechanism for local grants programs.
- Monies were envisioned for annual revisions. The monies were spent on consultants and professionals to direct the planning process. Materials to assist in this process were developed and made available.⁵⁰

Following the planning there are to be local priorities grants, matched on a one-to-one basis, which are to be divided according to a formula. Need and effort are factors to be evaluated for grant making. Local plan approval has to be obtained through the following bodies:

1. The County Board of Supervisors.
2. All local matching agencies for the Local Priorities Grant.
3. The city council of any city which has at least 20 % of the total county population. In this case, the plan will be developed jointly by the city and the county. If the development of a joint plan is not possible, then this city may withdraw from the county planning process and submit its own separate plan to the [California Arts Council]. If this is done, the city will receive its own Block Planning Grant and Local Priorities Grant, with the funds for these grants subtracted from the county's grants in proportion to the percentage of the county population inhabiting the city. However, all cities are strongly urged to work within the county planning process if at all possible.
4. The city councils of 50 % of the total number of cities in the county. In addition, this total number of cities must have a combined population representing at least 50 % of the total county population inhabiting incorporated areas of the county. If a city with 20 % of the total county

population has withdrawn from the county planning process, it will not be included in this approval procedure.

5. After review by [California Arts Council] staff, the plan will be approved by a majority vote of the California Arts Council at an open public meeting.⁵¹

This process has included everyone in the development — clearly a different concept from the Massachusetts Arts Lottery development. The guess is that a variety of agency types will develop in the California picture to handle the implementation of the plans. Existing ones will be used as well.

These statewide arts community development plans are new, and will flesh out in the early 1980s. It will be interesting to see their influence, if any, and the results of their efforts.

In North Carolina, the community development policy has nurtured a special groundwork that makes communities ready to take advantage of all the assistance that is available, such as the targeted programs that a federal agency such as the National Endowment for the Arts has offered over the years (e.g., City Spirit, Challenge Grants, and a CART program). As a state, North Carolina has built strength because the goals for community development have had priority. It would be fair to say that North Carolina has been relatively unimpeded by the struggle between major institutions and community needs that has unquestionably played a part in every other state and community with such institutions. In the next section of this chapter there is further discussion of North Carolina, where the institutions are the community — the community of the state.

Will the search for new sources of funds — as demonstrated by the Massachusetts Arts Lottery — create so many new and temporal bureaucracies as to create in its wake only the chaos of new arts organizations formed just because there are new sources of money and new distribution systems outside the federal-state-local partnership? Will the “populists” who created such agencies be disenchanted and disenfranchised along the way? Is it clear that such systems do not become immediately orderly and flawless? Is there a shortcut to finding good and knowledgeable people to give the time to help make decisions that will affect their communities about the arts?

Finally, can planning systems created today, such as the one in California, absorb all of the best information about planning and put some local systems in place that absorb what North Carolina’s community development has been all about — local incentive and local challenge, both in community planning and financial commitment? And will the major institution understand its part in the community as that develops?

Some believe that the future for the states lies in the resolution of their

relationship to the community councils. The story is old — the federal government is very willing to relinquish its power to the cities, creating a tension with the states, which are not as happy to relinquish power. The secret is in the state's not being paternalistic.

As someone said in North Carolina, "It all depends on people. The people make the difference." If that be so, let us hope that the right people are in the right place at the right time.

To place the state philosophies on community development in some perspective, there should be some discussion of the government support picture in general. In mid-1982 it is, at all levels, in a state of flux. However, according to NASAA statistics, the fiscal year 1982 appropriations for states and territories totaled \$123.6 million, an increase of 12.2 percent over fiscal year 1981, continuing a steady increase in support for the arts by state governments, since they were all in full gear by the late 1960s. It is important to note that the effects of the changes made and being considered during 1982 by the Reagan administration have not yet shown themselves, but can be expected to do so by 1983, when competition for state monies will be at a higher level. Federal cuts mean a great deal to states such as New Hampshire, Washington, and Oregon, which are sustained by one industry (such as the lumber industry in Oregon) and less to states such as New York, California, Massachusetts, and others sustained by multiple economic factors.⁵² The states' increase has been offset by a drop in the National Endowment for the Arts appropriations — and it would require a 34.1 percent increase in fiscal year 1983 appropriations at the state level to offset federal cuts envisioned. This would simply maintain, not increase, the level of support for the arts at the two top levels of government.⁵³

TABLE 2
Percent Increase (or Decrease) in Government Arts Support

Fiscal Year	Federal Government	National Endowment for the Arts	State Arts Agencies	Total
1980	17.4%	3.4%	29.6%	12.5%
1981	14.0%	2.7%	7.2%	4.5%
1982	10.4%	(9.9%)	12.2%	(0.9%)
1983	4.5%	(29.5%) ^a	10.0% ^b	(11.2%) ^b

Source: "State Appropriations: Will They Be Enough?" by Robert Porter, *ACA Update*, Volume 3, Number 2, 1982. Reprinted by permission of the American Council for the Arts. Copyright 1982.

^aProposed federal budget.

^bEstimated for comparative purposes.

ONE STATE: A FRAMEWORK FOR COMMUNITIES—NORTH CAROLINA

Every situation is unique. Every community has its own idiosyncrasies and characteristics that make it not quite like the next one. The same is true of states and their communities. Thus any models are really only to be understood in a context; they are not really transferrable in anything but outlines of philosophies and programs. If one were to choose one state with a strong community view that has included the arts in its philosophical priorities, one would choose North Carolina. It is a microcosm of the styles of the movement — its strengths and weaknesses. The community arts movement there preceded the state and federal movement; there were more than a dozen community councils in existence when the North Carolina Arts Council emerged in the 1960s. The communities could even have been said to have influenced the policy setting on the state level. That did not happen elsewhere, and for that reason alone North Carolina would be noteworthy. The creation of the North Carolina State Symphony Orchestra, Museum of Art, and School of the Arts are also indications of the priority for the developmental arts in that state.

THE SETTING

*The annual retreat of the Community Arts Council of North Carolina — “Quail Roost,” near Rougemount, North Carolina, a meeting and conference facility surrounded by 90 acres of gently rolling field and forest land. * Informal, casual, task-oriented, the group works through a mire of issues mutually affecting them by day; they share their talents in the evening. Guitar in hand, the Community Development Director, a professional musician, sums it up:*

ADMINISTRATOR’S BLUES

Here I sit behind a desk in a black and white room
Between two filing cabinets that seem to echo my doom
I’m an in-basket case in an institution of gloom

They bring me in the mail — each day a stack that’s nine inches high
Letters, flyers, brochures, newspapers, and memorandi
If my name were Evelyn Wood I might give it a try

*I attended the annual retreat of North Carolina Community Arts Councils in December 1980 to absorb the philosophy and address the North Carolina issues. The following section evolved from the material gathered through discussion and/or observation and reading.

The phone rings in the morning, the phone rings in the afternoon
It even rings on weekends, in the middle of my favorite cartoons
Well, it's nice to be needed but sometimes I wish I just pushed a broom

Applications, surveys, report forms and questionnaires
Budgets and financial statements — it's hard to bear
All these goddamn facts and figures can go to hell for all I care

(Break)

I used to talk in language people could understand
Subject, verb, object — my, it was grand
But it has come to my attention that my facility for verbal expression has been
negatively
Impacted by the jargon and verbosity of the bullshit-spewing bureaucracy
A part of which I am

The blues ain't such a bad thing, they let you see the other side
They punch you in the gut when you've become too satisfied
But if I don't get my grant I believe I'm gonna die

(Optional)

When I was just a young boy they asked me what I wanted to be
I said, "I think I'll be an artist and contemplate the beauty I see"
Well, it's a long, long way between your daydream and reality

But as tough as I have it, at least I'm doing something I choose
And I guess I'm doing good for others while I'm paying my dues
But until that day when I'm set free
And become everything God intended for me
I guess I'll be a victim of the administrator's blues
Administrator's blues
We've all got something to lose

John Le Sueur, Jr. *

Before the North Carolina Arts Council was started in 1964, there were already the North Carolina State Symphony Orchestra (begun in the 1930s), the North Carolina Museum of Art (organized in 1956), and the North Carolina School of the Arts, all established as state institutions — unique statements about North Carolina's commitment to the arts. There are not many state legislatures that have set aside public funds to found arts institutions for its people. The first two institutions existed long before the Arts Council was created. Today, the North Carolina Arts Council is organized as the Division of the Arts Council in the Department of Cultural Resources,

*Community Development Director, North Carolina Arts Council. Copyright 1978. Used by permission.

with Theater Arts as one of its sections. The State Symphony and Museum of Art report directly to the Secretary of the Department of Cultural Resources. The other two divisions are those of the State Library and of Archives and History. (The School of the Arts is under the department relating to higher education.)

"To be tenth in state population (5.5 million), and not have a city larger than 408,000 (Charlotte) nor to be able to 'name a town,' means that the population is really distributed in workable chunks. People are accustomed to organizing in order to accomplish, and they are in the driver's seat. They know the legislators well, and keep them on their toes," explained the present Arts Council Director, Mary Regan. The early Arts Council chairmen appointed by the governor had a community orientation. Phil Hanes, the first, had already been a leader in Winston-Salem; Sam Ragan, another early chairman, was from a small town. The guiding philosophy, when the incentive monies for states came from the Endowment during the late 1960s, was to fund for development, not for flashy programs as some states did. That was an early, conscious decision — to help small groups develop in little and solid ways.

From other states, one hears the comment, "You know North Carolina's uniqueness." All the important factors seemed to come together for North Carolina — people, philosophy, policy, timing, and long-range wisdom for what seemed right, given the known characteristics. There was, as one leader explained it, a feeling that the arts are included in part of the old idea of the cultured person. The idea that money and education hone a commitment to community, which includes a commitment to culture, is deeply rooted in the North Carolina leadership. It did not really matter whether it was Museum of Art leadership, or State Symphony leadership, or Arts Council leadership. While it is true that in most cities, this community commitment has not given the arts council priority equal to that of other cultural commitments, it probably has in more places in North Carolina than elsewhere. And it has been going on longer.

Although a rich variety of artistic effort in North Carolina was reported in the Arts Council survey of 1967, and the state government spent at that time nearly \$2 million in support of the arts, it was noted that

The greatest threat to the growth of the arts in North Carolina is complacency. This state has received much national publicity concerning its artistic growth. Many people around the country, and especially throughout the South, look to North Carolina as an example of what a state ought to be doing to support the arts. This kind of publicity and the admiration it often engenders is a source of much gratification. But, before we decide that we have become the Athens of the New World, or at least of the South, we should listen to our own artists and art educators. There is not a single art form in this state in

which professional practitioners of that art do not see great weaknesses. While it is clear that, in terms of production and support, some art forms are stronger than others, they *all* have great need for improvement — often in the quality of the work produced, but even more often in terms of financial support. Specifically: only a handful of professional artists in any art form in this state make a living from their art; the quality of amateur activities, both in the arts and in the support of the arts, is very uneven; education in the arts from the public schools through adult education leaves very much to be desired; business and foundation support of the arts has only barely been tapped.⁵⁴

The Arts Council proposed programs to remedy these declared problems, including professional touring in the performing arts, which would assist in bringing top-flight professional performers to areas of the state that were rarely, if ever, exposed to such quality. There was emphasis on improving artistic and teaching skills for public school teachers of the arts. Programs would begin the state process of improving opportunities for professional artists, developing audiences, expanding the role of the arts in all levels of education, and closing the gap between artists and the business community.⁵⁵ Improving the level of amateurism was also included as a goal.

On the community level, arts council leadership started in Winston-Salem in the late 1940s:

After five or six years of concern and several half-hearted attempts, the arts community of Winston-Salem founded the Arts Council in August 1949. There were eight participating member organizations at that time: the Piedmont Festival of the Arts, the Arts Committee of the Junior League (which had in 1946 approved a \$7,200 commitment to get the Arts Council started), [the] Civic Oratorio Society, [the] Maids of Melody, [the] Winston-Salem Operetta Association, [the] Winston-Salem Little Theatre, [the] Children's Theatre Board, and [the] Winston-Salem Symphony. Three other groups had to wait for their boards to approve their joining the new organization: They were [the] Civic Music Association, [the] Mozart Club, and the Arts and Crafts Association.

The mission of the Arts Council, from that auspicious day in 1949 until 1970, was to serve those members and new ones which subsequently joined. Membership now stands slightly over 40.⁵⁶

In 1970, the Arts Council's long-range planning committee found that it was not meeting the needs of the total community. A change in focus, from the membership to the community at large, was felt to be in order. This philosophical concept and policy is critical to the future of arts councils everywhere. In Winston-Salem, it was evolutionary and the result of study. Many councils have found themselves inhibited by a membership-only focus, if their *raison d'être* is to serve the total community. It has been

one of the hardest concepts for some cities to accept. But its meaning is enormous. Becoming community-based has probably allowed better fund-raising to take hold, and has caused a much wider community involvement. In Winston-Salem (population about 200,000), where over \$450,000* was being raised in the annual United Arts Fund drive, there were over 7,000 donors in 1979 out of a city population of about 61,000 family units. Not only were ten of the city's arts organizations funded from this source, but it supported the Council's base administrative budget (\$100,000); an Urban Arts programming arm of the Council, which works with new and neighborhood groups (\$25,000); and a Projects Pool from which one-time awards are made (\$70,000). These later programs, developed since the change in focus, have been concrete evidence of the Council's reaching out. The programming arm of the Council produces such things as an international festival highlighting the diverse ethnic heritages in the community (the Mayfest), Out-of-the-Bag concerts (weekly rock-pop-bluegrass concerts in a downtown mall), and art instruction for youths who cannot afford classes.

In 1977, stimulated by the tensions between professional arts organizations and community/participatory arts advocates, the Winston-Salem Arts Council studied its future with the assistance of an outside consultant familiar with the community and of 120 community representatives. A countywide Cultural Action Plan was developed. Basically, it recommended ways to help the Arts Council develop new funds and reach new audiences by expanding services and programs. It also recommended a major expansion of the physical facilities available for cultural activities, which would complement, if not spearhead, revitalization of the downtown area.

In order to accomplish the goals of renovation and expansion of facilities used for arts activities, the Arts Council tapped several sources of federal funds and their own unique social business community.

It has gone through two phases in its development, one as a service organization to its arts institution members, and a second as an aggressive programmer for the general public. It is entering a strong new phase as it tries to renew its role as a major support agency for the other cultural organizations of the city and continues to stimulate arts services for a broad and diverse public. These are its new dimensions.⁵⁷

The Winston-Salem Arts Council has earned the right of its reputation. Here is a good example of the community leadership taking the ball and, from the beginning, giving the council the clout and sanction needed to forge ahead. From one of the Council's past presidents comes this statement:

*United Arts Fund figures after this increase steadily, but reporting includes capital development funds in subsequent years.

Creative activity involving the arts and sciences is essential for survival; not a frill, not a luxury, not to be indulged if the budget allows, but a bedrock condition, of psychological salvation for young, old, white-collar, blue-collar, rich, poor, black, white, illiterate, or educated. This is our challenge.⁵⁶

One of the remaining weaknesses cited by Milton Rhodes, who has helped to direct this Council for about a decade, is that the Council is still reaching only 10 percent of the population.

While the four main functions of the Winston-Salem Arts Council may be fundraising, direct services, liaison, and facility maintenance, it has long been a supporter of downtown redevelopment and a catalyst for such, and, in fact, has taken a leadership role. It also seems no small item that R. Philip Hanes, Jr., long a local, state, and national arts council leader, is a leader in the downtown effort. The expectation was that Winston Square could become a national model of downtown renovation and revitalization through the arts. It certainly is an example of federal aid to the arts' generating private investment in downtown redevelopment. The impressive thing is that the support is coming not just from high-income corporate executives; it comes as well from impoverished minorities — not only R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company, but from the NAACP and neighborhood groups.

The success of Winston-Salem has probably set a standard for the arts councils in North Carolina that, consciously or unconsciously, has had its impact on the success of the councils of the other larger communities, and more subtly on the smaller ones as well. In one sense, all of North Carolina is one big community; the fact that leadership in one place has said that it is possible and permissible to include the arts councils among civic leadership roles does make a difference. It makes it a bit easier to gain the commitment of the corporate individuals who can envision themselves in the role. Because of the range of its services and programs, the Winston-Salem Arts Council has also provided a training ground for staff and a model for services and programs. Most councils have over the years evolved from service organizations for their arts institution members to aggressive organizations with concern for the general public and the city as a whole. The broadening of the first role as a support agency has stimulated the need for more services.

And although no two cities are exactly alike, there are leaders in every town, community, and city larger and smaller than Winston-Salem, and the arts councils should have as great a chance to capture their commitment of time and energy today as any organization. That is the key to the successful private community council. The quality of involvement of key leaders will make the difference between promise and fulfillment.

Winston-Salem's leadership may have a mythical quality about it by this time, but the story of the city's selection as the site for the School of the

Arts in 1965 stands as a fairly good indicator of the nature of its leadership. The school was sought by the state's cities, each of which promised funding to back up their dreams. Winston-Salem raised \$1 million from 5,000 donors in 48 hours just before the arrival of the site selection team — a hard act to follow. The school is there, needless to say. So when people talk of the Athens of the South, the flowering of the arts, the fulcrum for arts activity that is Winston-Salem, it is with admiration, respect — and a wee bit of jealousy.

North Carolina has eight of the nation's 50 or so united arts funds, most of which are run by some type of arts council. As defined recently by Michael Newton in the 1980 *United Arts Fund-Raising Manual*,

a united arts fund is a combined appeal conducted on an annual basis, raising operating funds for a minimum of three different organizations, and implying some degree of restriction on each organization's own fund raising. . . . Some, such as Lincoln Center in New York and the Performing Arts Council of the Music Center in Los Angeles [of which Newton is presently President] are connected with arts centers and provide for the immediate constituency of those centers. In general, though some variations exist, there are two types of drives: those that are corporate only, and those that are community-wide. Corporate appeals, of which there are fourteen, solicit only the community's corporate or business sector. In this instance, the funded organizations are free to approach everyone else, including individual donors and foundations, on their own. The balance of the drives is community-wide, meaning that fund raising from the private sector is carried out on a unified basis similar to the United Way in the field of health and welfare.⁵⁹

North Carolina's eight drives are patterned after the second model.

In Charlotte, North Carolina, an area of 408,000 people, 57 percent of the proceeds (\$660,600) from the 1980 United Arts Fund drive came from corporate solicitation. Some impressive numbers were the more than 1,000 firms that became involved and the 1,200 volunteers, including 300 from one corporation alone — the First Union National Bank. The effectiveness of this drive has increased over the years, but it has been much more vigorous since 1975, when a Cultural Action Plan was developed that achieved the necessary business commitment to the importance of the United Arts Fund drive. Total pledges have since increased. In 1980, the Charlotte Arts and Sciences Council ran the United Arts Fund drive for its 55 affiliate organizations, seven with budgets over \$150,000, topped by the Charlotte Symphony Orchestra's \$1 million (the largest budget). Their emphasis, in addition to basic fundraising, has been to help arts organizations become more professional and aware of opportunities. What does that mean? It means playing an advocate role (the arts are good business) and making a good living climate (the arts are smaller organizations, and individual artists, too).

The Culture Action Plan changed people's thinking, says the leadership. By the same token, when members of the business community get involved, they are demanding and deserving of a certain level of management and performance among those they fund. There has been an overall improvement in quality, quite discernible and yet subtle — better graphics, better marketing, better performance. This also comes from competition. The continuing improvement of the smaller groups plays a role.

The Charlotte Arts and Sciences Council, as with the best all over the country, has become used as a county and city clearinghouse even though it is a publicly designated private agency.

There is one big frustration, almost all agree: As a council becomes more successful, there is greater difficulty in getting the operating dollars it needs to continue to be as successful as it is. The problems lie in the things the council should be doing for itself — developing the advocacy for the council's own work and enough staff members to do a good image-making and professional job. Since the Endowment City Spirit grant that prompted the Cultural Action Plan in 1975, Charlotte has been able to make good use of the federal Endowment programs such as CityArts, which was the catalyst for more local neighborhood arts dollars, and a Challenge Grant of \$500,000 in behalf of five affiliate organizations.

Every North Carolina community contacted mentioned the desire and need for more minority leadership in their communities. Charlotte felt that there had been momentum gained in this area. An article in *Grassroots and Pavement*, a national journal of arts in America's neighborhoods, reflects this.

The North Carolina Cultural Arts Coalition, organized in 1977, was created to counteract the disparity in the distribution of state and federal dollars earmarked for arts programming; to develop black entrepreneurship and patronage in the arts; to provide visibility and technical assistance to black artists and arts organizations; and to assist black artists and arts administrators in finding employment in their chosen careers. To date, [the Coalition] has been responsible for 45 black artists and arts administrators getting full-time positions in the arts. A highlight of the recent annual meeting was an excellent collaborative workshop with the North Carolina State Arts Council on federal and state grantsmanship.⁶⁰

In Durham, in 1980, when the local Arts Council was 25 years old, even though programming attendance for Arts Council events had been 50 percent minority, there were only three minority representatives on the board of 34. The staff of eight had three minority persons. But the problem goes beyond the Council. Even though the largest wholly-black-owned insurance company in the nation is located in Durham, blacks have not been in the mainstream of city leadership.

Ten years ago, a local businessman characterized Durham as a "hot

dog” town; recently Anna Kisselgoff, dance critic of the *New York Times*, noted that it is a town where “arts are basic.” Someone else described Durham as the place “where it was about to happen” because of the influx of new people into the area who valued what the community has to offer.

Some exciting events have been based in Durham over the past years. The American Dance Festival moved from Connecticut College to Durham for its summer gathering; it involves 500 students, dance critics, and the Endowment’s Dance Touring groups. The Festival has planned a year-round format, which will serve to expand the concept of Durham as a focal point for dance. The plans are bound to have a profound impact statewide. Dance has been a difficult art form for the smaller communities of the state; perhaps now some concentrated efforts of a new kind will help bring people to a new awareness of dance. The Durham Arts Council is carrying out the community component of the current residency aspect of the Festival.

The Duke University Artists Series, started over 50 years ago, is the oldest in the country, and almost every major performing artist has appeared there. But it is felt that there is a need for even more exemplars in every art form and that the stimulus should come from the area which “houses more PhDs per square inch than anywhere else in the country.” There has been, in the estimation of some, a need for more professional artists in the area. Some seem to be moving in.

However, the Durham Arts Council is best known for its work in the neighborhoods. Its social service programs have met with great success over the last five years — in the city Parks and Recreation Department’s 17 neighborhood centers, in hospitals, and in prisons. So well received were the programs for the health care facilities that the Duke University Medical Center now has an office of cultural services! The media, in particular, tending to cover the human interest stories connected with the neighborhood program, have helped the Arts Council become known as the “antipoverty agency in the arts.” This is important when the city, facing a deficit, was considering cutting support to all noncity agencies. Because of their strong neighborhood work, which represented services not provided by other government agencies, the Arts Council support did not get cut.

The Council’s location is in downtown Durham, in an historic building that began in 1907 as a school and later (1924) became City Hall. By occupying the building, which is also being used for low-cost studio space, the Council is participating in turning the downtown around. It also has been a proven fundraiser, exceeding its goal in 1980 and expanding the number of corporate and individual contributors by over 50 percent.⁶¹

Because the concept of the Council’s work has become more inclusive, the board has been strengthened — a board now working for urban development and the arts as well. But in this city of about 100,000 (155,000 in the county), attracting the best leadership can be a problem, given the mo-

bility of the university population. The town is composed primarily of these persons, of the corporate group that works in Triangle Park, and of a major work force of blue-collar tobacco workers.

Fundraising has also been the hallmark of the Greensboro United Arts Council. In recent years, in addition to the United Arts Fund drive, the Council has led the fund raising to restore the turn-of-the-century Carolina Theater for the Performing Arts, and to renovate a building for an arts center with 20 classrooms/studios, four exhibit areas, and six dance studios. The Council has also been involved in an arts plan for the city.

Problems center around the mobile population characteristic of a community with seven universities. "We make an effort to bridge the old town-gown problem, but there is a long way to go," says the Arts Council Director. Given the disparate population, the Council's major future roles will be to increase awareness levels and to bring that population to a sense of community through the arts.

Two of the six categories of programs suggested in the statewide study of 1967 revolved around teachers — strengthening skills, providing trips for teachers to the Washington and New York museums, and professional performances in the public schools. Today almost every North Carolina community council has targeted the arts-in-education area a priority. Adult audience development in the smaller communities was found to be so difficult that all they could do was "keep one step ahead of what they are used to seeing." They felt that the hope lay with the children.

"Kids are the way to the parents, anyway." The Durham Council has, since 1972, nurtured and coordinated a nationally unique partnership with the city and county schools. Until 1979, the Arts Council had assumed the cost of the coordinator. After that, the coordinator, housed at the Arts Council, has worked for the school system and the cost is split, with the county paying half and the city and Council each paying one-fourth. One of the purposes of the Council is to seek to use artists and cultural institutions to make Durham a more livable community. It assists school officials in improving the quality of education through effective use of artists and art programs, which develop the perceptive skills of children by involving them and their teachers in creative activities.

The Winston-Salem/Forsyth County school system has had one of the strongest programs in arts in education, with special assistance from the JDR 3rd Fund, but the role is clarified thus: "We can go in once a week, but we cannot educate; the schools do that."

In 1967, the North Carolina Arts Council survey said in every nice way possible that the education systems were lacking in the arts experiences for the children. There was a long road ahead, and many needs for improvement were indicated. The same is still true today. The community arts councils, however, have tried in some of the best ways to improve, help, and

cooperate. But they can only build the best cooperative programs with artists, provide opportunities for teachers, and attend board meetings to monitor the arts budget. School administrators and school boards must develop curriculum, policy, and priority changes; the schools must do the educating.

In a typical set of instructions from the Toe River Arts Council for its Winter Arts program (which has received funds from two county boards of education and a joint grant from the North Carolina Arts Council and the Endowment), the schools are told such things as times and ways in which the artist will meet and plan with faculty, expectations in terms of scheduling, and the ways in which the artist will be available to students and faculty. Exhibits of the artist's work and presentations to such groups as PTAs are part of the program. Both the school and the artist evaluate activities so that there can be continuing cooperative efforts between the Arts Council and boards of education. The Arts Council also has provided performing arts consultants, and some live music, dance, and theater performances.⁶²

The Toe River Arts Council's program has been the only arts programming in one of its counties; in the other, they have had three music specialists and one art specialist in the schools. About 5,800 students in two school systems benefit from these programs. The Toe River Council has sponsored classes in many art forms for children of all ages and organized residencies in the community. "Efforts in arts education were designed to reach every school child in Mitchell County and Yancey County through the formation of a bicounty arts education committee which planned the comprehensive arts program."⁶³

In developing special events, programming was aimed at natives of the area, with several bluegrass performances and a visit by the Appalachian Bookmobile. The philosophy here, as in many of the other arts councils, was that what was presented should be of high quality, but that developing audiences for unfamiliar art forms is a slow process, and that there should be an emphasis on what appeals to the people who live in the area. What may appeal to directors and entrepreneurs may not appeal to the people, but the arts council is the vehicle for stretching the opportunities and expanding the horizons, and the leadership continually searches for the acceptable starting places. Whether the community council is the one in the Toe River area 50 miles from Asheville, covering a two-county, 28,000-person area in 1,200 square miles of territory, or the Macon County Arts Council in economically deprived mountain country with a permanent population of 19,000 that swells to approximately 30,000 in the summer, the needs are immense.

One of the older North Carolina councils — the Community Council for the Arts — serves Kinston, a town of 21,000, and Lenoir County, which has a population of 55,000. With an annual budget of about \$100,000, the Council has spent better than 50 percent of it for programs for young peo-

ple. In an attempt to reach children of all ages and economic backgrounds, the efforts are divided into professional performances, Community Youth programs, and the Artist-in-Schools programs. The Kinston Art Center, home of the Community Council, houses the Children's Art and Nature Awareness Museum. Established in 1979 as a community celebration for the International Year of the Child, the Children's Museum opened to audiences who have enjoyed wall hangings, paintings, sculpture, and a hologram from a New York museum.

A description of the Council's activities characterizes the focus and philosophy of the work of this community council.

Arts councils care about kids. For over 15 years, the Community Council for the Arts—formerly known as the Kinston Arts Council—has established programming for children as one of its primary goals. . . . We believe today's children are tomorrow's artists, musicians, dancers, scientists—citizens.⁶⁴

The Community Council budget (Table 3) shows funding projected from several public levels and several private sources of funding.

The concept of developing a central cultural arts facility as an integral part of larger efforts to shape a new role and identity for downtown has not been the province only of the arts councils in the larger communities of the state. Besides Charlotte (Spirit Square), Winston-Salem (Winston Square), Greensboro (the Greensboro Arts Center and the Carolina Theater), and Durham (the old City Hall), Fayetteville (population 63,000) and Cumberland County (250,000) have been developing a thorough and long-range planning process through most of the 1970s. The Arts Council there was central in assisting a professional feasibility study for an arts center, which looked into such aspects as event demand, financing sources, location, and management. In addition, it is the agent for a further study exploring service requirements for a central arts facility, evaluating possible sites, and planning the potential financing of the facility. They expect to continue to include broad citizen participation in the final "idea" stage, building on the planning completed thus far. At all stages, professional design consultants have been involved. "Although the Arts Council is the agent for the grant, this building is not just an Arts Council building. It's going to serve all of Cumberland County."⁶⁵

Most of the community councils described thus far, and by far the majority in North Carolina, are private agencies. In Morgantown, on the other hand, a unique connection has developed between the public and private sectors, as the Director of the Arts Council has filled two roles—one with the private Council and the other as the Director of Recreation, Parks, and Cultural Arts for Burke County. This dual arrangement really ties the two organizations closely together.

TABLE 3
1980 Budget, Community Council for the Arts,
Kinston, North Carolina

Source of Funds	Amount
Grants:	
City	\$24,300.00
County	20,000.00
N.C. Arts Council	—*
Local government match—city	5,000.00
Local government match—county	5,000.00
Grassroots Arts bill	6,249.00
Summer intern	1,400.00
General Grant Outreach	—*
Jazz touring	525.00
Jazz touring—local match ^a	1,225.00
Gifts and contributions:	
Membership	9,000.00
Donations and memorials	250.00
William S. Page Foundation	100.00
Dividends and interest:	
Lucy S. Hood Endowment	125.00
Jenkins-Tapp Foundation	600.00
Jefferson-Pilot	24.00
Classes:	2,500.00
Projects:	
Holiday Happening	7,200.00
Fine Film Series	2,228.00
Spring Arts Festival	3,000.00
Bright Leaf Festival	500.00
Professional children's performances	1,000.00
Other projects	1,300.00
Art center operations:	
Rent	600.00
Miscellaneous	1,000.00
From savings accounts ^a	1,557.32
Total	\$94,683.32

Source: Community Council for the Arts, Kinston, North Carolina, "Budget" for period ending September 30, 1980.

^aTo be taken from funds placed in savings at end of fiscal year 1979–80 for Jazz Program and Projects.

*Not available.

These councils are, as well, the agencies in their particular counties that have been nominated by their county commissioners and approved by the North Carolina Arts Council as the local distributing agent for Grass-roots Arts funds. The local distributing agent is the state Council's partner in providing state funds for arts development to local arts organizations. The North Carolina Arts Council has played no little part in developing the philosophy of a basic arts delivery network and community partnership program.

The four persons who have headed the North Carolina Arts Council since its inception agree on several things:

Important ideas and policies in North Carolina have been that the arts should become truly a part of people's lives, and that the better artists should be able to earn a living. (This differs vastly from the attitude in a state whose top priority would be to sustain the major arts organizations.) In order to accomplish this, the emphasis has been on community development. The philosophical base is to start where the people are and to make progress without being condescending. But in order to accomplish the goals, there have really needed to be people working in every community to promote, coordinate, and fund the arts. The state cannot impose anything—it can simply give good assistance.

Edgar Marston was the Executive Director of the North Carolina Arts Council during those formative years of 1968–74. (The first Director, Robert Brickel, was there for two years, and supervised the basic state survey.) It was then that the philosophy growing out of the study findings had to take hold.

Marston has said, "If we were going to get people truly involved, it had to be in every facet of their lives and we had to get every community organization involved in the arts, too." Systematically, there were meetings of the superintendents of schools (140 of a possible 150 attended), recreation departments, church leaders (who saw that 10,000 copies of the Art Council booklet were distributed), home extension programs, community colleges, and technical institutes. From these meetings evolved the Visiting Artists program, funded in part by those institutions (about \$1 million per year). Marston explains that the state had to realize that new constituencies would organize and that it had to happen in an atmosphere of partnership. If it were not carefully done, it would be seen as patronage.

The councils that had been in existence for some time (some for 15 or 20 years, such as the ones in Winston-Salem and Durham) were generous with their expertise and served as consultants all over the state. It was a two-way street, and the state, too, learned a lot. Many of the state administrators were involved in the arts themselves, so that there was understanding at high levels. There was, in fact, a time when the State Budget Director was a former musician, the State Treasurer was particularly interested

in museums, the Revenue Director was an opera buff, and the Chairman of the State Board of Education was an artist. And one cannot forget that \$3-4 million of state money was already being spent for the arts in support of the State Symphony, the Museum of Art, theater programs, and the School of the Arts. The Johnny Appleseed movement of the community arts councils was started in North Carolina in a richly supportive context.

North Carolina's community leaders, mentioned earlier, whose well-founded philosophy made its mark in the development of the policy of partnership between the state and communities and between state arts council board and staff, made the difference. It was they who rejected the "flashy" concepts some other states were developing, and said, "Let's develop it in communities—let's lay a groundwork."

This, then, is also the background for such state-initiated programs as the Grassroots Arts program, which is a partnership program between the councils and the communities. It also explains the fact that when Endowment monies were given to states in 1973 for communities, five already had a policy in place that was sympathetic and able to use the money for community development. It explains how a local arts council might be able to stimulate a local government challenge grant and help the whole community benefit. It explains how a local council and community college and/or school system might be able to plan together. It explains a lot.

It explains about the steppingstones to greater depth and responsiveness to community needs over the years. The communities were readied by their own statewide consultants for such opportunities as the National Endowment for the Arts City Spirit program and later the Challenge Grant program. These concepts of planning and coordination were not new; they could give new dimension and vigor to future directions and could galvanize new leadership in that process.

How important is it that the state enacted a law that some monies had to be allocated according to population (currently about ten cents per capita)? It has stimulated the growth and stability of arts councils. While there has been an effort to create a local support group in every county, 45 of the 100 counties still do not have them. There has been a special effort toward meeting the needs for strong management in community councils, exemplified by a state salary assistance program that gives diminishing amounts toward the director salaries on a two-thirds, one-half, one-third formula for three years. This has assisted the establishment of some professionally run councils. As in everything that is just beginning, some communities used this plan too soon and mistakes were made. Timing of its use is of major importance.

There is in North Carolina an Association of Community Arts Agencies, which represents these local community councils to the legislature and private interests. It gives the councils a forum through which they can

make their needs and reactions known. Through its efforts, the Grassroots Arts Fund (the per capita fund) has been greatly increased over the years. The 1980 Association meeting in North Carolina was about survival in the 1980s. It wasn't labeled "Survival," but when the groups divided into smaller discussion sessions, the urban problems session and the ones on management and funding were well populated. The session on programming was eliminated; there were no takers. There were models of every kind of programming all around: The Durham neighborhood program, the business lunch program in the Greensboro Arts Center introducing business employees to the center (their chief executive officers sent the invitations and picked up the bills), the Talent Bank of Charlotte, and the many successful local festivals are just some examples. Ten years ago at such a meeting there would have been show-and-tell sessions about how to accomplish these programs. But now the concern was the future—how to keep the good things going, stem the worst problems, and plan for stability.

While North Carolina is one of the few states where the communities as a whole have successfully developed local government dollars, generating collectively about \$2 million per year (it should be remembered that there are about 50 cities with populations of 25,000 to 50,000 people), the Assembly felt it necessary to look toward new sources. (Of note: Although the number of local governments involved has been growing steadily, greatly encouraged by the state challenge grants, only slightly over half of the communities were holding or increasing their local support. This shows the temporal nature of public monies and the never-ending efforts needed to be sure they continue.)

North Carolina has been looking at a hotel/motel tax, which connects tourism to the arts and which has been a successful source of revenue in other parts of the country; instituting such a measure would take a state-wide effort. "We pay it when we go out of the state; why not have people pay when they come in?" was one response. More remote sources, such as oil rig monies to be spent on the arts and open-space development, could be applicable to the needs of some of the cities planning new arts facilities and uses of space.

As a "community" of councils, the representatives shared notes on how much pressure they could exert in the private sector. They compared what the levels of bank giving were, so that they might be able to use that information from community to community. It was not the "how-to"s, but the community-to-community peer pressure that was the topic of discussion. That is a different level of inquiry than is seen elsewhere.

The importance of community in the state of North Carolina caused one of the former North Carolina Arts Council directors to take the helm of a community council *after* heading the state Council; it was not seen there, as it might be viewed elsewhere, as a lesser position. The state leaders have

also been national advocates for community council development and needs among their peers, the state arts councils. The fourth Director, Mary Regan, took a short leave in 1976 to do a report on the Community Development program within the National Endowment for the Arts Federal-State Partnership program, giving her a special and in-depth understanding of the nationwide picture before becoming her own state's leader. The Community Development program, used well, has been envisioned as an incentive for state agencies to become more directly involved with their communities. Few have used it with as much insight as North Carolina has.

North Carolina is a microcosm of the problems of arts councils as well. To begin with, there is the problem of quality. Buttressed by the expressed goals of supporting, bringing, or providing programs of the highest quality, since it is not possible to have a major museum or professional performing arts company in every region or small community, planners are constantly thinking of ways to transport the communities to the facilities. Buses and planes to major collections and museums, and to events such as the American Dance Festival in Durham, the Eastern Music Festival in Greensboro, and the Music in the Mountains Series near Spruce Pine achieve this. The events at the universities may bring 25,000 people who subscribe or attend at a reasonable fee.

There are also the turf problems. Older, single-discipline organizations have captured the interest of the town leadership in old patronage patterns. Symphony orchestra leadership, whether the community is one of 350,000 or one of 20,000, has been of particular community concern. The specifics of the tension vary, but in one city it was a conflict between the council's Pops Festival and the symphony; in another, it was a question of the acceptance of the arts council by the symphony; in yet another, it was a conflict between a museum and the arts council. It was suggested that a state task force be formed to look at realistic numbers of organizations and budgets.

Then there are the other problems concerning community leadership. In cities with college populations, otherwise mobile populations, or a high influx of new people, the arts council leadership may be problematic. In the cases of old councils, keeping the leadership renewed and invigorated is equally difficult. For the newly professional councils, the transition from volunteer to paid council staff is not easy (often the first paid staff person comes out of the volunteer ranks). Delineations of roles is particularly difficult because the tasks do not always differ; they may simply be of a more complex nature.

The North Carolina Arts Council has kept its eye on the goals set so early by those first council boards. Several of its programs *have* assisted the

better artists in earning a living, and the arts *have* certainly become more a part of people's lives. In one small community, the arts and water — two essential human services — are discussed in terms of who will take responsibility for their support. In the media, the dialogue is about the arts' being traded for water. The city asks the county to take care of the arts if it agrees to take over the responsibility for the water. In another community, an editorial suggests a cut in the garbage pickup so that dollars may be given to the arts.

On December 11, 1980, the *Raleigh News and Observer* ran the following article:

A North Carolina art group has won a federal tax exemption over the objection of the IRS.

The exemption for the Goldsboro Art League had been denied by IRS officials who claimed the League was a commercial enterprise because it operates two galleries where art works are sold.

The League appealed that ruling and was upheld by the U.S. Tax Court in a ruling made public Wednesday.

The court notes that the Art League conducts classes and engages in many educational activities.⁶⁶

The North Carolina community development policy has indeed taken hold; it is spirited, tenacious, and confident that it can keep improving the quality of offerings in a state that takes a person 14 hours to drive across. The communities' leaders themselves have evidenced this confidence as well. In Fayetteville, the board said "no" when the less-than-acceptable dinner theater invited the Arts Council to be the recipients of the money made from a benefit at the theater. The nude paintings at the gallery in a small Bible Belt town were upheld as acceptable; and the work of an avant-garde composer in Durham was supported by the Arts Council board, even though there might be the typical public controversy over the work.

The story of North Carolina is the microcosm of the story of the community arts council movement. Almost everyone one talks to attributes the success to the involvement of "the right people." That will be true of success anywhere in any field. The building of a network of peer support is a factor that makes the total effort more effective. The give-and-take between community and state, and sincere efforts to work through problems that have surfaced over the years, have been conducive to highly motivated and successful work. There is a feeling of caring and nurturing. And while some have become national leaders, their leadership role in their own state and communities has taken precedence. The results are evident, and they provide a framework for the arts council movement.

STATEWIDE AND REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

The community arts councils' development has been surrounded by that of two other organizational structures that have affected community-level development directly and indirectly — the regional organization network and the statewide service organization network, of which the assemblies or associations of community arts councils are a part. They are supportive in different ways.

The eight regional organizations — which include in their membership all but four of the 56 state and territorial arts agencies in the United States (not included are Washington, D.C., Texas, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands) — have developed organically from the regions themselves. Those regional organizations include the following: Affiliated State Arts Agencies of the Upper Midwest (ASAAUM — Iowa, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin); Consortium of Pacific Arts and Cultures (CPAC — Alaska, California, Hawaii, American Samoa, Guam, and the Northern Marianas); Great Lakes Arts Alliance (GLAA — Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio); Mid-America Arts Alliance (MAAA — Arkansas, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Oklahoma); Mid-Atlantic States Arts Consortium (MASAC — Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia); New England Foundation for the Arts, Inc. (NEFA — Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont); Southern Arts Federation (SAF — Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia); and Western States Arts Foundation (WESTAF — Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming).⁶⁷

These organizations, cooperative ventures of the state arts councils, have been publicly endorsed but private arts organizations, “encouraged and funded by the federal government (National Endowment for the Arts) but initiated, developed, and under the governance of the states comprising the regions the organizations were created to serve.”⁶⁸ They exist to provide multistate services that can be best offered by a regional organization. The distinguishable feature is that they are voluntary and state-initiated, not federal regional offices. (The National Endowment for the Arts has had liaison persons assigned to regions of the United States as links to all organizations in those areas. This activity has been unrelated to the regional organization development.) The organizations were building momentum as the 1980s began, and no one can determine the level of their impact. They are collectively “committed to the concept of cultural regionalism; moreover, they believe that all art, whether tribal dance or Mozart, is made available to people in isolated communities and in rural areas most effectively through cooperative regional efforts.”⁶⁹

Because the community council is often the local coordinator of touring and sponsoring programs, which seem to be the kernel of the activity of most of the regional organizations, there is a real and important relationship between community and regional groups, most especially in the case of smaller community councils. The touring programs' styles fall into two types: a tightly controlled and block-booked "national touring program" of major companies, and a less controlled "regional touring program" where sponsors have a broader selection of more affordable events from which to choose. Most combine the two. Because of the cutbacks in funding, especially for the touring programs, the emphasis in the future is bound to be on the "necklace tour," which will emphasize that which is closer to the home base of the performing group. (It should be noted that whereas traditionally colleges and universities used to be the primary sponsors of cultural events, local arts agencies now have become equally important as sponsors. Many jointly book an event; the college provides the facility, and the coordinator is the council.) The regional organizations are, depending on the specifics, also available for training and other kinds of services to local and state agencies.

One of the first statewide community arts council meetings expressly to coordinate matters between community arts councils and a state arts council may well have taken place in Springfield, Illinois, in 1972. It was to advise the state council on the needs of local arts councils. At that time, there were 18 local Illinois councils, including one of the oldest in the country, the Quincy Society of Fine Arts. The Illinois Arts Council had had advisory panels in each of the arts disciplines for some time, but it had never had a committee devoted solely to matters concerning community arts councils until then. Today, about half the states have such a group, usually called an assembly.⁷⁰

The relationship is not usually so close as it has been in Texas, where the Executive Director of the Texas Assembly of the Arts Councils has been an employee of the state Council, in charge of developing councils.

The most important first steps in the development of one of the strongest alliances (the one in New York) were taken very carefully, and with the involvement of those who needed to be involved in the process and development of a statewide agency. An early survey included questions about the establishment of such a group, its expectations, purposes, and structure. "When the steering committee members started saying 'we' instead of 'I,' it was an important step forward," remembers the Executive Director of the Alliance of New York State Arts Councils, Inc., Lee Howard (also a former president of NACAA). As most alliances, this started as a volunteer organization (1975). The credibility was built by stating what the group would do in the areas of communication and education, and then by accomplishing it. The most experienced persons from the arts council network in the state

were generous in sharing their knowledge with emerging organizations as advisors, panelists, and workshop leaders.

The concrete evidence of success is subtle — the higher level of questioning, the kinds of requests, and the behaviors of the arts council staffs and boards are the indicators that there has been a growth and change in the level of sophistication. The main areas of service have been in the educational workshops and in communication and information on programs, services, and legislative matters. The area of advocacy has been especially important for the councils, a logical network for information and action; the Alliance of New York State Arts Councils, Inc., has worked with the Concerned Citizens for the Arts in the state in a cooperative way.

It would be wrong to indicate that these alliances have always “gone along,” or agreed with their state agencies in small and large matters. In some cases the power struggle has become real. In the state of Alabama, the state arts agency, in response to “the input of the collective voice,” ceased to support the Alliance organization. “There is a gnawing fear that if anyone speaks out for or against any arts issue, funding would cease for that spokesman, that the withholding of funds is an effective silencer.”⁷¹

The trouble may stem from the fact that it is natural on the part of some state arts councils to feel the power of the assembly constituency, and to fear some loss of their own power. In some cases, the reaction has been to cut assembly dollars; but the assemblies have been almost totally dependent on those dollars. Solving the greater problem of the development of nongovernmental support for such a statewide group is a very difficult task.

In the face of extreme budget cuts, due to an across-the-board state dollar crunch affecting all state agencies, the Ohio Arts Council urged its alliances to band together somehow to economize on communications, travel, meetings, and the like.

In Michigan, a faltering economy was also forcing the state council to make cuts, especially in the special projects and minigrants program. The Michigan Association of Community Arts Agencies encouraged the formation of the Michigan Arts Forum, an informal association of the state’s arts service organizations to bolster advocacy efforts. The Michigan Association has purposes similar to the Alliance of New York State Arts Councils and issues a monthly newsletter *Re:*, covering information of importance to nearly 100 councils.*

*A year after the reports of the cuts cited, the Michigan Council for the Arts, in the face of even more general economic problems in the state, embarked on a new program that would serve minorities, the handicapped, and economically and culturally disadvantaged citizens. This state, at the same time, was reaffirming the need for programs for touring, market development, facilities improvement, rentals, planning, and cultural preservation. (See Charles C. Mark, *Arts Reporting Service*, no. 289, April 5, 1982.)

In Michigan, two-thirds of the funding for the Association of Community Arts Agencies in 1980 came from the state council. The other third was from dues and earned income from workshops, with a very small amount from outside sources. Desirable goals would reduce the dependency on the state council.

Another problem identified with the statewide assembly groups has to do with the lack of new blood in the leadership areas. They tend to draw leadership from the ranks of those already heavily involved. But the huge time commitments needed for travel and meetings are big investments in addition. The Michigan leader estimated this load to be 70 hours a month just for this volunteer effort. He was also a new appointee to the Michigan Council for the Arts and a board member of NACAA, quite apart from his job as fine arts producer at Michigan State University's WKAR-TV. Most of the organizations begin as volunteer organizations, but there comes a time when there is a need for a professional staff appointment, as there has been in New York, Kansas, Alabama, and Texas.

The Association of Community Arts Councils of Kansas has served on contract with the Kansas Arts Commission to provide community development services and encourage arts programming at the local level throughout Kansas. This is far different from the role as an independent organization envisioned by some of these groups. As a liaison with state and federal government, foundations, and the business community, the Kansas group, or any other group with that role, has an especially difficult time criticizing "the hand that feeds it." The programming role of the Kansas Association has been different from that of its Michigan and New York counterparts. One year, through its assistance efforts, the Dance Theater of Kansas Touring Ensemble played to 23 communities (56 percent with populations of less than 10,000), the Raymond Johnson Dance Company was presented to 7,824 people in four communities, and 15 prominent Kansas artists were involved in an art exhibit that toured 11 cities and was seen by approximately 10,000 people. The goals ranged from increasing public awareness for the art form, to introducing ballet, to providing residency opportunities. Each program's goals were clearly delineated, and the results of the program were evaluated.

These are just examples. Through the assistance of the Association, the booking opportunities of the Kansas Arts Commission (Kansas Touring Program and Traveling Visual Arts Program) and the Mid-America Arts Alliance (national artists come through their sponsorship to a five-state region for concerts and residencies, as well as regional tours of outstanding artists from those states) are made known to the communities. The range of all of these opportunities has been wide — the 1981–82 roster included the TASHI chamber music ensemble, the Dance Theatre of Harlem, the Gregg Smith Singers, the Kansas City Philharmonic, and the Missouri Repertory

Theater. In addition, there were major exhibitions and alternative exhibits. The National Endowment for the Arts Dance Touring program has enabled sponsors to book professional dance companies. The 1981-82 roster included about 90 companies of all styles of dance. Any community-oriented not-for-profit organization could be a sponsor for these residencies; community councils were only one group among them. Others were symphonies, drama groups, parks and recreation departments, churches, museums, and school districts. While the state associations do not coordinate these events, they give assistance to the communities that wish it, and act to stimulate the programming of these events.*

The important activities of communications through an arts newsletter, the educational workshops, and the normal range of technical assistance reflected in most assembly community activities have been stressed. The budget of the Kansas group had authorized several staff lines to fill what seems to be an "adjunct" role under contract with the state council. The travel expenses across the state for both board and staff are the largest expense and could never be assumed by volunteers.

Only those on site over a period of time can estimate the value of the model of the Kansas Association. There are constant turf and dollar questions that surface as the budget situation at the state level becomes tighter. At this writing, this organization is faced with a severely cut budget and reorganization. Because the Association was organized "from the top," the state, not the arts councils, has determined its role. The organizations served, perhaps, have had too little investment in what happens to the Association.

The independent status of the assemblies allows them to be much more responsive on the whole than any government agency can be. Most leaders reflect this philosophy, no matter what the nature of the relationship with the state agency is. Whether newer associations of community arts agencies—those in Ohio, Wisconsin, Tennessee, and Missouri, or others more recently begun—will be called upon to have greater adjunct roles in the state as the economy dictates legislative budget reductions remains to be seen.

There are bound to be constant turf and dollar questions under the surface, unless the associations find independent livelihoods and serve their community arts council clientele with regard to key issues relating to communities at state and federal levels.

States have organized their advocacy efforts in a variety of ways.† Some of the most interesting and effective have been interdisciplinary in their structure.

*There have already been alterations in the touring planning, as it has been known, for in FY 1983, Endowment monies for dance are to go more directly to companies instead of through presenters and other conduits.

†There were 29 state advocacy groups at last count.

The history of the California Confederation of the Arts reflects some of the reasons for the development there of a nonprofit statewide interdisciplinary arts service organization. It came into existence during the period when the California Arts Commission was abolished and the California Arts Council was being newly created. It was a period when many leaders in the arts community of the state realized they must unite in order to represent themselves effectively to the governor's office, the state legislature, and the public at large. In 1978, the confederation helped prevent the California Arts Council from being abolished by the state legislature in the wake of Proposition 13, and successfully worked to increase the budget of the California Arts Council by 600 percent between 1978 and 1979.

The Confederation is a statewide arts service organization representing all the arts and artists in California. All sizes and types of arts organizations — groups for the visual and performing arts, community arts councils, theater councils, the Association of Museums, and Artists Equity, to name a few — are included. Support comes from government, foundations, and business grants, as well as membership dues and donations. Some unique components seem to be present in this statewide organization, because it sees itself as an *arts service* organization as well as an advocacy group. Because it is a 501•C•3, only 20 percent of the budget and assets may be spent on advocacy activities.* It has become the resource for information, technical assistance, and advice on funding, legislative activities, economic data, and technical assistance. Such a centralized resource aids artists and arts organizations in developing managerial skills, their audiences, and more effective use of their time and materials.

In California, there are also arts discipline service organizations statewide. The services described in other states are sometimes provided by the arts council itself or the individual service organizations. There is, in addition, often a statewide citizens' advocacy group that is not a 501•C•3 organization, so that its full agenda is given over to lobbying. All such groups give specific instructions to their clientele about generating public opinion, addressing their remarks specifically to individual artists, arts administrators, boards of directors, audience participants, and volunteers. There are a variety of differing ways that each group can effectively communicate the needs of the arts in personal and general terms.

The California Confederation's other services include serving as an information clearinghouse, publishing a newsletter, and sponsoring or co-sponsoring seminars or workshops on arts topics of interest to *all* the arts

*While both 501•C•3 and 501•C•4 organizations are tax-exempt, nonprofit organizations, there are differences in their ability to lobby, and contributions are tax-deductible to C•3 organizations only. In the process of organizing or restructuring, the best advice is careful review of the legal implications of both designations.

disciplines as well as to the individual artists. Sensitive to avoiding any duplication with the four-discipline (symphony, dance, theater, museum) statewide service organizations and with Artists' Equity, the Confederation's seminars, such as the ones on the federal regulations concerning access to the handicapped, try to be of interest to all the arts. The organization sees itself moving into the network of arts education organizations — the Alliance of California Arts Education and the California Connection.

The oldest of the statewide advocacy groups is probably the Concerned Citizens for the Arts of New York State. It has been chaired by Amyas Ames, who had organized and chaired the Partnership for the Arts, which was formed in 1970 as a national advocacy group.

Some groups have looked at new sources of revenue. A major force behind the passage of the first tax check-off bill (beginning in 1982), which creates through the Oregon Arts Development Fund the opportunity to designate \$1, \$5, \$10, or another specified portion of one's tax refund for arts support by checking a box on the form, was the Oregon Advocates for the Arts. The monies placed in the fund are administered by the Oregon Arts Commission. (In the first year, a similar program raised nearly \$350,000 for the Nongame Wildlife Fund in the same state.)⁷²

Minnesota Citizens for the Arts, Inc., BRAVO in Virginia, Citizens for the Arts in Pennsylvania, Indiana Advocates for the Arts, and Ohio Citizens Committee for the Arts, among others, are all broad-based groups. They have been effective and instrumental in raising their state allocations to the arts by over 500 percent in some cases, depending on the years cited.

In Minnesota there are two groups, one a member group dedicated to insuring that all residents of Minnesota have access, enjoyment of, and education in the arts; and Minnesota Citizens for the Arts, whose efforts are entirely political. Minnesota Citizens for the Arts has focused on the state arts appropriation, and also pursued other avenues of public funding such as the 1 percent for the Arts bill, arts-in-education programs, and various county, local, or federal concerns. In recent years, this group worked to assist Minneapolis in advocating exemption from the 3 percent city sales tax for amusements and admissions, and for the increased dollar support for the Minneapolis Arts Commission. It is one of the few cases of a statewide advocacy group taking up the cause of a community arts commission. In Washington State there are also multiple advocacy groups with a similar mode of operation.*

*For information on some of the advocacy programs and strategies for developing solid advocacy efforts, there is the ACA resource monograph on the subject. It offers commentary and practicum, including a discussion of voter education, political activity, and the Internal Revenue Service. Because information about these groups is just now starting to be documented, the resource material for the present volume was gathered through a questionnaire sent to existing statewide advocacy groups.

In Ohio, the Ohio Citizens' Committee for the Arts was given its first home within the offices of the Cleveland Area Arts Council because of CAAC's willingness to undertake this effort. The citizen leadership was developed, and after the first year, a much broader formal statewide structure formed. To insure broad statewide support, it was felt important to move it from the state's largest cities and highest arts impact areas. Thus, the offices were, by the third year, ensconced in the smaller community of the Committee's new Chairman, and a part-time staff person was hired to assist the management of a growing undertaking.

Some of the citizens' committees for the arts are very small and strictly voluntary. In those states, the groups are very frugal and very focused. In New Hampshire, there has been concentration on more money for the state arts council, on a .5 Percent for the Arts bill, and on improving communication and the power of the constituency. The leadership has been mostly arts managers and individuals from statewide arts organizations who saw the need and had the "greed" for dollars.

Many of the citizens' committees, without staff, newsletters, or multiple ongoing purposes, become somewhat inactive between budget years or important legislative sessions. Statewide organizations take much effort to keep going on a volunteer basis.

The arts of the community have not yet developed an ongoing constituency, which makes the efforts of the Minnesota Citizens for the Arts' activities in behalf of the Minneapolis Arts Commission unusual. It is true that in critical times, when public budgets have been up for review, almost every arts commission has been able to call upon an arts representation to orchestrate a presentation in its behalf. Sometimes, that has not been possible, because private citizens and leaders of traditional arts organizations have not been used to responding to other than the traditional private support programs. The councils have represented in many instances the first link that the arts community has had with the public sector on arts issues.

TOWARD A FEDERAL-STATE-LOCAL PARTNERSHIP

In February 1981, at the very moment that the Reagan administration was announcing the broad sweep of its economic policies for the first time, and after more than ten years of discussion and more discussion, study, and re-study, the National Council on the Arts adopted a policy concerning local arts agencies. With no money, and no hope for quick implementation, the Council resolved that it is "appropriate to assist local and community arts agencies to improve and strengthen their financial and service support functions for arts of the highest quality and to do so in a cooperative relationship, a partnership, with their state arts agencies."⁷³ In the *Report to the President* from President Reagan's Task Force on the Arts and Humani-

ties of October 1981, Henry Geldzahler, Commissioner of Cultural Affairs in New York City, the only local arts agency representative on the ad hoc committee, had made sure of the inclusion of local arts agencies in the recommendation that the endowments and states "work out a federal-state relationship that will take into account the complex nature of the current relationship and the need for more effective use of federal funds."⁷⁴ In both cases, the recognition of the need to include policy regarding the local partnership was not a high priority, but was attended to when the group was reminded that it made sense and seemed timely.

In persuading the National Council to create a policy, Henry E. Putsch, then Executive Director for Partnership, NEA, distilled the thousands of pages of related studies and of related Endowment policies and programs mentioned briefly in preceding chapters, and included a synopsis of the present activities of the local arts agencies themselves. It seems appropriate to print, for a wider public, part of this documentation.

A summary of the common themes running through past reports and recommendations . . . [relate to] steps that encourage and assist local arts leaders to:

- develop and implement publicly accountable policies and programs for support of all the arts;
- increase both financial and service support for the arts at the local level;
- plan for the health of the artistic and cultural life of the total community;
- provide support for the arts in ways which are consistent with the purposes, goals, and standards of the Endowment's legislation, operating policies, and programs;
- cooperate and share responsibility for support of the arts with the state arts agencies and the National Endowment for the Arts;
- address such other standards and criteria for eligibility as are, from time to time, established by the National Endowment for the Arts and the state arts agencies.

The following policy statement and program recommendations have been drafted with these themes and past studies in mind and in response to those conditions and circumstances described in the background material that appears after the recommended policy and program statement.

II. RECOMMENDED POLICY AND PROGRAMS

A. *Recommended Policy Statement:* The National Council on the Arts has reviewed the development and role of local arts agencies in the United States and finds that:

- the arts support function of local arts agencies is a beneficial, significant,

and integral contribution to the arts in the United States and the artistic life of American communities;

- the state arts agencies desire to work in cooperation with local arts agencies to assure more effective support for the arts at the state and local level;
- the purposes and goals of the Arts Endowment are consistent with a program to encourage support for the arts at the local level as part of a broadly conceived national policy of support for the arts;
- the Congress of the United States has authorized and urged the National Endowment for the Arts to provide programs to encourage support for the arts by local arts agencies;
- greatly increased private and public support for the arts at the local level and the highest standards for providing that support are necessary for the arts to reach their full potential for touching the lives of Americans, for achieving and maintaining excellence and aesthetic diversity.

In view of these findings, the Council believes it is appropriate to assist local and community arts agencies to improve and strengthen their financial and service support functions for arts of the highest quality and to do so in a cooperative relationship, a partnership, with their state arts agencies.

B. Recommended Programming: In order to address the above policy, it is recommended that the Arts Endowment:

1. Develop a new program of assistance for local arts agencies through the state arts agencies. . . .
2. Establish, within the Office for Partnership, professional "State-Local Partnership" staff to develop the program and, as feasible, to provide a clearinghouse of information, technical assistance, and planning assistance to local-state arts support efforts; to identify and encourage model demonstrations of cooperative local-state arts planning, funding, and service projects and programs; to work with other agency programs to maximize opportunities for Endowment response to the purpose and goals of this policy; and to provide liaison functions for local arts agencies with other federal agencies.

The above recommendations are put forward without prejudice to existing practices that allow direct access to the individual arts discipline programs of the Arts Endowment on a competitive, merit-of-project basis consistent with the appropriate program guidelines, purposes and goals, as well as direct access to state agency programs. . . .

A positive response by the Council can encourage the growth, development, and effectiveness of local arts agencies for the purpose of providing increased financial and service support for artistic achievement of the highest quality in their communities.⁷⁵

The National Council voted unanimously to endorse this policy statement, which is excerpted from "Towards a Federal-State-Local Partner-

ship” advanced and recommended by the NACAA Board of Directors, the NASAA Executive Committee, and the National Council on the Arts/NASAA Policy Committee.

As one leader said, “Now we can begin. If the states, the accepted partners of the Endowment, are behind it, and the communities relate to them, the communities will be accepted partners too.”⁷⁶

Why didn’t it happen earlier? Influential factors include community arts agency, NACAA, and NASAA maturity; timing; and the long transition at the Endowment involving old and new personnel as the Carter administration moved into Washington and put the new Endowment administration into place. This latest policy decision has come when similar elements are in play, however. Even though the 1980 Congress and the states had urged the Endowment to formulate a communities policy, there was a new Congress with different priorities. The year 1981 was spent in preserving the national work that had just begun. The federal cuts were symbols of the need to keep the base broad and to work together. The states, caught in their own individual state struggles for funds and in the reality of cutbacks in the federal monies used to stimulate the state support, continued their interest in working with communities successfully. Thus again, timing was a problem.

In March 1982, at a CityArts conference at Wingspread (Racine, Wisconsin), Frank Hodsoll, then the new Reagan-appointed Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts said: “The CityArts program is the only real Endowment response to date to the larger, and unsettled, question of how the Endowment can and should relate to local arts agencies.” While pointing out that the program had not been perfect, he added, “This federal-local partnership gets at the heart of both national and local concerns. . . . it gives smaller and often experimental arts groups a degree of recognition that they probably would not have otherwise. The partnership helps those organizations build new audiences for their performances and exhibitions. The local matching requirements become a catalyst for the arts groups to seek out new private funding sources within their own neighborhoods and communities. And the return is often greater than simply new donations. New personal commitments of concern and interest are made by private citizens which often can have a value far beyond the dollar amounts given.” Hodsoll pointed to the development of larger “artistic pools” and “audience pools” from which the older, better-established arts institutions can draw. “There is an elusive but vitally important, link between the smaller emerging arts endeavors and the larger and more traditionally supported arts institutions.”⁷⁷

The word “decentralization” is a key word in partnership discussion and means a variety of things. Primarily it means giving away money to smaller units—regional, county, or city agencies—for redistribution for

the arts. The federal government in general is interested in decentralization. But there is a natural tension at the state level, whose business it is to distribute money. Money is power, and giving monies for redistribution is giving away power. In the 1980s, partnership will mean many things, including sharing power. The National Council, in its policy statement, is redistributing power. In order to meet their challenge successfully, states and communities are looking at this issue with new candor.

APPENDIX: CHRONOLOGY OF MUNICIPAL INVOLVEMENT IN THE ARTS*†

1723 Williamsburg, Virginia — The first recorded American theatre and dance school goes bankrupt. City officials later persuade “gentlemen subscribers for the play house” to donate the building for use as the town hall.

1730s Charleston, South Carolina — Theatrical entertainment overcomes an earlier puritanical stigma. Charleston city officials show such favor to the drama they permit the use of the courthouse for performances, including the first known opera in America.

1790 New York, New York — John Pintard, a distinguished citizen, persuades the Society of St. Tammany to found a museum in City Hall. The collection, consisting largely of Indian artifacts, was later sold to P. T. Barnum for his display of curiosities.

1813 Washington, D.C. — Benjamin Lathrobe, dismissed by Congress after a decade as the first public architect in the U.S., asserts: “I am bidding an eternal adieu to the malice, backbiting, slander, trickery, fraud, and hypocrisy, lofty pretensions and scanty means, boasts of patriotism and bargaining of conscience, upstart haughtiness and five thousand other nuisances that constitute the very essence of this community. The more you stir it, the more it stinketh.” Lathrobe sums up his experience in one sentence: “Government service is a ruinous connection.”

1816 New York, New York — The City Common Council votes a recommendation that citizens visit the exhibitions of art dealers. The Council also commissions portraits of heroes of the War of 1812 for a collection in City Hall.

1825 Baltimore, Maryland — The city becomes known as “The Monument City,” having erected the first monuments in America to Christopher Columbus in 1792 and George Washington in 1810.

*Source: Excerpted from “A Short History of Municipal Involvement in the Arts,” in Luisa Kreisberg, ed., *Local Government and the Arts* (New York: American Council for the Arts, 1979), pp. 7–9. Reprinted by permission of the American Council for the Arts. Copyright 1979.

†Note: It is important to note that local public support of the arts long preceded the development of the arts council agency as an organization. In some communities, there has been a long tradition of support to individual institutions such as art museums and symphonies by line-item municipal budgets. By and large, the newer public monies generated have been for broader distribution or for citywide activity such as arts festivals, or have been related to percent laws.

1870s—Local governments begin a new phase of art patronage by assisting museum development. Between 1870 and 1910 municipal and state governments contribute 40 percent of the total funds spent for museum buildings.

1871 Albany, New York—A joint committee of New York's American and Metropolitan Museums calls on the state legislature to pass enabling legislation permitting the city to use public funds for the construction of private museums. After protests by Boss Tweed's henchman Sweeny that the museum must belong to the people, the legislature creates a partnership under which the city puts up its own buildings for the museum to occupy, thus originating the now commonplace partnership between a nonprofit corporation and a municipal government.

1886 Taunton, Massachusetts—The Supreme Court (*Hubbard vs. City of Taunton*) upholds the right of a city to pay for band concerts. The case is decided on the basis of a state law permitting towns to appropriate monies "for armories, celebrations, and other public purposes." The latter is construed as admitting music.

1893 Claremont, New Hampshire—Civic leaders propose a new town hall containing an opera house. With the community split over the issue, the pro group clandestinely meets on election eve and tears the roof off the old hall. The proposal passes and a new town hall, two-thirds designed as an opera house, is finished in 1897.

1900—Conscious of the poor appearance of cities and public buildings, municipalities across the country begin to create art commissions to advise on the visual aspects of public policy. Among these cities are Denver, Los Angeles, and New York.

1907 St. Louis, Missouri—The City Art Museum of St. Louis, the first to be supported entirely by public funds, is established under the art museum law of the state of Missouri. The mayor of St. Louis complies with the law only after a group of citizens secure a court order compelling him to do so.

1908 New York, New York—The Municipal Art Commission is given an operating budget of \$7,500. The Art Commission is the only department of city government beside the Board of Estimate on which the mayor sits as a regular member.

1912 Portland, Maine—Through the gift of a pipe organ, Portland establishes a model of municipally supported organ recitals imitated by at least ten other cities and one county. The city appropriates \$12,000 a year to be used by the Portland Music Commission "to make it possible for every resident of Portland and the visitors within the city to hear the finest music produced by a master on the finest of musical instruments, and to encourage general musical activities."

1914 Chicago, Illinois—The city becomes the first to actively develop a municipally owned and acquired art collection. Through the Committee for the Encouragement of Local Art, it purchases contemporary art by Chicago artists. After four years of existence the collection includes nearly 100 paintings and pieces of sculpture. Appropriations are made on the recommendation of the mayor. Four years later the Finance Committee kills the project.

1915 Baltimore, Maryland—The city organizes the first municipal orchestra in the United States. Mayor Preston declares, "The people of Baltimore are entitled to municipal organizations which provide for aesthetic development, just as they are entitled to municipal services in education, sanitation, and public safety."

1919 Detroit, Michigan—The board of directors of the Detroit Art Museum agrees to turn its collection over to the city in return for an adequate building and op-

erating funds. The private corporation is dissolved and replaced by a board appointed by the mayor, making it the first museum both municipally owned and operated.

1920 New York, New York — Commenting on the relationship between art and politics, a spokesman for the Metropolitan Museum declares, "Let us give Tammany Hall the credit due it for the support it has given the Metropolitan."

1923 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania — The city council allocates the earliest recorded municipal grant for opera in the United States: a \$15,000 appropriation for a local opera company organized the same year. Local demand for opera is not yet sufficient to justify its support by taxation, and after a few seasons the appropriation is withdrawn.

1925 — A survey conducted by the National Bureau for the Advancement of Music finds that in 327 municipalities, a total of \$1,254,481 had been appropriated by city governments for music during the preceding year.

1926 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania — Harry A. Mackey runs for election as mayor, making municipal support of music one of the major planks of his platform. He wins the election and establishes a Municipal Bureau of Music.

1930 — City appropriations to art museums reach a new high. Twenty-seven municipalities spend a total of two and a half million dollars for art.

1931 Charleston, South Carolina — The city passes a zoning ordinance "to preserve and protect historic places and areas in the Old Historic Charleston District."

1932 San Francisco, California — The San Francisco Opera Association begins performances in War Memorial Opera House, the first municipally owned and operated opera house in the United States.

1935 San Francisco, California — An amendment to the city charter is passed permitting a tax to support low-cost symphony concerts. The proceeds are used to purchase concerts as opposed to direct subsidy, making San Francisco the most important example of this type of support in the country and setting a precedent for sub-contractual cultural services.

1936 New York, New York — The High School of Music and Art, the first public school in the United States exclusively for artistically gifted children, is established through the efforts of Mayor LaGuardia's Municipal Art Committee.

New Orleans, Louisiana — The Louisiana Legislature authorizes creation of the Vieux Carre Commission by the city of New Orleans for the preservation of such buildings "as shall be deemed to have architectural and historical value." Architectural controls and a tax exemption are included.

1939 — Federal contributions to museum construction, WPA art centers, and museum projects encourage most municipal governments to restore cultural budget cuts of the 1930–1934 period. Support from municipal funds becomes the second largest source of museum income. Laurence Coleman, Director of the American Association of Museums, states, "the regime of the wealthy benefactor and socialite is giving place to that of democratic support."

Helper, Utah — Barney Hyde, town butcher and city council member, proposes that the city of Helper appropriate the sum of \$225 plus twenty-five dollars per month for the building and maintenance of a WPA community art center. The motion passes a council vote. Five months later, Mr. Hyde is elected mayor, and Mayor J. Brackson Lee of neighboring Price demands, and gets, an arts center for his town also.

1940 — A survey reveals that 50 percent of municipalities having populations of 300,000 or more contribute to the income of museums in their cities.

1942 — As many as 70 percent of large cities now patronize art by supporting art museums.

1945 Los Angeles, California — The city begins a program of municipal support for local contemporary artists. Under the direction of the Department of Municipal Art, the city takes an active part in staging an annual Art Week and lends support and cooperation to art clubs and artists sponsoring the event.

1948 Flint, Michigan — Flint's mayor declares a Flint Civic Opera Week, "so that the people of Flint may show appreciation for the fact that our city has been recognized throughout the Nation as the outstanding leader and pioneer in the movement to establish completely civic opera in our own language in the cities of the United States."

1940s — The first community arts councils are formed in the late 1940s in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, and Quincy, Illinois, among others, to "coordinate efforts among arts organizations and focus community attention on the activities of the groups." By 1980, the number of councils has grown to over 1,000, and their functions expand to include focus on other arts needs in the various communities — facilities, programming, service, and technical assistance among them. The councils develop as both public and private agencies and become the major link between the arts and different segments of the community.

1950 Louisville, Kentucky — Mayor Charles Farnsley, concerned over the perennial financial crises suffered by his city's arts organizations, calls together community cultural leaders and suggests they undertake a united arts fund campaign. As a result of increased funds, the Louisville Symphony Orchestra begins a program of commissioning, performing, and recording an impressive number of new musical compositions.

1953 St. Paul, Minnesota — In response to a 1950 community-wide survey recommending better arts facilities and the development of new audiences for local arts programs, the city passes bond issues allocating \$1.7 million for an arts and science center.

Nationwide — The American Association of Museums reports a two-thirds increase in municipal support to museums over the past fifteen years.

1959 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania — The city passes a municipal " % for Art" ordinance requiring "a maximum of 2 percent of public construction costs to be spent on art." The long-established Philadelphia Art Commission is charged with implementing the law and coordinating the process of selecting artists and approving their designs.

1960s Flint, Michigan — The city fathers establish a municipal musician-in-residence, concert pianist Coleman Blumfield, "to let his good works spread about the city." His contract calls for two concerts a year and demonstrations at school assemblies. He performs free of charge to standing-room-only crowds.

1963 Detroit, Michigan — The mayor exercises the authority of his office by increasing the appropriation for school and public concerts from \$50,000 to \$70,000 a year. This helps break a deadlock in union contract negotiations that had threatened the Detroit Symphony 1963–1964 season.

1964 Detroit, Michigan — The director of city planning tries to attract practic-

ing artists to contribute towards the visual design and adornment of the city through an unusual provision of free studios, called Common Ground.

Nationwide — The American Symphony Orchestra League reports seventeen major orchestras receive more than a million dollars from city and county governments.

1966 Waupun, Wisconsin — The Waupun Area Arts Council persuades the city government to renovate the city hall auditorium to use for plays and concerts. According to Mayor Glen Wilson, "It's the best investment we ever made because now people really use it."

1968 Boston, Massachusetts — The Mayor's Office of Cultural Affairs is formed to bring the arts to a wider spectrum of city residents. A resulting project is Summerthing, a ten-week neighborhood arts festival operating in more than a dozen Boston neighborhoods.

1970s New York, New York — The city responds to the urgent need for low-cost living and work space for artists. SoHo, a declining manufacturing center filled with nineteenth-century cast iron architecture, is rezoned for artists' residences.

1971 Seattle, Washington — The Seattle Arts Commission is established through a municipal ordinance prefaced with the following statement: "The establishment of a Seattle Arts Commission to promote and encourage public awareness of and interest in the fine and performing arts *is essential to the public welfare.*"

St. Louis, Missouri — Attendance surveys reveal that St. Louis museums draw twice as many county as city residents while only city residents are taxed for their support. Voters pass a bill which brings the county into the tax base for the city's two museums and zoo. For the first time, county residents choose to carry their fair share of support for cultural institutions located in the city.

1974 — The United States Conference of Mayors passes a resolution on the arts and city government. It recommends that the arts be recognized as an essential city service and made available to all citizens.

1975–1976 — The Bicentennial celebration and a growing interest in revitalizing urban cores encourage a growing trend for local government to institutionalize support of the arts.

1977 — The National League of Cities surveys over 450 cities, asking them to define their future cultural needs. The responses stress programming for a wider variety of audiences, more and better facilities, and administrative and funding help from local governments.

NOTES

1. James Backas, "The State Arts Council Movement" (background paper for the National Endowment for the Arts National Partnership Meeting, June 23–25, 1980), p. 2.
2. Ibid.
3. U.S. Congress, House, Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, *Supplemental Appropriation Bill 1966: Hearings*, 89th Congress, 1st session, 1965, pp. 25–26.
4. David B. H. Martin, (material prepared for the Office of Partnership, National Endowment for the Arts, 1980).
5. Maryo and Peter Ewell, "Planning for Grassroots Arts Development: A Research

Study of Nine Communities in Transition," *Arts in Society* 12(1975):92.

6. Robert Gard, "The Arts in the Small Community," *Arts in Society* 12(1975):82-91.
7. Ibid.
8. Maryo and Peter Ewell, "Planning for Grassroots Art Development," p. 94.
9. Robert Gard, "The Arts in the Small Community," pp. 82-91.
10. Lyman Field, "The States: Partnership in the Public Interest," *Cultural Affairs*, Spring 1970, p. 18.
11. Ibid., p. 19.
12. Letter from John Everitt to John Blaine (March 27, 1978).
13. Michael Newton (letter to ACA members, March 1978).
14. Andy Leon Harney, ed., *The City and the Arts - A Civic Handbook of Grants Offered by the National Endowment for the Arts* (Washington, D.C.: Partners for Livable Places, 1980).
15. Studies and task forces created by the National Endowment for the Arts for Communities Program examination in 1969, 1972, 1974, 1976, and 1979.
16. Letter from Nancy Hanks to Milton Rhodes (April 22, 1977).
17. James Backas, *A National Program for the Development of the Arts at the Community Level* (Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Arts, 1977).
18. Larry Chernikoff, "Livable Cities," *The Cultural Post* (Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Arts, October 1978).
19. Reported to the NACAA Board by memo, December 1979; quoted from Livingston Biddle as he announced that a person would be hired to develop alternative courses of action.
20. National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, position paper on Community Arts Program of the National Endowment for the Arts, *NASAA Newsletter* September 27, 1980, p. 7.
21. Ann Day, "Community Arts Agencies Project: Overview and Points for Discussion" (position paper examining the relationship of the National Endowment for the Arts and community arts agencies, June 1976).
22. "NEA Community Program Policy Not Yet Dead," *Alliance News*, December/January 1979, p. 1.
23. This report never appeared in published form. It was presented as a slide/talk presentation, then taped and distributed to arts councils all over the country who wished to use it.
24. Van Tile Whitfield, *Policy Paper on Expansion Arts* (Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Arts, 1978).
25. Letter from A. B. Spellman to John Blaine in response to questions about CityArts (January 1978).
26. Robert P. McNulty, *The White Paper: Architecture and Environmental Arts Program* (Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Arts, 1973).
27. Pamela Baldwin, *How Small Grants Make a Difference* (Washington, D.C.: Partners for Livable Places, 1980), preface.
28. Ibid.
29. Ibid.
30. Ibid., p. 63.
31. Quote from conversation with Burton Woolf (July 1980).
32. Arts Council of San Antonio, *Summary report: City Spirit, San Antonio 1976* (San Antonio: Author, 1976).
33. Robert Porter, ed., *The Arts and City Planning* (New York: American Council for the Arts, 1980).
34. R. Philip Hanes, remarks made before the 11th National Conference of the ACA, June 17, 1965 (recorded in *The Arts: A Central Element in a Good Society*).
35. Interview with Frank Logue, Jr., 1980.
36. Ibid.

37. Luisa Kreisberg, *Local Government and the Arts* (New York: American Council for the Arts, 1979), p. 10.
38. National Endowment for the Arts, *Federal-State Partnership: Programs and Funding Information (July 1, 1973–June 30, 1974)* (Washington, D.C.: Author, 1973).
39. Backas, "The State Arts Council Movement," p. 5.
40. Mary Regan, *Community Development through the Endowment* (Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Arts, 1976), p. 18. (a report)
41. Ralph Burgard, *Completing the Circle: State/Local Cultural Partnerships*, (Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Art Agencies, 1982).
42. Ibid.
43. Regan, *Community Development*, p. 11.
44. Ibid., p. 15.
45. Ibid., p. 16.
46. New York State Council on the Arts, *Program Guidelines (1980–81)* (New York: Author, 1980), p. 46.
47. Max Friedli, "The Arts Lottery: A Piece of the Public Action," *American Arts*, January 1981, p. 13.
48. Ibid.
49. California Arts Council, "State/Local Partnership Program Guidelines 1980–81." Sacramento: Author. Reprinted by permission.
50. Ibid.
51. Ibid.
52. Charles Christopher Mark, *Arts Reporting Service*, no. 281 (December 14, 1981).
53. Robert Porter, "State Appropriations: Will They be Enough?" *ACA Update*, February 12, 1982, pp. 10–13.
54. North Carolina Arts Council, *The Arts in North Carolina 1967* (Raleigh: Author, 1967), p. 106.
55. Ibid., p. 107.
56. Robert A. Mayer, "The Local Arts Council Movement" (background paper for the National Endowment for the Arts National Partnership Meeting, June 23–25, 1980), p. 94.
57. Ibid., pp. 6–10.
58. H. Vernon Winters, *Annual Report*, Winston-Salem Arts Council, 1978.
59. Michael Newton, "Pros and Cons of United Fundraising for the Arts," in *United Arts Fund-Raising Manual*, ed. Robert Porter (New York: American Council for the Arts, 1980), p. 1.
60. "Clipboard," *Grassroots and Pavement* 2(2)(1981):17.
61. Durham Arts Council, *The Arterie* (Durham, N.C.: Author, 1980), p. 3.
62. Toe River (North Carolina) Arts Council, "Winter Arts Program" (brochure, 1980).
63. Toe River (North Carolina) Arts Council, "Activities Report 1979–80."
64. Community Council for the Arts, Kinston, North Carolina, slide presentation (Raleigh Civic Center, March 1980), pp. 1 and 4.
65. Fayetteville/Cumberland County (North Carolina) Arts Council, "Facts of the Matter—Design in '80" (brochure, 1980), p. 37.
66. *Raleigh News and Observer*, December 11, 1980.
67. James Backas, "The Regional Arts Organization Movement" (background paper for the National Endowment for the Arts National Partnership meeting, June 23–25, 1980), p. 2.
68. Ibid., introduction.
69. Ibid.
70. "Illinois Arts Council and Community Councils Meet," *ACA Reports*, November/December 1972, pp. 11–12.
71. Marlo Bussman, "Position Paper" (Alabama Assembly of Community Arts Agencies, 1980).

72. ACA *Update*, November 12, 1981, p. 9.
73. Nan S. Levinson, *Local Arts Agencies* (Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Arts, 1981).
74. Presidential Task Force on the Arts and Humanities, *Report to the President* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981), p. 14.
75. Henry E. Putsch, *Towards a Federal-State-Local Partnership: Policy and Program Recommendations for Strengthening Support for the Arts by Local Arts Agencies* (Washington, D.C.: National Council on the Arts, 1981), pp. 2-20.
76. Personal communication, Washington, D.C., December 1980.
77. Frank Hodsoll, (address given at CityArts Conference, Wingspread, Racine, Wisconsin, March 9, 1982).