

Visual Arts Symposium Proceedings

the visual artist and
**[the new funding
Environment]**

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON DECEMBER 11-12, 1997



Visual Arts Symposium Proceedings

**The Visual Artist and the New Funding Environment
Symposium Proceedings**

Presented by the Western States Arts Federation

Seattle, Washington
December 11-12, 1997

Supported by Sue Talbot and John Talbot
Missoula, Montana

Visual Arts Symposium Proceedings

**The Visual Artist and the New Funding Environment
Symposium Proceedings**

Symposium Director:

Linda Bukszar

Proceedings Editor:

Maripat Murphy

Contributing to the editing of these proceedings were:

Stacy Bengtson

Sonja Foss

Glynis Jones

Denise Montgomery

Anthony Radich

Design and Layout:

Carla Tedeschi

WESTAF

Western States Arts Federation

1543 Champa Street, Suite 220, Denver, Colorado 80202

www.westaf.org

[303] 629.1166 ph

[303] 629.9717 fx

[303] 607.9019 tty

Table of Contents

	About the Sponsor	04
	Symposium Process	05
	Symposium Participants	05
	Introduction	07
	Foreword	09
	Welcome	11
	Presentations	
13	Charles Bergman The Relationship of Private Foundations to Individual Artists	
17	Julie Lazar A Critique of Reports on Artist Support and Community Development	
25	Betty LaDuke An Artist's Perspective of How Awards Can Change a Life	
33	Jack Becker Comments and Concerns About Percent-for-Art Programs	
43	Carla Roberts How Native Communities Integrate Art Into the Social Fabric of Their Communities	
49	Lance Izumi The Political Right's Position on Public Support for the Arts	
57	Lorraine Garcia-Nakata A New Approach to Developing an Arts Education Curriculum	
63	Kathryn Reasoner The Impact of Artist Residency Programs	
74	Participants' Biographies	
81	Symposium Attendees	

About the Symposium Sponsor:

WESTAF [Western States Arts Federation]

The Western States Arts Federation, WESTAF, is a regional arts organization that serves the arts-development needs of the arts community and the general public in the 12 Western states. The 25-year-old organization is an active partnership of the state arts agencies of Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. Working with these states and in cooperation with private and public-sector funders, WESTAF's primary goals are to strengthen the arts infrastructure in the West and to expand the audience for all forms of the arts.

Throughout its history, WESTAF has adapted and transformed its programs and initiatives to reflect the current needs of the arts field and to respond to major structural changes of that field. The recent dramatic changes in arts funding in both the public and private sectors have prompted WESTAF once again to transform itself to ensure that it is properly positioned to best benefit the arts.

The organization remains committed to programmatic work in the areas of literature, folk arts, visual arts, Native American arts, and performing arts presenting. Programs in these areas include activities such as the convening of leaders from a discipline; the development of model programs; and the sponsorship of long-term, region-wide programs that fill a gap in the arts infrastructure of the West. WESTAF also has launched an ambitious program in the area of technology and the arts. The presence of the Internet has provided WESTAF with a much-sought-after means of serving artists and arts organizations across the vast reaches of the West. WESTAF also remains committed to the improvement of the capacity and quality of public funding of the arts by Western state arts agencies. The sustenance of this effort and the constant improvement of the manner in which it is administered are core commitments of WESTAF.

Symposium Process

The symposium featured eight presenters and four respondents. Each presenter was allowed approximately 20 minutes to deliver a prepared statement, after which the symposium facilitators directed a discussion that included all participants.

PRESENTERS:

Jack Becker, Publisher

Public Art Review

FORECAST Public Artworks

Minneapolis, MN

Charles Bergman, Executive Vice President

The Pollock-Krasner Foundation

New York, NY

Lorraine Garcia-Nakata, Managing Director

Mexican Museum

San Francisco, CA

Lance Izumi, Senior Fellow in California Studies

Pacific Research Institute for Public Policy

Sacramento, CA

Betty LaDuke

Visual Artist

Ashland, OR

Julie Lazar, Director of Experimental Programs

The Museum of Contemporary Art

Los Angeles, CA

Kathryn Reasoner, Executive Director

Headlands Center for the Arts

Sausalito, CA

Carla Roberts, Executive Director

Atlatl

Phoenix, AZ

RESPONDENTS:

Richard Andrews, Executive Director

Henry Art Gallery

University of Washington

Seattle, WA

Jan Brooks, Executive Director

Northern New Mexico Grantmakers

Santa Fe, NM

Anne Focke, Administrator

Grantmakers in the Arts

Seattle, WA

**Mark Van Proyen, Artist,
Art Critic, and Professor,
San Francisco Art Institute**

San Francisco, CA

CO-FACILITATORS:

Kim Abeles

Visual Artist

Los Angeles, CA

Nanette Carter

Visual Artist

New York, NY

Introduction

This symposium was designed to be a proactive step toward the redevelopment and expansion of opportunities for individual visual artists across the country. Such opportunities have been substantially eroded in recent years with the termination and outright prohibition of federal awards programs to individual visual artists. This forum explored the very real need for individual visual artists to receive encouragement and support. Its presentations and discussions provide insight as to how, as a field, we might build a new and better support system for individual visual artists in the current funding environment.

A regional organization such as WESTAF could not sponsor a symposium of this scope without the support of many friends from across the region and beyond. I first want to thank longtime WESTAF patrons Sue Talbot and John Talbot of Missoula, Montana, for their financial support of this project. In addition, I want to recognize the Visual Arts Program staff at the National Endowment for the Arts for their early and strong support of this effort. WESTAF is also indebted to Chris D'Arcy, a WESTAF Trustee and the Executive Director of the Oregon Arts Commission, who advised us on the development of this symposium and crafted a fine introduction to keynote speaker Charles Bergman. The contribution of Wendy Ceccherelli, the Executive Director of the Seattle Arts Commission, also is much appreciated. Her enthusiastic support of this project, her welcoming remarks, and her exemplary personal and professional commitment to improving the environment and opportunities for visual artists in Seattle are to be commended. Finally, I wish to thank Barbara Courtney, the Executive Director of the Seattle organization, Artist Trust. She and the Trust arranged for Pollock-Krasner Foundation Executive Vice President Charles Bergman to engage in a lively and productive dialogue with members of the Seattle area's artist community. WESTAF has benefited greatly from the interest and contributions of these friends, and we remain grateful for their support.

At the conclusion of the symposium, many asked what specific steps WESTAF would take to address the issues brought forth in the meeting. Although the meeting was not intended as a prelude to action, this organization is involved in a number of projects that will directly benefit individual artists. One of the most ambitious of these is the development of a very large internet site for individual artists and the active promotion of that site. Presently, many artists have personal sites that are underpromoted and difficult to find. This project will give artists access to a much larger audience and, through cooperative action, allow them to be participants in a marketing effort that few of them could afford on their own. WESTAF is also committed to working toward the reintroduction of a region-wide artist recognition program. The projects in which WESTAF has engaged in the past in this area have been very successful and of tremendous benefit to the artists of the West. Finally, WESTAF is committed to continuing its series of symposia on contemporary topics in the arts. We believe that such forums help identify issues and generate creative means for addressing those issues. In addition, the forums provide an opportunity to convene diverse parties who share an interest in a critical topic and to introduce some of those out-of-region experts to the professionals who work in state arts agencies in the West. These projects represent early steps in WESTAF's long-term commitment to build a visual arts program at WESTAF that properly serves the creative energy of the West.

Anthony Radich
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Western States Arts Federation

Foreword

James Pridgeon

Words fail me - but then, I expect them to. I am one of those visual artists who is most comfortable communicating through the creation of visual objects—a person who is far more comfortable with sight than sound bites. After all, if I could talk eloquently about my ideas, I would be much less compelled to manifest them in a physical form. In spite of my preference for nonverbal communication, I want to recommend to you the presentations and discussion that are captured in words on the pages that follow.

The symposium documented in this publication was designed to serve as a means of bringing together recognized experts to discuss the manner in which the current, more limited funding environment is affecting the lives and work of individual visual artists. To my fellow artists, I would like to note that these experts had a keen understanding of the challenges most individual artists face daily. They knew that most of us have day jobs and that we are incessantly worried about money, children, schools, and myriad other things, including the bedrock question, “How am I going to be who I am? ”

The symposium opened with a welcome by Wendy Ceccherelli, the Executive Director of the Seattle Arts Commission. Her overview of the long-time commitment the Commission has made to individual artists was inspiring. Indeed, the Commission has strongly supported individual visual artists through its public art and arts-in-education programs, as well as through a major funding initiative called *The Seattle Artists Program*. I am fortunate to live in a city with a model arts commission. I highly recommend that artists and others work to replicate the Seattle Arts Commission’s programs and attitudes in their home communities.

Charles Bergman, the Executive Vice President of the Pollock-Krasner Foundation, was the symposium’s keynote speaker. He effectively detailed the relationship the country’s private foundations have with individual artists. Bergman noted that Pollock-Krasner is one of the very few foundations that directly assists individual visual artists. If you are an artist, Bergman’s remarks include a useful list of foundations that might offer you some assistance. If you are an arts policymaker or philanthropist, I call your attention to Bergman’s detailing of appropriate and artist-friendly approaches to supporting individual artists.

A review of recent reports related to the work environment of and opportunities for artists was the central topic of Julie Lazar’s presentation. Applying her noteworthy experience at The Museum of Contemporary Art in Los Angeles, Lazar paid special attention to reports that addressed artists’ involvement in community development. This is an exciting area that offers a synergistic approach to community development and demonstrates potential benefits far beyond simple direct support of individual artists. The expansive thinking, the insight, and the good news here are that artists are working effectively in communities and can be critical elements of economic development efforts. One strong message here is that artists can enter into the spirit of a community and address issues of cultural identity without relinquishing their artistic power.

Betty La Duke’s presentation, “An Artist’s Perspective of How Awards Can Change a Life,” is, hands down, the most infectious, energizing talk I’ve heard in ages. If you’re in need of inspiration about life’s possibilities, you should go to her presentation in these proceedings now. Some of the most varied discussion of the symposium was triggered by Jack Becker’s presentation regarding the individual artists in the current public art scene. Becker’s candid comments clearly illustrated the great potential as well as the pitfalls facing artists in the constantly expanding world of public arts projects. Jack started *Public Art Review* and created FORECAST Public Artworks, which supports artists of all disciplines in their exploration of the public realm. He describes himself as a publisher, artist, and sponge for ideas and information who keeps his finger on the pulse of public art in America. As it turns out, this is a pretty good description.

Carla Roberts, the director of Atlatl, the national service organization for Native American artists, made an eloquent presentation on the topic of how American Indian communities integrate art into their social fabric. She noted that Native communities don't integrate the arts into their social fabric because the arts have never been separated from that fabric. This is a deep, thoughtful piece that explores her idea that "Native people truly engage in . . . artful living." Her rich essay also addresses issues such as the relationship between art and spirit, the cultural representative role of the artist, and the cultural dynamism of contemporary Native communities.

The inclusion of policy analyst Lance Izumi in the symposium was a step forward for all of us in the arts. Izumi, who articulately described the position of the "political right" on public art support, broke new conceptual ground for many in the room. His well-reasoned and intellectually grounded remarks stimulated a vigorous and healthy discussion. His opening statement will, I hope, encourage you to read his remarks: "I am not here to play devil's advocate or take an adversarial role. I am here to communicate to you what the political right thinks about the arts in general and individual artists in particular." Izumi did just that, and his contribution was a high point of the gathering.

Lorraine Garcia-Nakata is an artist and arts educator who is interested in arts education as a collaborative process. Her piece is tightly compressed and more beautiful than I can describe here. She is, like many of the people in that symposium room, a person who can transcend the ordinary. That transcendence moves endeavors such as arts education to the next level of development. One passage of her presentation I particularly appreciate is: "I will leave you with a thought that inspires me during difficult personal moments or uncertainty about the next step to take. Someone once told me that all our particular experiences and knowledge bring us to the moment we are in. If we don't push hard and just step back, we will know exactly what to do. The information we need is inside ourselves."

At one time or another, most artists aspire to participate in an artist residency center. Kathryn Reasoner, who leads the Headlands Center for the Arts, deconstructed such residency programs, and her insights are especially valuable reading. As a visual artist, I must say that I would have liked to have had the information she shared with us years ago. Not only does Reasoner effectively analyze various programs with which we all think we are familiar, but she clearly articulates issues and concerns in the development of the very concept of artist-residency programs—programs that offer artists extraordinary opportunities for creative growth.

That's it. The preview is over, and it's time for the show. Let me alert you, however, to read the following text with caution. Many of the ideas will inspire action and are, therefore, not safe for tourists.

Jim Pridgeon is an artist and a WESTAF trustee who lives and works in Seattle, Washington. He has received multiple awards from the National Endowment for the Arts; Art Matters Inc.; and the Washington State, Seattle, and King County Arts commissions. He wishes to thank his parents and family for their lifelong support.

Welcome

The City of Seattle, through its Arts Commission, has a long history of supporting individual artists. We are proud of that support and of the leaders who have helped shape the Seattle Arts Commission. The Commission's commitment to independent artists is exemplified by two major funding programs: the Arts in Education Program and the Seattle Artist Program. In the Arts in Education Program, community arts resources are integrated into the schools in collaborations between teachers and an artist. The Seattle Artists Program, jointly underwritten with public art and general city funds, is designed to help independent artists in all disciplines create work and present it to the public.

The means of supporting individual artists for which Seattle is perhaps best known is through public art. The public art program, administered by the Seattle Arts Commission, is intended to expand the public's experience with visual art. The city sets aside 1% of its capital construction budget for public art, resulting in approximately \$4 million that goes entirely to support individual artists.

Another way Seattle supports its artists is through public policy activism on behalf of the arts. The Seattle Arts Commission has always been a passionate advocate for artists and artists' rights. As such, the Commission has developed strong city policies that have been emulated by other cities regarding freedom of expression; intellectual property rights; and consistency with VARA, the Visual Artists Rights Act, particularly as it relates to copyright. The Seattle Arts Commission also serves as an advisor to elected city officials and city departments on a variety of arts activities. In this capacity, we deal with issues such as the effects of taxation on individual artists, arts districts, and licensing and zoning requirements as they affect the arts.

Seattle recently adopted a cultural resources element as part of the city's comprehensive plan. The comprehensive plan is required by the Washington State Growth Management Act and will guide city decision making for the next 20 years. The element of the plan concerned with cultural resources contains language encouraging Seattle to become a city that values and supports artists for their ability to entertain, inspire, challenge, and add dimension and enjoyment to the lives of the city's citizens. I am proud that such language is included in our city's comprehensive plan, and I am proud of the amendments we made to other sections of the plan. In the economic development component, for example, we added language noting the significant contributions made by Seattle artists and arts organizations to the city's healthy business climate. We also noted their role in creating a cultural environment that attracts high-wage employers to the region and the substantial benefits they provide to Seattle's residents and communities.

Perhaps the biggest challenge now facing artists in our community is the booming and prosperous economy. It is not true that a rising tide floats all ships. Seattle is home to the country's seventh largest population of working artists; according to the 1990 census, some 4,400 Seattle residents identified themselves as artists, and there may be 25,000 artists working in the greater Seattle area. More than 50% of those artists have incomes that are less than half of the median income for the city.

We are very concerned about losing our artists to other communities and are doing everything we can to provide an artist-friendly city. We are reviewing zoning regulations in order to create more affordable artists' living and working spaces. We are working with neighborhoods that are interested in the artist community and believe that artists are essential to their identity.

Our programming in direct support of artists has been enormously successful. Nonetheless, the Seattle Arts Commission is currently involved in a process of re-evaluating its funding programs and philosophies to ensure that they fit future needs. Although we have not yet defined what form our support for individual artists will take, we intend to keep our commitment and support for individual artists as strong as ever. Artist support will continue to be a very visible part of who we are and what we do at the Seattle Arts Commission.

Wendy Cerccherelli
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Seattle Arts Commission

Charles Bergman

The Relationship of Private Foundations to Individual Artists

We all know that the future of the National Endowment for the Arts [NEA] is decidedly uncertain. We know, too, that public and private funding will never be sufficient to adequately meet the demands of arts organizations and institutions, let alone individual artists. The *American Canvas* report released by the NEA in October, 1997, still summarizes the present climate for the arts and identifies the need to strengthen the arts and culture at a time of disquieting hostility, certainly in federal funding. This climate can and does continue to erode state and local public funding.

I am here to address a subject that commands my deepest concern, commitment, and passion—the need of individual artists and the role of the very few private foundations that attempt to remedy this never-ending problem. Support for individual artists never has been and probably never will be a priority concern for foundations—private, corporate, or community. I base this cynical conviction on the fact that for 20 years, I have served as an advisor to wealthy families in the United States and Europe, helping to set up foundations or evaluate foundations.

Regrettably, I have found that many wealthy donors share an erroneous and pervasive impression regarding funding of individual artists. First, many of these donors maintain that it is often forbidden by their foundation bylaws [existing or contemplated] to provide any funds or programs for individual artists. Second, they believe that any program involving individual artists is a monumental nuisance, troublesome to manage and expensive to staff. Many donors are absolutely convinced that to have anything to do with individual artists is a Pandora's box, opening up horrendous possibilities for controversy, negative publicity, even litigation. And sadly, many wealthy donors, including wealthy artists, consider artists a troublesome, unstable group—one that they are well advised to avoid supporting. Such views are ironic because many of these same donors profess to be great patrons of the arts. In fact, on occasion, these same donors will fund re-grant programs in which their institutional or organizational recipients pass along the funds to support individual artists!

I want to attempt to negate some of these unjustified perceptions by sharing the exciting story of The Pollock-Krasner Foundation and its international impact on the lives of visual artists. I will begin by describing the very few foundations that, like The Pollock-Krasner Foundation, choose to directly assist visual artists.

First, I wish to cite The Bush Foundation in St. Paul, which operates a highly regarded artist fellowship program, awarding grants in Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and western Wisconsin. The foundation annually awards 15 grants of \$30,000 each. Grants are given to artists who are not students and who are over 25 years of age. The grants are awarded by a juried panel and are intended to provide artists with a significant period of uninterrupted time to work in their chosen field.

Highly esteemed is the Adolph and Esther Gottlieb Foundation, which preceded The Pollock-Krasner Foundation and was a role model for much of what we do. I commend the Gottlieb Foundation for the support it grants visual artists, without geographic limitation. Each year, the foundation awards 10 grants of \$20,000 each. Even more critical to artists' survival, however, is the Gottlieb Foundation's emergency assistance grant program for painters, sculptors, and printmakers. This program is designed to help artists who have been working at their art for at least 10 years and who have, in the mature phase of their lives, encountered a crisis that requires immediate assistance. Their maximum emergency grant is \$10,000; the average award is \$4,600. In 1996, 37 grants were awarded.

The third foundation is one that I was privileged to play a role in creating. The Elizabeth Foundation for the Arts in New York was established by Jane Stephenson, the daughter of the donor. Modeled after The Pollock-Krasner Foundation and the Gottlieb Foundation, The Elizabeth Foundation awards grants to painters, sculptors, and artists who work on paper. Photographers and video and film artists are excluded. The Elizabeth Foundation for the Arts gives an average of 12-15 grants a year, ranging from \$2,500 to \$12,000. Grant criteria include artistic merit and demonstrated financial need. The Elizabeth Foundation for the Arts operates a studio program in New York City and is in the process of developing a new program for senior grants that is not yet open for application.

The John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation annually awards grants to 50 fellows in the United States, Canada, Latin America, and the Caribbean. It was historically the first to support individual artists; indeed, it was the first to support individuals in any field or discipline. The average award amount is \$28,000. A Guggenheim Foundation grant is extremely difficult to win and is given to creative artists of real distinction. Their very comprehensive screening and nomination process is such that an artist requires extensive references even to be eligible.

The Jerome Foundation in St. Paul is a well-established program, highly valued throughout the country. Its grants to artists enable them to travel in support of their professional development. Grants range from \$1,000 to \$5,000. The Jerome Foundation awards 40 to 50 grants a year.

A new foundation in New York is The Joan Mitchell Foundation, which was established by the late artist Joan Mitchell. The Mitchell Foundation gives 20 grants a year of \$15,000 each, for a total of \$300,000. Grants may not be applied for but are awarded by nomination only. Financial need is mentioned as a general criterion.

The Rockefeller Foundation, which historically has played a major role in helping artists of distinction and pre-eminence, offers a five-week residency program in Italy. Priority is given to artists who experiment across cultural boundaries. A distinguished committee assists in the screening process. In Philadelphia, the Pew Charitable Trust's generous fellowship program, Pew Fellowships in the Arts, is funded through the year 2000 and awards fellowships of \$50,000.

In addition to these foundations that directly fund artists, a select number of foundations offer indirect assistance in support of artists and the arts. The Marie Walsh Sharpe Art Foundation in Colorado, where I serve as senior advisor, has set up a program that provides artists with studio space in New York. The foundation also has been the catalyst for the creation of an artist's hotline and operates a summer program where young students can study under a distinguished faculty of senior artists. Perhaps most important of all, the Walsh Sharpe Art Foundation has taken a leadership role in the first definitive study of how artists' estates should be formulated and structured. At a recent symposium in New York, a group of us met with lawyers and accountants to address this critical issue: Whether you are famous or not, what do you do with your estate? How do you preserve your legacy after you are gone?

The Andy Warhol Foundation for the Visual Arts, interestingly enough, does not at this time directly assist individual artists. The Foundation does support historical preservation and is much involved in arts and culture in society. Although the Warhol Foundation currently offers no support for individual artists, I have expectations that, under the superb leadership of Arch Gillies, its President, who cares deeply about the dilemmas and challenges of individual artists, a program will be developed in this area in consort with other foundations.

What can we conclude from this somewhat sparse listing of foundations supporting individual artists? Despite the impact of well-utilized grants as documented in artists' final reports to our foundations, despite the wealth of information on how funding can change and enrich artists' lives, there currently is little interest in private support for individual artists—even from wealthy artists themselves!

Other interesting examples of how successful artists structure their philanthropy include: Robert Motherwell left an enormous estate for the legacy and perpetuation of the oeuvre of Robert Motherwell and some scholarly symposia on modern art. I should also mention The Judith Rothschild Foundation, a foundation established to support the work and legacy of deceased artists. Artists who have died after September 12, 1976, have the possibility of their work being purchased for leading museums and for assistance to publish catalog resumes of their oeuvre.

Only when a donor insists and is motivated to do so do we find foundations emulating the programs of the Gottlieb Foundation and The Pollock-Krasner Foundation. The story of The Pollock-Krasner Foundation is an unusual one. Lee Krasner was a highly respected and established artist in her own right before anyone had heard of Jackson Pollock. With his tragic death in 1956, Lee overnight had the possibility of becoming a very rich woman.

Lee Krasner's will dictated that, on her death, a foundation was to be established. Curiously, Lee did not even want her name associated with this entity. It was 1984, yet she was still in love with Pollock and directed her devoted friend, Gerry Dickler, a prominent lawyer, to establish The Pollock Foundation when she was deceased. It was Gerry who said, "You're a rich woman, Lee. What about helping other artists who might benefit from the complicated good fortune of your life?" His suggestion led to what eventually became The Pollock-Krasner Foundation. On Lee's death, I was brought in as a consultant to the estate to establish the foundation. When the foundation received its tax ruling in 1985, I became its Chief Operating Officer.

Originally, The Pollock-Krasner Foundation had a very modest corpus of about \$10 million worth of paintings and drawings by Jackson and Lee and a similar amount from Lee's investments. The Foundation has given away \$20 million of that original \$20 million. We have \$54 million remaining today, thanks to good investment counsel and the wise guidance of the disposition of our remaining art inventory by our co-trustee and the Foundation's President, Eugene Victor Thaw, co-author of the Pollock catalogue raisonne and a distinguished private art dealer and philanthropist in his own right. In the Northwest, we have made a modest effort to reach out to find good artists. The Pollock-Krasner Foundation has awarded about \$305,000 in grants in this region [\$143,000 in Washington state, of which \$123,000 was given to Seattle artists].

In regard to my earlier comments about donor apathy and lack of concern for individual artists, I consider it a pity that Lee Krasner did not want this foundation created in her lifetime. Had she seen what we have been able to do to nurture, sustain, and buttress the lives of artists, I think Lee would have been profoundly moved, despite her reputation as a tough lady. As anyone who has ever studied this amorphous, strange field of philanthropy knows, there is no substitute for personal involvement by a donor. That is the only way to truly perceive and appreciate the essence and substance of philanthropy.

Lee Krasner's will runs many pages, but in regard to distribution of foundation funds, there are only four words about criteria: "worthy and needy artists." The word *and* is the most important word in this document. The Pollock-Krasner Foundation defines merit and need very simply. By *merit* we mean excellence, artistry, focus, direction, maturity, and originality. By *need* we mean absolutely any legitimate need whether personal/professional or both. Our grants are available to artists worldwide. We award grants to individual artists in three categories: painters; sculptors; and artists who work on paper, including printmakers. We exclude commercial art, film, video, and crafts. Regrettably, we exclude fine arts still photography, but we do support artists who incorporate photography into their painting, sculpture, or printmaking.

The Pollock-Krasner Foundation grants are not available to students or artists fresh out of academia. If we have had any biases, it is for older artists, those in their sixties, seventies, eighties, even nineties. We care for artists who are out of fashion, artists who may never have been marketable. They may work in isolation, loneliness, and despair, beset by many problems and struggles. Many may not have won their deserved recognition, either through sales or critical acclaim. These are artists that we are particularly eager to reach, and we have reached them all over the world.

[...there is no substitute for
personal involvement by a donor.

That is the only way to truly
perceive and appreciate the essence and
substance of philanthropy.]

CHARLES BERGMAN

We now have an international network of thousands of artists, former grantees, government arts officials, museum directors, curators, art dealers, patrons, critics, and art historians who suggest names to us or ask us to forward applications to a particular artist. When we receive a request for application materials, we respond promptly, within 24 hours of that request. We have a detailed application that must be answered in English. We require a simple cover letter where we ask the artist to state why the money is needed. We ask for 10 two-by-two-inch slides, the quality of which is absolutely critical to the possibility of the review process. We acknowledge receipt of applications the same day.

If we seriously consider awarding a grant, we require extensive additional information, including tax returns of the current year and previous year. We ask for references, but those references are not a request to send fancy names to us but rather to validate the legitimacy of the artist's career. The references are simply a check and additional validation. What we are most concerned about are the slides and the work they show as well as the integrity and accuracy of the detailed application. Once the artist passes the selection committee, staff members review and investigate the application to be sure that the information, particularly the financial information, is accurate and legitimate.

Our selection committee is considered one of the most successful instruments in art philanthropy. It is a rotating four-person committee, with each member serving a three-year term. I chair this committee, but I do not vote on it. Identities of the voting members are kept secret, but I can tell you that the committee has included distinguished artists, museum directors and curators, patrons, critics, journalists, and art historians. Committee members are cross-culturally sophisticated, empathetic, and compassionate, and they recognize good art, whether it comes from Africa, Asia, Latin America, North America, or Europe.

There are no quotas for awarding grants by country. There is no formula for determining awards. Grants are determined on the basis of a delicate balance of merit and need. Committee members, however, are only concerned with merit. They are not involved with assessing financial need. They are not privy to that information because, as compassionate and caring individuals, were they to know the needs of the artists, it might prejudice their judgment. The average grant award to artists in the United States is \$20,000. Grant amounts reflect both the artist's individual needs and country of residence. We have no deadlines.

The Pollock-Krasner Foundation is highly visible because of the dollar volume of its grants, so I want to be candid and precise in my next comments. In its 14-year history, the selection committee has rejected approximately 90% of its grant applicants. These artists were rejected because their art is of poor quality. Because our application process is open to anyone and has no deadlines, we inevitably see a lot of bad art. However, of the roughly 10% of the applicants who have survived our selection committee, at least 75% have received a grant—an extraordinary figure by any standards.

We have had a rewarding experience thus far, one that I wish our friends in the Congress would hear loud and clear. In awarding over 1,600 grants in 52 countries totaling \$20 million, The Pollock-Krasner Foundation has never had a single instance of controversy in regard to style, school, technique, or subject matter of any grant. Not a peep of adverse flack. We have carefully studied the grants we have made over 13 years and, in all this period, have found only two grants that were ill advised. I am pleased The Pollock-Krasner Foundation made those grants and think we have established a significant record of critically needed philanthropy. We continue to be committed to our mission and ongoing mandate to serve artists.

Julie Lazar

A Critique of Reports on Artist Support and Community Development

I have been asked to comment on three reports: *Community Development in the Arts* by Eleanor Bowles, *Financial Support for Artists* by Anne Focke, and *Independence: Sustaining America's Artists* by Neill Bogan.

The first report, *Community Development in the Arts*, focuses on community redevelopment agencies and their projects with artists. Broadbased and diverse, this report represents different parts of the country, different ethnic groups, and different artists. In addition to good case studies, *Community Development in the Arts* provides useful information on how and when an organization began, if it was re-inventing itself, and what it has defined as its statement of purpose.

Through my work at The Museum of Contemporary Art [MOCA] in Los Angeles, I have some experience working with community redevelopment agencies. As a matter of fact, MOCA exists because of our relationship to our community redevelopment organization. *Community Development in the Arts* indicates that community activities are addressing and engaging audiences in a meaningful way. A tremendous amount can be learned from people who are successfully implementing community-based arts programming and the many public artists who are involved in these projects. Together, they are doing magnificent work, conveying to their audiences what the mission of art is and what artists contribute to our lives.

In *Community Development in the Arts*, Eleanor Bowles looks at how community development corporations [CDCs] are using the arts to improve the quality of life for low-income Americans in particular. CDCs are implementing arts programming as part of a comprehensive, synergistic approach to community development. The CDCs see the arts as a means of helping people construct a personal sense of time and place, a positive identity, and a sense of community. As such, the arts represent a much-needed resource for community development. Although the communities profiled in the report differ, I was struck by the extent of the communities' involvement in the arts and the extent to which this involvement grew out of needs the communities themselves had perceived.

The specific objectives of *Community Development in the Arts* are to [1] define the CDCs' arts-related strategies and activities; [2] describe the relationship between the arts and other areas of community development; [3] outline the problems CDCs face in initiating and maintaining arts activities; [4] identify needed resources; and [5] suggest ways CDCs can work with other organizations to build cultural institutions and strengthen cultural infrastructures within the community. As I scan this list, I see that CDCs share the same goals and obstacles faced by many of us involved in arts organizations or working directly with artists.

Bowles notes that a consensus is emerging among CDCs that the communities they serve are organic. To be sustainable, any community—development projects must address the community's interdependent economic, human, physical, social, and cultural issues. Successful CDC arts activities tend to be diverse and designed to meet a wide spectrum of community needs, such as nurturing emerging artists, making high—quality arts affordable, helping young people explore social issues and learn life skills, developing physical facilities for artists, forming community arts councils, and producing professional theater. *Community Development in the Arts* paints a clear picture of how these programs were started, what results were achieved, how many students were reached, how many jobs were created, and how much income was raised.

The CDCs utilize two basic arts-related strategies: direct arts programming and arts facilitation. CDCs that employ direct programming are likely to be older, enjoy greater arts-related budgets, employ larger arts staffs, and earn more income from the arts. What that signals to me is these CDCs are more experienced and have built a history and constituency. In other words, CDCs that have survived and are effective have taken the long view and are committed to their arts programming.

[*The issues concerning the arts and support for artists may be global and universal, but if we divorce our initiatives or interests from local needs, we cannot foster the community support the arts require to survive.*]

JULIE LAZAR

A prime concern facing CDCs is how to effectively integrate arts activities with their other program components. Some arts activities are separately incorporated or quasi-independent; some are considered to be a part of other programs. According to Bowles, while CDC arts-related activities are germane to programming that addresses economic, human, physical, and social areas, the arts are most likely to be connected to the organizations' human and social development goals.

The CDCs' overall strategic approach to development appears to be colored by the local political and social environment. Both *Community Development in the Arts* and Anne Focke's study, *Financial Support for Artists*, stress the importance of a local focus. The issues concerning the arts and support for artists may be global and universal, but if we divorce our initiatives or interests from local needs, we cannot foster the community support the arts require to survive.

Local needs and desires, however, may vary widely within only a few miles. Furthermore, the arts audience for CDCs tends to be more radically and ethnically diverse than even their target communities. A CDC in Long Beach that targets the Asian community may discover its potential arts audience spills over into the Latin American population and other groups. The CDCs that are effective in their programming are those that attract these multicultural audiences.

In the area of arts facilitation, CDCs engage in arts collaborations as a way to present more programming. All three reports point to collaborations as a key means of extending resources in the future. Collaborations offer multiple benefits in terms of financial and human resources. On the down side, collaborations absorb staff time and create problems having to do with turf and miscommunication. Nevertheless, my own experience with collaborations suggests they are more often worth the trouble than not.

To integrate the arts into their communities, CDCs must overcome differences in worldviews and problem-solving styles, as well as differences in language. The capacity for building arts-related components requires new funding strategies by the public and private sectors, increased training and technical assistance, and organizational assessment. Cultural capacity building also depends on central mechanisms for planning, collaboration, data collection, research and information dissemination, and broad-based public education.

Because of their range of functions and expertise, CDCs are seen as uniquely equipped to initiate and coordinate community cultural planning and educate the public about the relationship among art and culture and community revitalization. Education provides a direct link to the people within a community; it becomes, in a sense, a collaboration with an audience. The MOCA education department, for example, truly knows and understands the audiences our curators want to reach. The educators know audiences because they have been involved in diverse communities on a day-to-day basis, over multiple years. They have a good sense of what audiences really want and understand and what audiences don't want and don't understand.

Educational programs offer artists more direct access to their audience and the public in a way that lecturing at a gallery cannot. For the most part, I think people enjoy having contact with artists, and this generally translates into a better understanding of artists' work. It may also translate into more support for artists' art-making practices and more support for the institutions that serve them. Certainly, not every artist should get involved in fundraising, but we in institutions should at least invite artists' participation. Fundraising is a tremendous opportunity for education and advocacy for the arts.

CDCs cite funding as a major need for their arts-related activities. Some of the problems CDCs face in securing funding are attributed to the failure of funders to understand the contributions the arts can make to community development, the general lack of interest in community-based arts organizations shown by private grant-

makers in the arts, and an inconsistency in focus by funding organizations, which interferes with programs' continuity and effectiveness. The CDCs find that just as programs are funded and become effective, funding sources change directions. The CDCs must then regroup to match their programs to the new initiatives of the funding organizations.

A number of the findings in *Community Development in the Arts* parallel what Anne Focke found and stated perceptively but differently in her study, *Financial Support for Artists*. Although we in the arts feel that funding is receding and programs are declining, *Financial Support for Artists* found that funding is on the rise in some areas. Because of this development, Focke suggests that we stop acting from a crisis mentality. Focke advocates keeping the energy and momentum that can accompany a crisis but focusing on positive models, responding proactively rather than simply reacting.

The third report, *Independence: Sustaining America's Artists*, evolved from a roundtable discussion held in October, 1996. Sponsored by and held at the Virginia Center for the Creative Arts, the discussion included 19 writers, visual artists, and funders. This report, although somewhat informative, lacked the substance of the other two studies. *Independence: Sustaining America's Artists* made me appreciate all the more the research and work that went into *Community Development in the Arts* and *Financial Support for Artists*.

As I contemplated these reports and how we in the arts can make use of them, I came up with several recommendations for improving the survey process in general. One of my criticisms of *Independence: Sustaining America's Artists* is that it failed to offer any concrete plan of action. My first suggestion for increasing the viability of these studies is this: when a study is funded, that funding should include money that I call *action funds*. Once a study is completed, it almost always points in some direction where action is needed. In the current scenario, these studies are compiled, everyone agrees some action should be taken, and the next two years are spent raising money to fund that action. By that point, any momentum created by the study has evaporated. If every study had sizable seed money attached to it, work could begin immediately on whatever action was indicated by the study's findings.

As an example, studies have found that all across the country, organizations and artists need to better promote themselves. Seed funding could help institutions and individuals launch ad campaigns or use the services of experts in the field. These efforts could be followed up by an analysis of whether or not the activities were effective.

A second way to maximize the usefulness of studies and surveys of the arts would be to include complete contact information and biographical material about the participants, funders, writers, interviewees—all of the principals involved. If an individual reading the report sees similarities between her community and community "X" profiled in the report, she has the name of a person in X to whom she can speak and address her questions.

Third, these reports would be more useful if they included one or two case studies of well-intentioned new initiatives that failed. I am not advising that we focus on failures, but appropriate cases might help others embarking on new projects avoid the same pitfalls.

Fourth, the information compiled by these studies and studies in other fields should be shared across disciplines. Interdisciplinary analysts could discern any common trends and where an exchange of information might lead to applicable solutions. If the scientific community is trying to figure out how to get the word out to lay people about science and scientific discoveries, scientists could meet with community-development people who want to know how science can be more related to their daily lives.

Fifth, we must be more inclusive when we meet to discuss study and survey results. Any meetings that center on the arts should include artists; representatives from arts organizations; and interested constituents such as community leaders, members of support councils, and volunteers. In addition, staff members of funding organizations, foundations, and corporations and trustees of the represented organizations should be in attendance. Trustees need to hear directly about funding's impact from the people who have received that funding.

In line with this, I would like to see a congress of funders convened to discuss the results of recent funding projects. If a project involved artists, the artists would be present to detail the positive and sometimes negative effects of support in their lives and work. Such a congress could also bring together potential funders, especially those who might lend their political clout to advocate for the arts.

On the subject of support for artists, I believe we must give more credence, visibility, and recognition not just to funding foundations but to donors of in-kind gifts and services as well, including local governments, the media, and the educational community. A great deal more philanthropy happens in the world than is tallied in these studies. Among those underrecognized donors are often artists, who contribute time and services to arts organizations, schools, community groups, and one another.

In our focus on the national scene and the state of the arts in America, we sometimes overlook the effects of small, local action. We must become more realistic about how much we as arts activists take on; setting too broad an objective decreases our effectiveness and limits what we are actually able to accomplish. The pitfalls of a national organization to support artists is a point on which Anne Focke touches in *Financial Support for Artists*.

The arts are and always have been an integral part of all societies, yet we seem to be unable to maintain that view in our everyday lives or to communicate it to our communities. If we would only stop and think, however, we can all enumerate the ways art is interwoven in our society.

I heard a story from John Outterbridge, a wonderful community activist and artist in Los Angeles. For the past 20 years or so, John has been in residence at the Watts Towers Arts Center as perhaps the ultimate public artist. A curator from Germany came to the United States, bringing with her a group of students to meet the great

John Outterbridge. The woman was recording the interview, so she shoved a microphone in John's face and asked, "So, John, tell me why you think art is important." John thought, "Great, this lady is really putting me on the spot." He considered the woman's question and decided he would involve her students in the discussion. He said to them, "Let's talk about what you perceive as art. What is art?" The students listed all the obvious examples of art, moved on to design and fashion, and then cited journalism and other endeavors that might not typically be considered art. John asked, "Okay, now what happens when we eliminate all of that? What's left?" The students themselves answered the question of why art is important. Without art, not much is left.

Discussion

Focke: To begin, let me clarify Lazar's interpretation of one finding in my report. She said that I do not believe there should be a national fund for artists.

My participation in *Financial Support for Artists* came about because a group of individuals was deeply concerned about the loss of grant support for artists and proposed creation of what they termed a *national trust for artists*. They contracted with me to do some background research. Lazar's reference was to my conclusion that a large national fund is not the place to begin. It's not that I feel nothing should be attempted on a national scale, it's simply that there are so many other opportunities to pursue—some local, some discipline specific, some that follow a particular interest such as women artists or entrepreneurial projects or whatever.

I am encouraged by new activities that I see happening in many places. Through my study, I found many grant-makers looking closely at artists and how to support them. In Seattle, the newly reorganized Behnke Foundation has established a fellowship program for artists. The fellowship is called the Neddy after a Behnke family member, a painter who died young. In the first two years, the program awarded one fellowship. This year, the Behnke Foundation will give two awards, and the founders hope to expand the program even more. In northern California, the Humboldt Area Foundation has just started a small fellowship program for artists—one artist in the first year. Over the next several years, the Foundation plans to gradually increase both the budget for the program and the number of fellowships awarded. Many other programs are underway: some are fellowships, many are not; some are small and local, others are large and reach across regions; some are initiated by grantmaking institutions, some by individuals.

Van Proyen: I cannot quite echo the optimistic note that has been sounded thus far. I believe we are only now reaching the bottom of a rather dismal downswing that has plagued arts organizations for the last decade or so. For me, the question is how might we start moving forward again and how can we use this upward momentum productively?

I agree with much of Lazar's remarks about the reports. *Independence: Sustaining America's Artists* struck me as an example of rearranging deck chairs on the Titanic. As Lazar pointed out, the report provokes the response that such studies should always propose a plan of action and that such a plan should be judged not only by its coherence but also by its achievability.

Community Development in the Arts is much more problematic. It broaches issues but does not explicitly address them. These issues are at the core of what we should be addressing at this kind of symposium. When we talk about integrating arts activities with other kinds of community development, we have to think hard and carefully about what that means. Integration of the arts into that model could easily refer to an invidious process in which art becomes a component within a larger administrative program that is neither about art nor necessarily even in favor of art. The arts become a bureaucratic adornment, mirroring the art market's view of art as an aesthetic adornment.

Art and artists certainly expect more of arts organizations than putting a pretty face on what is essentially a social work agenda. The *American Canvas* report, published by the NEA, pinpoints the pitfalls associated with art and arts projects in the guise of social work. Mixing art and a social agenda may well be a formula for failure. After 30 years of the Great Society, social programming has suddenly been deemed nonbeneficial and socially irrelevant. Can arts organizations take essentially the same kind of socially directed task and hope to succeed? What happens when that failure to succeed inevitably damages the public perception of the arts? These concerns were not addressed by *Community Development in the Arts*. The report scored some interesting points, but it made questionable assumptions about such things as audiences and targeting audiences.

Lazar: Although I do not think we should impose upon arts organizations or artists to be social activists or agents, experiences have shown us there is nothing to fear when artists and arts organizations charge themselves with such a mission. We have before us in this country some stellar examples of people who had the courage to wander in naively and, using the same process that they use to make an artwork, have engaged themselves in depth and over a long period of time in their communities.

Van Proyen: I am not criticizing those kinds of efforts. What I am criticizing are administrative agendas that assume they can paternalistically support and control that process.

Lazar: I didn't find that kind of paternalism in *Community Development in the Arts*. The case histories cited in the report almost always came out of the desire of people in the communities to do something for themselves. The examples described the organic, meaningful, and profound relationships that individuals had developed with artists and the art-making process. We open ourselves to opportunities by engaging in dialogue with artists. I work with many artists who do not enter into these activities to teach but to learn. The relationship is a reciprocal one.

Garcia-Nakata: I would like to comment about collaboration, which Lazar addressed briefly in her presentation. When I talk about collaboration among artists, arts organizations, and philanthropic institutions, I am talking about collaboration in the truest sense. Collaboration is an effort among peers, not a colonial show of benevolence. To enter into a collaboration is to embark upon an ongoing learning process. Artists understand the concept of collaboration because they are used to venturing into unfamiliar territory; they do not approach a project with the idea that they have already summed it up and worked it out.

Lazar also mentioned that funding and shifts in funding directions were influencing artists and arts programming. As someone involved in philanthropy, I am troubled by the notion that a project that is up and rolling must be reshaped to meet a change in funding philosophy. In general, philanthropists seek projects and programs that excite them. Funding guidelines may point to what philanthropists say they are looking for, but I know from my own experience that I would be bored if applicants did not challenge the guidelines. If I, as an artist, am inspired by an idea, I would rather raise money on my own than shift my project focus to accommodate a funding source. Letting funding guidelines dictate the shape of the art is absolutely unnecessary, even if money is drying up.

Lazar: In my experience with arts organizations, I have seen artists adopt a chameleon-like behavior to conform to funding guidelines. Often, people are led off course without even realizing it. They embark on a project to secure a grant; they receive the grant, but they have no real enthusiasm for or investment in what they have committed themselves to producing.

Brooks: I would like to contextualize my response by explaining that I represent two different perspectives. Most of my life has been spent in the crafts field as a studio artist. Currently, I work inside philanthropy, running a regional association of grantmakers comprised of private and public foundations in New Mexico. Since I took this job, my perspective of philanthropy has been transformed. I have listened to my funders share their sense of being overwhelmed by government devolution and welfare reform and its effect on the 48th poorest state in the U.S.

I connected with the *Community Development in the Arts* report because of my own experience in southern Illinois as a student. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, I became involved in what was basically arts-related work in community development. We worked in 11 southern Illinois counties where the average age in those counties was 65; most people were living on fixed incomes and faced economic problems. I participated in these community-development efforts while working on my Master of Fine Arts degree. I found it very disconnecting to attend the academy and be exposed to one ideological set of circumstances and discourses and then venture into the community and try to develop economic opportunities. Our work in the communities was sometimes demonized in a sense because it had the aura that Mark Van Proyen referred to—it smacked of social reform and therapeutic, moral, and economic values as opposed to creating opportunities for individual expression and self-exploration. And so, from the early 1970s to now, I have felt that number one, local reality is everything, as Anne Focke pointed out in her report. Having worked in community development, I am very much against creating a monolithic, mega-institutional entity that attempts to serve the varied needs of unique communities.

Another idea that Focke stressed was this business of how language gets in the way and prevents us from having powerful discussions about the holistic nature of artistic expression. The problems we experience in talking about artistic identity and boundaries are attributable to nomenclature. What constitutes the “artistic identity” has been established by the academy, and that definition has affected funding in very categorical ways and circumscribed any larger dialogue we may have about the arts and artists. Our system of fellowships and rewards often denies the multiple intentionalities of artists.

Yes, artists are working in communities doing economic development work. They are concerned with the spirit of the community, its cultural identity, and all the other circumstances that affect art-in-public-places projects. Just because you participate in economic development as an artist and you work with an organization that has economic development as an agenda does not mean you are somehow denying or throwing away your artistic power. The fact is that, as artists, all of us are capable of having many different kinds of intentions, working in many different cultural contexts, and responding to many different problems. For me, *Financial Support for Artists* was significant for its recognition that it is at the local level that these kinds of multiple identities and intentions are allowed to play out. The average American does not perceive a singular artistic identity to the degree that our profession has often defined and circumscribed it.

The New York Times recently devoted 20 pages to philanthropy in America. According to the article, 80% of American giving is done by individuals. To me, the whole future of support for artists comes down to the power of one on one. There are even patronage systems emerging in which a single donor is so compelled by the work of an individual artist or arts-producing group that he or she will create ways to provide support.

Abeles: I appreciate the positive note that has been sounded here as well as the ideas this discussion has generated. Many models are out there, demonstrating positive and productive institutional and individual projects. What we must do is take some of these success stories and implement them elsewhere.

[*Our systems of fellowships and rewards often deny the multiple intentionalities of artist....The fact is that as artists, all of us are capable of having many different kinds of intentions, working in many different cultural contexts, and responding to many different problems. For me, Financial Support for Artists [by Anne Focke] was significant for its recognition that it is at the local level that these kinds of multiple identities and intentions are allowed to play out.]*

JAN BROOKS

Betty LaDuke

An Artist's Perspective of How Awards Can Change a Life

I am happy to share with you how the personal, the political, and the aesthetic merge in my life and art. I come from the Bronx of immigrant, working-class parents. I was lucky. Back in the 1940s, my parents sent me to an interracial summer camp, which was very unusual for that era. My art counselors happened to be African-Americans—Charles White and Elizabeth Catlett. I had never met artists before, and these two became my role models.

Charles White and Elizabeth Catlett instilled in me the belief that artists are responsible to their communities and that art reflects your heritage, your identity, and your community. Because of all that I learned from these two artists, I decided to explore the world outside the Bronx. Given my background, I had to reach out for grants and start seeking funding at an early age.

My first two scholarships took me to Denver and to the Cleveland Institute of Art. My third scholarship got me to Mexico, and another one gave me \$50 a month to live on and pay my expenses [\$50 could do it in those days]. I stayed in Mexico for three-and-a-half years. With that \$50 a month, I dropped out of college and began to paint on my own. I won some recognition, including five one-person shows sponsored by the Mexican government. I also worked in an indigenous community for a year, painting murals on the outdoor patio of an Otomi Indian school. My time in Mexico was a tremendous learning experience, one you couldn't buy at any college. It was outside the norm of the typical artist's education.

Coming back to New York was an eye opener. I had followed Mexican mural painting and pre-Columbian art, but what was this abstract expressionism? In New York, I worked in community settlement houses, starting with part-time jobs teaching art. My first full-time position was in the Grand Street Settlement house as art director. Even early on, teaching provided an economic base that supported me in making art.

Eventually, I married a Native American who earned his living falling off horses for Hollywood, so we moved from New York to Los Angeles. On the West Coast, it was hard for me to find the kinds of big and little jobs that I'd had in New York, and I realized that I had to go back to school. I attended California State University, graduated with a teaching credential, and began teaching art at Stevenson Junior High School in East Los Angeles. At that point, I was teaching during the day, working at night on my master's degree, and raising a child. Those were tough years. I even had to learn how to drive a car, and I think that was the toughest thing I ever learned. I felt, if I can do all this, I can do anything!

We moved to Oregon when I finished my master's. I joined the faculty of Southern Oregon State College, now Southern Oregon University. After living in big urban areas, I had trouble adjusting to a small town where certain books were banned and John Steinbeck and *The Nation* magazine that I'd grown up with were considered bad news. This was 1964.

For the first 18 years of my teaching career, I was the only woman on the faculty. [Think of what that did in terms of my development.] In the 1970s, I became involved with the women's movement, the College Art Association, and the first women's art caucuses. The women's art movement opened me up in a new way. I realized I was a statistic. I was a woman professor in the U.S., and that made me a statistic because although most art students were women, the faculty was still very narrowly confined as a male establishment.

Another event that affected my development happened in 1972, when I took my first sabbatical. My husband said, "Be adventurous," and I didn't have to be told twice. I packed up for a month and went by myself to

[*What it comes down to for all of us is identifying what you love to do, nurturing your talent, and seeing where it interfaces with what other people want or can use.*]

BETTY LADUKE

India. This was a big step because my youngest child was then two and a half. But I went. That month in India, like my sojourn in Mexico, opened me up to an awareness of non-Western cultures. It opened me up to how people live, how they subsist in small villages and towns. I forgot to take a camera with me, but I took a sketch book, and I came back with sketches.

When I returned from India, a new side of me started to emerge. People in my small town asked me to talk about this great adventure I'd had. From my trip, I had created not only sketches but etchings and paintings as well. So I put them together in slides, and I gave my first talk. I couldn't believe the response; people came and were interested.

That experience led me to reach out for grants, small amounts of money from here and there. I have now received 26 grants or more, most of them from local and state funds. The most money I ever received in any one grant was \$3,000. But whether \$3,000 or \$300, these awards have helped me travel the world every single summer since 1972.

In the small town where I was living, people were interested in my travels and the women artists I met and interviewed. So I initiated a course—Women in Art—not because I had an art history background but because I knew if I didn't do it, no one else would. The teaching part of me and the art part of me and the travel-adventure part of me began to merge. I received a very special grant from the Collins Foundation in Portland, which sent me to China in 1976 at a time when China was opening up in a unique and special way. I was the first person from the Rogue Valley to go on a three-week tour to China after it reopened to the West. I not only brought back three filled sketchbooks but notes from the entire journey, plus other materials that could be used in an educational way.

Another side of me, the artist part, was reaching out to have my own work honored. One of the organizations that years ago brought me into contact with WESTAF Executive Director Anthony Radich was Visual Arts Resources from the Museum of Art in Eugene, Oregon. Visual Arts Resources developed exhibitions on various themes and circulated these shows throughout Oregon and the entire Western region. In 1976, I proposed an exhibit, "Impressions of India," based on my sabbatical experience. This work was accepted and toured around the West.

That sparked the idea on my return from China to put together my own traveling exhibit as a way to express my artist side. I had a camera by this time, and I compiled the photographs, sketches, and paintings from my trip, together with the educational writings, into my own show, "China—An Outsider's Inside View." I created a brochure for the exhibit and booked the show into universities and colleges.

I kept reaching out and growing through my travels, and in the 1980s, I returned to Latin America. Being able to speak Spanish was a wonderful help, and I visited areas I had never been. I was very moved in Chile, Peru, Guatemala, Mexico, and in Nicaragua, especially. Something new happened to me on these travels; I felt that I not only had to paint, I had to write. I started writing up my interviews with women artists and their social, cultural, and political circumstances. I brought these writings back to the U.S. and initiated another course, *Art in the Third World*. Through my art and the art of artists that I was documenting, my students [who were mostly white, rural people from southern Oregon] gained new perspective on what it is like to be alive in this world today. These writings evolved into my first book, *Compañeras: Women, Art, and Social Change in Latin America*, which was published by City Lights in 1985.

My travels in Latin America, especially Haiti, Cuba, Grenada, and Brazil, led me to be aware, for the first time, of the African influence there. This awareness grew in part through my friendship with my first art teacher and role model, Elizabeth Catlett. She had remarried and lived in Mexico, and I went there to interview her. In my travels to Latin America, India, Yugoslavia, Borneo, and all over, I was writing about and documenting women's contributions to the arts. I felt that this was a particular contribution that I could make—to document women's role as artists in their communities.

As I was working on these activities, my friend Lois Mailou-Jones said, "Go to Africa." I didn't have to be told twice; I went. It was 1986, and from the moment I started traveling in Africa, I loved it. It was an enormous challenge, but I kept going back to different parts of Africa. In the past decade or so, I have made perhaps 13 trips. From my African experiences came the books *Africa Through The Eyes of Woman Artists*, 1990, and *Africa: Women's Art, Women's Lives*, 1997. These books chronicle some of the remarkable women I met—painters, sculptors, potters, and weavers. My photographs from my trips and the pieces that I collected became a traveling exhibit that has circulated through Exhibit Touring Services of Eastern Washington University. My most recent book, *Women Against Hunger: A Sketchbook Journey*, was published in 1997, also with Africa World Press.

Throughout my travels, I was always painting and creating my own art. I even invested in myself in a way that scared the heck out of me at the time. I made note cards of my images and approached companies, such as Pomegranate, that sold note cards. At first, the companies did not want to deal with me, but then the distributors began to say, "These cards are selling!" One thing led to another, and eventually Pomegranate produced a book about my artwork. *Multi-Cultural Celebrations, The Paintings of Betty LaDuke 1972-1992*, written by Gloria Feman Orenstein, professor at the University of California and a friend that I met at a feminist conference in Yugoslavia for women writers.

My note cards not only led me to a book but to a collector. A woman in Virginia phoned and said, "I want to buy a painting." All this time, I have been struggling to show my work, putting together touring exhibits of my own and other people's work, and it has been a hard juggling act. Out of the blue, this woman wants to buy a painting! She asked me how much I wanted, and I quoted a high price. I am not telling, but I took my favorite number and put it out there. She bought two paintings.

I am always building on the events and happenings in my life. I saw an opportunity to make videos, and I grabbed it. I received a grant from the Collins Foundation, which in years past had enabled me to visit China. I became interested in making a video because I realized I had this unique body of work that tied together many different cultures. With a colleague from my college and \$5,000, I made a first video in 1995, *Betty LaDuke, An Artist's Journey from the Bronx to Timbuktu*, and then a second. The last video, produced in 1996, was shot in Eritrea, a country I've returned to five times now. The second video, *Persistent Women Artists*, is about older American women artists of different ethnic heritages. Another video, *Africa Between Myth and Reality*, focuses on 10 years of my own work related to Africa and shows how my images interface with my life and with people in Africa and the United States. I have a whole line of videos now that are distributed nationally by a major company.

And then, because I reached out for another opportunity, my work was featured in an airline magazine. I fly all over the place, and I saw United Airlines' *Hemisphere* magazine and realized that United highlights artists. So I called the art director and asked if I could send him some slides. I ended up with a four- or five-page spread with several images, seen by two million people or so. Unfortunately, only one commercial art gallery was interested—story of my life!

Still, I've had a good life and a good battle. You just keep going and helping people along the way. Every year, I give a grant to other artists, students on my college campus, in the name of my parents, Helen and Sam Bernstein. The grant is only \$200, but it is awarded every year. And I promise, as soon as I get more sales, I will up that grant.

Discussion

Andrews: In all my years of working with artists, I never fail to be amazed at their passion and energy. This overwhelming presentation provided a clear example of how the arts might benefit from a new concept of fellowships. Maybe what we need is not foundations and fellowship programs but venture capital funds that invest in artists in a new way. The funds would go to artists who are capable of taking that money, using it to fuel their work and ideas, and eventually returning that money back to the fund for other artists to use.

Van Proyen: LaDuke's clear account of a wonderful and adventurous life in the arts should inspire us and be kept in mind as we talk about such abstractions as targeting audiences. Her presentation is the testament of someone who has taken matters into her own hands time and time again. She has not waited for philanthropists, art administrators, or institutions to legitimize her approach to her life and her art. Andrews' remark about a venture capital fund for artists should be broached seriously.

Izumi: I agree that entrepreneurship such as LaDuke's should be invested in. In her life, I see a parallel with the entrepreneurs in the Silicon Valley, who didn't bide their time as low-level technicians within a company or wait for IBM to come calling. These individuals created a synergy and a revolution in the high-tech industry by venturing out on their own, developing their ideas, and creating businesses from scratch. LaDuke's example offers a roadmap for artists: seek out and develop new strategies for creating art and supporting it.

LaDuke: One of the things that has been important for my own self-image and given me the encouragement to continue is bonding with grassroots organizations. The power of grassroots efforts on the local level should never be underestimated.

The Schneider family, who endowed the Schneider Art Museum at Southern Oregon University, donated money to an organization called *Freedom From Hunger*. When a Freedom From Hunger representative came to honor the Schneiders in Ashland, someone suggested they visit me. When I opened my door, a man came in, looked at the paintings in my studio, and said, "I have a bond with your work. I feel that in many ways it parallels what we're doing."

Freedom From Hunger is an organization that deals with women's communities throughout the world and lends women money—little sums of money, anywhere from \$30 to \$50. The women themselves determine their activities—anything from smoking and drying fish to planting a garden to raising rabbits. The women decide what economic activity they want to do, they do it, they learn to save and to pay back the money invested in them.

As it happened, I was going to Africa anyway, and Freedom From Hunger paid my expenses to travel the extra distance to visit its programs. I ended up going to villages and communities not only in Africa but in Bolivia, Thailand, and on the east coast of the U.S. in Mississippi, Alabama, and Georgia. I had an opportunity to use my sketchbooks and to write about what I saw—in short, to do what I love to do. What it comes down to for all of us is identifying what you love to do, nurturing your talent, and seeing where it interfaces with what other people want or can use.

Lazar: In her presentation, LaDuke again and again mentioned that she had received small grants. She relied on some level of support, and I do not feel you can erase this support until artists start earning sufficient wages for the work they do. When artists are adequately paid for the services they provide, perhaps then we will not need funding agencies and grants. But at this point, we still do. As I was listening to LaDuke, I could not help but imagine what she might have been able to accomplish with a grant of \$20,000.

Carter: On the topic of artists getting paid for their work, a mistaken notion has taken hold that if you are an artist, you have a gallery and are exhibiting your work, getting it before the public. I come from New York City, which I imagine has more galleries on the island of Manhattan alone than could be found in the rest of the U.S., and I can tell you that many artists do not have gallery representation. For an artist to

[*Betty LaDuke's*] presentation is the testament of someone who had taken matters into her own hands time and time again. She has not waited for philanthropists, art administrators, or institutions to legitimize her approach to her life and her art.]

MARK VAN PROYEN

receive an award represents not just a monetary benefit but a validation that “Yes, the work I am doing is important”. That is another factor many people do not understand: artists are alone most of the time. They do not often receive feedback, so an award, no matter what the amount, can be important to keep artists going.

Lazar: I have also found that most grants given to artists return more than their monetary value. Artists are creative in how they use their funds and are amazingly resourceful about maximizing the potential of a small sum.

I can offer a concrete example. Rick Lowe did not have much funding for Project Row Houses, yet the project puts large corporate developments to shame. Initiated in Houston’s Third Ward neighborhood in 1992, Project Row Houses has involved the transformation of two acres of abandoned land with dilapidated houses and vacant lots into a dynamic cultural center for the neighborhood. He spent very little in terms of money; what was expended was the love and labor of people whom he was able to engage in the project. Now Rick has ceded that idea to the people in his community, and they are continuing the project on their own.

[...most grants given to artists return more than their monetary value. Artists are creative in how they use their funds and are amazingly resourceful about maximizing the potential of a small sum.]

JULIE LAZAR

I was with Rick in Japan at a meeting of architects and city planners from all over the world. They could not believe what he had accomplished and wanted to know if such a project could be replicated. Who knows if it could? Project Row Houses evolved from the vision and commitment of a single individual. This is the kind of value that can come from a contribution or grant to an artist.

Focke: People who are concerned about economic development can learn something from artists. We must start thinking of artists as contributors and assets, not needy people who should be funded. Think of how much LaDuke has given, not just through her art but by the example she sets, the resourcefulness she has demonstrated. The most resourceful people I know are artists.

Andrews: Earlier we discussed the question, “What is art?” The question, “What is an artist?” is just as fundamental. What is represented by LaDuke and other artists is a way of moving through the world. By and large, the way the non-art world looks at artists is as producers of things, some highly valued, some little valued. But if we perceived artists as individuals who contribute not simply what they produce but how they approach the world, then we would want to find ways to support them. I do not mean support in terms of fellowships or foundation grants but simply ways of getting artists out there in the world because they are extraordinarily valuable people.

Brooks: The distinction you are making has to do with whether or not the general public views artists as producers of tangible materials or as producers of knowledge. We as a society tend to focus on the bottom line: a product’s worth in monetary terms. I would like Anne Focke to comment about the ongoing debate in philanthropy regarding venture capital. Grantmakers in the Arts recently republished Bruce Sievers’ response to an article circulating in the philanthropic community that proposed that the nonprofit sector start emulating venture capitalists.

Focke: The argument is that philanthropists can learn much from venture capitalists. Bruce Sievers, director of the Walter and Elise Haas Foundation in the Bay area, responded to that argument by pointing out that the nonprofit or charitable world serves a fundamentally different function. Venture capitalists have a single goal: does the investment make money? One cannot assign the same kind of monetary value to artists’ work or nonprofit work; the nonprofit sector has many purposes and many bottom lines.

Brooks: We have to ask ourselves if we value the idea of what is learned. Are posing creative questions, exploring the unknown, and finding answers activities that we actually value? Measuring this value in statistical or quantifiable ways is not easy. The venture-capital model and the debate about its applicability to the nonprofit sector forces us to define what is valued and what kind of capital we are dealing in.

Focke: Using LaDuke as an example once again, I would say that the value in her experience is not simply a matter of how much money she earned in the course of her lifetime. Certainly, that is one way to measure it, but such an assessment overlooks so many other contributions and knowledge gained from her experience. The fact that LaDuke managed to survive and make money along the way is important but does not reflect the true value of her life.

LaDuke: I should point out that the way I have made my way has been grounded on teaching. Teaching provided me with the means to do my art and gave me time to develop. Artists need a long incubation period. You need to be supported, even when your work is not up there professionally. In terms of your development, you need to have experiences and opportunities even when the work is not selling. Selling the work should not be the bottom line. You need to grow, to experience life, and to give back as you can. You cannot measure art by the bottom line like that venturesome capital concept.

Focke: I like the term venturesome capital.

Lazar: I do, too, because it implies a certain amount of *risk taking*. Funding of artists has taken on an overt expression of conservatism in our society; we will not fund that which is controversial. But many times, art, if it touches our nerves, is going to be controversial. Part of the role that artists have chosen for themselves is to observe and comment on life. Sometimes, art is going to hit nerves and be controversial, just to wake us out of the sleep we are in. Perhaps instead of seeking venture capital for artists, we need venturesome capital; we need to allow more risk and back something that could be blessedly controversial.

Jack Becker

Comments and Concerns About Percent-for-Art Programs

As a publisher and an artist [and a sponge for ideas and information], I try to keep my finger on the pulse of public art in America. *Public Art Review* started some nine years ago and reflects half of the mission of FORECAST Public Artworks, the small, private nonprofit organization that I helped create in 1978. FORECAST supports artists in all disciplines in their exploration of the public realm. It awards grants to Minnesota artists; produces educational programs related to the field, such as *Public Art Review*, catalogs, and public presentations; and provides technical assistance to organizations seeking to develop programs and services.

FORECAST Public Artworks grew out of the Comprehensive Employment Training Act [CETA] program of the late 1970s. In Minneapolis, CETA put 60 artists to work, both in their studios and in the community. I would say that 1977 and 1978 were watershed years for artists' support, and I am somewhat dismayed that the Clinton administration did not pick up this vital federal jobs program and keep it going. If you are looking for meaningful support models, especially at the federal level, I would start with CETA.

As for percent-for-art programs, it may come as a surprise to some of you, but percent-for-art programs were not started and, for the most part, still are not designed to serve artists. That is not their intent. Percent-for-art programs are a sales and commissioning resource for artists; they are essentially a commissioning arrangement based on a European patronage system that goes back centuries.

Percent-for-art efforts in the United States can be traced to the 1920s when Beaux Arts architects required decorations, ornamentations, and uplifting symbols for their post offices and government buildings and plazas. As far back as 1953, the General Services Administration [GSA], the federal agency responsible for buildings and supplies, was setting aside 1.5% of its capital building budget for works of art to be added to government buildings. The GSA gave architects full reign over selecting artists and adding artwork to their projects. What we call *percent for art* officially began in 1959 in Philadelphia and eventually grew to include more than 200 variations around the United States. It was those earlier GSA efforts, however, that served as the true model for many of our current municipal, county, and state programs.

In 1992, a survey was conducted by the Public Art Institute, a short-lived effort of the National Assembly of Local Arts Agencies [now part of Americans for the Arts]. Findings showed that in the seven years prior to 1992, the 75 agencies surveyed had spent more than \$160 million on percent-for-art programs. The agencies had purchased more than 6,000 works of art and installed more than 650 projects. Their allocations varied from .5% to as much as 2%. The programs were located in big cities and small towns. Some of the largest programs in existence today are in Seattle, Phoenix, New York City, the Boston-Cambridge area, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Chicago. But wonderful, innovative programs are flourishing in smaller towns and midsize communities as well.

Since their inception, percent-for-art programs have gone beyond mere ornamentation to attempt to address myriad concerns in contemporary society. These issues include preserving a community's artistic heritage, enriching the public environment, expanding opportunities for public involvement and appreciation, and facilitating collaborations between artists and other design professionals.

Seattle offers a fine example of a progressive program that has evolved far beyond a simple commissioning process. The fact that Seattle funds artists to work as design and planning consultants alongside public works, parks, and planning staff is an important new direction for percent-for-art programs and one that holds much promise. As promising as these efforts may be, however, the fact remains that percent-for-art programming is plagued by serious problems.

Percent-for-art programs are restricted by the legislative language that established them. Programs are limited in the types of public art that they can fund. Very few are allowed to fund temporary projects or works by artists other than visual artists. The programs tend to be insular, primarily funding artists who have already done commissions. This “catch 22” hinders artists trying to break into the field of public art.

Art is often selected by committees that include few arts professionals. Safe art tends to predominate. Few risks are taken, primarily to avoid controversy or political backlash. Artists’ ideas are often compromised. Programs usually operate at the mercy of larger arts councils or departments with numerous other concerns, so percent-for-art efforts are kept under fairly conservative scrutiny.

Funding mechanisms that provide for artwork often do not allocate money for staff to implement the programs. As a result, programs may be funded but have no one to run them. Money may not be available for design time, maintenance, or repair. Most programs have no provisions involving public education or artist training.

Percent-for-art programs are only as good as the people in charge of them, and many of these individuals have little or no experience working with artists. This is not surprising, given the lack of formal training programs in public art administration.

Artists are becoming fed up with dealing with percent-for-art bureaucracies. Even tracking down information about the opportunities available can be difficult. No uniform method exists for dealing with percent-for-art opportunities because each program is different. Each has its own application and selection procedure, and these processes can be quite lengthy, labor intensive, and speculative.

Contracts are outdated. They do not adequately protect the artist, and revisions, when obtainable, are likely to add months to a schedule. Project budgets are often too slim to cover the time it takes for the artist to complete the commission. And once the commission is awarded, there is no guarantee that the project will go through. Brad Goldberg, a Dallas sculptor, was selected to design a student health center plaza and entrance-way for Iowa State University in Ames, which has an excellent public art program on campus. Even though the committee was very thorough in their selection of the artist and Goldberg’s design work was incredible, the project was nixed by the dean of the university one day before materials were to be ordered, [He simply didn’t like it.] Another artist was quickly brought in to put a “band-aid” on the project.

Two artists in attendance here today—Walter Gordinier and Alice Van Leunen of Oregon—have a lawsuit pending against a Wisconsin program, charging program administrators with fraud, cover-up, and mismanagement. I do not think this situation is unusual; we simply do not hear about these cases very often. Artists fear [and rightly so] that if they exert pressure or file a lawsuit, it will cost them time, money, and future commissions. Yet, when problems arise in the course of a project, few support services are available to help deal with the conflicts and find solutions.

The picture is not entirely bleak, however. Although some programs around the country have been cut or eliminated, a number of new programs are being established. In fact, if we move beyond what we narrowly define as percent-for-art programs to public art—a much broader and more inclusive term—quite a bit of growth is taking place in this field, and its impact reaches more than visual arts audiences and artists.

The growth seems to have stemmed from increases in private-sector funding, new nonprofit initiatives, and partnerships. Growing numbers of women and minorities are finding work in this field. Growing numbers of interdisciplinary teams and neighborhood-based efforts are underway. More public art projects are being inte-

grated into social service and community-development activities. Exciting developments are taking place at the grassroots level. And, as a result of this activity, more consultants are emerging, eager to help facilitate these programs.

Another positive note are those few nonprofits that do place the needs of artists high up in their mission. In addition to FORECAST Public Artworks, the Twin Cities is home to Public Art St. Paul, which tries to influence the city's public development and public improvement projects and ensure that artists are brought in at the earliest stages of design and development. Chicago has the Chicago Public Art Group and Sculpture Chicago. New York has Creative Time and the Public Art Fund. The Boston-Cambridge area has the Revolving Museum and Reclamation Artists. Many other public art organizations can be found in California and along the West Coast.

A new direction taken by some nonprofits is serving as partners and administrators of percent-for-art programs for public agencies. The Tucson-Pima Arts Council, for example, is not a city agency but a private nonprofit entity that contracts with the county to manage its public art program. I strongly advocate for more partnerships between nonprofits and public art agencies to address some of the concerns I have noted.

As long as I am making recommendations, I suggest we improve our education efforts. We must train and educate artists in all disciplines about the field of public art and the opportunities available. More programs like the University of Southern California's public art studies are needed to train administrators to deal with the complexities inherent in the public art system. Unfortunately, universities and art schools, with one or two exceptions, have not included such training in their curriculums. I do not know how we can change our educational institutions, but it is clear they need a reality check.

We need more education at an early age—kindergarten through grade 12—about public art and, in particular, design. Is the word *design* even mentioned in K-12 education? And while we're adding to the curriculum, why not teach creative problem solving? It crosses all the disciplines taught in school.

In addition to education, we need improved documentation and evaluation. What is public art? What makes good public art? These are ongoing debates that publications such as *Public Art Review* try to address. We now have an on-line version of *Public Art Review*, <http://www.forecastart.org>, with a national clearinghouse of information. But it is difficult to fund such publications, let alone expand them, when almost no foundations provide for their support.

We must seek out support for research and development so that artists and communities can test ideas and working methodologies. We must improve the media's understanding of public art. All too often, public art and percent-for-art projects are relegated to a photo op in the metro section.

Some eight years ago, FORECAST Public Artworks initiated a re-granting program called Public Art Affairs. *Public Art Affairs* exists thanks to the Jerome Foundation, one of the best foundations for artist support and certainly a model for other grantmakers in the arts. Many foundations are restricted from giving grants to individuals, but they can indirectly support artists if that money is funneled through another entity. I am an enthusiastic proponent of re-granting awards through small nonprofits that have their finger on the pulse of individual artists and their particular needs.

We consider Public Art Affairs a model that could be replicated in other communities and regions. The usual commissioning process says, "Here's a wall, we want an artist to paint it." Public Art Affairs asks artists, "What do you want to do in the public realm? Here's a grant and technical assistance to go and do it." We want to know artists' ideas, issues, and observations. We believe that artists—not bureaucrats or commissioning agents—should be the primary ones defining public art and the direction it takes.

Allowing artists to design and create projects at sites of their choosing, allowing them to collaborate with the people they want to work with and do projects as they see fit can lead to an incredible groundswell of people involved with the arts and artists at the grassroots level. Such a movement contains all kinds of possibilities, even the notion of public art as a model for cultural revolution.

What we lack right now in terms of recognizing the value of artists in this society stems partly from our limited knowledge and exposure to art. You cannot have support for the arts without first having understanding, and you cannot have understanding without first having awareness. My final recommendation is to start with awareness. Let's make people more aware of what artists are doing and what they bring to the equation in terms of helping address the numerous issues confronting us today.

Discussion

Abeles: As an artist, I can attest that Jack Becker's description of the flaws in percent-for-art programs mirrored the nightmares I encountered in my public art project. I think that, across the board, artists would agree that the sluggishness and bureaucratic red tape is just as Becker described. Public art has inspired a zeal in some circles, but the bureaucracy was not set up to allow it to function properly. I find it a positive sign that people at least are aware of the problems and are attempting to find solutions.

Van Proyen: Becker cited CETA as a meaningful model. I have always considered CETA a practical happy medium between the Work Projects Administration [WPA] model of supporting public projects and the more recent Great Society model of supporting artists. CETA had solid bang-for-the-dollar delivery in terms of community redevelopment, finished projects, diversity of approaches, diversity of participants. I commend Becker for bringing that model up; CETA seems to have fallen through the cracks in most discussions of patronage.

Becker: In Minneapolis, CETA paid me and other artists to work half time in our studios as artists and the other half connected with community organizations such as daycare centers, senior citizen homes, and schools. I considered that recognition of both halves of our lives and work truly respectful of artists.

Garcia-Nakata: In the San Francisco Bay area and all of California, CETA provided the seed money for groups up and down the state to organize around issues. During this movement, in particular the Chicano movement, we were practicing artists, but we were also actively organizing within our communities. The issues at hand included impoverished situations and dangerous conditions confronting farm workers. From those CETA funds emerged an incredible list of nonprofit, action-oriented organizations. Artists and their organizations were often a catalyst for change linked to many areas of human need [health, legal, education, etc].

CETA money dried up in the early 1980s, about the time I entered the arts-administration field. At that point, 80-100% of nonprofits, all up and down the state, found themselves looking at budgets that depended on those funds. Nonprofits had to rethink their strategy and develop a more diversified funding base in order to survive—and many did.

Van Proyen: To me, one of the most admirable aspects of CETA programs was that, bureaucratically, they were very easy to manage. There were no complicated FASB [Federal Accounting Standards Board] standards that governed accounting, which meant that start-up organizations could successfully compete for CETA dollars with more established groups, thus providing opportunities for younger artists. There was no need to sustain a bureaucratic consulting organism. CETA programs were lean and mean, and they delivered the goods. CETA no doubt experienced some fraud, but I think the fear of fraud and mismanagement breeds control mechanisms that are unproductively coercive, breeding the kind of problems that Becker ascribed to percent-for-arts programs.

Garcia-Nakata: White-collar crime in the banking industry involved much larger dollar amounts, yet those incidents are virtually excused. The arts are held up to a very different standard. However, if you measure what CETA money and similar funds give back, that total far exceeds the instances of misappropriation of funds.

Andrews: I think we need to be cautious in our nostalgia for CETA as a program. CETA had its good points, but as in any other large-scale program, the good was the result of a few good people doing a few good things. Nostalgia for a program vested in the 1960s, a completely different political time, is dangerous. CETA has no application whatsoever to the present discourse about funding for individual artists because there is zero likelihood of such a program happening now.

[I consider artists' organizations some of
this country's most vital institutions, yet
too often, they fail to foresee their
dependency on grants, and that
failure leads to their demise.]

JULIE LAZAR

Lazar: My criticism of CETA and similar funding sources is that they may breed dependency. Organizations are created because of these funds and become dependent on them. When the funding source is eliminated, many of these groups collapse. NEA grants to artists' organizations can lead to similar dependency problems. I consider artists' organizations some of this country's most vital institutions, yet too often, they fail to foresee their dependency on grants, and that failure leads to their demise.

Perhaps what we need are successful partnerships between fledgling organizations and existing, stable arts organizations. The more experienced organizations could train the start-up groups and help them overcome administrative and organizational obstacles. Those of us who work in established arts organizations should do more to exercise and share our expertise. Currently, we serve on panels, we help choose work, but we do not assist in the administration of grants on an ongoing basis. Such work entails a different kind of commitment, a much longer commitment. Seeing an amazing public art project through to completion may take three, five, or fifteen years. Most arts organizations are used to seasons or at most, a two- or three-year commitment to conceive a project, raise the money, realize it, report on it, and wrap it up.

Garcia-Nakata: In Los Angeles, Julie, you enjoy an incredible commercial base. Yet, I know that many Los Angeles artists who come north are impressed by the percent-for-art programs they see in San Francisco and Seattle and Sacramento. I look at Los Angeles and the film industry and work going on and wonder why the artistic community has not organized to make a major percent-for-art program happen.

Lazar: We do have percent-for-art programs, but we have capitalized on them differently. For example, instead of commissioning 12 sizable public arts projects, when California Plaza was being developed in downtown LA, it was recommended to the city that the same amount of money be combined into one project, which became The Museum of Contemporary Art.

Andrews: The most interesting aspect of percent-for-art funding for me is the way it has been formed by location, not dictated from the top down. Percent for art had to be adopted city by city, county by county, state by state. Its success or failure was dependent upon the individual system. If there is a common thread running through the discussions at this symposium, it is the power inherent in the local experience. We need to concentrate on the local.

As a group of artists, arts administrators, and people interested in the arts, we can look back over the past 20 years and see that we have not been very effective on a national level. We have been close to inept as a national lobbying group. In the past 10 years, we may have fired off some good shots at the opposition, but we lost the battle. The devaluation of the individual artist, particularly the visual artist, happened on our watch. Contemporary artists, whether Mapplethorpe, Serrano, or Finley, have been effectively demonized in the national debate. Somewhat surprisingly, artists have not been categorically demonized on a local level. In fact, this symposium has cited many powerful and positive examples of the artist's value as a transformative agent in local situations.

Brooks: Thus far, the conversation about percent for art has focused on urban models. In rural communities and rural America, our greatest economic hope is cultural tourism, and percent-for-art projects contribute to the culture. The reason foreigners come to the United States is to experience the cultural expression of our communities. We should not be nostalgic for the past, for a CETA program or a WPA program, but we cannot afford amnesia about our past and the role artists play in communities and percent-for-art projects. The environment that they have created attracts visitors and makes cultural tourism possible.

Mike Stanford, Executive Director, The Print Arts Foundation: Some time ago, I was involved in museums and had run several small nonprofit organizations. Then I “dropped out,” and I have spent the last 10 years as a shipwright. I started working with my hands, building wooden boats.

Becker talked about the importance of teaching creative problem solving in our schools. I would take that a step further. When I became a woodworker and shipwright, I discovered a huge gap in my education, a gap that artists and artisans can help correct. I did not have the ability to solve problems in three dimensions. Three-dimensional problem solving is an important attribute of the human psyche that is totally ignored in our culture. In fact, our culture diminishes anyone who works with his hands. In places like Japan and Germany, craftsmen and artists are revered. We as a society need to start focusing on what artists can bring to our culture. This country suffers a terrible loss when the people who are making the decisions have no idea how to solve problems in three dimensions.

Linda Martin, Tacoma Arts Commission: We keep coming back to the role of the arts and artists in society. I am wondering if the role of artists in society in the past differs from the role artists play today. And what of the artist’s role in the future? What territory will artists explore, and what contribution will they make?

Reasoner: I think it’s dangerous to generalize. I have worked with artists from all over the world, and the way they position themselves depends on the political climate and the social circumstances. Having said that, I do feel that in the increasingly globalized marketplace economy, artists will take on the role of working with information and positioning themselves with that information.

Van Proyen: I think it’s becoming increasingly dangerous not to generalize. We seem to be constantly avoiding fundamental questions, or we address them with equivocation and situational responses. Such responses do not garner the confidence of the public. The answer to this fundamental question about the role of the artist is that the artist’s role is unchanged. Andrews summarized it best: the artist presents a transformative vision to society.

The role of art is to function as a kind of social dreaming. Artists as social dreamers are increasingly having to struggle for a place to dream in society. The entertainment industry is now doing most of our social dreaming for us. The artist presents a very different model of social dreaming than what we have become used to.

Timothy Siciliano, Visual Artist: I would like to respond to Becker’s comments about the percent-for-art program, specifically the complexity of the projects and the lack of training for artists. We artists seem to be thrown into a project and, before we know it, we are the designer, architect, and budget expert. Most of us make it up as we go along.

When I first got on board with percent for art, I was allowed to be part of a developing program. I was given opportunities through individual funding that gave me time to dream and figure out how my art would become public art. Now, however, as I look over applications and notices for percent-for-art projects, I have a sense that the programs have become more constricted. Instead of being told, “We want your dreams,” it’s “We want your product.” Today’s applicants need letters, recommendations, and proof of 30 years of public art. I am sorry that my up-and-coming colleagues will not have the opportunities I had to develop and refine my vision.

Becker: Requiring more professionalism of artists is not all bad. Artists need to become independent producers. They need to think of themselves as business people. They must start thinking more sensibly about how to get from where they are now to where they want to get to. A little strategic planning would go a long way for many artists I know.

[Artists need to become independent producers...They must start thinking more sensibly about how to get from where they are now to where they want to go to. A little strategic planning would go a long way for many artists I know.]

JACK BECKER

I tend to divide artists into general practitioners and specialists, just like in the medical profession. The general practitioner in public art is someone with a good bedside manner, someone who is diplomatic, can articulate ideas, and listen to other people. [I would dare say that's why women have excelled in this field more than men.]

I see more doors opening for artists and more delivery systems being available to artists in the future. It is up to the artists to define what they are doing and with whom they want to communicate.

Michael Jacobson, Northwest Stone Sculptors Association: At the risk of engaging in a bit of nostalgic recall of CETA, I want to share one of the most successful aspects of a program that I worked on. The people who developed our local CETA program added an arts administrator into the mix, so we had one arts administrator for two artists. That may not be the proper ratio of artists to arts administrators, but it worked for us; we certainly kept that arts administrator hopping. We had him putting together budgets, lining up meetings for us, doing public relations, taking photographs, and preparing us to speak before groups. When I think of that project, I realize I would not have been able to do it without the people who had the knowledge and the skills to help the two of us as artists relate to our community. I am not suggesting that CETA should be repeated or even can be repeated, but I think that CETA had its strengths.

Andrews: I love the notion of your own personal arts administrator. I just had this vision of the arts commission employees coming to a staff meeting and finding themselves assigned to work with four artists. The artists say, "Okay, here's what we want to accomplish," and the arts administrators say, "We can do this."

Becker: Many artists lack basic business and marketing skills. Many artists, visual artists in particular, lack representation. For the most part, people who are consultants in the field represent the buyers and not the artists. I think visual artists suffer in comparison with other art forms, especially those on the commercial arts side such as photographers, actors, and performers. We could benefit from more people with decent skills taking on marketing and public relations activities on behalf of talented artists. This would free artists to spend more time creating and working in the studio.

Kris Tucker, Boise City Arts Commission: In Boise, we have a public art program but not percent-for-art activities. We have built partnerships and specific funding mechanisms for each public art project, and this creates political discussion and expectations that aren't there in percent-for-art programs. Privatization of public art is changing the field. At this point, the definition of *public art* seems to be up for grabs.

Becker: I think of public art as art that occurs outside of traditional venues such as museums and galleries and is accessible to the public at no cost. But public art really is a hybrid these days. In general, however, fewer strings are attached when private sources are involved. Usually, the projects can take place more quickly and result in longer lasting partnerships.

Van Proyen: In my experience, private sources want to be involved in the decision-making process despite the fact that they have no experience in selecting any original work of art, let alone art that will be received by the public. Private sources have not given any thought to maintenance or even ownership of the piece. Integration of public art in a private development project leads to ownership issues, copyright issues, and numerous other troublesome issues.

Garcia-Nakata: In addition to these problems inherent in private-public partnerships, artists and nonprofits are often too hungry to create some kind of private-sector relationship and can concede too much to the funder in an effort to gain sponsorship dollars. Anyone managing a project with a private element should be grounded in copyright law and current arts issues. They should also be grounded in what they need and expect from a private sponsor or supporter. I believe in a give-and-take approach with corporations. I once insisted to a private sponsor [a tobacco company] that my organization would not be listed on any education materials. [This funding had been accepted before I had arrived as the Director.] The sponsor was fine with that and even paid for the labels to go over the top of the curriculum handbooks.

Becker: Many groups seeking foundation grants or contributions feel as if they are asking for a favor. What they are asking for, in fact, is a partnership. Foundations are seeking worthy causes to donate money to. Viable applicants for this money are doing foundations a favor by submitting good proposals. Foundations are required by law to give away money; people who need resources to be creative are helping foundations spend that money in an effective way.

Carla Roberts

How Native Communities Integrate Art Into the Social Fabric of Their Communities

I grew up in North Carolina, and I am Eastern Delaware, which means that I am part of the Algonquian language group. On the other side of my family, my ancestors came over from England about 1647, so if I talk about the European oppressors, remember that I am part of that heritage.

Atlatl, the organization I represent, is a national service organization for Native American artists. [I will use *Indian* and *Native American* interchangeably in this presentation; both are equally incorrect.]

Atlatl is not an acronym. It refers to a throwing stick that makes a spear go farther and with greater accuracy. The atlatl is a symbol of our mission as a service organization to assist Native Peoples to produce, present, and interpret indigenous art forms. Atlatl has been in existence for 20 years and currently provides programs in networking, presenting Native arts, and training and leadership development.

I have been considering how to broach this topic of Native communities integrating art into their social fabric. I wondered, should I speak of ceremonial cycles? Would my audience like to hear about Hopi katsina dolls that are given to girls at their birth? Would they like to hear about how katsinas are used to teach about the personas that are embodied by the dancers during the ceremonial cycle? Would they like to hear about how those katsinas are an economic development tool for individuals and produce profits that help to run the tribal museum? Should I talk about basketry and how it is used in puberty rituals and wedding ceremonies? Should I talk about quiltmakers, who have taken what is essentially a European art form and adapted it for use in naming ceremonies, honoring ceremonies for graduation, and other events? Should I talk about economic development in general? Or individuals, families, communities, and the way in which cultural tourism is a very vibrant part of the economy?

[Native communities do not integrate the arts into their social fabric because the arts have never been separated out.]

CARLA ROBERTS

As I pondered these questions, I realized the bottom line of my presentation: Native communities do not integrate the arts into their social fabric because the arts have never been separated out. That fact makes my topic difficult to address. The people who do the work do not always think of themselves as artists and are often surprised when someone comes along and considers them artists. They are simply people doing what they do because ceremonial aspects involve all citizens, who may have other jobs and other activities they pursue.

I believe that Native people truly engage in what I call *artful living*. When I think about art, I think about the fact that art is a gift from the Creator, that the animal kingdom and the insect kingdom made the first art forms. Hornets make nests, birds take twigs and make nests, birds take mud and make little nests. What are these but basketry and pottery, really? The difference is that, as human beings, we took these art forms to another place. But the basic gift came from the Creator.

I find it sad that these basketry and pottery forms, which are probably the very first human endeavors, are now considered crafts. A hierarchy, a totem pole, so to speak, has been created to rank the arts. I have read *Popular Culture and High Culture: An Analysis and Evaluation of Taste* by Herbert Gans, and I am waiting for someone to write a response to his argument because I do not believe that art is a hierarchy. I believe that we are all at the center of our own universe, and we have experiences that enable us to understand the world around us. Our lives are about expanding our circle and intersecting with others' circles. Our lives are not about high and low and up and down but about human experience. I am concerned about what happens when a culture—specifically, this Western European-dominated culture—loses that connection and becomes obsessed by its desire to consume.

You may have heard that we Native peoples have no word for art and, in many ways, that is true. To my knowledge, no representative of any Native language has come forward and said, "We have a word for art, and it is such and such." We do have ways to express what we do, however, and one of my favorites came from Gerri Keams, a Navajo performer who lives in Los Angeles. Gerri says that the word for making theater is most closely related to play. When Gerri goes home, her grandmother always asks, "Are you still playing in LA?"

In 1996, Atlatl held a conference in Tulsa, Oklahoma, around the theme, "We Have No Word For Art." It was an examination of that holistic point of view of the arts and Native culture. I would like to quote Senator Kelly Haney of Oklahoma, who served as the keynote speaker at this conference. He said, "For me, life and art go together, but art is like breathing. I don't have a choice about being an artist. I had a choice about being a politician and a businessman, but I don't have a choice of being an artist because that's what the Creator made me to be." Many Native artists have a similar story to tell; indeed, I feel that all artists have a similar story to tell—they do their art because they have to do it.

I believe that all art from all cultures basically derives from the realm of Spirit and that the arts and the religious communities are inextricably linked, whether we look at the animistic expressions of the cave dwellers of Lascaux, the patronage relationship between Michelangelo and the Vatican, or the controversy surrounding Andres Serrano's *Piss Christ*. The arts and religion are linked because both are for the Spirit.

This linkage may be misconstrued by the non-Native viewer in relation to Native American art. Too often, non-Native society marginalizes Native expression in a stereotypical construct that we at Atlatl call the *beads and feathers syndrome*. Spirituality in Native art, although an important effort and an important element, has been carried to negative extremes. Native art, Native artists, and Native peoples are considered to be spiritual gurus—people who know the way, people who have the answer to life's great question. Believe me, some of us don't even know what the question is.

These public misperceptions have created a mystique about the role of Native art in communities. This mystique evolved from a fascination at the turn of the last century with "traditional art." I say "traditional art" in quotes because bead work, which is considered traditional Native American art, started because beads were brought over to this country. It evolved out of working with seeds, quills, and other materials, but bead work mixed materials indigenous to this continent and materials brought here from other places. Similarly, ribbon work is considered traditional Native American art, but the ribbons were imported after the French Revolution because people in France did not want to wear finery.

You must also keep in mind that most of what is considered Native art was originally produced for internal consumption. And that makes a difference, whether the art is produced for internal consumption or external consumption. When the work is produced for external consumption, it will continue to embody its origins in the spiritual or the religious aspects of the community. But often a schism opens between the intellectual property rights of the individual and the cultural property rights of the community. What is acceptable to an individual artist may not always be acceptable to an extended community. Freedom of expression can become a paradoxical issue in Native communities because the general public always perceives Native artists as representatives of their own Native community and of all other Native communities, whether or not they choose to be.

Atlatl promotes the concept of artists as cultural representatives in our training programs. We teach that cultural integrity is a foundation for marketing. Our artistic philosophy also recognizes the dynamism of contemporary Native cultures. We promote the preservation of tribal arts, and we also encourage the perpetuation of Native cultures. By this, we recognize the importance of maintaining the techniques, skills, and knowledge about the art forms of our ancestors within the context of a living culture that contributes to contemporary artistic expression.

To play with that notion of the complexities of contemporary life in the context of tribal communities, Atlatl embarked upon a project, *Drawing the Lines*, which came to fruition in April of 1997. This project was a collaboration with Arizona State University Public Events, the Salt River Community [on the eastern edge of the Phoenix metro area], the Gila River and Ak-chin Communities [south of the Phoenix metro area], the San Carlos Apache Community [about two hours northeast of Phoenix], and the mixed tribal community of students at Arizona State University in Tempe.

Drawing the Lines placed contemporary artists into those communities for extended residencies. The partnerships included Spiderwoman Theater, three Kuna Rappahannock sisters who have a contemporary theater out of New York City. They worked with individual employees of the tribal museums and the art programs in Gila River and Ak-chin. Buddy Big Mountain, a Mohawk puppeteer, was stationed in Salt River, where he worked with tribal youth counselors. Chesley Wilson, a traditional Apache violin maker, and Brent Michael Davids, a contemporary Mohican composer, taught violin making and composition to a group of prison inmates and other community members. James Luna, a Lusieño performance artist, created an installation on Indian stereotypes for the ASU student gallery.

Initially, the Spiderwoman Theater believed it impossible to take an inexperienced group of people, teach them the elements of theater, and stage a production within three weeks. Spiderwoman Theater had intended that their only performance would be on the stage at ASU's Gammage Auditorium, but before the three weeks had passed, they were looking for a slot for a community performance.

The performance drew upon the life stories of the participants and was based on the dreams, visions, and experiences—both positive and negative—that had made those people the individuals they are today. Spiderwoman employed a story-weaving technique to help the participants develop individual scripts and blend them into a presentation that was called *The Grandmother Stories*. *The Grandmother Stories* presented very powerful depictions of domestic abuse, alcoholism, and issues of self-esteem, and they formed a cohesive body of work that spoke to contemporary reservation life in Gila River and Ak-chin. They also perpetuated the Native tradition of teaching through storytelling.

At Salt River, youth counselors learned to make puppets and developed a traditional tale from their community into a puppet play. The story, acted out with the hand-crafted puppets, explained how the rattlesnake came to be. On the opening night of the performance, the community center was packed with probably 200 people—families and tribal leaders who had turned out to witness the youth counselors' achievement. The elders saw a re-enactment of a story that they knew from their own childhood. The young people saw something that they had never seen before; even those who might have heard the story learned more about their people and their language. The tradition of storytelling has always relied upon the elements of performance and has used what we might call *props*—basketry, dolls, finger puppets—in some cultures. That evening, this tradition of storytelling was extended into a new forum. The performance proved to be an uplifting community event, and the people were very proud of what their youth counselors had accomplished.

At San Carlos, Chesley Wilson taught the people in his community the traditional skill of Apache violin making. The Apache violin is made from an agave cactus, a very big cactus with a large shoot and wooden stem. The Apache violin is a little instrument, with three or four strings, and is used for traditional songs. Chesley taught traditional songs, and Brent Michael Davids introduced the participants to classical composition. About 10 people from the community gave a performance on their violins on the stage of Gammage Auditorium.

James Luna used the surrounding communities as a resource for his installation. He sent students around metropolitan Phoenix to collect objects for the installation objects that they considered objectionable—stereotypical images of Indian people and trinkets that were being sold as souvenirs. The students' journey around the community was chronicled in a short video that became part of the installation. In bringing these stereotypical images together and confronting the community with them, Luna and the students challenged the consumption of these derogatory images.

These projects gave both Native and non-Native communities new food for thought about what constitutes Native art. Atlatl has the highest regard for the preservation of Native art forms that draw upon the social and historical traditions of a community. We also recognize that art is part of a dynamic community and that Native communities are no different in their capacity to utilize the arts to communicate where we have been, where we are now, and where we are going.

Discussion

Van Proyen: This presentation recalled to me the question of whether culture breeds society or society breeds culture. In the summer of 1997, I finally made my first trip to Europe. Apart from being dazzled by the museums and monuments, what struck me was the very different experience to be had in Europe.

In Europe, the assumption is that society is created by culture. In the United States, even as far back as the Constitution, the assertion, if not the reality, has been that culture is created by society. I think Europeans and people from other parts of the world come to this country because they are fascinated by the possibility that a culture created by society can exist. And that may explain why the great majority of people outside of the United States find us interesting and odd. Conversely, many Americans visit other countries and Native American communities in this country in order to see a society created by culture because we miss that in our world.

Roberts used the word *ceremony* five or six times in her remarks. Ceremony needs to be talked about more in relationship to arts and arts programs. I feel the lack of ceremony that surrounds the presentation of art is a profound disservice. Without ceremony, art just becomes more architecture.

Garcia-Nakata: One of the issues we're grappling with, as artists and as humans, is this question of our relationship to the natural world. We discuss being ethnocentric and economically centric, but we rarely explore the notion of how human centric we are. Our relationship to the natural world is not even a consideration for many of us. We understand science, yet we do not comprehend the life energy that runs through us as human organisms—and objects of the natural world science refers to as *inanimate*.

Indigenous peoples, on the other hand, have a connection with life and life sources that is very strong. American culture is unaware of or has forgotten that connection, but I hope that we still can obtain and/or retain some collective memory that we have the potential to access. The country needs it in order to fully engage all the resources available to us.

Brooks: The aspect of Roberts' presentation that resonated for me was her beautiful description of how Native cultures honor the spiritual and the ritualistic and their lack of separation between the artistic and the religious. During my academic career on the art faculties of universities, I had the opportunity to observe first-hand how little our Western society is able to integrate the artistic and the religious. As a silversmith teacher, I had Jewish students who wanted to make Judaica as part of the process of learning silversmithing. In the atmosphere of the art department, little encouragement was given for making work that was ecclesiastical or work that had to do with very old cultural traditions because such work didn't have anything to do with "art."

LaDuke: One notion that keeps coming up is a need for plurality in the way we look at art. When I studied at the Music and Art High School in New York City and my early college years, the definition of *art* was very Eurocentric, very Western, and nothing else. If you did not follow that vision as an artist or in your appreciation of art, you were out. What I would like to see in this country is an exploration and celebration of the diversity of who we are as Americans right now. I would like to make the diverse experiences of our population accessible to local communities, regardless of their ethnic or socio-economic character, so that we have a better sense of who we all are and what we may become in the future.

Lance Izumi

The Political Right's Position on Public Support for the Arts

I am not here to play devil's advocate or take an adversarial role. I am here to communicate to you what the political right thinks about the arts in general and individual artists in particular.

Unfortunately, people on both sides of the political fence tend to stereotype each other. Many on the left view conservatives as Jesse Helms types who want to put all artists on some train to never-never land. On the other side, some on the right may look at artists and say, "These people are not adding anything to society; they are promoting filth."

If we are going to discuss this subject and reach some fruitful outcome, we need to get beyond these stereotypes and begin to understand the other person's point of view. My participation in this symposium has helped break down stereotypes I initially had as a conservative public policy analyst. After listening to other presenters, I have a better perception of the views held by artists and arts administrators. Now I would like to help you break down old stereotypes by offering some reasons why people on the right feel the way they do about the arts.

The right's position on art and individual artists falls into two main categories. First, the right has an economic position, based on free-market theory, that is focused on funding—where it should come from and where it should go. The second view is more concerned with aesthetics and artistic judgment and how they are influenced by bureaucracy and ideology. The people who adhere to the right's positions are a large segment of society, and you are not going to swing them over to your side by demonizing them. As advocates for the arts, you would like more funding. If you want to achieve this goal, you have to address the right's concerns and try to forge some middle ground where both sides can come together.

The right's economic position is based on the view that government's role in society should be limited. At this symposium, there has been much talk of funding for the arts, but no distinction has been made between private and public funds. The right, on the other hand, draws a clear line between private and public funding. Even the most outrageous art probably would not draw much of a squawk from conservatives if it was purely privately funded. It is only when government funding is involved that the right begins to take an interest.

Some of you may feel uncomfortable that Senator Helms or other Congressional hard-liners are even involved in debates about art. The irony is that government funding has given them an avenue to get involved. Government funding of the arts is one item in the yearly federal budget discussion. Individual members of Congress discuss it and vote on it, and individual members may turn government funding of the arts into a political issue or use it as a platform to demonize not just arts funding but the arts in general. In a certain sense, public funding works against the arts. Government funding opens the door to all kinds of judgments about art that may not necessarily have to do with artistic merit.

The right's economic position is well delineated in various scholarly works and academic journals. A very good study was published by London's Institute of Economic Affairs, one of Margaret Thatcher's favorite institutions. *Should the Taxpayer Support the Arts?* by David Sawers is a British study, but its economic arguments nicely sum up why the right in this country is skeptical about government funding for the arts.

Sawers begins by discussing some of the arguments made for government support of the arts. One popular view holds that the arts cannot survive in the private market, that government funding is necessary to help the arts survive. Sawers counters with the same argument made by the right in the United States—that the arts were surviving quite well [or at least had survived] up until the 1950s and 1960s, when government funding first came into vogue. He points out that in Britain, the arts did not enjoy much patronage from royalty or the church

[...I find it odd that you articulate your positions using all the wrong language... Anyone attempting to influence opinion or reach a large audience has to be aware of nuances and be sensitive to diverse groups.]

LANCE IZUMI

[in contrast with continental Europe, which had a tradition of royal and religious patronage of the arts]. The Church of England was not a big patron of the arts in general and visual arts in particular, in part because the Reformation had fostered a view of the visual arts as a Roman Catholic institution. Despite lack of support from British institutions, however, artistic life in England flourished through the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries, mainly as a result of the increased wealth within the country. As individual wealth grew, so did the demand for art.

And yet, as Sawers writes:

The Arts Council [the British counterpart of the NEA] asks us to believe that the market based artistic system, which flourished for centuries and which produced the British cultural heritage. . . in periods when incomes were far smaller than they are today, cannot now function, that the arts cannot now survive without government subsidies. This claim is implausible. Subsidies may change the nature of the arts which get produced. . . because subsidized producers need not worry about the audience and can charge less. . . .

According to Sawers, this reduced dependence on the audience may well have made the arts more elitist. He notes that "artists now have a far larger market for their creations than they did a century or two ago—even if the subsidized sector is excluded—because of the growth of new media and new wealth." For this reason, Sawers believes that the arts should not be subsidized at a national level by government.

Sawers acknowledges there are those who advocate government funding of the arts on the basis that art is a merit good. Economists define a merit good as something of value in and of itself, regardless of whether a consumer wants it or not. What troubles Sawers is who decides that art is a merit good. If it is the government, then government is taking a paternalistic role, implying it knows more about the arts than the rest of society.

Sawers does support some funding for the arts but only at a local level. Interestingly, conservatives like Sawers support local arts funding if it improves the community's economy. A better economic argument can be made if people or businesses are taxed to promote local museums, individual artists, and festivals. They help promote a kind of cultural tourism that can stimulate the local economy. But Sawers believes that national taxation to support national goals provides fewer real benefits for real people. In his view, national taxation and national subsidies to support the arts are regressive; in a general sense, such taxes benefit the wealthy because they tend to consume more art.

Another area where Sawers supports government funding is art education. He considers art education an investment that produces a positive external benefit for society at large. I cite here an article by Samuel Lipman, a conservative writer for *Commentary* magazine and a pianist and music critic as well. Lipman argues that if we do not like the tastes of private patrons, the answer is not to get the government to take the place of the private patrons. That only substitutes one patron with bad taste for another. Instead, he suggests the answer lies in educating people about the arts. My area of expertise is kindergarten through grade 12 education reform, and I believe we should have a greater art education component in schools. Art education can help create better markets, better patrons, and better consumers for the arts. In the long term, this approach is more sensible and far reaching than the government stepping in and trying to play the role of art patron and arbiter.

The final argument that Sawers addresses is whether subsidies are needed to foster innovation in art. In her remarks, Wendy Cerccherelli mentioned that Seattle has 25,000 artists earning below \$15,000 a year. The implication seemed to be that these artists are not going to be able to earn a living doing their art, and this stifles their innovation. Sawers argues that subsidies may be superficially appealing, but they do not promote innovation. If government hands out subsidies on a large scale, government again takes on the role of deciding what art is worth subsidizing. Under subsidies, artistic innovation might be replaced by art with a bureaucratic stamp of approval.

The political right's economic arguments about government support of the arts can be discussed somewhat dispassionately. A far more inflammatory issue is the right's involvement in aesthetics and artistic judgment. Before delving into this issue, however, I would like to say something about rhetoric and the importance of language.

As a former political speechwriter, I understand the importance of language and tailoring your message to different audiences. You cannot deliver the same message in the same way to everybody; if you do, the people who don't like the message may turn you off. A transcript of this symposium, for example, is not likely to change the mind of a rabid conservative about government subsidizing the arts. The buzzwords are simply all wrong. All of you are involved in the arts, and the arts is a communicative field. You try to communicate some kind of idea to the audience, to the listener; you try to persuade them to your point of view. So I find it odd that you articulate your positions using all the wrong language. Maybe if you were engaged in conversation about arts funding with a member of the Christian Coalition, you might try and tailor your arguments to your audience. But it is interesting for me to see how often people do not change their rhetoric, regardless of the listener.

Different language carries different shades of meaning. Anyone attempting to influence opinion or reach a large audience has to be aware of nuances and be sensitive to diverse groups. The political right is part of that diverse population we call *America*. If you want to reach the right, you must be sensitive to the matters they consider important, such as religion. Earlier in this symposium, Jan Brooks shared an anecdote about her silversmith students who wanted to create items of Judaica, work that the school's faculty was less than happy about. Here, the comment slipped right by; no one appeared to think twice about it. But the political right might focus on this example and say, "You see? They hate religion."

The right's position on culture is best presented not by the Christian Coalition newsletter but by the journals of the academic right. Their main organ is *The New Criterion*, edited by Hilton Kramer, a former art critic of *The New York Times*. Whatever you think of Kramer and the people who write for him, they are not from some rural backwater. Their views represent the political right and filter down through elite organs like *The New Criterion* to the grassroots level.

In the September, 1993, issue of *The New Criterion*, Hilton Kramer gave his opinion of the arts bureaucracy, a view shared by many on the academic right:

In more and more of the art world's activities, the center of intellectual gravity has already shifted from decisions made by artists in their studios to decisions made by committees of non-artists that take a purely instrumentalist view of art. An immense superstructure of art advisers, art consultants, art lobbyists, art activists, and other non-artist art professionals working in close conjunction with a vast network of arts councils, offices of cultural affairs, public art projects, minority and "community" arts groups, and other special-interest cultural organizations, both in and out of government, now exerts an enormous influence in determining public policy as well as private patronage in the art world. The most significant thing about this bureaucratic leviathan is that it is completely captive to the political left. Its principal purpose today is to advance the radical left's agenda for the cultural revolution that has already completed its "long march" through the universities and is currently in the process of annexing many other institutions of cultural life—the art museums, for example, where the revolution has made enormous in-roads in programs and acquisitions, and in the policies of foundations, corporations, and agencies of government that support museums.

[*If you intend to change people's minds about individual artists and make a case for government arts funding, you must rid yourselves of this elitist, closed-to-the-mainstream image...You must begin to include in your activities people other than those who are already a part of the art world.*]

LANCE IZUMI

This is a rather all-encompassing statement, and no doubt most of you disagree with part or all of it. But if the right truly believes that grants are filtered from the government to individual artists through this type of bureaucracy, then how likely is it that the right will support government grants to artists? The people who decide where grant money will go and choose which artists will receive grants are the very people the right does not like.

If you intend to change people's minds about individual artists and make a case for government arts funding, you must rid yourselves of this elitist, closed-to-the-mainstream image. You must change your tactics and your language. You must begin to include in your activities people other than those who are already a part of the art world.

I love to talk to the local Republican Woman's Club. Why? Because they all agree with me. Nothing is easier than to meet with a group that already shares your beliefs. The larger challenge is to sit down with people who disagree with you and try not to convert them but to at least get them to say, "Okay, I will consider your point of view." This is a challenge you have not yet met. Through the conservative economic institute where I work, I am in touch with a number of socially conservative groups. I can safely say that these groups have little contact with most of you. But who do you think is influencing the legislature and the governor's office? Who has their ear? Is it you? Or is it the social conservatives, who have troops in the field and have proven their strength in elections over the last few years?

My recommendation is that you try to reach out to people on the political right and achieve some kind of détente. Perhaps you may arrive at a point where both sides can discuss the issues in a meaningful way, rather than ending up as stereotypes in each other's newsletters.

Discussion

Brooks: I want to respond because Izumi cited my example of students who wanted to make Judaica in my silversmithing classes. I would like to begin where he left off—by talking about rhetoric.

Izumi identified some people on the right, but no identification was made of the individuals on the so-called left. I think if we went around the room and asked, “Who do you think embodies the artistic identity that represents the so-called art world?” we would come up with the same handful of artists. But those of us who have worked in rural communities and as a part of a lineage of cultural traditions have gotten trapped in this very polemical dialogue. We are not even represented in this discussion.

I was interested to hear Izumi raise the point about language being exclusionary. I brought up the Judaica issue because I wanted to point out the academy’s responsibility for some of the identity issues surrounding art. If I were to ask artists whether or not they had ever made a piece that had to do with a religious belief, I think most artists would say, “you bet.” Yet, this spiritual component of art has not been expressed in the public sphere, and that leaves the right able to say, “The left is a bunch of atheists.”

Van Proyen: I have looked into the right’s view on arts policy, and I see a schism in right-wing thinking about the arts, a schism that, as budding middle-aged rhetoricians, we should start trying to actively exploit. The schism is this: Economic conservatives essentially are working with a Jeffersonian model of social organization that holds that the concept of official culture is fundamentally at odds with the construction of American democracy. If you have any government support for the arts, it becomes, in effect, an official culture. That is why even though there is public support for the arts, its status as official culture is not confirmed or even not apparent.

At odds with the economically conservative view is what we might call the religious conservative view. The goal of religious conservatives is not to argue with official culture per se but simply to control official culture so that official culture will at one level include their viewpoints. These are the people behind the agenda that American democracy is, in fact, an illusion, and what we really have is a Judeo-Christian culture that should be publicly supported as a Judeo-Christian culture. We in the arts community should call attention to the disparity in the right’s views. We need to speak up about how at odds these factions are with each other and how the so-called coalition of the right has fundamentally divided on this issue.

Izumi: Van Proyen has made a very accurate observation about the division between the social [or as he termed them, *religious*] conservatives on the one hand and the economic conservatives on the other. Although they often give lip service to low taxes and less government, when it comes right down to it, the social conservatives are not squeamish about using the levers of government to suit their purposes. I oppose that because I adhere more to the Jeffersonian model.

I think it is an open secret that the social conservatives are split. Look at the person in charge of the Christian Coalition right now. Don Hodel, former Secretary of Agriculture for Ronald Reagan, led the Sagebrush Rebellion in the Reagan administration. He is considered a free-market conservative. One faction of the social conservatives are more allied with market conservatives, and another, smaller group is aligned with those who support government power.

Lazar: The Museum of Contemporary Art in Los Angeles recently presented an exhibition by Robert Gober. Although we received a grant for the exhibition, Gober refused the money and returned it to the NEA because he knew the exhibition would be controversial. The installation’s central component was a life-size concrete

sculpture of the Virgin Mary, with a bronze culvert pipe passing horizontally through her womb. The sculpture straddled an oversized urban sewer grate. If you looked through the culvert pipe, you would see behind the sculpture a flood of water continuously rushing down a staircase, across the floor, and into another bronze grate. To the right and left were two suitcases open on the floor, with grates built into the bottom of them. Built beneath the museum's floor and visible through the grates were bright and beautiful tide pools with different elements, including rocks, sea creatures, coins, and rather enigmatic legs of a man and a diapered baby.

The piece was favorably reviewed in New York, where next to no one had seen the work in its actual form. A large image of Mary was depicted. We have never received more hate mail from the religious right. People were outraged because they thought Mary had been defaced. The museum administration met with a group of 500 protesters, including politicians, none of whom had seen the actual art work. They had seen the photo in *The New York Times*, and a drawing by someone other than the artist that had been faxed around. For me, the protest was problematic because it appeared to be less about spiritual or religious matters and more about politics. Some of the people in the audience seemed to be manipulated by the leaders. The protesters were sincere, but what they were saying was completely different from what their leaders were saying. I felt strongly that MOCA should have reached out to these people and provided another viewpoint to counteract the one presented by the media and politicians. In our responses to each of the letters we received, we could have included membership brochures. For the first time, the museum had registered with people who had never given MOCA a thought.

I agree that the way we speak to one another about our issues and concerns has to change. For me, one of the key observations made by Izumi is that the people who are making the decisions about where grants go and what artists are supported are the very people the right does not like. We in the arts must learn more about different views and be communicative about the arts, not just defensive. Otherwise, we will only confirm what the right already thinks of us.

Izumi: Robert Gober's piece at MOCA calls to mind a work by Chris O'Feely that was exhibited at the Royal Academy's "Sensations" art show in London. The piece—an image of the Virgin Mary surrounded by pornographic pictures of genitalia—created a huge uproar.

I have no idea what percentage of art is controversial in this way. Maybe it is a very small minority; maybe it is a majority. But it is these controversial works that make headlines. Most people do not go to art museums, but they do read the paper. The royal mess in London became an editorial in the *Wall Street Journal* and made a huge statement to people who never go to art exhibitions.

There may be hundreds of works involving a legitimate spirituality that someone with a pro-family point of view can support wholeheartedly. But you who are involved in the arts are not making the case for these hundreds of works.

Van Proyen: You make a good point. One of the findings from my research on the controversy around the National Endowment for the Arts was that of the 106,000 grants the NEA awarded over a 31-year period, only 48 were deemed controversial. Why was that piece of information not circulated in the summer of 1995?

Reasoner: How can we get that message out? Instead, I see misinformation being publicized. I see elements on the right cynically manipulating us because they see the arts as underfinanced and easy to demonize. I believe people are honestly interested in the facts, but, too often, their emotions are being manipulated by groups that are much better financed than we are.

Garcia-Nakata: I have lived in eastern Washington for nine years with people who are staunch Republicans or discount government altogether and hold very conservative views on the surface. Once exploring our ideology further, we found common ground in relation to the land and on issues of identity. Over all, I found that the bridge separating us was, in fact, very short. Often, I find the rhetoric of the right to be just that—rhetoric, especially as it relates to pandering to the people of America [working people] yet at the same time discounting those of no significant wealth.

Lance, you did mention something that intrigued me. You said you had shifted your position slightly because of some comments made during this symposium. I would be curious to hear what those comments were.

Izumi: I was favorably impressed by developments such as the private partnerships that have been going on at the local level, which indicate that the arts are not relying as much on money from central sources at the state or national level. To me, this kind of private funding is worthwhile and something I applaud. The political right finds it much easier to back government that is close to the people and reflects what local people want to do than to support decisions coming from a remote bureaucracy.

Lorraine Garcia-Nakata

A New Approach to Developing an Arts Education Curriculum

I wear many hats, but, fundamentally, I am an artist. I have been an artist in philanthropy, an artist as cultural worker, an artist working in program development for nonprofit organizations, and an artist creating educational programs. In discussions of the arts-education field, as in discussions of the arts in general, the artist is often overlooked. Even in foundations where I served as the arts and humanities program officer, I was always amazed that people would forget to include this perspective when the discussions focused on education.

In the arts, as in other fields, false dichotomies are erected all the time: the political right versus the left, high art versus low art. When I became the Director of Education at Yerba Buena Gardens in San Francisco, I was approached by various camps in the arts-education arena. While these colleagues were often good friends of mine, they were divided into camps just the same. Because Center for the Arts was a new institution, just determining its direction, everyone wanted to be associated with this organization. Instead, I said, "Tell me what you're doing conceptually. What are you working on?" In their responses, I kept listening for the role artists would play, how instructors were going to be more effectively engaged in the curriculum planning, and other important aspects of this work. What I heard was more of the same.

[One way to broaden our language and our perspective is to learn about other fields and their terminology so we can open avenues for an exchange of ideas....As you explore the progressive thinking in these areas, many links and parallels can be made to the creative practice.]

LORRAINE GARCIA-NAKATA

Within the arts and arts education, we have adhered to a narrow band in our language and our perspective. One way to broaden our language and our perspective is to learn about other fields and their terminology so we can open avenues for an exchange of ideas. I do a great deal of reading across subjects areas, such as science and progressive theology, etc. As you explore the progressive thinking in these areas, many links and parallels can be made to the creative practice. When I was reading, for instance, about black holes, I came across the concept of the event horizon. The event horizon is the place where you are neither in or outside the black hole, rather held somewhere inbetween. It has been described as the kind of environment where there is room for life to begin. It's the place where all life begins. When I stumbled on the concept of event horizon, it sounded much like the creative process. Artists, arts educators, and all sorts of people would benefit from encounters outside their own arenas, especially within the progressive area of thought. A familiarity with other fields is like being able to speak another language.

Returning to the discussion of artists and their role in education, artists are not the only group that is overlooked. We often overlook our elders and our young people. This failure to access the resources of the old and young, especially the young, is often manifest in arts education. In building a curriculum for arts education, no one asks the young people, "How do you view the world? What are your issues? What is your experience?" It is inherently difficult to create a viable educational environment without any grounding in the lives of those you are attempting to engage in learning.

What is even more difficult to fathom is that no one asks the teachers these questions. On a daily basis, teachers are disseminating information to their students and receiving feedback. They know the students and their needs better than anyone. I sit down with teachers and say, "I know your fifth-grade curriculum. What I want to find out are the kind of issues your students are experiencing in this particular year. What concerns are important to you as an instructor? Having been a teacher now for 25 years, what would you like to see in this curriculum?"

At first, teachers can't imagine they might contribute anything. Even in the profession of teaching, I am astounded by the lack of self-worth among the teachers. Once we engage them as peers, however, they quickly overcome their feelings of inadequacy and are ready to share wonderful ideas, keen observations, and cogent suggestions.

The people researching arts education and writing the curriculum produce books that claim to "know" art, yet many have never talked to an artist or may not know the creative process. These arts educators write the curriculum, send it to the schools, and then wonder why it's not used. They never take the trouble to engage artists, teachers, or the young people who are the intended recipients of their texts.

Arts education ought to be a collaborative process. To be direct, most people do not want to get that close to the messy work of collaboration. My frustration in my work has been that I have not had many viable examples to learn from. I don't use the word *model* because a model implies a template that can be placed anywhere and will operate successfully. The homework comes in actually spending the time to find out what the context is in every school and each classroom. You may sit down with the same teacher year after year, asking the same questions, and every year receive a different and important response because communities change.

Without viable examples in this field, I explore different options and approaches. At Center for the Arts, we were administering eight school programs, and I asked my staff over the course of two years to keep their antennae up in order to recommend two schools with whom we would propose a three-year partnership. The criteria for selecting the schools had nothing to do with financial needs. The schools had to have the capacity to operate as a working organism, to be able to engage at a meaningful level. We looked for a principal who had a good relationship with the teachers and whether the staff worked as a team. As it turned out, the two schools identified by my staff also filled the need criterion which I had hoped for. Over all, the in-depth program provided the opportunity to work with cultures that normally would not receive significant arts programming. Most important, the students and teachers saw themselves reflected in the written curriculum and on-site artist-led programming.

The collaborative process for these two schools began with that often-overlooked figure: the artist. Even before meeting with the teachers, I met with the artists involved. The programming we developed included all the usual elements—curriculum writing, pre-workshops, and follow-up workshops to the main demonstration. What was different about this project was that in the case of both the local choreographer, Robert Henry Johnson, and Urban Bush Women out of New York, I made a commitment to work with the artists for a year. I invested funds for the creation of student and instructor curriculum work books. Each student was provided with his or her own off-set printed workbook to use and keep.

Here is how the process of building a collaborative arts curriculum worked with Robert Henry Johnson. I sat down with him and spent an afternoon discussing the project and his work. I said, "Robert, I've seen your work, and the concepts you deal with are incredibly intriguing to me. Tell me about the new pieces you are working on at this point in your career. What are some of your ideas?" And he described two or three pieces he was creating. Now, Robert is interesting because he likes to literally write a story first. He actually writes a story in text before he begins to choreograph. He came up with particular pieces relating to the experiences of fifth-grade young people—in particular, males of color—during the prepubescent period. I contracted Robert to develop the idea and bring in his company to tell the story through dance. His artistic piece would be developed as a central element linked to a fifth-grade curriculum and issues the teachers were yet to identify.

My next task was to develop the curriculum with the teachers. After pulling from Robert all the ideas around the story, I met with the teachers and told them, "These are the artist's ideas underpinning the story and a performance he will create specifically for this project. How do these ideas overlap or engage with yours?" From Robert's ideas and the teachers' input, I developed a menu of points that were addressed in the work itself, the curriculum handbook, the exercises, and all of the follow-up.

On a side note, arts education and the education field in general have a limited notion of gifted and talented—some students are, some are not. This is a false dichotomy. Also, in the arts, we ourselves have perpetuated the idea of artists as specialists in touch with their particular inclination or gift. But, really, all of us have the responsibility to discover our inclination or gift or individual affinity. Unfortunately, schools never address these concepts in any formal or meaningful way. I am finding it is one of the most important concepts to communicate to students at the very earliest age possible.

Back to the collaboration, in the curriculum handbooks developed for the arts programming, we introduced the concepts of individual affinity and individual gifts to young people. We explained how our gifts help make us distinct. Some of us are good at one thing, some are good at another. Some of us are good at several things, which can make it difficult to follow the one road that is your particular heart's desire. You may be a great accountant, a great administrator, a great singer; however, your heart's desire may be to sing. In our contemporary society, we gear ourselves toward the job market; you may pick a career that has "better job potential." The curriculum handbook featured exercises designed to familiarize young people with the concept of their affinity and to encourage and guide them on how to discover that affinity for themselves.

Our programming included improvisational workshops, writing workshops, drawing projects, and pieces where students talked about who they were. Underlying all these activities was the idea of individual affinity. Even if the young people gained nothing else from this project, they would come away with a knowledge and belief in their own gifts.

Because Robert Henry Johnson and his company were going to perform a new work commissioned just for these two schools, we wrote a special piece to introduce the artists to the students. This introduction says, "Mr. Robert Henry Johnson is preparing his dance for you right now. He is looking forward to being at your school. He is older than you, but he remembers what it was like to see the world through younger eyes. He is also someone who is going toward his individual affinity. He had choices to make that were not always easy, and other people around him did not always support him, yet his love of dance provided the steps he needed to continue to grow. It is for all these reasons that his work is very strong and that we want him to visit with you at your school. He created the story of *Skinny* [the name of the skinny young man in the piece] and the dance you will see because he wanted to encourage you to know and follow what you really want to do in your life."

These are concepts not often found in curriculum handbooks. But as an artist and as an educator, I felt it was important to begin introducing these concepts. How different our world could be if teacher training included these ideas and teachers actively encouraged their students to discover their gifts.

Our experience with these two schools showed us that young people were not the only beneficiaries of learning about natural affinities. The teachers themselves became more aware of their own inclinations. After being together 10 or 20 years, teachers started to know one another on a new level. As they grew in their working relationships, the teachers operated with each other in a different way. For example, they came to know that one teacher had an affinity for dance and another an affinity toward psychology. The teachers were then able to incorporate these interests and skills in various projects with which they became involved. The result was more than improved teamwork. When you are moving toward what you are supposed to do in this life, a different life force runs through you. You become more observant, attentive, and clearer. You become a better teacher.

Obviously, the approach we took to developing an arts-education curriculum requires more time and is more labor intensive than creating kindergarten through grade 12 programs that deal with what style or how influential a piece of art is. Our process brought artists and teachers and students together to help shape ideas. We even solicited the kids' response to the programming after the fact and used their input to form the next curriculum. If you give attention to this input, you inherently create a very different approach, and your resulting curriculum will have more life and more resonance, not only with the young people but with the teachers as well. Our approach was risky, perhaps, but I know of no other way than to go in the direction that makes the most sense.

I will leave you with a thought that inspires me during difficult personal moments or times of uncertainty about the next step to take. Someone once told me that all our particular experiences and knowledge we have experienced to date will provide us with the information we need to know what to do in the present moment. If we stop for a moment to call this information forward, the answer will reveal itself. It is another way of operation that we are relearning. Thank you.

Discussion

Andrews: Listening to Garcia-Nakata's remarks about arts education, I find myself musing that this ought to be the one area on which both the right and the left agree. When I was with the NEA, Samuel Lipman, a conservative writer and critic, always articulated strongly the need for a classics-based arts education, even as he expressed considerable dismay about the state of contemporary art. My point, however, is that we may disagree about the substance of what should be taught in arts education, but in theory, the right and left concur that arts education should be taught. So I marvel that arts education has been systematically removed from our school system, and I cannot figure out who has done this. Why are there no classes of arts education, arts appreciation, or arts anything in schools across this whole country? It's a profound mystery and one of the great tragedies of our education system.

Van Proyen: If you look at the history of the right's political mobilization going back to the late 1970s, the first move that the right made was to place their representatives on school boards and then on state-level educational policy programs. But the right isn't in quite such agreement about the need for arts education as someone like Samuel Lipman might indicate.

Garcia-Nakata: It's not even as simple as the right coming in and removing arts education. The whole Republican movement aside, I think that, in general, most people do not understand the need to have the artist centrally located in the arts-education discourse. That has been the biggest frustration I have faced within my own arts-education community. Certainly, the monolith of the right has exercised some power, but I think that the elements of control and lack of knowledge about the artist practice are shared by both ends of the political spectrum.

Brooks: The observation Andrews made about the school boards being self-selected and having a particular agenda is true. Their participation in these arenas has had a direct effect on arts education. Another factor we should consider is that everyone feels entitled to make a judgment about the arts. In Izumi's presentation, he talked about different factions' economic theories regarding government funding of the arts. But would so many factions weigh in with opinions about what the government should fund in the sciences? The average American doesn't announce, "We shouldn't fund nuclear research." The average American doesn't feel she/he has a right to an opinion about a field in which she/he has no expertise. So why aren't the arts considered a field with a certain level of professional competence? Artists and others of us who work in the arts are treated as though we are not professionals, we are not participating in an occupation worthy of serious respect.

Garcia-Nakata: As a profession, teaching seems to be treated with a similar lack of knowledge and respect. Recently, I tried something I hadn't seen done before. I asked that the principal write a short description of the school and also asked the teachers to write a biographical note about their backgrounds and why they had chosen to become teachers. This information was included in the introductory section of the curriculum handbooks we produced. That simple gesture didn't cost a dime, but it said to them, you are professionals in a field, you are honored and respected. It set a new tone of professionalism within the school. Teachers were given extra copies of the curriculum book specifically for inclusion in their portfolios. For the first time, it occurred to them that they should even care about a portfolio. These gestures, while they might seem subtle or minor, created major repercussions that reverberated throughout the entire project.

Kathryn Reasoner

The Impact of Artist Residency Programs

I am a third-generation Californian and come from a long line of missionaries, teachers, and advocates. It was impressed upon me as a child that everyone in my family on both sides had contributed community service for generations. In my family, becoming an artist and going off to do your own thing was a rather radical act of rebellion. The longer I have been away from art school, however, the more I find myself circling back to my roots. Most of my career as an arts administrator has been spent trying to close the gap between artists and the general public. You may ask, then, why I am working as the director of a remote center, which supports very few individuals in the pursuit of their vision and which is located in a national park visited by very few members of the public. It is a question I have asked myself more than once and seriously pondered before accepting my position at Headlands Center for the Arts.

When I took this job, I did not know much about artist residencies. I did know that when I came to this site and to this organization, something going on there excited me, something that I needed. It was the same thing that led me into the arts in the first place. I think it is a feeling to which everyone in this room can relate. I felt something touch my soul and my spirit and nourish me. It was as basic as food; without it, I would die. We do not come across this nourishment enough in American life, in the spiritual realm or the aesthetic realm.

The stereotype of the artist residency community is the arts colony established when a rich lady leaves her mansion as a residence for artists and everyone hangs out, writing little books and drinking tea. I am still fairly new to this field, but what I am finding is that there are as many types of artist communities as there are idiosyncratic people who started them. The United States has some 125 communities identified as artist residency programs. Perhaps 70 of these are included in a directory published by the Alliance of Artists Communities, an organization of 30 artist residency groups. Artist residency communities are a diverse lot, composed mainly of small entities.

A look at the bottom line indicates that artist communities appear to be the least efficient, least economically viable, and least sane of any organization. Terrific amounts of resources are used to support a very few people. Artist residency programs spend money but rarely have any money-making mechanisms. Most communities with which I am familiar have a small percentage of revenue-earned income and depend heavily on contributions. A recent New York State Foundation for the Arts survey found that 75% of artist communities surveyed had budgets under half a million dollars. A total of perhaps five organizations in the entire field has any significant budget or staff infrastructure.

Yet, more new artist residency communities are starting up abroad and in the United States every day. I recently joined an organization called *Res Artis*, a new international association of artist residency communities that is run by a loose conglomeration of people from different countries. A conference I attended last year drew representatives from 65 nations and nearly 100 residential centers. People from Bulgaria, Latvia, and Africa were all discussing their centers or new residency programs they were creating. A similar trend is taking hold in this country. Since Headlands was established, seven artist residency programs have begun in the national parks alone.

The only reason I can see for this development is that these programs are needed. Artist residency communities offer a place to be with people who support and believe in ideas and pursuits that can't be measured by the measures our society typically applies to endeavors. At Headlands, we have had artists and scholars from the humanities and occasionally people from the environmental field.

Headlands happens to provide stipends along with the studios and housing and meals, but the creation of a special community is the most powerful benefit that artists receive from their residencies. Our artists tell us that what changes their lives and has a transformative impact on their work is the fellowship, the challenge, and the excitement of being with other people engaged in a search that's similar to but different from their own. Something happens in our community every day; it may be very small, and I don't know if it will change the world. I do know that it has changed people's lives and that it has affected mine.

[Our artists tell us that what changes their lives and has transformative impact on their work is the fellowship, the challenge, and the excitement of being with other people engaged in a search that's similar to but different from their own.]

KATHRYN REASONER

In November, 1997, the Alliance of Artists Communities held a conference at Brown University entitled "American Creativity at Risk." This conference was not about the arts but about creativity. We considered the question of why the world for many decades now has looked to the United States for innovation in science, computers, and education. What constitutes the advantage the U.S. has enjoyed? And is that special attribute in danger?

Conference panels included scientists, artists, humanists, and thinkers offering a wide spectrum of views. Everyone agreed, however, on the conditions necessary for creative work, breakthroughs, and innovation. The first ingredients are time and support. Every scientist who has made a discovery, every artist who has scored a breakthrough, knows the importance of allowing time to noodle around. You must have enough support and the right conditions to explore without worrying about the phone ringing, the dog whining to be fed, or the bills needing to be paid. This kind of support is something we understand in artist communities, and we do it very, very well. It can be difficult, however, to convince a very materialistic American society of the importance of open-ended inquiry and the value in giving people a space where there are no products required and nothing is predetermined, a place where people are free to play.

At Headlands, we believe it is equally important to create a dialogue and discourse with other artists and individuals in other fields because no one truly creates in a vacuum. The best creative ideas tend to be those that have been tested against other people. At the conference on creativity, everyone agreed on the importance of dialogue, especially across disciplines. The academy was criticized by many attendees precisely because academic disciplines become so segmented and isolated, whether it's the arts department or the science department. The people at Interval Research from Silicon Valley explained that they cannot do their research as well at Stanford, for example, because university systems don't encourage someone in biology wandering over to talk to somebody in the engineering or the art department.

The exhaustive exit interviews and tapes from residents of our program indicate that they consider cross-cultural exchange critical to their development. Living and working and eating with people who may not speak your language, who may come from parts of the world unknown to you, expand your worldview. Getting to know people under circumstances where you are more or less thrust together tests you and changes you. And again, many breakthroughs come from that kind of cross-cultural collaboration.

In addition to the freedom for open-ended inquiry and the exchange across disciplines and cultures, another ingredient is critical to anyone involved in a creative endeavor. Failure has to be seen as an integral part of the process. Accepting failure as part of the process allows individuals to take risks, to learn from their missteps, and to move on in a new direction.

One of my reasons for wanting to speak before this gathering was to provide more information about artist residency programming, its current status, and its future. As a field, we are only now beginning to become self-aware and self-identified, and that awareness is leading to a level of professionalism and self-scrutiny that I think is very healthy.

In 1995, the most recent year for which we have statistics, the 30-member programs of the Alliance of Artists Communities served 3,000 artists. The hours of support the artists were given and the amount of financial stipend they received rivaled the totals provided by the NEA. Keep in mind that we are talking about 30 organizations, many of them small and located in rural areas. Many of these artist residency programs are not very high on the evolutionary scale in terms of arts professionalism.

The model of the artist colony is the beautiful and rural situation isolated from the world. My criticism of artist residency communities is that many of them are tempted to adopt an outmoded idea of the artist as a lone genius. These communities may not necessarily understand or even be interested in trying to extend the conversation a little further and include the people down the road. An ongoing debate within the artist residency field concerns how public we should be. Who is the public? How do we involve the public? To what degree should we pursue this involvement and how does that affect our residents? The artist residency field also makes assumptions about who and what constitutes an artist. We must rethink the ways our institutional norms infantilize artists and perpetuate stereotypes of artists waiting with their hands out for a grant. We must look at the role of artists in the institutions themselves.

We need research [and we are doing research internally] about the benefits of artist communities. We see their influence spreading, and we see their impact. But we have not looked at who makes up these communities and who is not a part of them and how that affects our society down the line. We know our community of artists is in large part made up of people who have received recognition, who may later win MacArthur grants or NEA grants. But what of the people who have not been a part of artist communities? Most artist communities do not accept families, which rules out many women, who may have young children. At the moment, artist residencies are serving mostly very privileged, single people. The programs also do not necessarily support a wide variety of art forms, another aspect we must evaluate.

Artist residency programming is growing quickly because a need exists that is not being met by current support structures. The field is both localized and increasingly global. A great deal of cultural diplomacy is taking place within residency communities. In my three years in this job, I have met with more economic and social advisors to foreign governments than I did in any other sector of the arts community. In the last year alone, a number of emissaries from other nations have come to Headlands to ask if they can send artists to our center.

Two examples of this cultural diplomacy are Brazil and Mexico. Brazil wants to change the way Americans look at that country and is in the process of negotiating for a different relationship with the United States. Brazil has opened a new exchange program with us that is very much in line with the country's foreign policy. We hear a great deal about Mexico's cultural difficulties in terms of economics, but the country is even now aggressively trying to expand its cultural support. Mexico is also considering more cultural exchange in order to break down stereotypes, resolve some misunderstandings [particularly in California], and ultimately bring our two nations closer together.

Another development of which we as Americans should be aware is the number of governments that are increasing the cultural export of their artists to the United States and other countries. We should also note the amount of support these governments are putting behind their artists. This suggests to me that we may see a cultural deficit down the line because U.S. artists are not receiving an equivalent level of support and encouragement. Foreign artists come to this country, learn from our diversity, and return home, where they are given sustained time to create a body of work, write symphonies, paint paintings.

In addition to explosive growth, the artist residency field is undergoing dynamic changes to adapt and develop programs that better support artists and the arts. The changing nature of the artist residency programs is evident at Headlands, where we are still playing with the idea of how a residency model should work. Headlands was started by a group of artists who wanted to break down the limiting roles assigned to artists and show that artists could be active in the world. Over time, however, institutions tend to self-perpetuate, and what began as a means to an end becomes an end in itself. The idea of bringing people together to live and work was a means at first and then became a program; in the day-to-day operation of this program, the concept of artists being active in the world has been overlooked.

When I arrived three years ago, I began questioning why more of the artists coming to Headlands were not the artists performing public work or actively participating in their communities. In many cases, artists of color and women artists were so engaged with their communities that they couldn't disconnect themselves. It did not even occur to them to apply for residency, to take off and live in a national park for a few months. And yet, some of these artists doing the most exciting and valuable work—the very people who are national cultural resources—were in danger of burning out.

For the last three years, Headlands has had an invitational residency program targeting these artists. People who normally would not be involved in a residency program are invited to come to Headlands, to take time out and think about their work and perhaps develop a way to mentor, teach, or share that work with others. Some of the board members were a bit leery about inviting these artists committed to social activity. They feared conflicts would develop between these artists and the more contemplative types—a somewhat ironic reaction, given that we have always maintained that diversity is one of the factors that makes for a creative community. The effect that Headlands has on someone like Rick Lowe, for example, is not what might be expected. Rick, the originator of the Project Row Houses, is usually seen as a community activist. But when Rick comes to Headlands, he reads and paints. An artist who is strictly a studio person might come to Headlands and start hanging out and thinking about how to integrate work into the community.

Artists in a residency program like Headlands return to the community changed. The people who have met through our center go home and do their work very differently. What we provide and what we're about is giving people a chance to step back and equipping them better for the long haul. At Headlands, artists develop internal resources and access an energy and vitality that fuels their work. They find a place inside themselves that they remember and are mentally able to return to. Most important of all, they discover a greater belief in the possibilities of their own work and of themselves as artists, and those enhanced possibilities deepen the contribution that they make to all of us.

Discussion

Becker: The diversity of opportunities available to artists is astonishing. A place that intrigues me is Art Park in upstate New York, where a reclamation site has been converted into a state park, almost a summer camp for artists. What I found progressive about Art Park is that the money that would have been spent on the maintenance of a state park has been channeled into the program. I see a contradiction, however, in the notion of giving artists complete freedom and then directing artists because you, as an institution, have a different goal.

Reasoner: We don't direct artists at Headlands.

Becker: I am thinking of an instance where artists would be encouraged to be together or to participate in the community. I wonder if that creates any conflicts for the artists, not necessarily at Headlands, but perhaps at other programs.

Reasoner: For me, the beauty of the residence concept thus far is that programs are different and allow for different kinds of residencies. Djerassi Resident Artists Program, a sister organization to us in the Bay area, is 45 minutes off the main road, way up at a private estate with a locked gate. People may be out there for a month at a time without leaving. At Headlands, we are in wilderness but only 15 minutes from downtown San Francisco. We keep a bunch of junky cars that the artists share and sometimes fight over. If they want to, residents can spend every day in the city.

We do strive for community at Headlands. We ask residents to attend dinner a few nights a week. But residents are living on site at Headlands for a long time, from three to five months. That period allows plenty of room for going into the city, coming back, being with other people, and being alone. What we hear from our artists is that they like the freedom to make these choices. Ultimately, the residents may not hook up with all ten other people living at Headlands, but they do hook up with two or three other people living there. So I hear stories of the wild ride taken by the Taiwanese artist and the Slovakian artist, neither of whom speaks English. They get a flat tire and someone from Ohio comes to rescue them, but the rescuer doesn't know the city and winds up getting the artists lost, and they have a wonderful adventure.

We do not make many requirements of our residents. Because Headlands is not a project residency, artists have no obligations to complete projects while they are at the program. If artists do have work that they would like to share, they can meet with our program director, and they'll be given a public forum. But this is not a requirement.

Becker: Another development in artist opportunities is the growth in travel grants for artists. Artists can apply to numerous programs that allow them to travel to places they might not otherwise be able to afford. The value of that experience for an artist should not be underestimated. Other programs enable artists to trade studios—a New York artist trades studios with a Minnesota artist for a month. This seems like an economical approach to achieving some of the same objectives.

Reasoner: One of the biggest criticisms and concerns that I have about the residency field is that so many of these communities have started small and are still heavily subsidized by fees that the artists pay to go there. At least the older communities provide scholarships, and even those that charge offer at least a 50% scholarship. Headlands is much more limited in who we can take because we do not allow artists to pay their own way.

I am encouraged by the Lannan Foundation, which recently initiated a program offering artists stipends and travel. More communities are starting to provide stipends and cover more costs. This is an area where outside funding would be valuable to provide artists with travel grants that would make it possible for them to then take off and go.

Carter: In 1991, I participated in a unique artist residency opportunity. Triangle Workshop is a two-week program that was started by the sculptor Anthony Carl. Anthony Carl is British, but he owns land in upstate New York around Rhinebeck.

My Triangle Workshop experience was quite wonderful in that 36 artists from all over the world came together. These artists were from Korea, the Soviet Union, Costa Rica; we had one young man from Soweto. At the time, I was developing a series of works dealing with South Africa. Talking to this young man from Soweto and finding out what was going on with the apartheid system helped me develop my ideas. Even today, seven years later, I am pulling ideas from my talks with this man.

Triangle Workshop, which has been in existence for about 16 years, is different in that it encourages artists to try a new discipline for a two-week period. People were available to teach the different disciplines, so if a sculptor wanted to try painting, a painter would teach the sculptor how to stretch canvases and work with various paint media. I am a painter and printmaker, and I decided to try my hand at welding. The welding facility was very well equipped, with four people to work with you and train you in the art of welding.

The artists who attend Triangle Workshop are primarily professional artists, and what I discovered is that many people were not willing to try something new. Just the same, the artists were opened up to the possibilities of other media.

Triangle Workshop also offered artists a chance to meet with art critics and commentators. In addition to critiquing work himself, Anthony Carl would invite people like Hilton Kramer, editor of *The New Criterion* and former art critic for the *New York Times*; Clement Greenberg, the late esteemed New York art critic; Karen Wilkin, a writer for *The New Criterion* and *Art News*; and Ken Johnson of *Art in America*. The critics came up to Triangle for a day, visited our studios, critiqued our work, and then gave an evening talk and had dinner with us. Open exchange between critics and artists is an experience unavailable to most artists.

Reasoner: Artist residency programs certainly provide a range of experiences. The directory published by the Alliance of Artist Communities profiles 70 residency programs in detail and lists international and national centers as well. Artists can review the types of opportunities available and choose a community that suits their particular medium, interest, family needs, lifestyle. Artist communities are not one size fits all. But that is one of the aspects I like about this field; these programs often were started by eccentric patrons or artists who were making a sincere effort to help individual artists.

Xavier Leonard, Artist, Heads on Fire: I would like to make a comment related to previous presentations and discussions. Over the course of these proceedings, I have been pondering the relationship between the American public and funding for individual artists or the arts in general. We have not been talking about the majority of artists in these discussions. We have been talking about people who have been funded or people who have had the opportunity to attend residencies. This group is not representative of most artists. As Reasoner observed, decisions about who gets funded and who goes to residencies are not necessarily based on the quality of the work but on a number of factors.

Many artists are not on the funding radar or the museum curatorial radar, but they do have connections to people in communities all across the country. Whatever the public thinks about art and artists is a reflection of these artists, the ones who don't receive the funding. These artists are in the communities, teaching in schools, working at other jobs.

The political discussion of arts funding does not appear to be about art at all. It is not even about public policy [a misnomer because public policy is not public, it's political]. The debate surrounding arts funding is simply an issue that one political group can use to form a coalition and manipulate people. This debate does not substantially affect individuals' view of art or the place of art in their lives. If we could hone in on the true nature of people's relationship to art and connect that to the way arts are funded in the United States, we would create a more positive and accurate reflection of the desires of the American people.

The general public and even many artists are in the dark about the art world represented by museums and institutions and how that world operates. I know artists who are unfamiliar with the mechanics of how funding is allocated or how curatorial decisions are made. Even artists who are producing work and showing their work in galleries ask me, "Where do I find grant information?" The public at large does not know the processes that decide what art is presented and who is selected for awards and residencies. So many of these processes are simply closed off to the public, a situation perpetuated by institutions and funders.

The idea of artists being apart from society reflects the European tradition that Roberts was talking about earlier but that has never been an accurate portrait of the artistic life. It was a lie in Europe in the 19th century, and it is a lie now. People who are producing art are not separated from the world; they are part of their communities. But institutions and the existing processes foster the view that one needs an entrée into the arts and that the arts are not accessible by the public. When a curatorial board meets, the general public is not allowed to attend.

I feel much more a part of the process of the justice system than of the arts system. I can attend any trial and know I am welcome in any courtroom to observe the process. Unless I am a member of a jury, I play no part in the decision of whether a defendant is guilty, but I know that responsibility is available to me and every other citizen. That openness to participation defines my relationship to the justice system. The same access and openness could transform the American public's relationship to art and the art system.

Van Proyen: I agree that the curatorial process is in need of quick demystification. I also believe we must establish a basis for evaluating how well or how poorly the curatorial process functions. It seems to me that curators are in a particularly difficult position at this time. On one level, curators have to be able to persuasively "thematize" the field of art practice, making an explicit case for the significance of what they present. At the same time, they must make the case for their views to multiple groups. Curators have to constantly defend their projects to their institutions' board of trustees and also function as fundraisers for these projects. Given this seemingly impossible situation, it is no surprise that curatorial practice has become increasingly less concerned with the arts.

Coe Tug Morgan, Washington State Arts Commission: Robert E. Rubin, Secretary of the U.S. Department of the Treasury, was in town during this symposium and talked with several of us. He made the interesting observation that advocates of the arts are not nasty enough. In Olympia, Washington, we have an arts day once a year, and perhaps 200 people show up. We hold a labor rally, and 2,000 show up. If a businessman is unfair to labor on a contract, we go out and picket him. But if a church leader pickets and raises all sort of hell around our museum, do we do the same in front of his church? No, we don't because we're too nice.

Having been a labor lobbyist, I recognize power when I see it. The arts community has power but does not choose to wield it. We had better begin exercising our power. State arts commissions are limited in how much they can do, but those of you who are not employees of a political body have a right to get out and lobby. The artists among you have the right to contact senators and representatives. Think of how many artists there are in every state. Think of how many of them have a computer or fax or e-mail. Today, every legislator has a voice line, a fax line, and a modem to a computer. The political right is not the only group that can flood legislators with mail and phone calls. The arts community can do it as well.

[The public at large does not know the processes that decide what art is presented and who is selected for awards and residencies. So many of these processes are simply closed off to the public, a situation perpetuated by institutions and funders....

I feel much more a part of the process of the justice system than of the arts system.]

XAVIER LEONARD

Concluding Remarks

Anthony Radich, Executive Director, WESTAF: We have accomplished much in this meeting, thanks to your forthright and passionate participation. As an association of 12 Western states, WESTAF faces a difficult challenge communicating and networking with constituents and members on a regular basis. This kind of gathering is invaluable for members of the state agencies to meet individuals such as our presenters, facilitators, respondents, and observers.

The energy and ideas generated by an affair such as this symposium tempt us to jump on the bandwagon and sign up to take action right away. But that is not what this meeting has been about. Perhaps the most important outcome of this symposium will be to inform the direction of WESTAF programming. Over the last two decades, WESTAF has developed illustrious activities related to the visual arts. At present, however, we do not have the funding for that kind of activity. We hope that the comments and conversations that came out of this seminal event will lead us to appropriate and forward-looking programming in support of individual visual artists.

WESTAF Visual Arts Symposium Co-Facilitators

Kim Abeles

Kim Abeles is a visual artist whose work has been featured in numerous solo and group exhibitions. Since 1993, the touring exhibition, *Kim Abeles: Encyclopedia Persona*, has traveled to venues throughout the world, including the National Museum of Fine Arts in Santiago, Chile, and the Museum of Modern Art in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. *Encyclopedia Persona* is sponsored in part by the Fellows of Contemporary Art and by the United States Information Agency.

A 1996-1997 Fellowship Grant recipient from the City of Los Angeles Department of Cultural Affairs, Abeles has been the recipient of numerous other honors, awards, and commissions. She has organized and co-curated traveling exhibitions related to the AIDS epidemic, the Gulf War, air pollution, and activist art. In addition, Abeles has coordinated workshops, panel discussions, poetry readings, performances, and brochures to educate viewers.

Currently, Abeles is a board member of Los Angeles Contemporary Exhibitions, the Artist Advisory Committee of the Los Angeles Municipal Art Gallery, and the Advisory Committee for California State University Summer Arts. She has also served as a panelist for Visual Arts Public Projects for the National Endowment for the Arts. Abeles holds an MFA in studio art from the University of California—Irvine and a BFA in painting from Ohio University.

Nanette Carter

Nanette Carter is an educator and visual artist in painting and printmaking. She recently presented a lecture and workshops at the University of Rochester, New York; completed an artist residency at West Virginia Wesleyan College and the Art Institute of Chicago; participated in a panel presentations at Spelman College, Atlanta, and the Rockland Center for the Arts, New York; and served as Adjunct Professor of art at the City College of New York. A recipient of grants from the Wheeler Foundation and the Pollock-Krasner Foundation, Carter has been awarded numerous other grants, awards, and commissions.

A selected list of Carter's exhibitions include *Recent Works on Mylar*, Sande Webster Gallery, Philadelphia; *Point-Counterpoint*, June Kelly Gallery, New York; *Window View—Scapeology*, Alitash Kebede Gallery, Los Angeles; *Bearing Witness: Contemporary Works by African American Women Artists*, Spelman College Museum of Fine Art, Atlanta; *African American Printmakers: Three Decades of Excellence*, the Philadelphia Museum of Art; and *Women Artists of Color*, Pittsburgh Center for the Arts. In addition her work has been reviewed in such publications as *American Visions*, *ARTnews*, *the New Art Examiner*, *the New York Times*, and *the Philadelphia Inquirer*. She holds an MFA in painting from the Pratt Institute of Art.

WESTAF Visual Arts Symposium Participants

Richard Andrews

Richard Andrews is the Director of the Henry Art Gallery, the art museum of the University of Washington in Seattle. For three years prior to his 1987 appointment at the Henry, Andrews was Director of the Visual Arts Program at the National Endowment for the Arts in Washington, D.C., where he administered a \$6 million program of fellowships and grants and was responsible for developing national policies affecting visual artists and arts organizations.

Andrews has extensive experience in the field of public art, having coordinated the Art in Public Places Program for the Seattle Arts Commission from 1978 through 1984. During this time, he directed the visual arts programs that acquired and exhibited the city of Seattle's contemporary art collection. Andrews has also served as a consultant for public art programs across the country, including the Community Redevelopment Authority of Los Angeles, the city of Boston, and the Southern California Rapid Transit District.

Andrews has lectured and participated in numerous symposia on contemporary art in the United States and Europe. Among his publications are: *Art into Life: Russian Constructivism 1914-32*, for which he was co-curator with Milena Kalinovska, and essays on public art for *Insights/On Sites*, *Les dossiers de l'Art Public*, and *A Field Guide to Seattle's Public Art*. Andrews received a BA and an MFA from the University of Washington and a B.A. in art from Occidental College.

Jack Becker

Jack Becker is the founder of FORECAST Public Artworks. As a public artist and program administrator, Becker specializes in projects that connect the ideas and energies of artists with the needs and opportunities of communities. Becker established two annual programs for FORECAST: Public Art Affairs [a grant program for Minnesota artists] and the national journal, *Public Art Review*, which is published semi-annually.

In addition to his work as Project Manager for FORECAST, Becker has served as Art in Public Places Program Coordinator for the city of Minneapolis, Arts Development Manager for the city of St. Paul, and as an instructor at the College of Visual Arts, St. Paul. He has served on the boards of several nonprofit organizations, including Public Art St. Paul, *Handpapermaking Magazine*, and the Minnesota Craft Council.

Becker is currently developing bench and seating design projects for high schools and cultural centers. Working with community members and students, he establishes a customized process and a context for the work, emphasizing the use of recycled materials and found objects. In June, 1997, Becker was awarded a Jerome Foundation Travel & Study Grant to research AIDS memorial projects in San Francisco, Toronto, and Key West. The research will help Becker facilitate the development of an AIDS memorial project for Loring Park in Minneapolis.

Charles Bergman

Charles Bergman is Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer of the Pollock-Krasner Foundation, Inc. Established in 1985 under the will of Lee Krasner, one of the leading abstract expressionist painters, the Pollock-Krasner Foundation is the largest foundation ever created exclusively to aid worthy and needy visual artists internationally.

Bergman serves on the boards of the following organizations: The Millay Colony for the Arts, Inc., Austerlitz, New York; The Alliance for Young Artists & Writers, Inc., New York, New York; Creative Artists Network, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Very Special Arts, Washington, D.C.; Delfina Studios Trust, London, England; and the Fund for Arts and Culture in Central and Eastern Europe, Washington, D.C. In addition, he serves on the National Council of the Glimmerglass Opera, Cooperstown, New York, and is Senior Advisor to the Marie Walsh Sharpe Art Foundation, Colorado Springs, Colorado.

Long concerned with mental health, Bergman was, for a number of years, an Adjunct Professor of Psychiatry at New York Medical College and, under three Presidents [Nixon, Ford, and Carter], was a Special Advisor to the Public Committee on Mental Retardation. Under President Carter, he served as Special Advisor to the Public Committee on Mental Health, a private foundation created out of the President's Commission on Mental Health.

Bergman is a former member of the Select Advisory Committee on International Art Programs of the National Endowment for the Arts and also was a panelist for the New York State Council on the Arts. He was a Director of the Fund for Artists' Colonies. Formerly, Bergman served as Vice President of the Inter-American Foundation for the Arts, the first private cultural exchange program between the United States and Latin America.

Jan Brooks

Jan Brooks is the Executive Director of Northern New Mexico Grantmakers, an organization dedicated to increasing the effectiveness and impact of organized philanthropy in New Mexico. She is also a studio artist and activist and has served as a project coordinator for research, publications, conferences, and other cultural programs. Among her numerous projects, Brooks served as resource director for Handmade in America, a cultural planning and economic development project in western North Carolina; director of The Critical Journal Planning Project, a national arts and humanities program to design an interdisciplinary journal for crafts criticism; and conference coordinator for Public Art Dialogue, a meeting and publications project of the North Carolina Arts Council.

Formerly on the studio art faculties of Southern Illinois University and the University of North Carolina—Charlotte, her studio work has been presented in over 200 exhibitions, including shows in Mexico, Italy, Japan, and the United Kingdom.

Brooks has served as Vice President and Trustee of the American Craft Council and recently retired following a seven-year term as a founding board member of the National Campaign for Freedom of Expression. She holds a BA and MFA from Southern Illinois University.

Anne Focke

Ann Focke is a writer, arts consultant, and administrator for Grantmakers in the Arts, a new position created in 1996. Prior to assuming her current position, Focke was the founding co-director of ArtsWire, a computer network for news and communications among arts communities nationwide, and founder of Artist Trust, a non-profit organization that supports artists in Washington state. She also served as director of And/Or, a non-profit artists' organization, and assistant director of the Seattle Arts Commission.

In December, 1996, she completed *Financial Support for Artists*, a study of past and present sources of support for artists in the U.S., commissioned by several arts-service organizations and private foundations, including the Rockefeller Foundation and the Andy Warhol Foundation for the Visual Arts. She also coordinated "The Orcas Conference: Creative Support for Creative Artists," a national conference sponsored by the New York Foundation for the Arts, and advised the Goodwill Games in the development of its Goodwill Arts Festival. Focke has served on numerous Seattle arts boards and city planning committees, as well as on panels for the National Endowment for the Arts.

Lorraine Garcia-Nakata

Lorraine Garcia-Nakata is Managing Director of the Mexican Museum in San Francisco. She is nationally acknowledged for her extensive working experience and perspective in the areas of arts and cultural policy; nonprofit arts administration; philanthropy; program development; creative processes; and innovation in arts education.

Garcia-Nakata has been a guest instructor in the areas of arts program development, arts education, nonprofit administration, collections management, and community development at San Francisco State University, Golden Gate University, and Amherst College. She has served as a review panelist for the National Endowment for the Arts and speaker for numerous conferences. Garcia-Nakata is also acknowledged for her continued work as a practicing visual artist, which continues to be a central reference in all areas of her professional endeavors.

Prior to assuming her current position, Garcia-Nakata held the following posts: Director of Education/Associate Managing Director, Center for the Arts at Yerba Buena Gardens, San Francisco; Visual Arts Faculty, Big Bend Community College, Moses Lake, Washington; California Arts Council Organizational Grants Program Administrator; Arts and Humanities Program Officer, Marin Community Foundation; Development Director, Mexican Museum; Visual Arts Department Chair, California State Summer School for the Arts; and Program Director, Arts-in-Corrections, San Quentin State Prison.

Lance T. Izumi

Lance Izumi is presently a Senior Fellow in California Studies and Co-director of the Center for Innovation in Education at the Pacific Research Institute for Public Policy, a San Francisco-based public policy think tank. Izumi also serves as a senior partner with the Capitol Group, a Sacramento research and writing firm, and is a Visiting Fellow in Educational Studies at the Institute for Economic Affairs, headquartered in London.

Prior to assuming his current positions, Izumi served as director of the Claremont Institute's Golden State Center for Policy Studies and chief speechwriter and director of writing and research for California Governor George Deukmejian. He also served in the Reagan administration as speechwriter to the United States Attorney

General, Edwin Meese III. His articles have appeared in a number of publications, including the *Sacramento Union*, *National Review*, *Sunday Times* [of London], *San Francisco Chronicle*, and *Los Angeles Daily News*. Izumi is a regular contributor to the "Perspectives" opinion series on National Public Radio.

Izumi received his master's degree in political science from the University of California at Davis and his Juris Doctorate from the University of Southern California Law Center.

Betty LaDuke

Betty LaDuke is a visual artist and the producer for documentary videos, including: *Eritrean Artists in War and Peace*; *Africa Between Myth and Reality*; *Persistent Women Artists: Velarde, Okubo, Jones*; and *Betty LaDuke: An Artist's Journey from the Bronx to Timbuktu*. After living in Mexico from 1953-1956, LaDuke began a series of travels that have spanned the globe from Asia to Latin America and have continued with annual trips to Africa since 1986.

A professor at Southern Oregon University from 1964-1996, LaDuke initiated the courses, Women and Art and Art in the Third World. LaDuke's paintings, prints, and drawings have been featured in over 200 solo exhibitions at universities, galleries, and museums. LaDuke also has exhibited and lectured internationally, including a 1995 series of art workshops and lectures in Eritrea, Africa. Her five published books include: *Africa: Women's Art, Women's Lives*, 1997, Africa World Press; *Women Against Hunger, A Sketchbook Journey*, 1997, Africa World Press; *Women Artists: Multi-Cultural Visions*, 1992, Red Sea Press; *Africa Through the Eyes of Women Artists*, 1991, Africa World Press; and *Compañeras: Women, Art, and Social Change in Latin America*, 1985, City Lights. LaDuke's paintings are the subject of the book, *Multi-Cultural Celebrations: Betty LaDuke Paintings 1972-1992*, written by Gloria Feman Orenstein.

LaDuke is the recipient of many grants and awards, including a 1993 Governor's Award for the Arts [Oregon] and a 1996 Ziegfeld Award from the National Art Education Association for distinguished international leadership in art education. Her work has been reviewed in many books and journals, including *Women Speak: The Eloquence of Women's Lives*, by Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss, and *Feminist Studies*.

Julie Lazar

Julie Lazar is Director of Experimental Programs at The Museum of Contemporary Art [MOCA] in Los Angeles, a new position created for her in 1997. Since 1982, she had served as a founding curator for the Museum, working in all media. Programs and exhibitions Lazar organized include: the public radio series, *The Territory of Art*; *The Arts for Television*, a touring video exhibition; the interdisciplinary performance series, *Explorations*; *World Tour* by Renee Green; *In the Mood* by Hirokazu Kosaka; and *Rolywholyover: A Circus for Museum* by John Cage, which traveled to five major cities. Under Lazar's direction, the Museum is developing programs that primarily focus on artists' uses of new technologies. This initiative is centered on commissioning and presenting artists' works and new educational programs, as well as the potential establishment of Temporary Contemporary sites/resource centers in various locations internationally.

With co-curator Tom Finkelpearl, Lazar recently organized *Uncommon Sense*, a program of commissioned, interactive public art works by Ann Carlson and Mary Ellen Strom, Cornerstone Theater Company, Karen Finley, Mel Chin and the GALA Committee, Rick Lowe, and Mierle Laderman Ukeles. Lazar also served as curator of the Hybrid Section of the '97 Kwangju Biennale with Richard Koshalek, Commissioner; their section included 15 installations by artists from 11 countries.

Kathryn Reasoner

Kathryn Reasoner is Executive Director of the Headlands Center for the Arts, an international artists' residency program and cultural center in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Prior to her appointment in February, 1995, she served as Director of Extension Education and Summer Programs for the San Francisco Art Institute. Reasoner is also a teacher; she designed and taught a model art education program at the Art Institute that matched art students with children at inner-city elementary schools and taught graduate-level courses in arts administration for six years at public and private universities.

Reasoner has been an active participant in the arts community for over 15 years. Through her work in the early 1980s with the People's Theater Coalition and the State/Local Partnership Program in San Francisco, she has worked with a wide range of cultural organizations. She also served as the Executive Director of the Richmond Art Center from 1985 through early 1991.

Reasoner has been involved in arts advocacy and arts-policy development throughout California, including service on the board of the California Confederation of the Arts. She has served as a consultant, lecturer, and grants panelist for the California Arts Council, the San Francisco Foundation, and the Center for the Arts at Yerba Buena Gardens. She is also the recipient of special awards for her work in cultural planning from the city of San Francisco and for community service from the city of Richmond. She currently serves on the board of Res Artis, the international organization of artist residency centers. Reasoner has an MA in arts administration from Golden Gate University Graduate School of Management and a BA in painting from the University of California at Santa Cruz.

Carla Roberts

Carla Roberts is Executive Director of Atlatl, a national service organization for Native American arts in Phoenix, Arizona. Since 1988, Roberts has been an arts—management consultant and has worked with a number of organizations, including the Boston Conservatory and the Institute of Alaska Native Arts in Fairbanks, Alaska. Roberts also has served as Executive Director of the Boston Film/Video Foundation, Assistant Director of Intermedia Arts—Minnesota at the University of Minnesota, Executive Director of Southwest Minnesota Arts and Humanities Council, and Coordinator for University of Alaska—Rural Education. She is the author of several publications, including her "Suitable for Hanging," published in 1997 in *To Honor and Comfort: Native Quilting Traditions* with prepublication in *New Mexico Magazine*.

Roberts has served as an advisor for the National Museum of the American Indian, the National Endowment for the Arts, the Western States Arts Federation [WESTAF], the Hispanic Arts Council of Taos, the National Association of Artists Organizations, and the Association for American Cultures. She is a member of the Board of Trustees of Indian Hill Arts in Littleton, Massachusetts.

Roberts has been the recipient of numerous grants and awards, including a Rockefeller Scholar Grant from the College Art Association in New York City and a National Endowment for the Arts Fellowship. Roberts holds a BFA in studio art from the University of Alaska and an MFA in arts management from the University of Iowa.

Mark Van Proyen

Mark Van Proyen is an Associate Professor of art history, painting, and digital imaging at the San Francisco Art Institute. He also teaches at University of California Extension in San Francisco and has taught at Stanford University, the University of San Francisco, University of California—Santa Cruz, University of California—Berkeley, and California College of Arts and Crafts. Van Proyen is also a contributing editor to *Artweek* magazine, where he was the Northern California Editor from 1990-1992. From 1983-1986, he was the Editor of *Expo-See* magazine in San Francisco.

For the past 20 years, Van Proyen's art has been exhibited in numerous solo and group exhibitions. His 1997 exhibitions include the solo show, *Recent Paintings*, at the SOMAR Gallery in San Francisco and the *International Computer Art Exhibition* in Beijing, China.

Van Proyen holds a BFA and MFA from the San Francisco Art Institute. He has been the recipient of a Lifework Award from the Palkirk Cultural Center in San Rafael, a painting Fellowship from the Marin Arts Council, and a Bay Regional Fellowship from the Mortimer Flieshacker Foundation.

Symposium Attendees

Lila Abersold, Visual Arts Program,
Utah Arts Council

Nola Ahola, Visual Artist and Writer

Kristina Austin, Interim Executive Director,
New Mexico Arts

Susan Boskoff, Executive Director, Nevada
State Arts Council

Cath Brunner, Public Arts Coordinator, King
County Office of Cultural Resources

Marti Campbell, Visual Artist and Educator

John Coe, Executive Director, Wyoming
Arts Council

Shelley Cohn, Executive Director, Arizona
Commission on the Arts

Barbara Courtney, Executive Director,
Artist Trust

Julia Fenton, Executive Director, Newport
Visual Arts Center

Arlynn Fishbaugh, Executive Director,
Montana Arts Council

Lillian Francuz, Visual Arts Director,
Wyoming Arts Council

Barbara Garrett, Visual Arts Director, Idaho
Commission on the Arts

April Geary, Marketing and Communications
Officer, California Arts Council

Walter Gordinier, Visual Artist, Gordinier
and Van Leunen

Teri Hopkins, Exhibition Director,
Marylhurst College

Helen Howarth, Executive Director, Alaska
State Council on the Arts

Michael Jacobsen, Northwest Stone
Sculptors Association

Jill Janow, Photographic Center Northwest

Nancy Legge, Arts and Education Director

Helen Lessick, Visual Arts Coordinator, King
County Office of Cultural Resources

Louise Kodis, Board of Trustees, Artist Trust

Xavier Leonard, Executive Director, Heads on Fire

Eloise D. MacMurray, Public Art Director, Portland
Regional Arts and Culture Council

Linda Martin, Tacoma Arts Commission

Kathy Minette, Art in Public Places, New
Mexico Arts

Heidi Morford, Central Washington University

Coe Tug Morgan, Washington State
Arts Commission

Lee Musgrave, Special Projects Officer, Maryhill
Museum of Art

Patsy Surh O'Connell, Board of trustees, Asia
Pacific Cultural Center

Bill Palmer, Interim Executive Director,
Washington State Arts Commission

Shannon Planchon, Grants Administrator,
Alaska State Council on the Arts

Anthony Rampton, Chair, WESTAF Board
of Trustees

Sharon Rosse, Artists' Services Program
Director, Nevada State Council on the Arts

Frank Samuelson, Visual Artist

Carol Shiffman, Manager, Artists
fellowship Program

Timothy Siciliano, Visual Artist

Kay Slusarenko, Marylhurst College
Art Department

Julie Numbers Smith, Interim Executive Director,
Idaho Commission on the Arts

Mike Stamper, The Print Arts Foundation

Steve Thompson, Art in Public Places, Washington
State Arts Commission

Kris Tucker, Boise City Arts Commission

Alice Van Leunen, Visual Artist, Gordinier
and Van Leunen

Bev Watt, Art in Public Places, Washington
State Arts Commission

Clark Wiegman, Artifact, Inc.

George Wright, Visual Artist

Ann McCall Wyman, Wyman Youth Trust