

1ST STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1998 The Kansas City Star Co.
THE KANSAS CITY STAR

January 30, 1998 Friday METROPOLITAN EDITION

SECTION: METROPOLITAN; Pg. C1; BARBARA SHELLY

LENGTH: 662 words

HEADLINE: Learning the art of citizenship

BYLINE: BARBARA SHELLY

BODY:

They came from Mexico, Singapore and the nations that used to make up the Soviet Union. In all, 66 persons became citizens of the United States last week at a ceremony at the federal courthouse in Kansas City, Kan.

Behind each beaming face - everybody beams on these occasions - lie some common themes. Everyone struggled. They wondered whether they were doing the right thing. People helped them out. They got lucky.

Among those 66 new citizens were Kwan and Ling Wu, immigrants from China.

Their story has all the familiar elements. They struggled to choose between their homeland and their new land. They had help. And they were lucky - luck in this case being the intersection where talent and opportunity cross paths.

The story of Kwan Wu, who previously used the name Xin Kun Wu, is not unfamiliar to many in Kansas City.

He is the artist selected in 1991 by federal judges to design and sculpt the 14-foot bronze sculpture in front of the federal courthouse in Kansas City. The sculpture was created as a frame for a plaque inscribed with the Bill of Rights.

At the time, Wu had been in this country just more than two years. An informal arrangement to act as a visiting professor at the University of Kansas had evolved into a wish to remain.

Wu's reasons were many. China's crushing of the democracy movement at Tiananmen Square was a big one. He and his wife had one child, all they would be permitted in their homeland. He liked the freedom of an artist's life here - he didn't need official permission to design a sculpture.

Ling Wu - who also is an artist - and their son, Lon, joined him in 1990. They applied for permanent residency.

Now they have it. And unlike most newly naturalized citizens, Kwan and Ling Wu were toasted at punch-and-cookie receptions in two

THE KANSAS CITY STAR, January 30, 1998, Friday

U.S. courthouses.

The first was after their ceremony in Kansas City, Kan. The second was Wednesday in Kansas City, in the offices of U.S. Judge Scott O. Wright.

Wright loves naturalization ceremonies. "It's by far the most pleasurable thing we do in this business," he said.

He dearly wanted to preside over the rites for the Wus. But they live in Olathe, and Wright doesn't handle affairs in Kansas.

As noted above, every new citizen has gotten help along the way.

Two of the persons who helped Kwan Wu were Wright and his wife, Shirley, who was one of Wu's first sculpturing students.

It was Shirley Wright who recommended that the judges consider Wu to create the Bill of Rights sculpture. A committee of lawyers raised money for the project.

The Bill of Rights sculpture opened up other opportunities. Wu designed a sculpture of Phog Allen for KU, and another for the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum in Kansas City's 18th and Vine district.

Kwan and Ling Wu attended the reception Wednesday with 5-year-old Lee and 3-year-old Cindy - the son and daughter they wouldn't have been allowed to have in China.

As friends and court employees crowded into the room, Wu's English, which is good, faltered a bit.

"I feel I am part of the country now," he said. "Before, I didn't feel the same. I still feel like a guest."

As a U.S. citizen, Wu, 46, can practice art without interference and follow any religion he chooses. An army will not arrest him, as it did some of his former students in the Tiananmen Square rebellion.

If he chooses, he can bear arms.

A guest no longer, he can claim all the privileges on the plaque
he encased in bronze.

To leave a comment for Barbara Shelly, call (816) 889-7827 and enter 1017, or send e-mail to bshelly@kcstar.com

LOAD-DATE: January 30, 1998

[illegible]

**FIRST LADY HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
REMARKS FOR THE OPENING OF THE SCULPTURE EXHIBITION
EAST ROOM, THE WHITE HOUSE
JULY 22, 1996**

- Today, we celebrate the fourth and final installment in a series of exhibitions of Twentieth Century American Sculpture at the White House. As most of you know, this exhibit in the Jacqueline Kennedy Garden was inspired, in part, by Mrs. Onassis and her extraordinary artistic and cultural contributions to the White House. There is no place more appropriate for this celebration of American art than in the garden named in her honor.
- The 12 pieces in this exhibition represent the diverse visions and rich talents of sculptors from the Northeastern part of our country. Many of these sculptures have been inspired by the Northeastern landscapes and environments. The sculptors have incorporated such items as twigs from a backyard, old tires, pennies, leaves, and sardine skeletons into their works. Tom Otterness created his bronze sculpture "Head" with the intention of using New York's Wall Street as a backdrop.
- The President and I believe that art should be accessible to everyone because it can offer each of us a deeper understanding of our lives and of the rich cultural traditions we share as a nation and a people. Art can make our spirits soar and remind us of our powers to imagine and to create.
- It gives me great satisfaction and joy to know that the thousands of visitors who pass through the White House have been and will be able to look out the Colonnade window and share in the extraordinary power of these sculptures.
- This exhibition also celebrates the sculptors themselves. Anne Tucker once said "All art requires is courage." So on behalf of the President and myself, I would like to thank the artists who are featured in this exhibit.
- I would also like to thank and recognize the people who have made this exhibit possible. It took enormous generosity, dedication, and wisdom to make this happen.

[Special thanks to Marcia Tucker and the staff of The New Museum of Contemporary Art who curated and organized this exhibit; the Iris and B. Gerald Cantor Foundation; J. Carter Brown; the lending institutions; White House Preservation Committee and the White House Historical Association; White House Curator Rex Scouten; The Association of Art Museum Directors]

###

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

National Arts and Humanities Month

October 1994

The arts have long been an integral part of America's cultural heritage, encouraging us to gain a deeper understanding of ourselves and of our society. In a world too often beset by hatred and incivility, the arts and humanities empower us to celebrate our individual identities, while reminding us of the values and commitments that unite us as a country.

Although the rich diversity of our nation would seem to preclude an official American culture, we have a powerful tradition of artistic expression and intellectual inquiry that honors every one of us equally. Through art, music, literature, history, and philosophy, we preserve and pass along, from generation to generation, our most cherished images, ideas, and beliefs.

For more than two centuries, the arts and humanities have helped Americans transcend political, religious, racial, and ethnic divisions by engaging us in the common task of interpreting and expressing the meaning of human experience. When we read each other's stories, discuss each other's ideas, and feel each other's emotions through dance, painting, and song, we come to understand the complexity and texture of each other's lives. In so doing, we gain a greater appreciation and understanding of the breadth of human thought and emotion. And we gain a more profound sense of our common purpose as Americans.

But if the arts and humanities are essential to appreciating and preserving our culture, they are also essential to our growth and renewal as a people. For it is only by deepening our understanding, unleashing our imaginations, and enlarging our capacities to see and to feel that we can envision a better future for ourselves, our communities, and our nation.

In the new and complicated century that awaits us, we will depend even more on our artists and humanists to help us discover the roots of our deepest beliefs and gain a vision of our most promising possibilities.

The month of October has been designated National Arts and Humanities Month, and I urge all Americans to celebrate the artistic and intellectual freedoms we enjoy and to reflect on the crucial role they play in reinvigorating and renewing our great nation every day.

Bill Clinton

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

June 6, 1995

For Immediate Release

Remarks by
First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton
at the 125th Anniversary Celebration of the
Metropolitan Museum of Art
New York, New York

MRS. CLINTON: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you, very much. It is such a great honor and pleasure for me to join you this evening. I am someone who is a great fan of this Museum and a great fan of the Cantors.

And to have an occasion such as this where we celebrate both a special. I want to add my word of thanks to this Museum and to all of you who have supported it, nurtured it, loved it, brought it to where it is today. I have just had an opportunity to view the proposed new galleries, for the exhibition of the collection of Greek and Roman art, as I was told, the finest collection in the Western hemisphere.

And it is very exciting to see the plans for this and to know what a contribution it will make to the continuing greatness of the Museum. None of this would be possible without all of you who have been patrons and supporters of this Museum. And tonight, we honor two people who have been especially important.

Bill and Bernie have over the years stood behind so many important causes in health care and education. And tonight, we celebrate their contribution to the arts. What they have done by their generosity has not only meant that literally millions of people have been enhanced by their eye, their passion, their commitment. But it has also, I believe, served to spur others to be similarly generous with their own love of art.

For all we celebrate tonight, I must say, though, it is something of a bittersweet moment, for those of us who care deeply about the arts in our country. Because, there is, as you know, a movement underway to undermine the cultural traditions that all of you in this room are upholding by your presence tonight.

It is sad, that there are those among us who do not appreciate what this Museum represents - what it stands for. And who more than that, do not understand that our democracy depends upon culture. We are witnessing a full-scale assault on public support of the arts which in many ways is misguided and misinformed. One of the great accomplishments of the arts in America, is that it truly has become part of the public domain.

Accessible to all, firing the imaginations of all. I was told that Bernie saw his first Rodin here in 1945 and look where it has led. There is a proud tradition in our country of both private and public support - a unique partnership unlike what exists in many other countries not only in modern times but going back through history. Where art was either the domain of the public or of the private. But instead, in America there has been this marriage.

And that is thanks, in large part, to far-sighted people, like yourselves in both the public and the private sector. The NEA has helped to bring art to millions of Americans who would not have otherwise enjoyed it.

It has supported artists and teachers, students, men, women and children, whose daily lives have been transformed by their exposure to great art. And I would like to thank Bill Lures and the trustees, and the members of the business committee and all of you who have raised your voices in the last months on behalf of public support for the arts. I hope you will continue to do so because we cannot afford to retreat from that commitment.

I would argue strongly, that, contrary to what some say, public support for the arts is a luxury we can no longer afford, that it is, instead, a necessity for the continuing strength and vitality of our community of culture in this country.

It is particularly ironic that those who bemoan the loss of civility and character and the loss of values in America are the first to recommend obliterating the federal agencies, in many ways putting back on state and local support, responsible for promoting our cultural traditions.

For example, the Greek and Roman exhibition that is being worked on now, for those who at one hand, claim they support our Western traditions and Western civilization but who on the other hand would not support the kind of exhibition that would bring to life those very traditions and roots; are living, in my view, a very ironic way of demanding we do what they say, without recognizing how important it is to give other people the chance to have the same experience that they have had.

They fail to appreciate what every generation of Americans have intuitively known, that our artistic imagination is critical to our civilization and our democracy. So I hope that, as we think about this Museum tonight and the contribution of the Cantors, we will think about ways that each of us can try to continue the traditions represented. And we will think, too, about all of the children, two hundred to three hundred thousand a year, who come to this Museum. The potential artists and teachers and lovers and patrons of the arts of the future.

To make sure that their potential for appreciating what we have today, thanks to the partnership between public and private lovers of the art; will always be there. Yes, we have hard decisions to make in America; yes, they are challenging. But let us remember what really lies at the root of greatness as a people - investing in our future, caring about the best of our traditions. And let's not turn our back on that kind of legacy.

With your help, your generosity, your energy and your commitment, I don't think we will, but I know this is a challenging time. I personally wanted to be here this evening to thank the Cantors, to thank the Museum and to thank all of you for standing up on behalf of the arts in America. Thank you all.
(Applause)

###

8TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1995 The New York Times Company
The New York Times

August 13, 1995, Sunday, Late Edition - Final

SECTION: Section 7; Page 1; Column 2; Book Review Desk

LENGTH: 2177 words

HEADLINE: Bigger Than the Family, Smaller Than the State

BYLINE: By Fareed Zakaria; Fareed Zakaria is the managing editor of Foreign Affairs.

BODY:

TRUST

The Social Virtues and
the Creation of Prosperity.

By Francis Fukuyama.

457 pp. New York:

The Free Press. \$25.

IN 1989, as Communism teetered on the brink, Francis Fukuyama wrote a now-legendary essay extravagantly titled "The End of History." In it, he argued that the global movement toward democracy and capitalism had brought to a final conclusion the centuries-old ideological debate over the ideal form of government. Now Mr. Fukuyama has shifted his attention from the state to society; the result is a fascinating and frustrating book, "Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity." We have settled on the structure of the state, he writes, but "liberal political and economic institutions depend on a healthy and dynamic civil society for their vitality."

In the world of ideas, civil society is hot. It is almost impossible to read an article on foreign or domestic politics without coming across some mention of the concept. And "civil society" has bipartisan appeal; from Hillary Rodham Clinton to Pat Buchanan, politicians of all stripes routinely sing its praises.

At the heart of the concept of civil society lie "intermediate institutions," private groups that thrive between the realm of the state and the family. Alexis de Tocqueville famously observed during his sojourn in this country that America was teeming with such associations -- charities, choral groups, church study groups, book clubs -- and that they had a remarkably salutary effect on society, turning selfish individuals into public-spirited citizens.

The renewed interest in civil society first emerged in Eastern Europe after Communism crumbled. Leaders like Vaclav Havel wanted to go beyond establishing new governments and create a culture that could sustain political and economic liberalism. They looked for help to those private groups beyond the reach of the state -- citizens' associations, churches, human-rights chapters, jazz clubs -- that had nourished dissident life. Around the same time, the victorious Western democracies found themselves confronting sagging economies, a fraying social fabric and the loss of national purpose. Here too, the experts and statesmen agreed, revitalizing civil society would overcome our malaise.

The New York Times, August 13, 1995

Mr. Fukuyama, a social scientist and former State Department analyst who is now a scholar at the Rand Corporation, pushes Tocqueville's argument a step further. The art of association is good not just for politics, he asserts, but for economics too: association inculcates the habit of working together with ease and therefore increases productivity; it makes rigid rules and complex legal contracts unnecessary. In short, it smooths the frictions of capitalism. Since Tocqueville, we have assumed that Rotary Clubs help democracy; Mr. Fukuyama tells us they help capitalism as well.

The ability to form the kind of groups that will help, Mr. Fukuyama argues, depends on trust. If a society has a culture of trust, and particularly if its members have the capacity to trust people outside their families, it generates "social capital," which is as useful as financial capital to its economic well-being. "Social capital is critical to prosperity and to what has come to be called competitiveness," he says. *

Or that is what he says sometimes. Mr. Fukuyama has almost written two books in one. The first is his argument, interleaved throughout his 457 pages, for the virtue of trust, social capital and intermediate groups. The second, the bulk of the book, contains well-researched case studies of three "high-trust" countries -- Germany, Japan and the United States -- and three "low-trust" countries, France, Italy and China. In a discussion that is dazzling in its intelligence and complexity, he explains how trust and culture have affected the economic and political life of these six countries. Mr. Fukuyama ranges widely across civilizations and subjects, writing with as much originality and insight about Confucianism as about corporate structure. This very richness and nuance, however, undermines his book's general arguments.

MR. FUKUYAMA'S central assertion is that the strength of civil society strongly affects the industrial structure of societies. Far from being three distinct forms of capitalism, the American, Japanese and German economies, he says, bear a striking resemblance to one another. All three are dominated by large, private, professionally managed corporations, like the General Electric Company, the Toyota Motor Corporation and Siemens. France, Italy and China, on the other hand, have many small, family-run companies and a few giant, state-owned or subsidized corporations, like Renault and Italy's large banks. Mr. Fukuyama makes a persuasive case that this difference in industrial structure stems from differences in levels of trust within these societies. In France, Italy and China, people appear little able to trust anyone outside their families and form few intermediate organizations. The United States, Japan and Germany, by contrast, are societies of joiners, filled with organizations that bring strangers together in various ways. In a striking example, Mr. Fukuyama recounts how Wang Laboratories, "the one Chinese brand name familiar to many Americans," collapsed because its founder could not bring himself to trust professional managers and instead handed the company over to his incompetent son.

The correlation between trust and industrial structure is unimpeachable. But does it matter? Mr. Fukuyama admits that large professional corporations are not necessarily better for a country's growth or productivity. (The three fastest-growing industrialized nations in the postwar period have been Japan, France and Italy -- one high-trust and two low-trust countries.) In fact, some economists argue that in the post-industrial age, small companies have the flexibility to outwit their larger, lumbering competitors. Small businesses have produced most of the jobs in the industrial world in the last two decades. In

The New York Times, August 13, 1995

the end, Mr. Fukuyama reverts to a best-of-both-worlds prescription: the ideal economy, he says, would have small companies that are linked together, thus gaining both flexibility and size. Yet it is not clear why high-trust societies would be better at creating such arrangements. Indeed, linkages among small firms have already begun flourishing in low-trust Italy and China.

Social capital, then, is not critical to prosperity. Mr. Fukuyama mentions some ways that it might be useful economically, in positioning a country in key technological sectors, maintaining domestic control of arms industries and so on. But in truth, he seems to believe that civil society and social capital are good, not for their economic consequences, but rather for their noneconomic benefits. The "more important consequences," he writes, "may not be felt in the economy so much as in social and political life." Civil society breeds sociability, community and citizenship, and bolsters liberal democratic government; in other words, we are back to Tocqueville.

But even Tocqueville may have been wrong, not in his empirical observation that intermediate institutions bolster the American system of government, but in his generalization that such institutions are the key to democracy. Much of the current scholarly interest in intermediate institutions has been based on a study of Italian politics by the distinguished social scientist Robert D. Putnam, who argues that the rich civil society of northern Italy has fostered better government than the group-poor society of southern Italy. The book is brilliant, but its title, "Making Democracy Work," is utterly misleading. The Italian north has been better run than the Italian south for hundreds of years, during which time the country was, to put it mildly, not always democratic. One might more reasonably conclude from Mr. Putnam's research that social capital makes any regime work, whether monarchical, democratic or fascist. Democratic theorists, in fact, have typically disliked efficient government because it increases the power of the state vis-a-vis society, which is why James Madison consciously designed the Government of the United States to be unwieldy.

Behind much of the new interest in civil society, on the part of communitarians as well as social conservatives, is the idea that culture and society shape the nature of government. Obviously, there is some truth to this. But there is a tradition much older than Tocqueville's, running from Aristotle to Montesquieu, that asserts that fundamentally the state shapes society, not the other way around. Mr. Fukuyama claims that deep (and relatively unchanging) cultural traditions create trust, but his empirical sections suggest that culture is quite malleable. He argues -- persuasively -- that the growth of an overly centralized, regulatory and legalistic American state in the last 25 years has crowded out our once-flourishing civil society. Similarly, he shows that the reason the French, Italians and Chinese seem unwilling to trust people outside their families in business activities is a simple one. All three countries experienced long periods of centralized, arbitrary and domineering government with little respect for property rights and business contracts.

From East Asia to Africa, states that hit the right balance between order and liberty create successful nations and societies. (Even the Czech Republic will succeed more because of what Vaclav Klaus, the conservative economist who is Prime Minister, does to its state than what Vaclav Havel, the philosopher and playwright who is President, does to its society.) Consider Russia today, whose success or failure surely depends more on getting its political and economic fundamentals right than on the number of soccer leagues that spring up in Moscow. This is because the structure of the state has powerful effects, for

The New York Times, August 13, 1995

good or for ill, but also because not all Russia's private groups will be soccer leagues. The Mafia is, after all, an intermediate institution. The Middle East, to take another example, is currently experiencing a renaissance of intermediate institutions, but the citizens' groups forming there are often intolerant, politically and religiously extreme, and advocate violence and terror. It is difficult to believe that the emergence of more groups like these will lead to genuine democracy there.

We have come to think of civil society as being full of Rotary Clubs, Red Cross chapters and social workers' groups. Such organizations, of course, help bolster liberal democracy. But the space between the realm of government and that of the family can be filled with all kinds of associations, liberal and illiberal. Historians have amply laid out how the Nazi Party made its first inroads through infiltrating local groups. On a less extreme note, many of the small groups that have formed in America over the last two decades have been thoroughly illiberal in spirit: victims' groups that have discouraged individual responsibility, minority clubs that have Balkanized the campus and the workplace, pseudoreligious cults with violent agendas. Will more of these save American democracy?

In the economic realm, some private groups can actually hurt economic growth. Mr. Fukuyama is well aware that historically "medieval producers following the economic doctrines of the Catholic Church," as well as some unions and small special-interest groups, have created the deadlock and stasis that are inimical to energetic capitalism. Social capital, he says revealingly, "is likely to be helpful from an economic standpoint only if it is used to build wealth-creating economic organizations." Exactly. We like intermediate institutions when they have good effects and dislike them when they have bad ones. What we want, it would seem, is not civil society, but civics -- what the Romans called *civitas*; that is, public-spiritedness, sacrifice for the community, citizenship, even nobility. But not all of civil society is civic minded.

In a thoughtful essay at the beginning of this year, Mr. Putnam argued that America's social capital is dwindling dangerously; membership in Rotary Clubs, P.T.A.'s and the Boy Scouts is dropping. As a symbol of the problem, he noted that while more Americans are bowling, fewer are bowling in leagues and groups. With its haunting title, "Bowling Alone," the piece won applause across the spectrum, from George Will to President Bill Clinton.

Less noticed was a report in The New York Times four months later on Timothy J. McVeigh, the accused bomber of the Federal Building in Oklahoma City. It turns out that Mr. McVeigh and his buddies, Terry and James Nichols, would go to a bowling alley some evenings. The group seemed to perform all the functions of a good intermediate institution, creating a sense of community, fostering comradeship and facilitating the planning of group projects. But perhaps we would all have been better off if Mr. McVeigh had gone bowling alone.

GRAPHIC: Drawing

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: August 13, 1995

Wiss

THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITMENT TO THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

"For more than two centuries, the arts and the humanities have helped Americans transcend political, religious, racial and ethnic divisions by engaging us in the common task of interpreting and expressing the meaning of human experience. When we read each other's stories, discuss each other's ideas, and feel each other's emotions through dance, painting and song, we come to understand the complexity and texture of each other's lives. In doing so, we gain a greater appreciation and understanding of the breadth of human thought and emotion. And we gain a more profound sense of our common purpose as Americans."

President William J. Clinton, October 1994

President Clinton believes that a strong cultural life is the signature of a great nation. He has observed that the arts and the humanities stir our citizens' minds and senses, stimulating the learning and collective discourse we need in a participatory democracy.

Affirming Public Support

"America has flourished for over 200 years because of our willingness to cultivate the human spirit. In these challenging times, when some are questioning the value of public support for the arts and humanities, we must remember that these pursuits are not a luxury that we can live without - they are a vital part of our national character, the motivating force that makes us who we are."

President William J. Clinton, October 1995

President Clinton stood firm in his defense of the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Institute of Museum Services in the face of Congressional attempts to eliminate these agencies and to undermine our nation's rich cultural tradition. In vetoing the 1996 Interior Appropriations bill, he wrote to Congress in December of 1995:

"This bill is unacceptable because it would unduly restrict our ability to protect America's natural resources and cultural heritage...the bill represents a dramatic departure from our commitment to support for the arts and the humanities. It cuts funding of the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities so deeply as to jeopardize their capacity to keep providing the cultural, educational and artistic programs that enrich America's communities large and small."

In his 1997 budget message, the President recommended restoring \$36.5 million to the NEA's reduced budget of \$99.5 million, \$26 million to the NEH (now at \$110 million) and \$2 million to the IMS (now at \$21 million).

Celebrating America's Artists and Scholars

"The human imagination is still the most powerful tool we have in moving forward as a civilization."

President William J. Clinton, October 7, 1993

"Where there is imagination, there is always hope. Where there is potential for creative expression, there is always the possibility for human progress."

Hillary Rodham Clinton, June 15, 1994

Through events at the White House, the President and the First Lady convey the importance of the arts and the humanities, ~~in their rich variety~~, to American society.

Awards: Each year the President honors the nation's leading artists, scholars and cultural institutions.

- The National Medal of Arts - ~~recommended by the National Endowment for the Arts~~, and the Frankel Prize for outstanding work in the humanities - ~~recommended by the National Endowment for the Humanities~~ awarded each year in a ceremony ~~at the White House lawn~~. Recipients include: Ossie Davis and Ruby Dee, Charles Kuralt, David McCullough, Ray Charles and Arthur Miller.
- The National Award for Museum Services, presented by the First Lady in October 1994 and 1995, (explain)
- The National Heritage Awards, also presented by Mrs. Clinton, ~~which~~ recognize great traditional artists from the rich diversity of U.S. heritage.
- The Presidential Design Awards, hosted annually by the First Lady, ~~which~~ showcase the best in federal ~~buildings~~ and construction.

Isn't it also inventions and machines?

Exhibitions: The First Lady opened up the White House for exhibits of American art that the visiting public ~~have the chance to see~~. on view for the visiting public.

- The First Lady created the White House Sculpture Garden to showcase 20th century American sculpture from museum collections all around the country, and to make the White House grounds more inviting and accessible to the thousands of ~~Americans~~ ^{visitors} who ~~visit every day~~ enter each day.
- The First Lady assembled the White House Crafts Collection, a permanent collection of 72 pieces by 77 outstanding American artisans.

Events: Hundreds of artists performed at the Inaugural ceremonies and at the White House during the last four years, including Maya Angelou, Aretha Franklin, Mstislav Rostropovich, Isaac Stern, Jesse Norman, Pinchas Zukerman, Kathleen Battle, Thomas Hampson and Dawn Upshaw. Also showcased were:

Jessye?

- Young artists such as the St. Lawrence String Quartet, young dancers from Jacques D'Amboise's National Dance Institute, and the Chicago Children's Choir.
- The four-part Public Broadcasting Service series, "In Performance at the White House," presenting American talent in jazz, country and western, blues and soul music.
- American historians and other scholars, such as _____, ^{who travel} adding their ideas and expertise to ~~the Administration's thinking~~ ^{with the Administration's special}.

Expanding Our Children's Creativity

(HRC quote?)

Exposure to the arts must be a part of every child's schooling. Whether a youngster grows up in a ghetto, on a farm, in a city or a suburb, the arts are a vehicle for self-expression and for building self-esteem. The arts enable children from all backgrounds to develop their individuality and to contribute positively to the larger mosaic of American culture.

As part of our GOALS 2000 legislation, the arts will become a core subject in the school curriculum, along with English, math, science, history, civics, geography and foreign language...If we plan wisely today, our children will enjoy a lifelong connection to the arts, to our collective spirit, and to the never-ending process of learning.

President William J. Clinton, April 14, 1994

The President and Mrs. Clinton believe that all children should be able to explore their creative potentials through artistic and intellectual activities. They also have seen (first hand) how participation can transform "any child, but especially those at risk, beyond the bounds that circumstance has prescribed." (Hillary Rodham Clinton)

The First Lady ^(continues to) draws attention to the central role the arts and the humanities play in children's lives as she highlights some of the most successful programs in the country.

- Recently, she visited the Manchester Craftsman's Guild in North Pittsburgh and Gallery 37 in Chicago - programs for at-risk youth. *Gallery 37 not just for at-risk*
- In a White House ceremony recognizing the work of the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Institute of Museum Services, she released Coming Up Taller: Arts and Humanities Programs for Children and Youth At Risk, prepared by the President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities, *explain its findings*

(note: not sure we were including the above bullets)

The Administration encourages programs and partnerships ^{with} ~~across~~ the government, such as the youth program "Pathways to Success" funded by the Department of Justice and the National Endowment for the Arts.

Providing Cultural Leadership

President Clinton believes that the federal government can be a leader in supporting and promoting our cultural traditions.

President Clinton appointed strong, energetic leaders to head the federal cultural agencies:

- Jane Alexander as Chair of the National Endowment for the Arts
- John Brademas as Chair of the President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities
- Diane Frankel as Director of the Institute of Museum Services
- Sheldon Hackney as Chair of the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Signaling his dedication to the importance of America's cultural life, the President revitalized the President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities and charged the Committee with the ~~task~~ ^{task} of increasing private sector support for the arts and the humanities and increasing the public's ~~perception~~ ^{appreciation} of their value to society.

Federal agencies with cultural programs expand the influence of the arts and the humanities at home and abroad.

- U.S. Information Agency artistic and scholarly exchange programs share America's cultural genius with people around the world.
- The General Services Administration improves the design of public buildings and incorporates art into federal architecture.
- The Art in Embassies Program at the U.S. Department of State places over 2,200 works of art in more than 170 countries.
- The 1995 White House Conference on Travel and Tourism promoted cultural and heritage tourism. ??

End with quote?

Try to list more federal agency programs?

Under Affirming Public Support add: President Clinton supported full appropriations to our great federal cultural institutions such as the Smithsonian Institution, the Library of Congress, the National Gallery of Art and the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. (?)

I think this is still too long - what can we drop?

**SERVING DEMOCRACY BY SERVING
THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES**

(Traditional Perspectives, Unique Modern Conditions)

BY BENJAMIN R. BARBER



Washington, D.C. 1997

*An essay prepared for Creative America,
a report by the President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities
describing the system of support for cultural life in the United States today*

The relationship of the arts and the humanities to a free democratic society -- its diversity and pluralism, its manifold liberties, its openness and flexibility -- is complex and often problematic. The arts can flourish in democracy but have often developed with remarkable vibrancy as part of a culture of dissent or rebellion in autocratic societies. Democracy needs the arts (and the humanities which they anchor), for they constitute a crucial element in civil society's cultural infrastructure. Yet the democratic impulse has sometimes found itself at odds with artists and felt threatened by the avant garde or anti-majoritarian or the aristocratic in culture.

Ultimately, democracy perhaps needs the arts more than the arts need democracy -- although there is an obvious and vital symbiosis between the two in a well-functioning free society. For a free society gains its liberty and its democratic vitality from civil society, and the arts and humanities invest civil society with its creativity, its diverseness and its liberating spontaneity. What complicates the relationship is the market, with which civil society is sometimes conflated. The market offers free and private space to art and culture and thus insulates it from official governmental direction and censorship. But because market space is commercial space it draws the arts into commerce and exchange and can imperil artistic autonomy from a different quarter.

Historically, the relationship between the arts (which I will take here as paradigmatic of the larger phrase "arts and humanities") and society has taken

a number of different forms: some of those forms have seen the arts as mimetically reflecting society's norms and mores or even cheerleading for its official conventions and ideologies; others segregate the arts from society or give it a romantic rebellious character. Among the possible perspectives are:

THE CLASSICAL
THE ROMANTIC
THE REALIST (DISSENT VERSION)
THE REALIST (OFFICIAL VERSION)
THE AESTHETIC (LIBERAL)
THE ARISTOCRATIC (HIGH ART)
THE DEMOCRATIC (POP ART)
THE COMMERCIAL

THE CLASSICAL perspective treats the arts as a way of seeing (theoria or spectatorship) that, because it competes with religion, philosophy and political philosophy, either reinforces or rivals their visions of the social and the political. The tragic poets saw themselves as allies of the new democracy, for example, while the comedic writers of later Athens were critics of philosophical aristocracy (Aristophanes ridiculing Socrates in *The Clouds*). Aristocratic philosophy saw itself engaged in the same competition and so, Plato felt constrained to ban the poets from his aristocratic *Republic*, protesting that "artists craft phantoms" at a third remove from reality and are likely to corrupt justice in a well-ordered commonwealth.

Crucial to this perspective is the insistence on the absolute interactivity of art and politics. For better or worse, the two are regarded as being engaged in a single enterprise: that of fashioning a common vision for a people to feel,

think and live by. In the Athenian world, art had explicit public functions and was, for example, well represented in religious and civic festivals such as the Olympiad -- the forerunner of today's more narrowly construed athletic competitions. The great tragic trilogies of Aeschylus and Sophocles were written for these festivals, and were regarded less as mere entertainments and more as reflections on the civic and spiritual life of the Athenian polis.

The neo-classicism of the Enlightenment reflected the same intertwining of aesthetics, politics and truth. It supposed the three to be bound up together in much the same fashion. Keats' certainty that "truth's beauty and beauty's truth" and Shelley's wish that poetry might be the world's true legislator were nothing if not Athenian in their unitary aspirations.

THE ROMANTIC perspective lies at the other end of the art/society spectrum, although it also posits art as a profound form of power. It treats it, however, as an expression of inner vision -- a journey to the interior of the soul -- that is necessarily at odds with the norms of conventional society and its officialdom, whether they are democratic or autocratic. As a function of radical individual imagination, especially as it emerged immediately before and after the French Revolution, romantic art implacably opposed the ordinary and mundane. Because its sense of justice was personal and individual, it rarely could make common cause with social movements, even when they were conducted in justice's good name. Society could appreciate the products of the romantic imagination, but got no quarter from romantic artists who saw

themselves not as society's true teachers but its eternal rebels — its outlaws and outcasts.

A revolutionary democratic society may be assisted at its birth by romantic culture, but almost as soon as it becomes institutionalized and constitutionalized finds itself the target of its erstwhile romantic allies. Byron may have hoped to liberate Greece and put into practice Shelley's dream of poetry as the true Legislator of the world, but romanticism has succeeded as society's conscience and prod rather than as its constitution.

Eric Bentley referred to artists, approvingly, as "desperate characters," while John Cage has defined art as "criminal action." In the romantic vision, the artist is an outlaw of the mundane who pushes against limits, revolts against convention, and makes war on reality itself. "The weapon of poetry," wrote Ortega y Gasset with only a hint of hyperbole, "turns against natural things and wounds and murders them." Romantic artists are thus often viewed by society as self-lacerating madmen; they in turn treat social reality as a form of conventional madness (see the charming inversions of the film *King of Hearts*). No wonder that such artists may feel homeless in the mundane world, and see their journey (Eliot's words) as one of "continual self-sacrifice, a continual extinction of personality."

THE REALIST perspective (in its **dissent version**) has much in common with romanticism, but is outer- rather than inner-directed: rooted in a

sociological concern with justice in the real world and concerned with the individual as a member of communities of class, race and gender. It is thus fixed on reforming the world and its actual constitutions even if that means the refashioning of human souls. In writers like Ibsen, Zola, Shaw and Brecht the world's injustices are uncovered and revealed. Art's program here is liberation, not just of the unfettered imagination but of individuals as social beings. Nora's plight in Ibsen's *A Doll's House* models realism's concern with coercion and freedom and its quest for a way out. Like romantic art, realist art has a hand in democracy's generation. Unlike romanticism, however, it is less skeptical of the social products of its imagination – which leads it sometimes into imprudent alliances with states putatively founded on social justice, realism in its official version.

THE REALIST perspective in the **official version** – realism after the revolution, as it were – portrays culture as a critic of corrupt, autocratic societies but as a friend of democratic or socialist government or national socialist governments. Indeed, it is their handmaiden since, when successful, such governments supposedly incorporate the ideals in the name of which the revolution has been made and liberation won. The stubborn rebel may here become the mindless cheerleader. A visionary realist like Gorki thus becomes a supporter of the Soviet State after the Bolshevik revolution just as a realist critic of bourgeois society like Brecht becomes a cultural apparatchik of the East German State after the Communist accession to power there.

If justice and liberation are the true aims of art, the realist argument insists, then a "just" state legislating for a supposedly liberated society can presume to call upon artists to legitimate and communicate its ideals and order. Socialist as well as national socialist realism made exactly these claims. Even genuine democracies have enlisted artists in their cause. Democratic artists like Whitman, Frost and Langston Hughes, even as they protested the unjust and thus "un-American" features of the United States, have written "patriotically" about America as a potential land of liberty.

THE AESTHETIC perspective assumes the traditional liberal separation of private and public that insulates art from official society. It has no truck with officialdom, whether democratic or tyrannical. It assumes that art has private, aesthetic ends that are neither for or against democracy (or any other regime form) but simply irrelevant to it. Art is what artists do. It is to be prized for its integral aesthetic standards and its universal effect rather than judged on its relationship to the politically particular. "My art," said Nabakov, "bears no messages. I am not a postman." Irving Howe, often regarded as a moralist, nonetheless wrote: "There are kinds of beauty before which the moral imagination ought to withdraw." Even the realist Brecht decided, towards the end of his life, that art finally could have no other justification than itself, than *Spass* or simple fun (entertainment). In this liberal view, the only responsibility democracy has for art is to guarantee it private space in which it can flourish. The only thing art demands from democracy in turn is to be left

alone. True liberals are unlikely to think state subsidies for the arts are any more legitimate or desirable than state censorship. A high wall between the two that guarantees art security from the democratic "tyranny of opinion" (Tocqueville) and guarantees society security from political and propagandistic interventions by politicized artists is, from the liberal perspective, the only prudent policy. When at the end of his life Joseph Papp of the New York Shakespeare Festival decided he could no longer accept funding from the National Endowment for the Arts and preserve his aesthetic liberty, he was adopting a classical liberal posture.

THE ARISTOCRATIC perspective (defending **high art**) takes art to have an aristocratic function in a democratic society: to preserve the finer things in a vulgar world, to represent the taste of the cultivated minority in a mediocre majoritarian arena. Here beauty and truth are thought to represent independently grounded standards that can be used to mark off and judge the practices of a democratic culture (there is thus an element of neo-classicism here, since the high art perspective is not indifferent to the society by which it feels compromised and demeaned). Journals like *The New Criterion* have purveyed this aristocratic perspective with verve and Allan Bloom made it the keystone to his arch critique of democratic culture in his *The Closing of the American Mind*.

The art for art's sake complaint against government subsidized art is less the liberal fear of censorship as it is the aristocratic fear of a levelling

mediocrity. To yield to a democratic government's well-intended cultural ministrations is to acquiesce in what Tocqueville called the powerful "empire of opinion" that can only corrupt a pure cultural vision. The aristocrat eschews government "meddling" in the arts not out of respect for the liberal wall between private and public but out of disdain for a (by definition) "debased" democratic public realm.

THE DEMOCRATIC or popular art perspective is in some ways the mirror image of the aristocratic perspective. It takes art to be an expression of the dominant popular culture, and thus privileges as art those forms of popular expression that best reflect the majority's tastes. Art is not something distinct from or "above" society but society's aesthetic expression. It represents not some elite's abstract standards but whatever artists -- understood broadly as anyone who is engaged in self-expression and communication -- do. There is no distinction here to be made between pop art and high art other than the "pretensions" of those who purvey the latter.

In concrete terms, this perspective appeals to the "artist in everyone," and leads to "democratic" arts policies aimed at arts education and programs of fair distribution that spread the cultural wealth -- art and art subsidies -- to every part of the country rather than leaving them to a narrow coterie of so-called "elite" institutions. Its egalitarianism (depending on your point of view) both popularizes and vulgarizes art. Some claim that it also relativizes art by equating one "taste culture" (Herbert Gans) with another and, in the post-

modernist fashion, declaring all aesthetic visions and all cultural texts equal. In a popular arts perspective, government intervention is a natural outgrowth of art's public and popular character.

THE COMMERCIAL perspective treats art as a commodity no different than any other commercial product of the free market. To the degree democracy is reduced to free market philosophy, the commercial perspective may appear as an economistic version of the democratic perspective. It measures art by its capacity to attract consumers and pay for itself in the market's hard currencies. In doing so, it blurs distinctions between art and entertainment, between culture and commodity, and between self-expression and consumption. It treats popular (pop) art as conventional: fully embedded in the market. The commercial perspective can be understood as one particular dimension of the democratic perspective, but because it has serious consequences for policy (the commodification of art), it requires its own category and has policy entailments that may differ from those of the pop art perspective. Government, from this viewpoint, may wish to offset the constraining effects of markets and try to guarantee diversity against the market's uniformity, for example.

* * *

Historically, few societies have represented only one of these ideal types, least of all, the United States. In practice, they overlap and intersect.

Most polities are characterized by some variable and evolving combination, often in contradictory ways. In America, there has been some movement historically from liberal and aristocratic perspectives (in the nineteenth century), through romantic and realist/dissent perspectives (from the twenties through the sixties in this century), to a rough dialectic of aristocratic, democratic pop art and commercial perspectives in recent years. However, it would not be hard to demonstrate that aspects of nearly all of the perspectives noted above can be detected today in American struggles over arts policy and discussions of censorship, funding and arts education. Is there a state council for the arts where aristocratic advocates of pure art do not confront democratic advocates of art for everyone? where zealous supporters of culture's necessarily subversive (romantic) role are not arrayed against patriotic boosters of an official art sanctioned by and supportive of conventional cultural norms? Indeed, these ongoing arguments are themselves an expression of the pluralistic character of the "culture of culture" in the United States.

Like other observers and critics, I have my own generic views about the relationship between art and politics generally, and the arts and humanities and American society as it exists today. I suspect in general that art and culture are a good deal more resilient than most worriers allow. Absent subsidy, absent even democracy, and in the presence of the conformist pressures of either political autocracy or majoritarian mass opinion, the arts survive. For they are rooted in indelible human genius and an irrepressible

need for authentic self-expression and communication that surface under almost every imaginable condition, including the Gulag and the extermination camps of Nazi Germany. They are as difficult to root out and destroy as the human spirit itself.

At the same time, there are important and quite distinctive practical consequences that flow from the several perspectives portrayed above. The ultimate survivability of art is not an adequate reason to avoid addressing tough questions of arts policy in a democracy. Perhaps most importantly, the common linkage of democracy and the arts to a robust civil society demands careful attention. Democracy is not just a matter of formal governing institutions and a constitutional framework of popular sovereignty. A free press and a ready sense of rights are necessary but hardly sufficient conditions for democratic practice. As Dewey noted, democracy is as much a way of life as a form of government, and its success rests on the existence and heartiness of the civic domain – understood as distinct both from the government and the private commercial domain.

Civil society is constituted by free voluntary institutions that are also public in nature. Foundations, civic associations, charities, schools, religious institutions and the free media are all part of this domain – along with the arts. Indeed, the arts are civil society's driving engine, the key to its creativity, its diversity, its imagination and hence its spontaneousness and liberty. As democracy depends on civil society for its liberal spiritedness, so civil society

depends on the arts. And in this manner, democracy ultimately rests on the arts' commitment to free creativity, liberal diversity and unfettered imagination. A government that supports the arts and the humanities is not engaging in philanthropic activity but assuring the conditions of its own flourishing. This is perhaps the most important single argument in favor of a democratic government playing some role in the arts: not in the name of the needs of the arts, but in the name of the needs of democracy.

Under normal circumstances, however much a democratic way of life depends on the creativity and critical imagination generated by the arts and however much it is enhanced when it rests on a robust civic infrastructure nourished by the arts, the arts can survive without democratic support -- indeed, without a democratic constitution. Our circumstances today are not entirely normal, however. Under the adverse conditions of pervasive mass commerce, and as a consequence of our growing ambivalence about diversity and pluralism in what some fear is a hyper-pluralistic society, the arts may both be at risk and be necessary in unprecedented ways. Consequently, there may be some specific arguments in favor of a modest government presence in arts education and an argument for incentives and subsidies for creation and performance beyond the general relationship posited above between democracy, civil society and the arts. In particular, there are two conditions that have altered the landscape today and offer special justification for government intervention. The first is an ever more overweening commercial

environment, the second an ever more diversified and (some fear) fragmented society. Let me briefly address each of these crucial issues and how they may impact on arts policy.

COMMERCE: Art may have more to fear from the uncoerced and largely invisible constraints of commercialization nowadays than it does from a too pushy or censorious government. Artists in turn, although they certainly have the "right" to isolate themselves from society and pursue their muse free from interference, may discover that by assuming responsibilities for arts education and civic engagement, they contribute to a climate that is as tolerant and pluralistic as liberal philosophy says it ought to be. Artists as artists are responsible only to their art; but artists are also citizens, and as citizens they have a particular responsibility to contribute to and nourish an arts-supportive civil society. In doing so they serve both democracy and themselves, their fellow citizens and their art.

Advocates of "privatizing," suspicious of government meddling in the arts, may think that they are supporting a liberal domain of the private when they call for laissez-faire. But in an era when civil society has been collapsed into the commercial market sector, privatization may turn out to mean commercialization and the arts will not be "left alone" but subjected to the harsh interventionist dynamics of commerce. Under such conditions, neither high art, rebellious art nor even ordinary amateur art (community theater for

example) are likely to thrive. The market pushes towards uniformity of taste, a levelling of standards, and the commodification of art product in ways that will satisfy almost no one -- whatever perspective they represent. Magazines trump books, newspapers trump magazines, tabloids trump newspapers, television trumps tabloids, MTV trumps television -- until not even popular culture in its full diversity can survive, let alone the more fragile arts found on the margins of the conventional.

Not just high art and rebellious art, but popular culture too needs the incentives and balancing support of government and arts council subsidy in a market that, while "free" in theory, is in practice often monopolistic in ownership and conformist in taste. "Public" television has offered a place on the broadcast spectra where "other" tastes -- some "high," some "popular," but in any case not necessarily likely to flourish in a pure market environment -- can have a chance to educate, cultivate and entertain audiences. I can think of no good reason why so modest a presence, had for so modest a cost, should be seen as either a harbinger of government-sponsored taste or a usurpation of an otherwise quite nearly sovereign set of commercial market mechanisms.

DIVERSITY: Ours is not only a democratic market society in which commerce plays an usually powerful role in conditioning other features of the social landscape; it is also a pluralistic society that in recent decades has become so diversified and differentiated that historians like Arthur Schlesinger,

Jr. have begun to worry about the disintegration of our cultural fabric (see *The Disuniting of Democracy*, for example). The arts have a special role to play in this domain because they have the capacity simultaneously to offer expression to the particular identities of communities and groups (including those that feel excluded from the dominant community's space) and to capture commonalities and universalities that tie communities and groups together into a national whole. The Southern novel did not fragment America: it helped define an American perspective. The Hudson River School of painting represented an emerging American taste in the nineteenth century, just as New England transcendentalism helped create an American philosophical perspective. Jewish culture in New York helps tie the city together even as it gives special expression to particular identity. African-American music and theater have offered American blacks a unique avenue for particularistic cultural expression (see most recently *Bring in Da Noise, Bring in Da Funk!*) and at the same time stamped our national culture with much of its common identity. Jazz, tap, and blues, (and the broader popular music culture that finds its roots in them) at once define America and define the special contribution of African-Americans to America.

Thus, perhaps uniquely, the arts have the power to give voice to and hence to empower and recognize the marginalized and the minorities, and at the same moment to constitute from them an inclusive common culture from which none are excluded. This is their special contribution to an era in which

hyper-diversity has become a problem, and a special reason to consider offering unintrusive support to them from independent government bodies such as arts and humanities councils even though under more normal circumstances such support might seem unnecessary, superfluous or perhaps even undesirable.

Finally, let me recall that art and democracy share a dependency on one extraordinary human gift, imagination. Imagination is their common link to civil society. If imagination flourishes in the arts, democracy is benefitted. If it flourishes in democracy, the arts and the civil society the arts help ground also benefit. Imagination is the key to diversity, to civic compassion, and to commonality. It is the faculty by which we stretch ourselves to include others, expand the compass of our interests to discover common ground, and overcome the limits of our parochial selves to become fit subjects to live in democratic communities. The democratic citizen needs critical imagination to ward off tyranny and defend liberty. The artist needs critical imagination to ward off convention and defend creation. Ideally, in serving imagination, the arts serve democracy and democratic citizenship; and ideally, in supporting the arts, democracy serves itself – even where the arts it supports defy convention, outrage taste and flaunt democratic mores. It is only a mature democracy that fully appreciates these linkages. Ironically, youthful democracies that most need the arts to grow and mature are least likely to support them. It has been

a mark of America's maturity as a free society that it has sustained a supportive arts policy without becoming either proprietary or censorious.

To be sure, art will not perish even in the absence of active support and understanding from a democratic people and their government. Nor will democracy wilt and die in the absence of a robust arts policy and a correspondingly vibrant arts community. But democracy, depending for its liberty on a free civil society, will do better as the arts do better, and the arts will do better as democratic citizens and their governing institutions choose to support them (if not always underwrite them) and refrain from censoring them. Finally, though both benefit by the other's good health, it is democracy that has most to gain by cultivating and supporting the arts and the artists who are their creators. Though they remain stubborn, independent, cranky, rebellious, sometimes ungrateful and always subversive, artists cultivate and manifest the liberty that lies at the very core of democracy's liberal soul.

* * *

1. Public/private partnerships bringing art into the heart of urban areas to revitalize. Encouraging community art to help beautify abandoned spaces which encourages kids to feel ownership over the space in which they live.
2. Studies have shown that involvement in worthwhile civic activities encourages people to be good citizens - nurtures the spirit and allows them to feel a part of a larger whole.
3. Fareed Zakaria makes the point that government shapes society - not the other way around. If that is the case, shouldn't government lead by example in setting up a framework in which arts are prioritized? Does she think this?
4. The connection between state and civil society - which is more dependant on the other - what's their connection and how do they influence one another. I think this needs to be established at some point in the speech.
5. In his book, *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*, Francis Fukuyama argues that the art of association is good not only for democracy (Tocqueville) but for capitalism as well. Fukuyama makes the argument that in a society where people trust individuals outside of their families, "social capital" is generated, which is as useful as financial capital to a society's economic well-being. "Social capital is critical to prosperity and to what has come to be called competitiveness," he says. She probably isn't going to want to make the argument that art is good for the economy, but one could link the connection between art as a unifier and universalizer (is that a word?) of the human experience and its strength in bringing people together in a society, which helps make the society function better in the big picture. The "most important consequences," he writes, "may not be felt in the economy so much as in social and political life," Civil society breeds sociability, community and citizenship, and bolsters liberal democratic government.
6. The arts are civil society's foundation, they are the key to its creativity, its diversity, its imagination and as a result its spontaneousness and liberty. Just as democracy depends on civil society for its liberal spiritedness, civil society depends on the arts. A government that supports the arts and the humanities is not engaging in philanthropy, but assuring the conditions of its own flourishing. Our support of the arts is not for the sake of the arts but for the sake of democracy.
7. I thought this quote was great, not really for her to use but to speak to some of the movements in American history and the arts and how they have impacted us as a society and play an integral part in the way we define our history and ourselves as Americans. "The Southern novel did not fragment America: it helped define an American perspective. The Hudson River School of painting represented an emerging American taste in the nineteenth century, just as New England transcendentalism helped create an American philosophical perspective. Jewish culture in New York helps tie the city together even as it gives special expression to particular identity. African-American music and theater have offered American blacks a unique avenue for particularistic

cultural expression and at the same time stamped our national culture with much of its common identity. Jazz, tap, and blues at once define American and define the special contribution of African-Americans to America.” Art has a way of providing a voice for those whose voice was muted in the past, and through this voice their experiences or expressions are universalized and shaped into an inclusive common culture.

8. **IMAGINATION** as the tie in between democracy and the arts and the millennium (Honoring our past. Imagining our future) Connecting the role of imagination in democracy “It is the faculty by which we stretch ourselves to include others, expand the compass of our interests to discover common ground, and overcome the limits of our parochial selves to become fit subjects to live in democratic communities.” Connecting the role of imagination in the arts, “the artist needs critical imagination to ward off convention and defend creation. Ideally, in serving imagination, the arts serve democracy and democratic citizenship; and ideally, in supporting the arts, democracy serves itself -- event where the arts it supports defy convention, outrage taste and flaunt democratic mores. It is only a mature democracy that fully appreciates these linkages...It has been a mark of America’s maturity as a free society that it has sustained a supportive arts policy without becoming either proprietary or censorious.” In a 1995 speech delivered at the Met HRC said in response to those who oppose public funding of the arts, “they fail to appreciate what every generation of Americans have intuitively known, that our artistic imagination is critical to our civilization and our democracy.” She also said on June 15, 1994, “ Where there is imagination, there is always hope. Where there is potential for creative expression, there is always the possibility for human progress.”

9. Common themes that run throughout BC and HRC public statements on the arts:

- The arts encourage us to celebrate individual identities while reminding us of all that we have in common. By sharing in one another’s expression, we learn to understand the universal commonality of human experience. “In so doing we gain a greater appreciation and understanding of the breadth of human thought and emotion. And we gain a more profound sense of our common purpose as Americans. But if the arts and humanities are essential to appreciating and preserving our culture, they are also essential to our growth and renewal as a people. For it is only by deepening our understanding, unleashing our imaginations, and enlarging our capacities to see and to feel that we can envision a better future for ourselves, our communities, and our nation.”
- Art as public domain -- for and by the community. They speak out against those who say “Public support for the arts is a luxury we can no longer afford”, by insisting that it is a necessity for “the continuing strength and vitality of our community of culture in this country.”
- Our “moral strength” as Americans is in our appreciation of our rich cultural traditions and our appreciation of our diversity.

- NEA -- Public/private partnership. Makes art accessible to all sectors of our country.
- **CHILDREN.** In HRC's June 21, 1995 op-ed in the NYT she writes, "Too often, we seen children who, instead of discovering the joys of painting, music, sculpting or writing, express themselves through acts of frustration and even violence. The arts offer an alternative to the more disturbing elements of our popular culture, and a safe haven that allows children to explore their creative potential, transporting them beyond the bounds of their difficult circumstances. Their exposure to the roots and diverse richness of human civilization will enhance their understanding of their own heritage and the world in which they live...I hope we will remember that public support for the arts is a down payment on our future. It is an investment in the values we claim to honor and in the cultural traditions in which democracy has flourished for 218 years. Now is no time to turn our backs on that legacy or its promise."

April 24, 1998

MEMORANDUM TO CHRISTY

FROM: Noa
RE: Non-western thinkers/artists/poets etc.

Christy,

As I mentioned to you on the phone, most of these names are unfamiliar, so I'm not sure how useful they'll be. I spoke with Ginger at the Millennium Council yesterday and today about the apocalyptic predictions book. She was under the impression that you were dealing directly with Sanjay. Here it goes -- be warned, it's pretty slim pickings.

Octavio Paz
Gabrielle Garcia Marquez
Isabelle Allende
Khalil Jibran
Dalai Lama
Umm Khalthoum or Feyrouz - Famous women singers in the Arab world
Gandhi

Ibn Battuta - Arab geographer explored Sahara 1352
Li Hsing Tao - wrote "the chalk circle" famous Chinese play, 1352
Hafiz - Persian poet 1320-1389
Juan Manuel - Spanish poet 1282-1348
Nasir ed-Din - Arab scientist 1201-1274
Djelaleddin Rum - Persian Poet, founder of the Order of Dancing Dervishes 1273
Chao Meng-Fu - painter of the transitional era between the Sung and the Yuan dynasties 1254-1322.
Saadi - Persian poet 1257
Keiji Nishitani - 1900-1990
Kayashi Razan - Japanese thinker 1683-1657
Ogyu Sorai - Japanese thinker 1666-1728
Shikibu Murasaki - author of Genji, the world's oldest novel and Japan's greatest - circa 1000