

**PRESENTED BY
THE WESTERN STATES ARTS FEDERATION**

WESTAF

**THE ASPEN INSTITUTE
ASPEN, COLORADO
OCTOBER 6-8, 2000**

SYMPOSIUM PROCEEDINGS

**cultural
policy
in the
west
II**

SUPPORTED BY THE

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS



**NATIONAL
ENDOWMENT
FOR THE ARTS**

SYMPOSIUM PROCEEDINGS

SYMPOSIUM DIRECTORS:

LINDA BUKSZAR
DAN BUEHLER
ANTHONY RADICH
ERIN TRAPP

PROCEEDINGS EDITOR:

SONJA K. FOSS

CONTRIBUTING EDITOR:

KRISTA LEWIS

DESIGN:

DAVID BAKER



WESTAF

WESTERN STATES ARTS FEDERATION

1543 CHAMPA STREET, SUITE 220

DENVER, CO 80202

WWW.WESTAF.ORG

(303) 629-1166 PH

(303) 629-9717 FX

(303) 607-9019 TTY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ABOUT THE PROJECT SPONSOR	7
SYMPOSIUM PROCESS AND PARTICIPANTS	9
FOREWARD	
ERIN M. TRAPP	11
OVERCOMING OBSTACLES TO CULTURAL POLICY DEVELOPMENT: SUMMARY, OBSERVATIONS, AND PROVOCATIONS	
PRESENTATIONS	
VJERAN KATUNARIĆ	18
GLOBAL PERCEPTIONS OF CULTURAL POLICY	
FRANK HODSOLL	33
INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS	
NATHAN GRIFFITH	35
PROMULGATING CULTURAL POLICY VIA THE INTERNET	
JOHN KREIDLER	42
A CULTURAL POLICY SIMULATOR	
ADELMA ROACH	52
CREATING CULTURAL POLICIES WITH AND FOR YOUNG PEOPLE	
FERNANDO DELGADO	64
MAKING THE ARTS RELEVANT: THE CHALLENGE OF CONFRONTING THE ARTS	
ERIC HAYASHI	72
OBSERVATIONS AND CHALLENGES FOR CULTURAL POLICYMAKERS IN THE MULTICULTURAL WEST	
TOM COFFMAN	83
HAWAI'I AS A HARBINGER FOR CULTURAL POLICY IN THE WEST	
MICHAEL DORF	92
WESTERN SENATORS AGAINST THE ARTS: PASSION OR POLITICS?	
LANCE T. IZUMI	106
MISDIRECTED EFFORTS: CONSERVATISM AND THE ARTS	
CHRISTOPHER ZINN	115
CULTURAL AGENCIES AND CULTURAL AGENCY	
BIOGRAPHIES OF THE PARTICIPANTS	129
SYMPOSIUM ATTENDEES	138
BACKGROUND READINGS	139

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 27-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 with the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA). Working with these states, the NEA, and public- and private-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 community and to respond to major structural changes in the 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.

WESTAF remains committed to programmatic work in the areas of multicultural arts, literature, folk arts, visual arts, and performing-arts presenting. Programs in these areas include convening leaders from an arts 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. In addition, WESTAF remains committed to increasing the impact and effectiveness of the state arts agencies in the region. The maintenance of these agencies as a progressive force that benefits the arts interests of the public is WESTAF's preeminent goal.

PRESENTERS

Tom Coffman, Writer
Kaneohi, Hawai'i

Fernando Delgado, Professor
Arizona State University—West
Phoenix, Arizona

Michael Dorf, Attorney
Adducci, Dorf, Lehner, Mitchell &
Blankenship
Chicago, Illinois

Nathan Griffith, Art Specialist
Corbis
Bellevue, Washington

Eric Hayashi, Executive Director
Japanese American Community and Cultural
Center
Los Angeles, California

**Lance T. Izumi, Senior Fellow in California
Studies**
Pacific Research Institute for Public Policy
San Francisco, California

Vjeran Katunarić, Professor
University of Zagreb
Zagreb, Croatia

John Kreidler, Executive Director
Cultural Initiatives Silicon Valley
San Jose, California

Adelma Roach, Arts Consultant
ALIANZA
Santa Fe, New Mexico

Christopher Zinn, Executive Director
Oregon Council for the Humanities
Portland, Oregon

RESPONDENTS:

Steve Cisler, Consultant and Advisor
Tachyon, Inc.
San Jose, California

Paul Fees, Senior Curator
Buffalo Bill Historical Center
Cody, Wyoming

Fred Nahwooksy, Executive Director
Atlatl
Phoenix, Arizona

Kristin Tucker, Executive Director
Washington State Arts Commission
Olympia, Washington

Chip Walton, Artistic Director
Curious Theatre Company
Denver, Colorado

Larry D. Williams, Superintendent
Sioux City Community School District
Sioux City, Iowa

**Kesler Woodward, Artist and Professor
Emeritus**
University of Alaska
Fairbanks, Alaska

**Tomás Ybarra-Frausto, Associate Director,
Creativity and Culture**
The Rockefeller Foundation
New York, New York

CO-FACILITATORS

Frank Hodsoll, Cultural Consultant
Former Chair of the National Endowment for
the Arts
Ridgway, Colorado

**Colleen Jennings-Roggensack, Executive
Director**
Arizona State University Public Events
Tempe, Arizona

The symposium featured ten presenters and eight respondents. Each presenter was allocated 15 minutes to deliver a prepared statement, after which the symposium facilitators directed a discussion that included all participants. At the discretion of the facilitators, audience members were invited to participate in the discussion.

FOREWARD
OVERCOMING OBSTACLES TO CULTURAL POLICY DEVELOPMENT:
SUMMARY, OBSERVATIONS, AND PROVOCATIONS

E R I N M . T R A P P

The twentieth century in the U.S. ended far differently than it began. The silicon chip replaced the dynamo as the killer app of the future. Expansionism gave way to tighter borders and stringent immigration quotas. Homesteads were carved into ever-smaller parcels in sprawling suburbs. New immigrants who once were too shamed to speak their native tongue in public were succeeded by second and third generations who became vocal proponents of preserving and observing their native languages and traditions in their adopted home. The Cold War ended, and a philosopher declared the end of history. Perhaps the most significant shift of the late 20th century was that the notion of a unified national identity was supplanted by a panoply of increasingly strong voices for identities and practices. It is in this

tion of regional cultural policy in the
In October, 2000, the Western States convened a symposium at the As- that affect cultural policy in the is only one small part of a much an attempt to acknowledge the most large was made in selecting topics

“The cultural community has failed to embrace shifts in the environmental context that defines U.S. culture at the beginning of the 21st century..”

preservation of multicultural context that WESTAF’s examina- West commenced.

Arts Federation (WESTAF) pen Institute around four topics West. Because the culture sector larger socio-political environment, important factors in the world at for the symposium rather than

adopting an insular framework of culture. Experts in the fields of technology, youth culture, demographics, and politics were invited to share their perspectives on important trends and discuss the relationship of these areas to the culture sector that does or does not exist. The purpose of the gathering was to expand on the previous year’s forum on the same topic and to draw upon and highlight the intellectual resources of the region that can and do contribute to broader discussion of cultural policy. From these discussions emerged a picture of the West that both mirrors and belies that of the nation as a whole.

After decades of only infrequent mention of the term in the United States, *cultural policy* has become a major theme in today’s discussions concerning culture and its development. We suggest that the current attention to and emphasis on cultural policy is driven primarily by a crisis of leadership in the cultural community. The cultural community has failed to embrace shifts in the environmental context that defines U.S. culture at the beginning of the 21st century, leading to the loss of forward momentum in the funding and perceived significance of public sector culture agencies, particularly the national cultural agencies. This stagnation finally has forced individuals involved in and advantaged by the expansion of funding for and the influence of these agencies to examine the underlying causes. A second factor is the maturing of the field of cultural administration. This, we propose, has resulted in a demand for practitioners who understand policy theory as a foundation upon which to build action rather than for practitioners who take actions because they are, without any evidence whatsoever, perceived to be good. Finally, for the first time,

private funders are supporting significant inquiry into the dynamics of public sector cultural policy, which they have not done previously, creating a third impetus for a focus on cultural policy.

The symposium and these proceedings, while not attempting to develop a Western cultural policy establishment exclusively derived from and committed to the West, are presented to provide an opportunity to reflect on the cultural policy issues particular to this region, to introduce cultural policy practitioners in the region to one another, and to expand the acquaintance of national and international discussions of cultural policy with thinking and thinkers in the West.

Participants in the symposium provided thoughtful and insightful analyses of various dimensions of cultural policy in the United States and the West. At the same time, their discussions suggested problems with the current conception of cultural policy and, in the aggregate, were focused on the obstacles within the current cultural policy system and on challenges facing the development of effective cultural policy in the United States and the West. The positing of bold alternatives to the current state of affairs generally was not to be found in the discussions. The following themes, gleaned from the two days of the symposium, illustrate how the group, perhaps appropriately, instead struggled to explicate the current state of the field with the hope that such an understanding might generate a future-focused dialogue.

Retrospective Focus. The climate for innovative cultural policy currently is impeded by the largely retrospective focus of many cultural policy discussions that catalog the foundations and history of cultural policy. Certainly, an understanding of the foundations and strands of cultural policy is essential to establishing the cultural sector's place in the larger socio-political context; however, too much emphasis in this area has starved the field of forward-looking cultural policy options. To a large extent, these proceedings and the symposium they document extend the retrospective line of inquiry, exploring historical precedent as a means for better understanding the current state of the cultural sector. Cultural policymakers, however, need to eschew their retrospective posture at some point if significant advancement in cultural policy is to be made.

The prominence and prevalence of the Western myth serves to reinforce the historical focus of cultural policy development; the continued inability of the Western myth to accurately portray a complex, multicultural regional identity was explored at this symposium. For some, the West conjures up nostalgic images of hardy pioneers farming fertile soil. For others, it speaks of imperialism, genocide, exploitation, and abuse. Despite efforts to debunk the Western myth, it remains firmly entrenched in the psyche of the public and woven into the fabric of our public lives. A successful cultural policy in the West must be inoculated against the suffocating effect of the Western myth on cultural activities that do not conform to the master narrative of the region.

Among the defining characteristics of the Western myth are a resistance among Westerners to federal involvement in culture and a distaste for centralization. Perhaps the most divisive contemporary legacy of the myth is found in resentment of federal land ownership and land-use policies. The myth also is manifest in a desire for independence from government interference and market controls. Accordingly, many pro-

mote a pure market approach to cultural development. As Lance Izumi points out, however, neither a complete market approach to the arts nor a return to censorship would eliminate many of the products that conservatives find objectionable. Arguably, while the very lack of a homogenizing national cultural policy in the past allowed dissent to flourish in a manner that generated both the richness and difficulty of issues now expressed in discussions of race, regionalism, immigration, public safety, religion, environmentalism, and ultimately of cultural identity, it would be appropriate to consider the complex ways in which federal involvement in cultural policy may be productive.

Moribund Leadership in Cultural Agencies. A second obstacle to the development of a robust cultural policy is the limited leadership provided by participants representing the nonprofit cultural sector. In the absence of a policy-strong nonprofit cultural sector, the commercial entertainment sector has assumed the *de facto* leadership role in shaping global cultural policy; the dominance of the private sector over the worldwide perception of American culture is virtually unchallenged. Symposium keynote speaker Vjieran Katunarić explains how Hollywood’s portrayal of the Old West still commands the international psyche and plays a much larger role in our conception of culture in the West than anything produced by the nonprofit sector: “Today, we know that spectacular narratives about the West, managed by Hollywood filmmakers, were addressed to the vast public, both American and a good part of the rest of the world. . . . In these places, people still believed in the ultimate triumph of America as the leader of the Free World, in the White Man, and in their mission to bring justice to the rest of the world.” By ceding the territory of creation and maintenance of culture and cultural policy to the commercial entertainment sector and presiding as arts education programs in schools nationwide are eroded to the point of virtual extinction, the nonprofit sector now is left to watch as generations of Americans willingly accept the limited cultural forms and options that are developed solely based on profitability.

Furthermore, the isolation and insulation of many leaders of cultural policy efforts ultimately is injurious to the development of effective cultural policy. The nonprofit cultural sector largely is controlled by individuals running small government agencies that disappear in state bureaucracy or nonprofit organizations that are immune from forces in the community. Accordingly, leaders of these groups can hold a job for decades by appealing only to a small group of carefully selected trustees or by disappearing inside a small agency that usually is not important enough to elicit disapproval from legislators based on constituent complaints. Furthermore, many of these positions are political appointments and granted with negligible regard for the communities these leaders are meant to serve. Thus, there is scant means for the public to topple cultural leadership that has become outmoded through ignorance, arrogance, or resource starvation.

The response among the general public is largely to ignore the nonprofit cultural sector and to participate in culture elsewhere—often the commercial arena. Cultural expressions are ubiquitous in America, but the cultural community continually fails to acknowledge how particular activities can contribute to the cultural fabric of the community. Every day, Americans sing in church choirs, decorate piñatas, tattoo their bodies with elaborate designs, attend tractor pulls, and participate in Taiko drumming, their efforts unheralded by cultural leaders clinging to programming developed decades earlier on a Euro centric model. Culture leaders must adopt an inclusive definition of cultural participation that mirrors what the public uses when

defining the activities that color their lives. The alternative is the continued dominance of profit-driven activities.

Refusal to Embrace Technology as Central to Culture. Technological advancements are causing a regular and dizzying reconceptualization of every facet of life, including the community, the workplace, education, privacy, and entertainment. The staggering speed at which our core structures and belief systems are reframed also is contributing to uncertainty in the cultural policy environment and obscuring rather than clarifying the future. Although the general public has become adept at adapting to major conceptual changes in this framework, the cultural community—in its refusal to accept technological applications as a central tenet of every aspect of its work—has failed to lead what is at its core a creative process and continues to retrofit its systems to catch up with last year’s trends. The public’s expectation for technological resources continues to expand, and cultural organizations must devote adequate resources to technological programs, which largely have been allowed to wither in favor of “safe” established programs that are largely irrelevant to all but a few individuals.

In many ways, the issue of technology is more urgent to cultural policymakers in the West than in any other region because the development of the West mirrors the development of the Internet. Both were conceived as a federal project, both were built on a decentralized model, and both impact the national consciousness with a force that belies their youth. With parallel origins, the West and the Internet are increasingly co-dependent; the need for connectivity often is most acute in the vast open spaces of the region and, as a result, the West often has been the first to adopt or be affected by new technologies. One Western cultural organization that has managed to develop a cutting-edge advocacy program using technological applications—Cultural Initiatives Silicon Valley—is located in the geographical heart of the commercial technological world. John Kriedler describes how that organization built a cultural policy simulator that demonstrates how wise investments in culture can create strong communities. In using technology to demonstrate the dependent relationship among culture, economic success, and ultimately, healthy cities, this one cultural organization raised the bar for commercial development while promoting an integrated approach to culture.

Through its success, Cultural Initiatives Silicon Valley demonstrates the feasibility of a nonprofit-developed application with reach far beyond its meager resources, but examples such as this are few due to lack of leadership in the area of technology and culture. Ultimately, the cultural community never will impact the commercial sector with a tiny fraction of the resources available to commercial concerns unless its leadership takes an innovative approach to resource and leadership development and places technological programming at the center of its work. Cultural policymakers must create a long-term vision founded on historical projections and current trends that clearly articulates the role of culture in a changing society dominated by technological forces.

Failure to Acknowledge Complex Environmental Contexts. Cultural policy participants need to be more aware of the complex contexts in which their reflections, deliberations, and efforts will be received and implemented. A keen example is the manner in which cultural policy discussions typically occur without

consideration of key political and economic factors. Michael Dorf astutely points out that the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities are bargaining chips in a larger political game, noting that although “some of the opposition to the arts reflected philosophical concerns over the role of federal funding of culture as well as antipathy to particularly controversial grants made to individual artists, much of the West’s resistance to the NEA and the NEH in the Senate was a tactical response to actions of a powerful Chicago Congressional representative who was able to protect the arts by trading them against the [land and water policy] interests of the Western states. . . . Western antipathy to the arts was primarily a tactical maneuver.” To the degree that cultural policymakers are ignorant of factors other than specifically cultural ones that affect policy development and implementation, they cannot successfully navigate these arenas.

The failure of the cultural community to address the changing demographic context of the region in a meaningful way represents a crisis both of resources and leadership. Although anticipating the demographic changes that regularly re-

the region is sometimes difficult, cultural interests, and aesthetic the delivery of cultural products. It cultural community that no ethnic majority in California; this demography was predicted for more than a decade prior, and it represents the crisis that is coming elsewhere in the region as well. Still, the *ad hoc* approach that many organizations use with respect to programming fails to provide reliable and consistent support to those communities, further

“The failure of the cultural community to address the changing demographic context of the region in a meaningful way represents a crisis both of resources and leadership.”

shape the face and character of these shifts bring new art forms, tastes that must be considered in should come as no surprise to the community now counts as a graphic was predicted for more than a decade prior, and it represents the crisis that is coming elsewhere in the region as well. Still, the *ad hoc* approach that many organizations use with respect to programming fails to provide reliable and consistent support to those communities, further

perpetuating their status as under-served or “other” audiences. Arts organizations in the West ignore and subordinate the interests of diverse audiences at their own peril. If this attitude does not change, these organizations will collapse under the weight of apathy of their “underserved” audiences who will represent a majority of citizens.

Ambivalence Toward Multiculturalism. The ambivalence in the United States toward multiculturalism poses significant problems for the development of effective cultural policy. As William Ray points out, “the paradox of culture [is that] the same word denotes both the inherited social reflexes that elude awareness precisely because they set the parameters of awareness, and a practice of self-conscious individuation that stakes its claim on an understanding of those reflexes.”¹ The tension inherent in the word *culture*, as Ray describes it, underlies the hesitance of the nonprofit cultural community to embrace multiculturalism. Culture, a concept that binds individuals through shared social experiences and traditions, has been used to exclude and exalt a class of citizens based on a heritage in Euro centric art forms deemed worthy endeavors. The failure of cultural organizations to embrace the universality of culture in favor of particularism that exalts a single artistic and cultural tradition *de facto* invalidates cultural expressions that diverge from the norm. There is no small irony in the fact that America, the country that purports to reject monolithic cultural practices in favor of telling the multiple stories of its citizens, is the world’s primary exporter of a monolithic commercial culture—through popular music, clothing, soft drinks, fast food and the like. In

other countries' cries of cultural colonization, then, we hear echoes of our own Native and ethnic populations, who fear losing their language and culture to the greater mass culture. The paradox and discomfort of culture, then, prevents forward movement in terms of cultural policy that truly works because the ultimate effect of the nonprofit communities' refusal to accept an inclusive definition of culture is the obsolescence of their efforts.

This issue is further complicated by the fact that culture is not limited to ethnic heritage, although in its common usage in the field, *multicultural* generally is used as a catchall term relating to indigenous and non-European immigrant peoples. Each individual defines his or her own culture in different terms, however, based on ethnicity, age, regional identity, political affiliation, affinity, sexuality, or a fluid combination of these and other factors, as Eric Hayashi and Fred Nawooksy explore. The exclusive stance that restricts the effective development of cultural policy extends to the failure of the cultural community to work meaningfully with other important voices in the West that do not adhere to a particular dominant modality. As Adelma Roach highlights, the moribund nature of the relationship between cultural entities and young people mirrors the resistance of many cultural policymakers to contrapuntal entities that emerge from these multi-ethnic communities. Likewise, the refusal by cultural organizations to engage conservative policymakers, as Lance Izumi explores, further illustrates the ambivalence toward multiculturalism in its broadest sense. The notion that a tiny cadre of "experts" who feel differently about art and assess art differently from the general public is increasingly seen as elitist and dysfunctional, as Tomás Ybarra-Frausto suggests. Francis Fukuyama sparked a firestorm of debate in 1989 with an essay titled "The End of History," in which he declared that society entered a new and lasting phase with the triumph of liberal democracy over Communism. In an essay in defense of his position, Fukuyama asserts that "the vacuum that constitutes our freedom can be filled with anything: sloth and self-indulgence as well as moderation and courage, desire for wealth and preoccupation with commercial gain as well as love of reflection and pursuit of beauty, banality alongside spirituality."² Fukuyama acknowledges that freedom is what citizens make of it, and the simple failure of individuals to favor feudalistic notions of high culture over banal commercial pursuits does not justify the creation of vast infrastructures devoted to preserving select incarnations of cultural expression. The appropriate role for cultural leaders, then, is not to impose monolithic ideas on citizens or direct their creative activities so much as to equip them with the necessary tools and resources from which true creativity will emerge.

All of these obstacles to the development of effective cultural policy suggest that cultural leaders need to address in a more realistic fashion the social and environmental factors that influence culture today. It is no longer sufficient to approach cultural development from a supply-side perspective, which makes the false assumption that constituents value the programs and processes that were developed during the past 30 years. The need to manage expectations and foster both preservative and formative processes currently exceeds the need to support the discipline-specific structure that still is supported at many levels. Furthermore, resources must be diverted from archaic programs to activities relevant to diverse cultural communities and educational programs that foster creativity and equip citizens to make informed cultural choices. Culture is not a liberal pursuit of European immigrants over the age of 50. Culture reflects everyone in society, and meaningful discussions with people across the spectrums of age, politics, ethnicity, and class

are the only hope for the creation of meaningful cultural policies. Such a dialogue represents a paradigm shift for many cultural entities accustomed to operating in a sponsorship model. This new model that acknowledges that culture may not exist outside the marketplace no doubt will be very threatening to some in the cultural establishment because it will highlight the need for some of them to go out of business. Cultural policymakers must learn to enable and engage individuals and communities rather than attempting to reinforce hopelessly outdated notions of elite culture or risk a continued erosion of influence and public support for their work.

These proceedings suggest ideas that move the cultural sector and cultural policymakers into a progressive approach toward cultural policy. The notion that cultural entities can operate outside the central forces that shape our world is rampant in the cultural community; indeed, it is a central operating principle for many organizations that argue the marketplace fails to support worthy works of culture that must be buttressed by their efforts. This logic is based on a value judgment that favors traditional European art forms and that is not sustainable in this era of sweeping technological and demographic change. The time is coming when many cultural organizations will be forced to close their doors for lack of support. Tomás Ybarra-Frausto points out that “it may be that culture—just like water and land—is a non-renewable resource. Culture also dies if it is not taken care of.” The pertinent question is whether cultural policymakers are preparing to cultivate the next generation of culture makers in meaningful and relevant ways or planning for a future of increasing obsolescence.

¹ William Ray. “The Ideology of ‘Culture.’” *Oregon Humanities*, Fall, 2000. p. 4.

² Francis Fukuyama. “The End of Hysteria?” *The Guardian*, December 15, 1989.

KEYNOTE PRESENTATION
GLOBAL PERCEPTIONS OF CULTURAL POLICY

V J E R A N K A T U N A R I Ć

Coming here was an important event for me personally. This morning, when passing through the Rocky Mountains—a landmark for a foreigner—I felt like Woody Allen in *The Purple Rose of Cairo*, when he crossed over the dividing line between frustrating reality and exotic reality. Another Western American image, that of the Grand Canyon, has long impregnated my vision of the West. The image was implanted through the Western (or cowboy) movies of the 1950s. At the time, when I was a little boy, I identified with the gunman—usually a white man—riding through that landscape to execute a mission of justice.

French post-psychoanalytic Luce Irigaray suggests that “a terrible moment of passing through mirror”—i.e., abandoning the old identity and its step toward maturation. Today, we about the West, managed by Hollywood to the vast public, both American world—Europe, including the East-European countries, then Asia people still believed in the ultimate of the Free World, in the White Man, justice to the rest of the world. This sociologists call the classic idea of postmodernist-post-colonialist critical sales story of the Western world’s colonial ideology.

“Yet, the spectacularization of the myth is not only a typical instance of cultural policy in the 1950s but also . . . the strategic wisdom of cultural policies throughout the world.”

relations—represents a decisive know that spectacular narratives wood filmmakers, were addressed and a good part of the rest of the former Yugoslavia and some other and Africa. In these places, triumph of America as the leader and in their mission to bring belief is the cornerstone of what modernization or what ics interpret as the last successful

At the time of the Golden Age of the Western myth in the 1950s, the authorities in Yugoslavia, a communist country, invested heavily in the film industry to create their own mythology. These movies celebrated the struggle of the partisans against the Nazis and their domestic allies during World War II and the historic mission of the Communist Party to eradicate capitalistic exploitation and to install permanent peace and justice. This myth is “gone with the wind,” too.

Yet, the spectacularization of the myth is not only a typical instance of cultural policy in the 1950s but also, according to some influential cultural policy researchers, the strategic wisdom of cultural policies throughout the world. What does it mean to make a spectacle out of national cultural myths? It may suffice to look at the Olympic Games’ opening ceremonies in Sidney, Atlanta, and Barcelona. All of them “celebrate national character associated with such spectacle,”¹ which brings me to the topic of my presentation.

Cultural policy was born within the so-called *Machtpolitik*, which is the German expression for the politics of power of the European empires and, subsequently, the nation states in their strivings to expand their territories. This expansion was manifest in their languages, myths, worldviews, philosophies, architectural

styles, and the like. Culture has been assumed to serve as a resource of prestige for a dynasty or a national elite in its struggle for hegemony or recognition on the international scene.²

Although the ambitions of national cultural policies throughout the world have been curbed somewhat—or at least have become more diversified—the legacy of *Machtpolitik* has remained at the core of many cultural policy strategies. Cultural autonomy used to be a *cause célèbre* of almost all nationalistic movements at their beginnings in their “intellectual phase,”³ followed by political and territorial claims and, eventually, mass mobilizations and armed conflict. Not long ago, for example, the rebellion of Serbs in Croatia and armed conflict with the new Croatian state were preceded by claims for cultural autonomy for Serbs in Croatia; that was the pretext for their secession and the establishment of the para-state Republika Srpska Krajina. The Croatian nationalistic movement developed in a similar way, both within the Hapsburg empire and subsequently under two Yugoslav regimes. In these cases, culture was viewed as an important reservoir of symbolic power for the nation state.

Today, the goal of cultural policy must be redefined. In a small and developing country such as Croatia, embrace of a logic of power or a logic of economic development in terms of survival of the fittest is not appropriate. Croatia should preserve and readapt its cultural heritage; it should develop its cultural identity in more symbolic and artistic versions, resisting absorption into global and hegemonic cultural flows that require that it lose its specificity and visibility. However, it should resist being swayed by domestic advocates of a nationalistic *jihad* in culture and politics. According to the mindset of a nationalistic *jihad*, the meaning of culture is historically exhausted with the establishment of the nation state, and the purpose of a national cultural policy is then solely to preserve the national language and all cultural heritage that more or less celebrates the *raison d'état*.

During the past few months, a team of experts in Croatia, which I have had the honor of coordinating, has prepared a document called *Strategy of Cultural Development: Croatia in the 21st Century*. The team's general premise is that a new cultural policy should foster a sense of development—political, economic, technological, social, and cultural (in a word: *civilizational*)—as well as a kind of power based on values that are different from the imperialism of *Machtpolitik* and market-economy Darwinism. These values are a flattening of hierarchy, individualism with relatively strong patterns of social capital (horizontal social networks), femininity (giving priority to light and ecologically sound industries, expressiveness, compassion, and the like), and being comfortable in communication with others who are different from the self.

The new cultural policy is not designed for invited artists, curators, social scientists, and teachers to reeducate the population in order to develop a healthier social character,⁴ for our new policy goals are not to be achieved through brainwashing. Cultural policy means developing values, interests, and knowledge useful for solving problems that advocates of the competitive market, technological arena, and political struggle assume are unsolvable. For example, the rising unemployment, caused by the restructuring of the economy and introduction of new technologies that are capital intensive, can be reduced by introducing knowledge and skills that make the added values of human work more attractive, permanent, and healthier. Such work is produced in a company of people satisfied with their work and their mutual relations—a

company of “happier hands and heads”—and results in products far different from those created by machines or by workers who are afraid that they soon will be fired because they cannot produce sufficient amounts.

For me, art is the sublime peak of the pyramid of human work, the one that cannot be technologically substituted. And it is up to the art—as much as up to cultural policy—to rehabilitate the unparalleled values of human work. In *Man and Machine*, Louis Mumford suggests that the core meaning of cultural policy is to organize a community of art and work, in contrast to the community of things that largely characterizes our contemporary world. Mumford asserts that this alternative to a society of things is “a sound economy”:

The essential task of all sound economic activity is to produce a state in which creation will be a common fact in all experience: in which no group will be denied, by reason of toil or deficient education, their share in the cultural life of the community, up to the limits of their personal capacity.⁵

Before presenting some typical stages and models of cultural policies, drawn primarily from Europe, let me provide some examples to illustrate the disarray of the (in)significance or (non)ambitions of cultural policy today:

- “Informed”: “Cultural Policy Help Wanted!” is the title of an article by Dennis McQuale, one of the leading researchers in culture and media.⁶ Last month, at a high-level international conference that involved UNESCO and the Council of Europe that took place in the German city of Hanover (where the World EXPO was going on but without the U.S.), complaints were voiced about the lack of coordination between cultural research communities and cultural policy makers.
- Uninformed: What does cultural policy mean? Does it mean that other policies are not cultural (cultivated)? This was the reaction of one of my colleagues from another field (history) when he heard that I was involved in the preparation of a cultural development plan.
- Unimportant: I will illustrate this perspective with an e-mail message I received two months ago (I am keeping the country’s and person’s names anonymous): “Dear colleagues, For your information: The new minister of culture in the country Z is Ms. Y, the former chief of the National Philharmonic Orchestra. The former minister of culture, Mr. Z, has become the minister of defense.”
- Pretentiously important: “Croatia should be constitutionally determined as the cultural state, *Kulturstaat*, like Austria.” This is a statement to which at least two cultural experts in Croatia subscribe. By the way: Austria has, indeed, proclaimed itself a “cultural state.” However, let me remind you that, this year, that country was almost excluded from the European Union because of the involvement of an extreme right-wing party (led by Jörg Haider) in the government. The *Kulturstaat* is a historical derivation of the *Machtstaat*, and it was reinstalled in France as *L’Etat Culturel* during the era of the most famous French cultural minister André Malraux. Despite the great merits of Malraux and his followers, whose legacy extended to the late President Georges Pompidou, who undertook some of the world’s most remarkable ventures in facilities for arts, such a policy has remained a hallmark for a heavy statism and dictatorship in cultural policy, a “modern religion” of cultural policy, as some critics suggest.⁷

In a way, all of these examples illustrate loose ends in the search for cultural policy that has definitions other than those traditionally associated with the term—a symbolic reservoir used to further another power.

The history of cultural policy is a parade of the power tastes and ambitions of power elites heralded in public places: aristocracy; the white bourgeoisie; revolutionary populists; the Nazis; the red bourgeoisie; and, recently, BOBOS (Bourgeois Bohemians). Along with this historical procession, the meaning of culture has expanded enormously. All elites seem to operate according to the blueprint of the Book of Genesis (or parodying it, if you like) because the lower should be a copy—a kitsch version—of the higher. On the top of this mimetic array is waved a flag of splendor and glory, and down on the wide bottom are admirers and imitators of those envied who want to become as much like those on the top as possible. Marvelous architectural and art works, such as the Doge’s Palace in Venice, London’s Westminster, or Vienna’s Schönbrunn, are monuments of both power and glory at the same time.

The bourgeois have created their mega-monuments—from huge government buildings to commercial buildings to Olympic stadiums—and sometimes corporate inter-consensus fuses two tastes, elite definition a compromise between and a common sense that never According to the British cultural Volkerling, the central task of cultural policy is to provide a never-ending “difference boundaries between Us and Them, no matter who these are and whether distinctions would be monumental and spectacular or just banal and mundane.

“The history of cultural policy is a parade of the power tastes and ambitions of power elites heralded in public places”

to foster specific but largely national ests. Of course, such a cultural and popular, for nationalism is by a pretty silly idea about who we are has grasped what should be ours. policy researcher Michael Volkerling, the central task of cultural policy is to provide a culture as “engine”: To stretch up ever-new

The stages of cultural policy were and continue to be the expression of power hegemony in the realm of culture. The stages were (after World War II): idealistic or mono-cultural (high culture and professionalism dominate); then democratic-participatory or even populist (with the tendency of ethnicization, multiculturalism, the welfare state); next, market, as a reaction to welfarism; and, eventually, in the 1990s, nationalistic corporatism. Is cultural nationalism the end of the cultural policy developments? Is a life—not only in culture but in general—possible anymore after deconstructing its national belonging and reference? We know that all social contracts and national consensus after World War II have been organized around the welfare state based on either ethnic or civic nationalism. We also know that from the very beginning of the 19th century, culture, in the form of high culture, was projected as an asset protected by the Ministry of Interior.⁸ Cultural policies thus have been the constitutive parts of welfare policies and nationalistic consensus, even when they are decentralized, as they are in Britain.

There are a number of types of cultural policies that are not positive models:

- The Nordic model: The government is protective, serving as an “architect” to the arts and artists, for they are considered an indispensable public good. This type is found in Sweden, Denmark, Norway, and Finland.

- The Western European (continental) “impresario” model: The government protects quality production rather than the material well-being of artists. The cultural policy may be decentralized (as in Germany, Austria, Switzerland, and the Netherlands) but also firmly centralized (as in France), or something in between the two (as in Italy).
- The Anglo-Saxon, primarily British “patron” model: Cultural policy is not governmental but in the hands of arm’s length bodies or the Arts Councils with mostly private funding. The United States sometimes is said to be very much a liberalized variant of the British model, thanks to the National Endowment for the Arts. However, it seems more appropriate to identify the U.S. model as the one where a state or a government is a “facilitator”: The state supports the arts and culture in that it creates the appropriate tax breaks, but it takes no position at all with regard to the criteria of what should be publicly welcomed as forms of art and culture. This approach is unlike the patron-state model found in Britain.⁹
- The late Socialist-Communist or “engineer” model: The state and party take care of everything, including control and censorship over cultural production. Currently abandoned in the post-Communist countries, where the remnants of the cultural bureaucracy persist, the model currently uses cultural policy as a means of preserving and defending national culture against the forces of globalization.

Paradoxically, in the 1990s, the Europeans have started to look to Britain and even across the Atlantic to the U.S. to find a formula of economic efficiency for cultural institutions in their countries. At the same time, many Americans in the cultural policy arena have looked eagerly in reverse, to Europe, to a model of cultural ministries as caretakers. This was and still is, I am afraid, a major point of confusion that the American researcher J. Mark Schuster rightly calls “a Tower of Babel . . . in cultural policy”:

To my mind, there is something deeply wrong in confronting market place rationality with that of state regulation both in culture and in society in general. More properly, this is not fair and is basically absurd. First, to fraction any institution or group into parts who live in uncertainty and insecurity and those who enjoy permanency and security. This is not a dual system, for dualism is coherent and interconnected, but this system is disconnected, split and morally schizoid. Second, to extend either one of the principles to the rest of the institution or group, to make them overprotected or not protected at all, is also irresistible. Realistically and fair would be, I think, to maintain (introduce there where it does not exist) a “gradual” system, where only the most able and most successful, the fittest for what in cultural policy is called CCT (compulsory competitive tendering—introduced in Britain in 1989 by the government, but has been argued against by the London Arts Board who said the “arts management is different from other management services). And then a long spectrum of mixed forms of financing and regulation ending with a few privileged assuming the permanent role of supervising the whole policy and culture spectrum. However, neither the most established nor those competitively fittest—must be personified: no personality is predestined to be a permanent champion of open competition or bureaucracy. But when they are not in position anymore to keep up the most wanting roles in the spectrum, their right should be to fall down on the cushions of the rest of the spectrum, not in the abyss. Is this a welfarist story rewritten for arts and culture sector? Not necessarily, because the pivots of the spectrum, for instance, the most creative artists would already deserve or earn enough for to contribute to the market and production or to

community identity or reputation, that they cannot be paralleled with any counterpart in ordinary welfare systems (in social security, health, pensions and alike).¹⁰

Some remarkable international level efforts have been undertaken by cultural experts, enlightened bureaucrats and policy makers. These have operated at the level of UNESCO and the Council of Europe and seek to synthesize governmental-bureaucratic and managerial-efficiency principles in managing the arts and culture industries. These efforts have been embellished with varying degrees of rhetoric that celebrates diversity, multiculturalism, human rights, social contract, and the like.

Two major documents of these efforts are *Our Creative Diversity*¹¹ and *In From the Margins*.¹² They are considered seminal works to the degree they are called *Bibles* in many cultural policy organizations. On the one hand, they exhibit reason against the reductionism of marketization and the only-for-profit-oriented economy of culture. On the other, they argue for a concept of culture as a tool for economic and technological development, which seems to be entirely inconsistent. These documents have been criticized—and I recognize some traces of these themes in the proceedings from last year’s WESTAF symposium—namely, that inherent qualities of the arts, whatever these may mean, are compromised or perverted by economic or technological concerns.

Can these documents also be considered manifestoes against the American approach to culture and cultural policy? Let me enumerate some of the examples concerning culture in America that were mentioned in the UNESCO book:

- Example of good practice: During the 1960s, the creation of murals in public spaces was a part of “an authentic popular art movement that responded particularly to the need for expression felt by community groups to whom access to visual creativity had previously been barred” (e.g., Chicano).¹³
- Example of U.S. exceptionalism: Unlike in the U.S., in the rest of the world, public interest is still equated with public service broadcasting. It is admitted, however, that a genuine public service for public interest is difficult to establish, for it is supposed to stay out of the reach of the influence of both the governmental and private sectors.¹⁴
- Example of a lack of popularity abroad: American programs on the European TV market “failed to rank among the year’s top ten in eight of a dozen countries surveyed” in 1995.¹⁵
- Example of a clever, multicultural business of a global size: MTV, the U.S.-based satellite video channel has developed regional services with local color—i.e., products designed for separate markets.¹⁶
- Example of good cooperation between cultural industry and cultural antiquity: The country music industry in the U.S. owes much to the Library of Congress, the Smithsonian Institution, and folklore experts to record the sounds of “folk” music.”¹⁷

Other examples of good policy practice from America are listed (e.g., the transformation of the Valentine Museum in Richmond, Virginia, from an institution representing the white upper-middle-class elite culture to one that includes the stories of poor whites and African Americans in slavery).

The examples are cited with an almost euphoric tone that touts how cultural industries can be successful as an industrial branch and offer splendid opportunities in terms of economics. The document cites a 1992 report in *The Economist* that the long-term growth of the cultural sector in the U.S., due in part to the liberalization of broadcasting and commercialization of cultural institutions, should remain at about 10% per year, making culture one of the most advanced export industries (the second largest after aeronautic technology). On the other hand, a chart is presented that shows that the U.S. is the number-one country in the world in which “public sector expenditures do not depend on GNP”—i.e., those expenditures are inconceivably low.¹⁸

There is, of course, no clear official position (positive or negative) toward the American cultural policy and practice on the part of UNESCO. It is similar to the Council of Europe document *In From the Margins*. This document sometimes gives the impression that the American case is admired because of the unparalleled growth of the export cultural industry. On the other hand, it implies that the U. S. is careless toward the public sector for not having an activist state cultural policy. Sometimes, the impression is conveyed that there is an envy of this and a desire to achieve cultural economic effects similar to America but without using the American methods.

Yet, there is no clear pattern of how viewed in international surroundings is perhaps thought not fair to compare in which a country addresses the Union today, there is no sign that a policy ever will be created. In fact, where there is non-interference from Brussels. National cultural legislation and other cultural policy mechanisms are not expected to be integrated into a common regulatory framework, except in the areas of audiovisual technology and copyright.

“There are some other, even simpler, ways to distinguish among cultural policies according to the official definition of culture. In some countries—and the U.S. is typical—culture is almost synonymous with arts.”

U.S. cultural or arts policy is different. One reason is diplomatic. It is mentioned explicitly or officially on the part of its culture. In the European common framework of cultural policy, culture seems to be the only area

A second reason for the lack of international commentary on U. S. cultural policy is that intergovernmental organizations, such as UNESCO and the Council of Europe, are pragmatic. They have no common philosophical ideas, at least as far as the role of culture and cultural policy is concerned. An understanding and assessment of cultural policy are a matter of empirical scrutiny and of history, a “path dependency.” In other words, there are no lessons that can be learned from a *national* cultural policy, such as the American cultural policy, that can be used as a blueprint for transference into other countries such as Croatia. The Croatian case of cultural policy is deeply interwoven with history and the practice of statism—of a government that is not only overwhelmingly taking care of culture but that owes a good part of its emergence to the cultural elite.

There are some other, even simpler, ways to distinguish among cultural policies according to the official definition of culture. In some countries—and the U.S. is typical—culture is almost synonymous with *arts*.

With such a definition, ministries of culture are focused on the infrastructure for arts primarily in the form of buildings. In other countries, culture is a specific way of life that distinguishes, for example, a German from a Finnish city or village. In this case, art is considered one of the manifestations of the cultural identity of a community.

In Croatia, a communal definition of culture is employed, and the arts are included in it. We are, in a way, condemned to hold such a meaning of culture not only because culture has been at the very core of our national life, but also because we have no institutions or a strong private sector culturally aware enough to take care of museums, libraries, and monuments, in lieu of the state.

Finally, although tourism is a major industry in Croatia, the country's cultural tourism activity cannot match that of Italy, Greece, or Austria. In 1988, Council of Europe (CEU) experts—after the completion of a relatively long procedure of passing the Croatian national report on cultural policy through the cultural policy bodies of the CEU—recommended that the Croatian Ministry of Culture put culture at the center stage of national development. At that time, Croatia was ruled by the HDZ, a nationalist right-wing party whose cultural policy was fairly conservative and retrospective and who certainly was deaf to such ideas and reluctant to say farewell to the nationalistic assumption of culture and cultural belonging. The current situation is different.

In Croatia today, due to the change in political leadership, many new things are possible. However, generally speaking, we are still far from the fruits that will sprout from these new seeds. Instead of describing more precisely the past and present of cultural policy in Croatia, let me underline one principal difference between the Croatian and European cultural patterns, on the one hand, and the U. S. pattern on the other.

Our pattern is basically state oriented. Culture used to be and still is the constitutive part of nation building. Hence, cultural policy and state/governmental cultural policy used to be and still are synonyms. Also, and this is virtually the case with all countries apart from the U.S., cultural policy encompasses not only the arts (visual, literary, and performing) but also historical monuments, museums, libraries and archives, cultural industries, media, education and training in arts and culture, cultural minorities, and sometimes even the linguistic policy of a country. However, not all of these areas are managed exclusively by the ministries of culture. The areas of responsibility of different ministries can overlap. This is particularly the case in the areas of media, education, and minority cultures.

In Croatia, culture was seen primarily as the source of the power of identity. The politics of national identity have been elaborated through literary, visual, and musical means as a more sophisticated version of a popular myth-symbol that tells the story about the nation, usually in terms of epic poetry. This work of high culture might be crucial for the survival of small nations—at least for the survival of their identities when they are surrounded by competing and often aggressive definitions of the scope of identities and territorial magnitudes of large nations or empires. Thus, cultural policy was primarily a version of *Machtpolitik* for a small nation.

The political rulers in Croatia, who took power in 1990 and kept it until 2000, asserted that the millenarian dream of Croats was to have their own state. When the dream came true, however, the creative (or creationist) meaning of culture became obsolete. From then on, the only function of cultural policy in the future appeared to be to preserve memories and to wave flags in front of others. Of course, we could not advance with such a meaning of culture, for it is unsuitable for us as we rejoin the international scene.

Perhaps the grand (nationalistic) narratives might be readapted—in fact trivialized—to make them a part of the celebration of daily life, local festivals, and the tourist industry, as has happened with national flags, dress, and folk dances in many other countries. But this is just the beginning of a role for cultural policy in the post-national era of development. This is where the question of the relationship between cultural policy and other policies of development must be considered. In addition, there is the question of how much we should learn from America and the rest of Europe in order to join the international world with a cultural policy of identity and development that will be recognized and respected. This identity must be visible enough so that Croatia is not confused with Slovakia, Slovenia or Bosnia and Herzegovina.

To my mind, there are two cultural patterns of development. One is macho like and stresses the goal of competition or hegemony by all means, primarily through heavy industry, big corporations, massive military armament, and large proportions of everything, including megalomaniac ideas: from big numbers to ruling the world from one center. Unlike some colleagues of mine, especially those inclined to radicalism, I never use national or country names to identify such forces. Thus, the U. S. for me is not the personification of such forces. It is just a part of the U.S. (we have such forces in Croatia, too).

My point here is that the culture of such a system is deeply split between the arts or artists who contribute to strengthening the characteristics of such a system and artists who either want to cherish art for art's sake or who want to contribute to other and different characteristics in the development of culture, society, and economy. In fact, such a system has no need for art to play an important role in the public or private life of people, for the system needs people only as passive consumers, modest workers, self-sacrificing warriors, reproductive women, and the like.

The other pattern of development is feminine like, but I really do not want to employ this term as a biological metaphor but as a cultural metaphor—as an expression of inclinations that live in our souls and in almost all of our institutions. It has to do with what we feel sometimes when working in close cooperation with others and do not want to lose their trust; when choosing a job that will not bring us to the stairs of a corporate ladder but will might ensure the permanent attention of and support by colleagues; when we are able to understand others, sometimes being active in solidarity with weak people; when we are free to choose what or with whom to do certain things; “to work for to live” and not “to live for to work”; to develop a sense of “soft power,” both in diplomacy and in companies; and “to achieve desired outcome through attraction rather than coercion.”²⁰ In other words—and let me here paraphrase your colleague Patricia Limerick from last year's WESTAF proceedings—the most important step in passing from hard-power to soft-power culture and development is “to know when to stop”—to stop buying, selling, accumulating things, re-marrying, fighting, warring.

Again, it would be inappropriate to say that such a system is more suitable for small countries, for many small countries in the world are poor, for example, and many people in them would prefer to use any macho-like method as the means for achieving their goals because their social values are largely conservative and patriarchal. I just want to believe that interest in the arts and other parts of high culture, including the cultural production and folk tradition of any ethnic group, is more likely to come to the center stage in soft-power contexts. Another crucial question concerns how much those institutions, groups, or individuals who are the richest and the most powerful can be made more philanthropic. As was finely articulated in the WESTAF proceedings from 1999, millionaires and similar champions of hard-power culture are overwhelmingly disinterested in cultural and other philanthropy. The same is true of the newly rich in Croatia: They have donated funds only for works of quasi-art that celebrate actual politicians or invented events from the national past.

These are, then, two fundamentally different patterns of relationship between cultural capital (arts and institution, or society) and social values). Even the notion of creativity has different connotations in these two contexts.

Such a distinction might help us avoid ordinary confusion over the meaning of culture or, when trying to avoid confusion in assuming that “everything is culture,” might help us avoid deep cleavages between high culture and common culture, alternative cultures and ethnic cultures, or between monocultural and pluralism. A coherent policy must by no means be generous in the sense that it gives funds both to white supremacist or nationalist “cultural” journals and amateur artists or professional journals or commercial and non-commercial art at the same time. Therefore, cultural policy (in the sense that I prefer) must be coherent in its intent and its outcome to produce a common framework of support for all those who are prepared to offer projects, programs, and other initiatives that maintain or expand both the intrinsic value of the arts and culture and those extrinsic values that contribute to ecological, economic, political, social and other characteristics of soft and more inclusive development and power.

“Therefore, cultural policy ... must be coherent in its intent and its outcome to produce a common framework of support for all those who are prepared to offer projects, programs, and other initiatives that maintain or expand ... the intrinsic value of the arts and culture ...”

different meanings of culture—or culture and development or knowledge of an individual, capital (social networks and morality) has different connotations in

avoid ordinary confusion over the to avoid confusion in assuming help us avoid deep cleavages culture, alternative cultures and culture and pluralism. A coherent be generous in the sense that it cist or nationalist “cultural”

New cultural policy guides published by the CEU are seemingly close to such thinking. I say *seemingly* because they use a catchphrase, *balance*. *Balance* here means to avoid extremes, such as past versus contemporary, security versus fluidity, art for art’s sake versus commercial. So far so good. But, to avoid those extremes does not necessarily mean achievement of a coherence of meaning in terms of what we are for and against. Second, and this is a major flaw of guides and other instructive documents where the firm or publisher—such as the CEU or UNESCO—is “borrowed.” It is sad to see that, in the conditions given, the most coherent documents are those that are written by one or a few authors who have some clear ideas about what cultural policy should be. And then, when you inspect the back of the cover page, you find the

following fatal words: “The opinions expressed in this publication are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the view of [this international organization].” This way, any progress toward a coherent conception of cultural policy, let alone the outline of an international cultural policy framework, is prevented. The same thing happened with the critical report from 1998 on Croatian cultural policy made by an expert team on behalf of the CEU. The report followed the Croatian national report. The Croatian Minister of Culture said not only that the CEU report was only advisory to the Ministry but that the Croatian national report had this same status. The national report was the matter of those who wrote it, a group of experts, and it does not “necessarily reflect the view of the Ministry.”

Today, having seen many positive steps undertaken by the new government and the new ministry of culture in Croatia, I find that we are still far from cultural policy thinking in terms of a coherent developmental and power policy. Actually, the most significant recent innovation in Croatian cultural policy is the introduction of independent cultural councils. It is too much to expect, however, that their decision making will be guided by criteria of professional judgment based on peer review and independent decision making (whether by majority vote or consensus—both are legitimate) and not on the basis of clans and coteries. Unfortunately, the latter is always unavoidable, but this is not my primary concern. What is most worrisome is the continued lack of a cultural policy based on a coherent meaning of culture. From my review of the WESTAF proceedings from last year, I note that you have a similar problem.

My first encounter with American cultural policy concerns was mediated, bookish, but still informed and of high quality. I read an excellent article written by J. Mark Schuster, professor in the Department of Urban Studies and Planning of MIT,²¹ which I already have mentioned. The author convincingly demonstrates that the American system of funding and American organizational ecology cannot be transplanted to other cultural and national contexts. This is so, the author contends, not just because the American system never has been decentralized or privatized—it “was born that way”²²—but also because American artists and cultural workers are not very happy with their system. Further, it does not follow that a privatized and decentralized system necessarily produces positive effects for arts and culture, either in terms of efficiency or quality.

It may seem odd, however, that cultural policy thinkers and practitioners from Europe look to the U.S. and vice versa. Have cultural policy ideas from both sides entered a blind alley? We might be looking at this crossroads from an optimistic side, namely as a search for a new middle ground between the state and the private sector.

I have no idea, apart from the ideas presented in the WESTAF proceedings from last year (on which I will comment shortly), about the chances for creating a truly independent space for a publicly responsible, interdependent, and cooperative cultural policy in the U.S. A precondition for such a policy, I think, would be the promotion or rehabilitation of the notion of art or cultural policy itself.

What strikes me repeatedly is that even in publications that specialize in the area of policy studies that are published in the U.S., there is no room for “art policy” or “cultural policy,” at least not among the publica-

tions that are regarded as the most important ones. In fact, the classification of the policies to which I refer is legalistic.²³ It is based on “the top dozen congressional statutes.” The top dozen encompass economic, social, technology, political, and international policy.²⁴ Art, music, and literature are classified under the chapters where literature on creativity is listed (among “creativity how-to-it manuals”; “social science analysis of creativity”; “business and management creativity”; “science and technology creativity”; “public policy and administration creativity”; and “philosophy, theory, and religion creativity.”)²⁵ The arts are treated as creative elements that do not need their own policy, or their policy is somehow considered to be incorporated into other policies. If so, which ones? Also, for which goals is creativity supported—for which people or public, and for what cultural and developmental performances?

Now, let me briefly comment on the WESTAF proceedings from the last year, for they tackle all of these issues:

1. Your cultural policy thinking is informed and vibrant.
2. Some of your problems are similar to our problems—e.g., the fact that art classes are slashed in San Francisco. Visual arts and music classes were slashed in Croatia, too, under the pretext that they are not necessary in the new industrial era, for in art classes, students learn skills and a basic knowledge not needed for science and technology (I guess that such a foolish explanation has not been given in your case).
3. A substantial difference between our policy discussion and yours is that the participation of artists in your case seems to be significantly higher or at least more regular than in our case. In Croatia, artists take part in public discussions or conferences when they become anxious as a result of bureaucratic routine and inefficiency or because of political usurpation of cultural decision making—as when experts or artists, for example, are ignored in the decision to erect a new monument.
4. Much of the discussion is focused on decentralization issues. In Croatia, there is a large debate about what kind of decentralization is welcomed (financial, administrative, legal; for purposes of sustainability, coordination among different administrative levels, transformative effects in different cultural activities; its acceptability in public, non-profit, and private spheres). We also discuss the idea of a more secure decentralization by establishing cultural councils in those regions that have a minimum of experts in six or seven categories of culture, from audiovisual production to heritage. However, your problem is different in substance: How to reallocate to the West the funds from private foundations that are centralized in the East.
5. The assessment (by Christopher Zinn) that you have an “implicit cultural policy” concerns a majority of Eastern European countries in the 1990s. They had no—and still do not have—proper strategic documents, legislation, and planning. However, the process of reviewing and evaluating national cultural policies became an important part of the process of building national cultural policies.
6. I fully agree with discussant Tomás Ybarra-Frausto, who, although his plea was made in a different context (of multi-ethnic America), asserted that we need “a broader definition of national culture.” In Europe today, we would even say a “post-national culture.” Such a culture is not only non-integrationist and non-hegemonic but also more open than ever before to other sectors of the state and society, including the economy, as well as to the international world.

In the new environment, one problem is entirely new. It is not how to address others in terms of multiculturalism—those who belong to other cultures—for this is really not a new problem. The new problem is how to address others who do not belong to culture or who are far away from culture but who are very powerful and rich and belong to other professions and have other interests. We in the arts understand one another quite well. Even those who have very radical ideas about culture and cultural policy rarely shock us except when they request too much money for their ideas or projects.

The interdisciplinary language of culture and cultural policy is rudimentary, and this seems to be the crucial problem. Our language is inner directed and parochial. We speak primarily among or between one another, including through the grand pieces of cultural policy thinking such as one I mentioned earlier—the CEU’s *In From the Margins*, called the *Bible* among the cultural policy operators. But, as we know, the real *Bible* is for everyone. Our *Bible* is pretty esoteric and sectarian. Thus, when we address the “important others” (those presumably interested in culture but who operate in finance or high politics) with such a discourse, they more or less politely express their incompetence in the areas we are talking about, and the talk usually ends up with the following response from the important other: “This is very interesting. How much will it cost?” And it comes out that 3% of the national budget is the upper limit for the percentage of funds devoted to culture in achievement of art and culture in its foray into the external world. In short, it is not the words of our well-intended speech that impress the important other but the expenditure. For the important other, culture and everything else in the world are perceived in terms of costs and finances.

“The interdisciplinary language of culture and cultural policy is rudimentary, and this seems to be the crucial problem.”

Some time ago, we in Croatia had to deal with financial power holders whose level of understanding of the arts matches Ernst Gombrich’s ironic description of a Martian apprehension of a Beethoven quartet: “four people rubbing catgut with horsehair to make the air vibrate in given frequencies.”²⁶ (Last week, a high official from the Ministry of Culture of Azerbaijan, who holds a doctorate in the arts, told me a joke about the newly rich, who are called *New Russians* there. The question was, “Who is Beethoven?,” and the answer by the New Russians is “Oh, yes, I know him. He composes the music for cellular phones!”)

Our inability to communicate effectively with financial power holders is the weakest and the most dangerous compromise in our journey to the outer sectors. It is so for two reasons. First, the mere apprehension of arts and culture in terms of budgetary or market costs is presumably based on the preemption of the values of our projects by the important others. Our message is read *a priori*, with the product of our persuasive effort interpreted in a previously set—usually biased—manner. To make an argument for the most important dimension of the value of a project involving the arts and culture is impossible when establishment of the economic cost of the project is of primary concern, and the value is the multiplication of the effects of such a project.

I would not call these effects just added value because almost every instance of human communication or

social service from health to police intervention may produce added-value effects such as positive feelings, pleasure, and other positive externalities. When everything that happens in the realm of human work and communication is condemned to produce some added-value effects, it is necessary to describe what kind of added values are produced or may be produced by what I was describing before as concerted actions in enhancing socio-cultural capital in a human setting (whether in a local community, region, or nation). To my mind, we need more arguments, including more research work, to differentiate the art- and culture-added values from values of other forms of human work added to a product. In so doing, we should make a conceptual profile of culture for which we plead and that might be offered to others as a cultural vision of decent work, power, and development. Of course, the intrinsic value of art cannot be defended from this position alone. But the intrinsic art form is not the real matter of cultural policy judgment. The task of cultural policy is to expand the cognition and understanding of how important the cultural part of every aspect of human life is to the establishment of the precious balance between human needs and human products. In the core of the value of art is the creative ability to put that balance into life in our institutions and industries.

I hope and believe that your conference will contribute to the convergence between a vision of culture most appropriate to achieve the goals you consider to be the most important for the West and a kind of cultural policy that will serve such a vision.

¹Michael Volkerling, “Deconstructing of the Difference Engine: A Theory of Cultural Policy,” *European Journal of Cultural Policy*, 2 (1996): 205.

²Max Weber, *Gesammelte politische Schriften*, ed. Johannes Winckelmann (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1971).

³Miroslav Hroch, *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

⁴Erich Fromm, *The Sane Society* (Greenwich, CT: Fawcett, 1955).

⁵Lewis Mumford, *The Future of Technics and Civilization* (London: Freedom, 1986), p. 159.

⁶Dennis McQuail, “Policy Help Wanted: Willing and Able Media Culturalists Please Apply,” in *Cultural Studies in Question*, ed. Marjorie Ferguson and Peter Golding (London: Sage, 1997).

⁷Marc Fumaroli, *L’Etat culturel* (Paris: Editions de Fallois, 1991).

⁸Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986).

⁹Harry Hilman Chartrand and Claire McCaughey, “The Arm’s Length Principle and the Arts: An International Perspective—Past, Present and Future,” cited in *Cultural Policy in Europe—European Cultural Policy? Nation-State and Transnational Concepts*, ed. Veronika Ratzenböck (Vienna: Österreichische Kulturdocumentation, 1998), pp.14-20.

¹⁰Mark J. Schuster, “Deconstructing a Tower of Babel: Privatization, Decentralization and Devolution as Ideas in Good Currency in Cultural Policy,” *Culturelink*, 23 (November, 1997): 135-56.

¹¹UNESCO, *Our Creative Diversity* (Paris: UNESCO, 1995).

¹²Council of Europe, *In From the Margins* (Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 1998).

¹³UNESCO, p. 80.

¹⁴UNESCO, p. 109.

¹⁵UNESCO, p. 113.

¹⁶UNESCO, p. 120.

¹⁷UNESCO, p. 189.

¹⁸Report from *The Economist*, in UNESCO, p. 248.

¹⁹Early definitions of nations, from the French philosopher Ernest Renan to the Soviet dictator Joseph Stalin, are Eurocentric and restrictive because they legitimize the *nationhood* as the right to the *statehood*.

²⁰Schuster, pp. 135-56.

²¹Schuster, p. 156.

²²*Creativity Plus* (newsletter of the Policy Studies Organization, Georgia State University), (Spring 2000).

²³ *Creativity Plus*, pp. 32-33.

²⁴ *Creativity Plus*, pp. 28-31.

²⁵Ernst H. Gombrich, *Ideal and Idols: Essays on Values in History and in Art* (London: Phaidon, 1998), p. 157.

Hodsoll: You mentioned that there is a need to be able to assess the added value of culture in relation to other added values. Who has done that, and how do you do it?

Katunarić: There has been such a discussion in Europe in the last six or seven years, and the discussion is found in documents published by UNESCO. The focus of the discussion is that culture can add value to products or to communication. If you visit a physician or work with a police officer; they conduct work that adds value. I think culture has tremendous potential to be qualified for its value-added impact on human communication and for its power to connect cultural capital with social capital, but this is still an idea that must be developed.

Delgado: I want to comment on some of the issues you put forth. Much of what you are saying hinges on words that have the same root: *communication* and *community*. As a professor of media and communication, these words are part of my soul. The other part of my soul that belongs to telecommunications and the Internet suggests that we are in an age where even when we talk about culture, we are not talking about communication—that sense of the original transfer of values and ideas and identities from one group to another. We are in an age where we access information, which denies the importance of communication, even though we think we are accessing information through channels of communication. The act of accessing information is a much more independent, solitary, disconnected activity. If the arts are going to make themselves relevant in an age of technology, particularly the kind of technologies we have now, we might have to think of ways—not just in terms of policy but in terms of creativity—to traverse that technology and create spaces for, if not authentic, then at least some form of virtual communication. We may do this through technologies that are if not one-way, then at least oddly distorted two-way communication. I think of the Internet-based information that I received about the Aspen Meadows location [the lodging location for symposium participants]. I did not need to talk to anybody. I accessed archived pages, and I passively printed them out on my printer. I looked at them, and then I felt secure about the place that I was going to be because I had a picture of the location. But nobody had to share that information with me, and it strikes me that if the arts are part of the soul of our community, we need to find ways to get them to communicate with the technologies that we have available to us now.

Katunarić: This is one of the most important issues of the new global age. Of course, a virtual community does not necessarily repeat all of the characteristics of original communities. While original communities do not need to be romanticized and idealized, we are pretty disappointed with what has been presented to us as the new possibilities for community.

The adoption of an intensive focus on the monetary economy is one way to move out of the original community. One of the phenomena of the new economies and of new societies in Eastern Europe is that people are desperate to obtain money. They will take shortcuts and adopt a “fast-buck” ideology because they live in an altered time system positioned within the larger world community. They are prepared to destroy existing communities with the new monetary economy just to get rid of others and to live by themselves. We have to rehabilitate the values of communities.

FRANK HODSOLL

I fully agree with Vjieran Katunarić that history underlies everything. If you look at the human experience, it starts with cultural patterns, and there are many examples of such patterns. Out of these cultural patterns come marketplaces, and I am going to cite just one anecdote about marketplaces. When I was at the NEA, thanks to a wonderful Design Arts Program director, Adele Chatfield Taylor, the agency sponsored a seminar at Stanford that brought together industrial leaders such as the CEO of the Ford Motor Company. The conversation at the symposium centered on the relationship of culture to the industrial and commercial processes. Attending the forum was a Japanese CEO who was the head of Kenwood, a Japanese company that makes hi-fi equipment. One of the things I remember him saying was that his people traveled all over the world, including into African homes and villages, to seek inspiration for the design of Kenwood hi-fi equipment and, in that process, to learn how to produce goods that were in synch with the cultures in which the electronics were sold.

“If you look at the human experience, it starts with cultural patterns, and there are many examples of such patterns.”

Don Peterson, the CEO of Ford in the early 1980s, bet the company on the Sable and Taurus which, of course, became very successful for their success was that the cars were designed in a way that was sensitive to what people wanted—In the seminar, we laughed about the opera windows in 1970s’ Lincoln Continentals, which were ridiculous cultural accretions out of synch with the culture of the 1980s. But that’s about culture in the marketplace.

the early 1980s, bet the company course, became very successful for their success was that the cars sensitive to what people wanted—In the seminar, we laughed about coln Continentals, which were synch with the culture of the

That marketplace is described, supported, and opposed by artists, thinkers, and political and cultural leaders. After this process of description, support, and opposition, government perhaps gets into the act. But government only gets into it after all those other things have happened. There are three aspects of government that are probably more important to culture than anything else, and they are not housed in the cultural agencies. They have to do with regulation. One is related to prevention of monopolies, and that gets us to the Justice Department and the Federal Communications Commission with respect to the new technologies. Second, no censorship. That is the First Amendment, and government helps with that not only in our country but in other countries as well. Third is the protection of intellectual property from which artists and other thinkers are able to gain their living, and that, of course, in an age of technology, has become even more important.

Croatia and America have some similarities, but this country’s melting-pot phenomenon is stronger, and here I will take a leap and say that the Western Hemisphere of this planet is different from the Eastern Hemisphere in that in the Western Hemisphere, everybody came from someplace else. Even Native Americans came over through the Bering Strait, where there may have been a land bridge at some point. In fact, in Peru’s native dances, you will see Asian influences. Since everyone came to the Western Hemisphere

from somewhere else, there was less of a territorial aspect in this hemisphere. Because of this, I think it has been easier for those of us who came from somewhere else to diffuse—though not entirely eliminate—cultural tension. If we conduct a quick superficial run through history in this country, after the Native Americans came, there was a brief period of Scandinavian influence. Then the WASPs arrived, and the French probably came next or about the same time. And some of the things we did to the Native Americans were pretty awful. The White Anglo-Saxon Protestants and a few French were replaced by Northern Europeans and then by Europeans in general and then by Latinos and Asians. Another aspect involves African Americans who first arrived in that truly awful period of slavery.

The arts were a part of all of these migrations and of all of the languages of these peoples. They included the folk and the fine arts. There was no hierarchy at first, but then hierarchies gradually crept in. I think there is a difference between the West Coast and the rest of the West. When I talk about the West Coast, I don't mean all of California, Oregon, and Washington. I mean those parts of California, Washington, and Oregon that go up the coastal range. Sacramento is more similar to Denver than it is to San Francisco not because they are both state capitals but because of the nature of culture. In the West Coast melting pot, the migrations of Latinos and Asians are very influential, while in the Inland West, they are much less so.

I am going to conclude by talking about my home county, Ouray, Colorado—a county of 50 square miles with 3,500 inhabitants. Most of the land is owned by the federal government. Miners came from the United Kingdom and northern Italy, then railroaders arrived to help transport the silver. The railroaders were mostly from the United Kingdom and Ireland. Homesteading drew many kinds of Europeans, who consolidated and attracted like peoples. Then came the Depression, war, the counter culture, and after that came the very rich who decided that they liked what they saw in the Hollywood movies—the city slickers who wanted giant ranches. Then came retired people, and there will be more of those. Each of these groups had very different cultures, and you can still see remnants of these cultures in the county. But what is interesting to me is that there is a banding together of all of these cultures in the arts.

NATHAN GRIFFITH

Today, I am going to discuss the role of the Internet, which I am using as a model for technology and the arts and their integration in various guises into the mechanisms of Western culture. First, however, I need to define the term *cultural policy*. The term has been defined in many ways, but for the purpose of my presentation, I will define *cultural policy* as the discernable system of checks and balances that defines the essence of culture. I also want to define the Web or the Internet as a global network designed to facilitate the transfer and receipt of digital information.

Explicit in this idea of the Web is that it is primarily a means of information relay and only secondarily a mechanism for communication. In the not-too-distant future this could change radically with the wide introduction of broadband technology. However, at this time, the model of the Internet lies in information transfer and receipt. Using that perspective, the Internet is not really and should not be considered a means of communication any more so than—and this is going to seem strange—the telephoned form of communication. The telephone is a mediation of mediated communication. The reason why the telephone seems more or less like a mediated is because it is more was brought up by Fernando Delgado, and I want to make a point that the reason why the tele- phone seems more or less like a means of communication and less mediated is because it is more transparent, and most of that comes through the history of its use. I would say that we are currently developing a similar notion with the Web. With those perspectives in mind, I now will address how I view cultural policy developing in America and how components of cultural policy have been brought to the Web.

“... instead of thinking through how the Web is different from other forms of communication or information relay, there has been a reliance on traditional modes of presentation”

I believe that makers of American cultural policy are members of one of five groups. First, government—the national, state, local, and various regional abstractions of that. Second, academia. Third, arts organizations, by which I mean arts advocacy groups such as WESTAF, museums, trusts like the Getty Foundation, and the makers and producers of art. Fourth, the media. Fifth, the marketplace. I believe that the marketplace in America is probably one of the strongest determiners of culture. From my perspective—and I am talking from a visual arts perspective because that is what I know—the strongest forces at work in shaping cultural policy in America are the media and the marketplace.

How do these constituents make use of technology or the Web? The first three—academia, government, and arts organizations—are taking the position that they realize the importance of the Net.

The idea of the World Wide Web only has existed for about eight years. That is not a very long time when compared to devices such as telephones, newspapers, and the printed word. Everyone has a very high expectation for what the Web can be, but I don't feel like that expectation has been met. Part of the problem

is that instead of thinking through how the Web is different from other forms of communication or information relay, there has been a reliance on traditional modes of presentation, whether they are textual modes, the relay of television-like transmission, or others. Fundamentally, the way in which we experience the Web is different from these other forms of information retrieval.

Now, what is the reason for this? I think one of the reasons is the important fact that the Web has not been around very long, and we do not really understand what the Web is and how it works. There is a lot of theory being generated about the Web, but most of this is emerging either from the people who are developing the technology of the Web or from the high-level, critical analysts who are working in academia. Often, these theories do not reach the general public or the purveyors of cultural values in arts organizations, museums, and government.

What I observe occurring is a kind of free-for-all. Primary examples are found in a review of how advocacy groups and museums use the Web and how the marketplace adopts the strategy of the Web to market the visual cultural artifacts of our nation. For example, in governmental Web sites that attempt to transmit cultural information, the Web often takes what they have and translates it almost word for word from a textual, written, catalog-like perspective; as a result, it comes across as catalogued information.

A good example of this is the Smithsonian Web site. There are portions of the Smithsonian and the Library of Congress Web sites that are very informative, very entertaining, and very educational. The people who have written those portions have thought through their message and have taken the time to integrate the multimedia, narrative, and textual possibilities of the Web for an enriching experience. However, by and large, a person like me who is often only seeking factual, historical art information finds that the Smithsonian site can be a real trial. I finally figured out how to make it work. But it basically reads like a cataloguing system. There are bits and pieces of key words, informational markers, and other devices. But it is a maze through which the user must loop in order to find a very simple piece of information such as when a particular painting was produced. In order to perform that function, I have to go to the national inventory of American paintings and, from that, I have to figure out what key words are going to get me to the artist who produced the work. I then need to find where that painting might be. Then I encounter a list of information about that painting. This is a very complex and confusing way to present information. It is not very helpful, and most people will not go through what it takes to get to that end point—that final capturing of the desired information. Many of the federal, national, and state sites that I reviewed used a similar model—the simple translation of textual information into a Web format.

The adoption of the Web by museums has both good and bad examples. A prime example of a good site is the site of the Metropolitan Museum of Art. The designers of that site made a very strong attempt to put every single piece of art the museum owns up on the Web. The images are retrievable through a very easy mechanism—a set of key-word searches that help you look up a work using the name of the artist, the country produced, the subject of the work, the kind of work it is, and the medium. These key words bring the user a page of thumbnails of the images that the key words have identified. The user finds the desired image, points on it, and receives a bevy of information about the object.

From my standpoint (the standpoint of someone who has used the Web to conduct considerable research), the Metropolitan Museum's approach is very valuable. The Museum's site also has certain areas where it makes in-depth presentations about cultural histories with regard to the particular objects it owns, using those objects to illustrate the cultural history rather than using the objects or privileging the objects for the sake of explaining their value as objects.

An example of a bad site from the same city is the site for the Whitney Museum. I never can find anything I want at the Whitney site, and I have almost quit going there. The reason is that the Whitney has adopted the strategy that the Web and what it can do are somewhat of a virtual counterpart to what is presented in the museum through a temporal mechanism. In other words, the Whitney privileges on its site what it happens to be physically offering at the moment. What it does is give the user little teasers. It tells the site visitor that it has some object but then provides no access to information about the object. To me, such an approach is not very effective.

Another place I can go with this analysis is the development of certain sites like WESTAF's. In that Web site, WESTAF presents its mission very clearly. The organization appears to understand from an informational point of view what needs to be presented and how to connect the user with that information. I have gone to the site to find jobs and have referred individuals to WESTAF's ArtJob.org and ArtistsRegister.com. In other words, as an arts-advocacy organization, WESTAF's role is to facilitate communication among art makers, art viewers, and the custodians of art, and WESTAF understands that mission and presents it under the guise of many different pages—many ways to get to that information in a very easy and painless manner. WESTAF is privileged in its role as an arts-advocacy association. It is there to help other associations and people, so it sees itself as an umbrella association, whereas museums often see themselves as the custodians of objects or the keepers of objects.

From my perspective, what needs to be done to work through this problem is to focus on the notion of partnerships. Now, in one sense, WESTAF is a partnership. It leads in what it does, in a sense, but it is in partnership with many different organizations to provide results that elevate the notion of cultural policy and what it can do for our society. Now, if other organizations could think through this idea of partnership and bring e-commerce to the idea of how partnerships can enrich the production of a coherent cultural notion, then I think some gains might be made in the integration of arts and cultural production with this notion or this mechanism of the Web.

Cisler: From my background as a librarian, I can say that many of my colleagues did not view the Internet or the Web as anything but an information medium; they had a difficult time understanding that it could be a communication medium. On the other hand, people outside the library world were much more excited about the Internet as a communication medium. A French experiment at the time of the introduction of the Web showed about three times as much traffic in messages among people as people searching for any sort of information. This sort of imbalance has carried forth in some other areas. That said, I think that the Internet really has not reached its potential, which certainly is true in terms of communication. I think the expectations for the Internet have been extremely high. There have been very strong boosters and zealots who think it can do almost anything that a communication medium can do. I tend to waiver back and forth.

I grew up on a system called *the well*, which started in the mid 1990s in the San Francisco Bay area and held one of the first conferences Much more recently—in the *Nep Time* that linked avant-garde Europe. Many of these were new Society Institute and George Soros’

“The Internet really is a series of barriers, and some of us are slow in overcoming them.”

between arts activists and artists. 1990s—I took part in one called artists in eastern and central media centers funded by the Open endeavors.

The Internet has continued both as acrimonious between artists and

an interchange—sometimes very activists—and as a place for

experimentation using the Internet as a medium for Net art and not a conference for the expression of art. There is continuing debate about that. Nathan Griffith was describing the frustrations many of us have concerning the Internet. The Internet really is a series of barriers, and some of us are slow in overcoming them. The equipment costs are going down, access speed is improving, and the interface is getting better. But it still is extremely uneven, and research indicates that there is a large segment of the American public that has no use for the Internet. They either do not plan to use it, or they have tried it and are backing off.

There is another group that has been experimenting with communication, the Art and Technology Center at San Jose State University. The Center launched an experiment this year where the director purchased palm pilots with Internet connectivity so that a group of graduate student artists could communicate using very short messages in a very limited space. The director has no idea what is going to happen and whether the students even will use the devices or if they’re going to be using them, but that’s part of the experiment. This approach is very different from linking up community-affinity groups that are spread over great geographical distances. But both are going on at the same time.

An interesting question to pursue is how cultural producers and archivers—or those who hold the archive, the cultural artifacts—relate to overtures from commercial interests. This question opens up a number of issues, such as those related to musicians, copyright and Napster, the relationship between musicians and recording labels, and the more benevolent relationship between writers and publishers. We are seeing an entire range of technologies that theoretically could bypass editors and publishers and are totally decentral-

ized. They allow the trade not just of mp3 music files but of any kind of object, whether it is a sound file or an electronic rendition of a work of art or even a video, dance, or theater production. You may think it is impractical to exchange huge files, but some of you may have read about the whole process of taking movies that are released in the West, filming them in digital formats, and sending them over to Singapore and Bangkok for release onto pirate CDs or video CDs or individual display in local theaters in places where the copyright laws are not enforced. So there are all sorts of things that are happening about which some are excited and others are terrified.

Another point concerns indigenous groups and their own knowledge and how they relate to, for example, advertising firms for pharmaceutical companies. It is not a stretch to talk about pharmaceutical companies dealing with local culture because many medical practices are embedded in cultural practices and can be taken out of context. Certainly, the relationship between indigenous artists and how their art is used by folks outside of that particular ethnic group is an important issue. I spoke with some people who are responsible for writing the European Union memorandum of understanding that was drawn up specifically in reaction to Bill Gates' offer to buy art in various countries on behalf of Corbis, and that was very controversial in Europe some years ago.

Hodsoll: We have a digital dilemma in this technology. That is the phrase used in the best report (*Digital Dilemma*) I have seen put together by a committee on any subject. The question is: If the first copy is also the last copy, how do you implement the cultural bargain that is inherent in our Constitution and the copyright and patent laws? Second, even if one is able to do that on the Internet, how do you obtain sufficient recognition for anything, including cultural products, to allow people to have some ease in getting in above the clutter? Third—and this also is an individual dilemma—how do you preserve the material that goes out on the Internet? Technologies are evolving so rapidly that old technologies are no longer available to access certain kinds of things. Finally, what is the implication of virtual communities with respect to physical communities? The arts are both; they start as parts of physical communities, and then they become more and more electronic. What does this mean to the communities for which culture is both the glue and the means of defining their individualities in relation to other communities?

Woodward: I would like to add a couple of comments. What about the expectations of the Web versus the success of the Web? The growth of the Web is the greatest frustration for me in terms of daily use. I first encountered it in 1988 when I was a visiting faculty member at Dartmouth College. It wasn't the World Wide Web as we know it, but I was very excited by the fact that I was able to interact with colleagues at Berkeley, Cornell, and my home institution at the University of Alaska, and all of the e-mail discourse was intellectually based. Today, when I check my e-mail, I not only have commercial kinds of messages but, more important, what I spend most of my time on e-mail doing is answering questions from people who know I check my e-mail every day and, as a result, expect a rapid response from me. Now my family and everyone I know finds me available there.

I also wish to mention that, in terms of actions such as searching the Smithsonian Web site, to a large extent, we have become spoiled by our expectations of what the Web provides. I still think when I go to the

Smithsonian Web site how privileged I am to be able to access that information from my desk at home at all, compared to what it would have taken me to obtain that information before the Web came into being. I try, when I am frustrated by Web sites that are not very usable, to remind myself of what I would have had to do to locate anything like the volume and depth of information through the method of a book search in the library.

Zinn: I agree with Nathan that most arts institutions have yet to develop Web sites that enable users to take advantage of the resources of the Web. But we also should keep in mind that the advantages of Internet technology cannot be taken for granted. There are, for example, elements of the technology of the codex that so far are irreplaceable. The codex is luminous, it presents information vividly and in a spatially elegant form, and it boasts rapid indexing capabilities. Should these advantages be abandoned for a new technology that is only presumably better? For me, this raises the question of how well the marketplace—*this* marketplace—adjudicates the advantages of different cultural technologies and how well it is setting the agenda for the adoption and implementation of Web technology.

Forty-five years ago, the creation of the long-playing record was accompanied by the adoption of recording industry standards—the so-called RIAA (Recording Industry Association of America) curve—which ensured that LPs would have wide-band frequency response, even if specific pieces of music or individual playback systems did not take advantage of this technological capability. I do not see this sort of collective curatorial foresight in evidence in the rush to make visual and audio archives available on the Web. Mp3 files suffer from compression and low audio quality, and digital archives of paintings cannot begin to compare, so far, with the real thing, not even with decent reproductions in textbooks. Such archives are, admittedly, copious, but they offer diminished versions of cultural materials as a way of satisfying market demand or enlarging market share. Shouldn't cultural policy play a role in setting standards for cultural diffusion, especially if the marketplace, in its haste, is doing a poor job of this?

Fees: I caught myself thinking as a museum person about what you were saying about the Web and how we have not come to terms with the medium yet. I think that is true. I am speaking as an individual who works in a place that is collections driven and yet has found our computer-related department growing larger than our collections department in the last three years. We really have to come to terms with what our goals for the use of this medium are, and your comparison of the Whitney and the Metropolitan sites is a wonderful example of that. What is the reason that the Met does what it does? Is it to assume a magisterial role as an arbiter of what's art and what's not art? In the case of the Whitney, the teasers suggest that it is trying to attract visitation. Certainly for us up in Cody, attracting visitors to Cody, Wyoming, is an important component of our goals for using the Web.

Such a Web site also attracts funding because funding for Web-based information is attractive now. Still, building these systems represents a tremendous allocation of resources, and to bring this discussion to a question of cultural policy, the end seems to me to be the allocation of resources. The best reason for the allocation of resources to the Web in our case—or in the case of the Met or the Whitney—is simply to make information about art and the arts accessible to the widest possible audience and to attract new and young

audiences who otherwise are not going to be attracted to the things we are trying to convey. At a policy level, this is the economic encouragement to places like ours to put our selections on the Web in an accessible way.

Ybarra-Frausto: I have three observations that are indirectly connected. One is related to the notion of partnership and concerns the question of repertoire: How do we maintain multiple repertoires with each new technological development so that an artist or a person can have the meaning of the radio and the television and the whatever at the same time instead of putting everything on a new technology and hoping that it will do everything? I've begun thinking in cultural policy about the issue of maintaining repertoires because multiple groups and citizens actually do not have access to them all and should. A second question concerns how we can make the multiple repertoires more accessible. The last is an observation about being in the West. There is a kind of openness to unlimited horizons and an unlimited view of the future, but I also want to balance that with a way of looking toward the past that preserves embodied knowledge systems. So, one big question for me is what the consequences are when embodied knowledge systems get put into a disembodied medium, whatever it might be.

Hodsoll: Maintenance of multiple repertoires is not only a question of access. It is also a question of who controls the pipes through which the repertoire or the content goes. In the West, in the Ninth Circuit, there is a case—I do not know whether it will go to the Supreme Court or not—in which cable companies' denial—AT&T's denial, specifically—of access to the cable system in Multnomah County in Portland was litigated. The court came out without a real decision on it, but it did say that it was within the jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission, which is now beginning to start hearings on the subject. But as Neil Postman remarked concerning cable, at first there will be a multiplicity of cable channels and a great deal of content, with different kinds of repertoires available. But then, as he points out, the oligarchs will come marching in. How much variety do you find on cable today? Cable content today is largely old movies and what Murray Horwitz calls “All Hitler All the Time” on the History Channel.

J O H N K R E I D L E R

Cultural Initiatives Silicon Valley has created the first-ever cultural policy simulator: a software program aimed at demonstrating how the skillful application of investments in culture, over time, can build stronger communities and economies. The simulator, entitled *is.C³* (interactive simulation of culture, commerce and community), was designed to highlight the benefits of investments in arts education, cultural facilities, organizational effectiveness, cultural marketing, and increased output of cultural programming to business and civic leaders in Silicon Valley. Beyond this primary audience, *is.C³* should be useful for helping arts councils, arts service organizations, and funding sources consider policy options.

Sir Peter Hall, in his landmark book, *Cities in Civilization* (1998), examines the underlying conditions that led to the emergence of “cultural crucibles” in Athens, Florence, London, Vienna, and Berlin. In his work, Hall also considers cities that be-

“One of the key challenges, then, is finding ways to convince business and civic leaders that a vital cultural sector has relevance to a healthier community ...”

came centers of technological Berlin, Detroit, and, most recently, Tokyo) as well as regions that (Imperial Rome, London, Paris, Stockholm). Hall concludes with been learned from history to cal innovation, and urban organi- a great city of the 21st century.

Hall’s analysis is a useful point of Silicon Valley, a region of more than two million people that is now marked by a sense of world prominence in technological and business innovation. Throughout the Valley, one finds a culture that emphasizes youth, risk taking, informality, open process, and a passion for solving problems. Many here believe that this culture is the future model for regional development throughout the world. Simultaneously, there is a pervasive sense of impermanence and loss within Silicon Valley. As a physical place, it now has the look and feel of a vast suburb with epic traffic jams and undistinguished commercial districts. A massive influx of national and international immigrants is arriving daily to fuel economic expansion, but there is a lingering malaise that these newcomers have little desire to remain in the Valley and thereby contribute to its progress as a community. More than at any time past, the region is wrestling with a widening gap between the economic, education, and information haves and have-nots. Silicon Valley has seen boom times and numbing recessions throughout its post-war history, so both courses seem very possible.

departure for contemporary

Three years ago, a planning process was set in motion by San Jose’s then-mayor Susan Hammer. More than 1,000 people were involved in this effort, and the result was a 10-year cultural plan aimed at a broad sweep of developments in creative education, community-based cultural activities, nonprofit cultural institutions, facilities, and financial resources. Embedded in the plan is a recognition that Silicon Valley needs to harness its extraordinary technological and business acumen to the task of constructing a cultural sector of

equivalent vitality. It was this recognition that resulted in the formation of a new organization to champion the plan's objectives, Cultural Initiatives Silicon Valley.

The core purpose of Cultural Initiatives is to enhance community life by engaging the Valley's business and civic leadership in planning, advocacy, research, time-limited program initiatives, and resource development aimed at strengthening the cultural sector. One of the key challenges, then, is finding ways to convince business and civic leaders that a vital cultural sector has relevance to a healthier community and perhaps as well to sustained economic success. After pondering the alternatives of publications, videos, and other relatively passive media, Cultural Initiatives now has settled on the creation of a highly interactive computer simulation as the main vehicle for communicating its case to the Silicon Valley business sector.

During the past six months, Cultural Initiatives has been working with a systems dynamics consultant, a computer simulation firm, software designers, and artists to design a simulation in which users will be able to make policy decisions about arts education, cultural marketing, development of cultural organizations, increased supply of cultural programs, and construction of cultural facilities. Over a time horizon of two generations (40 years), the simulator will project how these policy decisions will promote or retard Silicon Valley's ability to build social capital; retain its workforce; promote technological innovation; and ultimately achieve the balance of culture, community, and commerce extolled by Sir Peter Hall.

Although the simulation makes no pretense of being truly predictive about the course of evolution in the Valley's economic and cultural ecosystems, it is being infused, wherever possible, with real baseline demographic, economic, and cultural data. Parallel with the creation of is.C³, Cultural Initiatives is also launching an indicators project designed to collect data on the Valley's progress in achieving a more advanced cultural and creative domain. The plan is to use these data to update is.C³ in future years as a way of enhancing the simulation's credibility and capacity for stimulating debate about cultural policy in Silicon Valley.

The simulator is.C³ is based on an advanced systems model of the relationships among community, culture, and the economy, but the experience of playing the game interface is laced with a combination of humor and challenge. A major Silicon Valley tycoon, Bruce Largecap, has just been killed by a speeding Mercedes sport utility vehicle. You (the player) have been selected in his videotaped will to serve as the CEO for life of the Largecap Renaissance Foundation. Through a series of animations, you are introduced to the logic of the five cultural investment policies that Largecap believed would transform Silicon Valley into one of the great city-regions of all time. As you play through your strategies, voice-over messages appear to warn you of impending problems or to congratulate you on noteworthy achievements. At the end of each run, you can evaluate your performance on the "Great Cities Index," which ranges from a low of "Ghost Town" to a high of "Belle Epoque." In addition, three progressive lessons, each illustrated by animations, will deepen your knowledge of the systemic relationships that underlie the simulation.

In the next several weeks, Cultural Initiatives will debut is.C³ before a select group of Silicon Valley business and civic leaders in a “beta testing” session designed to reveal any weaknesses in logic and presentation. By late October, is.C³ is expected to be ready for release in a CD-ROM version. Thereafter, Cultural Initiatives will intensively market is.C³ to our primary audience of the business and civic leadership of Silicon Valley. The purpose is to elevate their understanding of the relationship of culture to the vitality of the community and to the continued success of the local economy. In combination with other projects underway at Cultural Initiatives, the ultimate objective is to stimulate the direct engagement of Silicon Valley’s business sector in the development of the region’s cultural life through donations of funds and management expertise. By packaging our message in the form of interactive media, which has become the vernacular of the high-tech sector, Cultural Initiatives expects to instill a deeper understanding of the need for business investment in culture than would be possible through other forms of communication.

Although the game interface of is.C³ specifically targets a Silicon Valley business audience, the underlying architecture of the software model is applicable to any region struggling with the balance between economic success and community vitality. Silicon Valley is widely acknowledged as a bellwether of how the emerging new economy is changing a broad swath of daily life. Other regions throughout the world that monitor developments in the Valley as a means for pondering their own futures will find is.C³ to be a useful tool. The model advances the proposition that well-conceived business investment in the five available policy options (arts education, program output, marketing, organizational effectiveness, and facilities) can result in greater public engagement in cultural expression, which in turn can be a strong lever for advancing social capital. Social capital, in turn, promotes vibrant communities, which are good for business in various ways, including the recruitment and retention of a stable workforce and promotion of innovation. In summary, corporate investment in culture can yield significant returns for business. This proposition should be of interest to business leaders in any region that is wrestling with the societal issues associated with the new economy.

In addition, leaders in the nonprofit arts should find the model to be insightful. The model is based on a quite detailed and dynamic systems map of the cultural domain and its interconnections to community and business vitality. While many users undoubtedly will play is.C³ at a relatively superficial level that yields the central lessons of building balanced and sustainable urban landscapes, more advanced practitioners of cultural policy will find the systemic relationships underlying the model to be challenging. Achieving optimal results from the simulation requires multiple runs and complex strategies to explore scores of systemic relationships. Once these relationships are mastered, users can move on to even more advanced features of the model that allow for experimentation with multiple scenarios of population dynamics and business cycles. One screen within the simulator provides a bibliography of suggested readings that could be used, in combination with the software, to teach a graduate-level course in cultural policy.

The game is loaded in two versions, Windows and Mac, onto a single CD-ROM packaged with liner notes. Aside from basic mouse skills, is.C³ requires minimal computer literacy. The format of the game interface can function well for single users as well as group presentations.

I want to point out that the company that makes the software that does the simulation part of this is called *High Performance Systems* and is based in Hanover, New Hampshire. These are people who have been very supportive of the nonprofit sector and are interested in educational policy in a number of different fields. They have donated about \$30,000 worth of licensing rights that have allowed us to do all this.

This is the final version of the software. We're literally burning the CDs and printing the labels and putting them into cases at this point. We really wanted this to go on the Web, but there isn't a broad enough bandwidth to do it. There are just too many data in the simulation to be able to make it work very swiftly on the Web, and the underlying software itself isn't very well attuned to the Web, so we had to fall back on using a CD.

Ybarra-Frausto: A lot of the basic foundational premises of this are rather like Enlightenment projects of what a city is or what a community is or what an individual is, and I am wondering this: We are now in a kind of a post-Enlightenment, where people have made or are making post-Enlightenment projects and where some of these notions are no longer operable. There is a sense of founded community when, in reality, the work force is both, and the allegiances are multiple.

You talk a lot about the fact that Silicon Valley does not have a place, but people are no longer in place in the same way, and you can have allegiance to India and Silicon Valley or to Mexico and Silicon Valley. These multiplicities of behavior or of feeling or of all the things that it takes to make cultural capital are not the same as in integral cities and can serve as a model for us. I would like to see you include in the bibliography works representing the imaginations of the construction of post-Enlightenment projects, particularly in terms of the real specificity of the places for the people who work there—India, Latin America, or wherever. Thinkers from places such as India and Latin American have talked about these ideas in ways that probably would make more sense to those people. The United States is fine and is one part, but what about the other part? My critique is that what this enterprise leads to is a kind of Enlightenment project of self and community and nation, and I think Silicon Valley is way beyond that. Silicon Valley is really a place of risk taking and open processing, and we really should be thinking about it in a post-Enlightenment way.

Williams: I would encourage you to consider taking this project into schools because we forget that the young people are part of the community and will be the thinkers of the community in just a few years. An 18-year-old is not very far from adulthood.

Dorf: This is really fun. I did some cultural planning with the city of Chicago, and we came up with two things. One is that we had a dirty little secret about all of our studies of the economic impact of the arts. Most of the studies we had seen done—whether by community groups or the city—showed that every dollar spent on the arts brought in so many dollars. Most of that, however, was actually redistribution rather than new money: I am spending a dollar on the arts that I would have spent otherwise on the movies. I wonder how much your economic impact statements take that into account. The second point I want to make concerns the definition of culture. How much of this also could be accomplished by having a major league sports franchise in Silicon Valley? A sports franchise also would raise the city index levels of what keeps people in a place, would affect whether they're going to move from one job to another, and would create a sense of community.

Kreidler: I myself am not bound up with the superiority of high art in comparison to other forms of cultural expression, including sports. To me, it is every bit as valid to get a group of people together to play bridge as it is to engage in high culture. Athletics are a part of culture; game playing is a part of culture. Within our organization, there are debates about how much we should be oriented toward art as opposed to culture more broadly, but we are called *Cultural Initiatives* and, in general, we are trying to stay away from a narrow

vision in our approach. I think the issue is how to create interactive culture that brings meaning to people's lives. The hockey team in Silicon Valley is an example. It strikes me as rather strange because there is nothing indigenous about it; to have its major-league sports team be a hockey team when there is no history of hockey in Silicon Valley, as there is in Minnesota or Canada, is odd. But it seems to be something that galvanizes a lot of people, and I think that's fine.

Woodward: I have a very specific question about the term *belle époque*. I would caution you a little bit about using that term. Literally, it means *beautiful era*, and I think you are using it to mean a golden age. Art historically, it refers to a specific period in the late 19th century that was characterized by morbidity and decadence and a thin veneer of civilization over a pretty rotten core.

Cisler: I want to react to a couple of things that Tomás Ybarra-Frausto said. In many great imperial cities, there always have been outsiders who have been critical to a culture's development. In Greece and Seville—the Jews in Seville and the cities that were not really homogeneous or people who were outsiders. About 30% of the start-up Chinese, Japanese, Vietnamese, or think their common heritage is technology of Confucius or Ashoka or philosophical backgrounds. I think they message if they are at all interested

“... their common heritage is technology as opposed to the teachings of Confucius or Ashoka or philosophical figures from their national backgrounds.”

Greeks in Alexandria—you had CEOs in Silicon Valley are of other Asian ancestry, and I neous and depended on temporary ers, especially when crises came nology as opposed to the teachings philosophical figures from their national backgrounds could be addressed by this sort of in giving time and money.

Katunarić: The model strikes me as designed within the so-called false materialist system. But the values of people in different areas of the world are different, depending on the level of development. Silicon Valley will be for the foreseeable future a major emblem of materialism. Are perimeters related to degree of materialism included in your analytical framework for future scenarios?

Kreidler: Much of the conversation that we have had centers around the question of whether place is still relevant in the modern age. At Cultural Initiatives, we have maintained that place is very important and, whether it is post-materialist or not, some sense of belonging to a place and interacting within a place is not something that is going to be supplanted by the Internet.

There was a fascinating article a few weeks ago in a local throw-away paper about the Slovenian population of Silicon Valley from the former republic of Yugoslavia. There are many Slovenians in Silicon Valley. Slovenia is a country that writes lots of computer code, and they are very good at it. They feel they have to be in Silicon Valley, so they have established clients, and a whole Slovenian population has moved over. They cannot wait to return to Slovenia; they just hate it [Silicon Valley]. They think it is ugly; they do not think there is a sense of community to keep them there. That is the kind of issue that we are trying to raise in all of this: What would bring meaning to the many populations in Silicon Valley that would make them want to stay? Now, maybe it is legitimate for them to come to make a material fortune and learn what they

want from the technology and then return to Slovenia. That is fine, too. The simulation, however, contains no specific perimeters related to materialism.

Ybarra-Frausto: I want to continue the conversation. We had a Cold War, particularly those of us who participated in envisioning other Americas in the 1960s. If you are a hyphenated American, you have a place of origin and the place where you are, creating an imagined community that somehow maintains allegiance and ties to both. If you were Mexican-American, you were American; you were born here, and your ties were to that. But you also had to bring some culture, so you are tied to the Italian, Asian, or whatever culture, too. So, I am thinking again whether there are models that we already have made about doubleness and location in multiple sites that are more in keeping with the real fact of the immigrant and the migrant as not in place in one locale. The point is that to think nostalgically about one place, whether it is the West or Texas or whatever, is a 19th-century kind of thinking about place. Anyway, the question I am raising is that perhaps the nostalgic sense of place is a 19th- and not a 21st-century notion.

Fees: The notion of Silicon Valley's place is very interesting. I think Silicon Valley is a construct that defines a community of interest—a community of interest founded on an industry rather than an actual place, and it is a place with no center. Maybe *belle époque* is a perfect sort of label. During the rapid urbanization of the late 19th century, grand buildings created a sense of place—a sense of center for those emerging cities that had not had one before. It strikes me that what you are trying to do is create a center that will give Silicon Valley a definition as a place.

Cisler: I think one reason people are looking at place is to try to get away from pre-mediated experiences and back to something, and that something probably is going to be based on where you are. I think people's investment of so much life online is a part of this. In a lot of the things I have done with community networking, we moved away from the provision of Net-based services to being a physical place to convene, where we have activities for talking about technology and how we react to it. This includes urban areas, Indian reservations, and very disparate rural communities. The technology center as a place to gather is very important to us.

Hayashi: I have a question, John, that also is perhaps a comment about opportunity. Because you and your cohorts decided to use the gaming concept as the point of entry, are you thinking that you will be more market driven in responding to the reaction you get from people who run the game? Will you be doing second and third versions based on what you've learned from the responses? Are you thinking about doing that in short order or in the longer order? Or is it to be more academically research driven? I know of Sega because it is one of my benefactors for a project, and it brings things to market rapidly. It is constantly looking at the marketplace. It has people in San Francisco 24 hours a day, seven days a week, monitoring its Dreamcast Web sites to see what the marketplace is doing so it can respond in the next version—3.2 or whatever it is. Are you thinking that way with the simulation software?

Kreidler: The answer is yes. We already have conducted a couple of beta testing groups, and I am sure that when we take it public, we will get much more feedback. As I said, we are also trying to develop real data

that we can transfer into the simulation in future years. We may learn, however, that the simulation is just a blind alley and switch to PowerPoint or some other linear presentation format. I don't know, but we are hopeful that this highly interactive simulation will be the right direction. We are not wedded to it, and so far, our investment is about \$60,000 worth of direct funding plus many hours of my staff's time and the time of many volunteers. So, we have not bet the ranch on the simulation, but I would love to see it go through future iterations and, in fact, have those iterations be a reflection of changes in the community.

Coe: I come from Wyoming, a state of 480,000 people. In terms of size, we are the 9th largest state in the country, so we have a different problem. The thing I am wondering about is do the residents of Wyoming want to think about the future? Is this a real concern for them? And how do we entice people to become concerned about cultural development in our different kinds of communities? I live in a state with rich people and very poor people and everything in between. The problem I am finding often is an attitude of "we like it this way" or "we don't care" or "we don't even know that we should be concerned." How do we get people to think that this is a matter of concern?

Kreidler: Our assumption is that cultural expression is intrinsically good for you as an individual and it is good for your neighbors and your communities, whether the setting is rural or suburban or whatever. However, in this simulation, we are exploring the instrumental and practical arguments of cultural expression. Silicon Valley has boomed three times since World War II and has gone badly bust twice. There is always the specter of economic decline, so there is a continual search for strategies that can stabilize the Silicon Valley economy. We are saying in this simulation that culture may be one stabilizing strategy, but we are not saying it is the only strategy. It is important to build up the arts in the schools, for example, and it is equally important to improve health care. But, inevitably, there are people who live behind iron gates and see themselves completely unconnected to Silicon Valley. I do not know if we ever will make a breakthrough with those folks, but we are trying to reach the 600 or 800 local leaders who we think can be most influential in the advancement of cultural engagement in our region.

Walton: To return to the discussion about place, perhaps culture does not come from a place. Perhaps culture comes from communities of people who are not necessarily heterogeneous. I view the potential in this project as reminding people in the private sector or in the business marketplace that community is what creates culture. It is not necessarily about the Silicon Valley. I think it is about the people who live there and all of their multiple ethnicities, backgrounds, and interests. I think the power of something like this is to remind people that their culture does come from the narratives that we want to tell about one another and share with one another. That is what creates it; it is not place.

Hodsoll: There is an opposition of assumptions here as to the source of culture. But culture probably comes from both directions—from communities that are not related to place and those that are.

Nahwooksy: Right. The other side of that for Native American people is that place and environment are very important. We are very tied to the land, and we did not come across the Bering Strait—I'm sorry to have to correct you.

Delgado: I am a child of Silicon Valley. Silicon Valley used to be known as the garden of heart's delight, and the biggest industries used to be agriculture and food processing. It did not have "culture" even back then. San Jose/Silicon Valley never has had a history of culture. The Campbell Highlander games in my youth were as close as we came to culture. We had a disastrous performing-arts center that was built in the 1970s, and the roof kept falling in, and we had a pathetic art museum that is still not much more than marginal now.

But two things have changed in the last 20 years. One is that there was a group of people who defined themselves as San Joseans—as citizens of Silicon Valley. They have been priced out of the market; they are gone—the people of my generation and maybe a generation ahead. These are the people who had a commitment to place and who thought the plan to redevelop the downtown was really going to help. Instead, it became a boondoggle, with the stores down at the Pavilion closing left and right. As I recall, the earthquakes did not help much, either.

The point about the soccer team is designed to appeal to all these immigrants—virtually no support from them. One have a player who represents one of drum. You bring a player in from no, no, he's not from Mexico." You it's "No, no, no, he's not from the examples point to absences and bar-

“The same issues you are talking about now, intensified and accelerated by the digital age and the digital economy, were always issues in Silicon Valley.”

interesting. The soccer team was migrant communities, but it gets of the arguments is that you do not us, which is an interesting conun-Latin America, and they say, "No, bring a player in from Mexico and right part of Mexico." Both riers to culture and community.

But the more historical issues relate to San Francisco. In all my youth, if we were going to go get culture, if we were going to go see theater, if we were going to see the symphony, if we were going to go see opera, we went to the city. That's why San Francisco existed. God knows they did not do work there, right? It was cheaper and easier to fly into San Francisco, and it was cheaper to stay in San Jose. But you did your culture, you did your tourism in San Francisco, and until that perception changes nationally and regionally, San Jose is going to be in the same position Sacramento is. It is a great place to live, but when you want to do something interesting, San Francisco is just up the freeway. The same thing occurs in Los Angeles. There is a lot of cool stuff in greater Los Angeles, and people go there for that. I do not know, given the space and the costs now, whether the Silicon Valley can create those spaces because sprawl creates a situation where it is almost easier to drive up the coast to San Francisco than it is to drive across town in San Jose because of how San Jose is now laid out.

These are the economic, cultural, and geographical issues that have been pervasive in Silicon Valley at least since I moved there in 1970 and from what I can recall of my dad telling me about what San Jose was like in the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s. The same issues you are talking about now, intensified and accelerated by the digital age and the digital economy, were always issues in Silicon Valley. My presumption is that they always will be issues regardless of how migratory the population is.

Hodsoll: I want to make a sort of mechanic's observation here. I would suggest that most Americans live in suburbs, and while Silicon Valley has a certain notoriety of sorts, all of the suburbs face the same issues that we are talking about here. Most Americans live in suburbs, and whether they go for their culture to the nearest city or try to create something within those suburbs is a major cultural issue across this country.

Jennings-Roggensack: This is a fascinating discussion in many ways and for me in particular because many of the things you are talking about are actualized in the work that we do at Arizona State University Public Events. Our mission is connecting to communities. Our core value is creating places of meaning for people. The notion of investment in culture and creating successful communities is not a new idea. The return that you get from technology and business innovation in the work force is all very exciting, but the notion of investment of the wealthy in terms of the preservation and the future of culture is not a new idea.

Technology is something again that turns on light bulbs. I think the game is fascinating. The more it can get out, the more people can talk about it and play with it and the better it will be. Nathan Griffith's notion of the academy plays very well into this, and I think one of the things that we'll want to discuss is the notion of what part the academy plays both in cultural policy and the notions of technology. Thus, it is very exciting to hear that you'll find a home for it there.

Larry Williams raised the notion of generational shifts and how that variable plays back into this particular discussion. Tomás Ybarra-Frausto really brought home the notion of post-Enlightenment versus nostalgia in asking whether we are talking about yesterday or tomorrow. Steve Cisler continues to bring home the notion of technology as a common denominator. Can technology be a place? It falls into line with what the participants talked about in terms of the multiplicity of our communities and their make-up. Can all those communities find their place through technology and through the Web, and how does such a place translate back out into the community as a whole? John Kreidler raised the notion of meaning, and I think again and again that should come back to us. What brings people to technology, to our theaters, to arts places is meaning. Does technology get people to be concerned about one another and about culture? I'd like to hear that addressed as we move into the next presentations about young audiences and demographics.

Our next presentation involves one of the most exciting spectrums for us—not that technology isn't exciting. One of the notions that we need to keep in mind as we go on is that the concept of young audiences involves more than K-12. We also are not simply talking about art education but cradle to 35. One of the most interesting articles in the packet of information we received prior to this symposium was the article on surveys and statistics. Some of the statistics are fascinating—for example, that most people believe in God but seldom go to church. Most people are interested in actively participating in the arts but not in attending the arts. We've spent time talking about structure and ways to look at technology, how it impacts market-places, how it impacts policy, but we haven't talked about young people and young audiences. This is the subject of our next presentation.

A D E L M A R O A C H

What we have been conversing about in terms of space and place does have a lot of relevance when we are thinking about young people. At last year's WESTAF symposium, one of the things that was discussed was the key question in cultural policy making of who decides. When we talk about youth policy, much that is decided is created *for* youth, but there's actually very little policy created *with* young people or *by* youth themselves. We do not really have an explicit cultural policy for young people, and so, in the absence of a well-articulated set of values that will guide us in our cultural policy for and with young people, we have the question of how we will be involving young people in this process.

The story I want to tell you today is going to highlight some of the more invisible, often overlooked, spaces where creative learning is taking involved at the core of all creative sites for arts and cultural activity. nately, arts education funding has having to look in very innovative spaces and places for community tion.

I have been a part of a Stanford—that, since 1987, has been looking valued in different community Heath, a linguist anthropologist, set out with Mildred McLaughlin, who is a public policy analyst, to look at what good things were happening for kids in neighborhoods across the United States. Originally, they were looking at all different community sites—programs and organizations ranging from midnight basketball teams to boys' and girls' clubs to gardening groups to theater programs. About seven years into the research, Shirley Brice Heath realized that the young people who somehow had been involved in an arts program or organization carried with them a very different set of skills and capacities than the other kids seemed to hold. So, in the past five years of our research, we set out to look specifically at the role of the arts in young people's learning and the power the arts have in their development—personally, socially, cognitively, and linguistically.

“... in the absence of a well-articulated set of values that will guide us in our cultural policy for and with young people, we have the question of how we will be involving young people in this process.”

place and where young people are interaction. These are community In most of our states, unfortu- been slashed, so young people are ways beyond schools to find connection and cultural participa-

University-based research team at how young people are being places. Originally, Shirley Brice

I now wish to talk about two items I am sharing with the group. The first is a resource guide that is the culminating project of the 10 years of research that looks at what the arts do for kids in different places around the country. It highlights four particular organizations that young people actually played a very strong role in helping to shape. This is a really important piece of information when we're talking about cultural policy and young people because we often don't think of youth as the actual creators and designers of these types of programming. The second item is a documentary video we produced that shows some of what we are learning and what these kids are doing—how they're working together, teaching one another,

learning, and really working on a level of community and economic development through enterprise initiatives and entrepreneurial endeavors.

I would like to debunk several myths before I get into what these places look like. I think it's important to do so when we're talking about young people, especially when we're talking about young people and policy formation. We live in an age saturated by images, and young people within this landscape of media images play a very particular role. It's a contradictory role in that. On the one hand, we talk about youth as being this revered idealized state that everyone wants to attain. Yet, on the other hand, we don't necessarily know what to do with our young people. We love them when they're little—we adore them when we think they're cute—but as kids enter pre-adolescence and adolescence, it becomes much trickier to figure out how to deal with them. There are a lot of notions of kids being irresponsible and irrational and a little bit crazy and wild, and we even get some really dangerous notions of kids as super predators, as when young men of color were picked up during the Los Angeles riots by the LAPD and labeled *NHI*, which stands for “No Humans Involved.” That brings me to another point, which is that we really need to consider our language in all of this because these categories and these ways in which we make sense of young people really do matter.

So, let us look at some of these myths about young people. Myth #1 is the myth that young people only want to have fun. They really only want to hang out with their friends and play around and get into trouble. The reality that we've seen from our research, which, by the way, involved over 30,000 young people in 120 different sites from Boston to Hawai'i and in rural, urban, and mid-sized towns, is that the primary goal of youth is to have something to do. Our research included a million-word language data base of young people, and the phrase *have something to do* was one of the word sequences that came up again and again in the talk of young people. Young people want to be productive and creative, and they want to do this not only with their peers and alone, but they want to do this with caring adults as well.

Myth #2 is that young people have no respect for discipline and authority. The reality is that young people crave discipline. Youth actually make a fetish out of rules and new ways of pushing things to the next level. For example, we have a skateboarding park in Santa Fe, and every time I walk by there, I'm struck by how these kids take that jump and do it again and again and again and master excellence in that particular domain.

Myth #3 is that young people do not want to work. Actually, our youth crave work, but we need to be specific here that work is different from jobs and chores. Work is the glue of purpose and action that pulls individuals and groups together. It's meaningful, it's relevant, and it's connected.

There's another myth that young people want to be left alone, but young people actually crave companionship. They want to be part of a larger group and a network. We see this in gangs, which are really families that youth create. Our job is to figure out how to involve young people positively and productively in long-term projects as participants as well as audiences, producers, and evaluators. It's not necessarily a myth, but we talk about young people as being *at risk*, and while young people definitely do have to navigate a huge array of risks in our country today, they do so very creatively. It's important to honor that creative risk

taking rather than focus on youth as being at risk. The arts are very important in this piece because the arts demand that we rethink this notion of risk. Risk in the arts is very positive in the sense of taking a risk and being risky within a medium. For young people who need this heightened sense of risk, they can take it into the safe, creative context of the arts and do very positive things with it.

I want to give a couple of examples about language, an issue I mentioned earlier. I worked with a group of kids who are part of a gardening program, and each year they grow 45,000 pounds of organic vegetables. They do it in a food lot in an urban area, and they also do it in the suburban farm setting. They have developed a farmers' market for an underserved area that hasn't had access to organic fruits and vegetables. What they don't sell at the farmers' market, they give to soup kitchens and homeless shelters. They actually cook the food, too, so they're involved in that process of creation. Anyway, these kids have given themselves names for the crews in which they work when they're in the garden, and one of the names that they came up with was the *DIRT* crew. *DIRT* stands for *Dynamic Intelligent Responsible Teens*.

Another one of the young people with whom I worked in an organization is named Jason, and Jason created a little doll. He saw some telephone wires in his neighborhood and took those wires and put them into the form of this little guy. Because Jason is part of a youth organization that he actually helped found, Jason has the space and the creative tools to take this idea to the next level. Jason began building dolls in large human form—anatomically correct—and sometimes with light bulbs coming out of their hands, using all different media. Filene's Basement in Boston actually saw the dolls and asked Jason to produce a series of the dolls as mannequins. Jason's name for himself is *SWAT*, which stands for *Simultaneously Witnessing All Things*, exactly what Jason has done that has pushed him to higher levels of learning. I encourage us to think about the difference between simultaneously witnessing all things and being an at-risk young person.

There are also some myths about education. I think we have an outdated notion that learning takes place in the classroom. We hope that a lot of it happens there, but it also takes place in other areas. We also have to move beyond learning that occurs in a transmission model, where there are experts who, in a linear fashion, relay information to a novice, and that student presumably takes that information and does something with it. The reality is that young people only spend about 26% of their time in school, so we have to figure out what kids are going to be doing in those other hours and how they can be doing things that are creative and engaging when they're not in school.

We have seen in many of these youth organizations and programs that kids are learning in a very different way when they're out of school—in a way that's much more horizontal and distributed. It focuses on the intelligence of a group rather than on the smartness of an individual and builds the capacities of kids to work in communities and engage in the creative process together.

Finally, we have a myth that young people are the blind recipients of marketing—they're the consumers and the audiences for all of the media images. It is true that young people are really barraged by these images, and they definitely need tools that allow them to navigate that media terrain, but with adult support and with the provision of space and energy and creative tools, we are seeing that young people across the United

States in these unlikely spaces are becoming cultural producers in their own right. They are artists and creators, so they are participants in projects as much as they are audiences. I want to add that, in this research, we definitely looked at cultural institutions and formal organizations that are working with young people, but we also looked at the garage band, the *ad hoc* poetry slam—the places where kids formed themselves into groups to develop an area of interest or a talent or an expertise.

In all of the organizations we studied, there were three main things taking place with young people: roles, rules, and risk. We already have talked about risk and how risk can be flipped on its head in the arts. Basically, when young people are involved in high-quality artistic and cultural practices as participants, planners, and deciders, they take on risks because they're the ones who have a responsibility to be able to show what they're learning. Many of the groups we studied had what we saw as a cycle of learning in which the kids were involved, so the young people themselves decided what project they would be doing. For example, they planned, prepared, and then produced that project—whether a poetry or theatre production—and then critiqued it.

There are holistic cycles of learn—that authentic audience there in it—receiving and viewing what the means that there are high-stakes tant part of it. Of course, when there are a large number of rules as young people play an integral rules really serve as the cohesive the youth involved in it.

“This research really pushes us not only to think about physical spaces and places but also about metaphorical communities and ways of learning and working together that can be developed through the arts.”

ing for youth, and when you have place, someone will be critiquing young people are making. It games, and risk is a very impor—you're doing anything like that, that need to be upheld and as long part in making those rules, those glue for the organization and for

Roles also are an important piece of it. Often, we find that there is a lack of funding for this type of programming (non-school youth-arts development), which means that people have to be very innovative and resourceful in running a program or an organization. Young people, then, take on a lot of these roles. I would not ever want to tell policy makers to cut the funding and it will mean kids will be creative, but because of a lack of resources, young people are stepping into all sorts of different roles from publicity to mentoring younger kids in school to set design and lighting. You name it; they are participating in these ways in high-quality youth arts organizations.

When the young people talk about their spaces, they talk about the importance of building relationships, working resourcefully, and finding relevant and meaningful work. They talk about creativity and collaboration, community, and connection as being essential. This research really pushes us not only to think about physical spaces and places but also about metaphorical communities and ways of learning and working together that can be developed through the arts. This is so important because some of the physical spaces that did exist for young people and included young people in shared work do not exist like they used to. In the Southwest, for example, the plazas don't function socially as they once did. We do not have commons, and so there are not as many actual physical spaces where young people are incorporated into the social

fabric of sharing work. So, the question then becomes how the arts can help serve as this third space or this community connecting point for young people to be involved in creative and relevant practices.

I will end by posing a few questions for all of us to consider not only today but also in our own work as we go back home. I want us to think about where these shared, public, creative spaces will be physically and metaphorically and how young people can be present in them. How can we link young people to cultural resources? How can we involve kids constantly not only as spectators and audiences but as participants and cultural producers in their own right? Can we have young people on our boards? Can we have them on advisory groups? Are there opportunities for them to be apprenticing, to be shadowing professional adult artists, to be mentoring younger kids, or to be working with older mentors? How can we be building these creative extensions of learning for our young people and include youth every step of the way? It is really about modeling possibilities for our youth—not only modeling for them that they can be artists and appreciators of the arts but that they can be connected citizens and creative thinkers.

There are many programs that kids age out of because they get too old, so if we are talking about this in terms of a continuum, how do we keep building opportunities for young people and *with* young people so that they can continue all the way through 35 and beyond, participating in the arts and then hopefully attending them? There's a message a lot of kids get that, in order to be successful, they have to get out of some of the communities in which they are growing up, especially when they are in underserved communities. I want us to think about how the arts can show young people that there are possibilities and a viability of remaining local when they can be connected to these creative and cultural infrastructures.

One of the young people in our study talked about the arts as turning the *me* into a *we*. The way that we can do that with young people and for young people is by involving them in the decision making of cultural policy. If we want a next generation of audiences, we first need a next generation of cultural architects, producers, creators, and participants. Building cultural citizenship is what it's all about.

Woodward: This is very exciting. You are talking about the arts and youth in a really ground-breaking, different way. I think you have hit on the head the assumptions we make about young people. The kind of empirical study that Adelma Roach and those who worked with her on this Carnegie study have done is really crucial to our making the case to the people who bring funding to our organizations and to the people who make decisions about how much we're going to support arts and education. What Adelma has to say are some of the best things—I have to say almost the only things—I have read that make a strong case about what we have been saying for years—that the arts are basic to education. Often, we have believed that so strongly that we think if we just keep telling legislators and others that art is education, they will believe it. This is really a study that has given us some hard data to do that, and we need to make use of those data.

The two things that I want to highlight are that this study really is different from most in that it does not deal with arts in education; it deals with think it is significant that we do not place outside of schools. Maybe this tend to pigeonhole education in very much faith that arts education—as or will in the near future take place effects on communities or on cul-

“...youth are most engaged with the arts when they have a critical audience.”

arts programs outside of schools. I call it *arts education* when it takes is one of its strengths because we linear ways. I do not have very it has taken place in our schools in our schools—has the kinds of tural citizenship that are reported

in this study. I do think, after hearing what Adelma has to say and reading some of the Carnegie report, that the kinds of out-of-school arts programs she is talking about have had that effect and can continue to have even more of an effect.

This leaves us with a question: How might it be possible to infuse our in-school programs with some of these qualities that she is talking about in out-of-school programs, or should we even put our focus on the in-school programs? Should we instead focus on the out-of-school programs and change the ground of our discussion and our advocacy away from in-school programs and more in that direction? I do not know the answer to that.

The other question I want to raise comes out of the finding in the study that youth are most engaged with the arts when they have a critical audience. A critical audience presupposes that you can have a good product or a bad product. I participated in a discussion at my state arts council meeting a month ago in which someone was talking about putting together a contest for school children, and our arts and education consultant recommended against it. All of the arts education policy coming out now is saying that we should stay away from programs that make qualitative judgments about the products of school children. I think if we say to youth that whenever they make artistic products—whether they are dramatic products or visual arts products—that they are wonderful, then the message that we give them is that art is not important. We do not have any standards about the arts. Adelma's study really reinforces the fact that built into arts education does have to be an element of risk and that, by taking risks, young people have the opportunity to create something meaningful. They are not just engaged in some sort of playtime activity that does not have any interaction with the real world.

Roach: You make a good point about schools and what is occurring there and in the after-school hours. I want to say that rather than looking at this as an either-or choice, it's really important to think about multiple opportunities for learning for young people. Ideally, we have exposure to the arts and experience in the arts for young people all the way through school, but we definitely need to be developing bridges from school to non-school opportunities for young people to extend that learning, both in terms of content of learning and in terms of how that learning takes place in other settings. Kids, then, learn that while there is a museum here, there is also a community arts group. I want to see schools as strong starting points from which we can grow this larger ecology of learning for kids.

Izumi: I agree with what Kesler Woodward just said about quality. The studies I have seen concerning the general issue of self-esteem have shown that kids gain self-esteem not by being told that they should have better self-esteem or that they are good people but by doing things well. By doing things well, they actually gain self-esteem.

Nahwooksy: On some level, I agree with the issue of judging quality. However, I think we need a balance, so that when you do judge, you do not discourage young people. Obviously, there are good paintings, and there are really bad paintings, but sometimes, we are happy that somebody has even made a painting. There comes a place and time—when a person is 17 or 18 or going off to college—when you know you are not going to make it as an artist, and nobody is going to be interested in the work you have produced in your youth. But that also does not detract from what you produced then. What is the purpose of art in a community, anyway? Is it for personal internal use or is it for external presentation? There is a fine balance between these that must be found.

Katunarić: Another important question concerns the perception of artists as role models for young people. We have different perceptions of various professions, and young people—like the general population—do not have high regard for people who create art. Usually, artists are not viewed as people who do something. What they do is seen as not that important, not that serious—a hobby. It is very important for artists to make the argument and provide evidence as to why art is important. In terms of role models for young people, business people probably are near the top, and artists are somewhere near the bottom. When we represent the arts, we need to focus on how they develop us personally, cognitively, and emotionally and are the basis for creativity.

Ybarra-Frausto: Adelma Roach's presentation was wonderful, but I was thinking about the fact that youth is a social construction and that it was constructed actually in Victorian England. Because it is a social construction and because it has been filtered through a kind of Euro centric idea, we often forget that not all cultures think about youth in the same way. In Latino cultures, for example, children traditionally are considered little adults. An intergenerational model is different from a youth model, and I think many cultures value the wisdom of the elderly and how it is transmitted and passed on. There are two oppositional models—a kind of a youth-centric model and an intergenerational model. These are not the same, and in the United States, we are going to have some policy questions if we only function on a youth model.

Walton: To return to the issue of artists as role models for youth, based on my experience sharing my art with youth as well as creating art alongside youth, what I have found is that youth want to be able to express themselves. They often feel like they do not have a voice—they do not have an ability or avenue to express themselves. Whether sitting in a studio and watching a Latino kid cut a rap track or watching someone do a painting or watching graffiti artists undertake a work, youth always turn to artists because they are the clearest examples they see of how they can express themselves through non-conventional means. They do hold artists in high esteem.

Adelma Roach did a great job debunking a lot of myths, but I agree with Kesler Woodward about qualitative judgments. For most of the kids with whom I have worked, the most important thing to them is respect. They want you to give them respect, and they want to earn respect. I also have to earn their respect: Who is this White guy walking in here, and why should we listen to him? I have to earn their respect over a period of time. They want to know what I really think, so the artist/youth dynamic is actually a fertile dynamic for role-model development. All of it hinges on being honest with them; they want you to be honest with them, and they want to be honest with you.

Dorf: I have a question about the cultural policy implications of this. Should arts education remain a government responsibility? Should these programs be in departments of social services or in recreation departments or in departments of aging? Or is this something that really belongs to the not-for-profits that know how to structure these activities successfully?

Roach: Some of the most innovative work has occurred as a result of the formation of unlikely coalitions. People are finding resources in unexpected places, whether in the Department of Justice or the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, in a local group, or in a coalition of organizations. I would not want to lay out a template for how this works. I would hope that cultural policy would continue to generate as many resources as possible for this type of learning and youth and community development. But I also hope that there is enough room left within that cultural policy for the creativity and innovation that really do take place on the ground level.

Griffith: I really commend this study. It makes a number of positive observations that could lead to changes in cultural policy. I have to say, though, that we need to rethink what we consider school education and how we deal with education in the school. I do not think it is as simple as separating out art education because I think art education and the problems associated with it are symptomatic of a larger problem with the educational model that exists in America. In this country, education is primarily transmitted as information to be absorbed by the students, and it is up to the students to discover how to use that information. I view the non-school-located programs we are discussing to be largely experiential in nature—the opposite of the common educational experience.

Educational policy makers need to understand that the existing model of transmissional learning is not appropriate—that it does not provide the youth of any society with a foundation upon which to develop their sense of self, their sense of ability, their sense of how to learn. These outside-of-school programs are an

ideal place to show what works and to point to the success rate with these programs as a means to encourage a restructuring of how we view education in the schools.

You talked about the expanded creativity of youth with regard to out-of-school structured environments, but then you mentioned that you also examined things like self-generated poetry and garage bands. I would be interested to know how you correlate the data because I am very interested in this sort of experience. I remember my youth, and the way I became culturally independent had a lot to do with forming coalitions with my friends and developing things like bands. Did you look at how much impact this sort of non-structured or self-structured cultural experiment plays into the development of a self-sustaining creativity?

Roach: Yes. When we examined a range of organizations and programs and activities and compiled data from all of those different sites, we found many levels, some of which might be of interest to you here. We were able to administer surveys to a number of young people in some of these informal groups as well as in formal organizations and programs. garage bands and midnight poetry of data. Also, we looked at language able to develop vocabulary, commu- the process of creating a project or they were giving presumably to an that is another piece, which tells us hypothetical reasoning and lan- talk more about those specific question.

“the existing model of transmissional learning ... does not provide the youth of any society with a foundation upon which to develop their sense of self ...”

So, the responses of those kids in slams were included in our body development and how kids were nicating as they moved through a performance or whatever it was audience or another group. So, more about impact in terms of guage development. But we can groups because it is a good

Cisler: I want to mention that, about a year ago, I attended a poetry slam held at the Mexican Cultural Center in San Jose, California, where I live. There were young people from cities throughout California trying to raise money to get back to the nationals in Chicago. This was a poetry slam started in a bar, which says something about where folks can meet. They went on to win the nationals, and I am not sure you all realize it because it did not receive much publicity in any of the media in the Silicon Valley, but these young people are still living off the glow that they acquired from that win. It really has been interesting to observe how that cultural esteem has expanded.

Fees: There are some suggestions in what Adelma Roach was saying for something that Fernando Delgado and John Kreidler talked about earlier—the culture of work and leisure in Silicon Valley. As you point out, people there work 60, 80, 100 hours a week and then are not able to appreciate whatever leisure activities might be available to them. In fact, in Silicon Valley, you go off to San Francisco or Palo Alto or somewhere else to find your culture, and yet one of the things, it seems to me, your study showed is the value of pointing out that this dichotomy between work and leisure or life is a false dichotomy—or should be considered a false dichotomy. It is one thing to talk about a continuum in terms of age—an overlapping, intergenerational continuum—but that continuum also should be considered in terms of art and the creation and appreciation of art. That is something that should not be relegated to what we call *leisure time*; it should

be incorporated into the way we think of life. There is use to art. Art helps us see things in different ways and, obviously, as it was also pointed out, art is a means of expression. It goes against the grain perhaps, but it is a means of expression. The dichotomy between leisure and life strikes me as something we are working to overcome in these kinds of programs.

Ybarra-Frausto: I want to add that, in terms of the discussion of the continuum, that is precisely why I really value an intergenerational model. For example, in New York, the discussion regarding cultural citizenship among the youth on the Internet was centered on the fact that rap or whatever genre was dominant had antecedents in particular historical moments. Those poetry slams are not the result of a new consciousness, which you discover if you have historical memory. The Black kids and the Latino kids were discovering the antecedents in their communities and were learning who the masters of a particular genre were, seeing it as starting long before the 1970s in urban areas. Anyway, they were talking with one another on the Net, and then they brought in some of the elders, so there was a combination of live and cyber activities.

I also want to comment on the notion of evaluation. Evaluation has to be broadened to involve different norms and the different things that multiple groups choose to do. We do not know how, for example, to evaluate people in court dance because, in a democracy, anything that involves *court* is anathema, but we are going to have to deal with this because these are forms that some of the young people want to learn.

Zinn: A quick question. Adelma, in your research, you describe youth as a kind of public class, one that exists in a definite cultural and social space. I wonder whether, as you surveyed these youth, you gathered information about their relationships and attitudes toward their own family cultures? Do they see family culture as a source of conflict or tension with their own sense of emerging “class” identity?

Roach: The one thing that brings all of these young people together into this category or this social construction of youth is the age, and we were working with kids originally ages 8 to 16, and it kept on pushing to age 25 or 30, so in that sense, it is about that market-defined element of age. They talk a great deal about the different things with which they identify and how they have to navigate and negotiate what comes from family and what it means now to be in a different terrain with a different language. Youth arts organizations, as this “third space” I mentioned earlier, provide a safe and creative forum for discussions and negotiations of family, ethnicity, and gender to take place.

Holden: In expressing your frustration of dealing with the school system, I wonder what your opinion might be about the way we’re preparing teachers, especially art teachers. I am saddened by the fact that what I observe today in higher education is unchanged from the time I was involved in it. I was an arts educator, but it is not possible for many people, especially those who are pursuing a teaching credential, to have actual involvement as artists. Did you come across any of that in your research?

Roach: Our research did not look at schools much at all, so I only can speak from my personal experience in the last half year of working with schools. I would say, from what I have seen in New Mexico, that there are not art teachers because those positions have been cut. Art is not a core-mandated subject in high school

anymore because programs no longer exist or are not valued. So there is a huge need for certification of artists to be working in the classroom and to provide professional development for teachers, whether art teachers (if they exist) or general teachers. Teachers need exposure to and participation in creative learning opportunities so that they are not intimidated by the arts and realize that they can use many of those tools and practices in their own classrooms.

Jennings-Roggensack: Adelma Roach makes some excellent points about involving youth in our cultural policy. In addition, the role of media, which came up in our initial conversation regarding technology, plays a role here not only as it communicates to young people but as it describes our young people. We need to be very careful about our own language in our description of young people and our language in how we communicate both as educators and as artists. Many of our young people will learn outside of the classroom, and we need to know not only how to deal with that but what to call it. We also need to question where education is, its models of transmissive modeling, and how we can serve as a change agent in that area. We also need to know that our young people are not blind recipients of the media—that they make their own decisions and, with the support of adults, can be cultural producers. They can create their own organizations with support and with resources, but they also can be incredibly creative without those resources.

Roles, rules, risk—I found that fascinating. Who is playing which roles? What impacts do those roles have on individuals? Who makes those rules? Which rules make the difference and enable us to take greater risk? The notion of function of place, meaning singular, group, and intergenerational space, is something we need to keep in mind. I was struck by Tomás Ybarra-Frausto’s ongoing comment on the cycle and the continuation and his point that something did not simply spring out of the ground. We all stand on the shoulders of those who came before us. So the question is: How do we listen to the voices of those standing on our shoulders, and how do we work together?

Hodsoll: I would like to make four points. The first is, as Adelma Roach mentioned, role models, and I think that is extremely important. I will give you one example from the state of Colorado. There was a young woman who, as a student at the University of Colorado, ran for the Board of Regents as an undergraduate in a statewide election and won. She was a Regent throughout her undergraduate years, and at some point, she will be a U.S. Senator from Colorado. The reason I say this is because it is stories like that—it could be in the arts, too—that need to be disseminated through educational institutions to demonstrate that people who do take the initiative can achieve. The intergenerational point that Tomás Ybarra-Frausto made is also extremely important—the family structure is critical. If there is no real family structure, it is very difficult for that to happen.

The second point concerns evaluation and judging. When do you tell people they are not measuring up? A balance is required. Joe Polisi, who is, I think, still the president of Juilliard, said that one of the great failings in professional arts training is that the teachers and the deans do not tell their students honestly that they should be gifted amateurs. Rather, they allow too many to continue on. The issue is when and how to evaluate in an appropriate fashion and at an appropriate time. Vjeron Katunarić said that artists are on the bottom in our society. But in an age of celebrity, where most of the celebrities are artists, there is a large set

of role models—maybe the wrong role models—but there are all kinds of people out there, whether in sports or business, who are modeling themselves after folks who have achieved a certain acclaim as artists.

Third, the notion of schools versus the outside is fascinating. A number of you are making an argument that many conservatives make—that there is something really wrong with our schools and that more has to be done outside instead of inside our schools. I think much of this depends on the individual schools and individual school districts. Some are better than others at these things. Art, like history and math, can be done in schools, and it also sometimes can be done better outside of schools or in alternative schools. We teach in schools what society thinks is important for all kids to learn, and so, to the extent that you take the arts outside of the schools, you are saying what the school boards think—that the arts are not important.

My last point concerns work and leisure and the separation of these. James Coleman in the 1970s wrote a report on the educational system in which he talked about the divisions among education, work, and waiting for death. Education and work are actually interconnected with the human experience; learning is continual, work is continual, leisure is continual through people's lives. They cannot be separated out, and I think that schools and teachers of any kind need to reiterate that point over and over again.

FERNANDO DELGADO

I am going to change my presentation from what I had prepared. Given the way the conversation has gone, I want to elaborate on some ideas and connect them to some of the other presentations.

This is not a presentation; it is a lamentation. I am an academic administrator in charge of academic programs. When I am depressed, I have two choices: I can turn to the *Bible*, or I can turn to Baudrillard, and I tend to turn to Baudrillard. Jean Baudrillard, a postmodern philosopher, in a critique of politics, made a connection between discourse and the politics of indifference. I want to upend and change that and say that perhaps the whole politics of art today is to whip up radical indifference. From my position as a faculty member and an administrator in the state of Arizona, what I see is radical indifference.

Let me give you several examples. under-performing academic pro-academic programs is first on the performance. What have we done dance, we have cut out figurative We are left with a compositional because he runs the recording stu-art person, who is burning CD-left. When I came to the univer-are now down to about 4½, and this probably could become 2 soon.

“What our new educators are learning how to do is conform to educational policy in the state. . . . They are not learning how to be innovative teachers.”

I am now charged with evaluating grams. And guess which of our block? Interdisciplinary arts and to it so far? We have cut out art, and we have cut out music. person, but he is important only dio and that connects to our digital ROMs. So, he is the only person sity, we had a faculty of 7½; we

Why is that significant? It connects to the comments about education. In the state of Arizona, students who want to attend one of the region’s institutions have to set aside a humanities and a fine arts requirement. We just held a conference call among the chief academic officers and found that somewhere between 25 and 38% of our incoming freshman are deficient in that area. Why? Because there aren’t any teachers available to teach the courses, and there is no structured way to encourage students to get into the courses when they are being taught. When they are being taught, they are taught by faculty who have a background in humanities defined solely or predominately as English because we have a college of education, at least on my campus, that does not contain one criterial element for elementary or secondary education that includes the fine arts. And English—excuse me, what they call *language and communication*—is dominated by those folks who are learning to teach grammar. What our new educators are learning how to do is conform to educational policy in the state. That is what they have learned in their four years of undergraduate study in education. They are not learning content areas per se. They are not learning how to be innovative teachers. Why? Because the restrictions of our heavily and radically conservative state are that we want vocational education.

Before we go to the arts and start critiquing them, then, we have to understand that the new model for education does not educate people to be good citizens anymore. We are training people to work for Intel and Motorola, and that is a very different model of education. This model is not based on the liberal arts anymore—it is not a model that says, if this is as far as you go, you are going to be a good citizen. It is not a model that says we are going to encourage you to go farther to become an educated person. It says we are going to train you how to be a worker unless you go to certain kinds of charter schools—and their quality is highly variant and highly unstable—or unless you go to private schools, which by definition cut out a large segment of society.

When they come to the university, what we have is a bunch of students who think they are reasonably well prepared to become educated adults, but what we find are students who are woefully deficient in the areas of the humanities and fine arts, and it shows up in one particular area. In their K-12 trajectory, one of the things that humanities and fine arts could have sustained or elaborated is the ability to ask the question “why?” To pursue that question is a creative and innovative act in and of itself as you seek logical responses to this question. I ask my freshmen and sophomores and even many of my juniors when I see them in class: Is that what K-12 managed to do for them in the state of Arizona—to discourage the desire to ask “why?” When those kids were three and four years old, they asked “why?” until their parents were blue in the face. But at some time from when they turned five to when they turned 19, somebody—probably their parents, less so their peers, and certainly less so their instructors—took out their ability to be inquisitive and to be acquisitive of knowledge and creativity. What we are having to do in our lower division curriculum, in general study, is to try to infuse that back into their minds.

What I am suggesting, at least in the state of Arizona, is that the lack is not simply an institutional lack, though it is that. It is not solely a parental lack, though it is that. It is not a peer lack, though it is that, too. It is an entire cultural absence of sustaining the arts. Now, as somebody who was an outsider to the state of Arizona, I find this remarkable. Phoenix is a huge metropolitan area flush with resources. We have had a boom time now for five years, so much so that any time a new athletic team comes to the Valley, we say, “Here’s a couple hundred million dollars, build your stadium.” Yet, the ballet company cannot make its \$60,000 cash call for the next week to stay open, and we cannot afford even to create artist residencies in our public schools. I am talking about our average to above average public schools—the schools in the district where I live.

We can talk about the underresourced districts, which are even worse, and then we talk about how, in those districts, you cannot do it in the schools, so how about in the community? If they are underresourced, there are no street lights. How are the kids in these underresourced—often dangerous—communities going to walk from their school or their house to the community center and get back safely? How are their parents going to trust them to be able to do that? Still, the parents presume, “Well, we can’t afford that, but gosh, at least we have the school.” And, of course, the school is unable to deliver. So, from my perspective as an academic, what we are talking about is not just a sea change in policy but a sea change in culture to motivate that policy.

The reason why I say this is a lamentation and not a presentation is that there does not seem to be that kind of political will. There does not seem to be that kind of community good will to encourage these kinds of changes. Now, Arizona State University's main campus has a thriving college of fine arts, and it does a wonderful job. It has a thriving area of public events, and it does a fine job. But what is most supported? It is those traveling second-tier Broadway shows that are essentially either repertory companies or revivals of long-standing programs—they are the ones that attract the audiences. The innovative, the new, the local do not attract and sustain the audience. Why? Because we do not *know* them. If you visit the Phoenix Art Museum on a normal day, there is nobody there. You can hear the ocean go through the museum. It is like putting your head up against a conch shell. But you bring in somebody famous, somebody who fits into whatever norm of high culture we have—not local culture, not folk culture, not even mass culture—traditional high culture, and you will attract an audience.

This is great from a consumer model, but it says nothing about production. It says nothing about local autonomy. It says nothing about creating creativity in a culture of the community, and so it is a brand name. It is an event. Oh, Annie Leibovitz's 200 pictures are there. Great! We can go to Nordstrom's today for the sale, or we can go see Annie Leibovitz. A local show is mounted: Nothing. An alternative local show, to push it even farther—a youth alternative show—we are talking about a church basement here, and hopefully some of the parents show up. There is not an infrastructure among opinion leaders. There is not a strong linkage among academics to go out into the community. Finally, there is not an infrastructure of corporate goodwill to sustain all this.

If we are going to talk about policy in places like Arizona, which to me is the quintessential West—I come from San Francisco—and they wear cowboy hats and carry guns down the streets in Arizona. To me, that is the quintessential West. What we have here is an attitude of “yes, we could support the arts in theory—it is a nice idea—but we are not going to commit resources, and we are not going to commit the infrastructure.” We are not going to develop any notion that as you create a culture where people have an appreciation of art, they can appreciate it as consumers, as students of art history, or as producers—as people who find themselves through their art, who find their connection to the community, to family, to neighborhoods, to the state through art. Despite the best efforts that we have managed to cobble together—and I do mean this sincerely, *cobble together*—we still have not created that kind of environment.

Why is this significant? It is significant in two ways. In Arizona, we are replicating some of the same developmental issues that occur in Silicon Valley. Our economy has moved from agriculture to tourism and high tech. We've gone from a more stable smaller community to a booming community where, for every three people who move in, two people move out. So, we have a migratory community. We have gone to suburban nightmare. It is suburban hell in Phoenix. I live in one suburb, and I travel 52 miles to where I teach, and that is not atypical. But, such commuting further distances the individual from the community.

Then we have all of these people engaged in all of these voracious activities of going to work and acquiring and you have kids getting out of school at 2:00 p.m. without much direction. The only direction they do have is the same signal they have gotten in the previous six hours, so when I see them on Fridays at the

Boys and Girls Club of Gilbert, where I help out, they do not want to talk to me about the humanities and fine arts. It is important to them to know about algebra. It is important for them to know about science. It just seems odd that questions of literature, questions of finding self in literature, questions of self and other discovery through art never are readily apparent in that community.

What we find, therefore, at the college level, are automatons who see many surface images but have no way of seeing themselves in those images, no way of reading depth into those images; consciousness and awareness are gone. To me, that is a practical contribution of the arts. The arts inherently ask us to question things and to be reflective about things in ways that math and technology education do not have to because they are merely about plugging in an equation and punching in data sets using a keyboard.

Hodsoll: Fernando, your presentation was really fascinating and telling. Has anybody you know of undertaken a study of whether the people who succeed in the new technologies do better if they are simply technically trained in what are likely to be yesterday's—last decade's—technologies versus those trained with the ability to ask the question “why?”—the ability to invent new constructs that might be more efficient?

Delgado: We are starting to. We have a research project on the main campus to study the digital divide, and that is a piece of it. Let me give you some anecdotal evidence. The main campus has a journalism and public relations program; we do not have a public relations program, but we have a series of courses in public relations. Our students tend to be very competitive with those who major in public relations because, in terms of preparing our students, we send them to the art department to learn about the digital manipulation of images and learn art, whether photography. So, as a consequence, graphic communication through art, this to the Board of Regents, how-technical training.

“... a very fundamental barrier of narrative, and it is a feeling that I have gotten from youth [is] that they do not attend theater because they do not hear or see their stories on the stage.”

We have documentation from a pro-universities, one in Barcelona and audio-visual public communication.

and art history are taken as part of the preparation in audio-visual communication. Why? Because the perception is if you are going to be widely creative, you have to have a semiotic reservoir of images and be able to suggest which ones are going to be more communicative than not. That level of creativity is not taught in vocational programs. They teach manipulation and orientation on a page but not quality of images.

it be via CD-ROM or digital they interface the technologies of and they tend to produce documented. When we try to articulate ever, they think art and they think

gram in Spain. There are two one in Pamplona, that teach In these programs, art creativity

Walton: I think Fernando Delgado hit it on the head. I am an artist because I always ask “why?” And I am actually teaching a course right now on creativity—an introductory course for freshmen. I am using Leonardo da Vinci as the model of “why?” because he always seemed to ask “why?” about everything. My students come back and say to me that, when you are a kid, your parents say “because” when you ask “why?” That impulse at that very basic level to ask “why?”—to take something apart and figure out how it works, to play—is something that goes to the heart of this radical indifference Fernando has spoken about.

Part of what I try to do is to find ways to challenge and to re-energize that impulse to ask “why?” not only with youth but with all of my audiences, but I actually find it particularly intriguing to do that with youth. There are many barriers that get in the way of youth coming to theater and asking that “why?” question. Our theater company productions try to initiate cultural conversations. Essentially, we do what Fernando said. We like to stage plays that ask “why?” about something.

I find youth are really receptive to that, but I find that there are three barriers. The first is a barrier that is a very fundamental barrier of narrative, and it is a feeling that I have gotten from youth that they do not attend theater because they do not hear or see their stories on the stage. On one level, then, as an artist, I must find not only new stories to tell that have a direct relevance to their life but stories that make them think about things in a way that they have not thought about before.

The second barrier is actually an aesthetic framework. It is not just the stories that are told but how these stories are told. In that sense, I actually work against some of my counterparts because I actually embrace and try to assimilate popular culture into my work because, quite frankly, that is what the youth who come to see work are accustomed to, are comfortable with, and can receive. If I am a kid who grew up on videos and I go to the theater and must watch stuffy, boring theater, that is not what I am interested in creating.

I will use a story to illustrate my last point, which is that we need to take an inclusive approach to youth in the arts—particularly in the theatre and what traditionally has been an exclusive environment—and transcend the institutional, cultural, and aesthetic barriers that youth see when they see theatre. We presented the world premier of a play last spring that dealt with issues of youth, violence, and responsibility. More than with schools, we tend to work with residential facilities and treatment facilities. I hedge at using the term *at risk* because I know that is a problematic term, but, essentially, these kids would not otherwise have the opportunity to see theatre. I probably never will forget this experience—it is one of my most satisfying moments. On the opening night of the show with a full house of theatre patrons, we had a group of about 15 kids from a residential treatment facility in the balcony. They walked in with their headphones on, and we made the mistake of letting them sit in moveable chairs on the sides of the balcony.

Twenty minutes into the show, someone came up to me and said, “We’ve got to tell those kids to stop talking and stop moving around.” I started to and stopped myself and said, “They have probably never been in a theater before.” So I let it play out and, at intermission, I made a point of going down and talking to these kids and saying, “So, what’s going on?” They all said the same thing: “We thought this was going to be boring, but this is really good, man.” By the end of the play, those kids who had had their headphones on and who had been talking and moving around were entranced with what was going on on that stage. After the play, what I got from them was they wanted to know “why?” about so many things: “So why did this happen in that play?” “How did you do that?” It was an incredibly gratifying experience. They felt—just because I went up to them at intermission and talked to them and did not bust them for moving around and gave them the opportunity to establish a familiar and comfort zone in that physical space of the theatre—that they were actually able to say, “Hey, this is about me.”

Cisler: Some of things you said reminded me of a middle school in a pueblo in New Mexico, several hours out of Albuquerque. What they proposed to do was a Zuni-English multimedia dictionary. This was really ambitious for a bunch of kids and the librarian working there, but they got a lot done, and it was really quite impressive. At that time, a lot of people still spoke Zuni, although the elders were concerned, which is one reason they approved this project.

The other thing that struck me was that two kids from the school in a fairly traditional pueblo entered a rap contest in the state of New Mexico. It is really amazing how rap and reggae have traveled around the world more than any other kind of cultural format that I have seen. It was really amazing to see what this very small community had done with kids as producers. I wonder if the skills they gained and the questions they started asking led them to stay in the community 10 years later or whether they left.

Williams: If there is an enormous disconnect between how students are prepared for the university experience and the university itself, how can the university be something other than what it traditionally has tried to be? Will the university follow the presumed pattern of the public schools and become something less than how it once was conceived? What are the implications of cultural policy if that happens?

Delgado: What is the implication? Chances are we would strengthen and elaborate some of our requirements in their general studies. Chances are we would strengthen and elaborate requirements for our majors. Our Board of Regents unilaterally took down all the majors about five years ago from 130 or 136 credit hours to 120 credit hours. A great deal of preparation that might encourage humanities and fine arts had to be absorbed in the content area, which means you water down content and certain basic skills. We did not muster the political will then, and, quite honestly, I do not see us mustering the political will now to fight against particular kinds of legislatures, particular kinds of departments of education, particular kinds of boards of regents—all political appointees—and a very powerful community college district. Those are very powerful constituencies to battle against as public institutions.

Ybarra-Frausto: I was wondering about the juxtaposition of the radical indifference you talk about and the multi-voice exuberance we also see. More people go to the Met now because it is a dating place and because they have jazz, but they also see the art, so I am saying that, on one hand, we are not fatigued. We do have evidence of some really rich, multi-vocal, multi-voiced, multiple-spaced art activities, so maybe I am not yet willing to concede a totalizing of radical indifference because I keep coming from places where the other is the dominant modality.

Jennings-Roggensack: I live in Arizona and work on the Arizona State University main campus, and I think that part of our role continues to be about how we make places—whether for K-12, whether for our young people in college, or whether for our young people ages 20 through 35. People go to basketball games because a place of meaning has been created. I spend a great deal of time working with both the National Football League and the National Basketball Association. How they create those places of meaning and those places of ownership is our responsibility as presenters.

I will use my institution as an example. A recent play we presented, *Gila River*, is about the Japanese internment. It took place at the Gila River Reservation with Japanese Americans and Native Americans, and there was profound meaning in that work, so people came to those spaces. Very recently, working with the Hâlau O Kekuhi from Hawai'i, we had 7,000 people interested in Hawaiian culture, some of whom were Hawaiian and some of whom thought about Hawai'i, but we made the space a place of meaning. People will come if meaning is there. I think Fernando Delgado is right about the questions of “why?” and how educa-

tion—and particularly higher education—can do that. The notion of cultural policy is not separate from every other policy that we have governing this country. Arizona State University is run by a board of regents that really is interested in having industry come to the state, and these economic policies are something of which culture needs to be a part.

Delgado: I work on the university's West campus, and our job is to serve the West Valley of Maricopa County, which historically is underresourced. All of our students, by definition, are first-generation college students, somewhat unlike the main campus. We have one of the few places in the West Valley—one of the few open spaces—where people can come and do art. Who on our campus is going to coordinate the arts if we lose the battle to keep the artists on campus? That is the first issue.

The second issue is that we have an elected official who represents our district who is one of these radical conservatives who scare me. Not all conservatives scare me; Lance Izumi does not scare me. But one of the things she said when she came to a candidate forum was to suggest, as she looked around the campus, that we were misspending our money because there were too many works of art on our campus, and money would be better off being used to hire faculty. Well, that is an arguable point. What is unarguable, though, is that it is her legislature that has mandated a certain number of artistic creations must be on campus. Second, her comment implies that a university should be a sterile place with outward brick walls and interior white walls and that should be the appropriate place of learning. What this suggests to me, though, is not an institution of higher education but an institution of mental health disorders. She did not see anything ironic, negative, or destructive about that kind of sentiment but, in fact, she thought that an educational environment was a square room with four white walls, an instructor, and 32 students. The teacher should impart her knowledge to the student, and the student memorizes it and goes home.

This is the kind of person we want to educate, and this is the sort of tide under which we work, particularly in the West Valley. I believe the main campus has done a wonderful job of rearticulating itself and redefining itself. I think we've been less successful in the far East Valley and the far West Valley, in part because ASU sits in a historically distinct college town and has mustered up much more political goodwill than the other campuses have.

Jennings-Roggensack: Fernando Delgado's closing comment of who will keep the battle going is important, and, indeed, the academy must be a training ground for those individuals who will keep that battle going and keep culture in the foreground.

ERIC HAYASHI

When I first was asked to present to this body, I started with the question of “why?” Why are you asking me to present this particular work on demographics in the West? Was I being asked because I am a person of color in the field? Was I being asked because I am an arts manager who is also a person of color? Or was I being asked because I am an executive running a cultural agency that many of you know as an agency dealing with artists of color? My guess is that the answer to all of these is a little bit of “yes.”

I have engaged in roles previous to my current position where I worked in a far broader context, and I deliberately chose to come back home, if you will, to head up the Japanese American Cultural Community Center (JACCC). For me, it was not so much an artistic homecoming as a creative, socio-political, and economic one, too. What were the what I do, and why did I ask myself being a person of color and a pro- think that, as I am ending my for- been engaged for the past 30 years making art and encouraging other obviously, that is culturally specific. of you, my work is about communi- the meaning for those with whom I challenge is to try to create a larger my community for the broader public.

“... there is a mystique about Los Angeles for those of us who are Japanese Americans who have lived elsewhere.”

through-lines that caused me to do the little-box questions about me fessional arts manager of color? I ties, the work in which I have is really about the context of artists. It is a context for me, Ultimately, of course, as for many cating to all people and finding am communicating. Now my base of knowledge for and about

I left a permanent state job with all of its benefits to return to the fun-filled not-for-profit world in which I manage an entity with a multi-million annual budget and, unknowingly, a substantial accumulating deficit. For me, *community* is the through-line in the name *Japanese American Cultural and Community Center*, and it is something about which a number of our staff and a number of our board members feel very strongly. We hope we never will change the name because it provides context that identifies who we are in the Los Angeles and greater Los Angeles area.

I would like to talk about Japanese America for a minute. As I said, I have been in Los Angeles for about a year. I never have lived in Southern California before, and one of the surprising things that I have learned since arriving there is that there is a mystique about Los Angeles for those of us who are Japanese Americans who have lived elsewhere. I recently lived in Topeka, Kansas, and was one of 10 Japanese-American surnames in that city. There always has been a mystique that Los Angeles rules—it rocks when it comes to the Japanese-American demographic. What I found is that Little Tokyo, which is the enclave that my community center serves, is suffering through the same changing demographics that Nihonmachi—Japantown in San Francisco—is suffering. And it is suffering the same change in attrition of resources and

demographics that the Nihonmachi—Japantown—in San Jose, Seattle, and Vancouver, British Columbia, are suffering.

A statewide association has been formed to study the problem, and, fortunately for us, a Mormon bank bought a Japanese bank, and with that merger came community-related monies that could be allocated toward the study of this problem—a quarter million dollars to start. It is a study about the points of commonality between two traditions: the Japanese American and the Mormon. The study asks the questions: What are the differences, and what can we learn from one another? We have regular meetings to discuss this. We have sponsored two conferences that are held every other year. The most recent conference was in San Francisco and was called *Nikkei 2000*. *Nikkei* is a Japanese-American term that means *to define*—it defines Japanese Americans. It is like *Hispanic* to *Chicano*. It is a mostly officially used term, but it is a term that has been used to define people like myself. I am third-generation Japanese American, born in Chicago, raised in San Francisco.

One of the things that we have noticed as our three principal communities meet together is that the concept of the generational model that Japanese America has had no longer holds. My grandparents were first-generation people who came to the United States; my mother was the second-generation person to be born in the United States, and I am the third. A fourth-generation child really feels less impact from previous generations because the Japanese Americans are out-marrying at a greater rate than we are in-marrying. To some, if you out-marry, your child is not considered to be Japanese American. If you have children, they may not identify with the Japanese side of your family, and, to some, they definitely would not be considered Japanese American. They would be excluded from the community—it is a very conservative, traditional community. But that is changing.

The second thing that I did not know much about before I came to Los Angeles is that new Japanese immigrants are moving in more rapidly than we are generating homegrown Japanese. Almost 10,000 Japanese come to Los Angeles to work every year. Many of them originally come to the city for business and professional reasons on a two- to four-year track, but due to a macrochange in the economics in Japan, they are staying. So you have layers of folks who do not fit the generational model. Social service and cultural agencies were not set up to handle this phenomenon. So, for example, most of the social service agencies are run by third- and fourth-generation Japanese Americans. They do not speak Japanese; I do not speak Japanese. Most of the “new Japanese” only speak Japanese and can just get by with a little bit of street English. That is a problem when we try to deliver technical and medical services. So, we have to rethink and broaden our definition of ourselves.

This change directly affected Little Tokyo proper with the change of guard in management positions of many of the 501(c)(3) organizations. It definitely affected my organization. Over four years ago, there were political attacks raised by some of the Japanese-speaking segments of our population against the JACCC to the point that a lawsuit was filed because some members of those communities claimed we were not properly “serving” the cultural constituents of those populations. We prevailed in court, but politically it has been a very, very difficult process.

Four years ago, the JACCC embarked on a planning and restructuring process with the help of the Working Capital Fund. The process led to major changes within the board structure, the committees, and staffing as well. I am, essentially, coming to the JACCC as a result of those changes. The irony is they have hired a new CEO in me who, like my two predecessors, does not speak Japanese but very much embraces the concept of expanding the concept of community to include what we call the *new Japanese*, as well as embracing the concerns of the Japanese and other Asian Pacific Americans who have been here for 20 to 50 years and really are immigrants or post-War people.

You probably do not know that the JACCC is a national repository of memory in the form of the National Japanese-American Memorial to Japanese-American soldiers who have given their lives in service of this country in three wars: the Vietnam conflict, the Korean War, and World War II. People have journeyed from all over the United States, Hawai'i, and Canada to see their loved ones' names on the walls of the memorial. We hold regular services that have nothing to do with traditional Japanese arts or culture, but they have everything to do with the veterans and their connection to their respective communities around the country.

We have developed other cultural spaces as well. We are the developer of our plaza and sculpture that was designed by Isamu Noguchi, who was himself a Japanese-American international artist. In our plaza, we host street festivals, public gatherings and events, many of which are not directly art related. We are the developer of the James Irvine Garden, which is a design based on Buddhist principles—a Japanese natural garden versus a manicured garden—and many people who are interested in horticulture visit the garden, knowing nothing about the cultural work we do in the nearby theatre.

The Center has a bilingual library on its second floor, and many of the cultural and community programs that we offer, such as street fairs and festivals, really mark time in either form or ritual for what it is to be *Nikkei*, tied to a Japanese heritage. We sponsor an event every year showing people how to pound rice for our new year's tradition. We are one of the few places outside of San Jose that still pounds *mochi*—the rice cakes put up on the altar—by hand. We attract Japanese tourists who are in California. They come to watch something they no longer can see in Japan. Our new year's celebration, *Oshogatsu*, includes events that start with an expression on pieces of gold-trimmed paper called *Shikishi*. In Japan, if you were a traditionalist, you would write a poem or make a piece of art—perhaps a watercolor. We've "morphed" it Japanese-American style, and we invite people who are not of Japanese-American descent to interpret what the past year has meant for them and what the future will bring for them. We deliberately get people from all walks of life involved. This is something we do every January; it is tied to our ritual. Of course, we also celebrate the annual harvest festivals, and we sponsor children's day, which celebrates and honors our children.

These are ways that Japanese Americans traditionally have held onto culture. The challenge now is to do that in a broader context—to invite people like my son, who is half Japanese and half Pennsylvania Dutch—to consider themselves Japanese American. It is a struggle that I hope will continue because it is something we take as a microcosm for the larger whole that is a rapidly changing Asian America.

Ultimately, the JACCC is about the transmission of culture, and we say it just like that. We are about the transmission of culture in any way possible. Those of you who work in the arts know that we also stand behind avant-garde arts from Japan, ranging from the forms of *butoh* dance to the printing of calligraphy. I was surprised to learn that, in Los Angeles, the audience for avant-garde Japanese dance is not Japanese. There is an avant-garde audience—primarily Caucasian—that we draw from the zip codes of West Hollywood, Santa Monica, and beyond. We do not get much of a response from the Monterey Park area, where many Japanese live; they are not into avant-garde dance. In fact, they hate it. But we feel it is our mission to expose the broader American culture to work coming from Japan, whether it fits some of our market demographics or not. So, that is the JACCC.

Another thing I did not know about the physical place, Little Tokyo and the JACCC plaza, is that it happens to be, for some, the mecca for followers of the Pentecostal Church. In 1906, the Pentecostal Church was founded in a clapboard building on what is now our plaza. Its founding is, by some, considered one of the 100 most influential events in the last millenium. The Pentecostal Church is the fastest growing church in the world; today, it has 600 million members. Every day and night, we host people who have found out about this and want to look at the physical site where the church stood. The interesting thing about the Pentecostal Church is location; they outgrew the space. The interesting thing that it only lasted six years in that multiracial. Anglos, Mexican Their congregation was deliberately were the original parishioners of Americans, and African Americans of elytize, and only after that period the church. They went out to pros- did we begin to see the development of a racial divide within the did we begin to see the development Pentecostal Church in America. It is the fastest growing religion in Asia, Korea, and Southeast Asia, converting Catholics to Charismatics and growing like a wildfire. Add that little historical context beyond our Japanese-American community in Los Angeles. So, for me, community is very important to the context of the work that I do.

“The Chief of Police, Bernard Park, told me at a recent meeting that there are 89 recognized languages in Los Angeles, but he only has police who officially translate 40 of them.”

The topic is demographics, and the point I want to make is that there really is cultural plurality here. The state of California is the seventh largest economy in the world. According to the *Los Angeles Times*, Los Angeles is now the largest manufacturing city in the United States. Workers are needed to service those industries. The Chief of Police, Bernard Park, told me at a recent meeting that there are 89 recognized languages in Los Angeles, but he only has police who officially translate 40 of them. When a police car arrives to serve a person and the officer cannot speak the language, the officer is patched through to AT&T's Global Language Line, a 24-hour service based in Monterey, California. There, they usually locate someone who can speak the specific dialect or language. Los Angeles is a microcosm of a rapidly changing world; we have all the problems and challenges that are present in the world today.

This year, the state of California will become a non-majority state. Caucasians will be just barely 50% of the population. The fastest growth is occurring among Asians, Pacific Americans, and Chicanos and Latinos. They are the work force that fuels the manufacturing lines. By the year 2020, it is projected that

50% of all Californians will be Chicano, and the balance of the majority will be Latino and Asian-Pacific Americans, with Caucasians becoming less than 25% of California's total population.

In its July 16 issue, *The Denver Post* reported that in the metro area of Denver, the Indian population has grown by 60% in the last three years to about 10,000 people. Indians receive more H1B visas than any other ethnic or nationality group from the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), 48% of them. They have been doing this for the last three or four years. Guess what these visas are for? Technical work. The next highest percentage of INS visas for this category is 9.3%, which go to Chinese immigrants. The Milken Institute reported that 53% of all H1B visas went to persons holding computer-related jobs. The census projection for 2030 is that one out of four Americans will be Hispanic or Asian and that Caucasians will represent less than 60% of the national population for the first time in our history.

All of the 25 top metropolitan areas exhibit diversity that matches that 2030 profile right now—cities such as Los Angeles, San Francisco, Miami, Houston, and San Diego. At the same time, more than half of the 148 counties containing the largest 271 metropolitan areas remain at least 80% White. These areas are primarily in the Northeast, the Midwest, and the Rocky Mountain region. The only growth segment for Caucasian Americans is found in one particular group, the Mormons, who stretch from the Canadian border down into the middle of Mexico. Demographically, everything else is driven by immigration or domestic growth within the population segments of Latinos and Asians. Cultural opportunities exist with this global shift and with our access from the East/Far West, from Asia throughout the Ring of Fire, from South America and Central America, and all the way up around the Pacific Ocean.

A unique opportunity exists to those of us who are trying to develop, grow, and restructure the arts and cultural support for the arts. Often, immigrant cultures are full of practices and rituals that may be art, but the people do not consider them to be art. These activities are very important to their lives and their communities, and our work starts with such traditional activities. Within my community, Japanese *taiko* is a good example. Balinese *gamelan* and *Kulintang*, the brass-tuned gongs and music from the Philippines, are now on shore here in the United States, and those forms are growing. How do we encourage that kind of work? How do we bring it into the fold of the existing infrastructure and encourage its flourishing and growth in the next 10 to 20 years?

There are many examples that I am certain each of you can come up with that match this, and I think the challenge is for us to talk about the inclusion of this kind of work—non-traditional work, some which is not even corporate in organization let alone organized in a 501(c) 3 manner. If we do not seek inclusion in the arts, we will have the largest changing demographic in our nation's history and the smallest change in any market or business sector we can think of, and that to me is called *apartheid*.

Nahwooksy: My name is Fred Nahwooksy. I am Comanche, Kiowa, Cherokee, and White, although I cannot prove that part. My dad is half Kiowa and half Comanche, and my two sisters and I grew up as Comanche in southwest Oklahoma. My mother is half Cherokee and half Missouri mule. She grew up in a little town called Farver, Oklahoma, in the heart of the Cherokee nation. Our name *Nowooksee* comes from my great grandfather, whose name was *Nowook*, which means *young man*. In our community, we would take two or three different names as we grew up, and when he was still in his twenties, thirties, and forties, my father looked like a teenager, so he got this name *Young Man* or *Baby Face*, and that became our last name.

The primary point that Eric Hayashi makes for me is of the tremendous diversity that we experience and the rapidly changing demographics in the West. My experience with Native American groups mirrors Eric's experience in the Japanese-American community, and I think that our desires and our hopes for the future are very similar as well. After about 15 years of working intensely in museums and cultural organizations and promoting Native American arts and trying to figure out what it is that we should be doing as arts leaders, art managers, and planners for our communities, I have come to the conclusion that our future lies in our past and our connection in our home communities to tradition, to language, and to stories. Our collective experiences with governments and local communities inform our contemporary arts. In the area of cultural policy or art policy, as I say, our future is in our past.

“Our collective experiences with governments and local communities inform our contemporary arts.”

I feel like we need to concentrate more on preservation of our tradition, so we support experiences like the Institute of American Indian Art, which had a great helping hand from the Rockefeller Foundation back in 1960 or 1961. There was a big symposium at the University of Arizona, and they wondered what to do with contemporary Native American art. They partnered with the Bureau of Indian Affairs and set up an experiment with the Institute of the American Indian Arts and gave fine arts training—painting, print making, sculpture, and so forth—to a whole generation of young Native people. That creativity continues to flourish today, although the Institute is always on the brink of losing its federal funding. What do we do about these myriad issues that are all different? It is not just Native Americans, it is Comanche, Sioux, Arapaho, Navajo, 400 different groups who have lost 200 of their own languages at this point. What is it that we do? I do not think we can deal with them in the mass unless we set up a framework that allows each community and each group to determine its own future. This approach is similar to the way in which I approach folks when I meet with them and consult with them on any type of project. I explain the experiences I have had, what I thought worked, tell how I changed something, and encourage them to take from the smorgasbord what they think will work for them because their situation is different.

One of the important things for tribal people to do is to establish cultural plans. What is it that your community needs to identify as whatever kind of community? For me, it is to know the language. Unfortunately, there are many, many of us—and I am one of them—who are not conversant in our Native language. We

know words and phrases, and we know the context of what we hear, but we cannot talk with our folks in the Comanche language.

Language, then, might be one of the things that creates a community, but there are others. What stories do you need to know? What dances do you need to know? What ceremonies do you need to know? What are the social relationships that you need to understand? In our culture, our aunts are like our moms. Our parents did not reprimand us; our uncles did. Our grandparents did not reprimand us; they spoiled us rotten. I remember my grandfather, who died when I was five years old, chewed my food for me until I was five. That was our culture.

What I am saying is that everyone is different. So how do we help those groups—whether it is a community group or a tribal group—devise a plan that helps them not only accomplish what they want to accomplish in contemporary art but also preserves what they have? I appreciate WESTAF's convening of this meeting and these types of meetings because I think that this is where we obtain some of the frameworks that inform our groups out there.

Hayashi: For some on our East Coast, the issue is still between Blacks and Whites, but all of us in the West know this is not the issue. We have to convince people with decision-making and resourcing powers—foundations and the whole corporate sector—of what is happening in the West. They already know that it is happening globally, but we need to convince them that it is happening in our own back yard in the West. How do we help address this kind of development?

Nahwooksy: Part of what we see happening is that so many of our large arts organizations are getting the lion's share of the money. We have to figure out ways to filter that down to some of our smaller groups so they can sustain and launch their projects as well. I am not sure how we do that. Atlatl is the organization for which I work, and we have been very fortunate. We have a \$400,000 annual budget, but we are one of the largest Native arts organizations in the country. There are many that are operating in the \$50,000 and \$100,000 range that are doing important work and need that piece of the pie. How do we figure out how to spread that out so these other organizations can do what they need to do?

Griffith: There is something that troubles me, and I do not know how to resolve it. Eric Hayashi talked about the fourth-generation Japanese-American kids who are the result of mixed ethnicities. Fred Nahwooksy identified himself as being from two tribes and partially White. The fact of the matter is that population shifts and changes in marriages are resulting, particularly in America, in a large group of individuals of this generation who are not of a single ethnicity or racial character. How do we deal with their cultural politics and cultural histories? For example, you identified yourself as being of two tribes and partially White, but then you continued to describe yourself as Comanche. Somewhere, you have privileged the Comanche part and let go of the rest. How do we deal with this rising multi-racial, multi-ethnic population in terms of cultural policy and history?

Jennings-Roggensack: I would add to that, Nathan, that the statistics predict that, by the year 2020, one in five American children will be of mixed ancestry.

Dorf: Let's look at what the Census Bureau has been trying to do. For years, the Census Bureau had those boxes to check and decided who you were. This time, they put in 20 boxes and asked people to tell them who they are, and if some people want to say they're Comanche and not something else or want to say they are Japanese American, that is fine—they decide. There is something very refreshing about the government not telling us who we are. We can do our own identifying and create our own identities.

Nahwooksy: Here is the way I deal with that. I do privilege the Comanche because I am an enrolled Comanche. Native American people have triple citizenship here in tribal, state, and federal governments. Because of the treaties and what our ancestors gave up—not only in blood but in land—we have a treaty relationship with the federal government. There are things due to us because of that, and we expect them from now on. The government, of course, does not agree with that. But that is where we are. Now, in terms of my cultural identity, I am Comanche, and I grew up as a Comanche. That is the language I heard most, and the activities we attended most were Comanche. But we are also Kiowa, so my cultural view is expanded to include not just Comanche but also Kiowa and Cherokee.

Woodward: When we talk with people who are of other ethnicities, we tend to talk about how people identify themselves ethnically. But there is another element to this that I would be curious to explore and that is how the elements of those cultures other than our own become part of our culture as what people want. One of the most telling demographic statistics I have heard in the last couple of years is that a sea change in American culture is described by the bread that is most heavily consumed in American culture today. Throughout this entire century, it was bagels. In the last five years, it has become tortillas. Part of that has to do with how many Hispanic Americans there are, but it also has to do with how many more people who are not Hispanic Americans consume tortillas. This is just a single example, but it suggests the way we look at our culture as Americans and whether we identify ourselves as part of particular ethnicities or not.

Delgado: I think we need to think of demographic categories in our day-to-day lives and not in the way the Census does, which is static. Culture is not static. We have already known that identity is not static; it is contextual. Your narrative suggests that everything is contextual. I am an American, first generation. My mother is from Spain. When I go to Bilbao, I will use my mom's last name. Why? It is just safer. When I go to Mexico, where my dad is from, I am Mexican. Those are things that I recognize and bring to bear as resources.

The government has a desire and need to categorize us. In our-day-to-day lives, we do not feel those things; we are entirely more flexible. We change our identities depending upon any number of relationships. When I go back to Iowa, it is not important that I am from Arizona, it is not important that I am American, it is not important that I am Mexican, but it is damn important that I am a Hawkeye. And when I get off the plane in Cedar Rapids, I am a Hawkeye, and that is meaningful. And I know that it is meaningful, and they know that it is meaningful, and they know that I know that it is meaningful. We use these categories not arbi-

trarily but strategically. Some people might use them arbitrarily, but when we are interacting with one another, those categories are touchstones for other things, and on the way to the other things are the cultures that we create in our own relationships.

I have many Native American friends—Navajo, a very traditional group—who consider me to be one of them. Why? For some reason, they believe that because I am a person of color—because my dad came from Mexico, because I come from the university and represent the university without telling them what to do—that gives them the license to say that I understand them more than most. Because we are that close, I get some sort of honorary treatment. I have done nothing other than be myself. But that is the projected sense of identity.

We have the notion that artifacts and culture are static. But people as elements of culture are themselves never static, and the culture from which they come is never static. When I used to live in Spain, it was definitely Spanish. When I go back to Spain now, it is difficult to distinguish Madrid from New York City in all sorts of ways because of the Latin Americans who live there and the consumption of American culture that is present there. I think we do need to move away from these kinds of things but recognize that, in different kinds of ways, these boxes—these categories—have strategic value for ideological, political, and other purposes. That becomes a conundrum, I think, for culture.

“We have the notion that artifacts and culture are static. But people as elements of culture are themselves never static, and the culture from which they come is never static.”

to Spain now, it is difficult to distinguish Madrid from New York City in all sorts of ways because of the Latin Americans who live there and the consumption of American culture that is present there. I think we do need to move away from these kinds of things but recognize that, in different kinds of ways, these boxes—these categories—have strategic value for ideological, political, and other purposes. That becomes a conundrum, I think, for culture.

Ybarra-Frausto: I was trying to figure out how to get out of the conundrum. If I have read my history correctly, we always have had a tension in the United States between at least two ways of being American. One is a kind of inclusive, variegated, multiple meaning of what it means to be an American. The other is a sense of closure that suggests that there’s only one way of being an American. In ourselves, we have some sort of options for the demographic transition or the multiplicities within ourselves as a collective group. America, in fact, is an experiment. It did not begin with a notion of “this is the way it’s going to be,” as did any country in Europe. In France, if you are going to be French, this is the way you are, and everybody who goes there has to change to be this. That was our thinking in terms of the melting pot, but since that did not work, I think we have the option of going back and discovering models to get us out of the conundrum. This is a country in process from the very beginning. We all came from everywhere. You ask anybody who comes here why they came, and they give the same reason—religious freedom, they can be who they want, they can get a job, all the things that are the so-called American dream. So we have the possibility of creating a new America or of a new envisioning of the experiment.

But one complicated thing comes up when, for example, you are Japanese American in Brazil. Brazil itself has as many Japanese as the United States. But the way of being Japanese in Brazil is not the same way as being Japanese with all its variations in the United States. The difficulty is that we keep insisting that the American way of being Japanese or being Mexican or being African-American is the way to be, but if you

are Black and a Caribbean, that is not the only way you can be Black. Or if you are a Japanese from Brazil, that is not the only way you can be Japanese.

So I guess I am saying, on the one hand, that I think we can get out of the conundrum because our history already has. We all have been trying to make an experiment, and the experiment has multiple possibilities. How we make those choices in terms of cultural policy is very complex and involves language, which raises the whole question of whether that encodes allegiance or not. But that question is no longer being answered by a national group. Mexico is all of a sudden granting the right to all candidates in the last election to come to the United States to campaign. Are there possibilities of more flexible arrangements to deal with questions of citizenship, language, and all the things that make up the civil society? Again, if you are for the flexibility, then I think you are within a very American way of multiplicity and differences. If you are against that and want English only, then that is another America. A struggle is going on between these two.

Cisler: Fred, I would like to ask you to make a couple of comments on the pressure for tribes to change the terms of enrollment given intermarriage as the generations pass.

Nahwooksy: My personal opinion is that it has to happen to keep the tribe going. Right now, for instance, in my tribe, it takes a quarter blood to be a Comanche. In some tribes, however, it is based on your heritage, as with the Cherokees and some others. You have to have had a relative who was enrolled back in the 1800s sometime, and you can be 1/32 or 1/64. There is a story about what you get when you get 16 Cherokees in a room, and the answer is full blood. I have two boys I want to get enrolled. They have that cultural relationship, and they understand that, but they do not have that government or political relationship. I think it is an important thing to do. But more important than that, making those adjustments allows the tribes to determine for themselves and to maintain their sovereignty.

Griffith: I would like to say, in response to Fernando Delgado, that I wholly applaud the experiential nature of the strategic identity, and I think that is the way that we experience ourselves in the world. I feel very strongly, however, that most cultural policy decisions are determined more by the Census approach than by the recognition of this strategic identity. To my mind, the paramount issue with regard to this sort of notion is multi-ethnicity and multi-racial identity. But I do agree with you.

Katunarić: These categories of belonging are constructed within the context of a revolution of the 19th century that has to do with statistics. People were classified into definite categories that are exclusive by nature and related to nationalism and thus racism. If you are White, then you cannot be Red, and if you're Red, you cannot be White. Today, thanks to your tremendous, wonderful, new generation and new dynamics in America, even racial categories are going to be blurred—boundaries are going to be blurred.

I want to refer to Fernando Delgado's presentation and point out that there is something more in it. If we consider that art is a part of culture—a symbiotic culture—that means that we can use a kind of art to represent ourselves as belonging to a particular group. On the other hand, there is a question of whether art as art might be international or ethnic. Let me give an example. Many Croatian nationalists are not aware

that the composer of the national anthem of Croatia is, by nationality, a Serb, and the composer of the first national opera is Jewish. He took a pseudonym, but he is Jewish.

Jennings-Roggensack: There is a theme running through our entire discussion of context in meanings and the shifts in what that context is. Generationally, the models are not holding in place, and as our generations grow and develop, we are finding that new models are being created. Adelma Roach asked us to do some rethinking about who we are and what the language is that applies not only to youth but intergenerationally across the table. Eric Hayashi's statement that the JACCC holds memories and meaning may be a way to address this new cultural generation. I also think that, as those in the majority all of a sudden become the minority and the other, this reversal may bring an interest in learning.

The notions of technology and the changing demography of this country are critical. There is a way not only to access a wide array of cultures but also to transmit those cultures. Fred Nahwooksy raised the issue of whether or not cultural policies can support strategic building and the plans for the multiplicity of cultures that we have. Eric also brought into the conversation the notion that the West, in many ways, is light years ahead of the East Coast. We have long since forgotten that we are merely Black and White but are, indeed, a multiplicity of colors that fill out our Western landscapes.

Kesler Woodward's notion of the changes in our culture is important. It is not marriage that will bring us together but food. How many of us go out for Chinese, Japanese, Mexican, and Ethiopian and think we're just going out and choosing our meal, but we are also going on a particular multicultural adventure that is, indeed, part of our everyday landscape. Fernando Delgado raised the issue of resources and strategic placement. Vjieran Katunarić has brought to the table that the use of statistics is not new and that such statistics were used in Europe to separate us rather than to make us whole, providing us with a warning to which we need to pay attention.

T O M C O F F M A N

This is a view on which I focus very naturally, but it is also a view across the ocean. I spent all of my adult life in Hawai'i, and part of the reason why I find myself in Los Angeles is because it is a touchstone for many of the things that are happening in Hawai'i. I was born in Topeka, Kansas, and the story I am going to tell is a geo-political story that has become an underlying cultural story.

When I moved to Hawai'i as an eager young newspaper reporter in 1965, Hawai'i was in the sixth year of statehood. The operative story began with the 1954 victory of the Democratic party; the passage of the statehood bill in 1959; a huge excitement about the empowerment that comes with electing governors, Senators, and Congresspeople; the creation of an East-West Center at the University of Hawai'i; and the construction of an East-meets-West capitol building, which many of you probably have seen. People of Japanese, Hawaiian, Filipino, Chinese, Korean, Caucasian, and other ancestries mingled with considerable happiness and married freely. Everyone was a minority.

“Unlike Western states that are becoming ethnically diverse, Hawai'i came onto the American stage as a diverse society with a large non-White majority.”

While War veterans such as United States Senator Dan Inouye were emblems of the era, what actually happened during the War seemed remote. Hawai'i was the perfect state of the perfect nation, held together by a single, resounding narrative. For being the most ethnically diverse place in America, with arguably the most complicated history, the overarching story of Hawai'i as it played out in American culture was remarkably simple. All in all, it was a sort of end of history.

Unlike Western states that are becoming ethnically diverse, Hawai'i came onto the American stage as a diverse society with a large non-White majority. As late as 1893, Hawai'i had been a Polynesian nation, with a two-percent White American population. An enormous influx of people from Asia further set the stage. So the story was not about increasing diversity but of the overnight political annexation of a highly diverse people.

America, like other colonizers, undertook a program of cultural imposition. Campaigns were conducted to ensure the supremacy of English. The Territory of Hawai'i undertook a Speak American campaign. It prosecuted labor leaders of Japanese ancestry on conspiracy charges, arguing that labor organization was *Japanization* (another of our historical words). The White elite imported a historian who wrote a definitive three-volume history of Hawai'i. Look no further! Here was the whole tale. The suspect Japanese were harangued not merely to be good Americans but *100 % Americans*, a phrase that had wide currency.

In all of this mixing of humanity, relationships formed. Did you ever wonder why 99% of the Japanese community in Hawai'i was not interned during World War II, when they could have done real damage had

they, indeed, been disloyal to America? As part of this legacy, Americans of Japanese ancestry, mostly people from Hawai'i, gave their lives in battle during World War II in horrifying numbers. The resulting argument for statehood was that Hawai'i no longer had a Japanese problem but was populated with especially *good* Americans. Michener wrote about the "Golden People" and Lawrence Fuchs that "we are all haole now," meaning all had become White. The father figure of the state of Hawai'i, Governor John Burns, proclaimed the existence of "one people, one state."

On a rainy Friday night in the national archives in Washington, D. C., I found a more provocative understanding of statehood, written as a farewell by the then-delegate Burns as he departed for Hawai'i, statehood in hand. He predicted "a movement from a closed, centralized scheme of things to more open, diversified and flexible forms. The great question—for individuals as for larger groups—is 'who am I?'" Through statehood, Hawai'i's people have achieved a measure of identity but now could "achieve that identity as *best* they can."

The continued evolution of this more open, diversified society has led to a retrieval of many stories. The single, simple narrative has become a complicated narrative covering a much longer time. With openness, there has been an outpouring of Hawaiian-, Chinese-, Japanese-, and Korean-American storytelling, such as Maxine Hong Kingston's *Woman Warrior*, the plantation-based stories of Milton Murayama (*All I Asking is my Body*), and the chilling *Comfort Woman* by Okjah Keller. Writers have produced new, more diverse histories, such as Gary Okihiro's *Cane Fires*, a history of the anti-Japanese movement, and Peter Hyun's *Man Sei*, a history of the Korean-American independence movement. Optimistically, I think we are removing masks and stripping away layers of a sugar-coated history that was originally developed to disguise the annexation of the nation of Hawai'i by the United States.

These diverse voices carry us to an interesting place, in which there is no authoritative voice of history. No one renders history's proverbial judgment. No one center of influence—financial, cultural, ethnic, or political—can define who the people of Hawai'i are or where Hawai'i is going as a society. We see possibilities that are alternately more real, exciting, and disquieting. The Hawai'i of statehood has become a Hawai'i that was settled nearly 2,000 years ago by Polynesian voyagers.

Hawai'i is a submerged nation from which the suppressed Hawaiian nation today is struggling to be revived. How many of you know something about the Hawaiian sovereignty movement? While Hawai'i will continue to be a state, it likely also will be an indigenous nation spanning the entire archipelago, with discrete land masses, resources, and an identifiable national government. The Hawaiian nation will alter the meaning of the word *state* as it is used in *state of Hawai'i*. It is hard to see that such a change would take place in one state without Native nations in other states beginning to challenge status-quo government more aggressively as well.

In a diverse society, many things are in motion at once. Events of World War II and the Cold War led to passage of new immigration acts, the first in 1952 and the second in 1965. Because of the Asian migration, Hawai'i is the living demographic example of what the West Coast is becoming. Since 1954 in Hawai'i, the

legislature has been overwhelmingly led by Asian and Hawaiian figures. Since 1974, our governors have been of Japanese, Native Hawaiian, and now Filipino ancestry. So we are not only talking about an outburst of creativity but an assertion of political power that has been guided mainly by high ideals and a special interest in practicing high standards of fair play and openness.

One of my few cues from WESTAF was to comment on how Hawai'i perceives and shapes cultural policy. It has a clear active policy that results, I believe, from embracing the ideas of the National Endowment for the Arts as generated in the mid 1960s. In the outburst of enthusiasm for public life, the young state of Hawai'i pioneered the setting aside of one percent of its public works budget for public art. Diversity of skills, performance, and style play a prominent role in perpetuating everything from Hawaiian hula to Japanese *taiko* drumming. This past season at the university, there were excellent performances of Indonesian *gamelan* and Korean *pansori*, a traditional equivalent to the medieval bard who sang and told stories.

For much of the statehood period, our economy has followed Japan's more closely than North America's, which means that, in the past 10 years, while your economies have boomed, ours has stagnated. As a result, the budget of the State Foundation on Culture and the Arts has been cut by more than half.

I know relatively little about Hawai'i's relationship to national cultural policy. As a documentary producer, I do see that getting national funding and national air time is an uphill battle. I am painfully aware that 38% of all PBS prime schedule programming comes out of one station, WGBH/Boston. If several East Coast stations are added, the figure would be way over half. I think the Western states, even mighty California, are treated like remote colonies by PBS and Hawai'i worst of all. People do not think of Hawai'i as a center of culture but as a place to lie in the sun. It is extraordinary that two PBS documentaries set in Hawai'i are currently in the works, but they are about how well Natives sing and dance. One is on Hawaiian music, the other on hula, and both are being produced by mainland companies.

I would greatly prefer connecting Americans to the exciting complexity of Hawai'i. I can summarize my viewpoint with the working title of my next book, *On the Edge*. In small type, it will say *On the Edge . . . of America, in the middle of the Pacific, at the center of the Universe*. Yes, we are the western-most state, but we are in some ways more than a state and in some ways less than one. For us, history is immediate, and culture is tenacious. We are what we have been: An overseas colony and a separate nation, a mixed culture and society without precedent.

What is often portrayed as trivial or ethnic is really epic stuff. From the time of King Kamehameha the Great to the American-inspired overthrow of the Native government, the Hawaiian people resisted foreign takeover. Two years ago, a young Hawaiian scholar, Noenoe Silva, found in the Archives of America petitions against annexation from 95% of that population. By getting hold of such history, we can see that the current raging debate over Hawaiian sovereignty actually returns us to a kind of norm because the political status of Hawai'i has been actively debated for at least two thirds of the time since the 1850s.

Again, within a truly diverse society, multiple narratives develop simultaneously. While Hawaiians were trying to fight off annexation, the Chinese community in Hawai'i was rallying to gain voting rights in the White oligarchy's interim government. At a mass meeting of 3,000, a citizen of Chinese ancestry inquired, "By what right do our white-skinned brothers assume to lord it over us, and to say we shall do business, and trade, and live and breathe, only by their consent?" This same Chinese community cradled Sun Yat Sen in exile before his return to China to establish the Republic of China.

Meanwhile, the Korean community of Hawai'i kept alive the image of a sovereign, free Korea during that nation's 35-year annexation by Japan. As they did so, they developed an increasingly friendly relationship with Americans of Japanese ancestry, whose impact on America has yet to be fully understood.

When Rosa Parks was refusing to move to the back of the bus in Montgomery in 1955, Americans of Japanese ancestry were leading the political revolution in Hawai'i. When the Territory of Hawai'i, after 61 years, no longer could be denied South to block civil rights legisla- slipped away. The Civil Rights Acts crucial Senate votes from Hawai'i.

What I have seen on the edge of the middle of a Pacific flow, in which political change runs not only from If the indigenous Hawaiian resur- narrative likewise will endure. In the sky father, Wakea, and the earth occurred in the northern reach of and if you could look to this place each morning, as I do, you might even agree that Hawai'i is neither a get- away nor an outpost but the center of the known world. For contemplating that possibility with me, I thank you. *Mahalo ia.*

“What I have seen on the edge of America is that we are actually in the middle of a Pacific flow, in which fundamental socio-economic and political change runs not only from east to west but from west to east.”

tion in the United States Senate of 1964 and 1967 passed with

America is that we are actually in fundamental socioeconomic and east to west but from west to east. gence continues, then their that story, the islands were born of mother, Papa. This union actually Kaneohe Bay in windward Oahu,

Fees: The first thing I want to say is that, as a student of the image and myth of the American West, one of the things that I have been fond of pointing out to people is that to proclaim yourself a Westerner or a member of the interior West, you only have to dress for it. I used to say that we are unique in that respect, but Tom just reminded me that this is not the case. Hawai'i also has a way of proclaiming itself distinctive by the way in which people dress, so there is another blow to the uniqueness of the American West.

I am going to build on something that Tomás Ybarra-Frausto was saying. Tomás mentioned that the United States was an experiment; it was founded as an experiment. I think of that whenever I think of federal lands issues. The federal lands managers I know do not think of themselves as owners but as caretakers because federal lands are owned not by the federal government but by the people because we are the federal government. Most of those agencies are only a little older than I am. So, the U.S. is definitely an experiment. This thing that we were defining in terms of opportunity and jobs and freedom as the American dream is actually a part of the myth of the West. This is the topic discussed at length in the last symposium, so I won't go into it in any length, but I will point out that if we realize that this myth of the West is just that—a myth of process, a myth of experimentation, a myth of becoming new—we bring vitality to our understanding of American culture.

You talked about the new people who are going to come out of the melting of races and ethnic and national backgrounds. In the 1820s, the very conservative New England geographer Timothy Flint proclaimed that, in the West, there would become a new America from all of the regional differences from the other parts of the country and all the racial differences, including Native American. Eventually, the idea was, all of America would become like that. This idea is, of course, symbolized for us by that phrase *e pluribus unum*, and it seems to me that this conundrum that we have trying to find our way out of and with which the Hawaiians are obviously wrestling might in some ways be helped toward resolution by redefining the conundrum.

We all know that the melting pot is not a melting pot exactly. Cultural differences persist, and in this nation, people persist in forming communities based on ethnic or racial or cultural backgrounds. But maybe it would be useful to think of many ones—as being many communities of one. That gives us a chance, when we think of *e pluribus unum*, to take into account the multiple communities to which Fernando Delgado and Fred Nahwoosky belong. But out of those many cultural communities, there is one community. Hawai'i may be the most American part of America, with all of the different pressures coming together to form a new culture. Hawai'i, in some ways, is a 50-year-old experiment or model for understanding much of the rest of the American West.

I keep trying to figure out a way to tie this to policy, and the best way I think of for redirecting this set of notions to thinking about policy is to use a phrase that Adelma Roach brought up—that the arts are a meeting place. If there is a part of America's Western myth, our national myth, and our creation myth that to me stands out in these discussions we have been having, it is a myth of heroic endeavors. Beginning with

the Northwest Ordinance and the creation of new states, this country's history became a progressive set of heroic endeavors to overcome parochialism and to expand the borders and the franchise, and that expansion is going on all the time. We are always trying to correct wrong. We are always trying to reach out and embrace a large part of the population. One way we obviously do that is through the arts. We also do it through the appropriation of the arts, including the culinary arts. We appropriate tortillas to ourselves. In Hawai'i, on a reservation, or in Cody, the overcoming of parochialism can be encouraged through the creation of art at the level of the local culture, whether indigenous cultures or those kinds of odd mixed cultures that make up places like Cody and Detroit. In that process of learning how to do arts ourselves, we learn about the process that other people go through to define their cultures and to make their arts.

Tomás Ybarra-Frausto: I am interested in the question of the narratives of the center and the periphery. What you were talking about is very familiar, even though it is very specific. I was thinking of Puerto Rico, for example, another peripheral island that has fought mainland-island politics and diversity. I am wondering whether, indeed, the periphery within the United States is also very similar. My conclusion is that we are not that far apart, but we need to get all the alternative stories from the center and the periphery retold and find the common ground.

Tom Coffman: Yes, I heartily agree with that. Part of this opening up of history has been triggered by centennial dates. Centennial dates in Hawai'i—although this sounds corny—are a powerful way of organizing and focusing people. One was the centennial of the Native government; the second was the centennial of annexation, which occurred two years ago. What we did in that project was to link the history of Hawai'i with the flow of American expansionism and trace the commonality of our relationships to instances of island America such as Puerto Rico, which is a very geographically specific periphery. I agree with the drift of your thinking—there is a periphery, and I think Hawai'i has something to offer in this dialogue.

Fred Nahwooksy: How does the Office of Hawaiian Affairs and the sovereignty movement affect cultural policy or will it? I know there is a lot of action going on there today.

Heidi Kubo: I can tell you on a literal level that what they have been able to do is to identify and document, and they are probably the only centralized body that attempts to connect with all Native Hawaiians and Native Hawaiian cultural issues and political issues. They have an impact in that they are a granting agency. They fund cultural events and have produced wonderful directories of Native Hawaiian cultural resources. On the political side, the entire process by which the board members are elected has been overturned. It has been ruled illegal that only Native Hawaiians vote to elect the officers of that board. The new process really impinges upon the issue of sovereignty. The way our governor went about eliminating the current board and appointing some of them in the interim was a slap in the face of the Native Hawaiian community. The message essentially was that you fought for your rights to gain back your taken-away lands, which are called the *ceded lands*, for the monies that are due to you for your rights to gather even natural materials that are essential to your cultural practices. All of these things are embodied in the Office of Hawaiian Affairs. A lawsuit brought from the outside by one individual overturned their right even to vote

on the officers or trustees who manage this office. I cannot say it was a step back for them, but I think it certainly was typical of how the community has been treated.

Cisler: You spoke of this indigenous nation spreading across the whole archipelago. What would be its source of funding?

Coffman: The likelihood is that, out of the OHA (Office of Hawaiian Affairs) turmoil, there is going to come federal recognition as an indigenous people, as native North Americans are recognized. As a result, there is going to be inclusion in programs that is going to provide some cash flow. There is already a portfolio of about a billion dollars that is accumulating in OHA; there is the Bishop estate, which is a Native Hawaiian resource and is worth several billion dollars; and there are 200,000 acres of land included in the Hawaiian Homestead Act, which was voted on in 1920. Before anything else, before there is a settlement, which is really critical for Native peoples, the court strategy is to gain recognition, then negotiate a settlement. They want to get a government under their government keeps trying to force there is even a governmental entity; the negotiation begins, however, we and several billion dollars' worth of nation.

“Beyond that, it is very important that there is an attempt to define the underlying values that are not in true conflict with Western values and to synthesize Confucian values, Western values, and Hawaiian values.”

Jennings-Roggensack: Earlier, we Frank Hodson's presentations and cause of intermarriage and a vari-impact in Hawai'i? Do you see that

feet and then negotiate later. Our them into a settlement before that is part of the tension. Before start with 200,000 acres of land assets; that is a very wealthy

talked about Eric Hayashi's and a rethinking of who we are be-ety of other factors. What is that phenomenon occurring?

Coffman: I think that subtly what has gone on through this story of statehood and intense enthusiasm for statehood has been a redefining of who the people of Hawai'i are. We have understandably scattered across a wide front of definitions and spread ourselves through multiple narratives, but I think the aggregate is summed up by the statement, "We are Americans who are of islands." We are on the edge, and we are in the middle, meaning that there is significant understanding that the impact of Asia is not just that Sumitomo Bank has a big building downtown but that one third of all Japanese investment in America in the 1980s was in Hawai'i. Over 50% of us are Asian-descended immigrants. Beyond that, it is very important that there is an attempt to define the underlying values that are not in true conflict with Western values and to synthesize Confucian values, Western values, and Hawaiian values. That is a tall order, but it goes on, and it goes on pretty consciously. In December, the Japanese Cultural Center of Hawai'i is having a forum on Hawaiian values. It will be very interesting.

Kubo: This is an issue that really is coming to a head. We have blended, co-existed, intermarried, and been multiracial for many generations now, but this month, there will be a series of symposia that are being organized by a coalition supported by our community foundation, Aloha; United Way; and our community services council, a very large coalition of wonderful nonprofit organizations, to address the issue of race and

discrimination in Hawai'i. The series is called *A Place at the Table*. The dialogue is expected to be so widespread that they created four separate evenings for discussions that will be simulcast on our public radio station and aired on our public access channel. We need to begin the dialogue concerning something that we have lived with for many, many generations.

Jennings-Roggensack: Heidi, is there a formulation of a cultural policy in Hawai'i, or is there already one that is unspoken? Are there policy decisions that occur in other areas of government in which culture is not infused?

Kubo: The interesting thing about our government is that culture seems to appear in nearly every branch of our government. I was surprised to discover that we appear in the Department of Transportation, in the Department of Economic Development through the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, through the Office of Budget and Finance, through the Governor's office, and through the airport authority. Culture is in little bits and pieces throughout; it is very much a part of who we are. The paradox, however, is that it is also very much taken for granted, and the negative that has come in our policy development and decisions reflects that.

Hodsoll: I would like to say the following: (1) Culture and politics are intertwined; they always have been, and they always will be. Marketing studies are done to define both and, in a democracy, you have one person, one vote, and in a marketplace of culture, you have one person, one vote in accordance with his or her desires and means. In the case of politics, we have focus groups, increasingly sophisticated today, across religious, economic, demographic, ethnic, racial, and gender lines.

We have in national politics—but also in Congressional, state, and local politics—candidates writing off certain groups and concentrating on others. All you have to do is look at where the presidential candidates are today, and that notion becomes quite evident. Technology and politics also have taken quantum leaps forward in the last 20 or 25 years. For example, during the Reagan/Carter debates, I was involved in tracking audience responses in focus groups across the country, phrase by phrase, so we knew exactly how each phrase was going to play. It is not substance; it is cultural reaction to words that have been field tested. You could argue that this is terrible democracy, and it may be terrible or it may be good, but it is.

One of the things that the people on the cultural side need to do in the intertwining of politics and culture is to have a much better sense of the way in which political bodies and democracy work—whether at the national, the state, or the local level and whether in the executive, legislative, or judicial branches. Partisanship in culture really doesn't happen in a partisan way. You just have to look at the debates over the National Endowment for the Arts or at some of the Hollywood bashing that goes on, and it cuts across both party lines. In that sense, it is different from whether or not you are in favor of school vouchers or whether you are in favor of privatizing portions of Social Security.

Elite versus popular is an issue that crosses all of the disciplines for which the federal, the state, and even sometimes local governments provide funding—the issue of whether we need one of something everywhere or should concentrate on the very few that already have demonstrated excellence. The serious versus the

popular is another. Politics and culture are one vote at a time, and the coalitions that come out of that one vote at a time are put together in very similar ways.

WESTERN SENATORS AGAINST THE ARTS: PASSION OR POLITICS?

M I C H A E L C . D O R F

Land and water. What lies under it? What exists on top of it? Who owns it? Who can exploit it? Who can enjoy its benefits? The control of natural resources has driven the development of every civilization in history. Few examples have been as dramatic as the western march of the United States from the Atlantic to the Pacific Oceans. Within the United States, no region is more affected by land and water issues than the West.

United States Senators elected from the Western states are committed to representing their states' vital interests in controlling land and water policies. For much of the last 20 years, these same Senators—Democrats as well as Republicans—have been fervent opponents to funding for the National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities. I would like to demonstrate how those seemingly unrelated positions are tied. Although some of the opposition to the arts reflected philosophical concerns over the role of federal funding of culture as well as antipathy to particularly controversial grants made to individual artists, much of the West's resistance to the NEA and the NEH in the Senate was a tactical response to actions of a powerful Chicago Congressional representative who was able to protect the arts by trading them against the interests of the Western states. Through an appreciation of this subtle connection, Western advocates for the arts can prepare more effective strategies to achieve their goals in Congress in the upcoming years.

The owner of most of the land and water in the Western states is the United States. These public lands include national parks, national forests, wildlife refuges, public rangelands, grasslands, mountains and deserts, and other lands in the public domain. They include the coal, oil, gas, sodium, and other minerals beneath them. According to the most recent edition of *Public Land Statistics*, the federal government owns the following percentages of the 12 states that make up the Western States Arts Federation:

<u>Percent of land federally owned</u>	
Alaska	67.934
Arizona	45.579
California	44.934
Colorado	36.435
Idaho	62.481
Montana	28.022
Nevada	83.080
New Mexico	34.198
Oregon	52.649
Utah	64.531
Washington	28.544
Wyoming	49.866

These statistics should be compared with Illinois, where the federal government owns 1.754% of the total land area.

The departments of the federal government that are charged with the responsibility for managing these national resources are: (1) the Department of the Interior, which contains the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, and the Fish and Wildlife Service, as well as the Bureau of Indian Affairs, which oversees lands of Native American tribes, also beyond the jurisdiction of the states; (2) the Department of Agriculture, which has jurisdiction over national forests; and (3) the Department of Energy, whose fossil fuel programs set the policies for coal, oil, and gas exploitation. Of all these agencies, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is the primary caretaker.

The mission of the BLM, as stated on its Web site, is to “sustain the health, diversity and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.” The BLM is responsible for managing 264 million acres of land, most in the Western states, and about 300 million acres of subsurface mineral resources. The BLM is also responsible for a federal program titled “Payment in Lieu of Taxes,” which, in effect, reimburses the Western states for the property and other taxes the states would have been able to impose had the public lands been held privately.

The control of these agencies is vital to the life of the West. Accordingly, it is of primary importance for Senators elected from Western states, whether Democrats or Republicans, to get on the committees that set the policies and budgets for the Department of the Interior and the programs of Agriculture and Energy that I previously outlined. Chief among these committees is the Appropriations Committee, which decides how much money will be spent.

The federal fiscal year begins on October 1. In January of each year, the president submits a proposed budget to the Congress for the following fiscal year. Almost two thirds of that budget now consists of direct or mandatory spending programs, often called *entitlement programs*, such as Medicare, Social Security, and interest on the national debt.

The remainder of the budget is made up of discretionary spending programs. As the Senate Appropriations Committee has stated, “Discretionary spending covers everything from road building to police protection to medical research to our national defense—most of the government services with which Americans are familiar.” This part of the budget is referred to the respective Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, which in turn divide consideration of the budget among the 13 subcommittees of each Committee. The chairs of the subcommittees were known as the “Cardinals” for the power they wielded to withhold or provide political plums to Congressional representatives and Senators.

For the West, the most important subcommittee is the Subcommittee for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies. Known informally as the *Interior Appropriations Subcommittee*, this panel makes the recommendations to Congress for funding the Department of the Interior, the Forest Service programs of the

Department of Energy, and the fossil-fuel programs of the Department of Energy. It also is responsible for funding, among other agencies, the National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities.

On the Senate side, the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee historically has represented Western interests. Because so many Western Senators were Republicans, their influence was felt particularly during the years in which there was a Republican majority in the Senate, 1981-1986 and 1995 through the present. In the 97th Congress, for example, covering 1981-1982, six of the nine majority party members of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee came from Western states, including the chair of the subcommittee, James McClure of Idaho, and the chair of the full Appropriations Committee, Mark Hatfield of Oregon. In the current 106th Congress, covering 1999-2000, six of the eight majority party members of the subcommittee come from Western states, including the chair of the subcommittee, Slade Gorton of Washington state, and the chair of the full Appropriations Committee, Ted Stevens of Alaska.

Each subcommittee is given a target spending amount, which it cannot exceed without a special vote of the full Congress. Within that number, however, the subcommittee may recommend spending amounts that exceed, equal, or reduce the recommendations made by the president. They also may earmark spending for certain projects or place restrictions on spending.

During the spring and early summer of each year, the House and Senate Interior Appropriations subcommittees, along with the other subcommittees, hold hearings. Agencies under their jurisdiction testify in justification of the president's budget. Public witnesses and representatives from interest groups also testify. In mid summer, the subcommittees hold "markup" sessions, in which the president's budget is literally marked up, and changes recommended by the Congress are inserted. These recommendations go to the full Appropriations Committee for review and revision and ultimately to passage in the House and Senate, respectively. By tradition, the House of Representatives acts first, so the markup by the Senate Interior Appropriations Subcommittee is in part a reaction to the actions taken by its House counterpart.

After both the House and Senate have passed their respective versions of the Interior Appropriations bill, a House-Senate conference is held. Members of the two Interior Appropriations Subcommittees meet, along with the chairs and ranking minority party members of the full Appropriations Committees, to resolve the differences between the two versions. The compromise version, known as the *conference report*, is returned to each body of Congress for further passage and then sent to the president for signature. As with all bills, the president may sign or veto the bill, in which event it is returned to Congress for override or revision.

If a new appropriations bill has not been enacted into law by October 1, agencies within its jurisdiction are technically out of money and, except for services considered vital to national interests, not allowed to operate. This rule was carried to its extreme during the 1995 "shut down" of the government. In most cases, however, in the event the appropriations bill has not been passed, the Congress passes a "continuing resolution" to allow spending to continue at levels set in the prior year's bill until passage of the new measure.

In 1975, the chair of the House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, Julia Butler Hansen of Washington state, retired, turning over the helm to Congressional representative Sid Yates of Illinois. An unreconstructed liberal, Yates was first elected to Congress in 1948 and, except for a two-year hiatus due to an unsuccessful run for the Senate, had served continuously since then. His Chicago district, the Ninth, was described by *The Almanac of American Politics* as “the one large part of the city where the dominant political tone is intellectual and where voters’ gut preference, at least sometimes, is for reform over regular.” In fact, the majority of his constituents were known, sometimes admiringly, sometimes disparagingly, as the *lakefront liberals*. There were no national parks, national forests, or Native American reservations in the Ninth District of Illinois. There were, however, many arts organizations and arts lovers. Yates, a collector of abstract expressionist paintings and a frequent concert goer, was firmly among the latter.

Yates was also a fervent environmentalist. In fact, he had been the first Congressional representative ever endorsed for reelection by the Sierra Club. He originally had joined the Interior Appropriations Committee as a way to protect the country’s chair position, he saw that the key arts community was to use the Interior for cultural programs.

“Requiring the arts to split the pie with timber cuts and grazing rights would force the supporters of those programs, primarily in the Senate, to make an accommodation.”

public lands. As he assumed the to protecting the interests of the rior programs as a bargaining chip

The question was often raised why placed within the jurisdiction of the mittee. Proposals, in fact, had been the subcommittee responsible for which many thought was a closer fully against each such attempt. Our nation’s artists and arts organizations, he proclaimed, were no less natural resources of our country than our mountains and rivers. This was an argument that resonated strongly in the arts community and also earned support in the Congress.

the NEA and NEH had been Interior Appropriations Subcommittee made to move the agencies into funding education programs, match. Yates had fought success-

But Yates also understood that the constituencies whose primary interests were education were likely also to support the arts. Congress had imposed increasing restrictions on the appropriations subcommittees to prevent them from exceeding budget targets. This made the recommendations made by the subcommittees equivalent to zero-sum games—given a set total amount that the subcommittee could spend, in order for one program to get more, another had to get less. Forcing arts funding to compete with education would pit natural allies against one another. Requiring the arts to split the pie with timber cuts and grazing rights would force the supporters of those programs, primarily in the Senate, to make an accommodation.

For purposes of testing this theory, the recommendations made by the House Appropriations Committee for funding the NEA and NEH, on the one hand, and the Bureau of Land Management, on the other, have been compared over a 20-year period with the recommendations made by its Senate counterpart for those agencies. These recommendations are then analyzed in connection to the final numbers agreed to by the House-Senate conference committees. In all cases, the House acted first, and the Senate reacted to the House numbers. The Yates strategy would be to go high on NEH and NEA and low on BLM. To provide something

to trade in conference, the Senate would have to do the opposite. The following table shows the amount by which the Senate's recommendation exceeded the House's for the BLM and the amount by which it reduced the total House recommendation for the NEA and the NEH. It then shows the amount by which the conference recommendation either exceeded or reduced the House recommendation.

<u>Amount of Difference between Recommended Senate and House Appropriation</u>			<u>Amount by which Conference Recommendation Differed from House</u>	
<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>BLM</u>	<u>NEA+NEH</u>	<u>Conf. BLM</u>	<u>Conf. NEA/NEH</u>
1979	+21,399,000	-1,800,000		
1980	-475,000	-2,300,000	+6,060,000	-0-
1981	+12,400,000	-5,002,000	+12,200,000	-2,442,000
1982	+105,392,000	-68,561,000	+107,900,000	-16,561,000
1983	+24,046,000	-500,000	+17,986,000	-500,000
1984	+16,814,000	-42,000,000	+17,027,000	-13,000,000
1985	+45,264,000	-18,025,000	+39,468,000	-10,675,000
1986	+11,988,000	-3,760,000	+10,507,000	-0-
1987	+97,585,000	-7,652,000	+107,521,000	-731,000
1988	+16,460,000	-924,000	+12,156,000	+1,995,000
1989	+4,912,000	-9,834,000	+6,708,000	-610,000
1990	+121,397,000	-9,280,000	+122,109,000	-2,300,000
1991	-77,064,000	-12,040,000	-79,740,000	-4,800,000
1992	+111,008,000	-7,317,000	+12,372,000	-0-
1993	+18,258,000	-1,466,000	+18,041,000	-0-
1994	+653,105,000	+4,365,000	+652,145,000	+4,365,000
1995	+2,749,000	-6,082,000	+5,520,000	-100,000
1996	-7,148,000	+21,012,000	-5,002,000	+10,506,000
1997	+39,944,000	-5,000,000		
1998	+9,785,000	+120,000,000	+7,379,000	-88,700,000

As can be seen, in 17 out of 20 years, the Senate appropriated more for the BLM and less for the NEA and the NEH than its House counterparts. In almost every case, each side gave something back in conference. More times than not, the House was able to get almost all of its NEA/NEH money back.

Because of their consistently reduced recommendations for arts funding in committee, Western Senators appeared to be inalterably opposed to the arts. Examples from three appropriations cycles, however, show that the Western Senators' stance was more directly related to protecting constituent interests in BLM and the other Interior and Energy programs than any philosophical aversion to government funding for culture.

The elections of 1980 returned the Republicans to the majority in the Senate for the first time since the Eisenhower Administration. The Reagan revolution proclaimed the end of big government, and among the agencies scheduled for extinction were the NEA and NEH. According to the plan of Budget Director David Stockman, the Endowments were to have their budgets reduced by 50% during the first year of the Reagan Administration and be eliminated by the second. As the House Interior Appropriations Report (House Report 97-163) stated: “Suddenly, this year OMB (Office of Management and Budget) has decided that these excellent programs should be dismantled by proposing a 50-percent cut in appropriations upon the representation that the private sector would be willing and able to increase their contribution to more than make up for the reduction in government funding. The Committee cannot accept either OMB’s arbitrary action nor its premise for its action.”

The Republican leadership in the Senate urged all of its new Republican committee chairs to support the president. And indeed, other Reagan economic programs, such as the Gramm-Latta budget bill and the Roth-Kemp tax cut bill, passed overwhelmingly. Nevertheless, as the statistics for fiscal year 1982 indicate, although the Senate originally cut \$68.5 million from the House markup of the Endowments’ budgets, the final conference figures show that \$52 million was restored.

Since the inception of the NEA, Congressional critics of its existence have tried to find grant awards that could be used as ammunition for the closing of the agency. These have included a \$5,000 grant to Erica Jong in 1973 that assisted her writing *Fear of Flying*, a \$6,025 grant to LeAnne Wilchusky in 1977 to throw crepe paper streamers out of an airplane as a “sculpture in space,” and a grant to Aram Saroyan for a poem whose title and full text were “Light.” Efforts of Congressional supporters and politically astute NEA chairs, however, were able to nullify most of the controversy.

Two NEA grants funded in 1989, however, ignited a crisis that would not be resolved easily. As described by the Independent Commission in its Report to Congress on the National Endowment for the Arts, the first involved a photograph by Andres Serrano, *Piss Christ*, depicting a crucifix submerged in a container of the artist’s urine. The second concerned a planned exhibit of the work of the late Robert Mapplethorpe, which included photographs portraying sadomasochistic and homoerotic activities and nude children. Led by the American Family Association and Senator Jesse Helms (R. NC.), efforts were again made to abolish the NEA or at the very least restrict the type of grants that could be made.

Recognizing that some restrictive language was necessary, but hoping to avoid further cuts, the House appropriated \$121 million less than the Senate for BLM in fiscal year 1990. In response, the House was able to keep its markup for the Endowments with only a token reduction, and the restrictive language agreed upon was merely a restatement of existing law concerning obscenity.

Senator Helms was not satisfied by the resolution of the Mapplethorpe /Serrano incidents. Over the next years, through massive direct mail efforts, the Senate overwhelmingly adopted an amendment sponsored by Helms that would ban the NEA from funding works that “depict or describe, in a patently offensive way, sexual or excretory activities or organs.”

Yates countered with his most drastic funding recommendations yet. In fiscal 1992, the House Interior Appropriations subcommittee imposed new grazing fees for Western ranchers on public lands. The Senate Interior Committee quickly removed the Helms restrictions. Again in fiscal 1994, the House cut \$653 million from BLM's budget, once again trading grazing rights for removal of NEA funding restrictions. These two "corn for porn" trades, a phrase coined by conservative California Representative William Dannemeyer, convincingly demonstrate that the Western antipathy to the arts was primarily a tactical maneuver. The Republican takeover of the House of Representatives in 1995 would be even more conclusive.

The Congressional elections of 1994 brought the Republicans to the majority in the House for the first time since 1953. No longer chair, Sid Yates could advocate—but no longer control—arts funding. In addition, the Gingrich leadership had elevated many conservative Congressional representatives dedicated to closing down the Endowments. No longer required to reduce the Endowments' budgets as a bargaining chip, the Western Senators began exceeding arts funding. Sid Yates retired at Gorton, chair of the Senate Interior Appropriations bill for fiscal year Gorton stated: "I am pleased . . . Endowment for the Arts is increased National Endowment for the Humillion. [These increases] are in that these two agencies have within have responded to Congressional concerns about the types of activities being funded. . . . I will put the leadership of the [House] on notice . . . that the Senate has no intention of receding on this matter."

**"These two
'corn for porn' trades
... convincingly
demonstrate that the
Western antipathy to
the arts was primarily a
tactical maneuver."**

the House recommendations for the end of 1998. Senator Slade Appropriations subcommittee, arts. Enacting the Senate Interior 2001 on July 18, 2000, Senator that funding for the National by \$7 million, and funding for the manities is increased by \$5 dicative of the widespread support the Senate [and] reflect [that they]

Many of us involved in arts advocacy are so convinced of the universality of our position that we forget that the arts are a special interest, competing with other special interests for a limited portion of a shrinking fiscal budget. It is easy to demonize those who don't agree with us. It is much more time consuming to examine the competing pressures that face legislators as they prepare to vote on arts issues and to be prepared to move in when the pressures change.

During the years of the Yates zero-sum-game strategy, there would have been little chance of convincing Western state Senators to vote large budgets for the NEA and NEH in committee. It was too important to Western interests that the programs of the Interior and Energy Departments be supported. Yet, it would have been a great mistake to write off these same Senators as opponents of federal funding of cultural programs. As they demonstrated in conference and as they have demonstrated when the Yates counterweight was removed, there is a large reservoir of good will toward the arts that can be tapped.

It is up to us to take a global approach to arts advocacy, examining how our special interest fits in with others. We must do our homework and recognize where the new trades will be coming from. We must make

alliances with other special interests whose goals are compatible. We also must try to identify the new champions of the arts, both the ones who will affirmatively support the arts as well as the ones who will not oppose someone else's initiatives. Ultimately, we must recognize that the arts, with their capacity to stimulate, to exhilarate, to exasperate, and sometimes to offend, are inherently political. We must not shun the politics of the arts. We must embrace them.

POST-DORF DISCUSSION

Tucker: I really appreciated your comments about the land, Mike, and even though you are from Chicago, you recognize the issues here in the West. I want to talk a bit from my perspective. I have only been in Washington state a couple of years, and so there will be some Idaho in what I have to say. In Idaho, to say that there is a two-party system is a bit of a stretch. There are five Democrats in the Idaho State Senate right now; Washington state politics are bipartisan, and it is interesting to see how that plays out.

In Washington state, as in many of our Western states, there are some major and significant land issues that affect our politics. We refer to the *Cascade Curtain*; it is actually the Cascade Mountains, but they do divide the state or at least are perceived to divide the state into east/west and rural/urban. We have two major freeways; one goes north/south, one goes east/west, and both go through Seattle. There are also, however, some very rural populations that are land-based or ocean-based populations west of the Cascades—especially those along the Pacific coast—that have many of the same issues that the communities east of the Cascades do. Their understanding and articulation of issues are very different. Again, the land affects our politics and the urban areas. Seattle is very much an urban area, and many of its issues—issues about traffic, diverse communities, education, work-force development, and corporate connections—are understood very differently from how they are even in Spokane.

I want to talk about the Interior Appropriations Committees and Washington's representatives there. Norm Dicks, who is a Democrat from Washington state, is in a position of leadership with the House Interior Appropriations Committee. Slade Gorton, of course, has that position in the Senate and is a conservative Republican. Norm Dicks' district includes Bremerton, which is just across the Sound from Seattle, so that means he is connected to Seattle by ferries, and that is also how he is connected to the interstate and to the freeway, the main transportation artery. One of the key industries in Bremerton is the naval base, and so that is part of Norm's understanding of who he is and who his constituents are. Slade serves the state as a Senator. He also is up for election this year, and it is an interesting race. He is a conservative by most measures, and he has received some notoriety for his role in the NEA funding debates. He has not always been an NEA supporter, and my understanding is that some corporate leaders convinced him that such support was in his best interest, and he has changed his tune. He really has been a significant leader and was influential in getting the increase to the NEA's budget back this week.

Currently, Slade's race is against a Democrat, Marie Cantwell, who is a self-made millionaire. She made money in high tech, served in the state legislature, and is quite left of center, especially in comparison to Slade. Because of her personal wealth, she has financed her own campaign, so that if she is elected and goes to Washington, she will be without the strings and obligations many of her peers will have.

One of the other things that is interesting right now in Washington state politics is that we have 75% of the state legislature up for election this year. We have a governor's race right now that is very heated. A very popular Democratic governor is being opposed by a radio talk-show host. We are also on the fence in terms of the presidential race, so I think much of what is going to happen with Slade actually is going to depend on

how much time Gore and Bush spend in the state in the next month. It is going to be interesting to see how this plays itself out.

I think that Washington will continue to be a state that values independence. One of our current debates that will go to the state legislature in the next session will be about our state primary, which is an open primary, meaning that you can vote for a different party in each race. That arrangement has been contested in the Supreme Court and now has been handed as an issue to the state legislature. What that is going to do, then, is challenge our understanding of partisanship and the independence of the voters and the sanctity of party rules.

Woodward: As a life-long, politically engaged, very liberal Democrat, it pains me to have to agree with and to reinforce Frank Hodsoll's assertion that culture cuts across boundaries. But living in Alaska and relying on Ted Stevens for so many things, including support of the arts, compels me to do that. I do not know where most of the other Western Senators stand on arts support, but Ted Stevens—however much I disagree with him about nearly everything—has been a staunch supporter of the NEA, a staunch supporter of the arts, and a staunch supporter of the Smithsonian in spite of a couple of battles about exhibitions that reinterpret the West. He has not been carrying the flag the way some other Senators have, but he has been someone who has staunchly stood in the way of efforts to steamroll the NEA. I wonder if there are other examples of that sort because I know that he is someone on whom we in the arts in Alaska have relied for years, and we would not trade him for someone who was more overtly and openly carrying the flag for the arts with less seniority today.

Kreidler: As I mentioned earlier, I used to work at the U. S. Office of Management and Budget and in the Education/Labor unit through the first Nixon term. While there, I saw the NEA go astronomical in terms of percentage increases in its budget. In those days, I used to sit, twice a year, across the table from Nancy Hanks, the NEA Chair, and she always would come in with very aggressive budgets. OMB's instructions during the Nixon administration were to hold the line on the NEA along with all the other small agencies. This position had nothing to do with art. It was just that the NEA was a small agency, and the White House wanted to trim government. Ms. Hanks would take the OMB reductions to Leonard Garment and other connections in the White House who tended to restore the cuts, and the final budget would be moved to Congress, where it would be run up even farther. The NEA budget moved up very quickly. The NEA reached a high mark, if I remember correctly, of \$175 million in the late 1970s.

I want to raise the question of whether this issue of NEA funding really deserves all the attention we have been giving it. The NEA really helped to set a revolution in arts funding loose in this country. I tend to give more credit to the Ford Foundation than to the NEA, but the fact is that state and local arts councils in the United States owe much to the NEA for their establishment and growth. The growth in the economy has more than replaced all the NEA money that used to be in town. So, it strikes me that a lot of what we're talking about here is a largely symbolic debate because \$107 million, even in the context of the Interior budget, is not enough to fight about in terms of the sheer physical gravity of it. In the end, we put a lot of effort into getting a pretty small amount of money, and that to me is the lesson of the last 30 years. It is a

success story and, at the same time, there is a bittersweet side to the success we have had in getting the rest of the ecosystem to mushroom.

Dorf: In the last few years, the debate really has moved away from the dollars and has moved much more to the programs and the restrictions. I think supporters of the arts are quite justifiably asking whether we need an NEA that is just going to be another subsidy program. The NEA is currently not doing much more than what the state arts councils are doing, except maybe in terms of cross-state programs. I think the NEA was eviscerated when it lost its role of leading in terms of cultural policy, and it just does not do that anymore.

Williams: I agree with your point that it is a bittersweet kind of situation. I personally would not detract, however, from the importance of the symbolic aspect of public support for the arts—I think that has been very important. Federal dollars have leveraged a great many state dollars and ultimately more local dollars, and that needs to continue to be the case.

I also would make this comment in believe that the politics of the West probably will change many times which I am most familiar, such as been a profound change in the nation in terms of what it means to be a One of the changes was driven by a unions that was associated with the states. Another change—more pro-

“In many of the Western states, the conservative Democrat is a harder person to work with for the arts than the Republican, and it is creating a change at the state level.”

nature—is the dramatic change in the nature of agriculture and the nature of ranching. I think it probably would be safe to say that most of the Montana ranchers were once Republicans. The farmers for eons were largely Democrats. This was true of Minnesota, it was true of North Dakota, and I believe it was true of Montana. These voting patterns were driven by a form of populism. Much of that has changed, and the farmers now seem to be voting Republican. In many of the Western states, the conservative Democrat is a harder person to work with for the arts than the Republican, and it is creating a change at the state level. As we look at funding for the arts and we look at the obvious fact that much of that funding is coming from the state legislature with or without state-house support, we not only have to take a look at what the scene is in Washington, which is absolutely fascinating and important, but we also have to look at the states. Some states in the West have enjoyed substantial growth in support for the arts, but there have been many states that have decreased in population or have not grown very much at all and are struggling to maintain some sort of presence for public funding in the arts.

regard to politics of the West. I are changing, have changed, and again. Certainly, in the states with Montana and Idaho, there has ture of the politics—for example, Democrat within those states. dramatically reduced role of trade mining industry in some Western found and longer lasting in its

Ybarra-Frausto: This was a very rich conversation, Michael, thinking in terms of objects in the West connected with land and water. I thought about 10% of culture as a kind of renewable resource, and it may not be. It may be that culture—just like water and land—is a non-renewable resource. Culture also dies if it is not taken care of, just like land and water, so my point is that culture itself is a resource that may not be renewable.

Tucker: We have talked about the NEA loss and how so many local communities are generating funds to replace NEA funding. I think we have to be careful with that kind of thinking because there are so many inequities in that. There are local communities that are funding the arts very well, but the majority are not. I think there is more equity at the state level, but there are still states that go in these boom-and-bust cycles with arts funding, and to have some federal policy that establishes some kind of continuity would be a good thing. Behind all this is thinking about what we are after, and I really do not have an answer. In terms of our expectations for the role of the NEA or even the budget of the NEA, what are we after? What would we really want besides more than we have now? I have no idea, and I think it would be a good time to talk about that.

Hodsoll: This is a big issue, and it was an issue even when I was at the NEA. Let's say you were to double the NEA budget. What would we use the increment for?

Coffman: There is a parallel to this NEA story in the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. I am not any great expert on it, but I have looked at the data. I looked for it when the Gingrich Congress was elected, expecting there to be a big downtrend. There was not a big downtrend. There was a big wobble, and then a modest uptrend continued. But PBS content is a lot more transparent than the tremendously diversified arts that you are talking about. What happened was a tremendous shift toward conventional and conservative thinking—celebration of American archives. I do not know what happened in the arts, but I am pretty sure I know what happened in PBS—there was a definite move to the right.

Walton: I know this does not answer Kristin Tucker's question, but I think the issue of the NEA is very similar to our discussion about taking arts education out of the schools: What kind of a message does that send to the children in the educational system? It is a figurative commitment; it is a national commitment. I am an artist, and although I would never change that, in a situation where at very many turns in your professional and personal life, you feel that there are walls in your way, then I think it is incredibly important to have some sort of a national commitment to the value and vitality and the primacy of arts in our country's cultural life.

Hodsoll: I agree. There was some comment earlier on how the supply of arts education specialists in the schools has declined across the country. It may be true since the last NEA research project, but at least by the early 1990s, the supply in terms of arts specialists at the national level—I am not talking about any given state or locality, where the supply could be up or down—was at a more or less equal level. General music education was down as a demand matter, as a matter of supply, and so on. Having said that, what I am saying is that there is at least a question mark as to whether arts education is really down on a national basis.

There is another issue that we have not addressed here. The federal funding, at least, for education is about six to seven cents on the dollar. The real decisions related to education don't take place in state capitals; they take place in the 1600 or so school districts across the country. Those folks on the school boards are

elected, and if you want to change arts education, you need to work at that level, which is a lot more difficult than working at the national level.

Now, let's talk about what the national commitment is on arts education. Before I left office, Bill Bennet and I signed a document that was agreed to by President Reagan that was later picked up by the Bush initiative with the governors that the arts would be one of the basics. That is a scrap of paper. Under the Clinton administration, national guidelines and standards for arts education were finalized and published, along with guidelines and standards for math and history and other subjects. At the national level, leaving aside the small amount of funding that is available there, the paperwork is impeccable. Let me move to the state level because I looked at this about five years ago. In virtually all of the states—there are only two or three exceptions to this—there are reasonable arts education guidelines and standards that are designed to govern the curriculum school district by school district. But these guidelines are often not implemented. The action, I think, has to be school district by school district.

Nahwooksy: I wonder what we individual states in the WESTAF organizations. I am a great believer surveying what the needs are and them with policy decisions that ultimate efforts. I think we ought to to evaluate both at the state and re-our institutions are accomplishing, American Indian Art, which is a Indian art market in Santa Fe.

“The real decisions related to education don’t take place in state capitals; they take place in the 1600 or so school districts across the country.”

should be doing as well within region or even within our own in assessment and surveying—determining how we might meet timately are turned into program-do more of that. I think we ought gional levels—finding out what whether it is the Institute of training center, or Atlatl or the

Cisler: Tom Coffman’s mention of PBS reminded me of something that is going on that takes us back to the discussion concerning local voices and who controls the pipes. There is what is called the *low-power community-radio movement*, which has been pretty much below most people’s radar. The current chair of the FCC, William Kinnard, promulgated some regulations that drew an incredible amount of attack from the National Association of Broadcasters and PBS, which pulled together to fight this very modest plan to offer very low-power radio stations outside the major metro markets. PBS did not want to lose its meager share for these local voices. Spurious CD’s were distributed to members of Congress of purported tests that showed interference between these tiny, tiny stations and these megawatt clear channel administrations owned by just a few people. These stations have had a great influence in other countries. For instance, the kits you can buy to set up these stations were used for most of the stations in Haiti and eastern Europe at the same time that newspapers were being created and library training was implemented. So, it is interesting the way this sort of pirate culture has spread into more legitimate—by some people’s view—sorts of civil society institutions.

The interesting thing, though, is that you might have one group—one nonprofit religious group, an ethnic group, or one with just a very strong political agenda—controlling the station and excluding others locally.

But now there is the technology where you actually can program and chunk up the time and feed a remote link through the Internet and re-broadcast without any involvement with the local tiny stations. There are some protestors who are doing that in New York City right now. It means that even a local station does not have to be under the control of just one party.

Hodsoll: Let's say that all the laws and regulations came out so that there would be sort of limitless access. How is somebody going to be able to get through the clutter of all the stuff that is out there to find what they need?

Cisler: I think there will be a combination of electronic editors, some of which are emerging already in different realms, and improved machine intelligence. People I know in that field basically have the feeling that human intermediaries eventually will be swept aside. They see the curve of technological development pushing out to where the human judgment of a librarian or a newspaper editor or anybody who is a subject specialist will not have much of a role. But for a long time, I think, people are going to gravitate toward people and personalities who show this judgment.

Radich: What the NEA does next is a very critical issue for all of us. I'd like to remind us all that there are some positive elements that have come out of this fairly difficult period and the diversification of funding. For example, Denver now distributes \$33 million annually to the City and County of Denver and five surrounding counties. That is happening more and more around the country—diversification and sophistication and variation have come about in our funding. There also is a more sophisticated and less reactionary attitude toward political figures. We don't love or hate them anymore just because they happen to be of one party or another. I think that's very good. I also think we have swept away some things that probably needed to be swept away.

I think about an event in which Frank Hodsoll was involved many years ago when he was presenting a new framework for working in arts education that the Endowment was going to pursue. Luckily, there were not old tomatoes in the room because he would have been pretty profoundly pelted. The crowd was thinking of him as a conservative—something that was antithetical to their thinking—and actually, he was presenting something quite advanced. The conservatives in the room were reluctant to move forward and admit that there could be a broader way of approaching arts education. So, now and again, it's not so bad to have a bit of a sweeping away of some of these kinds of conceptions.

L A N C E I Z U M I

I would like to thank WESTAF for inviting me to be a panelist at this year's symposium. I enjoyed being a moderator at the last symposium, although as a policy wonk, it is not easy simply to smile and be satisfied with putting up warning cards telling speakers that their time is up. Keeping the trains running on time is an important job, but we all remember what happened to the last guy who had that distinction as his only claim to fame. I especially want to thank the WESTAF staff for putting together some very interesting and thought-provoking readings for us. Those readings certainly helped me immensely in deciding the topic and content of my remarks here today.

One of the reasons I have been asked to participate in WESTAF as a trustee and at conferences like this one is because I have a somewhat different philosophical orientation from perhaps most people in the arts community. I work as a policy ket think tank and share the and the conservative movement as a thing, though, and critiquing community, I thought it would be cisms of the arts made by conser- cause the arguments of many problems they perceive to be relevant for many of you in the West because you face conservative governments in your states and are subject to many of these criticisms.

“... the arguments of many conservatives often fail to get at the problems they perceive to be important.”

Take, for example, the issue of government involvement in the arts. From the right, criticisms of government arts policy usually fall into two categories. The first is the strict libertarian critique that only a very few, if any, activities should be undertaken by government. Under this Adam Smith-influenced viewpoint, the arts are not one of these activities. A strict libertarian would not care what type of art is produced as long as the market, not government, determined what that product was. While there is philosophical consistency to this point of view, it should be noted that strict libertarians are a minority in the conservative movement. Although most conservatives have free-market inclinations, for many, their major beef with government arts policy and the arts in general is that the “wrong” kind of product is being produced.

These “wrong” products, though, indicate not a government problem but a cultural one. As the late Samuel Lipman, long-time culture writer at the neo-conservative *Commentary* magazine, noted, government reflects the state of private society, especially in the arts.¹ Thus, if “better” kinds of artistic products are supposedly needed, getting government out of the arts business and simply relying on the market will not necessarily produce those products. Lipman pointed out quite accurately that most of the art products that upset conservatives are the products of the market, whether they be produced through private individuals, foundations, or institutions.² Brian Anderson, senior editor of the conservative New York-based *City Journal*,

recently has written, “When moral nihilism dominates the culture, as it does in Western societies—especially the U.S.—free markets can radicalize it by shouting it, so to speak, from the rooftops.”³ Anderson observes, “The greatest threat to the future of democratic capitalism . . . lies in the growing association of capitalist power and moral libertinism.”⁴

Thus, if the government were to withdraw from the arts tomorrow, many conservatives still would be unsatisfied with the state of the world. That is not an argument in favor of government arts policy—I am still very skeptical—but simply an observation that government arts policy has much less of an impact on the arts and our national culture than many conservatives would lead us to believe.

If the mechanical reliance on the market doesn’t guarantee conservatives’ goal of, in their view, better artistic and cultural products, the efforts of some conservatives to use government to achieve their goals also fail to address fundamental cultural problems. In our readings, Roger Kimball of the *New Criterion* discusses the controversy surrounding the “Sensation” exhibit at the Brooklyn Museum of Art.⁵ I have read many things that Roger Kimball has written and agree with him most of the time. Indeed, I agree with many of the criticisms he makes in his article. In fact, I authored a critical article of the “Sensation” exhibit that was published in the British journal *The Salisbury Review*. Kimball focuses much of his critique on the issue of artistic quality and also laments the involvement of the government judiciary in the whole affair, saying that in a healthy society, “such matters should be adjudicated in the court of taste and manners.”⁶

This past week, however, the *Wall Street Journal* published a piece by Kimball in which he advocates increased regulation and censorship for the products coming out of Hollywood.⁷ I’m not going to get into the arguments for and against censorship. For my purposes here, those arguments aren’t the main points. What is relevant, in my view, is that censorship seems to be a questionable short-term solution that fails to confront the much larger problem of a culture that produces the products Kimball and many other conservatives do not like. Even if censorship were to come back in vogue, the individuals and organizations producing the “bad” products still would be in place. Censorship is, therefore, a political band-aid solution. It implies that as long as conservatives or “right-thinking” people command the levers of power—in this case as censors—then society will be better off. Like the market solution, such political power solutions are far from being the panaceas for the cultural problems that conservatives believe ail our country.

Claes Ryn, the noted conservative professor of politics at Catholic University in Washington, D. C., has taken conservatives to task for this reliance on political solutions. In his important article “How Conservatives Failed ‘The Culture,’” published in *Humanitas*, Ryn says that the “ruling assumption of the now dominant strains of intellectual conservatism seems to be that the crux of social well-being is politics: bad politicians ruin society; good politicians set it right.”⁸ Given this assumption, too many conservatives, says Ryn, believe that for “social problems to be effectively remedied and for worthy objectives to be achieved, ‘our’ candidate must win the next election, our people man the government.”⁹

This emphasis on politics and power has deleterious effects. In Ryn’s view:

The ideological mindset, formed as it is at bottom by a desire to dominate rather than illuminate, is

an intruder in philosophy and the arts. It is closed in upon itself and resentful of competition. Instead of cultivating the openness to new influences that marks real philosophy and art and letting itself be exposed to the possible intellectual turmoil of fresh insight, ideology shunts inconvenient thought and imagination aside. Ideologues produce propaganda, although sometimes propaganda of a sophisticated kind. When such intellectuals set the tone, the intellectual and artistic life suffers.¹⁰

To be even handed to conservatives, Ryn's observation is just as applicable to the complaints voiced by bell hooks about her feminist and Black comrades on the left in another article from our readings.¹¹ Ryn states the core problem with too many conservatives as follows:

Unless ideas and art have some direct and obvious relationship to politics, many intellectual conservatives regard them as having negligible practical importance and to be provinces of the left in addition. Because philosophers and artists can be expected to favor the wrong causes, it is desirable to mobilize opposition to them from within their own ranks; yet, apart from this political problem, these conservatives see no large and compelling reason to worry about professors, writers, composers, and artists. After all, society is moved not by them but by individuals who pursue more practical pursuits, especially persons who affect public policy and, most prominently, leading politicians. To the bearer, this view of where the real power lies represents hard-nosed realism. In actuality, it exemplifies a narrow and shortsighted understanding of what shapes the future.¹²

For Ryn, the people who matter are the creators, not the politicians. He says:

Great power for shaping society lies with those who make us see life through their eyes. Deep within our personalities are the marks left by the imaginative and intellectual master-minds—poets, religious visionaries, painters, composers, and philosophers—the individuals whose intuitions or ideas leave others changed. Directly or indirectly, those individuals create the tenor of the age, for good or ill. They may be long dead, but their visions move the living.¹³

Ryn does warn: “Art and didacticism are incompatible, as are philosophy and propaganda.”¹⁴ However, Ryn says:

Still, as illuminating, orienting statements, the great works of art or thought always carry implications or have consequences for practical politics, however indirect and unanticipated. They are typically a reaction against life going wrong and present a vision of new possibilities. By affecting how people imagine or think about the world, these works affect political attitudes.¹⁵

If creativity, not political action, moves our culture, then the job for conservatives is much more formidable than simply criticizing the government and liberal members of the arts community or even allowing all things to be sorted out by the market. For conservatives, the task is to take seriously their theoretical belief in competition and present alternative artistic and creative products that can compete with the products already available. That such products may not be available in the quantity many conservatives would like is not the fault principally of the government. Nor is criticizing already available products, such as the works at the “Sensation” exhibit, sufficient. Brian Anderson urges that for our culture to improve, at least from the

viewpoint of conservatives, “We will need to paint again with the grace of Tintoretto; write with the humanity of Shakespeare; philosophize with the love of truth of Aristotle and Aquinas; and educate our best in the riches of dual heritage of faith and reason.”¹⁶

For this to happen, though, conservatives must work on their own supply problem—create the “better” products or create the circumstances where such products can be produced through, for example, increased arts education, and then compete vigorously for the hearts and minds of the people. In other words, put up or shut up. That might mean, among other things, working with people like all of you in the arts community. Conservatives therefore should see most of you as possible allies rather than people to be reflexively feared or opposed. Paul Johnson, in our readings, talked of wide-open future possibilities in art, architecture, music, and writing. Conservatives should focus on taking advantage of those opportunities in order to change and improve our culture. Such a task will be arduous and certainly will not be achieved in the shortness of an election cycle. However, if conservatives have the persistence, creativity, talent, and intellectual wherewithal to engage in such a long-term project, one that may span generations, then their victory, if one is achieved, will be more lasting and satisfying than any transient political triumph.

“... conservatives must work on their own supply problem—create the ‘better’ products ... and then compete vigorously for the hearts and minds of the people.”

¹Samuel Lipman, “The Real Problem is Private Patronage,” *The National Endowments*, ed. Laurence Jarvik, Herbert I. London, and James F. Cooper (Los Angeles, CA: Second Thoughts, 1995): 89.

²Lipman, p. 89.

³Brian C. Anderson, “Capitalism and the Suicide of Culture,” *First Things*, Feb. 2000: 29-30.

⁴Anderson, p. 30.

⁵Roger Kimball, “The Elephants in the Gallery or the Lessons of ‘Sensation,’” *The New Criterion*, available at <http://www.newcriterion.com/archive/18/nov99/sensation.htm>.

⁶Kimball, “The Elephants in the Gallery.”

⁷Roger Kimball, “A Little Censorship Would Be Good for Hollywood,” *Wall Street Journal*, 2 Oct. 2000, p. A34.

⁸Claes G. Ryn, “How Conservatives Failed ‘The Culture,’” available at <http://www.nhinet.org/failed.htm>.

⁹Ryn.

¹⁰Ryn.

¹¹bell hooks, “Censorship From Left to Right,” *Outlaw Culture: Resisting Representations* (New York: Routledge, 1994), pp. 64-72.

¹²Ryn.

¹³Ryn.

¹⁴Ryn.

¹⁵Ryn.

¹⁶Anderson.

Ybarra-Frausto: I really want to thank Lance and to try to enlarge the frame of what he said. The cultural sector really does call for a dialogue among these odd alliances that you are talking about, whether business, entertainment, or whatever. No sector, whatever ideology it possesses, is sufficient. So, I agree with the fact of these odd alliances. I would like to frame the notion of the conservative viewpoint in another way, and that is in terms of the narratives. The public is now engaged in creating a multiple-voice narrative. I would like to talk from the experience that I know the best, which is the Latino community, and I would like to talk about all communities in terms of the notion of conservatism.

I see a direct relationship between conserving who you are and preserving who you are, so, in essence, a lot of minority communities are actually very conservative, both ideologically and politically. If you look at election results, you know that the Cuban community in Miami is overwhelmingly conservative, both ideologically and intellectually. But my claim is that it is also true of the Mexican-American community. What I mean by *conservative* is a larger frame of transnational reality no longer framed by the U. S.

As people come—let us say Mexican Americans from Mexico—the politics of, for example, the basic questions with which you are dealing such as the relationship of government to the arts, are vastly different from the Mexican-American reality of being born in the United States. In Mexico, the relationship of the government to the arts until very recently was centralized, almost like the French model. And who knows what Fox is going to produce with his model about the relationship of the government to the arts. The ordinary person who comes here does not necessarily have a narrative of the relationship of the role of the government and the art sector in the way that it is necessary here.

You are sharing, I think, a reconsideration and a critique of certain ideologies of the conservative tradition in the U. S., but I am also saying at the same time that that ideology in all its forms relies on a core meaning of the notion of preservation of self. So, for example, let us take the notion of family values. If you take that notion to the Latino community, 95% of them, just by a little tweaking, believe in all the ways that those who adhere to the typical notion of family values believe. We would find really surprising alliances among ordinary people and artists and intellectuals within that group. We also would see possible new directions for a much more complicated view in which minority communities are not seen as radical only but as a complex group that has a real conservative component historically, culturally, and politically. I am very glad you raised this point because these odd alliances are what we all need as we begin creating a new and more complex narrative.

Delgado: One of the issues that most troubles conservatives is the splintering of conservative ideology. Some of the conservatism that Lance and I were actually sharing on the flight out here was born of what I would call *high-culture elitism*, often associated with academics and intellectuals who can share with one another that cultural base despite having differing political views. But I think part of the problem for the rank and file of the Republican party and many of the conservative folks who want to vote Republican is

that Republican leadership often has had to reach out to knee-jerk conservatives who do not have a concept of the kinds of issues of culture that Lance and I were sharing.

As an example, I would point to the figure of Rupert Murdoch, who, if you watch his Fox news, makes no pretense toward objectivity. News reporting there is editorializing, and it is very clearly conservative. But then if you look at the rest of the cultural programming that Rupert Murdoch gives us through his news corporation, it is not the model that many of the sources you cite would appreciate. He is certainly not giving us exposés on Tintoretto, and he is not giving us any kind of understanding of how shadow and light work in art. He is giving us Manchester United against Chelsea or he is giving us gossipy Hollywood programming, and that does not square. Granted, the leftists have been struggling with this for 50 years. Ever since we started incorporating Frankfurt School kinds of thoughts, we are trying to reconcile these Marxist ideals of the people with intellectual elitism that produce such idealism.

If the conservatives are going to us, they are going to have to com- interact with us at multiple levels. point of art, in fact, may be to pro- would lead to reasoned discourse is art, and I agree with that because art. But if art is going to energize be willing to say, “I do not like that, think?” Art that energizes cannot

“But if art is going to energize civic discourse, both sides have to be willing to say, ‘I do not like that, and this is why. What do you think?’”

energize liberals and interact with plicate their notion of culture and They have to presume that the duce reactions that we would hope rather than simply saying, “Here I like it.” That is one reaction to civic discourse, both sides have to and this is why. What do you be responded to with “I do not like

what we are talking about”—the “I-feel” kind of argument. And I fear that, for a lot of conservatives, that is their reaction. Many conservatives and people in the community have “I-feel” reactions to what they do not like, and it does not get beyond that. That does not improve our understanding of the arts and humanities in our day-to-day lives, and it certainly does not elevate our social and political discourse.

Izumi: I agree with regard to the Fox news network or any of the various conservative radio talk-show hosts. On a superficial level, some of those folks may be entertaining, but, again, the issue gets back to what I was talking about—what Claes Ryn was saying—that the focus is always on the political and who wins the next election and which candidate is better. The focus is very narrow in their discourse. You are right. We do not have any kind of great expectation of values or education from a conservative point of view on Fox. You are not going to hear about a review of a Shakespeare production on Rush Limbaugh’s show or even hear a suggestion that people should go see a Shakespeare play. Conservatives have to get away from that kind of easy type of activity and get into the harder type of activity of educating the average conservative who identifies with their point of view. There are as many problems with an uneducated conservative as there are with an uneducated liberal. It is up to people like me who are interested in this kind of thing to try to make folks know that there is more to our philosophy and our viewpoint than just who wins the next election.

Zinn: Thank you, Lance, for addressing the need to examine both liberal and conservative ideologies from our arguments about the arts. I am curious, though, about one thing. Are you saying that conservatives do not just disagree with liberals about the content of the arts but actually have a different understanding of what art should do in this society? Am I right to think that conservatives take a kind of Cromwellian view of the arts and believe that the arts should be judged by their effectiveness in establishing a unified, morally purposeful national culture? Are you saying that disagreement between liberals and conservatives about the purpose of the arts overall is far more important than questions about the ideology of individual works of art?

Izumi: The conservative viewpoint is not monolithic on that particular question. There is a strain of conservatism that views art in a Cromwellian type of way as something that should be related to our national culture. There is another strain, though, that you might see more in, for example, conservative Catholics, who see art as a universal statement of truth and beauty, so it is not something that is necessarily part of American culture.

Jennings-Roggensack: In terms of the government structure in Hawai'i and Heidi's explanation of how culture is really infused into much of the governmental decision making, how does the conservative/liberal debate play out there? How do they respond to the notion of culture and to the notion of cultural policy? The second part of my question is, from a conservative viewpoint, what is the value of cultural policy? If there is not a place for it, what about the Hawaiian notion of the infusion of culture at all levels of policy?

Coffman: The person who is recognized by everyone as the great artist in Hawai'i was John Charlot, who was of half Mexican ancestry and half French. He was an early participant in the Mexican muralist movement and, as a Catholic, he became alienated from the Marxists and moved to Hawai'i. He took with him his sense of celebration of peoples and was embraced across the spectrum. Perhaps arriving at some understanding of a multicultural ethic has that healing effect. There is some sense in your description, Tomás, of minorities, as they are thought of in North America, as being essentially conservative, and I think that is proven true in Hawai'i. The left/right political spectrum in Hawai'i is much more muted, and I think there is a healing effect that results from that.

Izumi: In terms of cultural policy, I think that conservatives would hesitate to talk about cultural policy. You are talking about it as something that may come from the government-inspired cultural policy. The hesitancy is there because what conservatives fear is that cultural policy would embody a kind of straight-jacket point of view about what cultural policy is. If you look, for example, at the conservative academics, most of them gravitate to economics. If you were to list all of the conservative academics in this country, the majority are probably professors of economics, and you do not have as many folks who are interested in cultural policy. People like Claes Ryn and others might be, but I think they would be in the minority. I think there would be a worry among conservatives that the folks who would gravitate to that area would be folks who might keep an open discussion.

Fees: I have been thinking about a model of American history that is a venerable religious model. It is founded on the notion of awakening. You mentioned how there is a fear and distaste for what appears to be a nihilism of late-20th-century American culture. It reminds me of those same kinds of fears and statements that have been expressed at several stages in American history when controlling powers are leveled, which is one of the tensions in American history. New allegiances and new consensuses are formed as different groups battle for a say in the way that things work as people attempt to get closer to the control of their own lives.

In a place like Wyoming, which is extremely conservative politically, one historian has said that our brand of what we call *individualism* is actually a faith in people rather than institutions. In places like Wyoming, institutional allegiances are quite weak, while our dependencies on institutions, government, and the federal government are quite high. Our conservative political structure resents that and almost seems to adopt a victim mentality about these great economic powers, the oil companies, the great political powers, and the federal government and how they seem to dominate and to dictate the way our lives go. The economic and political response of leadership in Wyoming is to resist any sort of control or infusion or direction from government.

Lance said that a goal of conservative perhaps should be to encourage the cultivation of arts education in the schools. Those involved in our socially conservative state government believe that the arts should be useful. I do not think they believe that they should be useful in a Marxist sense or a Fascist sense that somehow we should create monuments that define a culture, but they want them to be useful nonetheless. They do not buy into the notion that the arts, whatever they are, are attempts to make sense of our world. Otherwise, they would be encouraging grassroots arts efforts. What cripples our progress toward arts policy in a place like Wyoming or education policy in our university or through our school systems is just what you are alluding to—conservatives tie any sort of cultural policy to a fear of taxation because taxation is going to lead us somehow to another level of government domination. Until cultural policy and taxation can be divorced in the conservative political mind, at least in a place like Wyoming, there will not be progress made concerning cultural policy and cultural issues.

“Until cultural policy and taxation can be divorced in the conservative political mind, at least in a place like Wyoming, there will not be progress made concerning cultural policy and cultural issues.”

Griffith: If you take the notion of cultural conservatism Paul Johnson uses in his article in our readings and use it as the model by which to display a cultural program that illustrates our national heritage or our national culture, you are creating an illusion. There is really no such thing as a sort of founded and definable national culture, and it is certainly not going to be bound by post-Renaissance notions of art production. In addition, in taking that as a standard, you are pretty much negating the importance of probably more than 90% of the arts being produced by all the different kinds of people who make up this national culture.

Hayashi: I want to talk about the opportunities we have—and I am using the collective *we* here to mean we from the West. Most of us in the West really see the complexities and go beyond left/right or Democrat/Republican models in terms of cultural policy because those of us who live in the Western states have had to live with this kind of complexity at the local level. There are exceptions. I have to admit that I was surprised when I left the San Francisco Bay Area and first moved to Washington, D. C., and then to Kansas to see that there were people who were as committed as I was to advancing the arts who were extremely conservative politically. We had a very civil and advanced level of discourse about cultural policy, which broke my stereotype about the Midwest. I appreciate the opportunity we have in organizations like WESTAF or the other regionals to talk about cultural policy without necessarily advancing the old “federalist” notion about government support or the super-structure of government support of the arts the way it was talked about in the 1960s.

I struggle every day, in my work now as the head of a multi-million-dollar organization, with the fact that many of my board members are very conservative. They are all extremely supportive of the arts, and they want to advance the culture. We need to reach out to that impetus. How do we support the arts in our communities no matter what our political viewpoints may be? There is so much more that we have in common.

In Kansas, when I ran a state agency, I had to learn how to reach out and partner with the Christian Coalition in the state because two key Christian Coalition-related representatives were on my appropriations committee. I actually did not have such a difficult job. They would go out and support the arts and arts education, even though they were dead set against supporting the Kansas Board of Education and what they saw as a huge educational bureaucracy within their state. They easily could support my programs, which they thought were very efficient delivery systems on the local level. So, I think there is a whole range here that can be used to advance the notion of cultural policy, even on a national level, without necessarily talking about government involvement.

CHRISTOPHER ZINN

Let me begin by mentioning a couple of touchstones that have come up in the discussions over the last day and a half. One is the question of whether national cultural policy is always aligned with the nation state and its imperium. Can we have a national policy that exists to provide opportunities for our citizens rather than to further the agenda of the state itself? Second, Vjieran Katunarić asked us to consider how culture creates value, how it adds value in the marketplace. This question resonates for me with a comment from Dave Hickey. Since WESTAF was kind enough to include a copy of *Air Guitar* in our packets, let me read a couple of passages from the essay, “Frivolity and Uinction,” in which he challenges us to think differently about art:

If we do this, we can stop regarding the art world as a “world” or a “community” or a “market” and begin thinking of it as a semi-institutional agora—society, like that of professional sports, within which issues of private desire and public virtue are negotiated and cause the art world is no more world is about *sport*. The sports referendum on the matter in which compete. The art world conducts how things should look and the things—or it would, if art were regarded as sports are, as a wasteful, privileged endeavor through which very serious issues are sorted out.

“Can we have a national policy that exists to provide opportunities for our citizens rather than to further the agenda of the state itself?”

semi-public, semi-mercantile, an intermediate institution of civil sional sports, within which issues lic virtue are negotiated and cause the art world is no more world is about *sport*. The sports referendum on the matter in which compete. The art world conducts how things should look and the things—or it would, if art were

Because art doesn’t matter. What matters is how things look and the way we look at them in a democracy—just as it matters how we compete and cooperate—if we do so in the sporadic, bucolic manner of professional baseball. . . . Because, finally, the art world is no more a community than Congress is a community, although, like Congress, it is in danger of *becoming* one and losing its status as a forum of contested values where we vote on the construction and constituency of the visible world.

He continues:

So, I have been thinking, if art is “good” enough to be deserving of public patronage, just what does it do? I would suggest that since such work must be designed in compliance with extant legislation and regulatory protocols, it can only work on behalf of this legislation and those protocols. It can encourage us not just to obey the laws that we all fought so hard to pass, but to *believe* them, to internalize the regulatory norms of civil society into a “cultural belief system.” Unfortunately, art that aspires to this goal is nothing more or less than *tribal art*, a steady-state hedge against change and a guarantee of oppression in the name of consensus, however benign.

In this wonderfully provocative comment, Hickey expresses his belief in a kind of free-market aesthetic. He says art doesn't matter by itself, or it matters only because we find in it things that we like to look at and, in liking to look at something, we add value to it . . . particular kinds of value ranging from pleasure to political belief. This cool, free-market approach to the ascription of value seems the very opposite of what cultural agencies do. As he points out, agencies, with their agendas, tend to re-institute their own regulations in the kind of work that they sponsor.

I just want to add one other touchstone for myself. It comes from Herman Melville's *Moby Dick*, and it's the sentence where Ishmael says, "for a whale-ship was my Yale College and my Harvard," and I think I could find sentences like this in Frederick Douglass or Emily Dickinson. These are expressions of the belief that, in America, education is common and based in experience. It derives not from institutions but from the text of America itself. This belief in the possibility of non-traditional and non-institutional forms of education and of enlightened cultural participation is very important to me in my work as a cultural administrator. For me, the relation of cultural agencies to cultural agency is a central one. How do the administrative rationales of cultural agencies relate to the theory and practice of individual agency? I think that agencies propose an idea of culture that is, in important respects, dissonant with our own views of cultural agency.

We all work in cultural agencies, but how often do we have a chance to really examine our goals? Is the purpose of an agency to provide resources? To enlarge its budget? To implement policies? To keep a cluster of activities and ideas available for the public when they're in danger of removal? Any answer to these questions would reflect an organization's mission, but it also would imply certain beliefs about the conceived beneficiaries of these services—what I'd like to call *agents*.

I'm borrowing the concept of agency from political philosophy and cultural studies in order to ask ourselves how people become enfranchised in culture: How do they become full-fledged cultural participants in the cultures in which they live rather than *subjects* of a cultural system? For me, the answer is related to two different conceptions of culture. There is the now-common view of culture as an encompassing matrix of beliefs, habits, and customs—something that tends to involve all of us in a systematic, though not necessarily reflective, way. There is also the view of culture, however, as a set of activities and ideas that we undertake and cultivate as individuals and as groups. We choose, as much as possible, who or what we want to be in culture and build cultural loyalties and affinities as we go along. This is what I refer to as *cultural agency*.

Choice and deliberation are key components of cultural agency, but so is transparency. That is, we choose our cultural affiliations because we understand and envision the content and consequences of our decisions. Even more, in choosing our cultural dispositions, we also become less mystified by cultural loyalty itself. As Hickey says (paraphrasing Andy Warhol), we choose to like some things because we like the way they look. Finally, I would add to the components of cultural agency the notion of productivity. In aligning ourselves with particular cultural choices, we also come to feel that we play—or may play—a productive role within that cultural grid as audience, co-creator, critic, etc.

How can this concept of cultural agency inform the work that we do for our constituents and our beneficiaries? In my view, if we're doing our job well, we're fostering the emergence of robust forms of cultural agency in our society, enabling people to determine their own position in the culture of their choice. This is a particularly meaningful challenge to me right now for two reasons. One, I'm part of a two-year effort to develop a cultural plan for Oregon, one that encompasses the arts, humanities, and heritage. We are now preparing the final draft of the cultural plan for the Oregon legislature, and there is a reasonable chance that this interdisciplinary proposal may succeed.

The cultural plan that we've developed has three goals. One is to protect and stabilize Oregon's cultural resources, creating a solid foundation for the future. A second is to expand public access to these resources. The third is to ensure—as the Office of Economic Development likes to say—that Oregon's cultural resources are strong and dynamic contributors to economic development in Oregon's communities, thereby enhancing quality of life. The revenue sources for this trust have been carefully specified, and the goal is to create a fund of \$210 million over 10 years.

Under this plan, the existing cultural agencies (Oregon Arts Commission, Oregon Council for the Humanities, Heritage Commission, Oregon Historical Society, Office of Historic Preservation) would receive a third of the funds distributed through the Trust; another third will be available as challenge grants to cultural organizations statewide; and the final third will be distributed directly to local communities for their own cultural use. In addition, recognizing that cultural activity often transcends disciplinary and bureaucratic boundaries, the Trust provides significant incentives for interagency collaboration. The purpose of the Trust is clearly stated:

The task force envisions that the Cultural Plan will result in greater participation in and appreciation of culture in Oregon. The plan will support and measure the increased use of cultural assets as tools to enrich citizens' lives, to encourage life-long education and to promote knowledge of our state. The plan is designed to strengthen the connections between Oregon's cultural resources, community and economic development, and the citizenry.

In my mind, this passage expresses a beneficent, but nonetheless real, dissonance between the effort to bolster institutional cultural resources and the ideal of helping citizens become full-fledged participants in their culture—the dissonance, in other words, between cultural agencies and cultural agency. Because it's not obvious to me that one calls forth the other, I continue to wonder whether the steps outlined in the cultural plan—important and ambitious as they are—will be, by themselves, effective tools for advancing cultural participation.

I am struggling with this in another context as well. At the Council for the Humanities, we're developing a humanities publication that will be directed toward young people and include contributions by young people. This will be an addition to our standard publication, *Oregon Humanities*, which is addressed to adults interested in the humanities, especially as they touch on issues of public policy and general interest. We're trying to think about how this youth publication should look and what it should do. Is it an instrument

for extending our program resources? Is it a tool for developing the future constituent base of the Council? What do we even mean by *youth culture*, and what do the public humanities offer to young people?

One version of an answer to this last question begins with the fact that the humanities, even more than the arts, are based primarily in higher education. As young people make the transition from secondary education to higher education, they are often introduced for the first time to the methods of description, study, and analysis that comprise the humanities. But our exposure to these techniques, so essential to our understanding of culture and society, need not be limited to this relatively narrow window of opportunity. One purpose of the youth publication is to widen that aperture, to foster other and earlier occasions for young people to develop their sensitivity to cultural knowledge and understanding.

We would like this publication to be an effective way to develop and encourage forms of cultural literacy for young people, especially in regard to vernacular forms of cultural expression. We hope that young people will become interested in exploring youth as a historical category and can think about who they are as a social construction so that they can think about who they are as young people in more sophisticated terms. We want to invite consideration of the importance of generational historical memory as these young people come into their social and political and cultural majorities. We want to convene debates about art, artistic practices, and artistic worth on subjects that will interest and involve the young. We want to raise the issue of aesthetics in relevant ways—to locate the question of sincerity and irony as, say, the difference between new wave and punk music rather than simply a theme in the humanistic study of literature.

“Cultural critique, for instance, might help them better understand consumerism and enfranchise specific cultural strategies for deferring or evading its influences.”

Perhaps more than any other goal, we hope to demonstrate the pragmatic application of the humanities to the lives of young “cultural agents.” Cultural critique, for instance, might help them better understand consumerism and enfranchise specific cultural strategies for deferring or evading its influences. It might help a 15-year-old understand where she or he fits in with the sports culture that prevails in our culture. What is now available to youth to help them see that sports is a complex cultural discourse that solicits their allegiance in a number of ways? Won’t it help some young people to learn about the issues of gender, of material culture, of symbolic performance, that permeate athletics? While nearly all young people are told that they should participate in sports, they are hardly ever told anything about what sports are actually about. The exploration of questions of cultural identity, as they relate to sports, to music, to race, can create opportunities for the formation of strategic, mobile cultural identity while offering hermeneutic perspectives on the experience of youth in general. They also can help young people understand better who they are—surely a good thing.

In exploring the questions around this project, we have an opportunity to become more astute about the ways that the work of cultural agencies advances and hinders the development of cultural agency. Indeed, we’re trying to figure out right now whether the editorial model of the magazine should be a modified ‘zine

format that basically puts publication and methodological resources, as much as possible, directly into the hands of young people themselves. But we also have to have some faith in our own engagement with this work and our commitment to its long-term consequence and value.

In offering these reflections, I realize that I'm guided in my own work by some sort of "Hansel-and-Gretel" view of culture resources. In the story, Hansel and Gretel leave little pieces of bread along the trail in order to find their way back from the woods to a good place. As a young person, I think I felt that I was often picking up pieces of someone else's trail, finding clues and hints that someone else left behind for me. Whether looking through records at the local discount store, finding an interesting novel in the book rack of my hometown department store, or borrowing a biography of Einstein from the public library, I often had the sense that someone had placed these things in my path without really knowing why they were doing so but simply in the hope that someone else would come along and find a use for them. There was no cultural agency with program goals and strategies, only something to find and someone to find them and use them. And by finding these books and records, I gained access to the idea that there was this culture out there waiting for me to discover it and to participate in it. I hope that our agency can strew clues and hints along the path of people we do not yet know and that we can give them the sense that their agency is out there waiting for them as well.

Williams: Thank you, Chris, for your analysis and for your introduction of some very important concepts, not the least of which is that leaving a trail of bread crumbs to be discovered is a significant—if not always planned—set of activities that society can do for young people. Very seldom, as you said, are children invited to engage discursively. As I look at the institution of education, I think that is all too true, and it ties into the issue we were exploring with Fernando Delgado yesterday of how children today are not being taught that it is okay to explore the question of “why?”

So, what kind of an agency or institution is education? It has been around for a long time and has taken a lot of different forms. What is the history of education and the history of arts in education, and how do we capture something of that history? In the beginning, education differed widely from colony to colony. The Constitution of the United States, when we became the United States, did not address educational issues, so education came to be vested as a state function. This state function was locally controlled through the local school board.

Because the funding mechanism for public schools has been recognized in many states as being quite unequal from one community to the other due to economic and property valuation differences, there has been some effort recently to try to equalize education funding across communities within states that otherwise would have different capabilities. As that has happened, state legislatures have taken up the policy issue of accountability insofar as what education dollars should be spent for and how they might be accounted for, which, in turn, has had a profound impact on what the local school board is all about.

If we are taking a look at policy issues—and particularly cultural policy issues—and applying them in some fashion to education, we probably have two broad categories of issues. One is the politics that surrounds education, which includes who is going to be involved, who is going to decide, why they are going to be involved, why certain decisions are going to be made, and why certain decisions are not going to be addressed. The politics of the blueprint for education comes to mind as well, which includes the curriculum, what is going to be taught, what is going to be set out at what level, how that is going to be sequenced, how that is going to be connected, and how what is taught will be assessed.

Then there are the politics of rationale. What is the reason for including something in the curriculum—in the school? That might include one of the topics that we have addressed in this symposium, the value-added discussion—something is added into the curriculum or something is perpetuated in the curriculum—simply because it is presumed to add value. The conception of added value might be rather loose or amorphous, or it might be based on some serious philosophical underpinnings—some beliefs that young people need to encounter certain kinds of bread crumbs in a structured way so that they are able intellectually, through certain disciplines, to access other bread crumbs later on that might be more randomly placed.

If the endeavors of humankind over time amount to added value, we can say that one of the core areas of value added that should result from education or more particularly through arts education is self-expressive-

ness—the ability that one has to access communication to express one’s self and an ability to understand others who are communicating and expressing themselves to you. As Ernest Boyer profoundly articulated throughout his career, there is more than one expressive system. Oral language and written language are just one tradition; mathematical and scientific methods of communicating are another. Certainly, the arts individually and collectively are as legitimate in terms of self-expression as any of the other systems. The arts have their own syntax, their own tradition, their own history, and they enable us to impart information.

If not the essence of self-expressiveness, what is the value added by arts education to a general education? Is it expressive communication? Is it creativity? Or is it an issue of self-sufficiency? By that I mean, do we teach arts education in part because we want young people to become more self-sufficient? For example, I look at some stressful epochs in just our recent history—the Great Depression, World Wars I and II, the Vietnam War—certain times that perplex people and particularly young people. What is the role of the arts there for helping mediate an understanding of what is going on around us in contemporary civilization? Are the arts a necessary part of mental health in a societal sense? The answer, at least to me, is “absolutely.”

Education is a big field, and I do not in talking about agencies and culing the field of education as an suspect not, and that is an interest-omission because, when we talk education, we often are perplexed as do we engage superintendents? How do we engage boards of trustees? We really do not understand the politics of education. Education is a function of the state constitutionally, but it is very diffuse.

“Certainly, the arts individually and collectively are as legitimate in terms of self-expression as any of the other systems.”

know whether Christopher Zinn, tural work in Oregon, is includ-agency in the mix or not. I ing omission. It is a typical about arts and we talk about to how to engage educators. How

Indeed, the American School Board itself is a rather interesting political institution. It is non-partisan, presumably—at least in the West. It makes decisions of profound sorts and it does so without creating legislative bills. It does not legislate in any way that accords to what we teach in American political science, so we do not understand the mechanism by which the American school board makes decisions. We do not understand the process. We may understand a little bit about *Roberts’ Rules of Order*, but that is nothing very profound. That is not the process of deciding, and, I submit to you that we are virtually aimless in how we understand processing critical decisions at the local level. We have very little understanding of how we engage various parties at the local level. Certainly, the teachers are not very engaged with the school board, except on a few issues such as class size and compensation. I think that we do ourselves as a society a rather large disservice when we as citizens do not create high expectations for our school districts at the local level. We fail as a society to create the expectation that, in fact, a duty of the school board is to include the arts in the curriculum, and it is not okay not to include the arts.

But we puzzle over other issues: Why do we want the arts included? What passes for the arts experience in school or for arts education? We recoil from the tough decisions that Lance touched on because we are afraid that, in the hands of the wrong people, we may be teaching ideology, and we cannot grapple with the

kinds of rather profound thinking that has been going on at this table. I come back to the fact that we avoid engaging the very people we are attempting to teach—we avoid engaging the young people about the arts and self-expressiveness. Yet, we have heard from several of you—Adelma Roach, Chip Walton, and others—that it is very possible to do so. It is probably more possible to engage the students than the school board, given our limited understanding of how to engage school boards in the first place.

Finally—and on a somewhat different note—I would suggest that another challenging problem that affects cultural policy as far as schools are concerned is the fundamental change in American education of who will run for the school board. Who will stand for election to engage in the process to make these decisions and to engage in the far-reaching debate about these kinds of questions? Will any of you consider doing so, whether you have children in the school district or not? Who among us will stand for election to the school board because education in our society is vested at the local level? What will be our standards? What will be our expectations?

I will conclude my comments by simply saying that, on the way to this symposium, I stopped in Minneapolis to change planes, and I read a rather interesting editorial in the *Minneapolis Star Tribune*. Minnesota's eighth graders and juniors were seen to be performing well in science in comparison to international standards, and the editorial question was “why?” The answer, the editorial said, lies largely in the teaching. Well before the current standards movement, local science educators in Minnesota organized to set a statewide curriculum and teaching strategy, and they had the wisdom to stick with their plan over time. The teachers have high expectations both of themselves and of their students. Their lesson plans were found to be focused and rigorous; educators agreed about what, when, and how to teach; the curriculum and instructional approaches were consistent; and the teachers were well qualified.

On the other hand, math instruction in Minnesota was not seen to be nearly as effective, and it was subsumed under the guise of a curriculum that is “a mile wide and an inch deep.” I think that what passes for art curriculum in all too many cases is even worse than that. In the teaching of music, for example, we subscribe to some sort of gladiator syndrome where we send our best and our brightest into marching band, put them in uniforms, send them to the Orange Bowl, and believe that this represents community art. God help us if that is the case.

Zinn: I want to clarify a couple of things. In answer to your question, Larry, we actually work a great deal with teachers and students. The historical preservation committees are nimble and adroit by comparison with the Department of Education, if you get my drift. It is really hard working with them, so we go directly to the teachers and the schools. You helped clarify for me the premise of my talk—that “a whaling ship was my Harvard and my Yale College.” Kids learn outside of the classroom and that learning, too, can be addressed by our resources and by our office as much as it is through the classroom.

Williams: My fear is that we have all but abandoned in America what happens during the six hours of school in favor of what we can do outside of those six hours.

Hodsoll: That is quite a commentary on schools.

Larry Williams: I mean it to be a commentary on our society.

Hodsoll: All right, so it is both.

Cisler: As a former young adult, I think magazines can really effectively serve young people, especially those ages 10 to 17. The format has changed now, of course, given the Web. When WESTAF invited me to this seminar, I knew zip about cultural policy, but after the readings and looking at Web sites and talking to some artists, I had a little bit better idea. And then I thought back on my previous experience. I realize that, during the growth of the Internet in the past 10 years, one of the enduring themes from 1992 (when I wrote a piece called “Protection on the Internet”) to my dealings with indigenous groups and policy writers in Singapore and Latin America, was that the anxieties over the introduction of the Internet and all it meant were really related to cultural policy. We can find all sorts of quotes ranging from the premiere of China talking about closing the window before the flies come in to the head of the large bibliographic facility in the U. S. who asked why we should connect a fresh water supply to a sewage supply, referring to his proprietary network and the Internet. These metaphors of infestation and pollution have come up a lot.

When the Asian flu hit the Tiger States in Asia, one of the solutions taken by Malaysia was the establishment of a currency board to control volatile flow of outside currencies, and Argentina did something similar. During the bombing of Kosovo and Serbia, a friend of mine posted a satirical column on an avant-garde mailing list for European artists establishing a call for a cultural board—not a currency board—for Bulgaria, and some people took this quite seriously, and there was a discussion about what this might mean. In the debate between two of the presidential candidates this week, Vice President Gore referred to *cultural pollution* in America, which prompts us to think about the metaphors we use when we talk about culture. It also raises questions about the financial instruments now being introduced into the environmental movement such as pollution credits and how those might be transferred over to cultural policy.

Coffman: The starting point for me is a cry from people to be treated whole or a cry from young people to be treated whole. An idea that unifies many of us if we think in terms of transforming education is to look at schools as school homes. Sports is perhaps the most widely accepted model as a mechanism for keeping the school doors open, with the swimming pool opening at 5:30 in the morning and the gymnasium closing at 10:30 at night, but the glass-blowing shed and ceramics studio could stay open, too. I think if we can treat kids as whole, we can make our schools into school homes or community schools. The arts, then, I think would much more easily flow as a part of their lives. Kids want to do art and play music and dance to the music and talk about what they danced about. It is not just art; it is everything. My feeling is that getting centered in a school transformation is almost like the root approach—a radical approach—to transforming arts education as part of something that’s alive with powerful trends in our society.

Ybarra-Frausto: Chris, I want to respond to your question about how culture aids cultural agencies. In terms of this text of America to which you were alluding, I would recommend that we expand the archive—

expand the knowledge, the embodied knowledge system, the image bank. The archive of those to whom we allude for ideas has been very U.S. centric in a global world. Very few of us have brought in scholars and thinkers from Asia or from Latin America, even though we know that these are the cultures that are seeping in. I want to commend Tom Coffman because he brought us a list of writings and writers and thinkers from Hawai'i. This list is part of the embodied knowledge systems of the Japanese and the Native community. When do they know the culture that they have? One way is to broaden the dialogue from the archiving, embodied knowledge system and the image bank from which we draw.

Griffith: I would like to bring up an example that refers to what you are talking about. Have any of you been to the Experience Music Project in Seattle? The designers have made a brilliant foray into a new way of presenting culture. The museum is not only about presenting the object, it is also about presenting the history of the object from many different perspectives and through many different media. From that standpoint, it is an amazing thing and a really smart way for people to start looking at the possibilities of museum education and how the museum can function.

Tucker: The bread-crumble analogy standing of culture has to be about Experience Music Project has this, going to be interesting to watch partnership that you've developed, the things that you are doing. I am cultural organizations as you work to broaden our understanding of who

“There are competing interests, and particular cultural strains of peoples and communities exist that some want to fuse and others to preserve. Again, balance is needed.”

reminds me again that our understand both process and product. The and there are many things that are about that. I commend you for the and I am envious in some ways of anticipate some challenges for the together, but, again, we are asked we are.

Hodsoll: My task at this time is to provide some summary comments about what we have heard here. On the political side, what I heard was something that underlies everything. Before we dealt with legislatures, executive branches, and democratic institutions in general, we noted a tension between the general and the particular in culture. That same tension is in our Constitution as a nation. There was a great deal of attention given by our founders to the issue of the tyranny of the majority and the protected rights in the Bill of Rights. Basically, one has to have a balance, and you are going to hear me use this word over and over again because, in human relations, I think everything is a matter of balance. There are competing interests, and particular cultural strains of peoples and communities exist that some want to fuse and others to preserve. Again, balance is needed. Somebody said that the melting pot was a failure. I think that is too stark. The melting pot here and in other countries has its strengths and its weaknesses, and it works in some areas and leaves out the minorities in other areas. We talked under this same theme about Hawai'i and Puerto Rico and communities within the more general parts of the United States, and it seems to me that they are all part of the same issue.

Turning now to cultural politics, I think that Michael Dorf presented a very good overview of how Congress works. I would just add one comment in response to his argument that the West is linked to land and water to a greater degree than other regions. Culturally, the West is becoming more like the South and the North;

all parts of the country are becoming more and more similar. As a result, the arguments over land and water in the West have more to do with the tension between the newcomers (a majority), who want to preserve land but have no interest in preserving traditional uses, and the old timers (a minority), who want to preserve the land and the traditional uses.

Alliances across party lines were discussed by Christopher Zinn. You will find in culture unusual or odd alliances that are not true in other places. John Kreidler and Michael Dorf talked about the NEA becoming more symbolic in terms of its assistance to the arts. I think that could change, and I raise the question of how you would want it to change.

Tomás Ybarra-Frausto talked about culture as a non-renewable resource, which means it has to be preserved. Chris Zinn and others talked about how local dollars are not enough in most cases to sustain a vibrant community. I think the evidence is mixed on that. Tom Coffman, who has been involved with PBS, the Public Broadcasting System, talked about the tension between conservatives and liberals. I would note that conservatives tend to view the new PBS as a shadow of its former self. They would rather return to the old PBS, which had practically no ratings at all and, in that sense, the conservatives reject the marketplace of the not-for-profit arena.

Fred Nahwooksy talked about having better data, and I agree with that. Steve Cisler talked about the new pipes of the new technology and who controls them and the impact that is going to have. Lance Izumi complicated the traditional conservative perspective on the arts. Fernando Delgado talked about the complications of notions of cultures, whether from the left or the right. Tom Coffman talked about the cultures of marginalized groups and how they might be conservative. Vjeron Katunarić talked about the options for a national policy in which citizens would be allowed to develop a cultural policy for themselves.

Christopher Zinn made a good point about how sports, like the arts, have cultural components and how we need to define these and understand them better. Larry Williams talked about the politics of education and the realities of school boards, and he said something that astonished me—that the teachers are not involved in the school boards. I assumed that they were. In any event, that is what I got out of the political discussion.

I would suggest, before turning to technology, that it is important for people in this room, when they go back to their respective communities, to take these pieces—particularly the issue of balance—and try to identify the key decision leaders in the private as well as the public sector to see how those balances can be made more equitable across the board, whether for the particular or the general.

On the subject of technology, Nathan Griffith talked about the Web, which really only has been in existence for most people for eight years. Steve Cisler talked about the issues of piracy and the differences between writers and publishers on the one hand and music on the other hand. We also talked about how we are spoiled by the expectations of technology. Technology does not answer everything by any means, but it is, without question, a new tool. Tomás Ybarra-Frausto talked eloquently about the need for multiple reper-

toires, which brings us back to the politics of keeping the pipelines open to more than the conglomerates who control them. John Kreidler talked about his game of the Silicon Valley model, and I will say that I thought that the amount of work and thought that has gone into the game is extraordinary. It will help people gain a better understanding of the ingredients of cultural development. I would note that Silicon Valley is just one example of suburbs. Most Americans live in suburbs, and most of those who do not would like to. So what one does about suburbs culturally is a major issue.

Finally, Colleen Jennings-Roggensack, in her summary, which in some ways was more thorough than mine on technology, talked about a variety of things. She talked about long-term investment and differences between those who understand technology and those who do not. That has always been there. I actually know one person who does not like pianos—he would rather go back to the harpsichord. Colleen also talked about places and the meaning of places. Chip Walton said he wasn't sure that physical places were that important, and he noted the difference between physical places and communities. I do not know whether he meant it quite that way, but there is again a balance between the communities that you can access through electronic technologies and what happens in a place. Both are liberating and both are constraining, so, again, that balance exists.

BIOGRAPHIES OF THE PARTICIPANTS

PRESENTERS**Tom Coffman**

Tom Coffman is a full-time writer and documentary producer. He earned his bachelor's degree in journalism from the University of Kansas and began work as a reporter with the *Honolulu Advertiser* and then moved to the *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, where he wrote about government and politics. His exposure to the social and political turmoil of the time prompted him to write *Catch a Wave: A Case Study of Hawai'i's New Politics* in 1972. Coffman left the newspaper in 1973 to expand his career as a writer and a producer. He worked with Hawaiian activist Walter Ritte, Jr. and later with Hawaiian writer John Dominis Holt as he began to integrate material concerning the development of Hawai'i into his work. This led to the television documentaries *O Hawai'i: From Settlement to Kingdom* (1995) and *Nation Within: America's Annexation of Hawai'i* (1998). The latter coincided with the writing of the book *Nation Within*, which reflects Coffman's growing concern for reinterpreting Hawai'i's history as national and global history, and it was aired on over 70 PBS stations nationwide in 1999.

Coffman recently completed a documentary *May Earth Live: A Journey Through the Hawaiian Forest*, which will be aired on PBS in the near future. He has started a new documentary project titled *Look Homeward: The Korean American Struggle for Home and Homeland*. His work has won awards for the production of video, film, interactive media, and multi-image. *Ganbare* (1994), about the early wartime experiences of Japanese Americans, was chosen the best film by a Hawai'i filmmaker in the 1995 Hawai'i International Film Festival, and *Nation Within* received the Hawai'i Publishers' Award for Non-Fiction in 1999. Coffman received the Hawai'i Award for Literature in May, 2000.

Fernando Delgado

Fernando Delgado is an Associate Professor of Communication Studies at Arizona State University—West. He currently serves as Associate Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Academic Programs. In his role as a faculty member, Delgado has taught an array of courses, most of which have centered on cultural studies and the mass media. He also has worked in the areas of curriculum and program development and has served as a community resource on issues of cultural diversity and multiculturalism. Professionally, he is active in the National Communication Association and has served as an editorial board member or *ad hoc* reviewer for many publishers and academic journals.

Delgado's research has centered on the articulation of Latino identities through popular culture sites. His work on sports, music, film, television, and literature is published in various communication, sociology, and popular culture journals. Delgado has a bachelor's degree in political science from San Jose State University and earned his master's and doctoral degrees in communication studies at the University of Iowa.

Michael Dorf

Michael Dorf, a partner in the Chicago law firm of Adducci, Dorf, Lehner, Mitchell and Blankenship is a nationally recognized authority on political strategy and cultural planning at the national and local levels. Dorf served for six years as Special Counsel to United States Representative Sidney R. Yates. In this position, he helped develop national policies on arts funding and became an expert on the federal legislative and political process. He returned to Chicago at the request of the administration of Mayor Harold Washington to create Chicago's first cultural plan. In 1990, he served as Legal Affairs Consultant to the President's Independent Commission on the National Endowment for the Arts and as General Counsel to the Democratic Party of Illinois from 1993 to 1997. His writings on public funding for the arts have appeared in many publications, including *The Brookings Review* and *The Washington Post*.

Dorf is a Distinguished Lecturer in Arts Administration at the School of the Art Institute of Chicago, where he teaches courses such as Law, Politics, and the Arts and Street Law for the Artist. He also serves as a consultant to the Washington-based firm of Michael Sheehan and Associates in the area of political and communications strategies. He is currently collaborating on a musical theatre work concerning the life of Charles T. Yerkes, the traction magnate who built much of the Chicago elevated system and the London underground in the 1890s. Dorf is a graduate of the University of Chicago and the Law School of Columbia University.

Nathan Griffith

Nathan Griffith is an art specialist for the Information Processing Department and member of the Art Group of Corbis Corporation of Bellevue, Washington. Corbis, founded in 1989, is the leading provider of online photography and fine art on the Internet. Home to 65 million images, with more than 2.1 million available online, the Corbis collection includes content from the Bettmann collection, a renowned image library that ranges from prehistoric cave paintings to contemporary photojournalism. It also contains the largest historical and news photo collection in the world. Corbis has a variety of other image collections and services available, including the Corbis Royalty Free Collection, Corbis Commercial, Corbis Celebrity, and Corbis Sygma. Corbis also offers high-quality photographic prints from its collection and has launched the first authorized Ansel Adams Web site and store.

As a member of the information-processing team, Griffith constructs and reviews metadata attached to images from the visual arts collection within the larger Corbis archive. In his role as a member of the art group, he engages in all aspects of fine-art archive management, including quality assurance, acquisition, marketing, sales, and promotion of the collection. Prior to his arrival at Corbis, Griffith held academic posts at the University of Idaho, Washington State University, and the University of Michigan. In addition to teaching modern and Asian art, he taught a number of special seminars addressing the relationships among art, the body, and technology. Griffith earned his B. A. and M. A. degrees from the University of Oregon and his Ph.D. from the University of Michigan.

Eric Hayashi

Eric Hayashi is the Line Producer for *Forgotten Valor*, a short feature film by Lane Nishikawa that is scheduled for release in 2001. This motion picture tells the true-life story of the recent Congressional Medal of Honor awards to the Japanese-American soldiers fighting in Europe in World War II. The film is one of the first to be shot in the digital high-definition format with the new Panavision 24FP camera.

Hayashi served as the Executive Director of the Japanese American Cultural and Community Center in Los Angeles from October, 1999, through December, 2000. Prior to his last appointment, he served in three concurrent positions at California State University at Monterey Bay—Interim Director of the Institute for Teledramatic Arts and Technology, Director of Digital Stage and Screen Productions, and Interim Director of the World Theater. The programs integrate the study of feature filmmaking, theater, and television as they converge in the digital domain.

Hayashi was the Executive Director of the Kansas Arts Commission from 1995 to 1998 and has been credited with successfully completing a major agency reorganization. Prior to 1995, Hayashi served as the Assistant Program Director for the Theater Program for the National Endowment for the Arts, where he actively engaged in the planning and execution of a comprehensive program for the advancement and support of non-profit professional theater organizations.

Hayashi also has extensive experience with the Asian-American Theater Company in San Francisco, California, serving during his tenure there as a founding member, Managing Director, Executive Director, and Artistic Director and Producer. Hayashi has served on the boards of the Mid-America Arts Alliance, the Kansas Film Commission, the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, and the Association of American Cultures. He presently serves as a member of the Multicultural Advisory Task Force of WESTAF.

Lance T. Izumi

Lance T. Izumi is 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 is also a Senior Partner with the Capitol Group, a Sacramento research and speech-writing firm whose clients have included Governor George Deukmejian, Governor Pete Wilson, and California Attorney General Dan Lungren. Previously, Izumi served as Chief Speechwriter and Director of Writing and Research for Governor George Deukmejian and in the Reagan administration as Speechwriter to United States Attorney General Edwin Meese III. Izumi received his master's degree in political science from the University of California at Davis and his J. D. degree from the University of Southern California Law Center.

Prior to assuming his current positions, Izumi served as Director of the Claremont Institute's Golden State Center for Policy Studies. He also has served as a consultant on welfare reform to the State Department of Social Services and as a consultant on juvenile crime to the Governor's Office of Criminal Justice Planning. His articles have appeared in a number of publications, including the *Sacramento Union*, the *National Review*, the *Los Angeles Times*, the *San Francisco Chronicle*, the *Orange County Register*, and the *Los Angeles Daily News*. Izumi is a regular contributor to the "Perspectives" opinion series on National Public Radio.

Vjeran Katunarić

Vjeran Katunarić is Professor of Sociology at the University of Zagreb in Croatia, where his primary areas of research and teaching are ethnic relations, multiculturalism, and culture and development. A prolific writer, Katunarić has published more than 100 articles in five languages. A selected list of his authored or edited book credits include *The Socioeconomic Position of Migrant Workers in Receiving Countries*, *Women's Eros and the Civilization of Death*, *The Fragmentation of Society*, *Multicultural Reality and Perspectives in Croatia*, and *Cultural Policy in Croatia*.

Katunarić also has served in a number of administrative positions, including President of the Society for Intercultural Education, Vice President of the Society for Cooperation Between Members of Different Cultures of the Council of Europe, and Director of the project "Cultural Policy of the Republic of Croatia: National Report." He currently serves as Director of the project "Strategy of Cultural Development: Croatia in the 21st Century." His work has been supported by grants from UNESCO, the Japan Foundation, the University of Uppsala, and the University of Umea in Sweden. Active in international conferences, Katunarić has participated in academic and administrative forums in more than 50 countries, including France, Great Britain, Germany, Italy, Turkey, Ukraine, Switzerland, and the United States.

John Kreidler

John Kreidler received a bachelor's degree in political science and a master's degree in public administration from the University of California at Berkeley. His master's thesis, which dealt with the artists' employment programs of the Works Progress Administration in the mid-1930s, was the inspiration for his later work on issues of cultural diversity and artist employment in contemporary American society. From 1969 to 1973, Kreidler worked for the U.S. Office of Management and Budget, where he was responsible for a portfolio of federal programs involving youth employment and occupational health. After a year at the arts-administration program of the University of California at Los Angeles, Kreidler became Director of the Alameda County Neighborhood Arts Program and was active in a national movement to employ artists using federal Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA) funds.

From 1977 to 1979, Kreidler was the Director of Administration for the San Francisco Art Institute. He served as the Senior Program Executive for Arts and Humanities at the San Francisco Foundation from 1979 to 1999, where he administered a grant program of \$2.1 million that supported the advancement of more than 120 cultural organizations with an emphasis on multicultural groups, dance, literature, and the visual arts. He currently holds the position of Executive Director of Cultural Initiatives Silicon Valley.

Adelma Roach

Adelma Aurora Roach is an anthropologist, educator, arts education researcher, and community arts leader. From 1997 to 1999, Roach served as a Field Scholar at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. With Shirley Brice Heath and a team of anthropologists, artists, and educators, Roach focused her research at Stanford University and the Carnegie Foundation on the learning of young people in arts-based community organizations. Roach studies the creative activities and interactions of youth, both during their time outside of school as well as in school-based arts programs. She focuses on the talents and capaci-

ties of young people as resources and resourceful participants in their communities rather than addressing them as *at-risk*.

Roach currently serves as a consultant on programs relating to young people and the arts. She is also the coordinator for ALIANZA: The Arts Learning Network of Santa Fe. In this capacity, she works with youth, schools, artists, arts organizations, museums, foundations, and arts councils to develop distributed networks of communication and support for young people's learning in the arts.

Christopher Zinn

Christopher Zinn is the Executive Director of the Oregon Council for the Humanities and teaches cultural history at the Oregon College of Art and Craft. He also has taught Humanities and American Studies at Reed College in Portland and has co-chaired the American Studies program at Reed College. Since 1994, Zinn has served as an independent book critic for the *Oregonian*, writing reviews on works by Salman Rushdie, Peter Ackroyd, John Muir, and Thomas Pynchon, among others. He also has served as Co-Director of the Colloquium on Medicine and Humanities at the Oregon Health Sciences University. A former Fulbright Senior Lecturer in American Studies in Turkey, Zinn studied at Georgetown University and New York University, where he received his M. A. and Ph.D. degrees. Zinn is currently writing a book on Native American literature, *To Raise a Nation: Native American Literature in a Sovereign Culture*.

RESPONDENTS

Steve Cisler

Steve Cisler worked in libraries for 14 years before accepting a position at Apple Computer in 1988. There, he was a member of the Advanced Technology Group and ran the Apple Library of Tomorrow program, which provided equipment and software for innovative research and demonstration projects in libraries. Within the Advanced Technology Group, he was involved in national information policy and legislative issues affecting technology. Cisler served on the board of the Association for Community Networking, which was formed to assist local community networking advocates, and has lectured worldwide on the promise and cultural challenge of the Internet. He is the Conference Chair for INET 2001 in Stockholm, Sweden, and his conference, "Ties That Bind," an exploration of community computing projects, was an international success in 1994 and 1995. Cisler received the Library and Information Technology Association/Gaylord Award in 1993 and a Silver Award from the U.S. National Commission on Libraries and Information Science in 1996.

Cisler's current interests include the preservation and enhancement of cultures using the Internet and the establishment of public access sites for Internet access. Cisler now works as an advisor to Tachyon, Inc., a satellite Internet services carrier that is providing low-cost, high-bandwidth Internet access in global markets. Cisler earned a bachelor's degree in history and the literature of religion at Northwestern University and holds a master's degree in library science from the University of California, Berkeley.

Paul Fees

Paul Fees joined the Buffalo Bill Historical Center in Cody, Wyoming, as Curator of History in 1981. In 1986, he was elevated to his current position of Senior Curator. Fees received a bachelor's degree in history from Stanford University and earned his master's and doctoral degrees in American civilization from Brown University. He has been the lead curator for numerous significant exhibitions at the Buffalo Bill Historical Center, including "Heart Mountain Relocation Center: Both Sides of the Fence," "Women of the Wild West Shows," "Public Lands, Public Heritage: The National Forest Idea," and "A Century of Plains Indian Portraits."

Fees has contributed his expertise to several Wyoming organizations. He has served as President of the Wyoming Council for the Humanities, as a member of the Wyoming State Historical Records Advisory Board, on the Museum of the Mountain Men Advisory Board, and on the Wyoming Community Foundation Advisory Board. In recognition of his service to the state, he received the Wyoming Humanities Award in 1992. Fees has authored, co-authored, and edited numerous publications concerning Wyoming and the Western region throughout his career and was honored with the Historical Award for publications from the Wyoming State Historical Society in 1996.

Fred Nahwooksy

Fred Nahwooksy is Executive Director of Atlatl, a national Native American arts organization headquartered in Phoenix, Arizona. Prior to assuming his position at Atlatl, Nahwooksy served as the Director of the Red Earth Festival in Oklahoma City and was Director of the Museum at the Institute of American Indian Arts in Santa Fe, New Mexico. Nahwooksy also has worked as the Cultural Center Planning Coordinator for the Oneida Nation of Wisconsin.

Nahwooksy's experience as a cultural consultant to Native American art projects is wide ranging. He was a Museum Program Specialist, working as Community Services Coordinator with the National Museum of the American Indian, Exhibitions Coordinator for the same institution, and Visual Information Specialist with the Smithsonian's Office of Folklife Programs. Nahwooksy has organized and evaluated numerous festivals, exhibits, and other presentations of Native American and other traditional arts. He has curated and co-curated several contemporary and traditional art exhibitions and has several publications to his credit. He holds a B. S. in government and politics from the University of Maryland and is a member of the Comanche Tribe of Oklahoma.

Kristin Tucker

Kristin Tucker has served as Executive Director of the Washington State Arts Commission since January, 1999. In that capacity, she has designed and completed an innovative statewide planning process based on the open-space technology technique. In her brief tenure at the agency, she has successfully broadened and deepened the Commission's relationship with both the state legislature and the governor's office, making new state funding available to arts efforts in Washington state.

Before moving to the state arts commission agency, Tucker served as the Executive Director of the Boise City Arts Commission for five years. At the city commission, she successfully expanded the scope and authority of the agency and greatly increased its operating budget. In addition to her work in arts administration, Tucker has worked as a freelance writer, contributing articles to magazines and newspapers and publishing children's books. Tucker holds a bachelor's degree from Oregon State University and has completed graduate work at Boise State University.

Chip Walton

Chip Walton is the founder of the Curious Theatre Company of Denver, established in 1997 to produce culturally provocative professional work. For the world premiere of Robert Lewis Vaughan's *Praying for Rain* in the spring of 2000, Walton focused his outreach efforts on at-risk youth, which included cooperative endeavors with SAFE (Sane Alternative to the Firearms Epidemic) and SHINE (Seeking Harmony in Neighborhoods Everywhere). More than 500 Denver youth attended a free performance of the show. Walton hopes to launch a similar outreach effort targeting African-American youth with Curious Theatre's upcoming production of *Fences*.

Walton's work on the regional premiere of Tony Kushner's *Angels in America Parts I and II* garnered a Denver Drama Critics Circle "Best Director" Award in 1997, and his direction on Edward Bond's *Saved* earned him a nomination for Best Director in 1996. Other directing credits include the regional premieres of *Abingdon Square*; *Execution of Justice*; *Aunt Dan and Lemon*; *Full Gallop*; *A Lie of the Mind*; and the Curious Theatre Company's regional premiere of Paula Vogel's Pulitzer prize-winning play *How I Learned To Drive* at the Acoma Center, which was nominated for five Denver Drama Critics Circle Awards and a BackStageWest Garland Honor for Direction.

Walton earned a bachelor of fine arts degree at Miami University in Ohio and completed graduate work at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and the University of Colorado at Boulder. He is currently completing his doctoral dissertation on the authoring of political theatre. In addition to serving as Artistic Director of Curious Theatre Company, Walton teaches acting and directing at the University of Denver and the University of Colorado at Denver.

Larry D. Williams

Larry Williams is the Chair of WESTAF. He has served on the WESTAF Board since 1989 and has completed two terms as Chair. Currently Superintendent of the Sioux City Community School District in Sioux City, Iowa, Williams' career is centered in the West. He previously served as Superintendent of Schools in Great Falls, Montana, and as Music Supervisor for the Boise Public Schools. While in Montana, he was appointed by the governor to chair the Montana Arts Council. In Idaho, he was appointed as a field representative to the Idaho Arts Commission.

Williams' experiences and service to the field are wide ranging. He served as a Supervisory Park Ranger in Glacier National Park for 10 summers, chaired the board of Columbus Hospital in Great Falls, and served on the President's Council of both the University of Montana and the University of Great Falls. He also

served as Vice Chair of the Benefis Health Care Board and as director of the Big Sky Chapter of the American Red Cross. He is currently a member of the National School Boards Association/Music Educators National Conference (MENC) Joint Music Education Task Force and was a previous director of MENC's Executive Board. Earlier in his career, Williams was a music teacher, and he continues to sing in community and professional choral groups. He received his bachelor's degree in music from Dartmouth College and his master's degree in music education from the University of Montana.

Kesler Woodward

Kesler Woodward is a professional artist who lives in Fairbanks, Alaska. He recently retired as Emeritus Professor of Art at the University of Alaska—Fairbanks, where he taught and served as Chair of the Art Department. Woodward received his B. A. degree in art from Davidson College in Davidson, North Carolina, and his M. F. A. degree in painting and printmaking from Idaho State University. An Alaska resident since 1977, he served as Curator of Visual Arts at the Alaska State Museum and as Artistic Director of the Visual Art Center of Alaska.

Woodward's solo exhibition credits include the University of Alaska Museum, the Alaska State Museum, and the Anchorage Museum of History and Art. In addition, his work has been shown at juried and invitational exhibitions in Brazil and Russia. Public, corporate, and private art collections on both coasts and all major public art collections in Alaska include Woodward's work in their permanent collections.

Tomás Ybarra-Frausto

Tomás Ybarra-Frausto is Associate Director of Creativity and Culture at the Rockefeller Foundation. His work in the position includes the Humanities Residency Fellowship Program, Museum Program, U.S. Mexico Fund for Culture, and La Red Latino Americana de Productores Culturales.

Prior to his work at the Rockefeller Foundation, Ybarra-Frausto was a tenured professor at Stanford University in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese. Over a long period of active involvement in the effort to foster the work of Mexican-American artists, he formed an archive documenting the development of Chicano art in the United States. As a leading historian and theorist in the field of Chicano Studies, he has written extensively on the subject and has been instrumental in defining the canons of Chicano art. He is the co-author with Shifra M. Goldman of *Arte Chicano: A Comprehensive Annotated Bibliography of Chicano Art, 1965-1981*. Ybarra-Frausto has served as Chair of the Board of the Mexican Museum in San Francisco and Chair of the Smithsonian Council. In 1999, Ybarra-Frausto was awarded the Henry Medal by the Smithsonian Institution.

CO-FACILITATORS

Frank Hodsoll

Frank Hodsoll was Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts from 1981 to 1989. He served as the First Deputy Director for Management of the U.S. Office of Management and Budget and Chief Financial Officer of the U.S. Government from 1989 through 1993. In 1997, he co-chaired the 92nd American Assembly, “The Arts and the Public Purpose,” with Alberta Arthurs. Before his work in the Reagan and Bush administrations, Hodsoll was a career foreign service officer, a lawyer, and the principal of a trading company in the Philippines. He has received numerous management and arts awards, including an Oscar for the Arts Endowment, an Emmy Special Award, and two honorary doctorates.

Hodsoll is currently a commissioner of Ouray County in Colorado, a consultant to government and private interests on federal management and policy, and a speaker and advisor on arts policy and arts education. He is a member of the Board of Directors for the Center for Arts and Culture.

Colleen Jennings-Roggensack

Colleen Jennings-Roggensack is the Executive Director of Arizona State University Public Events. In that capacity, she manages a wide array of performing-arts events presented on campus and also supervises the university’s sports and entertainment facilities. In 1994, Jennings-Roggensack was appointed by President Bill Clinton to serve on the National Council on the Arts, the advisory body to the National Endowment for the Arts. She continues service to the Endowment through Ambassadors for the Arts, a group of distinguished individuals who have served on the National Council.

Jennings-Roggensack is an advisor to the National Dance Project, the Japan Foundation, and Africa Exchange and is a board member for the Creative Capital Foundation. She is a former President of the Association of Performing Arts Presenters and has served on the board of the model state advocacy organization, Arizonans for Cultural Development. Jennings-Roggensack previously held positions at Dartmouth College and Colorado State University and was the Director of performing arts and professional development at WESTAF.

AUTHOR OF FOREWARD

Erin M. Trapp

Erin Trapp is Deputy Director for WESTAF. In this capacity, Trapp is responsible for strategic oversight of the information systems division of WESTAF, including the *ArtistsRegister.com* and *ArtJob.com* Web services, and the development of customized technology systems solutions for the Western states. Trapp also directs the activities of the policy and research development division, which includes customized economic impact studies, topical strategic planning for Western state arts agencies and a multi-year youth audience-development research project.

Prior to joining WESTAF, Trapp was responsible for business plan development for new products and services (online and traditional), market research, regional planning, and regional macro-economic analysis

for Merrill Lynch. Trapp also has served as a speechwriter for government and private sector officials. She holds a degree in Public Policy and History from Swarthmore College, and is a doctoral student at the University of Colorado.

ATTENDEES

John Coe, Executive Director, Wyoming Arts Council

Shelly Feist, Program Associate, The Pew Charitable Trusts

Fran Holden, Executive Director, Colorado Council on the Arts

Heidi Kubo, Executive Director, Hawaii Consortium for the Arts

Shana Meehan Chase, Government Affairs Director, Association of Performing Arts Presenters

Mary Ellen Williams, District Administrator, Scientific & Cultural Facilities District

BACKGROUND READINGS

These selections were provided to participants prior to the symposium:

“A New Republican Heartland.” *The Economist*. 9 Oct. 1999. Online. LEXIS-NEXIS.

Botti, Simona. “What Role for Marketing in the Arts? An Analysis of Arts Consumption and Artistic Value.” *International Journal of Arts Management* 2 (Spring, 2000): 14-27.

Broder, David. “Wyoming Struggles to Avoid ‘Brain-Drain.’” *The Idaho Statesman*. 6 Oct. 1999. Online. LEXIS-NEXIS.

Cisler, Steve. “The Internet and Indigenous Groups.” *Cultural Survival Quarterly*. Online. 1998. Available <http://www.cs.org/publications/CSQ/csqinternet.html>.

Coffman, Tom. “A False Spring.” In *Nation Within: The Story of America’s Annexation of the Nation of Hawai’i*. By Tom Coffman. Kaneohe, Hawaii: Tom Coffman/EPICenter, 1998, pp. 1-22.

Corbis. “About Corbis: The Place for Pictures on the Internet.” Online. 2000. Available <http://www.corbis.com>.

Cvjeticanin, Biserka, and Vjeran Katunaric. “Transition: Myth and Reality.” In *Cultural Policy in Croatia: National Report*. Ed. Biserka Cvjeticanin and Vjeran Katunaric. Strasbourg, France: Council for Cultural Co-operation, 1999, pp. 3-8.

DiMaggio, Paul. “Social Structure, Institutions, and Cultural Goods: The Case of the United States.” In *The Politics of Culture*. Ed. Gigi Bradford. New York: The New Press, 2000, pp. 38-62.

Donaghy, Keola. “Olelo Hawai’i: A Rich Oral History, a Bright Digital Future.” *Cultural Survival Quarterly*. Online. 1998. Available <http://www.cs.org/publications/CSQ/csqinternet.html>.

Frey, William. “Multiple Melting Pots.” *World and I*. 1 May 2000.

Heath, Shirley Brice, with Elisabeth Soep and Adelma Roach. “Living the Arts Through Language+Learning: A Report on Community-Based Youth Organizations.” *Americans for the Arts Monographs* 2 (November 1998): 1-18.

hooks, bell. “Censorship From Left to Right.” In *Outlaw Culture: Resisting Representations*. By bell hooks. New York: Routledge, 1994, pp. 63-72.

Johnson, Paul. “Toward Recovery.” *National Review* (24 Jan. 2000): 37-41.

Kaplan, Robert D. “Like Tehran and São Paulo.” In *An Empire Wilderness: Travels Into America’s Future*. By Robert D. Kaplan. New York: Random House, 1998, pp. 79-90.

Kimball, Roger. “The Elephant in the Gallery or the Lessons of ‘Sensation.’” *The New Criterion*. November 1999. Online. Available <http://www.newcriterion.com/archive/18/nov99/sensation.htm>.

- Kreidler, John. "Cultural Initiatives Silicon Valley: Simulating the Interface Between Culture and the New Economy." San Jose, CA: Cultural Initiatives, 2000.
- Limerick, Patricia Nelson. "Layer Upon Layer of Memory in the American West." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. (3 March 2000) Online. Available <http://chronicle.merit.edu/chronicle/v46/4626guide.htm>.
- Mitchell, Susan. *Generation X: The Young Adult Market* 2nd ed. Ithaca, NY: New Strategist, 1999.
- National Association of Artists' Organizations. "A Gathering of Artists and Arts Professionals Thirty Years of Age and Under." *NAAO Bulletin*. (Summer,1997), pp. 12-16.
- Polly, Jean Armour. "Standing Stones in Cyberspace: The Oneida Indian Nation's Territory on the Web." *Cultural Survival Quarterly*. Online. 1998. Available <http://www.cs.org/publications/CSQ/csqinternet.html>.
- Purdum, Todd S. "Shift in the Mix Alters the Face of California." *The New York Times*. 4 July 2000. Online. LEXIS-NEXIS.
- Rao, Nina. "East Meets New West: The Burgeoning Indian Population Not Only Fills High-Tech Denver Jobs, It Also Creates a Sense of Community." *The Denver Post*. 16 July 2000. Online. LEXIS-NEXIS.
- Ray, William. "The Ideology of 'Culture.'" *Oregon Humanities* (Fall 1999): 4-11.
- Shapiro, Carl. "Will E-Commerce Erode Liberty?" *Harvard Business Review* vol. 78, no. 3 (May-June 2000): 189-194, 198-99.
- Siegfried, Susan L. "The Policy Landscape." In *The Politics of Culture*. Ed. Gigi Bradford. New York: The New Press, 2000, pp. 327-37.
- Smith, J. Walker, and Ann Clurman. *Rocking the Ages: The Yankelovich Report on Generational Marketing*. New York: HarperBusiness, 1997.
- "The Pew's Five Year Plan for Bureaucratizing the Arts." *The New Criterion*. September 1999. Online. Available <http://www.newcriterion.com>.