STATE ARTS COUNCIL THEATER PROJECTS: AN ASPECT OF AMERICA'S PLURALISTIC CULTURAL POLICY

Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
JOEL ALAN PLOTKIN

1971

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

STATE ARTS COUNCIL THEATER PROJECTS:
AN ASPECT OF AMERICA'S PLURALISTIC
CULTURAL POLICY

presented by

Joel Alan Plotkin

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Theatre

Major professor

Date November, 1971

O-7639

R33

Q 144

ABSTRACT

STATE ARTS COUNCIL THEATER PROJECTS:
AN ASPECT OF AMERICA'S PLURALISTIC
CULTURAL POLICY

By

Joel Alan Plotkin

Between 1960 and 1970, approximately 1,000 grants were given by state arts councils for projects involving or including theater, representing a cash outlay of approximately $4 million. The money was provided by state and federal government agencies under the newest phase of government aid for the arts, a patronage which recognizes the necessity of a multi-level effort to assist artists and arts organizations. The state and federal funds are minor in comparison to all forms of private contributions from individuals, foundations, and corporations; however, the selectivity of grants by the National Endowment for the Arts and the state arts councils often have broad impact, despite the paucity of funds allocated. The typically small budgets of the arts agencies do not permit continuing or substantial subsidy to arts organizations. The governmental fund sources are meant to supplement existing patronage and explore, through research and pilot programs, new ways by which the arts can become a

more accepted part of American society for a larger number of people.

In addition to an exploration of other aspects of America's pluralistic cultural policy, i.e., a history of federal patronage and discussion of the programs, including theater, of the National Endowment for the Arts, the study includes analysis and tabulation of all state arts council theater grants during the four years from 1966 to 1970. Data for this study consisted of examination of Final Evaluation Reports filed by the state agencies with the National Endowment, supplemented by study of annual reports of the state arts councils. Theater grants were classified according to type of project and cross-referenced as to sector of theater, e.g., professional resident theater, college or university theater, etc.

Verification of the fact that state arts councils devote a large share of their attention to amateur theater (community, college or university, and amateur children's theater) was one of the most significant findings of this study. The state agencies gave a greater percentage of their grants to amateur theater than did either the National Endowment or the major foundations. This indicates that the state agencies constitute a significant source of patronage for amateur theater, moreover, they are the only funding source whose concern is principally for amateur theater.

Distinct regional patterns were shown to exist between the arts council grants of five areas of the United States; differences appear when the date is tabulated according to size of arts council budget, as well. The percentage of grants to professional theater companies increases significantly as a council's program budget increases. The typical grant to a professional company is monetarily larger than one to an amateur company. Since the total appropriated to state arts councils has increased steadily since 1966, the implications of this finding are important to amateur theater companies desirous of state grants.

Community theaters, the sector receiving the most state arts council grants, utilized the funds principally for general program support and technical assistance. Professional theater companies were most often sponsored for young audience and general public touring performances, as were educational theater groups. Other findings in regard to audience development programs, educational workshops, and children's theater programs are noted.

The author recommends that national professional organizations take note of the continuing growth in state arts council projects and devote a share of their attention to evolving guidelines and evaluation procedures for this new source of funding for theater.

STATE ARTS COUNCIL THEATER PROJECTS: AN ASPECT OF AMERICA'S PLURALISTIC CULTURAL POLICY

By

Joel Alan Plotkin

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Theatre

1971

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank David Sennema and Joanne Pearlstein of the Office of State and Community Operations of the National Endowment for the Arts for their invaluable assistance, advice and kindness. Ray Scott, Gary Schaub and Helen Hastings of the Michigan Council for the Arts provided an invaluable introduction to the workings of one state arts council. Ken Dewey and Meyer Braiterman of the New York State Council for the Arts helped in deciphering the programs of the largest and most exciting of America's arts councils. Finally, thanks to Joseph Golden, Executive Director of the Cultural Resources Council of Syracuse and Onandaga County, New York for awakening my initial interest in arts administration.

The encouragement and support provided by my wife and child were the subsidy by which this study was accomplished.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

Between 1960 and 1970, approximately 1,000 grants were given by state arts councils for projects completely involving, or including theater. The nature of those projects is the subject of the present study. An attempt has been made to classify and analyze the data in order to provide theater artists and administrators, as well as state and community arts council personnel, with a descriptive breakdown of the projects based on the complete population, rather than any sample. It is hoped that knowledge of some of the characteristics of the funded projects will provide a foundation for further analysis and study, and should provide inspiration and information to those involved in planning or implementing future programs.

This study is one of the first comprehensive descriptions of an aspect of arts council activity; it is being written at a time when this field of public administration is in a phase of expansion and exploration. Background and descriptive information, therefore, occupies a prominent place in this study. At the present time few state arts councils have been in operation for more than five years. It is the author's hope that the material summarized here will be of value as the arts councils begin to stabilize

and mature and as funding becomes consistent and adequate.

The United States, in 1971, is in the midst of a major experiment in public administration of cultural policy. Breaking sharply from a past tradition of strict non-interference with the arts, the federal government through Congressional action and with Executive encouragement and approval, has begun to increase its activity with respect to the arts and artists within the country, and as representatives of American society abroad. The view that culture is not the proper business of government is still heard in Congress as appropriations come up for approval, but the attitudes of many former opponents of federal aid to the arts are changing, as evidenced by the lessened opposition to culturally-oriented legislation.[1]

It is within the context of this newly emerging relationship between government and the arts that the state council projects must be viewed. Although a consistent, but hardly enthusiastic, historical precedent exists for the present phase of activity, the arts councils, at the local, state, and federal levels are considered a new direction in the nation's history. Consequently, mistakes are being made, avenues of activity essayed, then abandoned, while planning and evaluation often take place concurrent, rather than prior

---

[1]See, for example, the Congressional Record for June 30, 1970, when the House of Representatives approved a $40 million authorization for the National Foundation of the Arts and Humanities.

to a project's operation. Government arts administration is an improvisatory venture, with few valid historic guidelines and only general lessons to be learned from other nations, many of whom have extensive traditions of national patronage and smoothly-functioning machinery to implement that subsidy. Part of the author's intention in undertaking this study is an understanding of the similarities and differences between policies and programs of state and federal arts agencies, as interpreted through the dimensions of their programs in theater.

A definition of the term "cultural policy" prepared by national representatives at a Round-Table Meeting on Cultural Policies held by UNESCO in Monaco will stand as a good starting point for the present study.

> . . . cultural policy should be taken to mean the sum total of the conscious and deliberate usages, action or lack of action in a society, aimed at meeting certain cultural needs through the utilization of all the physical and human resources available to that society at a given time; that certain criteria should be defined, and that culture should be linked to the fulfilment of personality and to economic and social development.[2]

An official cultural policy had been viewed as anathema in the United States for most of the country's history. The formula by which the newest phase of federal support for the arts was undertaken emphasizes a pluralistic approach to arts patronage--a combination of federal, state, municipal,

---

[2]Quoted in Charles Mark's contribution to the symposium, A Study of Cultural Policy in the United States, UNESCO Studies and Documents on Cultural Policy, No. 2 (Paris: UNESCO, 1969), p. 9 (hereinafter referred to as Cultural Policy).

and private efforts to overcome the financial crisis of arts institutions outlined in a number of studies published during the 1960's.[3] The cautious and modest investments of the federal and state legislatures in the newly-established machinery can be seen as indications of residual suspicion among elected representatives of extensive involvement with the arts. The steady rise in state and federal appropriations since the inception of government involvement in 1960 may be due to the success of the arts agencies' participation in a broadly-based effort to re-define the role of the arts in American daily life.

The growing involvement of government agencies in cultural policy is a symptom of increased public concern for the arts, not a cause of such concern (although once established, the National Council on the Arts assumed a leadership role in publicizing the plight of arts institutions). Repeated attempts had been made since the Depression to form Bureaus of Fine Arts, Cabinet-level Departments of the Arts, or similar agencies, but not until 1964 did Congress accede to the few strong supporters of the arts within its ranks. The political reasons for the passage of legislation creating

---

[3]The most important of these are: Rockefeller Panel Report, The Performing Arts: Problems and Prospects (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965); William Baumol and William Bowen, Performing Arts: The Economic Dilemma (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1966) (hereinafter referred to as Performing Arts); and America's Museums: The Belmont Report (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Museums, 1968).

the National Council on the Arts are beyond the scope of this study, but the climate of concern for the arts, indicated by increased discussion in popular and limited-audience periodicals, can be viewed as one of the factors favoring acceptance of the first hesitant steps toward establishment of a permanent federal agency for the arts.

The term "cultural explosion" was used frequently to describe what seemed to many observers to be a dramatic increase of interest by the American public in the arts, as shown through sales of paperback books, long-playing records, and tickets to concerts, plays, dance recitals, and theater. Although the "cultural explosion" phenomenon was treated harshly by some commentators,[4] it is significant to note that 173 arts centers and theaters were completed in the United States between 1962 and 1969, with another 179 in construction or serious planning stages,[5] an unparalleled occurrence.

The publication of the Rockefeller Panel Report and Twentieth Century Fund studies verified the warnings of arts administrators and lent documentary proof of the economic

---

[4]Notably Alan Levy, The Culture Vultures (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1968). See also Harold C. Schonberg, "How Cultural Is the Cultural Explosion?" McCall's, LVI, July, 1969. For a more balanced view, see Baumol and Bowen, Performing Arts, pp. 35-69.

[5]Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on Performing Arts Centers, Bricks, Mortar and the Performing Arts (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1970), p. 1.

instability of most performance arts[6] organizations, projecting an ever-increasing gap between income and expenditure.

A considerable number of dramatic and well-publicized grants by the Ford Foundation throughout the decade contributed to public awareness of the crisis in the performance arts before the publication of the two detailed studies. Over $60 million was distributed to various sectors of the arts between 1957 and 1964; a grant of $85 million to aid symphony orchestras, announced in 1965, capped the Foundation's efforts in this area.[7]

The Ford Foundation grants and the other foundation-sponsored studies are mentioned as indications of the public climate in which the federal arts programs came into being. It is safe to say that the creation of a government agency concerned with the arts was an outgrowth of that climate. As such, the national arts council was only one of a number of ventures initiated during this period to aid the arts. It is important to view the federal involvement as only one aspect of the new phase of support for arts activities. Only when seen in this context does the program of

---

[6]Baumol and Bowen, in a brief footnote at the beginning of their massive study, register a protest against the "barbaric phrase"--the performing arts (p. xi). The above is offered as a substitute, less flowing than its predecessor, but more appropriate.

[7]Baumol and Bowen, Performing Arts, pp. 343, 542-47.

federal grants to state arts councils take on the importance with which it should be viewed.

Charles Mark, discussing the cultural policy of the United States, writes:

> . . . by refusing the central government the right to set policy, the states and private sectors are forced to adopt concepts suitable to their aims, resulting in a pluralistic approach. Diversity in cultural policy is one of the touchstones of the United States position. The states, cities, private groups, and individuals are free to develop separate and unique positions independent of Washington. Once developed, these attitudes cannot be officially encouraged or discouraged by any other sector of the society. No "official" art can develop artificially, government control for propaganda or political purposes is simply impossible because no ideology exists to perpetuate. The only official philosophy is that everyone is free to have his own philosophy.[8]

This diversified approach, partly a result of the limited federal funds, partly built into the program by centralization-leary legislators,[9] and partly a reflection of existing practices and on-going programs, is revealed quite clearly in the theater project data collected and analyzed. The creation of a broad base of independent, decentralized state agencies was accomplished, in large measure, by the federal incentive of funds earmarked for the states. Once established, the agencies were under no pressure or obligation to conform to national policies or

---

[8]Mark, Cultural Policy, pp. 9-10.

[9]The National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 specifies requirements for matching grants, funds contingent upon private donations, and disbursement of funds to the States.

precepts. Their independence and creativity can be seen by an examination of their programs, either in descriptive survey or the objective analysis of collected data presented in the latter part of this study. With programs tailored to the unique needs of each state, the arts councils improvised around the conditions revealed by statewide surveys of cultural resources. Program funds for the councils varied from a minimum of the annual federal grant unsupplemented by any state appropriation to approximately $20 million allotted by the New York State Council for the Arts in Fiscal Year (FY) 1971. The agencies made grants that were often ingenious and imaginative in their attempts to match available funds to existing needs.

During the latter part of the decade, the state arts agencies operated alongside other programs of support and encouragement of the arts. The programs of the federal government, through the National Endowment for the Arts, the Office of Education, the Smithsonian Institution, the Department of State, and innumerable grants and funds in nearly every existing government agency[10] were one aspect of the pluralistic American cultural policy. The state programs form a second rank of government grants. A third rank of

---

[10]Comprehensively listed in a handbook published by the Associated Councils of the Arts (ACA), Washington and the Arts (New York: ACA, 1971) (hereinafter referred to as Washington).

even greater diversity and unpredictability was the municipal and local level of arts support.

No attempt has been made to analyze the scope or dimensions of the municipal programs in this study. The size of such an undertaking would be enormous, since the volume of material generated by any government agency would be multiplied by the great number of municipalities and townships committed to some participation in preservation, support, or extension of cultural resources. Nearly every major city contains a planning and design commission devoted to approval or rejection of municipal architecture, acquisition of art works for parks and public places, municipal museum purchases, and similar functions. Many of these art commissions date back to the later part of the nineteenth century when interest in urban planning was spurred by such unified design projects as the Chicago World's Fair, held in 1893.[11] These municipal art commissions, devoted to the concepts of the "garden city" and the "city beautiful" were the forerunners of the present phase of government arts patronage. Imitated on the state and federal level, these commissions were the first arts councils, although their functions were generally limited to approval (often not binding) of projects otherwise initiated. Typically, positions on these

---

[11]Ralph Purcell, Government and Art: A Study of the American Experience (Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press, 1956), pp. 38-39 (hereinafter referred to as Government and Art).

commissions were voluntary and honorary; few such groups had any paid staffs or budgets, often not even per diem or travel allowances to members. The federal agency created in this mold, the Commission of Fine Arts, was established in 1910 to oversee the beautification of the District of Columbia,[12] and is still in existence today, passing judgment on all federal construction within the District and many federal projects throughout the country and abroad.

A survey of municipal arts patronage made by the Library of Congress in 1959 showed twenty-nine of thirty-eight cities surveyed reporting some expenditures for arts-related projects.[13] Museums and symphonies account for the majority of these allocations. Many cities contribute generously to arts organizations for maintenance and operations, providing a stable administrative base upon which private fund-raising can build. In addition, the in-kind and service contributions of cities in the form of zoning adjustment, preferred locations, facilities construction, and such assistance, is an inestimable factor in discussions of the municipal role. Since the Library of Congress study,

---

[12]U. S., Commission of Fine Arts, A Brief History: 1910-1963 (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1964) (hereinafter referred to as History).

[13]Baumol and Bowen, Performing Arts, pp. 347-50; Thomas Gale Moore, The Economics of the American Theater (Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1968), pp. 114-15 (hereinafter referred to as Economics).

many cities have adopted more aggressive policies of arts support. This area of government arts activity has yet to undergo a major study and description.

In addition to the multi-level government activities, support efforts in the private sector were important adjuncts to the state programs. Foundation grants constituted a major area of support. The Ford Foundation grants referred to above are the largest single-source group of arts patronage allocations recorded. Both the Baumol and Bowen study and a more recent survey of foundation giving by the Economic and Social Development Institute[14] note the difficulty of tabulating complete information because of the large numbers of foundations, many of which were unlisted or difficult to locate. Both studies make use of annual listings of grants of $10,000 or more compiled in semi-annual issues of Foundation News, a publication of the Foundation Library Center. This published listing is not regarded as complete, since an unestimated number of grants go unreported. Nonetheless, both the Baumol-Bowen and Seligson studies mention the general high regard for the accuracy of the Foundation Library listings.

Private philanthropic foundations donated over $329 million to the arts between 1965 and 1970,[15] according

---

[14]"Statistical Guide to Arts Information," compiled for the National Endowment for the Arts by Sureva Seligson (unpublished) (hereinafter referred to as "Statistical Guide").

[15]Ibid. (Study is unpaginated.)

to the Foundation News. A detailed breakdown of those allocations as to arts sector and purpose of grant was made by Seligson. This analysis revealed that 44 per cent of all grants made during this period to the arts were in the field of music. This commanding lead (no other category accounts for more than 22 per cent of the total) is due to the massive Ford Foundation grant of $85 million to major symphony orchestras in 1965. Museums received the next largest number of grants (22%), with Theater (9%) and Arts Centers (9%) sharing third place. All other areas received less than 6 per cent of the total.

Baumol and Bowen, commenting on the general role of foundation grants in an arts organization's program,[16] consider that grants are often made for innovative or experimental projects vital to the creative energy of performing artists, but which may be impractical or financially unrewarding. Similarly, budgeting for long-range audience development may be impractical for an individual organization on its own; with foundation assistance, however, such programs can be carried out without draining operations or administrative funds. The authors caution, however, that foundation money creates special problems in the field of the performance arts. Nearly all grants are "seed money" or for pilot programs, often given for a maximum of three to five years. The problem of continuing subsidy over a long period

---

[16]Baumol and Bowen, Performing Arts, pp. 343-45.

remains unmet by such grants. Since Baumol and Bowen's analysis of the economic problems of performance arts organizations reveals a constantly increasing deficit once an organization reaches a condition of artistic and administrative stability, the problem of basic financial support remains unmet by present foundation grant policies.

Seligson's breakdown by category of foundation grants to theater (Table 1) shows a major emphasis upon professional resident companies, both established and experimental. In comparison, grants to community theaters, children's theatre and school programs occupy small percentages of the total foundation support of theater programs. Over the five-year period covered by the study, a median figure of $5.2 million annually was awarded to various theater programs. As we shall see, this figure is a substantial one in comparison with both federal and state programs in theater. The distribution of the foundation allotment takes on added significance in comparison with National Endowment grants and the state grants analyzed for the first time in this study; reference will be made to this distribution in conjunction with conclusions and summary (Chapter III).

In addition to foundation grants, another major source of private arts support are corporations. Federal tax regulations permit a corporation to donate up to 5 per cent of taxable income annually. In addition to the financial benefits of this tax exemption, other benefits accrue to

TABLE 1.--Foundation Theater Grants--1965-70.

Grantee	1970(#)	1969(#)	1968(#)	1967(#)	1966(#)	1965(#)	Cumulative Total(#)(%)
Resident Professional Theaters							
Miscellaneous Companies	$2,002,805(12)	$560,000(4)	$666,950(11)	$1,791,470(9)	$295,381(7)	$45,000(2)	$5,361,606(45)(19)
Guthrie	190,000(7)	50,000(1)	26,698(1)	--	55,000(1)	30,000(2)	351,698(12)
Alley	43,655(1)	--	219,741(3)	1,425,000(2)	10,000(1)	70,000(3)	1,768,396(10)
Arena	310,000(2)	565,000(5)	--	--	227,950(3)	--	1,102,950(10)
Lincoln Center	--	550,000(3)	375,000(4)	--	200,481(3)	10,000(1)	1,135,481(11)
National Repertory Theater	--	--	95,000(4)	10,000(1)	25,000(1)	101,000(2)	231,000(8)
Pittsburgh Playhouse	--	75,000(1)	150,000(4)	782,500(8)	--	13,500(1)	1,021,000(14)
Yale	36,200(2)	162,900(2)	300,000(1)	80,000(1)	390,000(1)	12,000(1)	981,100(8)
Theatre, Inc.	50,000(1)	35,000(2)	950,000(3)	45,828(2)	75,000(2)	--	1,155,828(10)
Total Individual and Misc.	2,632,660(25)	1,997,900(18)	2,783,389(31)	4,134,798(23)	1,278,812(18)	281,500(12)	13,109,059(127)(48)
Experimental Theaters							
Miscellaneous Companies	441,427(9)	1,050,325(6)	413,500(4)	626,500(5)	242,625(5)	271,000(3)	3,045,377(32)
New Lafayette	62,500(2)	362,000(4)	36,000(2)	--	--	--	460,500(8)
Total Experimental Theaters	503,927(11)	1,412,325(10)	449,500(6)	626,500(5)	242,625(5)	271,000(3)	3,505,877(40)(13)
N. Y. Shakespeare Festival	400,000(1)	105,000(5)	125,000(1)	40,000(1)	109,000(3)	--	779,000(11)(3)
American Shakespeare Festival	120,000(2)	110,500(2)	--	10,000(1)	10,025(1)	296,800(3)	547,325(9)(2)
Regional Shakespeare	--	10,000(1)	--	--	10,000(1)	97,655(1)	117,655(3)(--)
Children and Youth	122,600(3)	24,000(2)	52,200(2)	15,000(1)	--	--	213,800(8)(1)
Community Theaters	596,854(11)	80,000(3)	1,139,400(12)	66,000(3)	115,034(4)	162,347(6)	2,159,635(39)(8)
Institutional	659,300(12)	237,575(6)	188,500(5)	75,000(1)	25,000(1)	88,000(2)	1,273,375(27)(5)
Schools	1,736,500(13)	486,670(10)	1,189,075(12)	867,800(11)	739,012(10)	443,340(6)	5,462,397(62)(20)
Fellowships	100,000(2)	--	--	--	--	--	100,000(2)(--)
ANTA	50,000(1)	35,000(1)	153,000(3)	--	65,000(2)	--	303,000(7)(1)
Total	$6,921,841(81)	$4,498,970(58)	$6,080,064(72)	$5,835,098(46)	$2,594,508(45)	$1,640,642(33)	$27,571,123(335)

Source: Economic and Social Development Institute, "Statistical Guide."

corporate donors. In a book intended for the corporate community, Richard Eels discussed in detail the rationale behind business support for the arts.[17] Asserting that the traditional appeal to a corporation's sense of social responsibility was not an adequate description of the interplay between the two institutions (the arts and business), Eels felt that a recognition of the common aims of social betterment and elevated cultural climate would be the key to a rise in contributions to the arts.

> The common telos in business and the arts appears in probing certain current issues that stir modern man and modern culture deeply. . . . When we begin to examine the purpose, scope, and methods of education, to take a prime example, it soon becomes obvious that both executive and artist can and must enter the dialogue. The same holds true of the nation's aim at a high culture.
>
> The long upward slant in economic growth is not unrelated to the pursuit of the nation's ecological and cultural goals. . . . If the rate of growth levels off or begins to decline, the effect on the arts and the cultural standards of the country may be profound . . .
>
> There is a growing national concern about our total ecosystem. One of the issues is our adaptation, as a society, to the natural environment of land, sea, air, and space under conditions that arise and will arise as a result of rapid technological change affecting all of these elements. It has gradually dawned on us that survival depends on human respect for certain canons of natural and man-made beauty in our environment. The arts are not alien to this issue, nor do they enter the picture merely to embellish the scene. The artist now becomes an indispensable part of civilization's survival plan . . .[18]

The donative or charitable approach to business arts patronage creates a relationship of dominance-passivity which

---

[17]Richard Eels, The Corporation and the Arts (New York: Macmillan Company, 1967).

[18]Ibid., pp. 217-18.

inevitably leads to embarrassment or hostility between donor and grantee. The businessman and the artist must enter into a "partnership of equals."[19]

An attempt to forge such a partnership was made in 1967, when the Business Committee for the Arts (BCA) was founded after a series of meetings and discussions by the New York Board of Trade. Headed originally by Esquire magazine publisher Arnold Gingrich, the Committee sought to increase the volume and value of corporate arts patronage by information dissemination, advice and encouragement to executives considering such support, and a program of annual awards to corporations whose grants were considered outstanding.

Contributions to the arts from the corporate sector were estimated to total $85 million in one year--1968.[20] This figure was extrapolated from American Association of Fund Raising Counsel figures for total corporate contributions. Granville Meader, Director of Programs for the Arts, estimated that by 1975 corporate contributions to the arts in the form of funds, gifts in kind, and business expense, will exceed a half billion dollars. A survey undertaken by the BCA in 1969 showed that business arts support had quadrupled in the ten years previous and would increase

---

[19] Ibid., p. 216.

[20] Seligson, "Statistical Guide."

with similar rapidity in the future. Arts patronage was extended by some 70% of America's corporations, but the characteristics associated with the most frequent supporters showed a publicly-held, local manufacturing company with fewer than 1,000 employees.[21]

Rationales for corporate giving included the assumption of community responsibility, publicity accruing from major grants, improvement of cultural climate as a way of attracting employees and additional business, etc. A breakdown of corporate giving by category or kind of contribution was not available at the time this study was completed.

Corporate grants were sometimes a major influence on government subsidy. The Endowment's matching fund proviso, setting aside a portion of the federal allotment to be used only if donations to the National Foundation were forthcoming, encouraged corporate grants and many such were received. At least one state arts agency (Illinois) relied heavily upon corporate grants to expand its small state and federal program funds.[22] In Michigan, numerous attempts were made to initiate a private foundation for receipt of corporate funds.[23] Whether or not corporate support directly

---

[21] Ibid.

[22] Illinois, Arts Council, "Balance Sheet, July 1, 1965-December 31, 1966" (mimeographed).

[23] Michigan, Council for the Arts, Annual Reports, 1966-1970.

supplemented government subsidy, however, it is an aspect of the totality of America's pluralistic arts patronage.

Compared to the $47 million in foundation grants (1968) and the estimated $85 million in corporate funds and services, the National Endowment's allocation for 1968 ($7.1 million) is small, indeed; the total of all state appropriations to arts councils for the same year was $6.7 million.[24] The use of these government funds to aid the cultural climate in an entire area, region, or sector of the arts is a significant difference from the specific, often organizational allotments of the corporations. Given the mandate of disbursing funds for projects with wide-ranging ramifications, the arts councils operated under a different set of conditions. A purely monetary comparison between these sectors of patronage requires deeper analysis. No comparison of grants made by all patrons has yet been made; such a comparison would be a massive and complex study. The different sectors of support meet overlapping needs of the artists and organizations; grants to a single organization may be for many purposes. It would be conceivable for a resident theater company to receive a National Endowment grant for raising the salaries of its actors and hiring a guest director, as well as grants from local corporations of

---

[24]ACA, Directory of State Arts Councils, 1970-71 (New York: ACA, 1971), p. 3 (hereinafter referred to as Directory, 1970-71). This does not include state funds given directly to museums, symphony orchestras, etc.

general support funds for administrative purposes, free air travel for its artistic director, and surplus electronics parts for its sound system. The state arts council may add money to pay the costs of a tour to a nearby ghetto area, while a large national foundation could include the company in a series of grants to resident theaters designed to raise standards.

In addition to the funds received from these sources, our hypothetical resident theater may collect a portion of money raised by a community-wide fund drive to benefit all local arts organizations. Such United Arts Fund campaigns, on the model of Community Chest or United Fund drives, were run by twenty-four cities in 1970.[25] These twenty-four campaigns raised $5.0 million in 1970, 88 per cent of their projected goals. Fund drives of this kind were organized by civic leaders, businessmen, and arts organization personnel to encourage corporate and private donations to local cultural resources. Division of the collected funds among arts institutions is decided by pre-arranged formula. Some cities have encountered resistance from well-established institutions--museums or symphony orchestras--which have conducted fund drives for many years and resent the dilution of support represented by the unified approach. The organizations feel that many of their hard-earned channels of support should not be shared by newer, less stable organizations. The attitude

---

[25]Seligson, "Statistical Guide."

is understandable in view of the competition for the charitable dollar among non-profit groups such as hospitals, colleges, social agencies, etc.[26]

The drives have varying success--nineteen of the drives achieved 90 per cent of their goals or more; however, three cities reached only 50 per cent or less. Conducted both by professional fund-raising organizations and private individuals, the campaign averaged a cost of 5.9 per cent of funds raised, with a range of less than 5 per cent to 20 per cent. Seeking money from both firms and individuals, the drives sent individual, volunteer solicitors to prospective donors. Media publicity accompanied the individual solicitations; in several cities, novelty events such as St. Louis' Cultural Auction of Many Extraordinary Lots of Treasure (CAMELOT) provided additional publicity. The auction of many and assorted donated items raised $250,000 for the arts in St. Louis. Bids were accepted on many novel offers--a walk-on part in a CBS television program, the right to name a flower newly developed by the Botanical Garden, the use for a week of a yacht with food and drink and a crew of six--as well as appliances, jewelry, furs, and services.[27] National

---

[26]A particularly helpful journalistic account of one such fund drive can be found in Michael Newton and Scott Hatley, Persuade and Provide: The Story of the Arts and Education Council in St. Louis (New York: ACA, 1970).

[27]Ibid., pp. 207-21.

coverage gave a considerable boost to the city's arts drive.

The united arts fund drives point up another sector of patronage--the private sector. Although no detailed figures are available, a "mildly educated guess" by Baumol and Bowen put an estimate of $50 to $75 million on total private support to the performing arts.[28] Based on foundation figures, this would probably total $100 to $125 million for all the arts. There is no question that this is the largest sector of patronage; least is known about the source of funding through contributions and bequests because of the sheer mass of data requiring analysis. Private contributions to the arts are tax-deductible, hence some investigators claim that this amounts to an indirect subsidy of the arts through the federal policy on exemptions.[29] Conservative analysts feel that this is the proper role for the federal government--encouragement of the private sector, rather than the creation of a bureaucratic centralized agency. This view can be found expressed in articles dating to the early 1960's, the period when debate over the assumption of

---

[28]Baumol and Bowen, Performing Arts, p. 327.

[29]See Mark, Cultural Policy, pp. 21-22; Baumol and Bowen, Performing Arts, pp. 305-28, 398-403; Alvin Toffler, The Culture Consumers: A Study of Art and Affluence in America (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1964), pp. 187-88 (hereinafter referred to as Culture Consumers); Moore, Economics, pp. 110-30.

an official role was most vocal.[29] The incalculable benefits derived from the present tax exemption system far exceed even the most generous European arts subsidy, claim proponents of tax incentive as the answer to the economic problems of the arts.[30]

Baumol and Bowen estimate that as much as 90 per cent of all private giving comes from individuals (the rest from foundations and corporations). In projecting future policy for this source of patronage, they come to the conclusion that contributions to the arts, having increased more rapidly than all private contributions since World War II ended, can increase further as a percentage of total giving through judicious fund-raising.[31]

Money available from government sources did not begin to rival private giving during the period under study in this report. Nor, given the background of the American patronage experience, is it likely to in the future. Nonetheless, by adopting the policy of working around existing subsidy, rather than trying to supplant it, the federal and

---

[29]See "Federal Subsidy of the Arts," The Critic, XXI, No. 3 (December 1962-January 1963). Russell Lynes, "The Case Against Government Aid to the Arts," The New York Times Magazine (March 25, 1962) and, later "How to Make Politics from Art and Vice Versa," Harper's Magazine (August, 1969). This is also Moore's favored solution (Economics, pp. 126-28).

[30]Toffler, Culture Consumers, pp. 202-3.

[31]Baumol and Bowen, Performing Arts, pp. 398-403.

state agencies attempted to stimulate greater community support for, and involvement in, the well-being of the arts.

In attempting to widen the base of support for the arts, the government arts agencies realized that more than simply the public attitude had to change. In some cases, the arts organizations themselves needed a change of attitude. The notion of outreach to the community became a more prevalent part of the programs of many groups. Support and appreciation of the arts had to be won from the public, often in the face of attitudes and prejudices engrained over the years. As the concept of public involvement in the arts began its cautious realization, the spirit of artistic involvement in the community led artists to try to meet their public more than halfway, not by debasing, popularizing or cheapening their art, but by an inclusion and acceptance of a non-elite or non-cult audience. This outreach and extension is impossible to document or annotate, except possibly by filming the excitement of a neighborhood arts festival on a ghetto street on a summer night or recording the sound of a jazz group playing in a city playground. The goal of any artist--to transmit the feeling which spurred his creative act and to make it equally important to his audience--was given new means and support by the arts agencies.

Among the new avenues for involvement of the arts in society, one of the most exciting in its merger of social

and artistic goals was the sponsorship of arts programs as part of poverty-area community action in both urban and rural slums. A conference on the Role of the Arts in Meeting the Social and Educational Needs of the Disadvantaged, held in 1966 under Office of Education sponsorship, explored ways by which the arts could reach into the cultural hearts of minority communities.[32] Conference participants acknowledged:

> That the arts could play a primary role in meeting the challenge of poverty seems at first glance a frivolous notion--a strained attempt to relate an essentially peripheral, ornamental pastime to individual misery and a deeply disturbing social problem.[33]

But in fact the arts were uniquely valuable in reaching out to community youth:

> Like apprenticeships, the Job Corps, and the armed forces, the performing arts centers became a way out for restless youth--competing with the non-institutional alternatives of dropping out, delinquency, and drugs . . . the experience of Hull House, Karamu, the Henry Street Settlement, and a host of others, has been that the arts support the life style of minority youth and open up a visual, aural, and kinetic means of expression that is frequently lacking in the educational experience that urban schools purvey.[34]

---

[32]Judith Murphy and Ronald Gross, The Arts and the Poor: New Challenge for Educators, U.S. Office of Education (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968).

[33]Ibid., p. 1.

[34]Don Bushnell, The Arts, Education, and the Urban Sub-Culture (Santa Barbara, Calif.: The Communications Foundation, 1970), p. viii.

A survey of 443 such community-based arts programs[35] showed that 83 per cent of those sampled employed professional artists as instructors or leaders. Drama was the primary program area of the arts centers studied; original material and improvisation around familiar themes was a common activity. Although funds for such projects came largely from private contributions, municipal support was a key source of subsidy, while state and federal funds provided only a small percentage of assistance.

Not only ghetto education, but the entire field of education was a parallel source of arts subsidy. Under terms of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, over $80 million was used to support projects in the arts and the humanities during 1968 alone.[36] The Act proved to be a valuable source for expanding arts education research, funding pilot projects, developing curriculum material, and training teachers to improve the quality of the arts experience throughout the public school system. The Educational Laboratory Theater projects in three cities[37] were financed partly through Office of Education support. A complete development program in Aesthetic Education was begun and

---

[35] Ibid.

[36] Mel Scott, "The Federal-State Partnership in the Arts," Public Administration Review, XXX, No. 4 (July-August, 1970), 378 (hereinafter referred to as "Partnership").

[37] See below, pp. 77-81.

tested through the Central Midwestern Region Educational Laboratory (CEMREL) in St. Louis. This program planned a K-12 curriculum based completely on the arts, with cognitive skills drawn into the program as needed. All of the necessary elementary and secondary curriculum would be covered, but from a starting point of exercising and training affective skills.[38] Nearly 25 per cent of all research projects allotted grants by the Arts and Humanities Division of the Office of Education were for theater education.[39]

This necessarily sketchy overview is meant only to indicate the nature and variety of some of the other components of the diversified support for the arts, of which the state arts councils form a small but valuable aspect. Where possible, the state arts council projects under study are compared to the programs of other supporting agencies or sectors. Some of the scope and complexity of the multi-level effort should be evident, even from the brief mention made of the various forms of patronage. This complexity, which is often cumbersome, confusing, slow, and burdensome to artists and patrons alike, is the chief characteristic of cultural life in the United States in 1970. It is an assurance, however, of diversity and freedom for the arts. No single overriding policy can affect all sectors equally,

---

[38]CEMREL offers numerous publications describing Aesthetic Education in detail.

[39]Seligson, "Statistical Guide."

under the present system, and new avenues exist where old ones may be closed off. By their assumption of a policy which views arts subsidy as a partnership, state and federal arts agencies have rejected aspirations to centralization, exclusivity of control, or official taste-making.

CHAPTER I

THE BACKGROUND OF GOVERNMENT ARTS SUPPORT

The Federal Government

The United States is in the midst of articulating a relationship between government and the arts which has neither model nor antecedent. The relationship is being uniquely defined to meet the specific needs of this country. In its pluralistic and scattershot approach, the American program is a reflection of the desire to bring the arts within reach of all people, not merely to assure the existence of a few elite groups with a small cult audience. Our program differs from those of European countries where a tradition of patronage has existed for many years.[1]

Figures showing per capita allocations for the arts by various governments were widely publicized in the United States by proponents of increased federal spending. Contrasted with the amounts appropriated per person by other governments--West Germany ($2.42), Sweden ($2.00), Austria ($3.78), Canada ($1.29), Israel ($1.34), and Great Britain

---

[1]See Frederick Dorian, Commitment to Culture (Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1964).

($1.23)--the American appropriation ($.10) seems disturbingly small.[2]

The comparison, however, is not as simple as dollar amounts. The United States figure includes funds for the Department of State Cultural Presentations Program, the Office of Education Arts and Humanities Division, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, arts divisions of the Smithsonian Institution, and the National Endowment for the Arts. These are the major, but not the only government arts programs. The simplified comparison does not take note of the tax incentive which some observers feel should be considered a form of government subsidy, although an indirect one.

The public familiarity with the arts in Europe is the result of centuries of presence, despite the fact that for much of that time the arts were available to only a small segment of the population. In contrast to the European experience, the American cultural background is not one that is rich in the traditional arts. Our greatest artistic achievements may well be the popular and folk arts of the various regions of the country.

The attitudes toward theater, dance, music and decoration brought to the country by religious groups such

---

[2]U.S., Congress, Amendments to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, Joint Hearings held in Washington, January 26, 28; February 3, 1970, 91st Congress, 2nd Session, p. 144 (hereinafter referred to as Hearings).

as the Puritans, have had, and continue to have, a significant hold on American imagination. The arts were considered at worst sinful, at best unnecessary or impractical. Specifically repressive decrees about theater were common during the colonial period--one of the first recorded dramatic performances (1665) resulted in the arrest and fining of three college students for an underground production of "Ye Beare and Ye Cubbe."[3] During the Revolution, the Continental Congress passed a resolution suspending all entertainments, including theatrical performances, for the duration of the war.

Except for occasional Presidential command performances, there is available no instance of federal support nor encouragement of theater before the 1930's. The record is less meager in the decorative, visual, and architectural arts. There is a distinct, though hardly an enthusiastic, thread of government payments for murals, building decoration, portraits, war paintings, and architectural designs. Even in 1817, however, there was opposition to this limited expense of government money for tangible services rendered: a Congressional resolution in that year declared that:

> . . . it was neither just nor proper for the government to become the patron of the fine arts; that no such expense (for decorating the Capitol) ought to be authorized until the faith of the government was redeemed by fulfillment of all its pecuniary obligations; nor,

---

[3]Barnard Hewitt, Theatre U.S.A.--1665 to 1957 (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959), p. 2.

> indeed, until every debt was paid arising out of the war of the Revolution.[4]

The restrictive attitude of that Congressional resolution is more typical of the history of American cultural policy than the humanist ideals of Thomas Jefferson. The breadth of knowledge and experience which Jefferson brought to his philosophy of governance led him to feel that the arts were an irreplaceable adjunct to public and private life. The construction of the state as a thing of beauty inevitably included a clear physical manifestation of beauty. His plans for the city of Washington were an expression of his love of art, a love he wished to instill in the national life:

> You see, I am an enthusiast on the subject of the arts, but it is an enthusiasm of which I am not ashamed, as its object is to improve the taste of my countrymen, to increase their reputation, to reconcile to them the respect of the world, and procure them its praise.[5]

Jefferson's art collection, plans for personal sculpture acquisitions, abiding interest in the violin which he played regularly throughout his life, and achievements in architecture and landscaping all bear witness to his love of beauty in all his surroundings.[6]

---

[4]Purcell, Government and Art, p. 15.

[5]Ibid., p. 15.

[6]Fiske Kimball, "Jefferson and the Arts," Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, LXXXVII, No. 3 (July, 1943), pp. 238-45.

Jefferson's Enlightenment humanism stems from an admiration of certain aspects of European life; the attitude of the new nation, on the whole, was quite different. Alexis de Tocqueville, when he wrote his landmark study of the country, Democracy in America, noted the place of the arts in the young nation with an accuracy that has an evocative ring even in reference to current programs:

> Democratic nations . . . will therefore cultivate the arts which serve to render life easy, in preference to those whose object is to adorn it. They will habitually prefer the useful to the beautiful, and they will require that the beautiful should be useful.[7]

An excessive concern with practicality and material gain was the dominant feature of American life, in de Tocqueville's view; reflected in our arts, this led to emphasis on the Real rather than the Ideal, a concern for surface rather than essence.

Although James Smithson's bequest to the United States of $550,000 to found an establishment "for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men,"[8] was received by the government in 1835, it was not until 1846 that the Smithsonian Institution was founded because of Congressional squabbling over acceptance of the grant. Headed by a scientist, Joseph Henry, the Institution was largely devoted to

---

[7]Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America, trans. by Henry Reeves, Henry Steele Commager, ed., Vol. 2 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947), p. 272.

[8]Webster P. True, The First Hundred Years of the Smithsonian Institution, 1846-1946 (Washington, D. C.: No publisher given, 1946), p. 1 (hereinafter referred to as Smithsonian).

scientific experiment during its first half century. Although the enabling legislation authorized an art gallery, the Institution owned only two paintings. After a fire destroyed a borrowed collection the Smithsonian abandoned efforts to establish an art museum. In 1906, a bequest of paintings was made to the government to form part of a "National Gallery of Art, when one is established;"[9] Congress designated the Smithsonian as a National Gallery and the collection was accepted.

A National Commission on Fine Arts had been urged by various organizations after the Chicago World's Fair (1893), but was not formed until 1909 when President Theodore Roosevelt initiated a Council of Fine Arts in response to a request from the American Institute of Architects.[10] This prototype group was abolished by President William Howard Taft, but reinstated by Congress in 1910. The Commission of Fine Arts, as it was finally called, had the responsibility of advising upon "the location of statues, fountains, and monuments in the public squares, streets, and parks in the District of Columbia"[11] and all such erected under federal auspices. The scope of its authorization was later widened by President Taft to include all public buildings erected

---

[9] Ibid., p. 44.

[10] U.S., Commission of Fine Arts, A Brief History, pp. 1-3.

[11] Ibid., p. 2.

in the District. The first action of the new Commission was the selection of a site for the Lincoln Memorial.

This early instance of a governmental arts agency was in imitation of the many states and municipalities which had appointed similar unpaid, advisory commissions with no permanent staff or budget.

With completion of a building to house a major donation of Oriental art from Charles Freer in 1923, the Smithsonian's role as a national showplace for art was firmly established. The donation of his entire collection of art by Andrew Mellon in 1937 formed the basis of a National Gallery of Art truly worthy of the name.[12]

America's first extensive experiment with government funding of the arts came during the economic depression of the 1930's. New York Governor Franklin Roosevelt was elected President of the United States in 1932 and brought with him to Washington many of the relief concepts which had been put into effect in his state to ease the economic plight of New Yorkers. Increasing public employment to offset the precipitous decline of private capital meant a massive program of work relief to benefit the country through constructive projects. Work relief, as opposed to either public works projects, or direct relief, was responsible for the genesis of the federal programs in the arts.[13] Roosevelt's first

---

[12]True, Smithsonian, p. 46.

[13]Purcell, Government and Art, pp. 46-47.

action in this area was the initiation of the Federal Emergency Relief Act (FERA) in 1932. This legislation provided federal grants-in-aid to state and local relief agencies for the creation of work relief projects. The staff assembled to administer and coordinate these grants, under the leadership of Harry Hopkins, encouraged the creation of diversified work programs to utilize the skills of unemployed men and women. The employment of white collar workers, professionals, and women in jobs suited to their background and talents was recognized as essential to the success of the program.[14] As head of New York State's Temporary Emergency Relief Administration, Hopkins had seen the success of projects involving professionals, including artists, musicians and actors.

The FERA, however, was only a coordinating agency. It could suggest projects and advise the local agencies, but had no central authority and few statutory standards to enforce. It was a decentralized agency which left primary responsibility in the hands of the states.

The short-lived (7 months) Civil Works Administration (CWA) was the first concerted effort to federalize work relief.[15] This attempt to combine the work relief concept

---

[14]Arthur Macmahon, et al., The Administration of Federal Work Relief (Chicago: Public Administration Service, 1941), p. 27 (hereinafter referred to as Work Relief).

[15]Ibid., p. 18.

and a public works program spawned several major programs in the arts, at least one of which--the Public Works of Art Project (PWAP) for the decoration of public buildings--continued under Treasury Department auspices after the demise of CWA. The various arts projects of the CWA program were decidedly amateur in nature, aimed more for community service than for professional artistic standards: free concerts in libraries and museums, portable theaters touring to parks, and play productions at Civilian Conservation Corps Camps.

The brief period of federal control whetted the appetite of federal relief administrators. After the demise of CWA, the FERA attempted to cajole the state relief organizations into increasing their professional employment projects through earmarked funds. This effort was rewarded, during the period from July 1934 and October 1934, by a substantial increase in state-initiated projects in the arts. The effort was abandoned in October 1934, however, because of administrative uncertainty over its legality under provisions of the Congressional appropriation.[16]

When Roosevelt and his staff began planning to put all government relief projects under the auspices of one central agency--the Works Progress Administration (WPA), arts projects figured significantly in their formulations. In

---

[16]Ibid., p. 22. See also William McDonald, Federal Relief Administration and the Arts (Columbus: Ohio University Press, 1969), p. 64 (hereinafter referred to as Relief).

organizing the complex administrative machinery of WPA, after creation by executive order on May 6, 1935, it was decided that the arts and professional projects should be wholly federally initiated and sponsored, rather than leaving sponsorship to the states. (This bypassing of the state WPA administration was a major point of contention throughout the entire life of the project.)[17] Thus the first extensive large-scale American government patronage of the arts came into being. Federal Project Number One of the WPA Division of Professional and Service Projects was to employ persons on relief qualified in fields of art, music, drama, and writing.

To describe adequately the 4-year history of the WPA projects in the arts, and particularly the Federal Theater Project, would be a massive task. Many such studies have been written, from varying points of view. One point on which nearly all writers agree is the fundamental discrepancy between the work relief concepts for which Federal One was inaugurated and the professional program to which it aspired.[18]

---

[17]McDonald, Relief, pp. 112-13, 126-32; also Macmahon, Work Relief, pp. 253-58.

[18]McDonald, as a specialist in public administration, is the most lucid and least biased of all the commentaries read in his analysis of Federal One. All other authors are highly disposed towards the arts projects and reflect this bias. Macmahon treats Federal One very briefly. Other essential works are Hallie Flanagan, Arena: The History of the Federal Theatre (revised ed.; New York: Benjamin Blom, 1965) hereinafter referred to as Arena); Jane DeHart Mathews, The Federal Theatre, 1935-39: Plays, Relief, and Politics

The prime thrust of the WPA was to provide jobs for all employable workers, in fields suited to their skills. As a very minor part of the relief effort, Federal One dealt with a tiny 2 per cent of the total WPA employment. From the beginning of the program, however, the arts projects claimed preference and special procedures. As far as possible, Federal One operated outside the WPA administrative hierarchy.

Preferential operating procedure was claimed by Federal One in several areas. A higher percentage of non-relief workers was permitted on the arts projects (up to, and sometimes more than, 25%) than were permitted on the majority of WPA programs (10%).[19] Minimum and maximum hours per week of work were carefully delineated by the Washington WPA staff, but the arts projects were exempted from the minimums, because of the alleged unique nature of the employment. Wage preferentials were claimed for Federal One employees, through various means.

(Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967) (hereinafter referred to as Federal Theatre); Willson Whitman, Bread and Circuses: A Study of the Federal Theatre (New York: Oxford University Press, 1937) (hereinafter referred to as Bread and Circuses); and Francis V. O'Connor, Federal Support for the Visual Arts: The New Deal and Now (Greenwich, Conn.: New York Graphic Society, 1969) (hereinafter referred to as Support). Also read was Leland Lemke Zimmerman, "The Federal Theater: An Evaluation and Comparison with Foreign National Theaters" (unpublished dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1955) (hereinafter referred to as "Federal Theater").

[19]McDonald, Relief, pp. 172-87.

Although many of these marks of early favor were rescinded by Executive or administrative order, they are indicative of the restlessness felt by the directors and staff of the federal arts projects, many of whom were new to public administration. Continual impatience with the slow machinery of government bureaucracy was endemic to all of the projects, particularly theater. Confusion over chain-of-command authority resulted in considerable chafing among local, state, regional, and national staffs, as well as between Federal One and regular WPA administration.

The higher costs of Federal One were tolerated by WPA, in part because of the special affection felt by the President, Mrs. Roosevelt, and WPA head Harry Hopkins for the arts programs.[20] The ratio of cost of program to number employed was significantly higher than for other WPA programs. This ratio, expressed as man-month cost (the amount needed to employ one relief worker for one month), was the standard financial criterion for judging WPA economy and efficiency. Average man-month costs for Federal One in 1937 were $100, as compared with an over-all WPA average of $59.[21]

These two figures reflect the high salary scales of Federal One, which paid mostly professional-scale wages. Concentration of Federal One employees in metropolitan areas,

---

[20]Flanagan, Arena, pp. 10-12, 222, 329.

[21]McDonald, Relief, p. 232.

where prevailing wages were higher, was another factor in the obvious difference.

A look at the comparative costs of the projects under Federal One is provided by Table 2.

TABLE 2

Man-Month Costs for WPA Arts Projects--
FY 1938

Project	Employment	Man-Month Cost
Federal Art Project	4,900	$102
Federal Music Project	11,500	95
Federal Theater Project	10,500	104
Federal Writers Project	4,600	95
Historical Records Survey	8,100	79

Source: McDonald, Relief, p. 234.

These costs are drawn from a period after major operational changes had been instituted to bring Federal One in line with WPA standard procedure. Figures from 1935 or 1936 would show somewhat higher man-month figures for all programs.

More expensive than either art, music, or writing, the Federal Theater Project (FTP) had the distinction of being the only one of the arts projects closed down by Congress. The Emergency Recovery Act of 1939 returned all the federally sponsored programs to state sponsorship, and specifically enjoined funds for the Federal Theater Project.

Additional restrictive requirements regarding ticket receipts, project sponsorship, minimum work weeks, and continuous employment completed the cutback of arts projects which had been initiated by the Administration. This last point is important to note--some commentators regard Congress as the villain in the dismantling of Federal One.[21] In fact, there was continual friction within the WPA over the arts programs; most of the punitive measures had been contemplated or attempted by the Administration before Congress made them mandatory.[22]

The complete elimination of the theater projects, however, was an unusual and serious step. Many reasons have been offered for this distinctive treatment. Congressional investigations and individual assertions of subversive activity, fiscal extravagance, and lax administration are most often cited as bases for the abolition of the project.[23] McDonald, however, notes that these charges were made against all of the WPA arts projects.[24] Only theater

---

[21]Flanagan and Zimmerman blame Congress exclusively, although Flanagan believes that the Administration deliberately sacrificed the FTP to save WPA. Mathews notes the naivete of the FTP, but does not deal with Executive disapproval of aspects of the arts projects.

[22]McDonald, Relief, pp. 177-80, 183, 222-31.

[23]Zimmerman goes into detail on all charges made against the FTP, Federal Theater, Chapter IV.

[24]McDonald, Relief, pp. 533-39.

was killed; reasons for this discriminatory treatment, according to McDonald, were the project's failure to achieve a non-metropolitan character, the productions of the Living Newspaper Unit in New York City, and an episode involving the cast of The Swing Mikado, a highly successful Federal Theater production.[25]

Much of the thrust of the New Deal was aimed at alleviating the plight of rural America; the initial proclamations of the Federal Theater emphasized the importance of regional theater programs. The concentration of effort, however, was in New York, Boston, Chicago, and Los Angeles. These four cities accounted for over 80 per cent of Federal Theater appropriations. New York alone spent nearly 50 per cent of the Federal funds.[26] The emphasis upon professional achievement, indicated by the concentration of effort in major theatrical centers, was in conflict with the goals of decentralized community service espoused by the New Deal planners. McDonald notes:

> The Directors of Federal One forgot that in a commonwealth such as ours, the test of a program is not how good it is for the people but what measure of support on the part of the people it can win. The establishment of a public arts program, if such was the purpose of Federal One, was no more dependent on the approval of the art world than, a hundred years before, the establishment of public education waited upon the support of the ivy-clad colleges of that age. The spirit of school children in Mississippi who travelled long distances

---

[25] Ibid.

[26] Zimmerman, Federal Theater, p. 73.

> without breakfast to study music in the classes instituted by the Music Project was more important, not only socially and politically, but also in relation to the artistic future of America, than an exhibition of WPA art in the New York Museum of Modern Art or a musical performance that rivalled in technique the production of a privately subsidized symphony orchestra. The art world, to be sure, has its rightful responsibilities, among which is the maintenance of standards as art and interest in art spread. But the democratization of art and art appreciation is to be achieved not through the art world but through the people, and only by those who, while retaining their respect for professional competence, are willing to risk their reputation among their colleagues by consorting with sinners.[27]

The sin of elitism, then, was shared by all the arts programs but, in the case of the Federal Theater, the imbalance between urban and rural programs was particularly pronounced.

To be sure, the regulations under which WPA operated made it difficult to transfer workers from the locality where they had joined the relief rolls. Since the greatest concentrations of unemployed theater workers were to be found in theatrical centers, urban areas also had the largest numbers of relief workers who had listed theatrical trades as professions.

The work relief nature of the program militated against professional excellence in another important area--quality of personnel. A worker could join the Federal Theater simply by listing his profession as "actor" when he applied for relief. There were audition boards in some

---

[27]McDonald, Relief, p. 283.

states to weed out obviously incompetent individuals, but a number of Federal Theater employees were marginally proficient or poorly trained for the ambitious efforts planned by Hallie Flanagan and her staff. The predominance of vaudeville artists, unsuited for any other theatrical format, was a major problem for the project. Retraining attempts were of varying success, but the very existance of the problem is indicative of the contradictions inherent in trying to combine work relief and professional excellence.

Two of the most successful New Deal projects in the visual arts, the Public Works of Art Project (PWAP) and the Treasury Relief Art Project (TRAP), are regarded by McDonald as having been successful primarily because of their high selectivity and exclusive numbers of employed painters and sculptors.[28] The WPA projects, with the mandate of employing the greatest number of workers possible with a given budget, could not afford the luxury of selectivity.

The Federal Theater staff's discomfort with the concept of work relief was evident in an incident which received wide publicity and earned the program considerable criticism in Congress. The highly commercially successful production of The Swing Mikado, a jazz version of the Gilbert and Sullivan operetta produced by the Chicago Federal Theater, was to be taken on tour to New York City. Several commercial

---

[28]McDonald, Relief, p. 117n; see also O'Connor, Support.

producers sought to bring the production's tour under private auspices by offering contracts to the performers. The Federal Theater's Washington office turned down all offers in order to keep the production under WPA auspices, in clear violation of the thrust of the work relief program to return the unemployed to private gainful employment.[29] The Swing Mikado was the one outstanding commercial success of the Federal Theater and the desire to reap a share of its glory (and to use admission receipts for production expenses) was, no doubt, a compelling one, but such an impulse was incompatible with the public trust administered by the WPA.

Another source of Congressional ire were the productions of the Living Newspaper unit in New York. This unique theatrical form, a blend of newsreel, epic theater, and lecture hall, was a special favorite of FTP Director Flanagan, who described the new venture in glowing terms:

> The living newspaper, factual and formal, musical and acrobatic, abstract and concrete, visual and aural, psychological, economic, and social, is a dramatic form in the beginning stage, a form capable of infinite extension.[30]

Although praised by dramatic critics and historians as a major American contribution to theatrical form,[31] the Living

---

[29]Mathews, Federal Theatre, p. 242; Flanagan in a brief account, notes the irregularity of the incident, Arena, pp. 145-48.

[30]Flanagan, Arena, p. 70.

[31]See, for example, John Gassner, ed., A Treasury of the Theater from Henrik Ibsen to Arthur Miller (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1956), pp. 780-81.

Newspaper was bound to be an irritant to a section of popular opinion. Criticism of the project developed from the time of its inception until the abolition of Federal One. The first Living Newspaper production, Ethiopia, caused State Department intervention--the depiction of Haile Selassie, Emperor of the African country, was considered a potential insult and a threat to international relations. Under pressure from Washington, the character of Selassie was eliminated and his speech presented on tape in accordance with a hastily-formulated rule banning the characterization of living national leaders on the Federal Theater stages.[32] Later Living Newspaper productions, such as Power (about the Tennessee Valley Authority), Triple A Plowed Under (about agricultural relief), and One Third of a Nation (about the housing problem) depicted contemporary American problems and extolled New Deal solutions. This blatant partisanship toward the Administration which supported the Federal Theater was another example of insensitivity to political reality. Congressmen were especially incensed by readings from the Congressional Record in Power; actual speeches of senators opposed to the TVA were used in the production with a clearly pejorative intent.[33] The Federal Theater's defense of the use of the material as a matter of public record was a weak one, given the editing and context.

---

[32]Flanagan, Arena, pp. 65-66.

[33]McDonald, Relief, pp. 534-35.

Accusations of subversive activity, levelled by Congressmen against all the projects of Federal One, were particularly vehement in the case of both theater and writing, arts in which ideas hold a paramount place. Pro-communist ideas, plays written by communists, vocal communist personnel, and similar complaints were charged against the Federal Theater, particularly the New York units.

There is little question that the theater unit, like many government projects of the times, contained a small number of communist or pro-communist workers. The allegations of un-American ideas, however, are difficult to justify; in most cases, they reflect the prejudices of the accusors rather than actual intent on the part of the Federal Theater. This clearly personal prejudice of some opponents of the project could be seen in the accusation of salacious material as evidenced by suggestive play titles and the concern of some Congressmen over interracial casting.[34] Though hardly supportable, these accusations added to the climate of opinion which resulted in the elimination of all federal funding for theater projects.

Naive and unpolitical as the Federal Theater staff may have been, according to Mathews,[35] there is little question that the project was a valuable one, both in its

---

[34]Flanagan, Arena, pp. 333-56.

[35]Mathews, Federal Theatre, pp. 313-14.

contribution to work relief and to the state of the art. Over 30 million individuals attended nearly 64,000 performances of 1200 plays;[36] the figures are impressive stated with or without a detailed examination as to location, audience profile, type of play, or quality of production. Within the five divisions of Federal One, theater was always the second highest in number of workers employed (second to music). Low cost or free performances enabled the units to reach substantial numbers of individuals for whom theater was a new experience. This is certainly true of most productions in rural areas; it is also true, however, of audiences from New York's labor unions, slums, or hospitals for whom play attendance was a previously unattainable luxury.

The attitude and artistic philosophy of project director Hallie Flanagan permeated many of the FTP productions; plays dealing with political and contemporary social problems occupy a significant percentage of the total production offerings. Plays from the classical repertoire were not as frequently presented as might be expected given this vast body of royalty-free literature.[37] Ambitious artistic projects such as the Living Newspaper received great support from the Washington office; innovation and experiment were encouraged.

---

[36]Flanagan, Arena, pp. 432, 435.

[37]McDonald, Relief, p. 551.

Mathews calls the FTP a union of art and government that was "enforced" rather than chosen.[38] The plans for a Federal Theater were formulated by individuals who had separate and contradictory ideas about its purpose. Roosevelt and Hopkins saw it as a way to bring urban amenities to rural districts through educational and recreational projects manned by unemployed professionals.[39] Hallie Flanagan saw the FTP as a means for the "establishment of theatres so vital to community life that they will continue to function after the program of this Federal project is completed,"[40] and as the basis of "a national theater to build a national culture."[41] Her vision of such a theater drew upon her commitment to experimental and innovative production concepts. Theater professionals wanted the FTP to maintain high production standards without competing with existing commercial theater. The college and civic theater directors who became staff members under Flanagan wanted the FTP to be the basis of a decentralized grassroots regional theater.

Ultimately the Federal Theater was none of these. Forced to centralize because of the refusal of WPA

---

[38]Mathews, Federal Theatre, p. 313.

[39]McDonald, Relief, p. 496.

[40]Ibid., p. 503.

[41]Ibid.

administrators to permit relocation of relief workers, the Project took on a largely metropolitan character. The determination and leadership of the Director encouraged experimentation and political commitment in production and discouraged purely recreational projects. The uncertainty of relief rolls as a source of qualified theater workers assured an uneven level of talent. Instead of a single project with clear goals and a detailed methodology, the FTP was a clumsy and poorly organized agency "which never lost the air of controlled hysteria which permeated every facet of its operations."[42]

On occasions, the bold ambitious efforts of the major FTP units received great publicity and inspired both praise and criticism. Smaller units often achieved considerable success without much publicity. Projects in marionette theater, productions touring CCC camps, regional pageants and festivals, foreign-language theater (Yiddish, French, German, Italian, and Spanish), black theater, and radio drama reached limited local audiences, but proved that the FTP could function with outstanding success by filling artistic needs unlikely to be met by commercial theater.

The unrealistic goals and inherent contradictions under which the Theater Project labored were not the only reason for its mixed success. In light of the present

---

[42]Mathews, Federal Theatre, p. 306.

government arts patronage, it is evident that the arts projects of Federal One were government production units in the nature of, for example, the Army Entertainment Program. If the arts are to be used for a specific purpose--e.g., a film to teach farmers to use the services of the Department of Agriculture, a mural for the Capitol rotunda, a band for Presidential receptions--then government is not aiding the arts, but using them. Whitman, writing during the existence of the Federal Theater, suggests that it be turned into a political educational tool, whereby the government could publicize its programs and plans.[43] This seemingly naive suggestion was actually a sound concept.

The WPA arts programs were valuable not only for the many outstanding works created during three and a half years of life but for the example they provide of the great difficulty in assuming the roles of creative and interpretive artist, producer, and director, while administering a public trust under the fiscal and administrative practices of a massive bureaucracy. The present policy of assisting in the many-faceted public and private effort on behalf of the arts accepts the diversity of American society, concentrating on creating an audience while assisting local existing organizations. The government role is one of leadership, coordination, facilitation, assistance, and support, not production.

---

[43]Whitman, Bread and Circuses, pp. 166-72.

In 1939, Congress ordered the elimination of all federally-administered divisions within the WPA. All the programs in the arts were thus given over to state administration, except theater, for which all funds were forbidden. Returning the arts projects to state control resulted in a gradual diminution of activity. States in which projects in music, art, or literature were well-established and popular generally retained these programs, while less stable units were eliminated. Some locally sponsored programs in theater, of an educational or recreational nature, did continue even with the loss of federal funds. After the outbreak of the European war in September 1939, however, the relief program took second place to an emphasis on military preparedness. The arts projects increasingly took on a military aspect--concerts for military posts, etc.--and after the attack on Pearl Harbor, all relief projects which did not contribute to the war effort were discontinued. The WPA Arts Program officially expired in June 1943; in fact, its activities had ceased months before this date.

The mixed success of the nation's first major program combining government and the arts motivated many efforts throughout the 1940's and 1950's to revive a revised arts program. The WPA programs provided an instructive example and a motivating factor--nearly all the proposed plans made reference to the depression project. One of the first such proposals, made by George Biddle, a painter and member of

the National Resources Planning Board, called for the creation of a National Bureau of Fine Arts to combine all "art-fostering projects which sundry government bureaus and agencies have launched or manipulated during the past ten years."[44] Referring specifically to the Section of Fine Arts of the Treasury Department, the educational programs of the National Youth Administration, and the Federal Art Project, Biddle felt that combining the programs would lead to better coordination, less friction between the agencies, and the best quality of art for the government's murals, war propaganda, and advertising.

In 1945, Serge Koussevitsky, conductor of the Boston Symphony Orchestra, urged that the federal government institute a program of regular support for the arts. His plea for a Department of Fine Arts, at the Cabinet level, was repeated year after year.[45] In 1946, Dr. Koussevitsky wrote:

> This Government, . . . while extending aid to countries wrecked and ravaged by war, must be reminded that the light of art and culture, with which America is blessed, can and will prevent future world catastrophes.[46]

Particularly strident objection by a number of Congressmen to the inclusion of abstract art in an exhibition of American painting and sculpture sent abroad by the State

---

[44]"The Government and the Arts: A Proposal by George Biddle, with Comment and Criticism by Others," Harper's Magazine, October, 1943.

[45]New York Times, October 13, 1945, p. 10.

[46]The New York Times, June 30, 1946, p. 25. See also May 11, 1949, p. 34.

Department in 1946 caused the removal of the entire exhibit. An angry response from artist Aline Loucheim called for the establishment of a permanent government agency to oversee such projects, and remove them from Congressional purview:

> Ultimately Congress might learn the value of such cultural gestures. It might realize its members were not art authorities and would set up a qualified agency with adequate funds for a sustained program of public ownership.[47]

In 1951, Representatives Emanuel Celler and Arthur Klein of New York introduced legislation calling for the establishment of an Assistant Secretary of Fine Arts in the Department of the Interior. The new post would not be one for control or direction, but a means for assisting "entities which are now engaged in the presentation, perpetuation, or development of the fine arts, and to aid civic, non-profit organizations in their endeavor to develop the fine arts."[48] During the same year, President Truman endorsed the idea of a privately financed theater and sports center for the city of Washington. This proposal, urged repeatedly in Congress, was finally passed during President Eisenhower's term of office and is scheduled for completion in the fall of 1971, as the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

Truman also took steps to evaluate the existing role of the federal government with respect to the arts and

---

[47] New York Times, May 23, 1947, Section II, p. 8.

[48] New York Times, March 1, 1951, p. 33.

instructed the Commission of Fine Arts to undertake a survey of programs and make recommendations for the future. This report, completed in 1953,[49] urged that no permanent funding council or agency be established for government programs in the arts. The Commission wished to preserve its own role as an independent advisory agency with no powers of enforcement, contending that its integrity would be compromised if it were given large sums to administer, "in the manner of arts councils and ministries in other countries."[50] Recommending increased funding for other agencies, the Commission felt that no coordination or consolidation was desirable. The rest of the report contained specific proposals for various agencies: the Smithsonian Institution, the Library of Congress, General Services Administration, the Department of State, etc., and the programs administered by each. All recommendations were quite modest, suggesting procedural changes rather than any new conceptual direction.

The report contained a minority statement by George Biddle which set forth his belief that the Commission itself should have an increase in budget and staff. Reversing his stand of ten years previous, however, Biddle said that he agreed with the Commission's underlying principle: ". . . the

---

[49]U.S., Commission of Fine Arts, Art and Government, Report to the President (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1953).

[50]Ibid., p. 14.

belief that a centralized Bureau of Fine Arts would not serve the best interests of our diversified, decentralized, federated form of government."[51]

This attitude prevailed throughout ten more years of legislative proposals and initiatives to form a government arts agency. Not a single Congressional session went by without a bill proposing some form of aid to the arts; most died in committee.

Two succeeded--in 1954, President Eisenhower asked for and received authorization to establish a Special International Program to sponsor tours abroad by American musicians, dancers, and actors. Given permanent authorization by the Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956,[52] this program became the basis of the Department of State Cultural Presentations Program. The National Cultural Center, mentioned by President Truman, was supported by President Eisenhower as well; Congress finally passed legislation granting a site for such a center, but no funds.[53]

The example of the British Arts Council was cited by supporters of an American patronage system; in 1957, an example closer to home was provided when the Canada Council

---

[51]Ibid., p. 29.

[52]New York Times, August 5, 1956, Section II, p. 7.

[53]John S. Harris, "The Politics of Government Arts Patronage in the United States," Parliamentary Affairs, XX, No. 4 (Autumn, 1967), 318.

was formed to aid the arts and humanities in our neighboring country. The Congressional efforts became more frequent after this event, but to no avail.

The National Endowment for the Arts

A major agency for direct federal aid to the arts was finally established in 1965. The creation of the National Endowment for the Arts was the culmination of a series of actions which began in 1962, when President John F. Kennedy appointed August Hecksher as a Special Consultant on the Arts. Charging Hecksher with surveying the present cultural role of the federal government and with finding and recommending changes in the implementation of that role, Kennedy put the prestige of his office behind the project. President and Mrs. Kennedy, as well as many of their advisors and assistants, had a personal commitment to the arts which permeated the Washington atmosphere. Debunkers of the Kennedy "mystique" have called the apparent commitment an illusory and superficial one[54] but whether for good reasons or bad, the arts became a fashionable subject for discussion and political speculation. Robert Frost's poetry reading at the Inauguration, an evening of chamber music at the White House by violincellist Pablo Casals, and presidential dinner parties for prominent artists enhanced the

---

[54]Frank Getlein, "The Man Who's Made 'the Most Solid Contribution to the Arts of Any President Since F.D.R.'," New York Times Magazine, February 14, 1971, pp. 14 ff.

atmosphere of cultural renaissance, an atmosphere which President Kennedy certainly wished to promote.

Hecksher's report was submitted to the President in 1963.[55] After a brief survey of the history of national cultural policy, the study analyzed the points of contact between existing federal agencies and the arts in a number of broad categories: the acquisition of art, raising design standards, impact on the cultural environment, presentation and display of art, education and training, and government recognition of the artist.

Hecksher included in his report a long list of suggestions regarding general policies which affect the arts directly or indirectly. He felt that the encouragement to private patronage of tax regulations was of great value to performance groups and museums, but not to individual artists who cannot legally receive such gifts. Tax reform for the individual was needed, to take into account the widely fluctuating yearly income of most artists and to provide full deductions for contributions of works of art made by the artist. Admissions taxes for performances were considered contradictory to the income tax-free status of non-profit groups; repeal of all admissions taxes was urged.

An assortment of regulations regarding copyright laws, postal rates, duty and custom fees, and government

---

[55]August Hecksher, "The Arts and the National Government," Senate Document #28, May 28, 1963 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1963).

surplus property sales needed re-examination, according to the study.[56]

The crux of this seminal re-examination of the federal role in America's cultural life was the recommendation for the establishment of permanent administrative machinery for matters relating to the arts. The agency should be "nothing heavy-handed or pretentious"[57] but should provide a means for disbursement of grants-in-aid to the states or to cultural institutions, a coordinating function for the programs of the various federal agencies, and methods for supplementing the goals of the National Cultural Center (now John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts). An advisory council to aid in this work and recommend long-range policies and programs in the area was recommended.

In Hecksher's view, the national cultural policy should always be a limited one, marginal in scope. Emphasis on individual creativity and private support was essential to avoid any of the dangers of totalitarian manipulation of art or artists or the misuse of art for political purposes.

The report prompted President Kennedy to plan for the formation of a National Council on the Arts. Failing to persuade Congress to authorize the council, the President made plans to create one by Executive Order.

---

[56] Ibid., pp. 21-27.

[57] Ibid., p. 27.

Announcement of the plan was reportedly scheduled for the week in which Kennedy was assassinated.[58]

Kennedy's plan for the arts council was revived by Lyndon Johnson in April 1964; the appointment of Roger Stevens as Special Assistant to the President on the Arts was the first step toward the formation of a national arts council. Legislation was sought from Congress and authorization was given with the provision that no more than administrative funds be available to the group. The National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964, signed by President Johnson in September 1964, provided for a 24-member council.

The members were appointed in February 1965--a distinguished group of professional artists, educators, arts administrators and concerned laymen. Principles established at their first two meetings became guidelines for the later work of the council. Planning for the distribution of funds when money became available from Congress, the arts council made the following decisions:

> . . . first, that funds should not be used for physical structures or rehabilitation; second, that deficits of performing groups, previously met by private funds, should not be taken over by the Council; third, that except on rare occasions, new organizations should not be funded; and fourth that the Council's principal emphasis should be on audience development and aiding outstanding talent and institutions wherever possible.[59]

---

[58]Roger Stevens, "Putting it Together," Cultural Affairs #7, p. 5.

[59]Ibid.

With the passage of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, the federal mechanism for arts assistance was complete. An eloquent Declaration of Purpose summarizes the philosophy behind the establishment of the Foundation:

> The Congress hereby finds and declares--
> 1. that the encouragement and support of national progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, while primarily a matter for private and local initiative, is also an appropriate matter of concern to the Federal Government;
> 2. that a high civilization must not limit its efforts to science and technology alone but must give full value and support to the other great branches of man's scholarly and cultural activity;
> 3. that democracy demands wisdom and vision in its citizens and that it must therefore foster and support a form of education designed to make men masters of their technology and not its unthinking servant;
> 4. that it is necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to complement, assist, and add to programs for the advancement of the humanities and the arts by local, State, regional, and private agencies and their organizations;
> 5. that the practice of art and the study of the humanities requires constant dedication and devotion and that, while no government can call a great artist or scholar into existence, it is necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to help create and sustain not only a climate encouraging freedom of thought, imagination, and inquiry but also the material conditions facilitating the release of this creative talent;
> 6. that the world leadership which has come to the United States cannot rest solely upon superior power, wealth, and technology, but must be solidly founded upon worldwide respect and admiration for the Nation's high qualities as a leader in the realm of ideas and of the spirit; and
> 7. that in order to implement these findings, it is desirable to establish a National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities and to strengthen the responsibilities of the Office of Education with respect to education in the arts and the humanities.[60]

---

[60]U.S., Congress, National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, Public Law 209, Sec. 2, 89th Congress, 1st session (hereinafter referred to as Public Law 209).

At first glance, the terminology for the different divisions makes differentiation of function somewhat difficult. The National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities has within it two divisions: the National Endowment for the Arts (with its policy-making body--the National Council on the Arts) and the National Endowment for the Humanities with a National Council on the Humanities. In addition, the act established a Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities to coordinate the activities of all federal agencies involved in such programs. Membership on the Federal Council consists of the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, the United States Commissioner of Education, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, the Director of the National Science Foundation, the Librarian of Congress, the Director of the National Gallery of Art, the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, and a member designated by the Secretary of State.

Authorization of appropriations was in three major categories: direct appropriation to each Endowment, a specific appropriation to the National Endowment for the Arts for distribution to state arts councils, and a provision for matching private funds donated to the Foundation.[61]

---

[61]A minor provision of the Act provided an additional allocation of funds for acquisition of equipment for instruction in the arts and humanities and teacher training institutes for such subjects.

To avoid confusion, reference will be made only to funds asked and received for the National Endowment for the Arts, not the total amount received by the Foundation. Table 3 is a summary of the Arts Endowment financial history.

The gap between authorized funds and appropriated funds is indicative of the suspicion and hostility with which many Congressmen viewed the relationship between government and the arts. The debate over the FY 1969 appropriation was particularly vituperative; the slash in funds is evident. The level to which the debate declined may be seen in this speech of Rep. Paul Fino of New York:

> The National Endowment for the Arts can use its slush fund . . . to subsidize any bearded agitator who can wield a paintbrush, any screwball folksinger who can hum "We Shall Overcome" and any Vietnik who can strum a guitar. . . . Beatniks, hippies, junkies, Communists, and Black Nationalists can be supported. . . . Provisions are needed to forbid aid to any production, workshop or group or groups which cast disrepute on the Government, flag, emblems of Armed Forces of the United States, or any State or municipality thereof or on any social or religious group.[62]

The scorn heaped upon the efforts of the Endowment was sufficient to prevent its equally outspoken defenders from securing increased funding for the agency. The debate in 1968 was the most vehement in the Endowment's as yet brief history.

When the legislation came up for extension in June 1970, increased authorization was approved by a surprising majority in the House. More than 100 Congressmen who had

---

[62] Congressional Record, February 27, 1968, pp. 4333-34.

TABLE 3.--National Endowment for the Arts--Funds Authorized, Requested, and Appropriated--FY1966-FY1970.

	Authorized	NEA Request	Admin. Request	Appropriated
Fiscal 1966				
Program	$5,000,000	$4,850,000	$2,500,000	$2,500,000
State Grants	. .	. .	. .	. .
Donation				
Matching Funds	2,250,000	2,250,000	2,000,000	34,308[a]
Totals	$7,250,000	$7,100,000	$4,500,000	$2,534,308
Fiscal 1967				
Program	$5,000,000	$5,000,000	$5,000,000	$4,000,000
States	2,750,000	2,750,000	2,750,000	2,000,000
Matching Funds	2,250,000	(1,965,692)	(1,965,692)	1,965,692[a]
Totals	$10,000,000	$9,715,692	$9,715,692	$7,965,692
Fiscal 1968				
Programs	$5,000,000	$5,000,000	$5,000,000	$4,500,000
States	2,750,000	2,750,000	2,750,000	2,000,000
Matching Funds	2,250,000	2,250,000	1,000,000	674,291[b]
Totals	$10,000,000	$10,000,000	$8,750,000	$7,174,291
Fiscal 1969				
Programs	$6,000,000	$6,550,000	$6,550,000	$3,700,000
States	2,000,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	1,700,000
Matching Funds	6,750,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	500,000
		1,500,000 Supp.	1,500,000 Supp.	1,856,875 Supp.[d]
Totals	$14,750,000	$11,550,000[c]	$11,550,000	$7,756,875

Fiscal 1970				
Program	$6,500,000	$6,500,000	$4,500,000	$4,250,000
States	2,500,000	2,500,000[e]	2,000,000	2,000,000
Matching Funds	4,750,000	6,250,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Totals	$13,750,000	$15,250,000	$7,500,000	$7,250,000

[a]Up to $2 million was authorized for FY 1966 and 1967; in FY 1966 $34,308 was donated to the Endowment and matched; in FY 1967, $1,965,692 was donated and matched.

[b]Up to $1 million was appropriated for both the Arts and Humanities Endowments; donations totaling $674,291 were received and matched for the Arts Endowment.

[c]In its budget request of September 1967, prior to passage of re-authorizing legislation, the Endowment had requested a total of $32,500,000; in March 1968, in line with House action on the bill, the Endowment reduced its request to a total of $10,050,000; subsequent to this request amounts authorized were reduced further.

[d]Congress appropriated a total of up to $3,000,000 as a supplemental appropriation for both the Arts and Humanities Endowments; the Arts Endowment received and matched donations totaling $1,856,875.

[e]Endowment request for funds to match private donations for FY 1970 was made prior to submission of the $1,500,000 FY 1969 supplemental request.

Source: National Endowment for the Arts--Office of Research.

voted for cuts in 1968 reversed their positions, many for reasons similar to those of Rep. Gerald Ford of Michigan who had "wondered at that time [1968] . . . whether the arts would not be harmed by controls . . . and whether it was prudent to appropriate Government funds at all."[63] The appropriation approved for FY 1971 was $20 million for the Arts Endowment, a significant increase that more than doubled the previous year's commitment. By 1971, supporters of the Endowment were cheered by President Richard Nixon's request that the arts organization receive $30 million for the coming FY 1972.

Under the Endowment's first Chairman, Roger Stevens, a Broadway producer and theater owner, administrative procedures began to take form. The staff was organized into a series of program offices: Architecture, Planning, and Design; Dance; Education; Literature; Music; Public Media; Theater; Visual Arts; and Special Research. The Arts Council makes use of special panels of outside experts for a variety of purposes rather than permanent advisory committees. Projects are submitted by outside individuals or groups, reviewed, categorized and, where needed, developed by the Endowment staff. After approval by the National Council on the Arts, the projects go to the Bureau of the Budget, and then follow an extended journey through House and Senate sub-committees and committees and floor vote. Finally, after

---

[63] New York Times, July 8, 1970, p. 36.

the President's signature, the projects are given to the Endowment staff once again for detailed development and planning.[64]

The scope and breadth of the Endowment's activities is awesome. Carefully harboring their limited funds, and faced with the enormous task of choosing a necessarily small number of projects to assist, their allocation of resources has been selective and sensitive.

Over 250 projects of the Endowment between 1965 and 1970 aided numerous individual artists and arts organizations, and reached tens of thousands of Americans to increase awareness of the arts. The outlay by the federal agency stimulated matching funds from state and private sources in a ratio of $3 for every $1 expended.[65]

In June 1970, Roger Stevens left the post of Chairman of the National Endowment and was replaced by Nancy Hanks, former head of the Associated Councils for the Arts (ACA). As an active member of the ACA staff, Miss Hanks had acquired an extensive knowledge of the growing field of arts administration. Miss Hanks was an exceptionally qualified person for the position; President Nixon's choice was well-received by arts organizations. Under Miss Hank's leadership, the Endowment programs followed the patterns established

---

[64]Alvin Reiss, "Government and the Arts," Cultural Affairs #1, p. 25.

[65]Hearings, p. 134.

by Stevens. A general improvement in communication with state arts councils was noted by some observers[66]--a change in keeping with Miss Hanks' background. The Council and Endowment staff established three goals for program development in an attempt to define the areas in which it could most effectively work:

> To encourage broad dissemination of the best of American arts across the country;
> To work toward solutions of some of the core problems that plague art institutions in their efforts to provide greater public service;
> To provide support that leads toward improving quality and standards for our audiences and encouraging creativity among our most gifted artists.[67]

Implementation of the goals takes place under three categories--(1) the availability of artistic resources, (2) cultural resources development, (3) advancement of America's cultural legacy.

Touring of performance and visual arts throughout the country is a major part of the Endowment's operations to overcome the fact that "the availability of the arts in this country has long been limited by geographic and economic factors."[68] The Endowment's coordinated residency touring program for dance, considered highly successful by Miss Hanks,

---

[66]E. Ray Scott, Executive Director, Michigan Council for the Arts, Detroit. Interview, July 28, 1970.

[67]Hearings, p. 126.

[68]Ibid.

was cited as a model for successful dissemination of the arts. The dance tours, involving the nation's major ballet and modern dance groups, provided support for local sponsors to engage the companies for a visit of at least a half week during which the dance company provides a variety of services such as master classes, lecture demonstrations, music and design workshops and teachers' classes. Funds for this program were allotted through state arts councils. In 1970, six regional touring circuits involved twenty-two states.

Research into new means of transporting visual arts was under study in order to increase the exhibition range of touring art shows.

The task of increasing the availability of artistic resources was one in which the federal-state partnership functioned most effectively. The enforced decentralization which had been written into law provided machinery for implementing Endowment plans.

Programs were formulated to assist professional institutions "to adapt themselves more effectively to the changing needs of their publics by alleviating some of their more pressing financial problems."[69] Using its limited funds judiciously, the Council discovered that relatively modest grants could significantly strengthen and stabilize arts

---

[69] Ibid.

organizations. During its first five years, these support grants had been given by the Endowment to dance and theater organizations. Expansion to museums and orchestras was expected once Congress approved a higher level of funding.[70] Under the assistance program the institutions requesting funds would set priorities for assistance rather than the Endowment, to avoid any suggestion of government control. Assistance programs encouraged the development of new artistic and educational projects to reach larger audiences, but also could be used for maintenance of existing activities.

The stimulation of private support by the Endowment was essential to the program's success; the government role is only a limited one, and private support must provide the bulk of any artistic organization's patronage. A frequently expressed fear of opponents of government aid to the arts is that private support would decline as the federal role increased.[71] By stimulating additional private support as part of its program assistance, the Endowment hoped to forestall any diminution in private spending.

In addition to these programs intended to support and extend availability of existing institutions, the Endowment devoted a portion of its allocations to innovative

---

[70] Ibid.

[71] Baumol and Bowen, Performing Arts, p. 372.

projects, which explored new opportunities for audience and artist alike. Through the creation of new arts organizations, grants to individuals to develop talents or explore new areas of environmental problems, systematic research and data collection, and programs to support the arts in education, the Endowment hoped to alter the role of the arts in society. The recognition that only a tiny percentage of the population attended performances or museums on a regular basis was a sobering one, and suggested that major attention should be given to changing the traditional nature of the artist-audience relationship. The Endowment planned to take a more active role in setting up pilot programs in the arts at the early childhood and elementary education level. The new programs would establish the arts as an integral part of the educational process; quality in performance, teaching, and staffing would be emphasized through the use of professionally trained artists, craftsmen and technicians.

The work of the Endowment took place along these lines in the first five years of its operation. Although generally well-received and lauded for the scope and effectiveness of its projects, there were complaints about the philosophy behind the allocations of the federal agency. Grants to individuals were of particular concern to critics of the Endowment.

To answer some of the criticism of its policy on individual grants, the National Council discussed and

approved a position paper in January 1970.[72] Pointing out that grants to individuals constituted only six per cent of total funding, the paper stressed the careful and systematic review of applications for grants, the open announcement of fund availability, and the thoughtful selection process. Descriptions of individual grants were given--choreography commissions and rehearsal reimbursements to dancers, score copying for composers, and research fellowships to architects.

The paper concluded:

> . . . not every grant to an individual, no matter what its purpose, will lead to the creation of a great work of art or the solution of a serious environmental problem that will accrue to the benefit of all our people. This is a hesitancy in prophecy we share with the sciences, and social sciences, and education. We know that the ratio between attempt and reality might seem discouraging at times but artistic creativity, like research in science or education, is essential to a civilized society.
>
> There is no doubt that mistakes will occasionally be made, no matter who makes the choices or administers the program. Imbalances will creep in. But with continuing review by the National Council and our advisory panels, they can be redressed.[73]

Some critics of the Endowment programs felt that all or a larger proportion of the federal funds should go directly to the states for allocation. This position was expressed by the executive directors of several state arts councils, particularly those receiving little or no funding

---

[72]Reprinted in Hearings, pp. 132-33.

[73]Ibid., p. 133.

from their own state legislatures.[74] Nancy Hanks estimated that although direct grants to the states totaled about one-third of total allocations, additional program grants made by the Endowment to the state arts councils raised this proportion to approximately one-half.[75] Moreover, by emphasizing regional programming or supporting arts institutions in population centers such as New York and California, the Endowment was able to use its funds in such a manner as to benefit more than one state--"arts simply do not have a geographical boundary."[76]

A study of National Endowment programming during its first five years reveals a distinct emphasis on the performance arts, particularly theater. This emphasis reflects the choice of the National Council, alluded to by Chairman Hanks,[77] recognizing the larger amounts necessary to support organizations faced with the rising costs and generally fixed income cited by Baumol and Bowen. Music, dance, and theater account for 58 per cent of the total Endowment program allocations. This total is raised somewhat when performance arts grants under the headings of Education and Coordinated Programs are added.

---

[74]See, for example, letters from Idaho and Louisiana in Hearings, pp. 308-9, 317-20, and testimony from Tennessee, p. 243.

[75]Ibid., p. 134. [76]Ibid. [77]Ibid., p. 126.

TABLE 4.--National Endowment Programming, by Art Medium--FY 1966-FY 1970.

Medium	Amount	Percentage of Total
Architecture, Planning, and Design	$ 988,787	4
Dance	3,478,208	13
Education	1,884,450	7
Literature	1,894,925	7
Music	5,132,605	19
Public Media	1,195,525	5
Theater	6,737,619	26
Visual Arts	2,993,622	11
Coordinated Programs	2,048,573	8
Total	$26,354,314	

Source: Compiled from National Endowment for the Arts, The First Five Years: Fiscal 1966 through Fiscal 1970 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970) (hereinafter referred to as First Five Years).

Programs in theater constitute the largest group of allocations. This is due to the general support grants of up to $25,000 given to 33 theaters throughout the country and two major projects--a contract for housing touring resident theater companies at the ANTA building in New York City for limited engagements ($1,132,000) and the Educational Laboratory Theater program undertaken by the Endowment

in cooperation with the U.S. Office of Education ($1,351,000).

Only fully professional companies have received grants under the Endowment's Theater Program. "We haven't touched community or university theaters," admitted Ruth Mayleas,[78] Program Director for Theater, because of the need to concentrate the limited funds at hand. The general support grants to thirty-three resident theater companies were meant to be of limited assistance in raising levels of artistic quality and improving standards in theaters that have begun to establish themselves as parts of their communities. Seeing this program as a continuing one to strengthen the resident professional theater movement and the decentralization of American theater, Mayleas noted that grants were meant to be used to strengthen and enrich a theater's existing program, not for "crazy schemes." It was not necessary for a theater to plan elaborate new programs to meet specific federal requirements. The Endowment encouraged its grantees to use the limited subsidy for raising actors' salaries, engaging guest directors, performers, and technical personnel, or producing works by new playwrights.

In 1967, the Endowment widened its support program to include experimental theaters and workshops in order to

---

[78]Interview, August 25, 1970 in Washington, D.C.

"provide encouragement and assistance to new playwrights, and to stimulate the production of new works and the development of new forms and techniques."[79] This series of grants was also limited to professional theater companies but the professional status of many of the groups was difficult to establish. "Equity and the unions don't consider them professional," Mayleas observed. Working out of lofts, church basements, or old movie houses, these groups accounted for "some of the most adventurous and promising works in the country."[80] Of the thirty-five theaters given grants, nineteen were located in New York City.

"Except for a few groups [The Paper Bag Players and the Bil Baird Puppet Theater], Children's Theater is one area we haven't gotten into," Mayleas admitted, remarking also on the small number of professional companies in this field.

The Educational Laboratory Theater was a massive three-year project to provide professional theater performances as an enrichment of secondary school drama curriculum. Resident theater companies in three cities--Providence, Rhode Island (Trinity Square Repertory Company); New Orleans, Louisiana (Repertory Theater New Orleans); and Los Angeles, California (Inner City Cultural Center)--produced plays

---

[79]National Endowment for the Arts, First Five Years.

[80]Ibid.

suggested by the English departments of area high schools, developed curriculum materials, and participated in class discussions and criticism of the plays. Four plays were presented during each of three academic years to tenth-grade English classes in the course of this long-range program in audience development.

Experiences with the project differed widely in the three cities. A detailed analysis of the entire program was underway in 1971, after the three-year span had ended. The Central Midwestern Region Educational Laboratory (CEMREL), an independent research and curriculum development agency which had designed classroom materials for the Laboratory Theaters, was conducting a series of tests and interviews to help judge the program's effectiveness.

Dr. Hans Stern, Coordinator for the Los Angeles theater program, gave an informal evaluation at an American Educational Theater Association convention in August 1970.[81] Students from tenth-grade classes saw the following plays presented by the Inner City Repertory Company: Tartuffe, The Glass Menagerie, The Sea Gull, A Midsummer Night's Dream, A Raisin in the Sun, Our Town, Macbeth, The Fantasticks, West Side Story, Room Service, Antigone (Anouilh), and The Bald Soprano. During the three years, many program

---

[81]"The Educational Laboratory Theatre Project--Its First Three Years," report presented at the National Convention of the American Educational Theatre Association, August 24, 1970.

changes were made to meet unexpected difficulties, such as pupil attendance (buses were often not available to bring students to the special matinees) and production time (afternoon matinees were poorly attended due to conflicting extracurricular events). After the first year, greater emphasis was placed on teacher training and workshops, to assist use of the curriculum materials provided by CEMREL. Visits to the schools by actors, directors and designers, special open rehearsals, videotape projects, student press conferences, and lectures supplemented the curriculum packages, in an effort to make the theatrical event a rich and meaningful experience on many levels.

One of the most serious problems under which the Los Angeles project labored, according to Dr. Stern, was an unmet deficit of $350,000 resulting from low estimates on theater renovation. This deficit plagued the theater continually, causing the directors to skimp on rehearsal time. As a result, the students who saw the productions during the opening week "saw . . . performances [which] must be classed as run-throughs."[82] The constant pressure did not permit consistently high production standards.

Despite the difficulties of the project, Dr. Stern felt that it had been a highly successful and exciting experiment.

---

[82] Ibid.

> Students have participated in a vigorous, controversial, stimulating artistic endeavor. They have not liked every play, as they will not like every play they will attend in the future. They have learned that a play often represents the world in miniature, that stage experience is compressed and expanded to serve the communication experience. Students and their teachers have seen that the theatre is a unique and important part of the environment in a civilized society. They have learned that keeping a theatre alive is expensive in time, money and effort and that whatever the costs, the rewards outweigh them.[83]

Among many recommendations, Dr. Stern suggested that a five-year program would have been ideal--one year of detailed planning, one year of a small pilot program, then three years of full-scale operation. Evening performances were recommended, as was a broadening of the course to include all the arts. The experience showed that "a massive reorganization of secondary education is necessary, so that activities such as those in the Project will not be regarded as 'interruptions'."[84]

Ruth Mayleas felt that the Los Angeles project, because of its truly integrated company, had been quite effective on a sociological as well as artistic level. The New Orleans and Los Angeles companies had been born with the project; the Inner City Repertory Company continued after the termination of the project. In Rhode Island, the Trinity Square Repertory Company performed "superbly"[85] and raised its own performance level considerably during the project.

---

[83] Ibid.

[84] Ibid.

[85] Mayleas, interview.

In none of the three cities, however, did the project continue under local sponsorship, as had been hoped. The high cost of professional theater made the Educational Laboratory Theater program an impossibility without substantial government subsidy.

The other expensive theatrical effort of the Endowment, the ANTA residency contract, provided for tours to New York by resident theater companies for limited engagements. Conceding the makeshift nature of this program, Mayleas pointed to the lack of planning before its commencement. The logistics and expenses of the tour proved too difficult for many theaters; fewer were able to come than had been expected. Mayleas felt that a better use of the money might have been a series of tours and exchanges among the resident theaters.

Although amateur and educational theaters were excluded from direct grants, this sector of American theater benefited from the Endowment's support of professional service organizations such as the American Educational Theatre Association, the International Theatre Institute, the American National Theatre and Academy, the American Playwrights Theatre, and the American Society for Theatre Research. Professional programs at Boston University, Brandeis University, the University of Michigan and Yale University received grants, as well.

When asked what an ideal national theater program would be, Mayleas listed areas where existing subsidy might be increased, where activity could be initiated, and wider audiences reached. Grants to resident theaters would be substantially increased; more theaters could be included. Special projects in new areas, improvement of conservatory and training programs, fellowships and grants to playwrights, directors, and designers, special touring programs, artistic exchanges among regional theaters, and circuit booking of youth and children's companies were all possible areas for program development if funding became available.

On the subject of audience development, Mayleas felt that many programs in this area were impractical. "We don't want a mass audience, we want to play for those who love, understand and appreciate us."[86] From this small, elite audience, a wider circle may be built so that companies can play to full houses. But a totally mass audience was neither desirable nor possible, according to Mayleas.

Although the National Endowment is the keystone of the government's new program in the arts, it is only one of several agencies which receive allocations specifically for the arts. Table 5 lists the total of major direct arts expenditures during FY 1970. It is by no means a complete listing, since innumerable other agencies directly or

---

[86] Ibid.

TABLE 5.--Direct Federal Government Arts Expenditures--FY 1970

Department		Amount
1. STATE DEPARTMENT--		
Cultural Presentations		$ 474,631
2. SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION		13,498,538
Performing Arts Division	$ 226,000	
Music Division	25,000	
Freer Gallery	45,000	
National Collection of Fine Arts	1,015,000	
National Portrait Gallery	768,000	
Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden	308,000	
National Gallery of Art	3,611,536	
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts	7,500,000[a]	
3. OFFICE OF EDUCATION--		
Arts and Humanities Program		882,404
4. NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS		9,150,000
Programs	4,250,000	
States Program	2,000,000	
Funds to match private donations	2,000,000	
Office of Education Transfer Funds	900,000	
5. CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING		15,000,000
TOTAL		$39,005,573

Source: National Endowment for the Arts, Office of Research, October, 1970.

[a]Plus $5 million bonding authority for Treasury.

indirectly expend federal funds for arts-related programs.[87] Description of these programs would be a considerable project, only tangentially related to the main theme of this paper. A history and analysis of the programs of the Department of State which relate directly to the arts, International Educational Exchange and the Cultural Presentations Program, is included as an appendix to this thesis, as an example of government aid that predates the present phase of arts patronage. Similar studies of the Smithsonian's Performing Arts Division and John F. Kennedy Center, the Department of Defense Army Entertainment Program and Armed Forces Special Services Program, the Office of Education's Arts and Humanities Division, and the Department of the Interior's National Park Service Performing Arts Facilities would cover most theater activities of the government.

The Background of Government Arts Patronage--the States

The early history of support for the arts among the states parallels that of the federal government. Before the Depression, the major arts activity consisted of adornment of courthouses, legislative chambers and capital buildings. A few states gave aid to libraries or museums; at the end of the nineteenth century, many states formed art commissions

---

[87]See ACA, Washington, for complete listings.

to advise on the purchase of art works and architectural design for public buildings. The first to form such a council was Utah (1899).

The Minnesota Art Commission, formed in 1900, had broader power than the simple evaluation of art purchases which became a pattern for public arts agencies. With a budget of $7,000 annually, an extensive touring program was developed to exhibit works of art in all parts of the state; several major exhibitions of art were held.[88]

Instances of support for other than visual arts were rare, although municipal orchestras were occasionally aided through state or local contribution to largely private financing. Municipal facilities for housing the arts constitute an inestimable asset of long-standing value; whether constructed wholly, in part, or not at all with municipal funds, most major concert halls were accorded favored status by municipal governments in securing locations, zoning or licensing requirements, and other matters.

During the period of depression work relief, few states initiated projects in the arts until encouraged to do so by Washington. Even then, before the Works Progress Administration began sponsorship and administration of fully professional projects, state efforts were usually of an amateur, recreational, or educational nature. A notable

---

[88]Purcell, Government and Art, pp. 40-41.

exception was New York, where work relief projects for professional artists under the Temporary Emergency Relief Administration (TERA) provided the model for federal programs.

During the period from 1940 to 1960, when no federal leadership for arts projects was present, individual states embarked on programs of varying scope and dimension. One of the most ambitious programs was carried out by the state of North Carolina, which sponsored the nation's first state symphony orchestra and gave extensive support to outdoor historical dramas, such as The Lost Colony by Paul Green. State funds were used to purchase an art collection, to help build a civic theater, and to found the North Carolina School of the Arts, a professional school offering intensive training in music, dance, drama, and visual arts. Historical restorations, museums, and festivals also received state appropriations. Total expenditures on a variety of cultural programs in North Carolina was approximately $500,000 annually prior to 1965.[89]

In 1960, a study conducted by the Library of Congress[90] revealed that most state appropriations for cultural activities were made for museums and historical sites, often

---

[89]North Carolina, Arts Council, The Arts in North Carolina--1967 (Winston-Salem: North Carolina Arts Council, 1967), pp. 91-93.

[90]Congressional Record, February 2, 1961, pp. 1626-32.

with the purpose of increasing tourism within the state. Libraries received a large proportion of the funds allotted. Few of the states made appropriations for music, theater, or dance projects. Almost all the states, through their support of state universities and colleges, provided indirect aid to the arts, but this was not considered by the Library of Congress study due to the difficulty of evaluating such appropriations.

The survey of programs revealed dispersed and uncoordinated activity, with no established priorities or guidelines among the various states. Some of the programs were imaginative and ambitious, but most states gave little aid to the arts unless tied to education or tourism.

Theater projects were sparsely represented--only nine are mentioned in the 1961 report (see Table 6).

The record of state activity compiled in 1960 by the Library of Congress was not a distinguished one. That year marks the inception of the present government effort at arts patronage; the formation of the New York State Council on the Arts in 1960 was the first step taken at either the national or state level toward exploration of a government role that was equitable, non-restricting, and effective. An initial grant of $50,000 was made to survey the state's cultural resources and study "appropriate methods to encourage participation in and

TABLE 6.--State Funds Expended for Theater Projects Prior to 1961.

State	Project	Amount	Date
Connecticut	Renovation and preservation of Goodspeed Opera House	$10,000	1959-61
Florida	Ringling Museum and Asolo Theater	$95,374	1958-59
Massachusetts	Open-air summer drama in Boston	a	1959
New York	Construction of Jones Beach Marine Theater;	$4.2 mill	b
	Saratoga Springs Theater leased to private stock company;	a	b
	Parks made available to Performing Arts	a	b
North Carolina	Roanoke Island Outdoor Drama;	deficits	annually
	Smoky Mountains Historical Drama	"	"
Virginia	The Barter Theater	$15,000	1960-61

Source: Congressional Record, February 2, 1961.

[a]No amount given.

[b]No data given.

appreciation of the arts."[91] The enthusiastic support of Governor Nelson Rockefeller was a major factor in the passage of the initial authorization;[92] long a patron of the arts himself, he was uniquely qualified to provide the leadership necessary to balance political and artistic considerations. The State Legislature, acting on the recommendations of the initial study, appropriated $450,000 for the first full year of the Council's operation (1961-1962).

During its first two years, the Council concentrated on an extensive program of touring attractions, both performance arts troupes and visual arts exhibitions. The programs won considerable support for the Council from the residents of upstate New York, from communities which for the first time could view the wealth of New York City's professional dance, music and theater artists. Allaying fears that the new council would devote its efforts only to New York City, the touring program increased dramatically each year, both in number of communities assisted and in the numbers of attractions offered.

The touring program was originally organized to provide grants to the performing organizations themselves. In the third year of operation, this policy was changed:

---

[91]William Howard Adams, The Politics of Art--Forming a State Arts Council (New York: ACA, 1966), p. viii (hereinafter referred to as Politics).

[92]Scott, "Partnership," p. 379.

grants were given to the communities instead of the organizations. The sponsoring group within the community contracted directly with one of an approved group of artists. The Council gave additional support to the sponsor to cover possible deficits between costs incurred and box-office receipts. This policy change reduced the council's expenditures for tours from $264,500 in 1962-63 to $155,550 in 1963-64.[93] The new policy was so successful that it became the model for the touring programs of all subsequent state arts councils.

In addition to touring, the new council gave technical and consultant assistance to museums, historical societies, and communities on a variety of problems, ranging from preservation of historic sites to facilities for display and exhibition. The Council matched the community's needs, from submitted applications, with an appropriate expert and paid a portion of the consultant fee and travel expenses. Both the professional advice and person-to-person contact were invaluable to upstate communities.

Perhaps more important than the individual projects was the attitude of the council staff. Constantly experimenting with new approaches and projects, the staff always maintained exacting standards to assure high professional quality. Executive Director John MacFadyen maintained that

---

[93] Ibid.

"Patronage must always be selective; for the Council to attempt an attitude of 'something for everyone' would be to set an artistically unsound precedent for emerging government support."[94]

The Council did not attempt to maintain the arts as an elite activity, however. The arts were brought out of museums and concert halls into the streets and community centers of New York, Buffalo, Rochester and Syracuse ghetto neighborhoods. The projects encouraged participation as well as observation, as professional filmmakers, dancers, and actors led workshops and demonstrations for children. The willingness to experiment and grow (and a budget to support these innovative projects) gave the nation a fine example of how to begin a program of support for the arts. The National Endowment for the Arts, as well as other state councils, drew considerably from the New York experience.

Table 7 provides a program and budget history of the New York State Council on the Arts to illustrate the breadth and scope of its program and the size of the state's commitment. In FY 1971, the New York State Legislature took another unprecedented step and allocated $18 million to the arts council in addition to its regular program budget of $2,203,015. The additional funds were distributed to cultural organizations throughout the state for general

---

[94]John MacFadyen, "Summary of Future Plans," Second Annual Report (New York: New York State Council on the Arts, 1962), p. 44.

TABLE 7.--New York State Council on the Arts--Budget History.

Item	FY 1962	FY 1963	FY 1964	FY 1965	FY 1966	FY 1967	FY 1968	FY 1969	FY 1970
Administrative	50,000	110,250[h]	81,065	93,160	140,424	160,934	207,545	396,293	432,199
Federal Program	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	200,000	140,000
Film Program	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	40,000	46,260	60,000	45,000
Financial Research	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	11,500
Ghetto Arts	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	300,000	350,000	300,000[a]
Museum Aid	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	600,000	592,300	600,000	550,000
Poetry & Writers Program[e]	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	20,000	20,000
Professional Teach the Performing Arts[d]	. .	. .	. .	. .	50,000	75,000	65,231	55,000	35,000
Program Development	. .	. .	73,480	38,450	32,000	65,900	40,000	49,600	45,000

TABLE 7.--Continued.

Item	FY 1962	FY 1963	FY 1964	FY 1965	FY 1966	FY 1967	FY 1968	FY 1969	FY 1970
Publications, Studies, Public Information[b]	. .	. .	29,144	15,700	20,000	34,450	40,000[b]	63,950[b]	50,000[b]
Special Projects[f]	. .	185,500	73,480	112,175	146,986	229,450	252,170	266,153	207,575
Technical Assistance	29,600	. .	30,000	47,700	76,295	89,728	87,000	76,354	100,000
Touring Program	330,000	264,500	166,800	153,300	178,300	186,445	222,609	212,602	137,425[c]
Traveling (Visual Arts) Exhibitions	40,400	. .	80,250	96,850	127,890	72,560	83,853	80,000	75,000
Disbursements Matching National Council Grant[g]	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	61,818	81,363

TABLE 7.--Continued.

Item	FY 1962	FY 1963	FY 1964	FY 1965	FY 1966	FY 1967	FY 1968	FY 1969	FY 1970
Statewide Contractual Services	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	31,000	62,775

[a]Includes Miscellaneous Appropriations grant.

[b]Includes New York State Awards.

[c]Includes $65,000 for Composer in Performance & State University Touring Program.

[d]Also called Educational Presentation.

[e]Included in Special Projects before 1968-69.

[f]Special Projects included Young Artists, Poetry--National Grant disbursements before 1968-69.

[g]Prior to 1968-69 included in Special Projects.

[h]Includes Technical Assistance, Workshops and Special Projects.

Source: New York State Council on the Arts Annual Reports, 1961-1970.

support. During that year, the New York State agency had a larger budget for arts support than any other state or federal agency.

Other states, following the initiative of New York, began to evaluate their role in support of the arts within their borders. The Governor of Missouri, in December 1962, appointed a Committee on the Arts to evaluate the state's cultural resources and suggest methods for expanding the outreach of these institutions. In Illinois, Governor Otto Kerner appointed an Arts Council Advisory Committee in June 1963; the following year, by executive order, he created the Illinois Arts Council which was given legislative permanence in 1966. Other states, such as California and Minnesota, inaugurated their state councils through legislative, rather than executive leadership.

By the summer of 1965, prompted by the certain prospect of a federal agency for the arts, over twenty states had officially created state arts councils, some by executive decree, some through legislative sanction, and some by restructuring existing agencies.

The Act creating the National Endowment for the Arts contained a provision for disbursement of funds to state councils:

> The Chairman, with the advice of the Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities and the National Council on the Arts, is authorized to establish and carry out a program of grants-in-aid to assist the several states in supporting existing projects and productions which meet

> the standards enumerated in section 5 (c) of the Act, and in developing projects and production in the arts in such a manner as will furnish adequate programs, facilities, and services in the arts to all the people and communities in each of the several States.[95]

The Act permitted a state to request as much as $25,000 "to conduct a study to plan the development of a state agency"[96] on the arts, if no such agency existed. Those states in which a council or commission was already in existence were eligible to receive funds on a matching basis to carry out programs in the arts. The scramble to establish arts councils prior to the passage of the National Foundation Act can be explained by this latter clause. By the end of the first year of the Endowment's operation of the federal-state partnership in the arts, all of the states, four territories and the District of Columbia had established permanent arts councils.[97] Fiscal 1967 saw the first distribution of grants to state councils. Eleven states received $50,000 from the Endowment. Other states received $25,000 study grants, while some received an additional allotment of $12,000 for matching funds to assist local groups.

Spurred to birth by a combination of federal incentive and local interest, the councils were similar in superficial characteristics of structure, administration and typically meager budgets; in goals and effectiveness,

---

[95] U.S., Congress, Public Law #209, Section 5 (h).

[96] Ibid.

[97] Scott, "Partnership," p.

however, the agencies were as different as their state flags. Nearly all the councils consisted of a group of citizens, appointed usually by the governor of the state (often subject to the approval of the state legislature). A small group of states (including Connecticut and California) provided for a legislative role in selecting council members. Typically, the council members are not salaried, although they do receive per diem and travel expenses for council meetings.

Council members were not usually drawn from the ranks of professional artists. Businessmen, educators, arts administrators, and housewives constituted the largest groups represented, according to one survey of eight arts councils.[98] Reasons for this may be seen by the experience of the Michigan Council for the Arts, whose membership was originally drawn almost exclusively from the arts. According to Michigan Executive Director E. Ray Scott, it was decided that this approach was unsatisfactory. The chairman of the arts council felt that "it would be a better idea to have some people with clout, people known outside the arts or university circles who could call up a legislator and make him listen."[99]

---

[98]John S. Harris, "Arts Councils: A Survey and Analysis," Public Administration Review, Vol. XXX, No. 4, pp. 387-99.

[99]Interview, July 28, 1970.

Representation from all geographic parts of the state was considered important, especially in states which had large metropolitan centers, since the problem of diffusion of cultural resources to the deprived rural areas was a key consideration. Partisanship in selection of council members was avoided, to remove this sector of public administration from political squabbling.

In addition to the members of the council, advisory panels or committees were usually selected to provide expert assistance in program development and evaluation. In all cases, the advisory panels consisted of professional artists and educators, or working practitioners of the discipline under which they were gathered. The role of the advisory groups in relation to the council as a decision-making body was a sensitive one that varied with each state--conflict or resentment over the council's treatment of panel proposals sometimes arise.

Depending on the size of the council's budget, an administrative staff was appointed, usually an executive director and a secretary. Budget permitting, program assistants often supplemented this staff, either on a full or part-time basis. Much of the initiative in program origination came from the executive directors, who usually put in long hours developing and overseeing the council's plans.

The first task confronting any arts council was the assessment of existing cultural resources and the

establishment of communication between arts organizations. Many symphony, museum, or theater administrators treated their organizations as feudal fiefs, embattled fortresses to be defended from public scrutiny. Jealousy among neighboring organizations was prevalent. These attitudes are understandable given the intense competition for private support and public attendance. A simple listing of available performance or exhibit facilities was a rarity in most states.

The core of the council's work, of course, was the development of a program for support of the arts within its state borders. Through a combination of general support for organizations, grants for service projects of outreach to the community, and educational projects, the council could experiment and arrive at the best possible balance of project type for a given budget and region.

The key to success, however, was not the particular projects nor the amount of money, but the philosophy and attitude of the council members. John Willett, discussing the role of the arts in city planning, points out some of the dangers of public patronage:

> If people need art, it is not to bolster up their claim to be civilized but because it is an age-old human activity, a continual delight to practice, study or simply sit back and gape at; full of jokes, problems, explosions, sudden breath-taking beauties; something unpredictable that can set up against modern life's mechanisms and routines.
>
> Whether we take art to be a key to things beyond this world or as a marvelously refined man-made contrivance

> it is this that people want when they claim art as one of the basic rights of man. It is not a loud claim, though it is becoming more so. But it can easily be stifled and distorted if the art-conscious minority appears in the guise of Lady Bountiful, patronizing the artists and improving the public mind; for nobody likes to be condescended to, and rightly or wrongly the suspicion is bound to arise that the guardians of art are only trying to find takers for the kind of art that they themselves prefer. The public prefers to see art as a source of hope than as an implied reproach.[100]

The Associated Councils of the Arts, membership organization for the fledgling agencies, enunciated a number of guidelines for program planning and policy-making.[101] Recognizing that the entire council, made up of nine to fifteen members, met too infrequently to be involved in detailed planning, the ACA suggested that only broad policy decisions and long-range goals be the subject of full council meetings. Specific objectives and plans would be worked out by executive committee, administrative staff and/or advisory committees. To avoid disharmony, the ACA cautioned that definition of the roles of each segment of the council be explicit. For the advisory committees in particular a clear description of their function in relation to the council as a whole and the administrative staff was vital, as well as a breakdown of all steps of the decision-making process.

The actual program of activity should be chosen only after decisions had been made as to areas of principal

---

[100]John Willett, Art in a City (London: Methuen & Co., 1967), p. 239.

[101]Adams, Politics, p. 15.

emphasis--professional, amateur, or semi-professional groups. From the New York State Council on the Arts came the suggestion that of three possible areas in which the arts council could be of assistance--the creative artist, the interpreter, and the audience--the latter was the most important factor and the one offering most chance of success.[102]

The public relations of the arts council should be considered a primary concern, noted the ACA. Geographical distribution of projects was necessary so that maximum coverage was achieved. The arts council is meant to be of service to its community--to initiate and plan imaginative projects but always to concentrate on the needs of its public; to design and administer programs suggested by its constituents; and to break down the insularity and cultural close-mindedness of many artists without diluting the quality of performance.

Finally, the ACA tried to spell out the sensitive and delicate nature of the political realities of possible public disapproval of sponsored art works. Freedom of the arts, an important aspect of the nation's cultural heritage, had to be assured. Controversial performances or displays were bound to appear on occasion. To guard against both the possibilities of political reprisals and a crippling self-censorship "the administrative imagination must be strained

---

[102] Ibid., p. 16.

to the utmost to construct a viable system of patronage. It must have elaborate, intricate, and sophisticated administrative procedures to protect its program policies, especially where the contemporary arts are involved."[103] Sensitivity to the experimental nature of the entire concept of government support of the arts would guard against unnecessarily reckless endeavors; a firm foundation of public support and enlightened sponsorship, however, would free the council from blame or repercussions. As with all council projects, controversial or not, public acceptance was the most important goal of firm leadership in this innovative field.

The policies evolved by "the several States" show a diversity and breadth which reflects the scope of our varied national heritage. The creative individuality expressed through the varied levels of local, state and federal patronage was an assurance that no homogeneous state art would be forced on the nation. The rich variety of program fostered by state arts councils shows an assertive local pride in regional culture, and often a respect for humble, neglected crafts or forgotten history. Professional artists and organizations received a substantial share of program money, but not to the exclusion of amateur groups, community arts festivals, and local heritage projects.

---

[103] Ibid., p. 20.

The State of Hawaii, for example, spent $25,000 to "foster research in and the development of the various ethnic cultures of which the State population is composed."[104] The pilot project involved native Hawaiian and Filipino culture, aiming at "strengthening a sense of individual identity, self-esteem and motivation, and a greater social and economic capacity for survival."[105] Ultimately the programs would involve Samoan, Korean, Okinawan, and Portuguese cultures as well as other immigrant groups.

A West Virginia program which was widely publicized involved a series of regional summer camps stressing the "Mountain Heritage" of the region. Children from all parts of the state were shown that the "bad language" of grandmothers and grandfathers, of which they were taught to be ashamed, was derived from Elizabethan English. Folk songs and folk dances were taught and crafts were displayed as examples of a native art form. The re-introduction to their state history gave the children a greater appreciation and pride in their background and ethnic identity.[106]

Many states sponsored programs for black residents of inner-city communities which attempted to accomplish the same aim of developing ethnic pride and identity. New York's, of course, was the most extensive and complete. Its primary aim was giving artists in black and Puerto Rican communities a chance to present their work.

---

[104] *Hearings*, p. 305. [105] *Ibid*. [106] *Ibid*.

> The Ghetto Arts Program is conceived as neither a poverty program nor a therapy program, and it is concerned with very much more than keeping people off the streets in summertime. Ghetto artists need a place to experiment to clarify what they consider valid and relevant to themselves and their communities. They need the opportunity to make mistakes, to forge their own definition of their art.[107]

Under the leadership of Harlem theater director and actress Vinnette Carroll, an Urban Arts Corps was formed, consisting of talented ghetto students. Specially trained in arts management as well as their chosen art forms, the young black men and women offered their services and leadership to community groups to improve artistic quality.

Faced with typically small budgets and inadequate staffs, some councils chose to concentrate their funds and energy on a unified program of cultural development. The Pennsylvania Council of the Arts spent much of its budget on a series of community arts festivals. Sponsored and staffed by local members of community arts councils, the festivals combined exhibits, drama performances, concerts, and dance recitals by civic and professional groups into a unified presentation with total community involvement and support. The festivals had a well-established history in the state, so the state council capitalized upon an existing resource, providing technical assistance, limited funds, and information. The result was a significant improvement in festival standards, a pooling of information between

---

[107]New York, State Council on the Arts, Annual Report 1968-69, p. 79.

communities, and a widening of public knowledge of the work of the state arts council.[108]

West Virginia chose to focus on the quality of music education in the state's public schools. In 1968, twenty-six of its forty-nine projects involved music teachers, student performers, or student audiences.[109] Realizing that a young audience program could only solve part of the problem of poor quality music education, the council sponsored a series of workshops and programs for music teachers to introduce them to new curriculum techniques and to contemporary music--jazz, rock, folk, electronic--which was largely ignored in music courses. Musicians such as Duke Ellington, Pete Seeger, Aaron Copeland, Gunther Schuller, Paul Simon and Art Garfunkel, Dizzy Gillespie and Odetta took part in the workshops, performing and explaining their music. The state's program developers recognized that there were few "full-time" cultural organizations within the state and wisely concentrated on areas in which they had some hope of success.

Another state with a paucity of professional arts organizations, South Carolina, lent its support to a program of technical assistance to local and regional groups. To upgrade standards in civic art groups and community arts councils, a program called Arts Organization Personnel

---

[108] Hearings, pp. 351-56. [109] Ibid., pp. 386-92.

Development was evolved. "Through it we get to the root of the problem with many of our arts organizations," noted Executive Director David Sennema in 1969. "We help them establish new paid positions with the organizations by offering to pay two-thirds of the salary the first year, one-half the second, and one-third the third."[110] The professional arts manager not only upgrades the work of the organization, he provides a direct liaison between the Council and the communities, taking some burden off the small staff of the Arts Council.

In addition to matching program funds, the National Endowment often granted outright funds, on a non-matching basis, to outstanding state council-proposed projects. In Fiscal 1969 and Fiscal 1970, thirty-three state councils received such grants for a variety of proposals.[111] The West Virginia "Mountain Heritage" camps were financed in this fashion.

To look at all state arts councils is to view fifty-five manifestations of a single administrative concept. Analysis of the individual orientation of an arts council requires more than simply objective investigation. The growth and direction of a council depends on intangible factors not easily measured or described such as the attitude

---

[110]"States: A Survey, Part I," Cultural Affairs #5, p. 44.

[111]National Endowment for the Arts, First Five Years.

of the governor, the background personality of the executive director, or the degree of cultural involvement in the state previous to the council's formation. Objective factors which would be of value in analysis of a state council might include the number and character of permanent arts organizations in the state, both professional and amateur; the population and population density; degree of urbanization, expressed as a ratio of urban-rural population; concentration of arts organizations by location, related to population density mapping; budgets of arts groups; average and weighted income figures for the state, and so forth. Measured against such figures as state legislative allotment, number of programs, degree of outreach (number of spectators or participants), and evaluation by survey of program effectiveness, such data might prove revealing.

Another area of arts council administration which would benefit from detailed study is program-staff budget ratio. During observation and study of one arts council, it became evident that members of the advisory committee were quite bitter over the ratio of administrative and staff expenses compared to funds available for programs. During one council meeting, at which funds for the entire fiscal year were to be allocated, the total funds available were reported to be $305,000. Of this amount $158,000 (52%) had been estimated for staff salaries and benefits, office equipment, supplies and services. This

figure was divided into administrative costs and program implementation costs. The seemingly high proportion of administrative costs is reduced by half if one accepts the contention that staff salaries and services for program implementation are not administrative expenses.

The full-time work of coordinating widely dispersed projects, originating proposals, maintaining communication among the arts personnel of the state, and keeping abreast of local and national fund sources is a vital aspect of an arts council's program and not to be considered an administrative expense, according to one viewpoint. The very presence of a paid director for state or local arts activity is one of the most significant aspects of many councils, as important as any project or grant. Opposed to this viewpoint is the idea that administrative or staff expenses should be minimal, to increase the available funds for artists and arts institutions. The planning and evaluation functions of program implementation can be handled by advisory committees, while a small staff oversees and coordinates programs.

Favoring the latter position, naturally, are members of the advisory committees and individual artists. A periodical published by a New York-based professional organization for artists contained the following statement:

> Even now as the cry for state support of the arts is becoming more fashionable, the artist is still being left out. At least one self-proclaimed lobbying group

> for the arts has made it clear that they would rather not be concerned with the artist as well. One reads much in the literature of these groups about the needs of "the arts," but next to nothing about "the artist," unless the artist in question happens to be a big name superstar . . . It is apparently the belief of these pressure groups that "the arts" come into being through a process of parthenogenesis or joyous virgin birth without the need of an artist as parent.[112]

That the problem is not exclusive to the United States is indicated by a privately-printed manifesto deploring the policies of the well-established and generously endowed Arts Council of Great Britain:

> The key to good patronage is to accept artists as they appear. The real issue at present is not finance; it is the emergence of a new group of middle men--the organizers of art and art patronage--who are unintentionally stifling art.[113]

Whether an arts administration establishment is in fact emerging from the latest phase of American arts support is apparently a matter of concern to some potential recipients of grants. As a beginning to understanding this aspect of the new patronage, and as a means of ascertaining the truth in the claims of the artists, a study of the ratio of administrative to program expenses of all the arts councils should be made. Grouping the agencies by budget size, a comparison could be obtained among councils of similar allocations. Such a study would have to come from an institution

---

[112]"Forces Gather for Long Government Arts Struggle," Art Workers Newsletter, I, No. 3, National Art Workers Community, p. 1.

[113]David Castillejo, A Counter-Report on Art Patronage (London: By the Author, 1968), p. 6.

not connected with the National Endowment for the Arts or the Associated Councils of the Arts, since neither of these groups would wish to engage in any activity that might be interpreted as regulatory or judgmental.

A study of state arts council programs was made for the National Endowment by Sureva Seligson of the Economic and Social Development Institute. The study is a review of art forms and types of activities supported by state arts agencies.[114]

By analyzing forms filed with the Endowment by the state councils, Seligson obtained the breakdown by discipline listed in Table 8.

The emphasis on the performance arts is obvious. Seligson's choice of categories, especially the ambiguous "Varied Media" classifications, makes comparison with National Endowment programs difficult. By a series of adjustments (combining Craft Arts, Photography, and Varied Media [Visual] with Visual Arts, Film with Public Media, Varied Media [Visual and Performing] with Conferences as Coordinated Programs, and dividing Varied Media [Performing] equally between Theater, Dance, and Music), however, a rough comparison can be made (see Table 9).

Conclusions drawn from this comparison must be regarded as tentative; the greater attention given by the

---

[114]Seligson, "Statistical Guide."

TABLE 8.--State Arts Council Grants--By Art Medium.

Art Medium	FY 1969 Amount(Number)	FY 1970 Amount(Number)
Music	$ 380,552(203)	$ 468,748(176)
Varied Media (Visual and Performing)	267,666(113)	469,824(109)
Theater	243,071(130)	277,205(102)
Visual Arts	204,388(125)	237,703(97)
Dance	95,966(53)	107,765(46)
Varied Media (Performing)	77,828(25)	112,545(21)
Literature and Poetry	27,267(21)	30,404(22)
Craft Arts	25,046(34)	33,412(28)
Photography	18,448(6)	. .
Film	18,400(16)	21,456(10)
Varied Media (Visual)	15,212(13)	. .
Architecture and Design	11,982(12)	17,331(13)
Public Media	11,801(9)	29,918(16)
Conference	3,975(5)	6,263(4)
Total	$1,401,602(765)	$1,830,574(644)

Source: Seligson, "Statistical Guide."

TABLE 9.--Federal and State Arts Grants--Comparison by Art Medium.

Art Medium	National Endowment	State Councils
Architecture, Planning and Design	4%	1%
Dance	13	9
Education	7	. .
Literature	7	2
Music	19	29
Public Media	5	2
Theater	26	19
Visual Arts	11	19
Coordinated Programs	8	19

state agencies to music and visual arts, however, is noticeable. Theater and dance occupy a less preferred place in the state council budget than in the National Endowment allocations. An intuitive explanation might be the ready availability of musical organizations and museums as permanent and established aspects of a state's cultural resources. The federal organization, with its overview of the nation's resources and needs, can choose priorities with greater freedom than a state council, limited to grants within its borders.

In addition to the media classification summarized in Table 8, Seligson delineated the state council projects according to type and description. This listing is difficult to interpret because of the large number of categories used (33 for 765 projects) and the overly specific category identifications. Some categories seem designed to fit one or two projects only. Seligson notes the difficulty encountered in this method of data tabulation:

> In many cases, reporting is incomplete and in all cases programs have been arbitrarily classified by art form and type of activity involved. Despite attempts to be consistent, it is difficult to slot arts activities and programs into narrow classifications.[115]

Her list is reproduced in Table 10 because it is unavailable except in office copies.

Because of the categories used, it is difficult to see significant trends in the scope and nature of the

---

[115] Ibid.

TABLE 10.--State Arts Council Grants--By Project Description.

Project Description	Amount(number)	Percentage
Artist in Residence	$ 30,693(10)	2
Visiting Professional Artist	6,506(12)	1
Award Program(Recognition or Cash)	16,291(18)	1
Competition (No Cash Award)	10,826(7)	1
Commission or Purchase of New Work	30,972(16)	2
Curriculum Development	39,813(24)	3
Home City Performance for School Children	42,486(30)	3
Home City Performance for General Public	93,859(67)	7
Touring Performance for School Children	91,547(43)	7
Touring Performance for General Public	303,283(101)	22
Exhibition--One Location	32,104(36)	2
Exhibition--Touring	54,158(26)	4
Technical Assistance	216,048(87)	16
Survey Program	1,625(2)	. .
Research Program	16,881(11)	1
Workshop (Led by Professional Outside Classroom)	45,558(53)	3
Workshop (Led by Professional Inside Classroom)	4,771(3)	. .
Classroom Instruction (Not Professional)	9,312(12)	1

TABLE 10.--Continued.

Project Description	Amount(number)	Percentage
Lecture-Demonstration (Not Specifically for Students)	$ 26,797(25)	2
Distribution of Films, Slides, Tapes	17,603(9)	1
Preparation of Films, Slides, Tapes	2,650(3)	. .
Art Mobile	4,063(2)	. .
Establishment of Cultural Center	10,111(7)	1
Symposium	6,969(7)	1
Tour and Workshop	33,996(14)	3
Publication	31,866(14)	2
Arts Festival	58,030(37)	4
Theater Residence	700(1)	. .
Scholarships/Apprentice-ships (Study)	10,642(14)	1
Apprentice or Intern Program	2,500(1)	. .
To Expand Existing Program	24,418(16)	2
Classroom Summer Program	31,855(11)	2
Unspecified Activity	40,042(14)	3
Total	$1,348,975(733)	

projects listed. Only four areas have a representation greater than 5 per cent of the total--touring performances for school children and the general public, home city performances for the general public, and technical assistance. It is instructive to see the great emphasis placed by state arts agencies on live performances--nearly 40 per cent of all projects. The technical assistance category, however, is a catch-all for many types of assistance--consultants, salary assistance, guest speakers, etc.--and a deeper analysis of this item would be helpful.

Seligson's study provides us with an insight into the diversity of state arts council programs, but is of little help in understanding common problems and solutions. It should be noted that her data was not cross-checked with annual reports or other material to specify the often vague project descriptions found in the Final Evaluation Reports and grant applications. The study was not intended as a comprehensive or complete one. Seligson calls it "merely a by-product of an effort to create a working file of State arts agency programming for the use of State arts agency directors."[116] A complete study of all state arts council projects would be desirable.

The ACA was engaged in such a study at the time this paper was completed (July 1971). For their Directory of

---

[116] Ibid.

State Arts Councils, 1970-71,[117] the ACA compiled a series of descriptive charts showing state arts agency rankings according to size of state appropriation, per capita appropriation, and regional appropriations. Table 11 is a comprehensive listing of all state arts council budgets during the years from 1960 through 1970. This list includes only state appropriation and federal grant; it does not include private funds, subscription fees, membership dues, or other items which may be included in a council's income.

There seems little question that state arts agencies are becoming a permanent part of America's arts administration. Their growth is due to federal incentive and the leadership example of states such as New York, Missouri, and Illinois, and the territories of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Although operating under state funding that is often painfully inadequate, the under-staffed councils are creating a place for themselves in the cultural lives of their states. Even those whose program budgets consist entirely of the annual federal grant perform a service by maintaining communication among the artists and cultural organizations within the state.

By making use of existing cultural resources, both professional and amateur, the councils have begun to build an overall program that is diversified; federal control of

---

[117]Associated Councils of the Arts, State, 1970-71.

TABLE 11.--State Arts Council Budget History.

State	FY 1966	FY 1967	FY 1968	FY 1969	FY 1970
Alabama	$ . .	$ 37,053	$ 89,383	$ 80,909	$ 136,363
Alaska	. .	54,778	86,299	78,310	83,963
American Samoa	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .
Arizona	. .	37,053	39,383	30,909	59,924
Arkansas	. .	57,747	75,097	66,872	36,363
California	152,000	211,142	185,081	198,909	207,360
Colorado	. .	52,053	64,383	56,659	62,852
Connecticut	21,500	68,361	97,651	107,641	151,163
Delaware	. .	37,026	. .	. .	81,817
District of Columbia	. .	119,275	109,354	50,838	62,024
Florida	10,000	46,165	50,218	30,909	41,363
Georgia	27,500	67,267	68,538	79,425	124,423
Guam	. .	15,376	38,128	30,909	33,715
Hawaii	2,500	122,972	162,247	149,854	199,942
Idaho	. .	25,000	. .	36,406	46,363

TABLE 11.--Continued.

State	FY 1966	FY 1967	FY 1968	FY 1969	FY 1970
Illinois	$ 25,000	$ 62,053	$ 139,383	$ 130,909	$ 286,363
Indiana	12,500	29,081	. .	. .	61,341
Iowa	. .	24,608	55,976	52,657	67,093
Kansas	3,000	44,653	104,383	98,858	102,386
Kentucky	7,500	150,000	139,383	149,424	171,363
Louisiana	. .	61,800	64,383	65,889	64,043
Maine	1,000	35,000	99,383	90,909	115,863
Maryland	. .	87,106	89,383	290,909	311,868
Massachusetts	. .	59,971	90,173	130,476	136,072
Michigan	5,000	150,000	141,383	141,329	176,363
Minnesota	5,000	42,053	124,383	115,909	148,863
Mississippi	. .	25,000	39,383	30,909	36,363
Missouri	170,000	249,975	261,190	288,909	229,278
Montana	. .	23,798	51,445	42,695	61,363
Nebraska	. .	54,633	42,775	42,659	48,855
Nevada	. .	25,000	19,453	30,909	36,363

TABLE 11.--Continued

State	FY 1966	FY 1967	FY 1968	FY 1969	FY 1970
New Hampshire	$ . .	$ 37,053	$ 46,883	$ 38,204	$ 46,363
New Jersey	7,500	121,713	114,383	95,836	108,021
New Mexico	15,000	71,393	54,083	50,909	56,363
New York[a]	771,895	1,554,477	1,936,968	2,522,770	2,292,837
North Carolina	. .	36,873	104,346	102,208	126,370
North Dakota	. .	21,908	13,175	29,173	36,363
Ohio	. .	48,960	78,739	70,507	259,770
Oklahoma	10,000	47,478	74,383	65,898	102,102
Oregon	. .	25,000	38,883	54,768	61,287
Pennsylvania	. .	77,053	176,856	229,114	240,363
Puerto Rico	915,300	1,096,947	1,303,283	1,383,109	1,527,626
Rhode Island	. .	70,000	101,383	129,909	142,162
South Carolina	. .	25,000	89,500	130,263	168,151
South Dakota	. .	25,000	10,000	48,909	55,083
Tennessee	. .	26,500	89,383	80,909	105,063
Texas	. .	37,053	120,076	100,613	142,021

TABLE 11.--Continued

State	FY 1966	FY 1967	FY 1968	FY 1969	FY 1970
Utah	$ 20,000	$ 66,053	$ 91,078	$ 83,732	$ 119,363
Vermont	500	36,863	64,037	58,180	65,163
Virgin Islands	. .	35,000	89,383	170,909	196,363
Virginia	478,445[b]	1,045,060[b]	1,205,716[b]	40,744	46,187
Washington	7,500	57,500	75,036	68,644	117,361
West Virginia	2,000	80,300	94,580	111,009	153,568
Wisconsin	. .	37,053	39,278	30,909	36,363
Wyoming	. .	37,053	39,164	30,909	36,363

[a]For a complete budget history of New York's council, see Table 7.

[b]Figures are for the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, designated as recipient of federal grant during FY 1967 and 1968.

the state programs, feared by some, has been non-existent. Relations have been excellent between the National Endowment for the Arts, which disburses funds to the states, and the local agencies. Although the federal agency limits its funds to professional artists and groups, no such requirement has been imposed on the states. The small grants of the typical state agency can go a long way in the budget of a civic theater or orchestra; marginal groups such as these avocational arts organizations can benefit significantly from arts council grants. That a large number of grants do indeed go to amateur organizations was revealed by the study of arts council theater projects conducted by the author.

As part of the pluralistic American arts patronage, the state agencies occupy an important position as liaison between local artists and organizations and national sources of funding and support.

CHAPTER II

CLASSIFICATION AND ANALYSIS OF STATE ARTS COUNCIL THEATER PROJECTS

Data for this study was collected from two principal sources--Final Evaluation Reports filed with the National Endowment for the Arts and annual reports of state arts councils. Each council receiving a grant from the Endowment is required to account for its allocations of that money through a detailed financial statement as well as an evaluation report. The latter calls for a general description of each project; an analysis of the project's success; statistics regarding number of performances or appearances, audience size, etc.; and a breakdown of the project's budget into federal, state, and private matching funds expended. The latter is required in order to meet the statutory provision mandating a one-to-one matching of federal funds allocated to the states.

Gathering data from these forms is not a completely reliable method, however. Project descriptions are often terse and vague, making identification and classification difficult. The forms themselves have undergone one major revision (in 1968), having been reduced in length from four

pages to one. The task is made more difficult by non-standard methods of reporting programs. One council may submit a single evaluation report for an activity such as touring programs; another council will submit five reports, one for each attraction toured under such a program. This practice is especially prevalent in the area of technical assistance, often the most numerous of a council's activities.

A further difficulty is encountered when dealing with arts councils whose budget includes funds beyond a state matching grant for the federal allocation. Only matching funds need to be reported to the National Endowment; in an agency such as the New York State Council on the Arts, therefore, evaluation material is submitted only for approximately $36,000 out of a total budget of over $2 million. In such cases, the Endowment data must be supplemented by descriptions contained in the annual reports of the state arts council.

The annual reports, which come in a bewildering variety of shapes, colors, and lengths, are often no more help than the evaluation reports. Designed for aesthetic and publicity purposes as well as information, they sometimes contain more enthusiastic promotion material than hard copy. Many councils report every two years instead of annually. When reports are on a calendar year basis,

correlation with the Endowment's Fiscal Year planning is difficult.

Finally, the annual reports are hard to obtain. Libraries at both the National Endowment and the ACA are spotty and incomplete. Annual reports, therefore, had to be supplemented by correspondence and phone calls.

Once located, the data required classification and analysis. A preliminary breakdown was made of theater projects, based on experience with ten annual reports. Faced with the mass of data gathered and the multiplicity of projects to be described, it became obvious to the author that the original categories established were inadequate. As a guideline, the Seligson study proved to be a good place for a new beginning.

Seligson used a total of nineteen categories to describe theater projects:

Visiting professional artist

Competition (No cash award)

Commissioning or purchasing new work

Curriculum development

Home city performance--for school children

Home city performance--for general public

Touring performance--for school children

Touring performance--for general public

Technical assistance

Research

Workshop (Professional outside classroom)

Classroom instruction (Not professional)

Lecture-Demonstration (Not specifically students)

Synposium

Tour and workshop

Theater residence

Scholarship/Apprenticeship to study

To expand existing program

Classroom summer programs (Not by professional)

Because Seligson was comparing all the media programs of the state arts councils, her categories sometimes seem forced or arbitrary when applied to theater. Distinctions between home city and touring performances are academic when a theater embarks on a tour of inner city schools where live performance may be as inaccessible as in a rural school district. The distinctions between educational programs are needlessly specific.

Perhaps most glaring a deficiency for those interested in a profile of the theater projects, is the lack of any description of the type of organization to which the grant is given. A breakdown is needed into professional, college, or community theaters, and the type of projects carried out by each of the various sectors of American theater.

Seligson's classification was revised into the following fifteen categories:

Touring to Young Audiences--including all tours to audiences of young people whether in school or not.

Touring to General Public--including outdoor or park performances, unless specifically intended for young audiences, or such outdoor enterprises as a summer historic drama. Theater tours which included performances for both young audiences and general public are placed in this category.

Newsletters, Films, and Publications--material produced or distributed by the state arts council which includes theater activities; videotapes or films of productions are included.

Research and Feasibility Studies--surveys, facility and resource listing, and other analyses of cultural activity which directly or indirectly affected theater.

Scholarships and Apprenticeships--money used to facilitate student participation in theater programs or workshops.

Educational Programs and Student Workshops--including lecture-demonstrations and participatory sessions, short-term or summer.

Conferences and Practica--symposia and workshops for adult participants--artists, teachers, practitioners of theater, etc.

Competitions--playwrighting, acting, or production contests; used for cash awards, publicity, or judging.

Arts Festivals--programs of varied media, including theater.

Audience Development--including ticket subsidy, transportation, labor union liaison and such programs. Classified as audience development are programs for adults, primarily, meant to bring people into the theater, rather than bringing theater to them.

General Program Support--grants given to organizations to raise production standards, expand personnel, or continue operation; one of three technical assistance categories.

Production Assistance--funds used for a single performance or production rather than for general organizational support.

Other Technical Assistance--a variety of grants for miscellaneous purposes, including improvement of sound systems, building toilet facilities, etc.

Short-Term Consultants--experts brought in for brief visitations to advise on a number of problems. Distinguished from guest directors or artists included in the category below.

Salary Assistance--professional personnel brought in for longer periods by grantee organization; includes guest artists, teachers, business managers, full or part-time directors.

These fifteen categories were cross-referenced as to the type of theater or level of educational workshop.

The following theater identifications were used:

Professional Resident Theater--defined as such by receipt of National Endowment grants under this classification. The Endowment's list of resident theaters is broader than that of the Theater Communications Group or the Baumol and Bowen study, including theaters which do not meet Equity salary standards but which have achieved permanence and stability.

Professional Touring Theaters--national touring repertory programs, not Broadway tours. These touring theaters generally play to young audiences.

Other Professional Companies--including newly established groups, experimental theaters, or professional companies not identified as resident theaters where a degree of permanence is established and staff is salaried.

Summer Theater--including both amateur and commercial ventures. Summer theaters run by colleges or universities were also included here.

Community Theater--civic theater guilds for amateur or avocational participants, some with paid directors, technical director or staff.

Children's Theater--Amateur--college or community groups playing for preschool or elementary school audiences.

Children's Theater--Professional--used to refer to children's theater performed by professional theaters not primarily devoted to such fare as well as the few companies whose sole work is for children.

College and University Theater--educational or semi-professional programs housed at academic institutions.

Children's Workshops--programs for preschool or elementary school children; also includes workshops for teachers of children.

Youth Workshops--for junior and senior high school students and teachers.

In addition to these classifications, two additional descriptions were used. Projects which were meant for minority or ethnic audiences were listed under Black or Minority Theater in addition to other classifications. Professional companies whose work has been called innovative or avant-garde were tallied under Experimental Theater. The National Endowment grants to experimental companies were used as a reference; this list was supplemented when project descriptions, in the author's judgment, indicated an experimental orientation. These separate tallies were maintained as indicators only, and do not appear on any of the descriptive charts. Because of the newness of the present phase of federal and state arts administration, all projects undertaken by arts councils are innovative and experimental. Regional differences, too, alter the nature of avant-garde theater. A presentation of a modern classic such as Waiting for Godot can be as daringly contemporary in one community as the most expressive non-verbal, multi-media happening in an urban area.

Any classification of arts activities must be somewhat arbitrary; the categories used do, the author feels,

cherish the variety and diversity of state arts council theater projects without an abundance of niches for odd projects. No category contains fewer than one per cent of the total; only six miscellaneous projects were listed. Designation of the projects was difficult only where two or more purposes were served. Thus, a fee for a professional lecturer at a theater convention was placed under conferences rather than short-term consultants. Planning for a high school fine arts camp is designated under research rather than student workshops. A grant to cover the expense of a consultant to a community arts council to discuss plans for a forthcoming arts festival is a short-term consultation; a similar grant to the local arts council for publicity or part-time paid staff to implement the arts festival would be listed under arts festivals. The distinctions are meant to logically identify the main thrust of each council effort for purposes of comparison, without violating its distinctive identity.

Similarly, cross-referencing calls for choices, though distinctions here are not as fine. A workshop run by a professional theater for high school students is designated under professional theater rather than youth workshops. A workshop established independently or operating outside an established institution is classified according to the level of student or subject matter. Newsletters and publications, or similar projects having a broad and beneficial

effect on all the arts within the state, were cross-referenced as General, since presumably all sectors of theater were equally aided.

Although information about monetary allocations was collected, such data was not recorded on the comprehensive charts. A grant of $3,000 to a community theater may represent its entire production budget; a similar grant to a resident theater will barely cover the costs of a short tour. Monetary considerations will be treated separately, where comparison is more meaningful.

The breakdown of theater projects by type bears out Seligson's findings as to the most common grant areas. Table 12 shows the largest number of programs in the areas of general program support (12%), touring to the general public (12%), young audiences touring (11%), and student workshops (10%). Seligson had characterized the leading areas as performances for the general public, technical assistance and performances for children. It is interesting that the present study's breakdown of the technical assistance classification into three separate areas does not affect its primary. Taken together, the three categories (general program support, production assistance, other technical assistance) account for 27 per cent of all state arts council theater projects.

A grant for technical assistance is an indication of general support for an organization, rather than for a service

TABLE 12.--State Arts Council Theater Grants--By Project Description.

Project Description	Number	Percentage
Young Audiences Touring	95	11
General Public Touring	99	12
Newsletters and Films	48	6
Research and Feasibility Studies	29	3
Scholarships and Apprenticeships	18	2
Competitions	11	1
Arts Festivals	67	8
Audience Development	30	4
General Program Support	102	12
Production Assistance	67	8
Other Technical Assistance	60	7
Conferences and Practica	61	7
Educational Programs and Workshops	86	10
Short-Term Consultants	16	2
Salary Assistance	55	6
Miscellaneous	4	. .
Total	848	

Source: State Arts Council Final Evaluation Reports and Annual Reports.

project of outreach to the community. This is not true in every case, of course; the grant may have been for such a service project in addition to the organization's regular program. But experience with the data indicates that the technical assistance grants are meant to stabilize and encourage existing organizations to raise standards, improve programming, or expand their season. Touring and workshops, on the other hand, are projects which by their very nature involve extension and outreach.

Touring is a diffusion of resources, a dispersal from an area of greater concentration or availability to a less well-endowed region. On a young audience tour, the goal is long-range development of an aware and experienced audience. The same is true of an educational workshop. Through direct experience of the theatrical process, a young person's awareness of the nature of the art is increased.

A tour for the benefit of the general public does not have the same intention, generally. Touring for older audiences is meant to increase availability of artistic resources through greater convenience, more equitable price, or uniqueness of setting. Such a tour is of immediate service, with some implications of short-term audience development. The expectation of increasing home audience is generally regarded as unrealistic. As an example, 77,000 people may turn out for a New York Philharmonic concert in Central Park; it is probably likely that any one of these

individuals may come to another free outdoor concert. The chances of increasing the Philharmonic subscription list because of such a concert are not so great. Although the composition of audiences at free, outdoor events differs in certain characteristics from the regular performance arts audience,[1] there can be no ascertainment of any general increase in the audience for the arts in general.

This may be a fine point, but the presence of an audience member at a single event does not add him to the profile of the regular audience for the arts unless he changes his former life style after his first exposure to include a seeking out of the arts. Displaying a well-known painting on television certainly increases availability of that form of art; whether it builds an audience for the arts in general is highly problematical.

Whether each exposure of young audiences will significantly affect the future base of support and attendance is equally open to question. If a noticeable increase in the arts audience occurs, or a change of its composition in the near future, this may well be due to factors other than the present activity in schools.

The observations noted above are not meant to suggest that these activities should be eliminated from arts agency programming; the intention is solely to point out

---

[1]Baumol and Bowen, Performing Arts, pp. 382.84.

some areas where research is needed. A tour to a remote area is a significant event in itself; this immediate good is clearly identifiable. Its future implications are not as yet known.

Table 13 indicates that, although community theaters received a substantial plurality of all state arts council theater support (29%), professional theater companies, resident, touring, or other, are second in number of projects (18%), leading college and university programs by a slight margin. This is surprising because of the large number of educational theater programs in comparison with professional companies, resident or otherwise. Few councils have the resources to emulate the federal agency's policy of support for professional companies only. An intuitive projection, therefore, might anticipate state council grants to approximate the distribution of theaters in the state. Although these distribution figures were not collected for comparison, the author feels safe in assuming that professional companies do not outnumber educational programs nationwide. An explanation for the project distribution, therefore, lies elsewhere.

Tables 14 and 15, analyses of the distribution of the two largest categories of grants--touring and technical assistance, provide greater insight into the problem. In both categories, the percentage distribution deviates significantly from the overall breakdown in Table 13.

TABLE 13.--State Arts Council Theater Grants--By Theater Sector.

Theater Sector	Number	Percentage
Professional Resident Theater	63	8
Professional Touring Company	11	1
Other Professional Company	68	9
Summer Theater	74	10
Community Theater	227	29
Amateur Children's Theater	67	9
Professional Children's Theater	22	3
College and University Theater	111	14
General	123	16
Miscellaneous	5	1
Total	771	
Workshop Level		
Children	16	21
Youth	59	77
Adult	2	2
Total	77	

Source: State Arts Council Final Evaluation Reports and Annual Reports.

TABLE 14.--Touring Programs--By Theater Sector.

Theater Sector	Young Audiences	General Public	Percentage
Professional Resident Theater	7	19	13
Professional Touring Company	9	2	6
Other Professional Company	6	22	14
Summer Theater	1	3	2
Community Theater	7	17	12
Amateur Children's Theater	32	2	18
Professional Children's Theater	11	. .	6
College and University Theater	21	34	28
Miscellaneous	1	. .	1
Total	95	99	

TABLE 15.--Technical Assistance--By Theater Sector.

Theater Sector	General Program Support	Production Assistance	Other Technical Assistance	Percentage
Professional Resident	9	3	2	6
Professional Touring	. .	. .	. .	. .
Other Professional	13	2	3	8
Summer Theater	28	6	8	18
Community Theater	39	26	35	44
Amateur Children's Theater	4	7	1	5
Professional Children's Theater	4	5	. .	4
College and University Theater	5	14	7	11
General	. .	. .	3	1
Miscellaneous	. .	4	1	2
Total	102	67	60	

Professional theaters accounted for nearly 34 per cent of all tours undertaken by the state agencies, while educational theaters provided the next most frequent source of touring productions (28%). The children's theater area, also, tours more productions than would be expected by overall distribution. Community theaters, the largest area of overall state arts council theater activity, are near the bottom of the list in this category of council work.

A look at the technical assistance area shows the reason for community theater's overall primacy--grants for support and assistance to civic theaters total nearly half (44%) of all such allocations. Summer theaters were assisted in this manner more frequently than either college or professional theaters. These figures are a reflection, the author assumes, of the marginal financial stability of civic and summer theaters. Even though Moore considers summer stock to be one of the strongest elements of American commercial theater,[2] his sample is taken exclusively from Equity-bonded stock companies mostly in the Eastern United States. The states art council summer theater projects largely fall outside this region.[3] It is a safe assumption that many summer stock companies operate close to the break-even point. Even in Moore's limited sample of twelve Equity

---

[2]Moore, Economics, pp. 101-9.

[3]See Table 22.

companies, three claimed to have operated at a loss, while profits among the others were low.[4]

The lower representation of educational theaters in the technical assistance category is most likely due to their source of support--not box-office income, in most cases, but college or university budgets. Arts council grants are given to educational theaters for specific projects, most commonly touring. Analysis of all college and university theater grants reveals that 50 per cent of all grants to academic theaters are for touring, 10 per cent are for arts festivals, and 13 per cent for production assistance.[5] In the overall breakdown of all arts council theater projects, educational theater may be under-represented according to its nationwide distribution because of the relative stability of its support. An academic theater will not be inclined to expand its operations unless specific funds are available--hence, the large percentage of service projects, such as touring.

The higher representation of professional theater (relative to its nationwide distribution) may be due to the attention given this sector by the National Endowment. In many cases, the councils may be adding their own, smaller, grants to federal allocations to resident companies within their borders. Although the resident theater companies are

---

[4]Moore, Economics, p. 107. [5]Table 16.

TABLE 16.--Educational Theater Grants--By Project Description.

Type of Grant	Number	Percentage	Overall Percentage
Young Audience Touring	21	19	11
General Public Touring	34	31	12
Research and Feasibility Studies	2	2	3
Scholarships and Apprenticeships	2	2	2
Competition	2	2	1
Arts Festivals	11	10	8
Audience Development	2	2	4
General Program Support	5	5	12
Production Assistance	14	13	8
Other Technical Assistance	7	6	7
Conferences and Practica	4	4	7
Educational Programs and Workshops	5	5	10
Short-Term Consultants	1	1	2
Salary Assistance	1	1	6
Total	111		

by no means a financially stable sector of American theater, it seems safe to assume that their sources of support are considerably better-endowed than state arts councils--the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, philanthropic foundations, business and industry, and private donations. It is reasonable, therefore, to expect technical assistance to professional theater companies to be somewhat lower than the overall project distribution; despite a slightly larger percentage in the general support area, this is the case for the three categories of technical assistance.[6] Professional theater companies received more grants for audience development than the theater sector as a whole. No salary assistance grants whatsoever were received by professional companies during the period studied; a tribute, perhaps, to their professional status. In other categories, grants to professional companies averaged lower percentages than the overall figures, indicating a concentration on touring, audience development, and program support grants by state arts councils for the professional theater.

As noted above, nearly half of all grants for technical assistance went to community theaters. This area accounts for the largest category of community theater allocations.[7] Fewer community theaters embarked on tours (for either general public or young audiences) with council

---

[6]Table 17.

[7]Table 18.

TABLE 17.--Professional Theater Grants--By Project Description.

Type Grant	Resident Theater	Touring Company	Other	Number	Percentage	Overall Percentage
Young Audience Tour	7	9	6	22	15	11
General Public Tour	19	2	22	43	30	12
Newsletters and Films	1		1	2	1	6
Research and Feasibility Studies	4		3	7	5	3
Scholarships and Apprenticeships	3			3	2	2
Competitions						1
Arts Festivals	2		5	7	5	8
Audience Development	9		7	16	11	4
General Program Support	9		13	22	15	12
Production Assistance	3		2	5	4	12
Other Technical Assistance	2		3	5	4	7
Conferences and Practica	1		2	3	2	7
Educational Programs and Workshops	2		3	5	4	10
Short-Term Consultants			1	1	1	2
Salary Assistance						6
Miscellaneous	1			1	1	1
Total	63	11	68	142		

TABLE 18.--Community Theater Grants--By Project Description.

Type of Grant	Number	Percentage	Overall Percentage
Young Audience Touring	7	3	11
General Public Touring	17	8	12
Research and Feasibility Studies	2	1	3
Scholarships and Apprenticeships	1	. .	2
Competitions	3	1	1
Arts Festivals	14	6	8
Audience Development	4	2	4
General Program Support	39	18	12
Production Assistance	26	12	8
Other Technical Assistance	35	16	7
Conferences and Practica	19	9	7
Educational Programs and Workshops	12	5	2
Short-Term Consultants	12	5	2
Salary Assistance	31	14	6
Total	222		

assistance than either college or professional theater. If the emphasis on technical assistance, consultants, and salary assistance is any indication of community theater needs, this sector turned to arts councils more for help than to offer service. Certainly this area is one in which the local arts agency can be of substantial assistance, since budgets for civic theaters are considerably smaller than resident theaters or other professional companies. Through a program or production support grant, an arts council can maintain the existence of this most prevalent form of theatrical activity in some communities. Through conferences and practica, consultants, and salary assistance, artistic standards can be upgraded and the achievement of excellence encouraged.

Nearly three-quarters of all grants to summer theaters (73%) were for technical assistance or salary assistance,[8] indicating that in this area, also, arts council grants can be of substantial value to existing, but marginal theater activities. Whether of professional, semi-professional, or amateur status, summer theater is a major area of arts council activity, suggesting that it is a prevalent and popular theatrical activity at the grassroots level.

Although not discussed with any frequency in theater journals or studies of American theater (Moore is an

---

[8]Table 19.

TABLE 19.--Summer Theater Grants--By Project Description.

Type of Grant	Number	Percentage	Overall Percentage
Young Audiences Touring	1	1	11
General Public Touring	3	4	12
Research and Feasibility Studies	4	5	3
Scholarships and Apprenticeships	8	11	2
Arts Festivals	1	1	8
Audience Development	2	3	4
General Program Support	28	38	12
Production Assistance	6	8	8
Other Technical Assistance	8	11	7
Conferences and Workshops	1	1	7
Salary Assistance	12	16	6
Total	74		

exception), summer theater should be a topic of concern, the present study indicates. The distribution of grants to summer theaters conforms closely to community theater grants, indicating that many of the groups assisted may be amateur. Perhaps a differentiation between amateur and professional summer theater groups should have been attempted, but this was difficult to ascertain from the given data. Intuitively, such a breakdown would probably show professional summer theater grants conforming to resident professional theater. Some professional summer festivals, such as the American Shakespeare Festival in Stratford, Connecticut, the Old Globe Theater in San Diego, California and the New York City Shakespeare Festival have received grants from foundations and from the National Endowment. In any case, further study and greater attention is indicated in this sector.

Young audience programming was carried out by all sectors of theater, but the number of theaters specializing in children's theater which received arts council grants is of great interest to those who believe that the future of the arts in America depends upon exposure of young children to high-quality performances.[9] It is, of course, impossible to judge the quality of arts council projects from the given data. Theaters identified as concerned with children's drama

---

[9]Table 20.

TABLE 20.--Children's Theater Grants--By Project Description.

Type of Grant	Amateur	Professional	Percentage	Overall Percentage
Young Audiences Touring	32	11	48	11
General Public Touring	2	. .	2	12
Arts Festivals	2	. .	2	8
Audience Development	1	1	2	4
General Program Support	4	4	9	12
Production Assistance	7	5	13	8
Other Technical Assistance	1	. .	1	7
Conferences and Practica	6	. .	7	7
Educational Programs and Workshops	6	. .	7	10
Short-Term Consultants	1	. .	1	2
Salary Assistance	5	1	7	6
Total	67	22		

received 12 per cent of the state arts council allocations. The most frequent type of project sponsored was touring--half of all children's theater grants were for this purpose. Of other categories, only production assistance is higher for children's theater than the overall average. Although most of the projects were carried out by community or college groups, a surprising number of professional theaters were involved--surprising because of the paucity of such professional theater companies. The fact that one-quarter of all children's theater programs sponsored by the state agencies were performed by professionals indicates that the councils made use of professional artists when and where they were available. The indication augurs well for a high level of production standards in this critical artistic sector.

Finally, workshops[10] conducted under arts council auspices were largely for high school and junior high school youths (77%). An interesting sidelight in this area of assistance is the fact that although workshops in children's theater were divided equally between those aimed at children and at teachers, youth workshops were exclusively meant for students, rather than teachers or practitioners. Training of teachers in this area would be an equally valuable activity for state council sponsorship and would perhaps assure

---

[10]Table 13.

more numerous and more successful workshops for young people.

To provide a better understanding of the collected data, projects were correlated with two other factors--arts council budgets, to determine whether level of appropriation had any effect on type of theater projects, and regional distribution, to see whether patterns could be established according to area of the country.

From these listings,[11] it became obvious that there were indeed significant variations according to the different categories. Although grants to resident theaters and professional touring companies remained constant, there was a definite increase in projects with other professional companies as council budget increased. Similarly, there was a decline in the percentage of projects involving college, community, and summer theaters as council budgets increased. This suggests that the arts agencies which devoted a greater share of their attention to professional theater are those with budgets large enough to permit the greater outlay of money necessary to support professional programs. An alternate interpretation would be that those states with larger budgets happen to be the same states with a number of professional companies. States with low allocations, indicating a possible lesser concern for the arts,

---

[11]Tables 21 and 22.

TABLE 21.--State Arts Council Grants by Theater Sector Correlated with State Arts Council Budget.

Sector	Budget			
	$0-49,999 (%)	$50,000-99,999 (%)	$100,000-149,999 (%)	Over $150,000 (%)
Resident Professional	15 (10)	28 (9)	16 (9)	11 (8)
Touring Professional	1 (1)	8 (2)	1 (1)	1 (1)
Other Professional	2 (1)	15 (5)	22 (13)	30 (23)
Summer Theater	26 (17)	26 (8)	14 (8)	8 (6)
Community Theater	55 (36)	115 (35)	32 (19)	28 (21)
Children's Theater--Amateur	7 (5)	37 (11)	17 (10)	7 (5)
Children's Theater--Professional	3 (2)	5 (2)	8 (5)	7 (5)
College Theater	28 (18)	51 (16)	23 (13)	12 (9)
General	17 (11)	40 (12)	38 (22)	29 (22)
Total	154	325	171	133

TABLE 22.--State Arts Council Grants by Theater Sector Correlated by Region.

Sector	Region[a]				
	1 (%)	2 (%)	3 (%)	4 (%)	5 (%)
Resident Professional	22 (18)	9 (6)	15 (8)	7 (5)	10 (7)
Touring Professional	3 (2)	2 (1)	2 (1)	2 (2)	2 (1)
Other Professional	13 (11)	3 (2)	20 (11)	6 (5)	11 (8)
Summer Theater	8 (7)	13 (9)	19 (11)	9 (7)	24 (16)
Community Theater	17 (14)	46 (32)	35 (20)	65 (50)	45 (31)
Children's Theater--Amateur	7 (6)	22 (15)	16 (9)	7 (5)	15 (10)
Children's Theater--Professional	10 (8)	3 (2)	. .	1 (1)	5 (3)
College Theater	7 (6)	24 (17)	35 (20)	18 (14)	22 (15)
General	36 (29)	23 (16)	35 (20)	14 (11)	12 (8)
Total	123	145	177	129	146

[a]Territories are not included.

REGION 1 (East): Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont.

REGION 2 (South): Alabama, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia.

REGION 3 (Central): Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin.

REGION 4 (Southwest): Arizona, Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas.

REGION 5 (West): Alaska, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming.

at least among state legislators, may contain few or no professional theater groups, eliminating any opportunity to sponsor professional activities. To test this alternative hypothesis, National Endowment grants to resident theater companies were distributed according to arts councils budgets of the states in which the theaters resided.[12]

TABLE 23.--National Endowment Grants to Resident Theaters by Arts Council Budget of Resident State.

$0-49,000	$50,000-999,999	$100,000-149,000	Over $150,000
14	31	21	14

Although arts agency grants to resident companies remained constant as program budget increased, the presence of a resident company may be an indication of other professional activity within the state. States which contained National Endowment-assisted resident theaters were randomly distributed across budget categories. If the hypothesis that the presence of a resident theater connotes additional professional theater activity is true, then the supposition that states with larger arts council budgets also contain greater numbers of profession theaters is demonstrably untrue. The noticeable increase in grants to professional theater companies as a percentage of total theater allocations among arts councils as budget increases can then be ascribed, at least in part, to monetary considerations.

[12]Table 23.

When classified by region, significant variations are also recorded.[13] Divided into five regions--East, South, Central, Southwest, and West--the state arts councils are shown to devote differing portions of their effort to the differing sectors of American theater. Arts councils in the East sponsored more professional theater projects in relation to their total theater allocations than councils in other regions of the country. That this is a result of the greater concentration of professional companies in this region is intuitively evident. Analysis of National Endowment grants to resident companies, broken down as to region, bears out the hypothesis that more professional theater companies are present in the East.[14]

TABLE 24.--National Endowment Grants to Resident Theaters--By Region.

Region				
1	2	3	4	5
17	7	5	3	5

Proportionate to the larger percentage of grants to professional companies by Eastern arts councils is a decline

[13]Table 22.

[14]Table 24; see also Baumol and Bowen, Performing Arts, pp. 441-42.

in attention to community and educational theater in this region. The example of the New York arts agency may well be an influencing factor here as well as the greater concentration of professional companies. New York's allocations have been almost exclusively to professional companies. Because of the size and scope of New York's budget program, these theater projects were not included in any of the analyses.

The South, Midwest, and West conform most closely to the overall distribution of grants. Deviations are not as significant in these three regions. Nonetheless, it should be noted that a larger percentage of grants for summer theaters were given by Western arts councils than by those of any other region. Similarly, educational theater in the Central states received higher fractions of allocations than in any other area. These two configurations are unique--in the West, summer theater is second only to community theater among all grantees and in the Central states, educational and community theaters received the same percentage of allocation.

Professional children's theater activity is highest in the East--also a result, possibly, of the greater concentration of professional activity. Amateur children's theater projects as a fraction of all projects are greatest in the South.

A striking figure on this chart is the high number and percentage of community theater projects in the Southwest. Although this region is the smallest of the five, the number of community theater projects is highest, as well as the percentage figure. Comparison with Baumol and Bowen's Percentage Distribution of Performing Arts Establishments[15] indicates that the Southwest contains fewer professional theater "establishments" than other regions (as combined for purposes of this study). The gap caused by the absence of a concentration of professional theaters has been met by an increase in grants to community theaters only. There are no proportionate increases in any other area, such as educational theater. This is an indication of a theatrical climate notably different from other regions in its hospitability to community theater activity. Further research may indicate reasons for this.

The data suggest that regional patterns for arts council projects do exist, although further study would be needed to determine all factors involved. Suggested interpretations accompanying data are only intuitive hypotheses. Nonetheless, trends revealed are significant and support the use of this method as a means for preliminary analysis of the nature of state arts council theater projects. By dealing with the entire population of such projects, more

---

[15] Ibid.

accurate measurements can be obtained. Because of regional and budgeting patterns, a random sample would not be a valid indication to use.

Collected data were also studied for information about size of grant, according to project type and theater area. Here the data is difficult to interpret. In the breakdown of grants by project description,[15] the most expensive projects are publications and films, arts festivals, and general program support. Some inexplicable differences appear, such as the discrepancy between young audiences and general public touring. There seems to be little correlation between the expense of project and its frequency; no simple explanation is possible that certain activities are selected because they are less costly, at least in regard to project type.

However, when we examine the data as to sector of theater,[16] there is a definite indication that projects involving professional theaters cost more than those affecting non-professional groups. The hypothesis that more non-professional projects are approved because they cost less, however, is unwarranted, if we accept the indication from Table 25 that there is no relationship between frequency of type of project and cost. Considering this data alongside the indication in Table 22 that there was a negative

---

[15]Table 25.

[16]Table 26.

TABLE 25.--State Arts Council Funds Allocated for Theater--FY 1970--By Project Description.

Grant	Total Amount	(%)	Number	Median
Young Audiences Touring	$ 99,706	(14)	37	$ 1,750
General Public Touring	86,725	(12)	43	1,200
Newsletters and Films	94,831	(13)	17	4,682
Research and Feasibility	500	(. .)	1	500
Scholarships and Apprenticeships	11,198	(2)	8	1,025
Competition	4,212	(1)	3	758
Arts Festivals	38,455	(5)	11	2,291
Audience Development	13,025	(2)	4	1,650
General Program Support	80,301	(11)	31	1,978
Production Assistance	30,446	(4)	19	1,000
Other Technical Assistance	14,850	(2)	14	746
Conferences and Practica	83,114	(11)	22	685
Student Workshops	110,188	(15)	34	1,275
Short-Term Consultants	3,333	(. .)	1	3,333
Salary Assistance	32,816	(5)	18	1,589
Miscellaneous	16,000	(2)	1	16,000
Total	$719,710		264	

TABLE 26.--State Arts Council Funds Allocated for Theater--FY 1970--By Theater Sector.

Sector	Amount	(%)	Number	Median
Resident Professional Theater	$ 81,334	(11)	19	$2,300
Professional Touring Theater	7,248	(1)	5	550
Other Professional Companies	49,117	(7)	17	1,750
Summer Theater	53,918	(7)	21	2,100
Community Theater	112,122	(17)	73	1,000
Amateur Children's Theater	31,117	(4)	23	1,000
Professional Children's Theater	22,594	(3)	6	3,872
Children's Theater Workshops	68,133	(9)	7	1,400
Youth Theater Workshops	82,761	(11)	21	1,125
College and University Theater	83,007	(11)	45	967
General and Miscellaneous	128,359	(18)	27	2,920
Total	$719,710		264	

relationship between the size of an arts council's budget and the percentage of non-professional theater projects, we can affirm that some definite relationship exists between the frequency of community theater projects and their lesser cost. Whether it is directly causal or purely incidental cannot be determined from the data. The lesser cost of non-professional projects certainly indicates that this is an area in which a greater number of projects can be accomplished with a given outlay of program funds.

During the period under study, the number of projects involving experimental theater, either companies so labelled by the National Endowment or those whose project descriptions indicated use of advanced training or production techniques, was only 2 per cent of the total projects. Projects with an avowed intention of reaching black or minority artists or audiences constituted only 4 per cent of the total. These figures are only the roughest of indications, since there is no necessity to indicate in a tour description or mention of a technical grant the racial makeup of the audience or sponsoring group. In fact, the black theater scholarshop program of one state[17] was denied federal funds because it was discriminatory. The entire project budget of Puerto Rico, by one view, would constitute money allocated for a minority group. In their annual

---

[17]Michigan.

report, however, the Institute of Puerto Rican Culture notes that a grant to an English-language community theater is meant to assist a minority enterprise. Grants to minority-oriented projects were most frequently for touring, production assistance, and student workshops. The experimental theaters received most grants for touring and general program support.

To test the hypothesis that experimental theater is underrepresented in the list of state arts council theater projects, the records of states whose companies received National Endowment support grants were examined. Of the thirty-three resident theaters receiving support grants from the National Endowment (outside of New York), nineteen received allotments from the state arts council, as well. Of the seventeen experimental companies who received Endowment support (outside of New York), only three were given state grants. If in these cases, the state agencies did not give funds to experimental programs which had been singled out by the national agency for contributing to the vitality of American theater, it is not unreasonable to expect that other experimental groups were similarly unrepresented among grantees. It is difficult to show, from the data available, that there is a definite trend to the underrepresentation of experimental companies, although many reasons could be brought forward to explain such a trend. Moreover, as was pointed out earlier, all the efforts of the state arts

councils, as of the National Endowment, must be regarded as experimental given the past history of government and the arts. The experiment in context is as significant as any intra-professional experiment in content.

For comparison with the state-sponsored projects, the National Endowment's theater grants were similarly analyzed. Because the New York State Council on the Arts rivals the National Endowment in program funds, and because of the exclusively professional orientation of both agencies, the data on New York's projects were listed on the same table as the Endowment.[18]

Here the difference between grants of a state arts council and the national agency show up most clearly. While the New York council sponsored a variety of types of projects, the federal agency limited itself to program support and production assistance, for the most part. Similarly, while New York State funds went to a variety of groups (although mostly to other professional and professional children's companies), the National Endowment grants were heavily concentrated in two areas only (resident and other professional companies). The data thus bears out Ruth Mayleas' description of the orientation of the National Endowment[19] theater program. It also points up, in the

---

[18]Tables 27 and 28.

[19]See above, p. 75.

TABLE 27.--Theater Grants of the National Endowment for the Arts and the New York State Council on the Arts--By Project Description.

Type of Grant	New York (%)[a]	Endowment (%)[b]
Young Audiences Touring	72 (34)	. .
General Public Touring	76 (36)	1 (1)
Newsletter and Films	2 (1)	. .
Research and Feasibility Studies	2 (1)	1 (1)
Scholarships and Apprenticeships	. .	. .
Competition	. .	. .
Arts Festivals	1 (. .)	. .
Audience Development	4 (2)	2 (2)
General Program Support	14 (7)	81 (84)
Production Assistance	2 (1)	5 (5)
Other Technical Assistance	8 (4)	1 (1)
Conferences and Practica	5 (2)	4 (4)
Educational Programs and Workshops	19 (9)	2 (2)
Short-Term Consultants	1 (1)	. .
Salary Assistance	8 (4)	. .
Miscellaneous	. .	. .
Total	214	97

[a]Theater grants awarded in FY 1967-FY 1970.

[b]Theater grants awarded between FY 1966 and FY 1970.

Source: New York State Council on the Arts Annual Reports; National Endowment for the Arts Office of Research.

TABLE 28.--Theater Grants of the National Endowment for the Arts and the New York State Council on the Arts-- By Theater Sector.

Sector	New York (%)	Endowment (%)
Professional Resident Theater	6 (3)	47 (48)
Professional Touring Company	2 (1)	1 (1)
Other Professional	105 (49)	37 (38)
Summer Theater	1 (. .)	1 (1)
Community Theater	. .	. .
Amateur Children's Theater	. .	. .
Professional Children's Theater	71 (33)	2 (2)
Children's Theater Workshops	2 (1)	. .
Youth Theater Workshops	12 (6)	1 (1)
College and University Theater	1 (. .)	. .
Service Organizations	2 (1)	5 (5)
General	9 (4)	3 (3)
Miscellaneous	3 (1)	. .
Total	214	97

author's view, the healthy diversity between the programs of the national organization and the leading state agency, despite a restriction in both groups on the nature of grantee (only professional theater groups). Although both agencies have chosen to concentrate on professional theater, the difference in method is significant. The Endowment has put its money into a narrow category of theater groups and projects to lend maximum support with a given amount of money. The state agency, typically, has spread its money to cover a broad range of both service and support grants. The disparity is illustrative of the different purposes of each agency. The federal arts council must maintain an overview of the entire national arts scene--trends, developments, weak and strong areas, media balance, etc. Its grants, therefore, are highly selective and chosen with concern as to maximum national value. The tendency to focus that is shown by the breakdown of Endowment grants, reflects a conscious choice to accomplish the most good in a single area of theater, the one in which the National Council deemed its assistance most needed and most likely to be successful. The state grants, while no less carefully selected, are dispersed more widely among local institutions for a variety of projects, assuring extensive coverage of both the profession and the region.

CHAPTER III

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

American Theater during the 1960's

During the period under study, American theater has undergone many changes and developments. Theater was a popular, mass-audience entertainment medium in nineteenth century America. Through a variety of production methods, such as the stock company, travelling leading actors, and the combination system,[1] the theater was geographically within reach of the entire country. For a variety of reasons, the art became centralized as producers developed "circuits" of theaters around the country which presented only the companies of a single producer. By the 1920's, there was already a considerable decline in the number of productions on Broadway some years before, Poggi notes, the introduction of sound-synchronized film.[2]

By the 1960's, theater had been surpassed as a mass entertainment art by, successively, motion pictures, radio

---

[1]Refers to an entire company touring as a single production with complete costumes and scenery. See Jack Poggi, Theater in America: The Impact of Economic Forces, 1897-1967 (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1968), pp. 3-27 (hereinafter referred to as Theater).

[2]Ibid., pp. 46-64.

and television. Baumol and Bowen's survey and many others show the profile of regular theater-goers to be a quite homogeneous group of white professional people in an upper-middle income bracket, with a very high median level of education,[3] no more than 2 per cent of the population of the United States.

Professional theater has, unquestionably, become a specialized taste. Yet a look at American theater during the decade under consideration reveals a variety of activity, production style, and artistic purpose evocative not of an institutionalized, elite art but of a medium in the midst of change and redefinition. Partaking of the value-questioning, experimentation, and cultural change undergone by American society as a whole,[4] theater artists pushed the limits of their art form beyond existing boundaries.

The proliferation of resident companies accomplished a significant decentralization of American theater. The activity of these theaters, which produced mostly classic plays, was augmented by experimental companies and workshops devoted to a variety of artistic styles and techniques, including chance theater events, happenings, non-verbal

---

[3]Baumol and Bowen, Performing Arts, pp. 71-97; also Moore, Economics, pp. 69-89; and Theatre Communication Group, Toward a New Audience--A Report on a Continuing Workshop in Audience Development (New York: TCG, 1967).

[4]"Arts in the 60's: Coming to Terms with Society and Its Woes," New York Times, December 30, 1969, pp. 20-21.

theater, use of ritual and quasi-religious spectacle and chanting, borrowing from Oriental theater, improvisatory training and performance, cultural or political revolutionary ideology, and many others. Theater was a major artistic force in community action workshops and minority compensatory education. Utilizing the rich vocabulary of actor-training methods which emphasized inner character motivation, new developments in psychology and psychotherapy shared exercises and methods with the experimental theater. A continuing interchange between the two disciplines was evident in the search for private release in a public context through psychodrama, sensitivity T-groups, encounter therapy, and a variety of sensory awareness games. College and university theater departments explored new relationships between educational and professional theater, some hosting fully professional companies for campus residency, some forming semi-professional graduate repertory companies, others initiating theatrical artistic conservatories within the university framework to offer intensive professional training.

Of these developments, the burgeoning resident theater movement was most widely hailed as a major step in the re-introduction of theater arts into American life. The movement grew most rapidly after 1960. Before that date, only twelve resident companies existed, according to one survey.[5]

---

[5]Sandra Schmidt, "Regional Theatres, Some Statistics," Tulane Drama Review, X, No. 1 (Fall, 1965), pp. 50-61.

By 1967, the same survey defined seventy-three groups as resident theaters.[6] Achieving a high degree of administrative stability and a measure of artistic continuity, the resident companies worked to build a regular theater-going audience in communities formerly served only by road shows, community or educational theater productions. Varying success was achieved, although some theaters experienced, after the novelty of the first year's operation, a steady decline in attendance.[7] All of the theaters depended on some kind of subsidy for their existence; none paid all expenses simply from box office receipts.[8] Foundation grants played an important role in the new movement--between 1965 and 1970, $13.1 million were given to various resident companies by foundations, nearly half of all foundation grants to the entire field of theater.[9] This six-year total does not include a 1962 Ford Foundation grant of $6.1 million to nine resident companies to help the theaters "attain artistic and economic continuity as permanent institutions."[10] The establishment by the Ford Foundation of the Theatre

---

[6]Poggi, who excludes all non-Equity companies from his list, counts only 40 during the 1966-67 season; Theater, pp. 213-16.

[7]See Bradley Morison and Kay Fliehr, In Search of an Audience (New York: Pitman Publishing, 1968).

[8]Poggi, Theater, p. 230. [9]See Table 1.

[10]Ford Foundation, Annual Report, 1964 (New York: Ford Foundation, 1965), p. 26.

Communications Group was another major aid to the new movement. The organization was a clearing house for information and pooled services, such as administrative and accounting workshops, nationwide auditions, and a voice training institute.

In 1966, the theatrical trade newspaper, Variety, announced in a front-page article ("Hinterland Legits Top B'Way")[11] that for the first time since the previous century, more professional actors were at work in regional theaters than on Broadway. The trend has certainly continued, since the Variety figures, based on a study by Actor's Equity, did not include the festival theaters which were not in operation when the January survey was made.

As the movement gained a firmer base, problems became apparent. Among participant directors and managers, two difficulties stood out--the need to build an audience and the creation of a talented, permanent acting ensemble.[12] The later problem was particularly serious--one observer noted the poor vocal technique and characterization difficulty of actors at nearly all the many resident theaters he had attended.[13] Beside the poor training of many actors, a

---

[11]March 9, 1966.

[12]Robert Gard, et al., Theater in America: Appraisal and Challenge (Madison, Wis.: Dembar Educational Services, 1968), p. 131 (hereinafter referred to as Appraisal).

[13]Julius Novick, Beyond Broadway: The Quest for Permanent Theaters (New York: Hill and Wang, 1968), pp. 15-16.

high note of turnover made the companies less than permanent. Criticism from outside the movement related not to organization or structural problems, but the entire artistic orientation of the companies. The Drama Review (TDR), an early supporter of the movement, became an outlet for vehement criticism of resident theaters by one of its editors. In an articulate and bitter article,[14] Richard Schechner criticized grants by the Ford and Rockefeller foundations for promoting a type of theater more concerned with attaining stability and economic viability than with artistic integrity. The resident companies, according to Schechner, produced a "menu selection" of classics and "safe" or inoffensive contemporary plays, with an occasional farce or Broadway comedy. The subscription ticket policy advocated by TCG was aimed only at a white professional audience, rather than the "multi-class" audience Schechner considered essential to an exciting theater.

The only alternative foreseen by this outspoken critic of the "museum" policy of the resident companies was the creation of a series of "island theater institutions: some multi-class, some expressing radical democratic values, some both."[15] These experimental companies were considered the only force which could save American theater from stultification.

---

[14]Richard Schechner, "Ford, Rockefeller, and Theatre," Tulane Drama Review, X, No. 1 (Fall, 1965).

[15]Ibid., p. 49.

The island theaters of which Schechner spoke proliferated throughout the 1960's. Reminiscent of the fragmented experimental groups in Europe after the First World War which worked in Expressionist, Surrealist, and Dada modes, the new companies were eclectic in choice of material and format, drawing upon all available sources--yoga, light sculpture, action painting, found objects or found situations--any factor to add to the collage of theatrical effects. The avant-garde of the 1960's ranged from the Happening artists, whose theater-pieces used many chance elements and relied heavily upon setting and props to the Open Theater, a group which spent many months evolving plays improvised around themes, performed without sets, lighting or sound effects, solely through the physical presence of the actors. Some chose theatrical contexts in which to present their performances; others, so-called guerrilla theaters, formed plays in the midst of normal social dealings such as political demonstrations, classroom lectures, street corner gatherings, parades, etc.

Working in lofts, coffee-houses, church basement, or out on the street, these groups were subsidized almost entirely by the performers themselves. Some of the older and more permanent companies were awarded grants by foundations;[16] since 1968, thirty-five experimental companies,

---

[16] 13% of all foundation grants went to experimental companies; see Table 1.

most of them in New York, received small grants from the National Endowment for the Arts.

The growing concern for professionalism among college and university theater departments resulted in a number of operations with far-reaching implications. The establishment of professional training conservatories by a number of schools was a result of the observed inadequacies among resident theater actors. Programs of intensive training in voice, movement, theater games, improvisation, characterization, and scene study were begun by New York University, the Julliard School, the California Institute of the Arts, and Southern Methodist University, among others. Existing well-established drama schools at Yale and Carnegie-Mellon Universities completely revised and restaffed their programs. The new schools ranked among the best in the world. Formerly, American actors seeking advanced training went to England, to the Royal Academy of Dramatic Arts, the London Academy of Music and Dramatic Arts, and the Bristol Old Vic. Many schools hosted professional companies in residence for all or part of the academic year, providing an opportunity for students to observe and work with professionals in production and in class. Brandeis and Stanford Universities hosted year-round Equity companies in this manner; the University of Michigan hosted the Association of Performing Artists (APA) for an annual four-week residency.

Schools unable to afford the expense of a full-time professional company often formed semi-professional companies of graduate students. These companies provided production-oriented students with an opportunity to work in their artistic field while they completed degree requirements. So widespread had this practice become that in 1969, the University Resident Theater Association was formed to exchange information and hold nationwide auditions. According to the 1970-71 Directory, 23 schools were members of the URTA.

The university initiatives were made during the 1960's, after a major address by W. NcNeil Lowry, vice-president of the Ford Foundation and architect of the regional theater grants, who contended that the facilities of the universities were the "best-equipped in the United States."[17] Believing that universities could potentially become sponsors of a high quality apprenticeship, creating a middle ground between educational theater and Broadway, Lowry foresaw that such an alliance would require a "radical shift in the university atmosphere surrounding students considered potential artists."[18]

The concern for professionalism and higher standards of production was expressed frequently during the 1960's

---

[17]W. McNeil Lowry, "The University and the Creative Arts," Educational Theatre Journal, XIV, No. 2 (May, 1962), p. 104.

[18]Ibid., p. 106.

because it was apparent that the existing professional theater, i.e., Broadway, was not a satisfactory artistic outlet. Decried for years by artists and educators for its crass commercialism, Broadway began to show evidence that its fiscal acumen was in doubt, as well. A continuing decline in the number of shows opening on Broadway brought attention to the enormous costs of a single production. Analysis by Moore put the blame for rising costs on the great increase in advertising expenditures, as well as a proliferation of assorted administrative expenses such as legal and audit costs, office charges, payroll taxes, insurance, dues, mail order expenses, transportation charges, departmental bills, stationery and printing, etc.[19]. All other expenses, including the union wages often pointed to as the source of Broadway's economic problems, followed normal inflation.

One attempt to assist in the solution of commercial theater's problems at the source rather than through the alternative resident theaters was the Theater Development Fund, a foundation-initiated plan which received National Endowment assistance. The Fund bought up blocs of tickets to a number of carefully-selected productions, chosen for outstanding artistic merit by a panel of theater experts. The ticket purchases guaranteed the shows a minimum run of

---

[19]Moore, Economics, p. 56.

at least a month, so that a production would have time to establish an audience through word-of-mouth. Tickets were distributed at reduced rates or free, through labor unions and schools, in an effort to bring new audiences to the theater.[20]

Another industry-initiated plan went into operation during the 1970-71 season. The League of New York Theaters announced the Limited Gross Agreement contract by which a producer, theater owner, cast and crew agreed to hold weekly gross down to $25,000 instead of the potential $70,000 possible in most Broadway theaters. Through the cooperation of theatrical unions and guilds, production costs could be held down considerably until a show established itself. The contract could be changed to a regular Broadway agreement after the show's opening. The twelve theaters chosen to be eligible for the Limited Gross Agreement were selected because they had been unoccupied for fifty percent of the time during the two previous years.[21]

Gard, in his study of American theater notes that the community theater movement came to "dynamic fruition" in America about 1915[22] and was highly creative and

---

[20]New York Times, January 29, 1968, p. 1; October 1, 1970, p. 52.

[21]New York Times, January 6, 1971, p. 28.

[22]Gard, et al., Appraisal, p. 39.

experimental. That spirit of experiment is less prevalent today. Although community theaters involve more people in production than any other sector of American theater, there has been no major study of this theater area in recent years. The number of community theaters in the country "might well run between 30,000 and 80,000"[23] and the audience for these theaters, according to a Stanford Research Institute study, consisted of fifty million spectators.[24] This figure seems excessive. The problems faced by a community theater have been noted succinctly by Joseph Golden:

> Because of the impossibly vulnerable and frustrating position in which a dual purpose community theater finds itself--an elite and exclusive art form floundering in a sea of democratic and all inclusive operating principles--it does not, as a rule, possess the strength to become a dominant symbol of a community's character or to invade, on a more intimate level, the lives and actions of a community's citizens. As a result, the Community Theater is still woefully lacking in support--moral, physical and economic.[25]

Very few of these groups employed full or part-time directors or other professional staff. The productions done by community theaters tend to be recent Broadway hits or popular favorites, such as The Mousetrap, Our Town, My Three Angels, Harvey, etc.[26] The National Theater Conference

---

[23]Ibid., p. 40.

[24]Ibid.

[25]Joseph Golden, The Death of Tinker Bell: The American Theater in the 20th Century (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1967), p. 168.

[26]Gard, et al., Appraisal, pp. 57-58.

study authored by Gard, Balch and Temkin considered that trained leadership was the most critical need in community theater, and deplored the prejudice and snobbishness which kept young graduates from considering careers in the most active sector of American theater.[27]

This sketchy and cursory view of some facets of American theater during the period from 1960-1970 gives an indication of many sectors of theatrical activity, all in need of support or assistance. Within the varied and multi-dimensional art, what has been the role of state government in offering assistance to or facilitating service by theatrical organizations?

The Role of the State Arts Council

The primary responsibility of a government agency concerned with the arts is to the public which authorized its creation, not to the artists and organizations to be served. If aid to the arts is deemed a matter for public concern, then the rationale for subsidy must involve the social, moral, or economic benefit to the public good of the continued presence, economic health, and expanded programming of the arts, artists, or organizations. All of the many audience studies show that only a small percentage of the American people constitute a regular audience for the arts. The government funds expended, therefore, are partially subsidizing a minority activity. Precedent for this

[27] Ibid., p. 69.

practice exists, of course, as in federal aid to farmers, scientists, or colleges. Nonetheless, the consciousness of Philistine resentment over funds expended for what some people consider expensive luxuries must temper the activities of the Endowment and the state arts agencies. Often expressed in legislative chambers, this attitude has appeared in print, as well:

> The unhappy fact is that many Americans don't give a hang about either the humanities or the arts. For the total audience for culture has been estimated . . . at roughly 5 million people. It also happens to include far and away the most affluent segment of our society, one whose interest and pursuits, no matter how worthy, the ordinary working stiff should scarcely be taxed to support.[28]

This "unhappy fact" is indeed true and one which the arts councils are faced with as their primary problem--not how to keep the arts alive through artificial respiration or continued massive subsidy, but how to help find the combinations by which the arts can become a more meaningful part of American life. The arts council can assist in putting together the many diversified factors in American cultural life to find the right combination for each region or locality. The Endowment tries to accomplish this with an overview of the entire nation; the state councils try within their borders.

---

[28]"Eat My Bread, Sing My Song: Uncle Sam Has No Business Playing Patron of the Arts," Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly, XLIX (December 22, 1969), p. 8.

The policy of any arts council cannot be an imposition of taste or purpose, but must reflect both the needs of the artists and, more important, the reality of the cultural climate, not to mention the all too pressing matter of budget and staff. This examination of projects in one artistic area cannot be evaluative therefore, without a much wider study than that offered by the methodology used. Recommendations regarding project type are only meant for theater professionals and those involved in theater advisory committees of the arts agencies.

The most obvious deficiency noted during this study was the lack of a uniform system for reporting and describing projects. A means for adequate and evocative description of projects undertaken should be available in one central location, not simply for academic research, but for use by other arts councils and arts organizations. At present the information is scattered. The Endowment Final Evaluation Reports are less than fully adequate for the reasons noted in Chapter II,[29] as are the annual reports. Most important, the system for better reporting must be one which does not add to the administrative burden of the already-overworked council staffs, who are responsible to two government bureaucracies. Perhaps the most equitable means for accomplishing this would be a request for fuller description of

---

[29]See above, pp. 122-23.

projects in the annual report. The ACA, as the council's membership organization, would be responsible for preparing guidelines and possibly an outline for such descriptions; a complete library of annual reports and state surveys should be maintained at this location. In cases where complete descriptions would unnecessarily increase the size or cost of the annual report, which serves more needs than simply listing activities, the complete list should be available as a mimeographed appendix to the report.

Classification of projects, as was done by Seligson and this author, is useful only as a tool and can be of assistance to comprehensive research or for certain administrative reasons. There is no reason, however, to adopt either descriptive system for general use, especially not for reporting projects in the manner called for above. Box-checking can become an excuse for avoiding proper description.

Another area in which the author feels study is necessary is the matter of staff-program budget ratios. Extensive observation of one state arts council made evident the need for guidelines or recommendations about the optimum size of staff with regard to total council budget. Obviously each council is aware of its own needs; in addition, many councils work under earmarked funds, with administrative expenses written into the appropriation. Nonetheless, there may be cases where a council has misjudged its administrative needs or is not utilizing its budget in the most efficient manner.

Some means for evaluating these administrative procedures should be devised. Neither the ACA, which as a membership organization should not make value judgments on its members, nor the National Endowment should take the task upon itself. One of the foundations or a university institute devoted to public administration or arts management would be the proper outlet for conducting such a study and evolving such guidelines.

Along with this problem, the need for some means of evaluating the projects of the arts councils, at both the state and federal level, is a pressing one. Obviously, evaluation takes place constantly at all administrative levels. But a testing method needs to be devised that acknowledges the subjective value of any arts project while establishing certain objective criteria for evaluation. It would be impractical to study every project in the intensive manner such a test would require, but each council could select one or two representative projects. Such a tool would be invaluable for future planning or re-designing existing programs. The test might be no more than a list of key people to interview, or sampling technique for a questionnaire, but uniform guidelines would incorporate the flexibility necessary for such a test to be acceptable to a variety of arts councils and project types.

Dealing specifically with arts council theater projects, this study noted that a good balance exists between

different types of projects. The three most frequent areas for theater grants were touring (to both young and adult audiences), general program support, and educational programs (including workshops). These three areas, which account for nearly half of all the projects studied, constitute three complementary objectives of arts assistance--diffusion of existing resources, stabilization of arts organizations, and long-range audience development. Each state needs to arrive at its own ratio among projects since few councils have the resources to accomplish all three goals. All should be considered, however.

Audience development projects are thought to be a key factor in overcoming the unhappy fact noted in the Barron's article that few Americans care much about the arts. One approach to the problem favors concentration on the adult population, changing existing habits through greater availability of arts attractions either by touring plays to areas which have few or no cultural resources or by making tickets available at reduced rates, providing transportation, etc. The other approach concentrates on young people, the audience of the future. Tours to schools or youth groups and educational workshops are frequently recommended for this approach. Although young audience and general public tours were nearly identical in frequency, a significantly greater number of workshops were conducted than audience development projects.

It is heartening to note that both approaches to audience development are being attempted. Although adult habits may be difficult to alter, it seems unrealistic to base all future hopes upon "exposure" of the young to the arts. The term suggests a contagious disease; an inborn or culturally induced immunity may be more widespread than arts administrators think. Certainly a child who has experienced and enjoyed the arts, meeting indifference or scorn from parents, will not be likely to pursue the interest. Both adult and child need the attention of the arts councils.

The analysis of arts council grants by sector reveals the most significant findings of this study. Arts councils devote major portions of their theater budget to amateur theater projects, in the areas of community theater, amateur children's theater, college and university programs, and amateur summer theaters.

The state arts council is thus the only major source of arts patronage (for which data is available) which contributes heavily to amateur theater. Table 29 shows this quite plainly. Although the total amount contributed by the state agencies is quite small in comparison with the other patronage sources, the percentage of attention devoted to amateur theater is significantly greater.

It is imperative, therefore, that theater practitioners be made aware of this distribution in order to evolve the best possible programs for use of the funds

TABLE 29.--Theater Grants of Three Major Patronage Sources--By Theater Sector.

Sector	National Endowment[a]	Foundations[b]	State Arts Councils[c]
Resident Theater	48%	48%	8%
Touring Theaters	1	. .	1
Other Professional Theaters	38	13	9
Summer Theaters	1	5	10
Community Theaters	. .	8	29
Amateur Children's Theater	. .	. .	9
Professional Children's Theater	2	1	3
College and University Theater	. .	20	14
General and Miscellaneous	9	6	17
	d	d	d

[a]Figured from National Endowment project descriptions, 1965-1970. Total allotted--$6,737,619.

[b]Seligson Study--Foundation grants from 1965-1970. Total allotted--$27,571,123.

[c]Gathered by author; state arts council projects from 1966-1970, except New York State. Total allotted--$3,500,000 (estimated).

[d]Percentages may not total 100% because of decimal rounding.

allotted. The author feels that, although local agencies certainly have the final say as to the type of project and sector of the art, national professional organizations such as the American Educational Theatre Association, the American Community Theatre Association, and the National Theatre Conference, can assist the arts agencies by formulating pilot projects, conducting evaluation studies, and suggesting guidelines for state arts council theater grants.

Since community theaters receive a substantial plurality of all theater grants from the state agencies, it is of interest to all theater artists to see that the money is being used wisely. Robert Gard, one of the leading supporters of community theater, feels that every community theater ought to have at least two full-time employees--a professional director and technical director.[30] State council grants should help to achieve this end.

The national organizations should publicize projects that accomplish desired goals so that local organizations can develop similar plans or work with their arts councils to adapt noteworthy projects to local conditions. The identification and evaluation of excellent state arts council grants should be done by concerned professionals.

The author does not feel that the large percentage of grants to amateur theater is cause for concern. Since

---

[30]Gard, et al., Appraisal, p. 52.

neither the National Endowment nor the major foundations devote major attention to this area, it is only fitting that the state agencies, closest in touch with the arts at the grassroots level, take this sector under their wing. What should be a matter of concern is the manner in which the sector is being aided. Do production assistance or general support grants accomplish as much as a salary assistance allocation? Are training workshops for community theater actors as valuable as sessions for directors? Questions such as these need to be studied in order for the state grants to have the greatest effect.

There is a definite tendency, shown in the data, for the percentage of attention to community theater to decline as the council budgets increase. All the states received grants from the National Endowment for FY 1971 nearly twice as large as in FY 1970; this grant is likely to increase as the Endowment budget does. Will this mean less money for community theaters? Is the ratio shown by the data a desirable one? All these questions need to be discussed more widely.

Involvement in and awareness of state arts council projects is urged upon all theater practitioners, despite the frustration of inadequate funding and often aimlessly extensive discussion. As a state government function, the arts council is close to the people who may benefit by its

grants and more accessible to individuals than distant federal agencies or major foundations.

The following facts also emerge from the collected data: professional theaters do receive a significant percentage of all grants, mostly for touring. Educational theater also receives a high percentage of all its grants for touring, but most community theater grants are for program support and technical assistance.

This suggests that most community theater grants are for organizational support rather than service or outreach. With the observed negligence from other sources of subsidy, this is not surprising. But is this the best way to assist community theaters? The author feels that salary assistance and periodic training for participants would be the most valuable type of project for the field as a whole, although local needs may vary considerably.

It has been noted that grants to professional companies cost more than grants to amateur companies. This suggests that a state arts council, with an often meager budget, can assist more amateur theaters than professional companies in a given year. The greater diffusion of money among the groups in the state may improve the cultural climate of the entire state. On the other hand, concentration of the funds in one project may accomplish the same ends. The size of the grant alone is no determinant of its

effectiveness. Here is another area where organizational guidelines can be of great value.

The observed regional differences in council programs is an indication of the healthy diversity of the federal-state partnership for support of the arts. Eastern arts councils support a greater percentage of professional theater projects than the other regions. The South and Central agencies, while conforming to the average pattern generally, favor children's theater and educational theater projects respectively, somewhat more than the average. Community theaters in the Southwest receive half of their state arts council theater grants, while western states devoted greater attention to summer theater than the rest of the country. Each region and by implication, each arts council, is evolving a program to meet specific needs and conditions, rather than following a rigid formula laid down by the national agency. The regional distribution shown by data analysis is a tribute to the pluralistic approach to arts patronage. Experience with project descriptions has shown that the arts councils are determined to cherish the individual character of local cultural factors; there is an important aspect of chauvinism and local pride in this independence.

Program differences due to size of council budget are more difficult to account for. One indicator seems to show that there is no correlation between a low budget and

the number of professional theaters in the state. But it is clear that a higher level of funding is associated with a greater percentage of the more costly grants to professional theaters. As noted earlier in this chapter, the implications of this finding will be important if state appropriations and federal grants continue to increase.

Student workshops and educational programs are a vital phase of the government program. Most of the workshops sponsored were for junior and senior high school students. One significant fact revealed by the data is the lack of workshops for teachers of secondary students. Children's theater workshops were divided equally between those meant for children and for elementary teachers. The training of teachers is equally vital so that extra-curricular workshops or tours can continue to be reinforced in the classroom. The Educational Laboratory Theater project provides corroboration for this contention.

One of the rationales for assistance to the arts takes note of the value of permitting an organization to attempt experimental and innovative work without fear of financial loss. Have the state agencies, on the whole, given grants to experimental companies? The evidence collected by this author would suggest that they have not.

---

[31]Baumol and Bowen, Performing Arts, p. 344. Chapter XVI in this work is the most concise and inclusive summary of arguments for and against public support.

Not only do few experimental companies appear in council reports, but the states have not supported innovative groups identified as such and allocated funds by the National Endowment and the major foundations. The exception, of course, is New York State, where experimental companies have received substantial grants, in proportions similar to the federal or foundation allocations.

Although, as noted in Chapter II, in this new field of public arts administration, all projects should be considered innovative and experimental, this author feels that theater groups engaged in exploration of the limits of the medium are excellent prospects for government subsidy. Many of the groups are concerned with what they consider the institutionalization of the art in museum theater companies devoted to the past. Their efforts are often to create a new relationship between actor and audience, a mutual involvement and creative structure; this search is the same as that of the state arts council. By working together, surely these two groups can find ways to "advance the cultural legacy"[32] in new and meaningful projects. Hesitations among council members about the alienating effect of artistic radicalism can surely be overcome by mutual discussion.

Inconclusive information shows a distinct, but not overwhelming concern with black or ethnic minority audiences.

---

[32]See above, p. 68.

Because of the difficulty of gleaning evidence from the data as collected, the author can only point to the enthusiastic reception for ghetto arts programs in Office of Education and New York State Council on the Arts grants. Because of the fact that a cultural revolution is an intimate part of the growing social and political awareness of many black people, this is an area in which society and the arts can achieve a high degree of unity.

Due to a lack of support funds, the author was unable to make a deeper study of several successful theater projects in order to analyze some of their characteristics. An intuitive projection, however, based on readings and discussions would characterize such projects as ones which:

--answer a clear and pressing need unlikely to be solved by another means;

--bring together seemingly unlikely and incompatible factors successfully;

--put the art in an unexpected and pleasing context for an audience unaccustomed to the regular presence of theater;

--are presented by artists determined to win a new audience without snobbery or evangelism, but also without lowering standards;

--are designed by members of the community in conjunction with artists and administrators.

These common sense requirements need no special elaboration or description. Most criteria are met by the best of the theater grants. Some poorly planned projects, no doubt, could meet the same criteria and still be unsuccessful. Obviously, further study is needed in this area of

defining excellence and effectiveness. Actual observation and interview seem to be essential to such evaluation.

Of the recommendations above, the most important is the need for participation of artists and administrators in state arts council planning despite possible bureaucratic frustration, and the need for studies by professional organizations of guidelines for state arts council theater grants. As a vitally concerned citizen, the theater artist has a great stake in assisting the planning and implementation of grants. Not only do the state arts councils offer a potential source of funds, they afford an outlet for exploring new relationships between art and society. "The value of the theater," notes Poggi, "lies in its power to make people more alive."[34] The task is to bring out the potential audience for theater among the millions who do not attend plays because of geographic restrictions, financial limitations, cultural preconceptions, or low standards among available productions. Theater will never again be a mass entertainment, but its audience can be a wider one, enriching their experience through the peculiarly public celebration of private feelings which constitute the theatrical art. By their efforts within the diversified framework of pluralistic arts patronage, the state arts councils offer a most promising avenue for furthering that end.

---

[34]Poggi, Theater, p. 286.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Adams, William Howard. The Politics of Art: Forming a State Arts Council. New York: Associated Councils of the Arts, 1966.

America's Museums: The Belmont Report. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Museums, 1968.

Associated Councils of the Arts. The Arts: A Central Element of a Good Society. New York: ACA, 1965.

_____. The Arts: Planning for Change. New York: ACA, 1966.

_____. Washington and the Arts: A Guide and Directory to Federal Programs and Dollars for the Arts. New York: ACA, 1971.

Baumol, William J. and Bowen, William G. Performing Arts: The Economic Dilemma. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1968.

Burgard, Ralph. Arts in the City: Organizing and Programming Community Arts Councils. New York: ACA, 1968.

Bushnell, Don. The Arts, Education and the Urban Sub-Culture. Santa Barbara, Cal.: The Communications Foundation, 1970.

Castillejo, David. A Counter-Report on Art Patronage. London: Privately Printed, 1968.

Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. The Arts in a Democratic Society. Santa Barbara, Cal.: Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, 1966.

Chagy, Gideon, ed. Business in the Arts '70. New York: Paul S. Eriksson, Inc., 1970.

Dorian, Frederick. Commitment to Culture. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1964.

Eels, Richard. The Corporation and the Arts. New York: Macmillan Company, 1967.

Flanagan, Hallie. Arena--The History of the Federal Theatre. Reissued edition. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1965.

Ford Foundation. Annual Report, 1964. New York: Ford Foundation, 1964.

Gard, Robert; Balch, Marston; and Temkin, Pauline. Theater in America: Appraisal and Challenge. Madison, Wis.: Dembar Educational Research Services, Inc., 1968.

Gassner, John. A Treasury of the Theater from Henrik Ibsen to Arthur Miller. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1956.

Gingrich, Arnold. Business and the Arts: An Answer to Tomorrow. New York: Business Committee for the Arts, 1969.

Golden, Joseph. The Death of Tinker Bell: The American Theater in the Twentieth Century. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1967.

Goldman, William. The Season: A Candid Look at Broadway. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1969.

Griswold, A. Whitney, et al. The Fine Arts and the University. The Frank Gerstein Lectures, 1965, York University Series. Toronto: Macmillan Co., 1965.

Harris, John S. Government Patronage of the Arts in Great Britain. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Hecksher, August. The City and the Arts. Pittsburgh: Institute of Local Government, University of Pittsburgh, 1964.

Hewitt, Barnard. Theatre, U.S.A.: 1665 to 1957. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

Levy, Alan. The Culture Vultures. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1968.

Lewis, Emory. Stages: The Fifty-Year Childhood of the American Theater. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

Macmahon, Arthur; Millett, John; and Ogden, Gladys. The Administration of Federal Work Relief. Chicago: Public Administration Service, 1941.

Mathews, Jane De Hart. The Federal Theatre, 1935-1939: Plays, Relief, and Politics. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967.

McDonald, William F. Federal Relief Administration and the Arts. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1969.

Miller, James E., Jr. and Herring, Paul D., eds. The Arts and the Public. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.

Moore, Thomas Gale. The Economics of the American Theater. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1968.

Morison, Bradley and Fliehr, Kay. In Search of an Audience. New York: Pitman Publishing Corp., 1968.

Moskow, Michael H. Labor Relations in the Performing Arts. New York: ACA, 1969.

Newton, Michael and Hatley, Scott. Persuade and Provide: The Story of the Arts and Education Council in St. Louis. New York: ACA, 1970.

Novick, Julius. Beyond Broadway: The Quest for Permanent Theatres. New York: Hill and Wang, 1968.

O'Connor, Francis V. Federal Support for the Visual Arts: The New Deal and Now. Greenwich, Conn.: New York Graphic Society, 1969.

O'Connor, William Van. The Arts in Minnesota. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1958.

Overmyer, Grace. Government and the Arts. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1939.

Poggi, Jack. Theater in America: The Impact of Economic Forces--1870-1967. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1968.

Province of Ontario Council for the Arts. The Awkward Stage: The Ontario Theatre Study Report. Toronto: Methuen, 1969.

Purcell, Ralph. Government and Art: A Study of the American Experience. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1956.

Rockefeller Panel Report. Performing Arts: Problems and Prospects. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Runes, D. D. and Schrickel, H. G., eds. Art in a Post-War World. Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press, 1969.

Russell-Cobb, Trevor. Paying the Piper: The Theory and Practice of Industrial Patronage. London: Queen Anne P.C., 1968.

Scott, Mel. The States and the Arts: The California Arts Commission and the Emerging Federal-State Partnership. Berkeley, Cal.: Institute of Governmental Studies, 1971.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. Democracy in America. Translated by Henry Reeves. Henry Steele Commager, ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1947.

Toffler, Alvin. The Culture Consumers: A Study of Art and Affluence in America. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1964.

Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on Performing Arts Centers. Bricks, Mortar and the Performing Arts. New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1970.

Weales, Gerald. The Jumping-Off Place: American Drama in the 1960's. New York: Macmillan Co., 1969.

Whitman, Willson. Bread and Circuses: A Study of the Federal Theatre. New York: Oxford University Press, 1937.

Willett, John. Art in a City. London: Methuen, 1967.

Articles and Periodicals

"Arts in the 60's: Coming to Terms with Society and Its Woes." New York Times, December 30, 1969.

Brustein, Robert. "Revolution as Theatre." New Republic, CLXII, No. 11 (March 14, 1970).

_____. "Art, Non-Art: The Curse of Official Culture." New Republic, CLI, No. 19 (November 7, 1964).

Cultural Affairs, Nos. 1-15.

"Eat My Bread, Sing My Song: Uncle Sam Has No Business Playing Patron of the Arts." Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly, XLIX (December 22, 1969).

Eddy, Junius. "Government, the Arts, and Ghetto Youth." Public Administration Review, XXX, No. 4 (July-August, 1970).

Elliot, David. "Art for the People." Chicago Daily News, July 18-19, 1970.

"Federal Subsidy of the Arts." The Critic, XXI, No. 3 (December 1962-January 1963).

"For Art's Sake." Editorial. New Republic, CLXII, No. 1 (January 3, 1970).

"Forces Gather for Long Government Arts Struggle." Art Worker's Newsletter, I, No. 3. National Art Workers Community, 48 West 22nd St., New York, N.Y.

Getlein, Frank. "The Man Who's Made 'the Most Solid Contribution to the Arts of any President since F.D.R.'." New York Times Magazine, February 14, 1971.

Gilman, Richard. "The Theater of Ignorance." Atlantic Monthly, CCXXIV, No. 1 (July, 1969).

Goldstein, Richard. "Guerilla Theatre." Vogue, CLIII, No. 5 (March 1, 1969).

"The Government and the Arts: A Proposal by George Biddle, with Comment and Criticisms by Others." Harper's Magazine, October, 1943.

Greenfield, Meg. "The Politics of Art." Reporter, XXXV, No. 4 (September 22, 1966).

Hanks, Nancy. "Government and the Arts." Guest editorial. Saturday Review, February 28, 1970.

Hardy, Hugh. "An Architecture of Awareness for the Performing Arts." Architectural Record, CXLV, No. 3 (March, 1969).

Harris, John. "Arts Councils: A Survey and Analysis." Public Administration Review, XXX, No. 4 (July-August, 1970).

_____. "The Politics of Government Patronage of the Arts in the United States." Parliamentary Affairs, XX, No. 4 (Autumn, 1967).

Hewes, Henry. "Blessed Is the Profitmaker." Saturday Review, October 4, 1969.

"Hinterland Legits Top B'way." Variety, March 9, 1966.

Hughes, Catherine R. "Theatre of Ritual?" America, CXXI, No. 7 (September 13, 1969).

Kerr, Walter. "Participatory Theater." Harper's Magazine, October, 1969.

Kimball, Fiske. "Jefferson and the Arts." Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, LXXXVII, No. 3 (July, 1943).

Kogan, Deen. "This Is Street Theater." Parks and Recreation, V, No. 1 (January, 1970).

Lowry, W. McNeil. "The University and the Creative Arts." Educational Theatre Journal, XIV, No. 2 (May, 1962).

Lynes, Russell. "The Artist as Uneconomic Man." Saturday Review, February 28, 1970.

_____. "Atlanta's Culture for All Seasons." Harper's Magazine, March, 1969.

_____. "The Case Against Government Aid to the Arts." New York Times Magazine, March 25, 1962.

_____. "How to Make Politics from Art, and Vice Versa." Harper's Magazine, August, 1969.

Mark, Charles. A Study of Cultural Policy in the United States. UNESCO Studies and Documents on Cultural Policy, No. 2 (Paris: UNESCO, 1969).

Mayer, Martin. "Where the Dollars Go." Saturday Review, February 28, 1970.

Murdoch, Lawrence C., Jr. "S.R.O. and SOS: The Performing Arts Paradox." Business Review, Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia (March, 1962).

New York Times. October 13, 1945; June 30, 1946; May 23, 1947; May 11, 1949; March 1, 1951; August 5, 1956; January 29, 1968; July 27, 1969; July 8, 1970; October 1, 1970; January 6, 1971.

"Partnership for the Arts to Aid Nationwide Plight." Lincoln Center Marquee (February 6, 1971).

Schechner, Richard. "Ford, Rockefeller, and Theatre." Tulane Drama Review, X, No. 1 (Fall, 1965).

Schiff, Bennett. "The Hungry Arts." New Republic, February 28, 1970.

Schmidt, Sandra. "Regional Theatres, Some Statistics." Tulane Drama Review, X, No. 1 (Fall, 1965).

Schonberg, Harold C. "How Cultural Is the Cultural Explosion?" McCall's, July, 1969.

Scott, Mel. "The Federal-State Partnership in the Arts." Public Administration Review, XXX, No. 4 (July-August, 1970).

Spater, George. "A New Mission for Business." Saturday Review, February 28, 1970.

Stevens, Roger L. "America's Stake in the Arts." Saturday Review, February 28, 1970.

Straight, Michael. "The Arts Go Begging." New Republic, March 22, 1969.

Taubman, Joseph. "Review of Baumol and Bowen's Performing Arts: The Economic Dilemma." Tulane Law Review, XLIII, No. 1 (December, 1968).

"A Tax Break for Artists." Editorial. Saturday Review, November 15, 1969.

"Theatre-Business." Fortune, February, 1938.

"There's Slow Business in Show Business." Business Week, October 18, 1969.

Williams, Sir William Emrys. "The Arts and Public Patronage." Lloyds Bank Review, XLIX (July, 1958).

Winter, William O. "The University, the City, and the Arts." Public Administration Review, XXX, No. 4 (July-August, 1970).

Public Documents--Federal

Hecksher, August. "The Arts and the National Government." Senate Document #28 (May 28, 1963), 88th Congress, 1st Session.

Murphy, Judith and Gross, Ronald. The Arts and the Poor: New Challenge for Educators. U.S. Office of Education. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968.

Peluso, Joseph. A Survey of the Status of Theatre in United States High Schools. U.S. Office of Education Bureau of Research. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970.

True, Webster B. The First Hundred Years of the Smithsonian Institution, 1846-1946. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1946.

United States. Commission of Fine Arts. Art and Government: Report to the President. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1953.

_____. _____. A Brief History, 1910-1963. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1964.

_____. Congress. National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965. Public Law #209. 89th Congress.

_____. _____. Amendments to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965. Joint Hearings before the Select Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor and the Special Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. 91st Congress, 2nd Session, 1970.

_____. _____. House of Representatives. Select Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. Hearings, Amendments to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965. 91st Congress, 2nd Session, 1970.

_____. Congressional Record. February 2, 1961; February 27, 1968; June 30, 1970.

_____. Department of State. Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. Annual Reports, 1965-1969. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

_____. _____. The Cultural Cooperation Program: 1938-1943. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1944.

_____. _____. Cultural Presentations Program. Annual Reports, 1963-1969. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

_____. _____. A Guide to U.S. Government Agencies Involved in International Educational and Cultural Activities. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966.

_____. _____. International Educational Exchange: The Opening Decades, 1946-1966, Report of the Board of Foreign Scholarships. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966.

_____. _____. International Educational Exchange Program: 1948-1958, 19th Semi-Annual Report to Congress. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1958.

_____. _____. Special International Program: Tenth Semi-Annual Report, January 1-June 30, 1961. Report of the Coordinator of the program, based on material prepared by the Departments of State, Commerce, Labor, and the U.S. Information Agency. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1961.

_____. _____. Swords into Plowshares: A New Venture in International Understanding. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1956.

_____. _____. Twenty Years After: Two Decades of Government-Sponsored Cultural Relations. Prepared by Francis Colligan. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1958.

_____. National Council on the Arts. National Endowment for the Arts. The First Five Years: Fiscal 1966 through Fiscal 1970. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970.

_____. Office of Education. "Arts and Humanities--Educational Research Projects." (Multilithed.)

_____. _____. Support for the Arts and the Humanities. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968.

_____. Smithsonian Institution. Increase and Diffusion: A Brief Introduction to the Smithsonian Institution. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1970.

_____. _____. Smithsonian Year (Annual Report), 1965-1970. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Public Documents--States

Cutler, Bruce, ed. The Arts at the Grass Roots. Lawrence: Kansas Cultural Arts Commission, 1968.

California. Arts Commission. Annual Report, 1969-70.

Hawaii. State Foundation on Culture and the Arts. Annual Report, 1970.

Illinois. Arts Council. "Balance Sheet, July 1, 1965-December 31, 1966." (Mimeographed.)

Maryland. Arts Council. Annual Reports, 1968-1970.

Michigan. Council for the Arts. Annual Reports, 1966-70.

Minnesota. State Arts Council. Annual Reports, 1967-1970.

Missouri. State Council on the Arts. Annual Report, 1966.

_____. _____. "The Arts and the State of Missouri." (Mimeographed.)

Montana. Arts Council. The Arts in Montana: A Report by the Montana Arts Council. Missoula: 1968.

New York. State Council on the Arts. Annual Reports, 1961-1970.

North Carolina. Arts Council. The Arts in North Carolina: 1967. Raleigh: 1967.

_____. _____. Biennial Report, 1967-1969.

Ohio. Arts Council. Annual Report, 1970.

Pennsylvania, Commonwealth of. Council on the Arts. Pennsylvania Culture: The Arts, the Artists, the Audience. Lebanon: 1969.

South Carolina. Arts Commission. Annual Report, 1970.

_____. _____. The Arts in South Carolina. Columbia: 1968.

Virgin Islands. Council on the Arts. Annual Report, 1971.

Other Sources

Associated Councils of the Arts. Directory of National Arts Organizations. New York: ACA, 1969.

_____. Directory of State Arts Councils: 1969-70. New York: ACA, 1969.

_____. Directory of State Arts Councils: 1970-71. New York: ACA, 1971.

Gerstein, Beverly. Department of State Cultural Presentations Program. Interview, Washington, D.C., August 25, 1970.

Mayleas, Ruth. Program Director-Theater, National Endowment for the Arts. Interview, Washington, D.C., August 25, 1970.

Office of Community Arts Development--Wisconsin Idea Theatre. University Extension, University of Wisconsin. The Arts in the Small Community--A National Plan. Madison: University of Wisconsin Extension, n.d.

Scott, E. Ray. Executive Director, Michigan Council for the Arts. Interviews, Detroit, March 12, 1968; July 10, 1970; July 28, 1970.

Seligson, Sureva. Associate Director, Economic and Social Development Institute. "Statistical Guide to Arts Information." Compiled for the National Endowment for the Arts. (Unpublished.)

Stern, Dr. Hans Georg. "The Educational Laboratory Theatre Project--Its First Three Years." Report presented at the National Convention of the American Educational Theatre Association, Washington, D.C., August 24, 1970.

Theatre Communications Group. Toward a New Audience--A Report on a Continuing Workshop in Audience Development. New York: TCG, 1967.

Zimmerman, Leland Lemke. "The Federal Theatre: An Evaluation and Comparison with Foreign National Theaters." (Unpublished dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1955.)

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

DEPARTMENT OF STATE ARTS INVOLVEMENT: AN EXAMPLE OF FEDERAL ARTS SUPPORT PREDATING THE PRESENT PHASE OF ARTS ACTIVITY

The Department of State began a program of cultural outreach in 1938, with the inauguration of the Cultural Cooperation Program. An outgrowth of President Roosevelt's Good Neighbor Policy, the program was spurred by fear of Nazi penetration of Latin America. Administered by the Division of Cultural Relations within the Department of State, a program of educational and information exchange with the countries of Latin America began to take shape.[1] The division concentrated its activities in South America exclusively until 1942, when the program was expanded to include China. Further expansion to Africa and the Near East followed. In March 1944, the Department of State

---

[1]U.S., Department of State, The Cultural-Cooperation Program: 1938-1943, report prepared by Haldore Hansen (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1944), p. 1 (hereinafter referred to as Cooperation). See also U.S., Department of State, Twenty Years After: Two Decades of Government-Sponsored Cultural Relations, prepared by Francis Colligan (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1958), pp. 1-3 (hereinafter referred to as Twenty Years).

recommended that the United States assist in the emergency educational and cultural rebuilding of the war-torn United Nations, thereby adding Europe to the program. Throughout the period of the Second World War, however, the main thrust of the program was toward Latin America. In FY 1944, for example, $4.5 million was spent in Latin America and only $2.9 million in all other areas.[2]

Objectives of the original program were outlined in a report of the advisory agency responsible for policy development:

1. The General Advisory Committee of the Division of Cultural Relations urges the vigorous development of cultural relations on a basis of mutual understanding and appreciation.
2. The Committee conceives the program of cultural relations as a long-term program of continuing activities which should, however, be realistically acceptable to changing circumstances and needs, whether in normal times or in times of emergency.
3. The Committee believes that the program should be as broad as intellectual and cultural activities themselves. It includes interchanges in all fields of the arts, sciences, technology, letters, and education and throughout the entire range of economic and social life.
4. The interchanges should be of value to all countries participating in them; they should serve to promote human welfare; they should extend to all groups of the population; and they should help to preserve intellectual and cultural freedom.[3]

The Division's varied activities included travel and study grants to students, professionals, teachers; grants to

---

[2]U.S., Department of State, Twenty Years, p. 5.

[3]U.S., Department of State, Cooperation, pp. 1-2.

cultural centers, United States government-sponsored libraries and schools abroad; transmitting cultural materials such as books, films, microfilms and translations to foreign libraries; exhibitions and concerts abroad, as well as grants to artists and scholars; the exchange of music recordings and materials; radio and film exchanges, and assistance to educational and professional institutes. The program was administered under guidelines laid down by a General Advisory Committee, appointed by the President, made up of State Department officials and distinguished citizens in education, the professions, and the arts.

In 1944, an American delegation to the London Conference for the reconstruction of war-torn Europe, headed by Senator J. William Fulbright, recommended a continuing expansion of the Cultural Cooperation program ". . . for immediate needs of the war period and for the long-range undergirding of American security."[4] The devastation of the war made evident the need for a complete re-establishment and restocking of educational facilities, such as libraries and museums. Looting of valuable archives and art works was a major concern to all the countries which had undergone invasion. The necessary cultural reconstruction was accomplished with assistance from Marshall Plan funds and United Nations coordination following the completion of the war.

---

[4] Ibid., pp. 5-6.

In 1946, Senator Fulbright proposed an amendment to a bill authorizing the sale of United States surplus war materials, permitting countries to "pay" for the materials by sponsoring an exchange of scholars. Precedent for this move was found in authorization given in 1920 by then-chief of reconstruction and relief programs Herbert Hoover to use money from the liquidation of war supplies in Belgium for the establishment of the Belgian-American Education Fund.[5] The act became known as the Fulbright Act and the scholarships granted to both American and foreign scholars have been popularly called "Fulbrights."

After the war, all agencies dealing with information and cultural exchange were gathered into the Department of State Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs which, among other programs, administered the Fulbright scholarships. A major objection to the original Fulbright program was its lack of provision for the exchange of foreign scholars to come to the United States. Because the exchange was funded through foreign currency which remained in the country of origin, only travel expenses for foreign grantees could be covered. To correct this deficiency and to ensure the permanence of the program, Senator H. Alexander Smith and Representative Karl Mundt

---

[5]U.S., Department of State, Swords into Plowshares: A New Venture in International Understanding (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1956), p. 2 (hereinafter referred to as Swords).

sponsored legislation to create a permanent agency for reciprocal exchanges. The Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (also called the Smith-Mundt Act) gave statutory authorization to all the pre-existing practices of the State Department office--reciprocity of exchange, maximum use of non-governmental agencies and advisors, encouragement of private funding (where possible), and a full utilization of federal resources--in addition to providing substantial funding to the program.[6] Funds allotted for FY 1948 amounted to $5.2 million; by FY 1953, the Office was budgeted at $22.2 million.

A major reorganization of the Department of State in 1953 transferred all of the functions of the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs to the United States Information Agency (USIA) except for educational exchange, which remained under State Department supervision.

An assessment of grants to American and foreign scholars up to 1955 revealed the following information concerning the proportion of grants in arts areas: out of 21,833 persons assisted under the program, 1,895 (8.7%) received grants in the fields of architecture, art, art history, music, or theater. Of the grants in the arts area, 198 (10.5%) received funds to study theater.[7]

---

[6]U.S., Department of State, Twenty Years, pp. 9-10.

[7]U.S., Department of State, Swords, pp. 53-55.

There were no major additions or changes in the exchange program except for the addition of Cultural Presentations (see below) until 1961, when the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (Fulbright-Hays Act), sponsored by Senator Fulbright and Representative Wayne Hays, established a Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs within the Department of State. The Fulbright-Hays Act brought together many of the previous statutes under which educational exchange had been authorized and greatly strengthened the program through widened scope, greater flexibility, and increased dollar support. The new program assured all countries of participation, regardless of the sale of surplus war materials, and authorized the establishment of additional sources of foreign currency funds for use in the exchange program.

Aside from exchange of individuals, such as young artists, students, scholars, and teachers, the Bureau fostered American Studies programs abroad at colleges, universities, and institutes. Support of English-language teaching and curriculum development were areas of major concern to the agency, as well. The program involved over 100 countries at the height of its operations, in FY 1966.

A breakdown of grants given during the twenty years previous made in 1966 revealed that the most popular subject for foreign grantees coming to the United States was science, while among American grantees, humanities and the

arts were the most common fields of interest.[8] Nearly 20 per cent of all grants to American students were awarded in the arts. The 1966 figures, as in 1955, showed that over half the young art students who went abroad studied music--principally singers and pianists. Nearly 7 per cent of the grantees studied acting abroad, the majority in England.[9]

The general decline in funds expended for foreign aid in the latter part of the decade of the 1960's is reflected in the sharp cutback of funds allotted for educational exchange. In 1969, $31.4 million was made available by Congress as opposed to $43 million in 1966.[10]

Another aspect of the State Department cultural exchange programs was instituted in 1954. In response to the growing popularity of Soviet performing groups on tour throughout the world, the Department of State initiated the Cultural Presentation Program to sponsor and assist American performing groups abroad. Permanent authority for the program was given by Congress in 1956 with the passage of the Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956

---

[8]U.S., Department of State, International Educational Exchange: The Opening Decades, 1946-1966, a report of the Board of Foreign Scholarships (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 22.

[9]Ibid., pp. 28-29.

[10]Tabulated from Annual Reports of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, U.S., Department of State, 1965-1969.

sponsored by Senator Hubert Humphrey and Representative Frank Thompson. The stated purpose of the program is:

> . . . to strengthen the ties which unite us with other nations by demonstrating the cultural interests, developments, and achievements of the people of the United States . . . and thus to assist in the development of friendly, sympathetic, and peaceful relations between the United States and the other countries of the world.[11]

The act provided for tours by creative artists and athletes and for United States representation in artistic, dramatic, musical, sports and other cultural festivals and competitions abroad. The sum of $2.25 million was authorized for the program.

Selection of groups for sponsorship was handled originally through a contractual arrangement with the American National Theatre and Academy (ANTA), which appointed three advisory panels of authorities in music, dance, and drama.[12] Programming the recommended groups was administered by the Performing Artists Branch of the Department of State, based on recommendations by area and desk officers in the Department and the USIA, and by the expressed desires and needs of the foreign post. The Department approached

---

[11]U.S., Department of State, Special International Program: Tenth Semi-Annual Report (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, June, 1961), p. 29 (hereinafter referred to as Special Program).

[12]U.S., Department of State, Cultural Presentations Program, Annual Report, 1963-64 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1965), p. 83.

programming on a geographical area basis, hoping to cover maximum area for minimal costs, but spot requests for appearances were met when the appearance of an American artist or group was deemed important.

Special emphasis was given to sponsoring groups in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Agreements for mutual exchange of artists were made annually between the United States and the Soviet Union to promote better understanding.

A slightly larger budget for cultural presentations was granted by the Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, the Fulbright-Hays Act, approximately $2.5 million. Shortly thereafter, the Department of State studied the entire project, with an eye to revision. The report resulting from that study, written by Roy Larsen, urged that the previous competitive nature of the program in response to the Soviet "cultural offensive" be abandoned for a more positive approach. A new statement of purpose was accepted:

> . . . to reflect abroad the state of the performing arts in America, both in terms of creative cultural vitality and the desire and capacity of a free people to support the development of a flourishing national culture.[13]

The report also recommended that the Department handle all management of tours, terminating the practice of contracting out to ANTA, and that advisory committees of artists be appointed by the Department to substantially

---

[13] Ibid., p. 3.

assist in selection of performers. The following criteria were drawn up for future operation of the program:

1. Artistic excellence is the pre-eminent criterion for selecting artists to represent the United States overseas.

2. Responsibility for artistic judgment rests completely with the advisory panels of experts.

3. Offstage personal contact is expected of artists. Tour time is allotted for workshops, seminars and individual contacts. The performer's time, however, should be handled with care to avoid over-scheduling.

4. Both professional and academic touring groups are needed for two different kinds of audience.

5. A balance between large and small performing groups is needed.

6. The tours of an individual artist are to be supported only by facilitating the extension of a tour undertaken on the artist's own initiative.

7. Participation at music festivals should be limited to only 8 or 10 major areas, every few years.

8. Tours should meet the needs of various geographical areas; this should be accomplished not through equal allotments but careful proportioning.

9. Public recognition for participating artists needs to be increased in the United States.

10. The USIA should give more time to promotion and preparation of the tours in the sponsoring country.

11. Drama, despite its expense, must be included to a greater extent in future tours.[14]

An interesting feature of the Larsen report is its recognition of the importance of Cultural Presentations Program money to artists:

---

[14] Ibid., pp. 4-12.

> We should not lose sight of the fact that the program does assist the development of the arts in the United States by providing a stability and continuity to some artistic groups that they might otherwise not have had.[15]

The program has given primary emphasis to music, because of the universality of its language, the relative ease of transporting instruments, and the undemanding requirements for performance space. Nearly 85 per cent of the sponsored projects have been from the field of music. The Department has varied its selection considerably within the field, however, choosing symphonic orchestras, chamber ensembles, chorales, jazz bands and groups, and folksingers. Because of the language barrier, theater has not been a favored mode of presentation. Other factors enter into the small number of theater projects--the expense of transporting sets and costumes, the specialized facilities necessary for presentation, and the impermanent nature of commercial theater companies. This last factor is evidently an important one, since the expense and facilities factors are shared by dance companies (which do not, however, face the language barrier), which are highly favored by the Department.

Nearly half of the theater projects sponsored by the Cultural Presentation program have been academic (college) groups, many of whom had undertaken a tour under Department

---

[15] Ibid., p. 81.

of Defense auspices. The State Department extended the tour, thus incurring considerably less expense. Only one-third of the theater tours were full-length professional productions of complete plays. Variety shows, evenings of readings, drama demonstrations and college productions make up the bulk of the projects.

One of the latter shows an interesting and imaginative use of available funds. In 1965, the Department sponsored a series of demonstration sessions in Japan of a rehearsal of Eugene O'Neill's Long Day's Journey Into Night, directed by Harold Clurman. Designed to "share knowledge and experience with Japanese theater professionals and to demonstrate American acting and production techniques,"[16] the project involved five actors and director Clurman. Members of the Institute of Dramatic Arts in Tokyo observed Clurman in a series of rehearsals with the American actors. Preparing their own version of the O'Neill play translated into Japanese, the local theater professionals and students had an opportunity to observe nuances of American life and acting style difficult to identify in any other fashion. Clurman and members of the cast gave freely of their time, participating in seminars, interviews, lectures, receptions, workshops and readings. Two performances of Clurman's

---

[16]U.S., Department of State, Cultural Presentations Program, Annual Report, 1964-65 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 22.

production were given to invited audiences; although this had not been contracted for, requests by Japanese professionals for a performance were granted by the Americans. Clurman graciously urged the audiences to regard his production only as an open rehearsal--the real performance, he emphasized, would be given in Japanese by the Kumo troupe with which he had worked.

Of productions taken abroad by the Department of State, one-third of all plays (professional and academic) were musicals. Nearly two-thirds of the remaining plays were comedies.[17] The decided preference for light entertainment reflects several factors: requests by field offices and embassy personnel, a belief in the Washington office that the musical is the most distinctively American form of theater, and the observed popularity of these productions abroad. Contemporary straight plays were avoided, because of possible controversy either at home or abroad.[18]

One such controversy provided a pretext for a substantial slash in funds for the program. During hearings held in Washington in March 1969, objections were raised by House Subcommittee on Appropriations chairman, Representative

---

[17]Tabulated from U.S., Department of State, Cultural Presentations Program Annual Reports, 1962-1969, and cumulative listing in U.S., Department of State, Special Program.

[18]Interview, Beverly Gerstein, Department of State Cultural Presentations Program, Washington, D.C., August 25, 1970.

John Rooney, to material presented abroad by a group from the University of Kansas. The troupe of six student actors and one professor had traveled to Yugoslavia, Hungary, Rumania, Poland, and Czechoslovakia to work with Eastern European theater groups and present scenes from contemporary American plays. They were sponsored not by the Cultural Presentations Program, but the Educational Exchange office. Scenes from the plays Chicago by Sam Shepard and America Hurrah by Jean-Claude van Itallie contained language which incurred heavy criticism for the group, the State Department, and all cultural exchange activities. As a result, the funds allotted to cultural exchange were deleted completely from the appropriations bill as passed by the House. Representative Rooney's comment on cultural exchange was strongly worded:

> It is a wasteful, stupid, vicious program run by wasteful, stupid people. I don't want incompetent people having anything to do with any programs.[19]

Funds for the Cultural Presentations Program, as well as Educational Exchange, were partially restored by the Senate. A reorganization of funds by the State Department from other programs permitted cultural exchange to continue, though at a much-reduced level. The incident was a dramatic reminder of the tenuous relationship between government and art.

---

[19] New York Times, July 27, 1969, p. 37.

From an average of $2.3 million annually between 1954 and 1965, with a peak of $2.8 million in 1966, funds have been cut repeatedly to the FY 1970 appropriation of only $550,000. This has caused considerable disquiet to the CPP staff. Roy Larsen, chairman of the program's arts advisory committee, expressed the feelings of all staff members in a statement in the FY 1968 Annual Report:

> The Cultural Presentation Program under present conditions amounts to hardly more than a "holding operation," pathetically inadequate to reflect the achievements of the performing arts in the United States.
>
> The downgrading of the Cultural Exchange Program in recent years must certainly take its share of the blame for the "economic crisis in the arts," so strikingly described by W. McNeil Lowry in his recent report on the 1968 program in the Humanities and the Arts of the Ford Foundation. Mr. Lowry points out that part of the stated purpose of the Fulbright-Hays Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 was "to strengthen the ties which unite us with other nations by demonstrating the educational and cultural interests, developments and achievements of the people of the United States and other nations . . ." These words, he says, have become only a "statement of intent."[20]

Deploring the "drastic cut" which "has clearly undermined the initial purposes and effectiveness of the Program," Larsen called for an objective assessment of its value and stated the need of an annual budget of $3 million for a proper operation. The Program's Advisory Committee on the Arts felt that it would be better "to stop the Program than to have it continue under budgetary limitations which will not permit it to accomplish its purpose."[21]

---

[20] U.S., Department of State, Cultural Presentations Program, Annual Report, 1967-1968 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969), pp. iv-v.

[21] Ibid., p. vi.

Despite these strong pleas for adequate funding or dissolution of operations, the program, in 1970, was still operating under token allocations. Private sponsorship was sought to make continued touring possible, but projects were far fewer than in the peak years of 1965-1967.