

National Council on the Arts



National Endowment for the Arts

1800 G STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

Office of the Chairman

November 1, 1968

Dear Mr. President:

It is with pleasure and satisfaction that I herewith transmit to you the History of the National Council on the Arts and the National Endowment for the Arts. Since both of these agencies were created because of your leadership, I am happy to record their histories for you and take a measure of satisfaction in the accomplishments.

Between 1964 and 1968, the arts moved from the periphery toward the center of our national life. They became an open public issue. The Federal role in the arts changed from skepticism and prejudice to enthusiastic support and acceptance. The National Endowment for the Arts has assisted every State and territory and almost every major artistic institution in the nation during its four years of existence.

The attached history tells the story as fully as possible.

Sincerely yours,

Roger L. Stevens
Roger L. Stevens
Chairman

The President
The White House
Washington, D. C.

Attachment

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS AND THE NATIONAL
ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS DURING THE ADMINISTRATION OF
PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Volume I
THE HISTORY
November 1968

FOREWORD

"The National Council on the Arts and the National Endowment for the Arts During the Administration of President Lyndon B. Johnson," was drafted under the close personal direction of Chairman Roger L. Stevens by Mr. Charles C. Mark, Director of Planning and Analysis, and Miss Ana Steele, Head, Special Research Projects, with the aid of Research Assistants Karen Szurek and Madelyn Mailman.

In addition, comments, suggestions and additions were provided by each of the Endowment's Program Directors, the Chairman's Special Assistant, and the Foundation's General Counsel, all of whom generously gave of their time and attention to insure the completeness and accuracy of this document.

Rather than enumerate every Endowment project, the drafters of this history have elected to highlight those programs which at this time appear most significant in their implications and promise for the future of America's cultural development.

PREFACE

It is with considerable and, we hope, justified satisfaction that the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Council on the Arts present their story to their country and the world. "Born part of despair and disbelief," as The New York Times said, the National Endowment for the Arts acknowledges its debt to President Lyndon B. Johnson for providing the leadership which turned sporadic government interest into meaningful national action on behalf of America's creative life.

The Endowment's history, spanning three years of intense political and social upheaval and change, has underlined and endorsed Arnold Toynbee's warning that "To give a fair chance to potential creativity is a matter of life and death for any society." Dedicating their efforts and energies to providing that "fair chance," the Council and the Endowment have felt strongly and urgently that a society in search of new meanings must have available to it the wisdom and vision and commitment of its creative people.

Up until a few years ago, as President Johnson once stated, America's scientists occupied the penthouse while her artists were relegated to the basement. In addition, it seemed that this country was aiming at greatly increased leisure time for its citizens, but was making no provision for constructive use of that time. These situations have changed, not radically, not entirely, and, some might say, not enough - but the fact remains that for the

first time in its history, the United States has demonstrated its concern for the arts as an important and relevant part of American life. This should indeed be a source of pride for this Nation, the President, and the 89th Congress. A much-desired goal of the Council and the Endowment is to affirm with specific and positive action this Nation's growing awareness that physical well-being is not all there is to life; that accusations leveled against America's materialistic preoccupations need not go uncontested; and that the arts have a crucial role to play in revealing man to himself and in bringing all men together out of a deepened understanding and a renewed insight.

These have been fruitful and rewarding years for the members of the National Council on the Arts and the National Endowment for the Arts, years of challenge and frustration, of striving and growth, of successes and setbacks. But more than any of these things, these years have seen the birth and development of an exciting new endeavor, launched with hope and seasoned by experience, an endeavor which has been in part a reflection of, and in part a catalyst to, greatly increased American cultural growth. We trust that the future will bring deeper and broader national artistic life, and that the Council and the Endowment will continue to play an important part in enriching the lives of all Americans.

On a more personal note, we should like to take this opportunity to pay a well-deserved tribute to the members of the National Council on the Arts, and to the members of all of the panels drawn up to assist the Council and

the Endowment, for having given so unselfishly of their time and efforts to this new national program. This has been in the best tradition of public service, and the contributions of these outstanding Americans have been of inestimable value in carrying forward this historic undertaking. In addition, we have been blessed with an extremely knowledgeable and dedicated staff who have labored long and hard over these past three years. To all of them, Council, panels, and staff, we express our profound gratitude.

Roger L. Stevens
Chairman

T H E H I S T O R Y

"This Congress will consider many programs which will leave an enduring mark on American life. But it may well be that passage of this legislation, modest as it is, will help secure for this Congress a sure and honored place in the story of the advance of our civilization."

With these words, President Lyndon B. Johnson on March 10, 1965, transmitted to the 89th Congress a bill to establish the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. The establishment within the Federal structure of an agency concerned solely with the cultural health of the Nation, controversial though it was, was a milestone in America's development which enhanced the country's image in the eyes of its own people and of the world; the American government, for the first time in its history, demonstrated its concern for the arts as central to the well-being of its people. The Foundation is composed of two Endowments, one for the Arts, the other for the Humanities. Each Endowment is guided by its own Council of private citizens.

In its three years of existence, and operating with extremely limited funds, the National Endowment for the Arts has accomplished more than even the framers of its enabling legislation might have anticipated. Its programs have encompassed the broadest possible spectrum, from creation of a multi-million dollar American Film Institute, to programs of small but vital direct assistance to individual artists; from rescuing great performing groups on the brink of

financial collapse and enabling them to develop and flourish, to initiating creative pilot projects which have had a tremendous impact on young America's appreciation of, and involvement in, the arts. The Arts Endowment's programs, conceived in accordance with the advice given by the National Council on the Arts, have been influential across the Nation, and have drawn into partnership major corporations, labor unions, other Federal agencies, private foundations, State and local government agencies, and individuals, all of whom have joined in an unprecedented and concentrated effort to encourage and support America's artists and her cultural development. As Scripps-Howard newspapers Arts Writer Norman Nadel stated: "Mr. (Roger L.) Stevens...is chairman of the National Council on the Arts, one of the Federal Government's newest agencies here. In the past three years, he and his staff have spurred greater artistic activity nationally than in the whole previous history of the nation."¹

* * * * *

- 3 -

The importance of Federal involvement in the Nation's cultural development was recognized early in this country's history, and rudimentary attempts to establish by legislation some sort of Federal arts organization were made as early as 1877, when Representative Samuel S. Cox of New York unsuccessfully introduced H.R. 126 to establish a council on art matters. In 1891, President Harrison signed a bill designating a New York music school as the National Conservatory of Music; the following year, under President Cleveland's Administration, Antonin Dvorak began a three-year stay in America as artistic director of the Conservatory. It was during this time, and as a result of America's impressions on him, that his famous symphony, "From the New World," was composed and premiered by the New York Philharmonic. The Conservatory, which still exists technically as its charter set no expiration date, closed its doors some years later -- Congress had made no provision for financial support.

Another attempt at Federal involvement in the Nation's artistic life was made when a Commission of Fine Arts was established in 1910 under President Taft. Although the enabling legislation authorized the Commission to "advise generally upon questions of art when required to do so by the President, or by... Congress," as well as to make recommendations on the District of Columbia's architecture and art, the Commission ultimately elected to restrict its attentions to the District of Columbia, unless specifically requested to undertake any project with broader implications.

On January 26, 1951, President Truman chose to utilize the Commission's broad advisory powers when he asked that it investigate ways in which the arts could be aided on a national scale by the Federal Government. The Commission failed to report during President Truman's tenure, and when the Report² was delivered to President Eisenhower on May 15, 1953, no action was taken on the many recommendations contained therein, with one notable exception. The Report recommended the establishment of a music center in Washington under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government in which operas, symphony concerts and ballets could be performed; on September 2, 1958, President Eisenhower signed Public Law 85-874 establishing a National Cultural Center which would provide impressive facilities for all the performing arts in the Nation's Capital.

In March of 1962, President Kennedy took important initiative by appointing August Heckscher as Special Consultant on the Arts on a part-time basis. Mr. Heckscher's major assignment "was to make a survey of policies and programs within the executive departments and agencies affecting the arts, and to make recommendations for raising standards and encouraging the fullest use of the opportunities available."³ Upon his resignation on May 28, 1963, Mr. Heckscher submitted his Report to the President⁴ which evaluated the impact of existing government programs and policies upon the arts and made recommendations for action in various areas. Among the recommendations was a proposal that the post of Special Consultant on the Arts be made permanent, with its rank raised to ~~that~~ of Special Adviser, and that the President establish an Advisory Council on the Arts. The Report further noted and endorsed legislation already pending in Congress which would create a National Foundation on the Arts.

In accepting Mr. Heckscher's resignation on June 10, 1963, President Kennedy expressed his deep gratitude for the Report; and on June 12, he signed Executive Order No. 11112 to establish the President's Advisory Council on the Arts. This Order was never put into effect; President Kennedy was about to name the members of this Council when he was assassinated on November 22, 1963.

When President Johnson assumed the Presidency, he appointed a man to the rank of Special Assistant to the President on the Arts, a full-time arts adviser, the first in America's history, with the additional assignment of developing Congressional support for a permanent arts agency. The man selected was Roger L. Stevens, who had been serving since September 2, 1961 as Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the National Cultural Center (subsequently re-named the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts). The appointment to the post of Special Assistant to the President on the Arts was made on May 13, 1964; Mr. Stevens assumed the position immediately and began concentrating his efforts on passage of one of several bills pending before the 2nd Session of the 88th Congress, which had been introduced by Representative Frank Thompson (D., N.J.), the then Senator Hubert Humphrey (D., Minn.), and Senator Jacob Javits (R., N.Y.), as well as by numerous other Congressmen. Hearings had been held the previous fall and spring, and a large number of artists and other private citizens had testified on behalf of the bill.

The Senate Special Subcommittee on the Arts, under the leadership of Chairman Claiborne Pell (D., R.I.), had unanimously recommended passage to both

Houses; and the Senate, on December 20, 1963, had passed S. 2379 which would have created a National Council on the Arts and a National Arts Foundation. However, in the House of Representatives, the Committee on Rules thus far had taken no action to release arts legislation of any sort for floor debate. ✓

The White House staff, meanwhile, informed Mr. Stevens that because its attention would necessarily focus on the forthcoming Democratic Convention and national campaign, the Administration could not consider the arts legislation a priority item at that time. However, Mr. Stevens was assured that the Administration was fully in favor of the bill as passed by the Senate, and would support the legislation when it reached the House floor for a vote.

Mr. Stevens began visiting the leadership of the House Committee on Rules and key Congressmen in the House. He made the journey daily from the White House to the Hill during the month of July and talked with numerous Congressmen. It was evident that there was considerable resistance among some members of the House to arts legislation, whether to establish a Council (advisory) or a Foundation (permanent and funded); Representative Howard W. Smith (D., Va.), who was then Chairman of the Committee on Rules, was finally persuaded to release H.R. 9586, establishing only the Council, and report it for floor consideration. ✓

A communications breakdown almost caused the bill to reach the floor for a vote on a day when sufficient numbers of supporting Congressmen would not

be present, but through the good offices of the Majority Leader, the bill was held up and placed on the calendar for consideration on Thursday, August 20, 1964, when the bi-partisan support so vitally necessary could be depended upon. The National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964, H.R. 9586, passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 213 to 135; the following day, the Senate by voice vote also passed H.R. 9586. On August 22nd, Congress recessed for party conventions.

On August 20, 1964, Roger Stevens had appeared before the Democratic Platform Committee in Atlantic City to urge increased government recognition and support for the arts. This resulted in the following statement included in the Democratic Platform for 1964, "One Nation, One People": "We will encourage further support for the arts, giving people a better chance to use increased leisure and recognizing that the achievements of art are an index of the greatness of a civilization."

After the Convention, on September 3, 1964, President Johnson signed Public Law 88-579, establishing the National Council on the Arts, an advisory body of 24 distinguished citizens prominent in the arts, to recommend ways to maintain and increase the cultural resources of the Nation and to encourage and develop greater appreciation and enjoyment of the arts by its citizens.

It should be noted that Public Law 88-579 (H.R. 9586) in effect enacted Title I of S. 2379, a bill which had passed the Senate in December of 1963, and which had combined two bills brought before the 1st Session of the 88th Congress

(S. 1316 introduced by the then Senator Humphrey, and S. 165 introduced by Senator Javits). Title II of S. 2379 would have provided for the establishment of a National Arts Foundation. Only Title I was approved by the House and Senate when they passed H.R. 9586. Thus the National Council on the Arts was established, and the Foundation provisions were left for the 89th Congress to deliberate.

The concept of greater Federal support for the humanities had also been before the 88th Congress, but no progress had been made. Giving impetus to this concept, however, was a report published in 1964 by the National Commission on the Humanities.⁵ This report called for the establishment of a national humanities foundation as a much-needed independent Federal agency. One of the first Congressmen to act on this recommendation was Representative William S. Moorhead (D., Pa.) who introduced H.R. 334 to establish a National Humanities Foundation during the 1st Session of the 89th Congress.

On October 7, 1964, Public Law 88-635 was signed, providing a Fiscal 1965 appropriation of \$50,000 for the National Council on the Arts; this was the result of an inadvertent error on the part of Congress, which had intended to make the full \$150,000 authorization available to the Council on an annual basis (see page 18).

This \$50,000 appropriation made the question of staffing somewhat difficult, particularly when it was discovered that although Mr. Stevens had chosen not to accept any salary, this was not permissible under government regulations.

Mr. Charles C. Mark, employed as a Consultant on State arts programs for the Arts and Humanities Branch of the Office of Education, by mutual consent directed a large portion of his efforts towards setting up the staff and administrative procedures, and was later transferred to the Arts Council's payroll. On November 6, 1964, Mrs. Luna Diamond was employed as Staff Assistant, and in November of the following year became Secretary to the National Council on the Arts. And in June of 1965, Mr. Frank H. Crowther joined the staff as a Consultant, later becoming Special Assistant to the Chairman.

As part of the preparations for the forthcoming Inauguration, Mr. Stevens was requested by the President to submit a list of national figures in the arts who were to be invited to the Inaugural ceremonies. As a result of these efforts, fifty cultural leaders were invited to the January 1965 Inaugural festivities; in attendance over the three days were such outstanding artists as Eric Leinsdorf, Richard Wilbur, Maria Tallchief, Gian-Carlo Menotti and Bernard Malamud. These artists lent a special luster to the occasion, and one of them, in a letter to Mr. Stevens, perhaps expressed the meaning and import of the practice which the Johnson Administration was to repeat many times in the months and years to come: "For me, it was a great event....We need this intermingling so badly; and if I may speak for the others who were there, let me say that we were not only honored by the recognition of us by our President but pleased to have the chance to show our readiness to be of service to him and this country...."⁶

After the Inauguration, work began in earnest on developing and passing legislation to establish a government agency with sufficient funds to assist

actively American cultural development. Providing a strong impetus to the creation of such an agency, President Johnson, in his January 1965 State of the Union message, notified the Congress that: "To help promote and honor creative achievements, I will propose a National Foundation on the Arts."

In mid-February, discussions began to determine whether the Admini-
stration should transmit legislation to the Congress asking for an arts foundation, a foundation for both the arts and humanities, or two separate foundations. It was felt that combining Congressional support for both the arts and the humanities would enable both to secure adequate funding. The drafting of the Administration's proposals was assigned to the legal staff of the Bureau of the Budget with instructions that two separate but equal endowments were to be included, together with an additional mechanism for liaison with other Federal agencies which were providing some assistance to the arts but not as a major goal.

Meanwhile, Senator Pell and Representative Thompson were instrumental in having the Special Subcommittees of both Houses hold separate and Joint Hearings on relevant legislation. These Hearings commenced on February 23, 1965, and continued through March 24th.⁷ Forty-nine persons testified during either the Joint Hearings or those conducted separately by the Special House and Senate Subcommittees. Almost all of the testimony was enthusiastic and favorable. The Congressional examiners were equally enthusiastic after the opening session when Senator Javits chided Roger L. Stevens about President

Johnson's delay in appointing the members of the National Council on the Arts. So persistent was Senator Javits that Mr. Stevens appealed to the White House for immediate action. The 24 members and the Chairman were about to be named by the President, but Mr. Stevens was given permission by the White House to announce the names as part of his statement that same morning (February 23):

Chairman, Roger L. Stevens, Special Assistant to the President on the Arts.

Members with terms expiring in 1970

Albert Bush-Brown, President, Rhode Island School of Design,
Providence, Rhode Island.
Paul H. Engle, poet, writer, teacher, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
Ralph Philip Hanes, Jr., President, Arts Councils of America,
Winston-Salem, North Carolina.
René d'Harnoncourt, Director, the Museum of Modern Art,
New York City.
Oliver Smith, theatrical designer, producer, painter, New York City.
Isaac Stern, musician, New York City.
George Stevens, Sr., film director and producer, Los Angeles,
California.
Minoru Yamasaki, architect, Seattle, Washington, and Detroit,
Michigan.

Members with terms expiring in 1968

Leonard Bernstein, composer, conductor, New York City.
Anthony A. Bliss, President, Metropolitan Opera Association,
New York City.
David Brinkley, NBC News, Washington, D.C.
Warner Lawson, Dean of the College of Fine Arts, Howard University,
Washington, D.C.
William Pereira, architect, former movie producer, Los Angeles,
California.
David Smith, sculptor, Bolton Landing, New York.
James Johnson Sweeney, writer, Director, Museum of Fine Arts of
Houston, Texas.

Members with terms expiring in 1966

Elizabeth Ashley, actress, Los Angeles, California.
Agnes DeMille, choreographer, New York City.
Ralph Waldo Ellison, writer, lecturer, teacher, New York City.
Father Gilbert Hartke, Head, Speech and Drama Department,
Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.
Eleanor Lambert, Honorary Member, Council of Fashion Designers
of America, New York City.
Gregory Peck, actor, Los Angeles, California.
Otto Wittmann, Director, Toledo Museum of Art, Toledo, Ohio.
Stanley Young, author, publisher, executive director American
National Theatre and Academy, New York City.
Ex-officio, Dr. S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary of the Smithsonian
Institution.

On March 10, 1965, at the request of the Subcommittee Chairmen (Senator Pell and Representative Thompson), the President transmitted to Congress the Administration's bill, S. 1483, to establish a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. This bill, which encompassed the main objectives of legislation introduced earlier, was sent to all the witnesses who had appeared at the February-March hearings. It was generally agreed that S. 1483 improved upon the previous proposals, and Congressional Committee work began on the Administration bill.

On March 11, 1965, Roger L. Stevens was officially appointed Chairman of the National Council on the Arts.

One month after the President's transmittal of S. 1483, the National Council on the Arts held its first meeting (April 9-10, 1965) in the Fish Room of the White House. All members attended with the exception of Messrs.

Richard Rodgers and Minoru Yamasaki, who were ill; this new group set to work immediately and enthusiastically, despite the fact that legislation which might provide funds for future programs was still pending in Congress.

At 12:15 P.M. on April 9, the members were officially sworn in, and President Johnson spoke to them concerning the role they were to play:

"I believe that a world of creation and thought is at the very core of all civilization, and that our civilization will largely survive in the works of our creations. That quality, as I have said many times before, confirms the faith that our common hope may be much more enduring than our conflicting hostilities... Right now the men of affairs are struggling to catch up with the insights of great art. The stakes may well be the survival of our entire society. So this great nation...is looking to this handful of extremely talented individuals...for ways in which the Government can maintain and can strengthen an atmosphere which will permit the arts to flourish and to become a part of everyone's life."

President Johnson then met informally with the group and told them that he expected action from them with a minimum of meetings and discussion. Taking this cue from the President, the Council passed nearly 30 resolutions and recommendations to the President and the Congress. The Council endorsed the Administration bill, S. 1483, to establish an Arts and Humanities Foundation.

The Council then recommended extensive revision by Congress of existing copyright laws, called for mandatory fine arts decoration for all Federally-financed future buildings, an annual awards program for outstanding artists, assistance for public television arts programming, additional

cultural facilities and programs in national parks, changes necessary to make Federal surplus property available to non-profit arts institutions, and the recognition of museums and cultural centers in legislation as cultural assets equal to schools and libraries. The Council also urged that Congress ratify the Florence Agreement dealing with the importation of cultural and educational items, that some program for artists' housing be funded, and that the Federal Government commit itself to encouraging the highest quality of design for every item under government jurisdiction.

The afternoon of the second day (meetings were at the Smithsonian's Museum of History and Technology) was devoted to sub-group sessions, with Council members in effect acting as "panelists" on subjects of particular interest to them; the Council re-assembled at the end of the day to hear reports of the sessions and make recommendations thereon. The Visual Arts Group recommended exploration of a means for the Federal Government to support international exhibitions such as the Venice Biennale. The Public Interest and Education Group recommended training programs for professional arts administrators, and university tour circuits for young and mature soloists as well as for exhibitions of the visual and plastic arts. The Performing Arts Group called for a national theatre at popular prices, FHA-financed theatre buildings in suburban locations, and direct support to dance companies and resident professional theatres. The Public Media Group called for establishment of an American Film Institute. The Literature Group wanted to explore mixed-media projects, oral literature preservation, and the cultivation of a larger reading public.

Also at this first meeting, the Chairman suggested that if funds became available for program implementation, the Council might want to utilize outside panels of experts to offer advice and recommendations to the Council, and to provide a means of engaging increased numbers of private citizens in this fledgling partnership between the Federal Government and the arts world.

Admittedly, these early recommendations could only provide guidance to the Chairman as he continued his role of advising the President and the Congress. It was not expected that long-standing Federal programs would be established by the National Council on the Arts resolutions, but since the Council legislation provided no program authority, these recommendations represented the type of role the Council would have played had the Endowment bill failed to pass: that of persuasion and influence on other agencies with funds.

Meanwhile, during the spring and into the summer of 1965, executive sessions of the House and Senate Subcommittees continued, with the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reporting out, on June 7, 1965, an amended S. 1483, to establish a National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. On June 10, 1965, the Senate by voice vote passed S. 1483.

On June 24, 1965, the House Committee on Education and Labor reported out H.R. 6050, also to establish a National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, and ordered a clean bill introduced (this resulted, on July 8,

1965, in H.R. 9460 being reported out of Committee).

Also on June 24, when the House Committee was reporting out H.R. 6050, the second meeting of the National Council on the Arts began in Tarrytown, New York. Due to Senate passage of S. 1483 and what appeared to be favorable prospects for a similar bill in the House, the Council's mood was optimistic.

The one note of sadness in the proceedings was a resolution by the Council expressing its grief over the death of member David Smith, killed in an automobile accident in May. President Johnson had sent a personal letter of condolence to the Smith family which had been read at the funeral services by Council member Stanley Young, a friend of the deceased.

At this second meeting, the Council organized itself into committees, again utilizing an informal "panel" system, passed policy resolutions regarding its own conduct, and focused on practical programs for funding should the pending legislation be enacted. After the first day of lively but serious discussion the Council adopted a three-point policy as a general approach to its activities:

1. Support and aid the expansion of the highest standards of professionalism in order to provide better opportunities for our most talented artists.
2. Provide a postgraduate training program for our young artists by the creation of performing organizations to utilize their talents in cooperation with local support.
3. The use of both (1) and (2) above to increase standards of education and appreciation of the arts.

On the following days of the four-day meeting, the Council again divided into sub-groups and later reported back to the whole. Many of the reports contained recommendations which further refined those adopted at the first meeting, and others proposed entirely new programs:

- A pilot project in the visual arts which would develop interest and knowledge among elementary and secondary students by a cooperative effort between a local museum and public school system, to involve museum visits, touring exhibitions and class work.
- A recommendation for a "Presidential Citation for Excellence in the Arts" to be issued annually to artists who have made large and original contributions to the arts.
- A proposal to extend the seasons of major symphony orchestras by two or three weeks to feature American composers and young soloists.
- A recommendation that an ultimate goal of the Council be the establishment and maintenance of national companies in theatre, opera, dance, and folk heritage, and a national youth orchestra. The Council should, until such time as adequate funds become available, support outstanding regional companies, and, if feasible, assist in the founding of new regional companies in areas not presently being served.
- A recommendation to support the American Ballet Theatre and the leading modern dance companies.
- A recommendation to support educational and interpretational programs in art museums.
- A suggestion for a variety of projects combining architecture, urban design, landscape architecture and other art forms aimed at improving our physical environment.
- A recommendation that the creative artist be given assistance to release him from other employment in order to concentrate on creative work.

Many of the proposals suggested at this second meeting were subsequently carried out.

Meanwhile, as the Foundation bill moved through the labyrinth of the legislative process, some changes appeared. The House Education and Labor Committee, July 8, 1965, reported out its version (H.R. 9460) of the Senate-passed bill (S. 1483) so rapidly that it prompted a Minority Report⁸ by Representative Albert Quie (R., Minn.) and others. In their view the hasty approval by Committee was "a mockery of the legislative process," and the bill itself was objected to on the grounds that it was "creating Federal czars over the arts." Six out of a total of 31 Committee members joined Mr. Quie in his protest despite the compromises and adjustments that had been made and approved by the full Senate and by the majority of the House Committee members.

On August 13, 1965, Public Law 89-125 was signed, correcting a technical error in Public Law 88-579 which established the National Council on the Arts and which, in authorizing \$150,000 to the Council, inadvertently omitted the words "per annum" following the amount; the new law corrected the error and insured a continuing authorization for the Council.

It should be noted that during these months Mr. Stevens was the Administration spokesman for the humanities as well as the arts, since no humanities agency existed. This was at times a burden to everyone concerned. Due to the immediacy of most of the decisions there seldom was time to consult with a large number of leaders in the humanities before taking a position. Often questions needed an answer when no experts were readily available or no time was allowed to solicit an answer. Nevertheless, the situation was managed with a reasonable degree of efficiency and the Humanities section of the bill remained viable.

As previously stated, the Foundation bill had been passed by the Senate on June 10, 1965.⁹ In the House, however, a snag developed and the bill remained in the Committee on Rules. Since the 89th Congress operated under a 21-day rule which allowed the House as a whole to petition a bill out of the Committee on Rules, strategy was developed to invoke this procedure to obtain a House vote on the Foundation bill, together with six others, during the month of September. Since the Foundation bill had been favorably considered by the House Committee on Education and Labor, the task of leading the floor debate fell to Representative Adam Clayton Powell who was then its Chairman. Conservative leadership, aware of the scheduled fight to force these bills out of the Rules Committee, was prepared to defend its position indefinitely. The Arts and Humanities bill was not the main issue in question; the conservatives were more concerned with several of the other bills, and overriding any of the legislation per se was the principle of the prerogatives of the Rules Committee. Finally, on September 13, 1965, the debate began on the floor of the House.

Those opposed used parliamentary procedure to delay the session, which lasted from noon until 12:31 A.M. the following morning (the 14th), and forced an unprecedented 22 quorum roll calls. As the day wore on into evening, the leadership of those in favor began to fear erosion of their strength due to previous commitments and the growing shortage of patience among the members. When the issue of the 21-day rule was finally settled in favor of those supporting the legislation, further debates ensued as a series of House

Resolutions was introduced to allow the House to act on each of the seven pending bills. Shortly before adjournment, the House by a vote of 260 to 114 passed House Resolution 478 to allow the House to "work its will" on H.R. 9460, the Foundation bill, and the only one of the seven in question clearly supported by the Johnson Administration.

(It is interesting to note here that if it had not been for President Johnson's firmness, the Arts and Humanities bill would have remained in Committee. As the hours passed, word had been sent to the White House that it appeared as if it would be possible to withdraw three of the seven bills from the Committee on Rules, but that the Arts and Humanities bill was fourth on the list. President Johnson, reportedly through Lawrence O'Brien, sent word to Speaker McCormack that consideration of the Arts and Humanities bill was a "must" even if the House had to be kept in session until early morning hours. Thus, history should record that President Johnson himself is personally and directly responsible for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.)

On September 15, 1965, the Foundation bill finally reached the House floor for a vote, and lengthy, spirited - and at times even ludicrous - debate followed.¹⁰

Representative Gross (R., Iowa) introduced an amendment into the definition section pertaining to the arts---"after the word 'dance,' insert

the following: 'including but not limited to the irregular jactitations and/or rhythmic contraction and coordinated relaxations of the serrati, obliques, and abdominis recti group of muscles - accompanied by rotatory undulations, tilts, and turns timed with and attuned to the titillating and blended tones of synchronous woodwinds'." Debated as the "belly dance amendment," it was defeated. Mr. Gross then introduced another amendment, this time to include baseball, squash, pinochle and poker in the arts section. This was also defeated.

(The only amendment which passed designated the District of Columbia Board of Recreation as the official State agency under the provisions of the Federal-State partnership program in the arts.)

At one point, Representative Thompson of New Jersey addressed Mr. Gross and said: "The outstanding surprise of the day is that a gentleman from a farm State does not know the difference between a belly dancer and a bale of hay."

Mr. Gross answered: "Mr. Chairman, I hope that the gentleman this time will not try to put words in my mouth. The gentleman from Iowa has some vague idea of the difference between a bale of hay and a belly dancer."

Mr. Thompson: "I shall correct myself and admit that the gentleman from Iowa apparently does have a vague idea."

A motion to recommit the bill to Committee failed by a vote of 251 to 128; the bill subsequently passed by a voice vote. The following evening (September 16), the Senate concurred by voice vote with the House-passed version.

Thirteen days later, on September 29, 1965, the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities came into being when President Lyndon B. Johnson signed Public Law 89-209. Two hundred and fifty Congressional, humanistic, and cultural leaders were invited to the signing ceremony, attended by both the President and Mrs. Johnson and held at 9:50 A.M. in the Rose Garden at the White House. The President's remarks at this signing ceremony, in which he paid tribute to the excellent work of the National Council on the Arts and addressed himself to the future work of the new Foundation, are well worth recording:

"Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker, Senator Mansfield, Distinguished Members of Congress:

"In the long history of man, countless empires and nations have come and gone. Those which created no lasting works of art are reduced today to short footnotes in history's catalogue.

"Art is a nation's most precious heritage. For it is in our works of art that we reveal to ourselves, and to others, the inner vision which guides us as a nation. And where there is no vision, the people perish.

"We in America have not always been kind to the artists and the scholars who are the creators and the keepers of our vision. Somehow, the scientists always seem to get the penthouse, while the arts and the humanities get the basement.

"Last year, for the first time in our history, we passed legislation to start changing that situation. We created the National Council on the Arts.

"The talented and the distinguished members of that Council have worked very hard. They have worked creatively. They have dreamed dreams and they have developed ideas.

"This new bill, creating the National Foundation for the Arts and the Humanities, gives us the power to turn some of those dreams and ideas into reality.

"We would not have that bill but for the hard and the thorough and the dedicated work of some great legislators in both Houses of the Congress. All lovers of art are especially indebted to **Congressman** Adam Clayton Powell of New York, to Congressman Frank Thompson of New Jersey, to Senator Lister Hill of Alabama, to Senator Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island, to many Members of both the House and Senate who stand with me on this platform today -- too many names to mention.

"But these men and women have worked long and hard and effectively to give us this bill. And now we have it. Let me tell you what we are going to do with it. Working together with the state and the local governments, and with many private organizations in the arts, we will:

"Create a National Theater to bring ancient and modern classics of the theater to audiences all over America.

"We will support a National Opera Company and a National Ballet Company.

"We will create an American Film Institute, bringing together leading artists of the film industry, outstanding educators, and young men and women who wish to pursue the 20th Century art form as their life's work.

"We will commission new works of music by American composers.

"We will support our symphony orchestras.

"We will bring more great artists to our schools and universities by creating grants for their time in residence.

"But those are only a small part of the programs that we are ready to begin. They will have an unprecedented effect on the arts and the humanities of our great nation.

"But these actions, and others soon to follow, cannot alone achieve our goals. To produce true and lasting results, our states and our municipalities, our schools and our great private foundations, must join forces with us.

"It is in the neighborhoods of each community that a nation's art is born. In countless American towns there live thousands of obscure and unknown talents.

"What this bill really does is to bring active support to this great national asset, to make fresher the winds of art in this great land of ours.

"The arts and the humanities belong to the people, for it is, after all, the people who create them."

President Johnson's remarks came as a pleasant surprise to the Rose Garden guests. No one had seen a prepared text of the President's speech, and for good reason. An original draft of the remarks prepared for the signing ceremony had been discarded as being too lengthy and lacking specific, positive proposals, which the President always favored. Thus, early in the evening preceding signing day, Will Sparks, an Assistant to the President, and Frank Crowther, Special Assistant to Mr. Stevens, had met to work out a new draft which was written later by Mr. Sparks and hastily inserted into the President's "Night Reading" folder.

Most significant among the proposals was the President's statement that an American Film Institute would be created. Many notables from the film world were in the Rose Garden that day. For years, various diverse elements of the film community had been calling for the establishment of such an Institute, but had thus far been unable to join their talents and resources towards its creation. Looking back, it may have been the President's firm commitment that served as the catalyst, and enabled the Arts Council to establish this Institute less than two years later.

The National Endowment for the Arts legally existed as of September 29, 1965. It might be valuable at this point to give a brief explanation of the newly-created National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. Established as an independent agency in the Executive Branch of government, "to develop and promote a broadly conceived national policy of support for the humanities

and the arts in the United States," the Foundation exists only in its component organizations and not as a separate entity. The organizations which make up the Foundation are the National Endowment for the Arts, with its advisory National Council on the Arts, identical organizations for the Humanities, and a Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities. The Endowments are basically grant-making agencies, employing full-time staff members; the Councils are advisory bodies to the Chairmen of their respective Endowments; and the Federal Council is an advisory body established primarily to coordinate the activities of the Endowments with those of other Federal agencies. The Endowment Chairmen also serve as the Chairmen of their respective Councils, and the Chairman of the Federal Council is selected by the President from among its members. Mr. Stevens is Chairman of the National Council on the Arts and the National Endowment for the Arts, while retaining his position as Special Assistant to the President on the Arts and as Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Kennedy Center. —

The Act establishing the Foundation authorized funds for three years, Fiscal Years 1966, 1967, and 1968: for the Arts Endowment, there was authorized \$5 million annually for general program funds, \$2.25 million annually to match unrestricted gifts made to the Endowment, and \$2.75 million annually for the Federal-State partnership program, to begin in Fiscal 1967.

On October 31, 1965, President Johnson signed the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966, Public Law 89-309, providing the National Endowment

for the Arts with \$2.5 million for programs, up to \$2 million to match unrestricted donations made to the Endowment, and also providing \$700,000 in administrative funds for the entire Foundation.

These funds, totalling up to \$4.5 million for programs, were the first Federal funds ever appropriated solely and directly for support of America's arts. The funds could scarcely have been termed munificent (the Ford Foundation in July 1966 announced grants totalling \$80 million to some of the Nation's orchestras); but they were to mark the beginning of a new era in America's artistic development, and they at long last placed this country alongside every other "civilized" nation in the world in expressing a concern for its people's artistic interests and aspirations.

With its newly appropriated funds, the National Endowment for the Arts could now begin to acquire its staff. Mr. Livingston L. Biddle, Jr., who as Senator Pell's Special Assistant had worked closely with the Congress and with Mr. Stevens on the arts legislation, became first a Consultant and on December 21, 1965, Deputy Chairman of the Endowment. During the early months of organization and planning, Chairman Stevens had asked the advice of the National Science Foundation legal staff and had been impressed with the work of Deputy General Counsel Charles B. Ruttenberg. Mr. Ruttenberg continued to advise and assist the Chairman and on March 27, 1966, was officially appointed General Counsel of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.

With new quarters at 1800 G Street, N.W., acquired in December, additional people were hired to fill out the personnel complement until by June 1966, the Endowment had approximately 30 professional and clerical employees. David Stewart, who was Arts Consultant for the American Council on Education, and who had just completed a national study on the teaching of films in colleges, joined the staff as Director of education and public media programs. Mrs. Ruth Mayleas came from the American National Theatre and Academy, where she was Director of the National Theatre Service, to develop the theatre and dance programs. Author Carolyn Kizer, founder and Editor of Poetry Northwest magazine, left the University of Washington in Seattle to direct the literary programs. Mrs. Fannie Taylor, who was director of concert and theatre activities for the University of Wisconsin, moved to Washington to direct the music projects. Henry Geldzahler, Associate Curator of American Art and Sculpture at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, accepted the job of advising on visual arts projects. A year later, he became Director of these programs. Paul Spreiregen came from the American Institute of Architects, where he was Director of Urban Programs, to direct the architecture, planning and design programs. Two years later, Mrs. June Arey, who was originally hired as a general assistant for grants coordination, became Associate Director of dance programs.

The Endowment's Program Directors, under the supervision of the Chairman, served to carry out recommendations made by the National Council on the Arts and to develop programs, for Council recommendation and refinement,

responsive to America's artistic needs. Over the following years, the Program Directors were to spend endless hours preparing and implementing programs and then evaluating their successes and failures with an eye to improved future projects, as well as paying first-hand visits to theatre, opera, symphony, and dance performances and museums and galleries all over the country.

In addition, countless meetings and discussions were held by the staff with Council members, with panelists and with artists and arts organization heads, with Federal, State and local agency people, and with private foundation and business representatives, seeking an exchange of ideas and information, increased cooperation between various groups, avoidance of program overlap or duplication, and even, in some cases, sources of funds to supplement or supplant Endowment assistance.

During the intervening months between June and November of 1965, National Council on the Arts and Endowment staff members were hard at work consulting with one another, with Chairman Stevens, and with arts leaders and organizations across the country, developing programs for recommendation at the next meeting. The third meeting of the Council was held November 13-15 in Tarrytown, New York, which had been the scene of the second meeting; present at this meeting as observers were several members of the National Council of Fine Arts Deans, a practice which was to be continued at all following Arts Council meetings.

At this meeting, the Council passed a resolution on policy concerning projects for construction or remodeling of arts facilities: although it recognized the growing need for this kind of financial support, it resolved not to recommend any projects of this sort until increased funds became available to the Endowment.

The Council also established an Executive Committee, composed of members Young (Chairman), Bliss, d'Harnoncourt, Kenin, Peck, Pereira and Stern to help establish goals and set priorities for Council project considerations; this Committee met several times in the ensuing months, and provided valuable guidance to the Chairman and the Council, but was finally dissolved when the Council determined that informal subcommittees within its own structure could effectively provide the kind of assistance the Executive Committee was originally established to supply.

The Council, which was meeting for the first time to make recommendations on funded programs, now discussed the suggestion which Chairman Stevens had made at its first meeting: the use of outside panels of experts to aid the Council and the Endowment with programs by providing additional advice and recommendations. The Council decided that in lieu of committing itself to the use of permanent panels for any particular art form or any particular geographic representation, it would utilize panels "to advise the Council with respect to projects, policies or special studies as may be undertaken by the Council from time to time."¹¹

This policy resolution was to allow the Council the kind of flexibility it would need in the future; as the panel system evolved over the years, the Council found that in some cases, the original panel selected proved cumbersome and unwieldy, and smaller and more specialized panels were then formed to direct their attention to specific projects. In other cases, the original panel proved itself well suited to the several tasks at hand, and was then retained virtually unchanged over a period of time. At any rate, the Council and the Endowment were to find the additional expertise made available to them through use of panels an invaluable guide and assistance as programs were developed and implemented.

Following these general policy discussions and resolutions, the Council then turned its attention to recommending specific projects for funding during Fiscal 1966. The American Ballet Theatre was recommended for an emergency grant insuring the company's continued existence; an additional grant was recommended for a national tour. All grants to organizations were, by law and with only certain minor exceptions, to be matched by the grantee. With this first grant to a performing arts group, a policy was established that for similar organizations, box office receipts could qualify as matching funds. On December 20, 1965, Vice President Hubert Humphrey, representing the President, presented the first check ever issued by the Federal Government in direct support of the arts to the president of the American Ballet Theatre Foundation, an action which prompted Dance Critic Walter Terry to write that "The Treasury of the United States has saved a national treasure."¹²

Further recommendations at this third Council meeting called for support of an American exhibit at the 1966 Venice Biennale, and for a feasibility study leading to the establishment of an American Film Institute, following up the recommendation made two months earlier by President Johnson. Projects to provide low-cost artists' studio-living quarters, and assistance to composers, as well as to extend museum resources to outlying communities, were also recommended, and the Council requested further investigation of a proposal made by Mr. d'Harnoncourt for sculpture in public places. An invitational competition exhibition of living American artists, for which participating artists would receive rental fees for their paintings, was also suggested. However, the project was later rescinded due to objections from museum directors who feared that a precedent establishing monthly rental fees could lead to insurmountable financial problems for their museums.

The Council then recommended individual grants to choreographers to create and produce important dance works. This was the first such broad commissioning program in the history of the country, and all of the works which resulted from the commissioning later received superb reviews, enhancing the prestige of both American dance and the Arts Endowment.

Another project which proved extremely successful called for the production of new plays by resident professional and university theatre companies. Scripts by professional as well as aspiring playwrights were carefully reviewed by a jury of distinguished theatre experts, which

recommended five plays it felt to be of sufficient quality to merit production. One of these to date, Howard Sackler's "The Great White Hope," originally produced at Arena Stage with assistance from an Arts Endowment grant, has opened on Broadway to outstanding critical and audience acclaim and is scheduled to be made into a motion picture as well; and a second, Don Peterson's "Does A Tiger Wear A Necktie?", performed at Brandeis University through Endowment support, has also been optioned for a Broadway production later this ('68-'69) season.

The Council recommended a technical assistance program for national arts associations, a sabbatical leave program for teaching artists, and the Laboratory Theatre Project. This latter pilot project, which the Council hopes might prove a model for the entire country, was implemented in Providence, New Orleans and Los Angeles. Conceived in cooperation with the U.S. Office of Education, it enables professional theatre companies to perform the classics of dramatic literature in productions of the highest quality for secondary school students at the same time these plays are being studied in the classroom. The students are brought to the theatres - for many students a first in their lifetimes - so that the impact of the stage productions may bring to life the plays which, without the excitement provided by live theatre, might remain nothing more than words on a page.

Acclaiming the Laboratory Theatre Project, and noting this new

Federal partnership, Associated Press reporter William Glover wrote:

"The biggest theatrical angel this season isn't on Broadway-- but in Washington. He is Uncle Sam, backing with \$1 million a multipurpose test of drama in education....Taking part, in a rare display of agency togetherness, are the National Endowment for the Arts..., the United States Office of Education and state and local boards of education....It is the first time that two Federal units have meshed efforts and cash in the cause of culture."¹³

Even more encouraging than these words of Mr. Glover are the reports that have come back to the Endowment: tales of these young people going home from their "afternoon at the theatre" and urging their parents to go to the evening performances; tales of drastically altered attitudes and unprecedented enthusiasm on the part of teachers as well as students toward dramatic literature; and stories of the students' reactions while watching the productions, such as the one reported by New Orleans States-Item editorial writer Charles Dufour:

"Arthur Miller's 'The Crucible,' as you know is a powerful drama. And it is powerfully played by Repertory Theatre, New Orleans' strong cast at the Civic Theatre. Now in its fifth and final week, 'The Crucible' will have been witnessed by an audience of 50,000 when the curtain comes down on the last public performance on Saturday night. Forty-two thousand high school students...will have attended the play....I was tremendously impressed with the students' reception of this strong drama. They sat with attentive interest, applauded and laughed at the right spots and at the end gave the cast a standing ovation....There are only three public performances left of 'The Crucible'...and if you want to see topflight live professional theater, you should try mighty hard to catch one of these last...performances."¹⁴

While the programs recommended for Fiscal Year 1966 were being developed, another important aspect of the program started its first phase.

This was the Federal-State partnership which was written into the law and was designated to begin with the 1967 Fiscal Year. Mr. Charles C. Mark was appointed Director of State and Local Operations on December 21, 1965, to carry out this portion of the Endowment's activities, for which \$2 million would shortly be appropriated by the Congress.

It was decided that the first step was to inform the governors of every State concerning their rights and privileges under the Act; a letter to this effect from Mr. Stevens on behalf of the President was sent to the governors. This letter also requested each governor to appoint a representative to a meeting scheduled for January, 1966, in Chicago.

Representatives from every State and three of the Territories attended the meeting in Chicago on the coldest January 15 in recent memory. The delegates had been sent guidelines for the administration of the program and at this meeting were given the opportunity to discuss these procedures in detail.

Policy decisions were made at this time which were to affect the future of the State programs. The enabling legislation allowed the States to apply for "study" and/or "programming" funds in the first year of the program. The non-matching study funds were to enable the States to survey their cultural resources and develop plans to meet the needs of their communities. Policy was established that administrative expenses could be included in funds provided for studies, though not in funds provided for programming; this procedure allowed the States, with study funds, to hire professional staffs

and establish permanent organizations. It was also decided that any income, with the exception of other Federal funds, would constitute matching funds (all program funds were to be matched). The States were advised that the deadline for submitting their plans was May 1, 1966.

At the time the Foundation Act became law, only four States had active, functioning arts agencies. Half of the States had made some effort to form arts agencies, but almost all of these efforts resulted in privately chartered "paper organizations" lacking funds. The Endowment urged the governors, through their delegates at the Chicago meeting, that State legislatures be encouraged to enact legislation providing for permanent arts agencies supported by State funds.

From the time of the meeting in January until the first appropriations were made available to the States on July 1, 1966, Mr. Mark alternated between traveling to meet with State leaders and talking with them via telephone. When the smoke cleared in the summer, all the States and four out of five Territories had been given grants. Thirteen States received study grants leading toward the formation of a permanent arts agency, 12 received straight program grants, and 28 States received grants for study to be followed by program funds later in the year. American Samoa failed to join the program, and one State subsequently found itself unable to utilize the Fiscal 1967 funds.

By the spring of 1967 virtually every State and Territory had an arts agency functioning with at least some degree of effectiveness. Most States

had passed enabling legislation, almost all had professional executives employed under State civil service, and more than half had received some funding from State revenues.

On February 11 and 12, 1966, the National Council on the Arts held its fourth meeting, this time in Washington, D.C., with three new members in attendance. Herman D. Kenin, President of the American Federation of Musicians, had been appointed by President Johnson to take the place of the late David Smith; and Harper Lee, author of To Kill a Mockingbird, and Richard Diebenkorn, the painter, had been appointed to fill two additional seats on the Council created by the Congress under the Act establishing the Foundation.

At this meeting, and as the result of intensive preliminary work by the Council's Film Advisory Committee, the Council approved a contract with Stanford Research Institute to conduct the study which it was hoped would lead to the establishment of an American Film Institute.

As previously mentioned, the National Council on the Arts had proposed an American Film Institute at its very first meeting in April of 1965. And by November of 1965, at its third meeting, the Council had recommended a feasibility study leading to its creation. The Film Advisory Committee, composed of Miss Ashley and Messrs. Peck, Pereira and Stevens, had then proceeded to make an intensive survey of the most appropriate way to explore

and make recommendations for its establishment. The Committee had held numerous meetings, both as a group and individually, with college administrators, professors and students, as well as leaders in cultural centers, museums and the film industry, in many parts of the country.

During the course of this survey, it had become increasingly apparent that the planning and conduct of the actual research could best be done by an impartial, objective, professional research organization. Accordingly, Stanford Research Institute had been invited to submit a proposal for this investigation and had received tentative approval from the Film Advisory Committee, subject to final recommendation at this meeting by the National Council on the Arts.

To guide the work of the Stanford Research study team, the Film Committee later invited the assistance of a large resource group of leading members of the film industry and the educational community, many of whom provided valuable information concerning the needs of the film arts in the United States and gave much of their time for in-depth interviews during the months that followed. In October of 1966, 12 people, drawn from this resource group, joined with the Council's Film Committee to establish the 16-member Film Advisory Council which was to participate in the fact-gathering, the interpretation of research material, the presentation of final recommendations and, in essence, the development of the Institute from a concept to a reality.

The Council further allocated funds to a study of the feasibility of establishing a national institute for design, a growing need which many of the Council members, particularly those concerned with architecture and urban planning, strongly urged be made part of the Council's concern.

Several grants were recommended at this meeting, including some as the direct result of suggestions made by the Dance Panel, the first formal panel of outside experts utilized by the Council, which had met in January of 1966. The Council now recommended funds to enable the Martha Graham Dance Company to make its first national tour in fifteen years; there had been some discussion about Miss Graham and her company leaving the country to take up residence abroad, where they might have more financial security and opportunity to perform in more than one metropolitan area, and this grant helped to keep this great artistic personage in her own country, and enabled thousands of people across the Nation to witness her work and that of her company.

The Council also recommended a grant which enabled the Washington State Arts Commission to establish a summer residency in the Pacific Northwest for the Robert Joffrey Ballet Company. This grant for a Joffrey Ballet summer residency was to be the first of several grants for this outstanding young company. At least partially due to the Endowment's assistance and interest, the company has completed two extremely successful summer residencies in the Pacific Northwest, is tentatively scheduled for a third with ever-increasing local involvement and support, and has become the fall and winter dance-

company-in-residence at New York's City Center. Having thus solidified its position both artistically and administratively, the City Center Joffrey Ballet is now fully recognized as one of America's best dance companies; as The New York Times Dance and Theatre Critic Clive Barnes says of the company, "There are few dance groups in the world capable of giving such unalloyed pleasure."¹⁵

Recommendations were also made at this meeting to assist the American Conservatory Theatre, which was in its difficult formative stages at this time and which has since become one of this country's outstanding repertory theatre companies and is now in permanent residence in San Francisco. In addition to this, the Council recommended funds enabling the Academy of American Poets to launch a new, and what later proved to be extremely successful, pilot series aimed at radically altering and improving the teaching of literature in American secondary schools.

Here again, with the Academy of American Poets grant, the Council was to set in motion a program with vast implications for the students, their teachers, and the artists themselves. The program has a two-pronged approach, with well-known senior poets discussing with English teachers how to transmit the vitality of language to their students, and with younger poets reading and discussing poetry directly with students in their classrooms. Initiated in New York, Detroit and Pittsburgh, the program met with what Saturday Review writer David Dempsey called "staggering success,"¹⁶ and is being expanded into Minnesota, Illinois, California and several Southwestern States. In all of the

latter programs, administration and funding to match Endowment grants are being provided by local sponsors, with the Academy of American poets continuing to offer consultant services.

The effect of the senior poets-English teachers discussions was vitally constructive and, perhaps, predictable. What might have been considered less predictable was the effect of the younger poets on the students, and vice versa. But whatever doubts might have existed have been more than allayed in the floods of enthusiastic reports to the Academy by both students and poets, and in accounts such as the one by poet Donald Hall in Life magazine:

"Poets are used to reading to college students. We had never seen anything like the response of high school students. Last year at Amelia Earhart Junior High in Detroit, I could barely move in the hallways between classes. Kids - not members of the classes I was visiting - surrounded me....In the din I heard a shout, repeated, 'Say us a poem!' I shouted them a poem. By the time I had finished, my crowd had doubled, so I had to shout it over again. There is a real rapport, which begins with curiosity but moves on to a mutual delight in language and in independence of mind....The poets came to the schools to turn the students on -- and left turned on themselves."¹⁷

Continuing a policy informally established at earlier meetings, Council members formally organized themselves into "committees" to investigate specific program areas. Messrs. d'Harnoncourt, Sweeney, Wittmann and Bush-Brown would concern themselves with programs to assist regional museum exhibitions and to secure markets for the works of visual artists. The Misses de Mille and Ashley and Messrs. Peck, Young and Smith offered to conduct a survey of, and outline a program of assistance to, resident professional theatres in the country. And Miss Lee and Messrs. Ellison and Engle would focus on solutions to problems facing those in the American literary world.

Closing this fourth meeting on an encouraging note, Mr. Stevens announced that the Endowment had received its first unrestricted donation from a private organization: \$100,000 (\$20,000 annually over a five-year period) from the Martin Foundation of New York.

During the month following this Council meeting, hearings before House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees were held to determine the amount of funds which would be available to the Arts Endowment for Fiscal 1967; it had been determined that from this time forward, the Foundation's funds would be included with appropriations for "the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies." The Bureau of the Budget recommended, and President Johnson requested, \$5 million for general program funds and \$2.75 million for the Federal-State partnership program. In addition, the Endowment was to have available to match unrestricted donations, the \$1,965,692 which remained unused in the special Treasury fund (a total amount not to exceed \$2 million had been appropriated for Fiscal 1966 and 1967).

The hearings before the House Subcommittee were held on March 1, 1966; those before the Senate Subcommittee on March 10th. The bill, containing an appropriation at a level of funding below that requested by the Administration, was still awaiting final Congressional action when the fifth meeting of the National Council on the Arts took place on May 13-15 in Tarrytown.

Because the House of Representatives on April 6th had passed the appropriations bill, and the Senate on May 12th had passed an amended version thereof, the Council was able to recommend programs with an accurate idea of the amount of funding which they hoped would soon become available. While the Council discussed future programs, the appropriations bill was

being worked on by a Conference Committee composed of representatives from both Houses who met to iron out their differences. Their Report (H. Rept. 1538), representing agreement on all areas in question, was subsequently approved by the House on May 18th and the Senate on May 19th.

The fifth Council meeting began with the introduction of new member John Steinbeck, Nobel Prize-winning author, appointed by the President to replace David Brinkley who had resigned due to the demands of his work.

Perhaps the most significant decision made at this meeting concerned the "unrestricted gift fund" -- a special Treasury fund established by the law to match unrestricted donations made to the Endowment. Congress inserted this provision to stimulate private giving to the arts by enabling the Endowment to match each private dollar and make these "doubled" monies available to arts organizations to again be matched by non-Federal funds. Thus, four times the amount of the initial donation becomes available to the arts.

Although Congress had made up to \$2 million available to this fund for the first year, the Endowment had thus far received only \$34,308 in unrestricted gifts; it was evident that individuals and foundations would not readily give money to the Federal Government without any control over the ultimate use of the funds. Yet according to the Foundation law, gifts with restrictions attached were not eligible to be matched from the gift appropriation.

At Mr. Stevens' suggestion, the Council took a precedent-setting step aimed at resolving this problem. It was established by the General Counsel, Mr. Ruttenberg, that the National Council on the Arts could publicly state its intentions regarding unrestricted gifts before such gifts were received. Thus, the Council could state that should a certain amount of money be received, it would be matched from Treasury funds and used for Project X, the next amount for Project Y, and so on until the full appropriation was utilized.

In line with this suggestion, the Council recommended first priority to arts programming for educational television, and second priority to the proposed American Film Institute, should donations be received by the Endowment. This Council action, once announced, dramatically increased the amount of private funds made available to the Arts Endowment in future months.

The Council then turned its attention to specific grants. It recommended favorably on the entire group of applications by State Arts Agencies, thus launching the Federal-State partnership program; in line with this, Council members requested that the Chairman require reports from each of the States involved.

This Federal-State partnership program, developed by Charles Mark and formally inaugurated at this fifth Council meeting, has resulted in an extraordinary variety of arts programs spread throughout the country and

developed by State agencies with their own particular knowledge and understanding of local needs. It is extremely doubtful that the States and Territories, with a few notable exceptions, would have been able to accomplish so much if it had not been for the impetus provided by the legislation creating the Arts Endowment; because the impetus was provided, States have developed their own programs and administered their own projects, and have been able, in many cases, to stimulate not only State funds but also private monies to match the Endowment grants. Here is a perfect example of the Federal Government acting as a catalyst in the private sector and creating entirely new funding sources where none existed previously.

And the implications have not gone unnoticed, as the following statement in the Great Falls, Montana, Tribune illustrates:

"Although state arts councils are comparative newcomers to the American scene, the idea behind them is as old as the arts themselves....With passage of the Act (the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965), a principle accepted long ago could finally be put into practice. The federal government could enter into active partnership with the people to secure to them their rights to the good life. It could commit a share of the wealth of the most affluent country in the world to the nurturing of the intangible qualities that are the essence of the American genius...."¹⁸

The Council at this meeting was to launch a program with strong international implications: a series of grants to further worldwide communication and cooperation in the arts. For many years, people from other

countries had looked with skepticism at the United States which, despite its status as the wealthiest Nation in the world, and unlike virtually any other country, had never made funds available to host international arts events. Only since the establishment of the Endowment have funds become available for this purpose, enabling America to share this responsibility with nations around the world.

As a result of the Council's recommendations, the United States has hosted four international arts conferences: the first for a world-wide meeting of literary figures, members of International P.E.N. (Poets, Playwrights, Essayists and Novelists), held by the American chapter of that organization; the second to sponsor the International Society for Music Education Conference at the National Music Camp in Interlochen, Michigan; the third for the 12th International Theatre Institute Congress, sponsored by I.T.I.'s United States Centre; and the fourth enabling the National Music Council to host the International Music Council Congress.

Due to the efforts of Council members Ashley, deMille, Peck, Smith, and Young, who, together with Mr. Stevens, had traveled extensively and visited personally a large number of the resident professional theatres across the country, the Council now recommended grants to help raise the artistic standards of 15 of these theatres. It had been determined that the development of already existing American theatre resources was the logical first step toward eventual establishment of a national theatre,

and these grants initiated a policy of continuing Endowment assistance in this field of artistic endeavor. The Council also enthusiastically recommended funds enabling choreographer-director Jerome Robbins to create the American Theatre Laboratory, an experimental workshop established to investigate the great potential of the American lyric theatre.

Hoping to find a solution to the growing shortage of qualified string musicians in America, the Council recommended a study to determine the feasibility of establishing a national chamber orchestra institute which might be able to develop young musicians, enable them to learn and perform a broad repertoire of chamber music, and then provide a "feed" into American orchestras. The study, as well as conferences with managers of leading symphony orchestras, revealed that a chamber orchestra institute, as originally envisaged, would not be the most effective means of meeting the need, and the Council resolved to try to determine a better solution to this problem.

The Council recommended another important study at this meeting, this time to develop a program which might enable promising young musicians to participate in national tours. This study resulted in increased understanding of the problems inherent in a program of this sort; and the Council was in the future to launch an Audience Development Project which would provide a partial solution to this need.

It was also at this fifth meeting that the Council recommended a

grant for a national conference of dance companies to discuss the feasibility of establishing a national service organization for dance; this conference was extremely well-attended, stimulated a great deal of thoughtful and constructive discussion, and resulted in the creation of the Association of American Dance Companies. The Council continued its assistance to AADC, prompting a Dance Magazine editorial which read, in part:

"Never before have American dance organizations -- professional and non-professional, big and little, ballet and modern -- been able to meet together and work together to investigate common areas of concern. The AADC is beholden for its life to the National Endowment. And that life has already resulted in mature action."¹⁹

Mindful of its continuing responsibility to extend the arts as much as possible to all the people in the country, the Council then recommended support of an experimental three-year pilot project, administered by the University of Wisconsin's Idea Theatre, to bring the arts to five small rural communities whose inhabitants had not had the opportunity to attend or participate in arts activities. This project, which was further supported by the Council in later months, involved people in towns whose populations ranged from 1,150 to 8,800 in a variety of arts activities of their own choosing, and may provide an example for similar rural arts projects in the Nation.

Looking to the future, and following the suggestion made at the third meeting by Mr. d'Harnoncourt, the Council recommended an allocation to enable American cities to commission and place massive modern sculpture in prominent public places, to accustom the public, particularly those who might never visit a museum or gallery, to the sight and impact of the works of contemporary sculptors.

The Council further proposed that an annual anthology of the best prose, poetry, and criticism appearing in literary magazines be established.

Two weeks after this fifth Council meeting ended, on May 31, 1966, President Johnson signed Public Law 89-435, appropriating to the Arts Endowment, for Fiscal 1967, \$4 million for general program funds, \$2 million for the States program, and all of the funds remaining unused from the Fiscal 1966 \$2 million appropriation for the unrestricted gift fund. The Endowment staff could now begin to implement the programs which had just been recommended by the Council.

On August 3, 1966, Roger L. Stevens, on behalf of the National Council on the Arts, announced that The J. M. Kaplan Fund, Inc. would receive a \$100,000 matching grant to develop plans and specifications and to acquire properties for renovation into sorely needed studio-living quarters for artists in New York City. This Artists' Housing Project, which had been suggested at the Council's first meeting, and to which funds had been allocated at its third meeting, was at last underway, and the Kaplan Fund, already noted for its interest and activity in this field, seemed eminently suited to assist the Council in this endeavor.

The Newsweek cover story of March 14, 1966 entitled "The American Way of Giving" was perhaps prophetic about such projects as the Artists' Housing when it stated:

"The government's National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities promises to be one particularly adventurous agency and may even reverse traditional roles. Arts council chairman, Roger Stevens, has authority to finance pilot projects and then ask private foundations to put up matching funds or take over the projects. While foundations claim that they are the venture capital in a pluralistic economy, examples like this have prompted critics to say that government has captured the lead in innovation as well."

Three weeks after the Kaplan Fund announcement was made, the Council met for the sixth time, on August 26-27, 1966, in Washington, D.C. This was to be the final meeting for eight of the Council members whose terms would expire before the Council met again, and Chairman Stevens and the other Council members expressed their deep appreciation to the Misses de Mille, Lambert, and Ashley, and the Messrs. Ellison, Hartke, Peck, Wittmann, and Young, all of whom had worked with dedication to launch this historic national program. Many of these same Council members continued to devote their time and attention to Arts Endowment projects long after their terms had formally ended.

By this time, the Council was able to avail itself of not only the individual wisdom and expertise of its own members, but also of recommendations from arts experts all across the country who were by now serving on panels drawn up to assist the Council. The combined efforts of Council members, panelists, and Endowment staff were to provide an extremely effective means of "keeping in touch" with the entire range of the Nation's artistic needs and activities.

The first grants to individual creative writers, whose names had been suggested by the Literary Panel, were recommended by the Council at this meeting. The Council was to continue its recommendations for individual writers' grants in the months to come, and these grants were to have a profound effect on many of the writers who could use the funds to "buy time" for themselves - to free themselves from other employment and use the time for creative work.

The Council was also advised that the feasibility study on creation of a national design institute, recommended at the fourth Council meeting, was underway under the auspices of Robert Nathan Associates, Inc., of Washington, D.C.

In accordance with suggestions made by Council members, and following informal meetings with museum experts concerning ways to extend the resources of museums to their communities, as well as to broaden the base of community involvement and participation in museum activities, the Council recommended grants to initiate pilot projects in three museums located in different regions of the country.

Turning its attention to music, the Council allotted funds enabling the San Francisco Opera to create the Western Opera Theatre, a separate ensemble to perform condensed and full-length versions of operas in areas where opera on a large scale would not be feasible; the Western Opera Theatre was extremely successful in its initial efforts, and later received additional funds to enable it to tour an even broader area than was first possible.

The Council reiterated its priority recommendation with regard to unrestricted donations, with arts programming for educational television at the top of the list; this "priority" allocation was formally announced following the meeting, along with recommendations that these funds go to

the Educational Broadcasting Corporation, National Educational Television, and Educational Television Stations (a division of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters). All of these organizations subsequently received Endowment funds.

Another announcement made following this meeting concerned the "American Literary Anthology," a project which had been recommended at the fifth Council meeting and which was now on its way to becoming a reality: George Plimpton, editor of the Paris Review, had agreed to administer the project, and publication of this annual collection of the "best" of American writing from literary magazines would be undertaken, on a rotating basis, by leading American publishing houses which had volunteered to take part.

On September 29, 1966, the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities celebrated its first anniversary at a White House press conference attended by President Johnson and by the Chairmen of both Endowments.

Just ten days earlier, Chicago Tribune Music Editor Thomas Willis had paid tribute to the President and the Council when he wrote:

"In the arts and in the field of education, President Johnson has made far reaching, idealistic federal commitments without precedent. The arts in particular have received a series of shots in the arm which...are among the most creative fiscal allotments ever made. Taken in sum, they suggest a distinctively American plan for government aid to the arts which may overturn a good many notions and bromides....The remarkable fact is that the National Council on the Arts so far has been a muscular, fast-moving, and unorthodox arm of the government which plants its punches where they likely will count most and wastes neither energy nor money...the council has created more excitement and less controversy than anyone had a right to expect."²⁰

And four days after the first-year anniversary, the National Endowment for the Arts announced that the Bristol-Meyers Company had made an unrestricted donation of \$300,000, freeing an equal amount from the special Treasury fund; this generous gift, combined with several smaller amounts, confirmed the Council's wisdom in deciding to announce priorities for these funds, and enabled the Endowment to support a series of arts programs by the Educational Broadcasting Corporation. This was another "first" in the life of this still-new agency, and in the history of the country: a partnership between a major corporation and the Federal Government in direct support of the arts. And the partnership resulted not only in the production of a series of outstanding arts programs, but also in their national distribution, free of charge, to all educational television stations in the United States.

This Bristol-Meyers contribution was perhaps symptomatic of a gradually increasing interest in the arts on the part of the American business sector. The necessity for greater business involvement in the arts, outlined in the Rockefeller Panel Report, The Performing Arts: Problems and Prospects,²¹ was brought into sharper focus in a speech delivered by Chase Manhattan Bank President David Rockefeller in September 1966, one year after the creation of the National Endowment for the Arts, and finally resulted in establishment of the Business Committee for the Arts. This non-profit organization, whose establishment was announced in October 1967, is Chaired by C. Douglas Dillon, composed of prominent

businessmen across the Nation, and has a small full-time staff whose aim is not to raise funds nor to channel them, but rather to provide communication between the Arts and Business communities.

The National Endowment for the Arts has from the beginning been in close touch with the Business Committee for the Arts; it is hoped that, eventually, business support for the arts will progress from its current sporadic and limited status to providing significant assistance. As David Rockefeller, originator and Board Member of the Business Committee for the Arts, stated:

"Projects involving the arts are not just a kind of fluffy periphery of American life. They are essential to the root problems that face our country today. The Committee's task here is of vital importance. I think that if we, as businessmen, will bring to our country creativity, beauty and greatness in culture, we shall have contributed in a rather special way to a true renaissance of the twentieth century."²²

In a further effort to provide communication between the Arts community and portions of the private sector, this time with the hope of refining and enhancing America's appreciation of its artistic resources, over thirty well-known critics and authors gathered at the Whitney Museum in New York on December 9, 1966, to grapple with many of the problems facing today's critics and audiences of the performing arts, such as the pressing need to diversify, decentralize and circulate both criticism and the critics. Participants of the two-day conference, co-sponsored by the Arts Endowment and the U.S. Office of Education and entitled "The Current State of Criticism in the Performing Arts," included

Newsweek's Richard Gilman, The New York Times' Harold Schonberg and Howard Taubman, The Washington Post's Richard Coe, the San Francisco Chronicle's Alfred Frankenstein, the New York Review of Books' Elizabeth Hardwick, as well as Norman Lloyd of the Rockefeller Foundation, author Norman Mailer and poet/opera critic William Meredith.

On December 12, 1966, the White House announced that President Johnson had appointed the Misses Marian Anderson, Helen Hayes, Jimilu Mason, and Nancy White, and the Messrs. Lawrence Halprin, Charlton Heston, Sidney Poitier, and Donald Weismann to six-year terms on the National Council on the Arts.

The following evening, and in the midst of a raging blizzard, President and Mrs. Johnson held a White House dinner in honor of all of the members of the National Council on the Arts. In his informal remarks to these distinguished artists, President Johnson stated:

"We have learned that beauty and truth are the gold coins of international currency that make all nations richer for exchanging them....Your Government's pledge is now established as this nation's policy: to encourage the fullest growth of our artistic talents, to spread the fruits of that talent to all Americans, rich and poor.... We can call our task complete when the spotlight of our concern and the glow of our success fall equally on the top half and the grassroots."

Then, paying tribute to the work of the Council, and their valor in braving the elements, President Johnson concluded: "So I ask those of you who came through the cold this evening to now join me in a toast to that great day, to a truly democratic culture, greater glory for the arts, and to our best hope for both: the National Council on the Arts."

The following two days, December 14-15, 1966, the seventh meeting of the Council was held in the Main Conference Room of the State Department Building in Washington. Stanford Research Institute presented an illustrated report on their study concerning a possible Film Institute in America, and the Council recommended an initial grant, plus a priority of up to \$1.3 million should unrestricted donations be received, toward establishment of such an Institute. This move represented the culmination of months of effort on the part of the Film Advisory Council, which was composed of Council members Ashley, Heston, Peck (Chairman), Pereira, Poitier, and Stevens, and which also included Sherrill Corwin, John Culkin, S.J., Bruce Herschensohn, David Mallery, Arnold Picker, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., George Seaton, George Stevens, Jr., Jack Valenti, and Richard Walsh. The Foundation's General Counsel, Mr. Ruttenberg, had also devoted a great deal of time and effort during all these months of preliminary planning, and was to continue his advice and assistance in future months.

The Arts Council, having been advised that the study on a national design institute was in progress, recommended a series of grants in the field of architecture and design, as the type of projects which might later be assumed by such an institute, if established. Recommendations included funds to allow architecture students to travel and conduct research in the United States during the summer before their final year of study, as well as funds to enable advanced students to work on significant design projects being implemented by local public agencies.

Turning its attention to literature, the Council recommended funds enabling the National Institute of Public Affairs to establish a Coordinating Council of Literary Magazines; C.C.L.M. has since provided financial assistance to many of the small and struggling literary magazines which offer the only outlet and exposure for most of our young, unknown writers. The Council was to recommend continued aid to C.C.L.M. at future meetings.

The first panel to make recommendations on individual awards to visual artists had met in September of 1966; at this meeting, the Council accepted these recommendations and launched a continuing program of awards to individual painters and sculptors. At the time this history was written, nearly 90 artists had received awards, which an Art News magazine editorial called "the best list of grants (or prizes or honors, call them what you will) that we have ever seen in this field. It reveals a sophisticated knowledge on the part of the regional advisory panels which made the recommendations and, even rarer, the facts have been tempered with tact, finesse and a humane understanding of individual needs. The money has gone to artists at a point in their careers when it can make a real financial or psychological difference, possibly a crucial one....For almost all of them, the grant is a meaningful act of recognition and the whole enterprise is a major contribution to our culture."²³

Aware of the impending dissolution of the Metropolitan Opera's National Company, the Council passed a resolution supporting continuation of

a major American touring opera company and recommending that funds be made available to such an organization should its establishment become possible at some future date.

The Council also decided that as a matter of policy, it would not entertain grant requests from other Federal agencies except in special cases. Noting that other agencies were undertaking some projects involving the arts but with sociological purposes primarily intended, the Council decided to assist in three pilot projects where artistic excellence seemed to be integrally involved with the sociological aims: Budd Schulberg's Writers' Workshop in Watts, Dorothy Maynor's St. James Community House School of the Arts (now the well-known Harlem School of the Arts), and Hull House in Chicago.

Two months after this seventh meeting, the National Council on the Arts, at no cost to itself, hosted a dinner in New York City honoring Miss Jennie Lee, Great Britain's Minister for the Arts, who was visiting the United States and who, at this February 27th banquet, was able to address over 300 American artists concerning the activities of her government in the arts, as well as to exchange ideas and information on what America was doing in this field. This vital interchange of ideas, an urgent need of those involved in the arts all over the world, was extremely valuable to all concerned; and Mr. Stevens was to continue this practice, hosting arts experts from abroad during their visits to America, and travelling extensively, at his own expense, to collect information and bring the news of American artistic activity to people in other countries.

During the following months, Council members, panels, and the Endowment staff continued their work on projects already recommended and on developing future plans. In March of 1967, hearings began on the Fiscal 1968 appropriation for the Endowment. This appropriation was to be the last authorized under the Act which established the Foundation, and the Endowment would require new authorizing legislation following the Fiscal 1968 appropriation if its programs were to continue.

Once again, the Endowment requested the full amount which had been authorized, but never appropriated, for its activities, and once again this request was to be denied. On April 27, 1967, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 9029, the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1968, appropriating \$4.5 million to the Arts Endowment for general programs; \$2 million for the Federal-State partnership program; and only up to a total of \$1 million for both the Arts and Humanities Endowments to the unrestricted gift fund. This first session of the 90th Congress was already beginning to reflect growing public concern about the state of the Nation's finances, and its priorities were clearly not geared toward increased assistance for the Nation's cultural health and development.

When the National Council on the Arts met for the eighth time, on May 12-14, 1967, in Tarrytown, the Senate had not yet acted on the Endowment's appropriation; but the Council was able as before, to make recommendations on programs with a fair idea of the amount of funding which might become available.

It was at this meeting that the National Council on the Arts was to make its final formal recommendation on the American Film Institute: Chairman Stevens announced that the Institute was about to be incorporated in the District of Columbia, and the Council recommended that up to \$2.6 million be provided to the Institute from the special Treasury fund should private donations of up to \$1.3 million be made available.

The Council then recommended additional priorities for grants from the unrestricted gift fund contingent upon receipt of additional donations to the Endowment. These priority decisions resulted, on July 11, 1967, in grants being announced to the Association of Producing Artists (APA-Phoenix), the New York Shakespeare Festival, and the American Ballet Theatre. The grant to the New York Shakespeare Festival was specifically earmarked to assist the first season of the Festival's new Public Theatre, which was established to produce new works and which opened in October of that year.

Referring to its prior meeting resolution to assist a major national opera touring company, the Council recommended funds for the newly-created American National Opera Company, which had been established under the artistic direction of Sarah Caldwell. The Council further recommended a grant to enable the Music Critics Association to develop a prototype for American Musical Digest, a new publication to reprint, digest, abstract and translate music reviews and articles; it was hoped that this would enhance the scope and quality of music criticism throughout the country, and serve as a model for criticism in other fields of the arts.

At its third meeting, the Council had suggested a program of grants-in-aid to composers; this project was developed to enable orchestras to commission new works, and to provide assistance to the composers for copying scores and parts for orchestral presentation of their works. The first three grants under this program had been recommended at the seventh meeting, and at this meeting, a large number of grants was recommended. This program has not only provided direct assistance to individual artists, but also, as with the Audience Development Project, has reached into practically every State in the Nation.

The Audience Development Project, also recommended at this eighth meeting, has assisted countless young musicians by enabling college and university concert series all over the country to receive funds for additional programs by young or unknown American artists. And at this meeting, the Council was advised that a Music Panel, established with the advice of several Council members, and headed by Aaron Copeland, would be making its recommendations available to Council in future months.

This Panel, established in April of 1967, was originally composed of 18 individuals, each distinguished in the music field, drawn from all over the country. The Panel met three times in 1967 to review requests received by the Endowment in the music field. As the number of requests submitted to the Endowment increased, the Panel members realized that it was growing impossible for them to review the requests in any depth within

a reasonable period of time. They therefore decided that each request should receive thorough review by only those Panel members who were most likely to be concerned with it. (For example: a request in opera would be reviewed by only those members of the Panel most closely associated with that area of the music field.)

Six sub-committees (Arts Administration/Audience Development; Composition/Contemporary Music; Concerts/Performance; Education; Jazz; and Musical Theatre) were then formed to review requests. To assure a balanced membership of the committees, eight more individuals were invited to join the Music Panel, bringing its total membership to 26.

To maintain objectivity in review of the requests, the recommendations of each sub-committee are voted on by all of the Panel members. In this way, therefore, a member of one sub-committee, who may be familiar with a project being reviewed by another, is given the opportunity to express his views on it, an arrangement which frequently adds perspective to the sub-committee's recommendation.

In addition to its own efforts, the Music Panel also requested Allen Sapp, Chairman of the Music Department of the State University of New York at Buffalo to conduct a nationwide survey of local, State and Federal programs in music. It was hoped that this study would provide the Council and the Music Panel with an even more comprehensive understanding of the American music world, and would offer recommendations on future goals and programs to be developed.

The Council was to initiate three new programs for literature at this meeting: Distinguished Service Awards for creative writers, a project to assist Independent Literary and Art Presses throughout the country, and the Poets in Developing Colleges program. The first of these programs has thus far provided awards to six senior American writers for life-long contributions to American letters; and the second has assisted a limited number of distinguished non-commercial publishers and printers of fine books.

The third project, Poets in Developing Colleges, was undertaken with the assistance of the Woodrow Wilson Fellowship Foundation and The Poetry Center of the YM-YWHA in New York, to enable black and white writers to visit developing colleges in the South, primarily black in enrollment. These writers gave classroom lectures and workshop sessions on the art of writing, and public readings involving local as well as student writers; the first part of the program concluded with a poetry festival held at Morehouse College in Atlanta which brought together all of the poets and students involved in the program to read and discuss their works. Some of the poets have since become "writers-in-residence" at their respective colleges, and the program was later recommended for further support by the Council.

Expressing concern for the plight of the playwright, and recognizing that the economics of the commercial theatre are not usually conducive to the discovery of new talent, the Council then recommended a

series of grants to professional experimental theatres and workshop groups. These grants, many of them to groups working "Off-Off-Broadway" in New York, prompted a Variety article which read, in part, "The decision of the National Endowment for the Arts to dispense...grants to nine experimental theatres is a built-in rebuttal to critics who feared that Federal subsidy might result in exclusive nurturing of 'safe' or 'Establishment' legit...the experimental legit's produce new and sometimes provocative, occasionally challenging work, besides providing a practical workshop for budding playwrights."²⁴ The Council hopes to continue its assistance in this area, and is utilizing a special panel to provide information and recommendations.

At its sixth meeting, the Council had recommended assistance to launch an incentive grants program, administered by the Educational Television Stations Program Service, which would enable educational television stations throughout the country to develop new pilot arts projects. The Council now recommended additional funds for the production and national distribution of the arts programs developed by local educational television stations during the initial phase of the project. This Council assistance for arts programming on education television had earlier been lauded by a Springfield News (Massachusetts) editorial which addressed itself to the particular grants in question and to the whole question of Federal involvement in the arts:

"In this age of federal grants, where much of the emphasis has been on public works projects and physical facilities, it is encouraging to read of a...nationwide program of

government support for various educational and art forms... the largest single recipient is educational television as \$875,000 has been offered to three non-profit organizations which must match the government's share. This is the most extensive government assistance program ever undertaken for educational television and can prove a tremendous boon in realizing the potential of educational TV which has been hampered by limited funds...In a real sense, any nation is only as strong as its cultural heritage. Government financial aid to enrich this heritage promises to reap sound dividends."²⁵

In another effort to upgrade the quality of our public media, the Council decided to assist WGBH Radio in Boston with a one-year pilot project to establish a "repertory company" and to sponsor a nationwide competition to stimulate revived interest in the writing of significant radio drama scripts. The outstanding works, to be produced by the repertory group, would be distributed free of charge to all educational radio stations, as well as to graduate drama schools and leading repertory theatre groups.

The Council also recommended continuation of its program of assistance to resident professional theatres, and requested that a comprehensive study be undertaken by theatre critic and columnist Sandra Schmidt to assist the Theatre Panel and the Council with their recommendations on specific grantees.

This eighth Council meeting ended on an optimistic note: Mr. Ruttenberg had briefly outlined some of the beneficial new provisions which the Endowment hoped might be included in its new authorizing legislation, and the Council's "biggest" project to date, the American

Film Institute, was very nearly an actuality.

On June 5, 1967, at a special press luncheon, the announcement of the birth of the American Film Institute was made. The new Institute, to be headed by George Stevens, Jr., was a non-profit, non-government organization which was to concentrate its efforts on film education and training; restoration, cataloguing, and preservation of film; publications, and filmmaking.

President Johnson, who in September of 1965 had said, "We will create an American Film Institute, bringing together leading artists of the film industry, outstanding educators, and young men and women who wish to pursue the 20th Century art form as their life's work,"²⁶ sent a congratulatory letter to Roger L. Stevens. Gregory Peck, Acting Director of the Film Institute's Board of Trustees, outlined the history and aim of the Institute, and, noting that the film media press had for months been predicting dire flaws in the prospective Institute, remarked that this was the first production with which he had ever been involved that had been reviewed before it opened. McGeorge Bundy, President of the Ford Foundation which had provided an unrestricted gift of \$1.3 million, thus freeing an equal amount of Arts Endowment funding, sent a statement saying, "The Ford Foundation is confident that the leadership of Mr. Peck and his group and of Mr. Stevens will make the American Film Institute of real significance in the continuing development of film as an art."²⁷ Jack Valenti, on behalf of the seven member companies of the Motion Picture Association of America which had committed \$1.3 million to this undertaking

stated that "The endurance of excellence in motion pictures will be the prime objective of the American Film Institute. In this aim, the entire motion picture industry is eager to join."²⁸

Roger L. Stevens, having paid tribute to all of the individuals and organizations whose hard work and generosity had made the Film Institute a reality, said: "We hope this Institute will become the world leader in its field, as it certainly should. The United States has the talent and the skills and the technical expertise to bring about a great new era of filmmaking in this nation, and we believe the American Film Institute will make a significant contribution to this potential creative revolution in the art of the film."²⁹ And in his remarks, George Stevens, Jr., who had resigned his position as director of the Motion Picture and Television Service at U.S.I.A. to become Director and Chief Executive Officer of the Institute, said, "Asked why I chose to get involved in this kind of enterprise, the best answer I could supply was - 'because it isn't there'. "³⁰ He then went on to say, "And, let's face it, the art of motion picture in America has seen better times. The American Film Institute will be concerned with assuring the continuity of the proud tradition of the films which was born in this country in this century... And it is our own hope that when it grows up, America's Film Institute will be, as it should be, the best in the world."³¹

On June 24, 1967, President Johnson signed Public Law 90-28, the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1968; funds appropriated to the Arts Endowment remained unchanged from the amounts included in the House-passed H.R. 9029.

Several rather urgent items were brought before a special meeting of the Council, the ninth it was to hold, this time in Los Angeles on July 17, 1967. The Council recommended that the first grant from funds released as a result of unrestricted gifts in Fiscal 1968 be awarded to the American Conservatory Theatre, which, despite considerable support from the San Francisco community and from private foundations, was still in need of assistance for its large and varied repertory and its extensive training program.

Chairman Stevens then reported that the old Bell Telephone Laboratories on New York's lower West Side had become available; that they were ideal for a national artists' housing center; and that the project needed only the Council's recommendation on funding to enable the purchase and conversion of these properties. The Council promptly recommended awarding such funds as might be necessary to The J. M. Kaplan Fund for this purpose, and further resolved that the center, when complete, be named the David Smith Center, in honor of this great sculptor and Council member who had died in May of 1965.

Three weeks later, on August 7, 1967, Roger L. Stevens announced that the long search for suitable properties had ended, and that The J. M. Kaplan

Fund had received a matching grant from the Endowment to launch the first major national artists' housing center in the country. Commenting on this announcement, Robert C. Weaver, Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which was to assist with the project, stated: "I am very happy that the Federal Housing Administration's program has proved flexible enough to house both people and the arts. This is in keeping with our emphasis on developing cities which serve the soul as well as the body."³² Once again, two Federal agencies were to join hands, this time with considerable private resources as well, to benefit America's artists.

Mayor John V. Lindsay was present for this announcement and gave his enthusiastic endorsement of the project; Senator Robert F. Kennedy also sent a statement, regretting his inability to be present and saying, in part:

"The fact that this imaginative and creative project is becoming a reality is a concrete and encouraging result of Congress' enactment of the National Arts and Humanities Act....It is tangible evidence that that legislation created a governmental concern for the arts which will make a great difference. And it is evidence, too, that the drafters of the Act were right when they contemplated cooperation of private foundations in the projects which they authorized."³³

The 10th meeting of the National Council on the Arts was held in Washington, D.C., on November 3-4, 1967. Mr. Stevens informed the Council that Mr. Biddle, who was present at the meeting as an observer, had left the Endowment to assume his new position as Chairman of the newly-created Division of Fine Arts at Fordham University in New York. Mr. Stevens also announced that Mrs. Taylor, who had left the Endowment in May, had been retained in the capacity of

Consultant on music programs.

The Council now recommended assistance to enable American P.E.N., the American chapter of this international writers' organization, to establish a permanent headquarters and develop a professional staff, to publish a newsletter, and to organize and strengthen regional chapters.

A further recommendation in the field of literature was a program of assistance for literary festivals to be held at nine small colleges and universities, most of them in underpopulated and/or remote areas, enabling them to enlarge the scope of their activities and draw important writers to their campuses. And at the recommendation of six prominent writer-teachers who had spent three months on study grants from the Endowment searching for young writers of talent, the Council recommended awards to 29 young, needy writers.

Recognizing the importance of enhancing the artistic development of performing arts institutions outside New York City, the Council had previously recommended, at its July 1967 meeting, assistance to six well-established regional dance companies. At this meeting, it voted to support five additional companies in projects for artistic growth, administrative development and program expansion in their respective regions.

Achieving still another "first" in its history and that of the country, the Council recommended a grant for a project coordinator to work with representatives of the new AFL/CIO Council for Scientific, Professional and Cultural

Employees (SPACE) in New York City, Buffalo, Minneapolis, and Louisville on the development of arts demonstration projects. This new partnership between labor unions, community arts organizations, and the Federal Government established a precedent destined to benefit American artists as well as large segments of the population.

Another example of the Council's efforts to involve organized labor in programs of direct assistance to the arts also came to fruition at this meeting, with the recommendation to assist Oakland University of Rochester, Michigan in the first phase of a projected four-year audience development plan for theatre and music. Both the United Automobile Workers and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America would participate in the project, to involve the attendance of 800 couples (drawn from production line workers in local industry, retail store clerks from area department stores, public school teachers, and others from apartment community groups) at performances over a four-year period; these couples would provide basic information on their backgrounds and previous arts interest, and would furnish brief evaluations of each performance. Tickets were to be fully subsidized the first year but would follow a pattern of decreasing subsidization until by the fourth year, participants would be wholly responsible for their purchase.

In the area of music education, and as the result of a study grant previously awarded Alexander Ringer, professor of musicology at the University of Illinois, the Council now recommended grants to enable 10 music specialists/

educators to study the Kodaly concept of music education in Hungary during the 1968-69 school year, and return to the United States to plan the development of a new approach to music education in our schools based upon their observation and study.

Turning its attention to theatre, the Council recommended a series of grants to 18 resident professional theatres in 16 cities across the country, further implementing this assistance program which had been inaugurated at the fifth meeting, and which the Council had chosen to make a matter of continuing attention and concern.

As its final action at this 10th meeting, the Council again set priorities for funds should donations be received. Ultimately, each of the four organizations named received grants: the American National Opera Company, the Santa Fe Opera, the Opera Society of Washington, D.C., and the Theatre Development Fund, Inc. The grant to this latter organization, established through private foundation donations to the Endowment to stimulate creativity and experimentation in the commercial theatre, recommended unanimously by the Council and by other theatre experts with whom it had been discussed, stirred up a great deal of controversy in the months to come.

Perhaps spurred on by headlines such as "Funds Will Aid Shaky Plays on Broadway," "\$200,000 Fund to Help Sagging Stage Shows," and "Federal Funds to Aid Broadway Laggards," several Congressmen, newspaper people and private citizens set up a hue and cry that was to reverberate around the Endowment's walls

for many a week. Once again, Mr. Stevens was to make those trips to the Hill to explain the full purpose and intent of the grant, and to stress that three major private foundations had made the entire project possible. It had seemed evident to these foundations and to the National Council on the Arts that support for artistic excellence in the commercial theatre, not to be restricted to Broadway, could only redound to the benefit of the entire American theatre; it was, and is, a fact of theatre life that the commercial theatre has been the well-spring and source of very nearly all the material that is performed in theatres all over the country, as well as those productions which display American culture abroad. It was, and is, an equally important fact that the commercial theatre cannot be generally geared, first and foremost, toward artistic excellence, but rather toward "success" - which in commercial theatre means immediate and large audiences.

The double intent of the non-profit Theatre Development Fund, Inc. was to make possible the production of plays of genuine artistic merit and to attract back to the theatre the students, teachers, and other professional people who seemed to be less and less drawn to it. Thus, audiences would be developed and encouraged, private enterprise would be strengthened, and scripts of definite artistic merit would be given a full and proper exposure; surely it would be hard to doubt the benefit of any of these goals.

There was a certain irony implicit in the attacks, initiated primarily in the Congress, and, for the first time, with a definite partisan tint: although,

as Variety accurately reported, "the project was primarily inspired and has been largely financed by prominent Republicans,"³⁴ it was Republican Congressmen who found the grant "absolutely ridiculous,"³⁵ and termed it a "prime example of government waste and stupidity."³⁶

Despite strong support from theatre people and from the press, the attacks on the grant continued, and the timing could not have been worse: the announcement was made on January 28, 1968, just four weeks before the Foundation's new authorizing legislation was to reach the floor of the House for a vote.

During the previous summer, on June 29, 1967, Senator Pell had introduced S. 2061, authorizing further funding of programs under the Foundation Act. On July 10th, Representative Reid (R., N.Y.) had introduced a similar bill, H.R. 11308, in the House. It was announced by Senator Pell and Representative Thompson that their Special Subcommittees would hold Joint Hearings on the bills on July 12 and 13; further hearings were later held by the House Special Subcommittee on July 18 and 26, and by the Senate Special Subcommittee on August 15 and 16, 1967.

Through all these months, work had continued on the legislation and on January 30, 1968, the House Committee on Education and Labor reported out H.R. 11308. Less than one month later, on February 27th, the bill reached the floor of the House.

What was at issue here was not merely whether the Arts Endowment's programs could continue to exist; for nearly three years, the Arts Council and Endowment had been delving into the entire range of needs in the arts all across the country, and developing limited pilot projects to broaden its own understanding and to test possible solutions to the most pressing problems at hand. At the same time, the Council and the Endowment staff had been keeping an eye on the future, noting the deepening financial crisis facing all of the arts as documented by the Messrs. Baumol and Bowen, two Princeton economists, in Performing Arts: The Economic Dilemma.³⁷ The Council hoped that once its own "trial period" ended, funds would be forthcoming that would enable it to do more than provide stop-gap measures where long-range and substantive support was becoming increasingly essential. A "cultural explosion" had indeed begun in America; it was too early to make a full assessment of this "explosion," but the Council hoped it might be enabled to do more than merely scratch the surface - that the scope and range of its programs could be continued and greatly expanded to meet the expanding need, and to strengthen and support America's growing desire for an active cultural life.

And the Council, it would seem, had good reason to hope: in a very short time and with very limited funds, it had accomplished a great deal in many areas, not the least of them being the stimulation of vast new resources for support of the arts across the Nation. And the old bromide about "Federal control of the arts," (or, as phrased earlier, "Federal czars over the arts") had at last been put to rest, a fact attested to by many artists and arts

organizations for whom it had once been a matter of concern, as well as by newspaper articles such as Cleveland's The Plain Dealer:

"The biggest thing the foundation has done is to prove that fears of bureaucracy and political influence were unfounded. The foundation's activities have allayed fears...that the government might infringe artistic freedom."³⁸

Fully aware of the Endowment's accomplishments, and taking into account the impressive testimony concerning the severe and worsening financial problems besetting America's artists and arts institutions, the House Committee on Education and Labor reported out H.R. 11308 with a two-year authorization for the Arts Endowment alone totalling \$67.5 million, plus an open-ended authorization to match donations from private sources made to the Endowment. (The total Foundation authorization over the two-year period totalled \$135 million plus administrative funds and funds to match donations made to both Endowments.)

Foreseeing what might happen when the new authorization bill reached the Congress for a vote, a Milwaukee Journal editorial had stated: "Vietnamese war demands have cut sharply into vital poverty programs and sparked the recurring 'guns or butter' debate on priorities. But congress must look to the future. There is more to life than guns or butter or even both; provision must be made for a bit of essential nourishment for the creative spirit, too. The arts and humanities foundation must not be killed off and should get a reasonable refunding."³⁹ But unfortunately, on February 27, 1968, this plea was to go almost entirely unheeded.⁴⁰

Many Congressmen rose in support of the bill, and some of the most enlightened speeches on behalf of the legislation came from Congressmen Thompson, Brademas (D., Ind.), Reid, and Moorhead.

There were the expected attacks by Representatives Gross and Hall (R., Mo.), as well as a plea by Representative Anderson (R., Ill.) to establish priorities responsive to what he considered the most pressing needs of American life, and reduce the level of funding proposed for the Foundation. Other Congressmen joined in opposing the bill. Representative Bow (R., Ohio) remarked: "Certainly at this time there is not a soul on this floor who does not realize that we are at war...We cannot have guns and butter. And this is guns with strawberry shortcake covered with whipped cream and a cherry on top."⁴¹

Towards the end of the long debate preceding the vote, Representative Mahon (D., Tex.), Chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, rose to address the members of the House. Urging "fiscal responsibility," he emphasized that this was the "first key vote of the year on a bill to continue authorization for a going program."⁴² He continued: "We are on trial as a nation as to whether or not we have the discipline and the courage and the leadership to pay our way...Today we have a test vote and I hope that we will measure up to the demands of the moment."⁴³ Taking its cue from Representative Mahon, and making a "test vote" out of the Foundation's continuing funding, the House on that day (February 27th) passed, by a vote of 272 to 123, a radically amended version of H.R. 11308.

Although the Senate had not yet acted on H.R. 11308, the House's action, severely limiting the Endowment's activities, had a strong impact on the Council which met on April 19-21, 1968, for its 11th meeting in Tarrytown, New York.

After introducing to the Council the Endowment's new Deputy Chairman, William B. Cannon, and reporting that Mr. Mark had assumed the duties of Director of Planning and Analysis, Chairman Stevens turned the meeting over to the General Counsel.

Mr. Ruttenberg proceeded to inform the Council of the House action on H.R. 11308. He reported that the amended version of the bill limited the entire Foundation's authorization to \$11.2 million (plus administrative funds and provisions to match gifts), authorized its continuance for only one year (Fiscal 1969) instead of for two, and revoked the Arts Endowment's authority to make individual grants. The first two provisions had resulted from an amendment⁴⁴ offered by Representative Ashbrook (R., Ohio) which had passed the House by a vote of 261 to 130, and the latter provision had resulted from an amendment⁴⁵ offered by Representative Steiger (R., Wisc.) which had passed by a vote of 111 to 92. One constructive action taken by the House, in line with the Endowment's request, authorized the special Treasury fund to match restricted as well as unrestricted gifts, subject to a prior recommendation from the Council on acceptance of the gift.

During the afternoon session, the Council divided into groups for

general policy discussion on how best to utilize the limited funds available to the Endowment, and on Council attitudes with regard to future directions to be taken. These group meetings clearly reflected the Council's disturbance at the reduction in funding which seemed imminent, and their even deeper distress at revocation of Endowment authority to award individual grants. This latter issue permeated the entire meeting, touching off a series of discussions and culminating in a resolution affirming Council's belief that individual grants were fundamental to Federal support of the arts in the country; that the Council could not be responsible for the quality of Endowment programs in support of creative artists if the authority to recommend such awards was to be delegated to outside institutions rather than to the Council; and that, therefore, the action of the House with respect to individual grants should not be allowed to stand.⁴⁶

The Council's strong stand on behalf of individual grants had already been vindicated many times over, as witness the article referring to one of the Council's Distinguished Service Awards in the Fremont News Register (California):

"Some of the 'raving liberals'...would have us believe that this big, rich nation cares nothing for its creative personalities. A major refutation of this stand has just come out of Washington. The National Foundation of Arts...has awarded great poet Kenneth Patchen a...grant on the basis of his works. The story involves more than dollars. It involves a great deal of caring and extra effort by responsible human beings....Their caring represents a very well deserved 'thank you' to Kenneth Patchen and his lady for their huge contribution to American cultural life."⁴⁷

Continuing their discussion, and noting the fact that the limited funds which had been available thus far might now be reduced even further, several Council members indicated their preference for assisting the creation of new works rather than providing support for art works already in existence. This was closely related to the earlier discussion favoring assistance to individual artists, with the added provision that aid be for the creation of new work. It was agreed that Council should maintain flexibility in its approach, and that policies should not be dictated by the amount of money available, but rather by careful individual judgements on the merits of each project.

The Council, still evidently concerned about the House action, also considered the matter of audience development which it felt generally required larger initial investments than direct support of the creative artist. The general consensus of the discussion was that priority should be given to the work of the creative artist, but that rigid lines should be avoided; and that the development and education of audiences were vital if the benefits of creation were to be realized.

Turning the Council's attention to the program of assistance to the States, Mr. Stevens introduced Mr. Clark Mitze, the Endowment's new Director of State and Local Operations. Mr. Mitze discussed the projected State arts agency program for Fiscal 1969, and the Council recommended funding, consistent with each State's program and budget presentations, at a maximum of \$50,000,

contingent upon future appropriations. As a direct result of the cutback in funds appropriated for this program for Fiscal 1969, the figure was later reduced to a maximum of \$30,909, a reduction for each State of more than \$19,000 from the possible maximum, and of more than \$8,000 from the previous year grants.

The remainder of the meeting was spent reviewing the status of programs previously implemented and discussing future recommendations. In comments on the success of the Professional Experimental Theatres program, it was noted that Endowment support signified the first full program of assistance to this type of theatre, and seemed to have provided the impetus for enlarged private foundation support and interest.

The Council was also given a status report on the proposed National Design Institute, and reiterated its support for such an institution when established. An informal committee consisting of Council members Bush-Brown, Pereira, Yamasaki, and, following his appointment to the Council, Halprin, had held many meetings and had carefully followed the development of the Nathan Report, contracted for earlier at the Council's recommendation. Unfortunately, the drafters of the report never fully grasped what the architecture members of the Council were asking, and the final report was not accepted as a blueprint for the proposed Institute as conceived by the Arts Council members. Council members have continued their efforts to bring the Institute into being, but at the time this history was written, due to the severe cuts in the Endowment's budget, the matter of the Design Institute had been temporarily placed in abeyance.

It was also reported at this meeting that the first volume of the American Literary Anthology would be published in June of 1968 by Farrar, Strauss & Giroux, and that the second volume (to be published by Random House) was scheduled for early 1969. The publishers had agreed to publish at cost so that, hopefully, all Endowment funds could go into the discovery and rewarding of writers and editors. The American Literary Anthology/1, subsequently released, garnered excellent reviews and widespread praise for the concept which had prompted its establishment. As The New York Times said:

"This first volume of 'best' fiction, poetry and essays culled from the 1966 issue of nearly 300 magazines of limited circulation marks the first official recognition of the important role played by noncommercial magazines in the discovery and development of authentic literary talent. A substantial grant from the National Endowment for the Arts...not only makes possible an annual anthology judged by well known writers and critics, but is the occasion for financially rewarding worthy 'little' magazines, their editors, and outstanding contributors."⁴⁸

The Council, recognizing its responsibility to foster the development of new audiences, had previously supported national tours by major performing arts groups such as the American Ballet Theatre, the Martha Graham Dance Company, the National Repertory Theatre, the American National Opera Company, the Goldovsky Opera Theatre, and the Western Opera Theatre. At its 10th meeting, the Council had recommended an allocation for a National Touring Program to permit smaller performing groups to tour cities and communities normally unable to afford hosting them, and at this meeting recommended its first grant under this Program to the Utah Symphony.

The Council then proceeded to recommend grants to 15 museums in 14 States to be used for the purchase of two or more works of living American artists. This Museum Purchase Plan was the direct result of a meeting held the previous January, planned by the Arts Endowment and hosted by Mr. Thomas Hoving, Director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, which was attended by directors of leading museums from all over the country. The purpose of the meeting was to ascertain ways in which the Arts Endowment might best serve the needs of American art museums; a twelve-point agenda was offered for discussion, and the museum directors' unanimous and enthusiastic endorsement of the Museum Purchase Plan resulted in its immediate implementation and hopes for eventual expansion.

The Museum Purchase Plan not only provides direct assistance to living American artists, but also encourages museums to enlarge their collections of contemporary American Art, and creates and expands audiences for living artists by public display of their works. Art museums throughout the country were encouraged to apply for participation, and applications were reviewed by a panel of museum experts. Two additional grant stipulations which it was felt would enhance the program were that the museums' matching funds must come from newly-developed sources excluding already existing endowments or income, and that the total funds involved must be spent for the purchase of art works and not to defray indirect costs.

Joining museum directors and artists in their praise for this project,

Chicago Sun-Times Art Critic Harold Haydon stated:

"A great museum must acquire contemporary American art unaided, but the importance of doing so was underlined...by \$10,000 matching grants from the National Council on the Arts to 15 smaller museums for the purchase of works by living American artists. In this way, the heritage of American art is preserved and the museums fulfill a function of maturity."⁴⁹

The 11th meeting adjourned on a note of cautious optimism: the Senate had not yet acted on H.R. 11308, and the Council hoped that perhaps some of the House's restrictive actions might be reversed.

Two weeks later, on May 3, 1968, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reported out H.R. 11308; the Committee had revised the language of this bill and had reported it out in lieu of the original Senate bill, S. 2061. And on May 7th, the Senate passed its amended H.R. 11308 by a voice vote. The Senate bill restored a two-year authorization for the Foundation, and the authority of the Arts Endowment to make individual grants. On May 28th, conferees selected by both Houses agreed to file a Conference Report, having settled their disagreements in conference. That Report (H. Rept. 1511), recommending a two-year authorization and the authority to award grants to individuals "of exceptional talent," was agreed to by the Senate on May 29th and the House on June 5th.

On June 18, 1968, President Johnson signed Public Law 90-348 (H.R. 11308). The Law authorized appropriations for Fiscal Years 1969

and 1970: for the Arts Endowment, a total of \$12.5 million for programs and \$4.5 million for the State arts agencies. The bill also authorized funds to match both restricted and unrestricted donations in Fiscal 1969 and 1970 not to exceed a total for both Endowments of \$13.5 million for both years. (The total two-year authorization for the entire Foundation was \$47.5 million - a far cry from the \$135 million originally recommended by the House Committee on Education and Labor, but nevertheless an improvement over the House of Representatives' original \$11.2 million, plus gift funds, one-year authorization.) Of course, although the new Public Law authorized \$6 million for Arts programs and \$2 million for the States for Fiscal 1969, plus some portion of \$13.5 million to match donations, an appropriation still had to be obtained before the Council could know exactly what funds would be available for Fiscal 1969 programs.

On June 14, 1968, four days before Public Law 90-348 was signed, the Council met in New York for the 12th time. This meeting was to be the last for eight of its members whose terms would expire shortly, Messrs. Bernstein, Bliss, Kenin, Lawson, Pereira, Rodgers, Steinbeck, and Sweeney.

(In fact, this meeting was to the last for still another of its members: René d'Harnoncourt was struck and killed by an automobile on August 13, 1968, just six weeks after retiring as Director of the Museum of Modern Art. The Council members were to join citizens the world over in mourning the loss of this man whose outstanding contributions to the visual arts were exceeded only by the excellence of his person, noted in a New York Times tribute:

"René was humble. He was extraordinarily gentle, never irritable, and always kind. Indeed, I think his only fault was that he could never bring himself to hurt anyone...He had no peer.")⁵⁰

After preliminary discussions, the Council turned its attention to a project it had recommended at its 11th meeting: grants to 16 of the Nation's largest cities (Atlanta, Baltimore, Boston, Buffalo, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, Newark, New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco, St. Louis, and Washington, D.C.) to support inner city arts programs, in cooperation with the President's Council on Youth Opportunity, during the summer of 1968.

The Deputy Chairman, Mr. Cannon, reported on a conference which had taken place on May 8-9 in Racine, Wisconsin, concerning plans for this summer arts program. The representatives of the participating cities had agreed that assistance would be provided for projects of artistic quality, particularly for workshops which might discover and develop new talent and, hopefully, be of value in involving the arts on a permanent basis in these cities' ghetto programs as well as in other inner city programs being undertaken across the country. (The Wingspread conference, as well as a follow-up evaluatory meeting in October of 1968, were held through the courtesy of the Johnson Foundation which made these facilities available on both occasions to the participants involved in administering the inner city arts programs.)

Chairman Stevens then explained the problems which had developed concerning the financing of the project subsequent to the Council's 11th meeting. On April 9, 1968, letters had been sent to the Chairmen of the Senate and House Appropriations Subcommittees, requesting approval to use

program funds for the inner city projects. Having received approval from the House Subcommittee, and not having received any reply from the Senate Subcommittee, and therefore assuming that the Subcommittee did not disapprove the plan, Mr. Stevens had presented the program at the 11th meeting for a Council recommendation. Five weeks after the letter had been sent, and subsequent to the 11th meeting, a reply was received from the Senate Subcommittee objecting to the proposed use of the funds.

Mr. Stevens reminded the Council that because these financial difficulties had arisen, a benefit to raise the necessary funds for the program was to be held for the Endowment in New York City. The benefit, entitled "A Salute to H.R. 11308, As Amended," was subsequently held at the Pierre Hotel on June 26th; aided by the efforts of Mr. Stevens, all the costs of the benefit were covered: the program was designed and donated by artist Robert Indiana; the room and refreshments were paid for by a private foundation; and the entertainment was provided free of cost through the American Federation of Musicians. Thus, when the Endowment raised \$200,000 in private donations including the benefit, every dollar was available for matching by the Treasury fund, freeing \$400,000 for these programs. Each city in turn matched these funds on a two-for-one basis; thus, \$200,000 in Federal funds resulted in \$1.2 million being available for arts projects in the Nation's inner cities.

The Council then recommended grants to ten schools of architecture

and design for various environmental projects, including design internships, community design and training in ghetto areas, design in growing suburban communities, reclamation and design of strip-mined coal areas in Appalachia, and program development in environmental research. These grants reflected the continuing concern of the Council in developing prototypes of design which would be useful to other areas of the country, as demonstrated by previous recommendations to support studies into effective design techniques for the preservation of Hawaii's natural beauty and to develop plans for redesigning an old industrial river area in the Midwest.

Continuing its efforts to develop local activity, interest and sponsorship of arts activities, the Council launched a major program enabling a number of first-rate professional modern dance companies to undertake tours involving performances for at least three successive days in each of several locations in the Midwest, the Southeast, and New England. This Coordinated Residency Touring Program was initiated as a pilot project with an earlier grant enabling the Illinois Arts Council to develop a circuit for the presentation of four modern dance companies in six Illinois cities. As a result of the success of this initial effort, the Council action now enabled the Illinois circuit to expand to five additional States, and broadened the program through grants also to the Vermont Council on the Arts and the North Carolina Arts Council.

Thus, a total of ten major dance companies will perform 35 weeks

of dance in 12 States, lengthening their seasons and improving their touring conditions (no one-night stands), while providing dance-in-depth experience, through lecture-demonstrations and master classes as well as performances, to thousands of Americans previously without significant, or even any, exposure to the dance. Another project with similar goals, initiated with a study grant to develop a college residency circuit, was implemented at this meeting with a grant enabling the City Center Joffrey Ballet to tour to campuses in six States across the country.

The implications of both the above programs seem clear: greatly widened artistic activity nationally, growing local, State, and regional cooperation and involvement, and increased possibilities for other art forms to utilize the circuits developed through these projects or new circuits which might be better suited to their own particular needs.

At this meeting, the Council embarked upon various new areas of support. Taking its cue from President Johnson's message at the signing of the Foundation Act in September of 1965,⁵¹ where he urged that artists be brought to American campuses, the Council recommended support of Affiliate Artists, Inc. to develop a program of partnership between colleges and universities and performing artists; an institution would engage the services of an artist as an "affiliate" over a three-year period, exposing students to the creative process while allowing the artist the flexibility necessary to his creativity.

The Council also recommended another new pilot project enabling the Jackson Mississippi Folk Art Festival, during the summer of 1968, to establish nine-week workshops in a variety of art forms and a number of categories, including the American Negro and American Indian folk cultures in Mississippi.

In its efforts to encourage the participation of youth in the national cultural development, the Council recommended a grant enabling Young Audiences, Inc. to foster the growth of future audiences through special techniques designed to stimulate interest in the arts among elementary and pre-school children. The Council also recommended support for The Forum theater of The Repertory Theater of Lincoln Center which, along with enabling The Forum to continue its policy of making free tickets available to young people, would assist new performing and directing talent and the production of new plays.

At the Council's first meeting in April of 1965, members of the Literature Group had recommended supporting projects which would blend together more than one art form. The first recommendation for assistance to a mixed-media project involving literature was made at this meeting: a pilot program enabling the Washington Gallery of Modern Art to develop, sponsor and present an exhibit of the collected paintings, graphics, illuminated poetic statements and "painted books" of distinguished American poet Kenneth Patchen. This project, originally scheduled for the fall of 1968, has been delayed due to the merger, now taking place, of the Washington Gallery

of Modern Art with The Corcoran Gallery of Art.

Following a most persuasive statement by Mr. d'Harnoncourt on the growing necessity of developing a partnership between the artist and the technologist, the Council recommended a grant to Experiments in Art and Technology, Inc. (E.A.T.) of New York City. It hoped that its support for this new organization and its approach to inter-media experimentation would stimulate private interest and assistance, and would focus national attention on the importance of this union of art and science. In addition, the Council recommended a grant to television station KQED, San Francisco, for the production, and eventual distribution by the National Educational Television Network, of a film about Ghirardelli Square in San Francisco and the potentialities of urban living, combining the talents of a dancer-choreographer, a composer and a filmmaker. A second grant was also recommended to Hunter College of New York in further support of its "New Image of Sound" concert series, encouraging inter-media cooperation and expanding the audience for contemporary music.

The Council then recommended a grant for a National Educational Television American Regional Theatre program: an inter-media project involving the filming, and subsequent national distribution, of four full-length plays in the current repertory of four outstanding regional theatres, thereby highlighting the work of young, contemporary American playwrights as well as leading American regional theatres. In line with its concern for theatre development throughout the country, the

Council recommended assistance to the Eugene O'Neill Memorial Theater Foundation, Inc. to sponsor a Regional Theatre Directors project which would expose directors from around the Nation to new plays and playwrights and new trends in the theatre.

In an effort to strengthen communications between the American theatre and theatre abroad, as it had done for literature with its support for a permanent American P.E.N. organization, the Council recommended a grant to the U.S. Centre, International Theatre Institute for the operation and expansion of a permanent organization which would serve the international theatre community through theatre publications, international conferences and exchanges of information and theatre experts.

One week following the Council meeting, on June 21, 1968, a groundbreaking ceremony was held by Westbeth, the non-profit Corporation established to administer the renovation into artists' housing of the former Bell Telephone Laboratories building in New York City. Those speaking at this culturally historic event included Mr. Stevens, Miss Kizer, Jacob M. Kaplan, President of The J. M. Kaplan Fund, Secretary Weaver and Mayor Lindsay. In an article on the project, Emily Genauer, journalist for the New York Post, wrote:

"The most imaginative, unconventional and in some respects controversial of the many projects instigated by the National Council on the Arts to assist creative artists in all fields, at this point looks as if it could turn out to be the most successful...Artists will benefit from such a program, of course... But there isn't a city in the country where the physical and spiritual life of the rest of its citizens cannot help but be improved through the salvaging of sturdy, unused buildings for artists' housing...."⁵²

On July 26, 1968, President Johnson signed Public Law 90-425, appropriating to the Arts Endowment for Fiscal 1969 a total of \$5.4 million (\$3.7 for programs, \$1.7 for the States) plus some portion of \$1 million to match donations. It is interesting to look back from this \$5.4 million appropriation to the \$32.5 million originally recommended as the Arts Endowment's Fiscal 1969 authorization by the House Committee on Education and Labor when it reported out its ill-fated H.R. 11308. Several months after the Committee made this recommendation, the Bureau of the Budget cut this \$32.5 million to \$10.05 million in its annual budget request submitted in January of 1968. When the new authorizing legislation finally passed, it further reduced the amount to \$8 million plus some portion of \$13.5 million to match donations. This downward trend in the fortunes of the Arts Endowment continued, and, indeed, resulted in the \$5.4-plus-some-portion-of-\$1 million finally available for Fiscal 1969. The agency could only conclude for the future that it had nowhere to go but up.

On September 11, 1968, the White House announced that President Johnson had appointed eight new members to six-year terms on the National Council on the Arts, Miss Jean Dalrymple and the Messrs. Duke Ellington, O'Neil Ford, Richard Hunt, Robert Merrill, Gregory Peck, Rudolf Serkin and Edward Villella. At the time this history was written, the 13th meeting of the National Council on the Arts was scheduled for November 21-22, 1968.

The National Endowment for the Arts is utilizing this hopefully limited period of restricted funds in a number of constructive ways:

efforts to involve the private sector, which have already resulted in new resources too numerous to list, are continuing and expanding; Council members, panelists, and Endowment staff are engaged in evaluating the past and planning for the future; and a series of regional meetings currently being held across the country is resulting in increasing cooperation and communication between the State arts agencies and the Endowment.

Now in October of 1968, the National Council on the Arts and the National Endowment for the Arts look back on three years of extremely fruitful activity with deep satisfaction, and look to the future with a growing sense of excitement and urgency: there is so much to be done - the United States is clearly in a times of great artistic ferment and activity - and the needs grow as the days pass.

History has borne eloquent witness to the fact that "the achievements of art are an index of the greatness of a civilization,"⁵³ and all of those concerned with this new national involvement in the arts are indeed convinced that history will judge this Nation more kindly if, while directing its attention to material concerns, it continues and strengthens its commitment to deepen the understanding and enrich the minds and spirits of its people.

F O O T N O T E S

FOOTNOTES

- ¹The Washington Daily News, November 10, 1967.
- ²Art and Government, Report to the President; submitted by The Commission of Fine Arts, May 15, 1953.
- ³88th Congress, 1st Session, Document No. 28: The Arts and the National Government, Report to the President; submitted by August Heckscher, Special Consultant on the Arts, May 28, 1963, p. 3.
- ⁴Ibid.
- ⁵Report of The Commission on the Humanities, 1964; Library of Congress Catalogue Card No. 64:22353.
- ⁶From a letter by author William Goyen to Mr. Roger L. Stevens, Special Assistant to the President on the Arts, The White House, Washington, D.C., dated January 24, 1965.
- ⁷National Arts and Humanities Foundations Hearings. Joint Hearings before both Special Subcommittees: February 23 and March 3, 1965; Hearings before the House Special Subcommittee on Labor: February 24 and March 22-24, 1965; Hearings before the Senate Special Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities: March 4 and 5, 1965. Printed for the use of the House Committee on Education and Labor and the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.
- ⁸89th Congress, 1st Session, House of Representatives, Report No. 618, July 14, 1965.
- ⁹For further information on Congressional leaders involved in the evolution of the legislation see either S. Rept. 300 or H. Rept. 618, 89th Congress, 1st Session.
- ¹⁰Congressional Record, Proceedings and Debates of the 89th Congress, 1st Session, September 15, 1965, Vol. 111, No. 170, pp. 23078-23124.

Footnotes...2

- 11 From Council resolution on panels, Minutes of the Third Meeting of the National Council on the Arts, Tarrytown, New York, November 13-15, 1965, p. 7.
- 12 The New York Herald Tribune, February 13, 1966.
- 13 From Associated Press article entitled "Uncle Sam Is the Biggest Angel," as it appeared in the Washington (D.C.) Star, September 18, 1966.
- 14 The New Orleans States-Item, November 15, 1967.
- 15 The New York Times, "Dance: Dangers Defied," March 16, 1967.
- 16 The Saturday Review, "Endowing the Arts," August 12, 1967.
- 17 Life, "Hi, Poet - Say Us A Poem!", September 6, 1968.
- 18 Tribune (Great Falls, Montana), article by Maribeth Dwyer, February 26, 1967.
- 19 Dance Magazine, "May I? Yes, You May," by editor-in-chief Lydia Joel, August, 1967.
- 20 The Chicago Tribune, September 18, 1966.
- 21 Rockefeller Panel Report. The Performing Arts: Problems and Prospects, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965.
- 22 From an Address, entitled "The Challenge and The Responsibility," given by David Rockefeller at the Inaugural Meeting of the Business Committee for the Arts, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City, January 22, 1968.
- 23 Art News, February, 1967.

Footnotes...3

²⁴Variety (New York), September 13, 1967.

²⁵Springfield News (Massachusetts), August 31, 1966.

²⁶From Remarks of the President at the Signing of the Arts and Humanities Bill, September 29, 1965.

²⁷From Statement by McGeorge Bundy, President of the Ford Foundation, Upon Announcement of the Formation of the American Film Institute, June 5, 1967.

²⁸From Statement by Jack Valenti, President of the Motion Picture Association of America, June 5, 1967.

²⁹From Statement by Roger L. Stevens, Chairman of the National Council on the Arts, at the American Film Institute Press Luncheon, Washington, D.C., June 5, 1967.

³⁰From Remarks of George Stevens, Jr., on His Appointment as Director of the American Film Institute, June 5, 1967.

³¹Ibid.

³²From Statement by The Honorable Robert C. Weaver, Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, August 7, 1967.

³³From Statement by Senator Robert F. Kennedy, August 7, 1967.

³⁴Variety (New York), "Republican Raps at Theatre Fund Hit Own Friends," February 28, 1968.

³⁵The News (Logan, Ohio), "Miller Raps Grant To Aid Show 'Biz'," February 19, 1968.

³⁶The State Journal (Lansing, Michigan), "Economy Computer Would Be Big Help," February 15, 1968.

Footnotes...4

- ³⁷ Baumol, William J. and William G. Bowen, Performing Arts: The Economic Dilemma, New York, The Twentieth Century Fund, 1966.
- ³⁸ The Plain Dealer (Cleveland, Ohio), article by Mary Jo Warth, October 8, 1967.
- ³⁹ The Milwaukee Journal, November 25, 1967.
- ⁴⁰ Congressional Record, Proceedings and Debates of the 90th Congress, 2nd Session, February 27, 1968, Vol. 114, No. 29, pp. H 1400-1438.
- ⁴¹ Ibid., p. H 1433.
- ⁴² Ibid., p. H 1432.
- ⁴³ Ibid., p. H 1432.
- ⁴⁴ Ibid., p. H 1431.
- ⁴⁵ Ibid., p. H 1434.
- ⁴⁶ From Council resolution on individual grants, Minutes of the 11th Meeting of the National Council on the Arts, Tarrytown, New York, April 19-21, 1968, p. 41.
- ⁴⁷ Fremont News Register (California), editorial entitled "Inspiring Development," June 19, 1967.
- ⁴⁸ The New York Times, Books of The Times, "Angel Hair, Partisan Review Et Al," by Nona Balakian, June 26, 1968.
- ⁴⁹ The Chicago Sun-Times, "When Art Museum Has Growing Pains," by Harold Haydon, June 23, 1968.
- ⁵⁰ The New York Times, "René D'Harnoncourt: 1901-1968," by William S. Lieberman, August 25, 1968.

Footnotes...5

⁵¹From Remarks of the President at the Signing of the Arts and Humanities Bill, September 29, 1965.

⁵²The New York Post, "The Studio Complex," by Emily Genauer, June 29, 1968.

⁵³From Statement in the Democratic Platform for 1964, "One Nation, One People."

On A-7
~~11~~ CRP