

THE MUSEUM OF MODERN ART

11 WEST 53 STREET, NEW YORK 19, N. Y.

TELEPHONE: CIRCLE 5-8900

No. 52

FOR RELEASE:

Friday, April 26, 1963

109

500 ART EDUCATORS AT CONFERENCE AT MUSEUM OF MODERN ART

More than 500 leaders in art education in the United States and Canada are expected to attend the 21st Annual Conference of the Committee on Art Education, sponsored by the Museum of Modern Art, April 30 through May 4. The theme of the Conference is ART EDUCATION AND THE HUMAN SPIRIT.

The major addresses will be given by Dr. George D. Stoddard, Chancellor and Executive Vice President of New York University, who will speak on "Art As The Measure of Man" (Saturday, May 4); John H. MacFadyen, Executive Director, New York State Council on the Arts, who will speak on "Government in the Arts" (Friday, May 3); and Otto Wittmann, Director of the Toledo Museum of Art, Toledo, Ohio, who will speak on "The Role of the Museum in Art Education" (Tuesday, April 30).

Among the subjects to be explored in the 35 sessions are "The Museum and Television" (Wednesday, April 30) and "Recent Developments in Audio-Visual Instruction" (Saturday, May 4).

Commenting on the theme of this year's Conference, ART EDUCATION AND THE HUMAN SPIRIT, Victor D'Amico, Director of Education at the Museum of Modern Art said "Art has always served the spiritual needs of man, but today, perhaps more than ever before, the knowledge and enjoyment of the arts are needed to offset a growing mechanization and specialization. The major object of creative teaching in art education today is to initiate in all people a respect for the individual and an understanding of the human spirit."

This year for the first time, the first day of the Conference will be called "Museum Day," set aside especially to explore the expanding role of museums in art education for children and adults, and teachers.

The Committee on Art Education was founded in 1942 by Victor D'Amico; Robert Iglehart, Professor of Art, University of Michigan; and Arthur R. Young, Director of Art Education, Professor Emeritus, Teachers' College, Columbia University, for the purpose of exchanging ideas on the teaching of art from pre-school through graduate level. The Committee consists of about 1,000 professors, board of education art directors, high school and elementary school art teachers representing the United States and Canada.

Additional information available from Marcia Rubinoff, Publicity Department, Museum of Modern Art, 11 West 53 Street, New York 19, N. Y. CI 5-8900.

Philadelphia Inquirer
.....
Bulletin

Arthur Young - 420 W. 118 St.
NY 27, NY

THE MUSEUM OF MODERN ART

11 WEST 53 STREET, NEW YORK 19, N. Y.

TELEPHONE: CIRCLE 5-8900

SPECIAL TO PHILADELPHIA PAPERS

714
FOR RELEASE:
Friday, April 26, 1963

ARTHUR YOUNG TO PARTICIPATE IN CONFERENCE AT MUSEUM OF MODERN ART

Arthur R. Young, Director of Art Education, Philadelphia Museum College of Education, will be among the leaders in art education from the United States and Canada attending the 21st Annual Conference of the Committee on Art Education, sponsored by the Museum of Modern Art in New York City, April 30 through May 4. Mr. Young, one of the founders of the Committee in 1942, will lead the sessions on "Art Education -- A Spiritual Frontier" (Wednesday, May 1) and "Government In the Arts" (Friday, May 3). In addition to his responsibilities at the Philadelphia Museum College of Education, Mr. Young is Professor Emeritus, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Other Philadelphians participating in the Conference are: E.M. Benson, Dean, Philadelphia Museum College of Art; Jack Bookbinder, Director, Division of Art Education for the Public Schools of Philadelphia; and Robert Goldman, Assistant to Mr. Bookbinder.

Major speakers at the Conference will include: John H. MacFadyen, Executive Director, New York State Council on the Arts, who will speak on "Government in the Arts" (Friday, May 3), Dr. George Stoddard, Chancellor and Executive Vice President of New York University, who will speak on "Art As The Measure of Man" (Saturday, May 4), and Otto Wittmann, Director of the Toledo Museum of Art, Toledo, Ohio, who will speak on "The Role of the Museum in Art Education" (Tuesday, April 30).

Commenting on the theme of this year's Conference, ART EDUCATION AND THE HUMAN SPIRIT, Victor D'Amico, Director of Education at the Museum of Modern Art, said, "Art has always served the spiritual needs of man, but today, perhaps more than ever before, the knowledge and enjoyment of the arts are needed to offset a growing mechanization and specialization. The major object of creative teaching in art education today is to initiate in all people a respect for the individual and an understanding of the human spirit".

This year, for the first time, the first day of the Conference will be called "Museum Day" and will be especially devoted to explore the expanding role of museums in art education

Museum of Modern Art
May 4, 1963

Art As the Measure of Man

George D. Stoddard

New York University

Since I feel at home in the field of education--and nowhere else--
I should like to start from there.

In my book the aim of education is life fulfillment through learning and the creative process. Education is ongoing. We may judge its effectiveness by its results but its results are more than objects; they are conceptual. Under the right conditions, this process of insight-into-action leads to a work of art. If this is to happen, one necessary ingredient is talent and another is skill, but the truly rare factor is intellect. Through it all, we perceive a high degree of intensity and perseverance--of dedication, if you will. The artist or any other creative person produces something. He thinks things through, albeit speedily and with emotion. And then he works things through, for if he does not, he remains a dreamer, an escapist, a dilettante.

Every creative effort and every end-product is, like each individual person, unique. After a time, not even identical twins are alike; each one weaves into his personality and experience something new and different. So it is with true artists under the same teacher, the same ground rules, and the same cultural conditions--the sameness is superficial. If the artist fails to get away from his teacher or his school, he is forever imitative and inferior; if his view of the world does not contain something peculiar to him alone, he might better take up bookkeeping or bricklaying.

116

Of course with students, we need not fear; variety is the sign of life. The work may be creative and pleasant, but it takes enormous discipline to develop something that is not only original but also good. And to be good in any educational or artistic endeavor means to evoke thought and emotion in others. Thus the actor must express emotions in ways that communicate more than the real experience; his whisper of dismay must be heard and reacted to a long way off. Thus the writer has to get inside the minds of his characters--whether they be dogs, apes, or men--and he must be allowed to roam at will, in utter defiance of space, time, or common sense. Similarly the graphic artist keeps trying to penetrate all his worlds, possible or impossible, replacing conventional abstractions by wilder ones. Perhaps, if we become too familiar with the work of the "abstractionists" in form and color, they will turn back to stir us with more traditional abstractions.

In any case we should not lose sight of the fact that all art is based on illusion, abstraction, and the exercise of intelligence. Not long ago, speaking of creativity in education, I said (from H. H. Anderson (ed.), Creativity and Its Cultivation, Harper, New York, 1959):

"We should not overemphasize the technique of vision. We cannot think with the eyes, and we may think without them. Vision brings in the data, the raw materials, and the cues that guide our steps. The eye is an invaluable sense organ, a true part of the brain through its optic nerve, but the frontal lobes preside over the problems created and they are not to be denied. The artist is a man seeing and thinking--

117

both at once; his cunning is in his brain. It is not enough for him to experience beauty or love or hate; he must get it down on something at least two-dimensional. The artist is uncommon because speech is common. If man had kept to visual patterns and had not developed speech except in a gifted few, speech might have become the main vehicle of artistic endeavor. If everybody talked by drawing, and only a few by speaking, we would regard every manifestation of speech as a work of art--good, bad, or unintelligible. In fact, primitive Norsemen did regard writing as a form of magic and therefore, reprehensible. Talking has made babblers of us all, so that only the low idiots lack the gift to some degree. For us the difference between speech and graphic art is that in art few try. The painting, unless it carries the impact of a blinker sign, is regarded as tough reading with no reader's guide." (pp. 193-4)

"The artist seeks the meaning that is lost in the casual. If he achieves it for himself, he still cannot achieve it for us, but only offer us a better basis for finding the meaning than we might otherwise discover. He works hard at the task. He extracts, selects, arranges, does what we have little time or talent to do. Admittedly, if he fails to communicate, the failure may be in us. It

is wrong to hold, however, that the failure is always in us--the observers--for to do so would make painting as empty as a crystal ball. The archaic picture on the cave wall meant something that needed no reference to words to make it a passion to its creator fresh from the hunt. He saw; he felt. He transmitted, sometimes with wonderfully accurate drawing, the essence of the experience. Such works, devoid of borrowing from a culture pattern, are close to the heart of creativity." (p. 194)

Since art portrays ideas, the student's approach to it must be intellectual. If he creates something, the thing may be only two-dimensional--as in photography or a play of light to form designs and colors--or essentially two-dimensional as in drawing or painting. In the plastic arts, architecture, and the performing arts, we utilize three dimensions, but they, too, may be reducible to two dimensions as subject matter for drawings and paintings. But the creative concept itself is as nondimensional as thought, for the very good reason that it is thought. The concept itself is not a work of art; it has to be represented in a form communicable to others, that is, as designs, words, or actions.

It follows that no measure of artistic merit can be directly derived from its adherence to realism, naturalism, impressionism, abstractionism, or the like; they all embody abstract ideas. If some forms are imitative of real objects--let us say, prosaic photographs of prosaic objects, the photographs are nonetheless abstract. If a garbage heap is reduced to the size of a postage stamp, what is real about the representation? Since such a photograph probably is not art, the criteria of what is aesthetically good and what is cheap or bad must be found elsewhere.

Art is indeed a language, a form of communication, but if we are to bring it home to the classroom, the studio, or the exhibit, we must differentiate it from other mental activities. John Dewey, looking at the question as a psychologist and philosopher, said thirty years ago (John Dewey, Art As Experience, G. P. Putnam's & Sons, New York, 1934, 1958):

"Expression strikes below the barriers that separate human beings from one another. Since art is the most universal form of language, since it is constituted, even apart from literature, by the common qualities of the public world, it is the most universal and freest form of communication. Every intense experience of friendship and affection completes itself artistically. The sense of communion generated by a work of art may take on a definitely religious quality. The union of men with one another is the source of the rites that from the time of archaic man to the present have commemorated the crises of birth, death, and marriage. Art is the extension of the power of rites and ceremonies to unite men, through a shared celebration, to all incidents and scenes of life. This office is the reward and seal of art. That art weds man and nature is a familiar fact. Art also renders men aware of their union with one another in origin and destiny." (pp. 270-271)

"Rite and ceremony as well as legend bound the living and the dead in a common partnership. They were esthetic but they were more than esthetic. The rites of mourning expressed more than grief; the war and harvest dance were

120

more than a gathering of energy for tasks to be performed; magic was more than a way of commanding forces of nature to do the bidding of man; feasts were more than a satisfaction of hunger. Each of these communal modes of activity united the practical, the social, and the educative in an integrated whole having esthetic form. They introduced social values into experience in the way that was most impressive. They connected things that were overtly important and overtly done with the substantial life of the community. Art was in them, for these activities conformed to the needs and conditions of the most intense, most readily grasped and longest remembered experience." (pp. 327-328)

Such a view is scarcely consistent with any artificial imposition of art training from above or from without. If the student cannot escape his environment, he can, at least, be encouraged to get his sense of direction from within. Along this line Conant and Randall (Howard Conant and Arne Randall, Art in Education, Chas. A. Bennett, Peoria, Ill., 1959) quote Victor d'Amico as follows:

"The great value of creative experience is that it provides for and develops personal integration, because the child selects his own motivation and expresses himself in terms of his own needs and aptitudes. The sensitive art teacher guides the child into experience most suited to his ability and most satisfying to his individual concepts, at a rate of learning natural to him. The

17

curriculum approach is apt to destroy personal integration because the motivation comes from subject matter, such as social studies or science, allowing little expression for emotional needs or creative concepts." (p. 290)

They also quote Viktor Lowenfeld, as follows:

"Teachers often think if history is illustrated, or interpreted in the art lesson, integration of two subject matters takes place. This is by no means true. In such a superficial situation, neither history is explained, nor does a creative experience become meaningful. . . . Integration does not occur from the outside; integration is not 'made' by 'assembling' two subjects; integration happens from within. That says clearly that integration can only take place by self-identification. The integrated art experiences of the settlers who landed on our shores will, therefore, be different for each individual, according to the type of self-identification which takes place in each individual." (pp. 291-292)

Since a student will appreciate a work of art in terms of its power to evoke in him some new response, it is a task of the teacher to aid in this process. Perhaps that is why many works of art carry a name or title. They carry it as a symbolic reference to something the artist and the viewer intellectually share in another context. Untitled, or with the title withheld, there has to be some element that permits communication. Thus Michelangelo's

David carries a special connotation that means little to modern youth. Untitled but displayed as a nude, handsome young man it would doubtless be equally admired. Similarly for the ancient gods and goddesses whose names and addresses are lost upon the present generation of students. Today, a place name, a classical or Biblical reference, may or may not enhance the appeal; it may lead only to puzzlement. Of the tens of thousands of persons who recently viewed Rembrandt's Aristotle Contemplating a Bust of Homer, how many knew anything about the poet, the philosopher, or, for that matter, the painter? Mona Lisa smiles as a woman, whether in Italy, France, or the United States; it leads few persons to restudy the Renaissance. Cezanne's "Uncle" is anybody's hard-bitten relative.

In these examples, we get an intensive communication that could be enhanced by history and biography. For the teacher and the student we could get much more. We could show what has to be the nature of the talent, the technique, the striving--often the anguish--to produce such lasting effects. Never again should the informed student underplay either the achievement or the significance of great art in any form in any age. He will measure the distance between himself and the master; once in a million times, it may not be too great. The good teacher knows this and he has something for each student--an example in art beyond one's capacity to equal it, but quite within the range of enjoyment and inspiration of countless students and adults who will take the trouble to observe, to compare, to understand. So it is with music, drama, and literature.

Howard Conant goes so far as to place this experience at the core of art education. He says (Art Education Bulletin, May, 1960):

123

"The primary function of art education is to develop consumer taste--a working knowledge of art--in people of all ages who are now suffering from acute aesthetic anemia. There must be vastly increased attention to the aesthetic needs of boys and girls in elementary and secondary schools. Beginning in the primary grade, children should develop familiarity with important examples of the arts. The finest, most natural, and clearly the most effective way to do this is to place important, original painting, sculpture, and craft objects in school classrooms and corridors." (p. 8)

Conant's reference is to all art forms--graphic and plastic works, craft objects, textiles and industrial designs. The masters can be represented by first-rate reproductions. Such works are not just to be glimpsed, but studied and understood--woven into one's visual, intellectual, and emotional experience.

Some educational misconceptions may arise from a failure to realize that art is nonscientific. Its so-called formulas are inexact; they are not stated as equations, problems, or laws. Also art is nonstatistical; what counts is the individual artist and a particular product. Nonobjective art is not an abstraction in any algebraic or geometric sense. In science to express in symbols or drawings is inevitably only to illustrate. Except in the mind's eye there is no such thing as a triangle; it has shape and nothing but shape--no size, no color, no texture, no implicit significance. Likewise the uniquely valuable concept of zero in mathematics has no counterpart in art; it does not imply negation or emptiness, and certainly not a reduction to absurdity.

124

The ancient Greeks had need of science and technology in a world dominated by the arts and philosophy. Aristotle showed the way, but for two thousand years he was not followed. We cannot now go back to prescientific days, but the plain truth is not that science will fail to advance but that henceforth the human race may have relatively small need of such advances. True, there are a few diseases yet to be conquered, but they are outnumbered, a hundred to one, by medical services we now know how to render, but do not. Ill health, disease, and death are concomitants of practices known without any further technical advances to be faulty but deeply ingrained in personal choice and the social structure. In the midst of an extraordinary sophistication in the application of science, we remain fearful and frustrated in the realms of personality, politics, and social welfare.

What has this to do with art? Well, if art is to be taken as a measure of man, we need a better understanding of the human being and the human condition. We cannot truthfully assert, as a perverse religious sentiment, that all is disease and disrepair, but we can say with conviction that the whole world may be moving fast toward a total destruction, not only of the amenities of life, but of life itself.

Except through art, no man is immortal. History records; it enlarges and embellishes its subject matter of men and events. History plays up and it plays down, but the end result is diminution and dismissal unless art intervenes. Every conquest, to survive and remain meaningful, must be measured in the quality of the art it engenders, whether the times be those of the Egyptians, the Assyrians, the Greeks, or the Romans, or the fifteen centuries since. Every dogma, discovery, or political reform, in fact, every scientific advance gets accounted for in terms of its meaning, and

125

its meaning inevitably finds expression in the literary, visual, and performing arts. But that is not the whole range of art in civilization. While it is unlikely that art precedes the event, the insight, or the achievement, it certainly does accompany aspiration and pave the way to new advances. The heroes and saints of one age, through art, are able to inspire new generations.

It follows that to respond intelligently to the power of art to arouse us is to achieve a new dimension in the understanding of history, religion, and social structure. The only way we can transcend the dying person which is every man, is to make of him, and of all like him, a myth, and this is done invariably through art. The historical existence or character of the person is, in fact, irrelevant. Of the past, we know only the art-created man. If, like Zeus, or Mars, or Hamlet, or Mephistopheles, he did not exist at all, it matters little. Masters in the arts of language, visual form, and movement will create him and maintain him in our thoughts and dreams like one of us.

The arts of man may well outlive the human race that produced them, yielding a future on this earth somewhat like its archaic past--a world without land animals. But with a difference! Some inanimate products of man's short period of natural dominance will survive the effects of fire, blast, and poison. Uncomprehending vegetation will grow in the shadow of the pyramids, the great dams, and the enduring rubble of cities. Fish may crawl out of the sea on their stubby, finny legs to start again the endless cycle. After all, even the fish will know as much about their new environment and its left-over fragments as man himself knew about his environment only 100,000 years ago. And we know so little now! Only enough to sense our weakness,

our impotence, our utter insignificance on any scale of cosmic events. Only enough to realize that if life is to be worth living, it must be so in terms of a constant search for truth, beauty, and humanity, each attribute affected by the other and no one, taken alone, sufficient for the peace of mind of modern man.

Art is a form of truth, and truth of many sorts is revealed in and through art. Thus, if I may be more practical, science, with its handmaiden, technology, is essential as a shield against hunger, disease, slavery, and superstition, and as a structural form for social progress. Art, on the other hand, is essential if we are to keep above the other animals and in control of the animal drives within us. Art is a measure of what we most want to record, to preserve, to hand down in an alternating current of humility and pride. I have indicated that art involves an illusion, namely, that the transformation of what the sense organs bring us and the brain electrically integrates is a greater reality than any immediate psychological sensation. We seek and cling to the personification. We are so constructed physically, so conditioned psychologically, and so organized socially as to be compelled to interweave fact and fancy, object and dream-object, experience and hope. We can no more go back to atomistic responses than the body itself can to its chemical and physical ingredients.

In the triad referred to above, humanity--a term signifying love and brotherhood and justice--seems to hold the highest place. This makes sense to me, but it should not be construed to mean that science and art are subservient in any vulgar way. Quite the reverse! Science stands on its own feet; it needs no help at all from art. In fact, if art teachers stretch

127

themselves in order to aid science, the result may be useless to the scientist and humiliating to the artist. The engine, the dynamo, and the airplane may be beautiful objects, but that, if I may say so, is not their object; they represent neither science nor art, as such. Of course, scientific formulations and discoveries lie back of each design, but science stopped there--stopped with the problem, the process, the solution. Dressed up, the machine becomes a ship, a plane, an automobile, and now there is scope for the object to become not only an end-point in the application of scientific principles but a starting point for creative artistic ventures. The ship as a three-dimensional functioning object may be intrinsically beautiful; it may meet the criteria of a work of art. On the other hand, it may be functional and at the same time ugly--by its nature, or perhaps by the indifference of its designer. It is simply an accident that some mechanical forms strike us as beautiful; we like to think of beauty as an attribute of function. In the object or life form itself this does not follow. The solar-powered space vehicle with its great wing flaps is an ugly thing and so is the hyena or the balloon fish. Who is to say that the space contraption is less efficient than the graceful jet liner or the knobby swalling fish inferior to the trout? I suppose the Australian jackrabbit is not as graceful, and therefore not as beautiful, as the common American deer. Nature and science, after all, may get results in ways not aesthetically pleasing to the human taste. When the world of nature does manifest itself in beautiful shapes, colors, and movements, there is no doubt that the botanist, the marine biologist, and the astronomer, among others, are delighted by the convergence.

It is easy to be misunderstood at this point. Ugliness anywhere may become a thing of beauty, or in any event something to hold us and lift us up, through the magic touch of the artist in any medium. In a harsh and bitter world, we cannot shut our eyes to disappointment and danger. Does

128

not all great art, however beautiful its forms, reveal the ephemeral nature of the individual or the tendency to self-destruction of the human race? In all history, are there any examples of courage, nobility, and self-sacrifice, without the counterpart forces of cowardice, cruelty, and lust for power? Art may reveal all sides of every question, but not as a means of resolving the issues. It can help us to remember, to understand, to take action, but it will do so only by clinging to its own standards and its unique freedom. Political art, poster art, "cheesecake" art, are self-defeating, as art forms, however successful they may be otherwise. They are likely to proclaim an untruth as truth, a tyrant as a friend of the people, and ugly social situations as a gift from heaven.

As we place humanity at the top of the social structure, the paradox is that we allot to both science and art the wonderful twin gifts of freedom and responsibility, confident that only by so doing can we preserve the highest values of the whole man.

As an outsider looking in, I have been especially intrigued by some statements of Peter Fingesten. He writes (The Art Journal, Fall, 1961, XXI, 1):

"We know that Kandinsky and Mondrian derived their theoretical background from Theosophy; mandalas may have given them certain formal elements. Since Mondrian indicated in his early Notebooks that he believed in meditation practices it is more than likely that he was familiar with these mystic diagrams of oriental religions. A mandala is a magic circle or square (or a square within a circle) drawn on paper or on the ground,

129

or made of butter, rice and other materials. It is an abstract pattern upon which the devotee, monk or yogin meditates, for the center of the mandala is believed to be the seat of a deity. During meditation these mandalas become charged with immense power and the deity appears before the mental eye of the devotee. He identifies with it and often imagines that he himself is the god to whose perfection he aspires. Mandalas are also used in magic by lamas to acquire superhuman powers, or siddhis. Such mandalas have been used in the East since time immemorial and are evidence of the oriental antecedence of the theory that abstract patterns are charged with energy or spiritual forces. Certain remarks by Kandinsky confirm his belief in the latent spiritual powers of geometric designs. . . . The severe grid system of Mondrian's style profoundly affected international architecture, interior decoration, commercial art, typography and other fields of creative endeavor. Kandinsky, on the other hand, freed the artist's subconscious and substantially altered the history of painting towards a direct translation of the artist's intuition of the inner forces of nature. We are today surrounded by symbols of the equivalence of spirit and matter. But this is exactly what was desired by these artists for whom art was an implement in the evolution of man towards a greater awareness of the world of the spirit. . . . The founders of the non-objective styles

of art either identified with mystical movements or thought in terms of extreme subjective realism, aesthetically as well as philosophically. . . . Zen Buddhism has the same significance for the younger American abstract expressionists that Theosophy had for the founders." (p. 4)

Being neither artist nor art critic, but only a former psychologist, I cannot vouch for the accuracy or authority of this statement. Still, since it appeared in a recent issue of The Art Journal, let us assume that it represents a substantial body of opinion in the world of art.

We must admit that most men are no longer moved by the dry-bones rattling of theology. Western peoples, except as a kind of sentimental fringe benefit, do not expect to purify their souls by renouncing the world. Frequently, they do all too good a job of escaping from reality, but they wind up not in retreats or sacred resorts, but in sick wards and sanitariums.

For us, it follows that if Kandinsky and his followers were theosophists and painted accordingly, their inspiration, like their style, is an oriental importation of limited significance in Western cultures. Devoid of even these esoteric roots, the imitators of such a style would be expected to deteriorate. I do not, of course, refer to nonsymbolic designs that give us pleasure and serve to enliven the arts of decoration. I refer only to the futile attempts of observers either to read meaning into symbols of which they are ignorant or to impose symbols upon a nonsymbolic treatment of subject matter.

Of such painting, Fingesten says:

"No verbal gymnastics will make its mysteries more comprehensible precisely because one symbolism cannot be substituted for another." (p. 6)

And again, he says:

"Non-objective art has broken through the process of symbolization itself. . . (its) formal referents are not symbols in the traditional sense, evoking something outside of themselves, but . . . simply are without denotative content altogether." (p. 5)

What does it all come down to? Let us assume that the founders of nonobjective art were deeply moved by symbols which for them, as for millions of oriental devotees, carried the deepest significance. In this respect, their work is akin to the great mass of art from antiquity to our day, for that, too, has been based on religious myths, rites, and symbolic figures. The enduring works of art, pagan or Judeo-Christian, certainly carried a powerful message. They denoted persons and events that were infinitely precious, and they were capable of evoking the full range of human emotions. By such symbols, aesthetic or not, men lived and died, or perhaps concentrated on the destruction of others. For East and West those days are indeed over. Religious zeal, like religious movements, nowhere in the world causes one-tenth the stir set up by slight seismic movements in economic, political, or military affairs. We still know what we live by and it is still faith, but it is faith in the ultimate decency of the human race and in our ability to preserve it through effective social structures.

One further statement from Fingesten:

"The mature paintings of Kandinsky, Mondrian, or Pollock remind one of nothing ever seen in this world." (p. 5)

This could be said with equal relevance of some designs and paintings of ancient times. Angels, dragons, and devils obviously do remind us of things of this world, but calligraphy, geometry, and architecture long ago got away from forms generally found in nature. Parts were recombined to form new and original wholes. More recently, the microscope and the telescope have revealed forms and designs of such infinite variety as to make one cautious about ruling anything out of nature's creations. But we need not look through a glass to observe that absolutely everything in the works of these artists--and much more besides--is indeed found in nature. Some of it, like Mondrian's, is structured and serene, but more of it is fractured, disjointed, or disorganized. Diseases, wounds, and breakages regularly afford examples without limit. To observe this phenomenon we simply go from the orderly to the disorderly, from the systematic to the single event or portrayal. We do this best by shutting off our senses. In a dream, trance, or hypnagogic state all the phantasmagoria of which the human mind is capable runs fast before our interior vision--dots, dashes, lines, figures, blots, splotches, colors, and blank spaces. In that world everything exists; it can, under the right circumstances, be transmuted into some form of art.

There, I believe, lies the power of nonobjective art to intrigue us, move us, and perhaps inspire us. It is, to be sure, a freeing of the mind, just as reverie is, but with a difference. Nobody cares much about our personal images, dreams, and nightmares, unless in their telling we become artists. Whatever else it may be, art is a form of communication, at times so complex as to require a full use of sound, sight, and movement. The artist cares about his inner life; he strives, as it were, to bring it forth. If he is successful--needless to say, his chances are not very good--the result

is a poem, a novel, a play, a painting, a sculpture, a musical composition, a dance form--a design of some kind--that arouses others and endures. His vision becomes yours and mine for the good reason that he has found in his inner thought something that tunes in with the thought of others. He has got to the mind and heart of the matter and he has done more; he has developed or perfected a medium of expression.

In a culture pattern that, for short, may be called Western, it is permissible to ask questions without giving answers. In fact, it is held that an answer may be only an option or a hypothesis. As a layman, I should like to ask one now. Eschewing faith in the rites, rituals, and mystic forms of religions, pagan or otherwise, what may the artist fruitfully turn to? What is truly significant as a measure of man's fate, of his progress or deterioration as the case may be? To me the most attractive option lies in some form of humanism. After all, the aesthetic representations of gods and heroes derived their power from the beauty of the object as portrayed, reinforced by the putative deeds of the living person. Their virtues, like their vices, were all too human. It can be said of saints: they were and are people.

Except by a curious, irrational ambivalence, science and superstition--not science and religion--are irreconcilable. In this field of combat, science has won every battle and will continue to do so. But science is not justice, brotherhood, or love; it is not art. Just as we cannot today embrace any form of humanity that fails to take account of science, so we cannot define humanity without the dominant ingredient of art. But, to repeat, that is simply an option which I happen to choose, and there are others.

Suppose we choose the option of humanism, placing man at the center of his world--and humbly so, in view of what we know about biology, geology, and astronomy. Then what may be said to be, not the responsibility of the contemporary artist, for he has none in this respect, but the opportunity? I have a few suggestions to offer, negative and positive. On the negative side--

- Not incessant wailing; it goes against the grain of the Western world. From the beginning, it has been a source of weakness in the Christian ethic. If there is to be a final whimper, the bang will come first.
- No further refinement of religious symbols. Of course, for many persons their contemporary aesthetic treatment is superior to earlier forms. Still, if the inner faith is weak or nonexistent, the work, however sophisticated, is empty. Painters should paint what they see and believe, not what they ought to see or what other persons see.
- No concepts, visions, or rituals imported from other culture patterns wholesale unless they have displaced all else and are overmastering. The influence of the masters in other times or places is another matter. Artists learn by studying such works but not by any process of imitation or easy adaptation. It is all right to paint like a theosophist or Zen Buddhist if you really are one; in fact, how can you help doing so?

On the positive side, if we hold to humanism or ethical culture, there are rich opportunities for new directions in art. For example,

- The essence of modern man is, at once, to take thought and to take action. If he contemplates a navel, most likely it is not his own. A population that has to be bludgeoned into a tiny amount of physical exercise for its own sake is not likely to go far in Yogi; nor will it, on the other hand, substitute mental emptiness for recuperative diversion. The variable states of man in which he endeavors, confronts, and encounters run the whole gamut from brutality to nobility, and these struggles are significant, come peace or war.

- To some artists the post-Freudian studies of personality are still a closed book. As never before, artists could learn to react intuitively and aesthetically to the fascinating world of the mind at work or at play, and to the mind at odds with itself.

- The ways in which, through the insight gained by education, each person may come to terms with danger, defeat, inferiority, and mortality comprise a rich ore. It seems to me, however, that it is being more effectively worked out in the literary and performing arts on the American scene than in the strictly visual arts. To be obscure is not to be brave. The graphic

and plastic arts of recent years seem obscure to many an observer. Not so modern writing and performing. It is in touch; it counts. It is not thereby necessarily cheapened. Again, speaking as a layman, I find the greatest impact or strength--I do not speak of merit-- in architecture and in the design of useful objects in wood, stone, metal, or glass.

- Art, in no way compromising itself, can become a powerful ally in the struggle against poverty, injustice, and the brutalization of life. It can become a force for the survival of the human race, showing what is fleeting or trivial and what is precious.

Finally, it should be reaffirmed that the individual artist need not do anything at all except to practice his art. He is not asked to save anything or anybody, including himself. He can enjoy himself. He can encourage others to enjoy themselves through the wit and humor of his creations. Personally, I wonder why so much laughter has been removed from the graphic and plastic arts. Dramatists give a high place to comedy and the great ones make of it a great art. Not being in the time of Shakespeare or Moliere, we still respond to their art, whether it be in tragedy or comedy; over and over they evoke a response in depth. Surely it would be good to have some of this in every aesthetic medium.

The alternative to art as a measure of man is, I suppose, to retreat into a kind of minor league. Ortega y Gasset stated it this way (The Dehumanization of Art, Doubleday & Co., Garden City, New York, 1952):

"Art which--like science and politics--used to be very near the axis of enthusiasm, that backbone of our person, has moved toward the outer rings. It has lost none of its attributes, but it has become a minor issue. The trend toward pure art betrays not arrogance, as is often thought, but modesty. Art that has rid itself of human pathos is a thing without consequence--just art with no other pretenses." (p. 48)

But the paradox is that, stripped of all pretenses, art retains its power as the most original and delightful of all human endeavors that get beyond the acts and events of the day. It survives all its phases. It has no place to go except forward. Man himself can do no better.

sent to:

Chicago Tribune - City Desk

Chicago News - City Desk

Mary Cole - 9322 S. Ada St.

Chicago 20, Illinois

THE MUSEUM OF MODERN ART

11 WEST 53 STREET, NEW YORK 19, N. Y.

TELEPHONE: CIRCLE 5-8900

FOR RELEASE

Friday, April 26, 1963

SPECIAL TO CHICAGO PAPERS

MARY COLE TO PARTICIPATE IN CONFERENCE AT MUSEUM OF MODERN ART

Miss Mary Cole, Director of Art for the Chicago Public Schools, will be among the leaders in art education from the United States and Canada attending the 21st Annual Conference of the Committee on Art Education, sponsored by the Museum of Modern Art, in New York City, April 30 through May 4. Miss Cole will lead the session on "The Responsibility of the Administrator" on Saturday, May 4.

Mr. Roger Carlson of the Ray Elementary School will be a panel member for two sessions concerning art education in the junior high school, Friday, May 3.

Major speakers at the Conference will include: John H. MacFadyen, Executive Director, New York State Council on the Arts, who will speak on "Government in the Arts" (Friday, May 3), Dr. George Stoddard, Chancellor and Executive Vice President of New York University, who will speak on "Art As The Measure of Man" (Saturday, May 4), and Otto Wittmann, Director of the Toledo Museum of Art, Toledo, Ohio, who will speak on "The Role of the Museum in Art Education" (Tuesday, April 30).

Commenting on the theme of this year's Conference, ART EDUCATION AND THE HUMAN SPIRIT, Victor D'Amico, Director of Education at the Museum of Modern Art, said, "Art has always served the spiritual needs of man, but today, perhaps more than ever before, the knowledge and enjoyment of the arts are needed to offset a growing mechanization and specialization. The major object of creative teaching in art education today is to initiate in all people a respect for the individual and an understanding of the human spirit".

This year, for the first time, the first day of the Conference will be called "Museum Day", set aside especially to explore the expanding role of museums in art education for children and adults, and teachers.

The Committee on Art Education was founded in 1942 by Victor D'Amico; Robert Iglehart, Professor of Art, University of Michigan; and Arthur R. Young, Director of Art Education for the Philadelphia Museum College of Education and Professor Emeritus, Teachers College, Columbia University, for the purpose of exchanging ideas on the teaching of art from pre-school through graduate level. The Committee consists of about 1,000 professors, board of education art directors, high school and elementary school art teachers representing the United States and Canada.

139

For additional information contact: Marcia Rubinoff, Publicity Department,

Day", set aside especially to explore the expanding role of museums in art education
for children and adults and for teachers. 14

The Committee on Art Education was founded in 1942 by Victor D'Amico, Robert Young,
and Robert Iglehart, Professor of Art at the University of Michigan, for the purpose
of exchanging ideas on the teaching of art from pre-school through graduate level.
The Committee consists of about 1,000 professors, board of education art directors,
and high school and elementary school art teachers representing the United States and
Canada.

for additional information contact: Marcia Rubinoff, Publicity Department, Museum of
Modern Art, 11 West 53rd Street, New York 19, New York

THE MUSEUM OF MODERN ART

11 WEST 53 STREET, NEW YORK 19, N. Y.

TELEPHONE: CIRCLE 5-8900

FOR RELEASE

Friday, April 26 551963

MARY COLE TO PARTICIPATE IN CONFERENCE AT MUSEUM OF MODERN ART

Miss Mary Cole, Director of Art for the Chicago Public Schools, will be among the leaders in art education from the United States and Canada attending the 21st Annual Conference of the Committee on Art Education, sponsored by the Museum of Modern Art, in New York City, April 30 through May 4. Miss Cole will lead the session on *The Responsibility of the Administrator* on Saturday, May 4.

Mr. Roger Carlson of the Ray Elementary School will be a panel member for two sessions concerning art education in the junior high school, Friday, May 3.

Major speakers at the Conference will include: John H. MacFadyen, Executive Director, New York State Council on the Arts, who will speak on "Government in the Arts" (Friday, May 3), Dr. George Stoddard, Chancellor and Executive Vice President of New York University, who will speak on "Art As The Measure of Man" (Saturday, May 4), and Otto Wittmann, Director of the Toledo Museum of Art, Toledo, Ohio, who will speak on "The Role of the Museum in Art Education" (Tuesday, April 20).

Commenting on the theme of this year's Conference, ART EDUCATION AND THE HUMAN SPIRIT, Victor D'Amico, Director of Education at the Museum of Modern Art, said, "Art has always served the ^{so} spiritual needs of man, but today, perhaps more than ever before, the knowledge and enjoyment of the arts are needed to offset a growing mechanization and specialization. The major object of creative teaching in art education today is to initiate in all people a respect for the individual and an understanding of the human spirit".

This year, for the first time, the first day of the Conference will be called "Museum Day", set aside especially to explore the expanding role of museums in art education for children and adults, and teachers.

The Committee on Art Education was founded in 1942 by Victor D'Amico; Robert Iglehart, Professor of Art, University of Michigan; and Arthur R. Young, Director of Art Education for the Philadelphia Museum College of Education and Professor Emeritus, Teachers College, Columbia University, for the purpose of exchanging ideas on the teaching of art from pre-school through graduate level. The Committee consists of about 1,000 professors, board of education art directors, high school and elementary school art teachers representing the United States and Canada.

For additional information contact: Marcia Rubineoff, Publicity Department,

Los Angeles Times

Herald & Express
Examiner

MODERN ART
NEW YORK 19, N. Y.

FOR RELEASE:
APRIL 29, 1963
SPECIAL TO LOS ANGELES
PAPERS

LANIER TO PARTICIPATE IN CONFERENCE AT MUSEUM OF MODERN ART

Dr. Vincent Lanier, Associate Professor of Education and Fine Arts at the University of Southern California, will be among the leaders in art education from the United States and Canada attending the 21st Annual Conference of the Committee on Art Education, sponsored by the Museum of Modern Art, in New York City, April 30 through May 4. Dr. Lanier will be one of the two speakers at the session on "Research" on Friday, May 3. The other speaker will be Joseph Canino, Assistant Professor of Art Education at New York University.

Major speakers at the Conference will include: John H. MacFadyen, Executive Director, New York State Council on the Arts, who will speak on "Government in the Arts" (Friday, May 3), Dr. George Stoddard, Chancellor and Executive Vice President of New York University, who will speak on "Art As The Measure of Man" (Saturday, May 4), and Otto Wittmann, Director of the Toledo Museum, Toledo, Ohio, who will speak on "The Role of the Museum in Art Education" (Tuesday, April 30).

Commenting on the theme of this year's Conference, ART EDUCATION AND THE HUMAN SPIRIT, Victor D'Amico, Director of Education at the Museum of Modern Art, said, "Art has always served the spiritual needs of man, but today, perhaps more than ever before, the knowledge and enjoyment of the arts are needed to offset a growing mechanization and specialization. The major object of creative teaching in art education today is to initiate in all people a respect for the individual and an understanding in the human spirit".

This year, for the first time, the first day of the Conference will be called "Museum Day", set aside especially to explore the expanding role of museums in art education for children and adults and teachers.

The Committee on Art Education was founded in 1942 by Victor D'Amico; Robert Iglehart, Professor of Art, University of Michigan; and Arthur R. Young, Director of Art Education for the Philadelphia Museum College of Education and Professor Emeritus, Teachers College, Columbia University, for the purpose of exchanging ideas on the teaching of art from pre-school through graduate level. The Committee consists of about 1,000 professors, board of education art directors, high school and elementary school teachers representing the United States and Canada.

for additional information contact: Marcia Rubinoff, Publicity Department, the Museum of Modern Art, 11 West 53rd Street, New York 19, New York

143

THE MUSEUM OF MODERN ART

11 WEST 53 STREET, NEW YORK 19, N. Y.

TELEPHONE: CIRCLE 5-8900

21ST ANNUAL CONFERENCE

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON ART EDUCATION

April 30, May 1-4, 1963

Address: GOVERNMENT IN THE ARTS
John H. MacFadyen, Executive Director
New York State Council on the Arts

Friday, May 3, 1963
10:00 A.M. - 12:00 Noon
Americana Hotel - Georgian Ballroom "B"

It is a little more than two years since I succeeded Laurance Roberts as Executive Director of the New York State Council on the Arts, which had been created by our Legislature during the 1960 session. I can look with objective wonder at this political miracle, and with admiration at Governor Rockefeller's persistence and the Legislature's intuitive response. I direct this ray of hope on anyone who has come to despair of our lawmaker's capacity to take action not politically motivated.

I came to the job from a career in architecture - I still consider myself a temporarily displaced professional architect - and I entered a field which had never received my serious consideration. My qualifications were hazy if not doubtful. I was clinging to what may be the delusion that I personally, as an architect, might be an artist, which put me among those in all the arts who likewise cling. I had made the painful adjustment to admitting that there might be others in the field equally blessed with talent, and I had a modest record of organizational ability, certainly the minimum facility demanded in my profession.

I entered an arena so choked with lions and martyrs that it was hard to tell from the cries of the crowd which they were cheering, and as a newcomer I faced the somewhat hostile appraisal of these lions and martyrs as they tried to decide to which category I had been relegated. Being a natural coward I tried my best to look like both and become neither and if possible to stay close enough to the edge so that in an emergency I could jump the barrier and become lost in the crowd again.

While waiting for this emergency, and I'm still waiting, I watched and listened to the growing cries and gradually one word grew stronger than the rest until at last it stood alone - and that word was government! This year, I would wager, there isn't a single meeting of any national organization committed to the arts that has not included on the agenda a panel, or a forum, or a speaker on Government in the Arts. Indeed it is a modern medical miracle that that tireless, thoughtful, gifted man, August Heckscher, hasn't irrevocably lost his voice.

more....

Now - what is the force that has singled out government and indeed has so generally intensified the total cultural dialogue? Placing myself in President Kennedy's rocking chair I feel that in that position of indisputable power to choose, to demand the "command performance," I would certainly have the White House reeking of paint - both grease and oil - and ringing with the sounds of voice and music: who could resist this temptation? And I can hardly believe that a tv tour of the White House, however irresistible the hostess, would set off a national "renaissance" (I agree with Dr. Conant, that term is being emasculated). There is some merit to the suggestion that we are simply reaching the point where our larger and better educated population is demanding some of the logical benefits of that education, and it is certainly evident that enjoyment of the arts is reflecting a democratization experienced any number of years ago by political, economic, and other freedoms.

I would like to suggest that there are other more subtle and subconscious reasons. We are living in an era of data and documentation, where both are accumulating at an alarming rate. Machines are not only doing a major portion of our thinking, they are also doing our remembering for us. The problem of future generations will not be to find evidence of the records of our civilization, it will be to somehow interpret that civilization out of the mass of records we have left. We are further applying these techniques to the investigation and documentation of our past so that the final accumulated mountain of notated and filed knowledge is far beyond the comprehension of the simple human mind. No one has presumed to challenge this pretentious project, but I sense an uneasiness in the air, a sneaking suspicion that we may be overdoing it.

How, then, are we to compensate our descendants for this burden we are leaving them? To me, the answer is simple: we realize that we must also leave them the direct, honest record of our civilization through the only means of communication equipped to carry out this function, the arts.

For the purposes of this discussion, then, what are the arts? Broadly, our record is written in the creative arts, the act of writing, composing, or designing and executing works of literature, poetry, drama, music including opera and choral works, ballet and dance, painting, sculpture, the graphic arts including photography and the crafts, architecture, and finally for our time, films and television. This record is read, today and by future generations, through the interpretive arts, the act of interpreting the creative arts by individuals, groups or institutions through the designing, publishing, printing and collecting of books; the producing, directing and performing of drama; the performing of music and the producing, directing and performing of opera, choral works, etc.; the producing, directing and performing of ballet and dance; the selecting and exhibiting of the visual arts, crafts, and

more...

historic memorabilia; the construction and conservation of architecture; and the producing, directing and performing of films and television. And when you consider the newness of this last art you have some indication of the potential for developing new expressions in the future.

Central to the healthy development of both the creative and the interpretive arts is the problem of simple economics. While man may not live by bread alone it is generally conceded that bread more or less comes first. It has also been generally conceded that the arts are difficult to sustain on a pay-as-you-create, or pay-as-you-interpret, or pay-as-you-enjoy basis. For this reason the tradition of patronage has emerged, both for the creative and the interpretive arts. In the past this patronage has come from the seats of power - from monarchs and the court, from dominant religious institutions, and from the financial aristocracy. But as our governments become more truly representative of our total population we are looking more to them to accept their share of the patronage responsibility.

Now the important word here, certainly in America, is "share." The total responsibility for patronage cannot and must not be placed with government, we certainly have adequate proof, in this period in history, of the perils of such an approach. For the moment, then, let's review all the potential sources of patronage and later we will attempt to suggest the responsibility of each. But before that, let us define exactly what we mean by patronage. Again, for purposes of this discussion, let us assume that patronage means all sources of income to the arts exclusive of tax relief, paid admissions and the value of time contributed by persons in any way connected with a specific arts program.

The primary and all-important source of patronage should remain the individual: only in this way will we maintain an independence of vitality. While the extent to which each individual may contribute becomes more limited it should certainly be expected that the total number of contributing individuals will increase. I wonder how many of us here today are accepting our share of this general obligation, the one to ten dollar patron? It is imperative that we avoid delegating this obligation to our governments. Secondly, we have developed, particularly in America, the foundation or trust as an essential source of patronage, although their potential for support of the arts has hardly been touched. Third, we have a growing source in corporate, business and commercial giving, again relatively untouched. Fourth, the phenomenon of our great labor unions and organizations provides us with a new and potentially important source of patronage. Fifth, although we tend to disregard them, our educational institutions, both public and private, are and will continue to be significant in the overall pattern. And with number six we finally arrive at the threshold of government support, our municipal governments. This is particularly important in

more....

light of the national trend towards urbanization. Cities are expanding their boundaries to increase their revenues to pay for additional services demanded of them. Certainly the cultural services must play an important role in the urbanization trend. Seventh, we have county government. While county support is important in urban areas, it is even more significant regionally, where too often the counties are not accepting their share of the obligation to maintain the cultural organizations serving their region. Eighth, we have state government. New York State, in creating the Council on the Arts, has established a strong influence within the executive branch. But this is not enough. There are many other branches involved in potential support for the arts, including at least the Department of Public Works, the Department of Conservation, the Department of Education, the Department of Correction, and the Department of Commerce. Recently Legislation has been passed creating a new commission in New York State to coordinate the overlapping functions of these various departments. It is significant that the Council on the Arts is represented on this commission: the possibility for some sort of cultural coordination is promising.

Finally, we have the federal government as an existing and potential source of patronage. For today we will ignore the various bills which have been introduced into congress and recognize, instead, that there now exist, in the federal government, important sources of patronage within at least the Departments of State, Defense, Interior, Commerce and Health, Education and Welfare. To the best of my knowledge there is currently no effort to coordinate the affect of these sources.

Let us go back now and look at the creative and interpretive arts to define the areas which are dependent on one or more of the sources of patronage I have mentioned. For the creative artist we have, of course, his education. This includes not only general education where creative ability must be detected and encouraged but later special education in the techniques of a particular creative art. Next, we have the creative artist at work and patronage is responsible for tentative evaluations of this work and economic assistance during the early creative period, as well as for providing as much opportunity as possible to bring this work before a public. Since at this point the responsibility generally shifts to the interpretive artist we should recognize the same educational needs as well as the need for support for interpretive organizations. Support for the interpretation of contemporary creative work, in other words the performing or exhibiting of new work, is extremely hard to come by. The public has not been prepared to accept much of what is being done. It suffers from being exhibited under adverse conditions or being performed with inadequate rehearsal in appalling surroundings. A great conductor told me that ninety per cent of the new music being composed is destroyed by the first performance.

more....

Further, in the performing arts, we have the problems of collaboration with the creative artist in matters of production, etc. All of this demands dedicated patronage.

While my definition of patronage excludes tax-relief this is an important factor to both the creative and interpretive artist which deserves serious study and revision. In the case of the former, the financial rewards for achievement usually come late in life after years of frugality, yet little or no recognition of this period of development is made by our tax structure. At the same time, the productive years of the interpretive artist are usually limited and again there is little recognition of this limitation. Essential to any program of coordinated patronage will be this study and revision.

Finally, given the creative and interpretive artist there remains another responsibility for patronage, the audience. This again involves education, preparing the child for the experience of the arts; support for programs which permit the audience to come in contact with great art in its various forms; support for the provision of proper facilities in which the audience may enjoy the arts. We should never overlook the fact that in the audience lies our primary and all-important source of patronage, the individual. I'm afraid our work in this vineyard too often tends to be condescending if not aloof. If the public be damned, we all be damned shortly thereafter.

We have now, then, defined the arts, outlined the areas of their economic insecurity, and suggested the sources of patronage. How can these factors be brought together for the enlightened consideration of an effective force?

Recently the White House announced that the President would appoint, in the near future, a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts. I believe this to be excellent plan in principal. But this announcement implied a committee made up of persons knowledgeable in and representative of the various arts. Without wishing to offend my many friends who could be thus described, I would like to propose that this is, once again, putting the cart before the horse. While it would be ludicrous to suggest that art in America is anything but vigorous and inevitable, I am personally convinced that broad encouragement for the development of the arts must come from all the sources of patronage I have outlined. It is not difficult to get enlightened if somewhat narrow opinions on the economic problems of the arts or the prospects for their future. It is extremely difficult to bring these opinions to bear on any coordinated effort in their behalf.

I would suggest, therefore, that the Federal Advisory Council on the Arts be made up of important representatives from individual patronage, foundation giving,

more...

48

corporate, business and commercial giving, labor patronage, educational institutions, and municipal, county and state governments. The Council, in turn, would be guided by expert panels composed of persons professionally familiar with all phases of the development of each artistic discipline. The Council would be collectively responsible for establishing policy for broad patterns of patronage and individually responsible for coordinating the carrying out of this policy within the category they represent. Included on the Council should be representatives from the Federal Departments of State, Defense, Interior, Commerce and Health, Education and Welfare.

The advisory panels of the specific arts would suggest ways in which the creative artists could be encouraged, and the representatives of individual, foundation, and educational patronage as well as of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare with whom the prime responsibility for this encouragement rests, would attempt to guide the carrying out of these suggestions. The panels would suggest ways in which the interpretive arts could be encouraged and the representatives of individual, foundation, educational, labor, corporate, business and commercial, municipal and county government, certain departments of state government, and the Federal Departments of State, Defense, Interior and Commerce with whom the prime responsibility for this encouragement rests, would attempt to guide the carrying out of these suggestions. Similar efforts would be made on behalf of the audience by representatives of corporate, business and commercial and labor giving, municipal and county government, state government, and the Federal Departments of Defense, Commerce, Interior, and Health, Education and Welfare.

Now it is true that this Federal Advisory Council would have no legal powers to enforce their recommendations. They would, however, be in a strategic position to solicit public opinion. Eventually the Council would be in a position to guide the appropriation of funds within the various federal departments in such a way as to make them most effective for the welfare of the arts. Most significantly, they would be in a strong position to suggest cooperative measures in a field where there is an irresponsible amount of ineffective duplication and to encourage the development of all sources of patronage along well-defined lines of responsibility and results. I don't need to tell you what this intelligent guidance would mean to corporate, business and commercial sources alone.

I have specifically assigned the arts themselves to an advisory role because the individual dedication of their representatives has created a competition for patronage that has left the sources so confused that they too frequently take the easy way out which is no patronage at all. All major givers are berated mercilessly by disappointed fund seekers and to me it is a miracle that there still exist men of

more...

149

sufficient courage to accept the responsibility for what they are told is an interminable series of disastrous errors. The dedication is admirable but its affect is fraught with danger. A Federal Council such as I have proposed would significantly act not only collectively but could exert an important influence on all potential contributors within each category represented. The administration of the Council could avoid becoming bureaucratic because they would have no direct programming responsibilities.

Let me particularize on the potential of this plan with regard to just one source, state government. It is, of course, the source I know best. The New York State Council on the Arts is still very much in the experimental stage: it is, in fact, a temporary commission. The Legislation specifically recognized that "the practice and enjoyment of the arts are of increasing importance and the general welfare of the people of the state will be promoted by giving further recognition to the arts as a vital aspect of our culture and heritage and as a valued means of expanding the scope of our educational programs." During the first year of its existence the Council conducted a number of surveys to point out the economic problems of our arts institutions, the lack of opportunity for most of our citizens to enjoy the best of the arts, and the need for a concerted effort to encourage the raising of standards. In January, 1961, the Council went to the Legislature with this report and some recommendations on how the situation could be improved, and we were given an appropriation of \$450,000 to carry out these recommendations. Since then our programs have gone into more than two hundred separate communities throughout the state. While it is the policy of the Council to remain experimental, certain patterns are beginning to emerge as guides to our planning. Through the Council's program of support for touring performances and exhibitions it has become possible for any community to have the finest art available, tailored to the special limitations of their facilities. This program began by making specific grants to selected organizations to tour with Council support. This year in the performing arts we are contracting with local sponsors to support individual dates selected from a long list of approved attractions. We altered our approach in the hope that we would be able to do more with the same amount of money and that we could offer a greater variety of attractions to fill specific needs.

Our exhibitions of the visual arts have been largely organized by the American Federation of Arts, but we have also contracted with specific museums to prepare exhibitions.

The Council has also recognized a responsibility to local arts programs. Most of these are, of course, amateur, and our contribution has been in the form of

more....

offering technical assistance directed towards the raising of standards of performance by these organizations. This program has been particularly effective in guiding smaller museums, galleries, and historical societies in areas of display, identification, cataloging, conservation, community relations, etc.

Under our educational program we are attempting to make the experience of the live performance or the original work of art available to our young people to supplement the academic instruction of the class room.

Under our special projects we have available a limited amount of money which is primarily devoted to improving the opportunity of the individual creative or interpretive artist. This program operates only through existing organizations with that objective.

We continue to make selected surveys and studies. We are working county by county, without county support incidentally, on an architecture worth saving project which will, we hope, stop the bull-dozer at the critical moment, and provide the state with an inventory of its significant architectural treasures. We are encouraging the development of an association of regional opera companies for their mutual improvement. We are studying the possibilities for encouragement of the dance.

Each of these programs is related to conditions within our state. At the same time, there are developing across the nation similar state councils or commissions with similar objectives; in California, Missouri, Michigan, Minnesota, Connecticut, Rhode Island, North Carolina, Washington, Georgia, Kentucky, and many others. It is logical that, as these programs develop, there should be an exchange of ideas among the states concerned. A representative of the state movement, appointed to the Federal Advisory Council, could be effective in stimulating this exchange and relating it to the potentialities of other sources of patronage and planning. Major industries with national networks of plants could be advised as to how their patronage could be effectively applied. Foundations could be alerted to emerging creative programs of special merit. Where justified, some form of federal support for the development of facilities could be guided. All this with the advice of the professional artists. New York has sought and received this guidance from over one hundred persons in the past two years.

It seems to me that the time for some action has arrived. Maybe the hue and cry has been raised to divert us from the pain of serious personal reappraisal. We are all great procrastinators, this was brought abruptly home to me the other day when my young son asked "daddy, is today tomorrow?" Maybe, finally, today is

more....

tomorrow. My purpose this morning has been to try to protect the integrity of that word that seems to now stand alone, "government," as the savior for the arts. Presumably in America we are the government; its responsibilities are our responsibilities, the effectiveness of its functions are in our hands. When we demand anything as vaguely defined as "Government in the Arts" let each of us search our consciences; are we pigs looking for a new trough, are we vultures looking for a new cadaver, or are we honest dreamers willing to accept the realities that can help our dreams come true?

* * * * *