

NAPNOC

notes

Issue number 12

P.O. Box 3036, Washington DC 20010

May 1981

FREEDOM & DIVERSITY: U.S. HISTORY & THE CHALLENGE OF CULTURAL DEMOCRACY

The final scene: David (a Russian-born Jewish composer) and Vera (a Russian-born Christian settlement house worker), lovers, stand hand-in-hand against a sunset silhouette of the Statue of Liberty.

VERA: Look! How beautiful the sunset is after the storm!

DAVID: It is the fire of God round His Crucible. There she lies, the great Melting-Pot -- listen! Can't you hear the roaring and the bubbling? There gapes her mouth (he points east) -- the harbour where a thousand mammoth feeders come from the ends of the world to pour in their human freight. Ah, what a stirring and a seething! Celt and Latin, Slav and Teuton, Greek and Syrian, -- black and yellow --

VERA: Jew and Gentile

DAVID: Yes, East and West, North and South, the palm and the pine, the pole and the equator, the crescent and the cross -- how the great Alchemist melts and fuses them with his purging flame! Here shall they all unite to build the Republic of Man and the Kingdom of God...

--*The Melting Pot* (1908), a play by Israel Zangwill

Israel Zangwill, an English Jew, coined the phrase *melting pot* and it was quickly taken up by the press and the politicians. In fact, President Theodore Roosevelt gave Zangwill permission to dedicate *The Melting Pot* to him.

Roosevelt, like many influential Americans during the turn-of-the-century wave of immigration, saw more problems than promise in the United States' growing diversity. His solution -- to downplay differences in favor of a "truly American" identity, to look only to the future and forget the past -- was for many years the official prescription. Like Zangwill's play, this prescription presumes that the United States is a kind of crucible -- that it has a cultural character and identity apart from the people who make up its population.

Divine Right and Cultural Dominance

This imaginary crucible was fashioned in the image of those who held power in the U.S.' early days. They found it useful to believe that the dominance of the Western Europeans who settled here in the 17th, 18th

(continued on page two--)

D.C. UPDATE

1. HISPANIC AMERICAN ARTS

The National Council on the Arts (NCA) met on the weekend of May 9 and 10 at the posh Four Seasons Hotel in Washington, DC. Amidst the discussions of guidelines and President Reagan's plans for the arts agency, the NCA was presented with the final report of the Advisory Committee for Hispanic American Arts, the successor to the Hispanic American Arts Task Force (see NAPNOC notes #8 for a history).

The report followed a meeting in Denver in early April of members of the Advisory Committee, representatives of Hispanic American organizations that provide information and technical assistance to artists, and representatives from the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) and other agencies.

During the Denver meeting, the Hispanic American arts organizations represented formed a national alliance -- it is to be called the National Coalition of Hispanic American Arts Organizations (NCHAAO), according to the Advisory Committee report. NCHAAO will "assist in the establishment of an Information Network on a national basis ... Other such organizations perhaps representing artists will hopefully become part of the Network. An Interim Organizational Planning Committee was formed at the Denver meeting to help with the specific parts of setting up the Network, e.g., bylaws, incorporation, membership mechanism, and so forth."

The members of the Interim Committee are Luis Cardona of the Association for Resources & Technical Services (ARTS) in Washington, DC; Jose Gonzalez of MiRaza Arts Consortium (MIRA) (continued on page 7--)

NAPNOC notes is published by the Neighborhood Arts Programs National Organizing Committee (NAPNOC). Copyrighted articles may not be reprinted without permission of the authors; other material may be reprinted without special permission as long as proper credit is given to the authors and NAPNOC notes. Signed articles represent the views of their authors and not necessarily those of NAPNOC.

NAPNOC welcomes comments, letters and suggestions for articles. Please put NAPNOC on your organization's mailing list. Please address all correspondence to NAPNOC, P.O. Box 3036, Washington, DC 20010, or telephone (202)667-4200. NAPNOC notes is edited by NAPNOC Co-Directors Don Adams and Arlene Goldbard.

FREEDOM & DIVERSITY (cont'd from page 1)
and 19th centuries was a God-given right --
even a duty.

Listen to Andrew Jackson speaking to
Congress in December, 1830, on the subject
of removing American Indians from the South:

"What good man would prefer a country
covered with forests and ranged by a few
thousand savages to our extensive Republic,
studded with cities, towns, and prosperous
farms, embellished with all the improvements
which art can devise or industry execute,
occupied by more than 12,000,000 happy
people, and filled with all the blessings
of liberty, civilization, and religion?"

Harry Boyte, in the Citizen Heritage
Center's pamphlet Democratic Visions: Pro-
gressives and the American Heritage, traces
this self-serving philosophy through its re-
ligious manifestations:

"...Dwight Moody, who preached a 'Gospel
of Wealth' much favored by large industrial-
lists of the Gilded Age because it upheld the
'sacredness' of capitalism. 'I have heard
of reform, reform until I am tired and sick
of the whole thing,' declared Moody, who
raised vast amounts of money with his argu-
ment that 'there can be no better investment
for the capitalists of Chicago than to put
the saving salt of the Gospel into these
dark homes...' and "...preachers in the
south who praised textile mill owners as
'prophets of God doing what God wanted done'..."

Human Rights and Cultural Democracy

But Boyte also highlights the commitment
to justice in American religious tradition,
and in contrast to the Americanism of "rugged
individualism" and raw lust for power offers
the other side, where "...traditions of com-
munity self help, civic idealism and neigh-
borliness are also a part of the American
heritage. This is the legacy of quilting
bees and barnraisings; of gift-giving among
Native American tribes; of volunteer fire
departments, rescue squads, self-help groups;
of impoverished ghetto residents who raised
orphaned children and shared what little
they had...."

From the first in U.S. history -- from
the decentralized, cooperative and democratic
Iroquois Nation to Tom Paine (who John Adams
found "...so democratical, without any re-
straint or even an attempt at any equilibrium
or counterpoise, that it must produce con-
fusion and every evil work") and so on 'til
the present day -- the idea of cultural de-
mocracy has existed in contrast to the dom-
ination of Protestant Western European cul-
ture and the ideologies of divine right and
melting pot that go along with it. Cultural
democracy has always been the contender -- not
the dominant idea or the official policy, but
the counterforce against official policy.

In this article, we want to make a plea
for cultural democracy as official policy.
Such a policy would work against both the
melting pot idea, which seeks to disguise and
destroy differences, and indeed against the
very idea of a "superior" culture which
ought to dominate American society and pub-
lic policy.

I. THE SHAMEFUL HISTORY OF THE MELTING POT

"...in a 1927 presidential address to
the National Education Association, the
Illinois superintendent of public instruc-
tion said 'the great American school system
is the very pit of this melting pot. Here
the ancient foreign prejudices are melted
out of the youth and the best that was
brought and the best that is here are fused
together.' Forty years later a widely a-
dopted American history textbook claimed
that, as a result of the educational and
other institutions, by 'the middle of the
twentieth century the melting process was
astonishingly complete.'"

--Arthur Mann, The One and The Many (1979)

The most obvious manifestation of our
heterogeneity is ethnic diversity. The most
obvious attempts to impress a uniform, top-
down culture have been those intended to
suppress ethnic diversity -- either by elim-
inating minority people, or by systematically
devaluing and discouraging their cultures.

Nathan Hare, in his 1966 article "Brain-
washing of Black Men's Minds," tell us that
"Children (learning to read on white Dicks
and Janes) internalize the hatred of black
men early in life." Peter Farb's book on
North American Indians and the development
of the industrial state examines the educa-
tion foisted on children: "Most...attention
...was concentrated on the Indian children,
who were snatched from their families and
shipped off to boarding schools far from
their homes. The children usually were kept
at school for eight years, during which time
they were not permitted to see their parents,
relatives, or friends. Anything Indian --
dress, language, religious practices, even
outlook on life -- was uncompromisingly
prohibited...."

Learning the Language

All manifestations of diversity -- re-
gional accents, for instance -- have stood
in the way of the melting pot. Philip
Arnault, head of the Baltimore Theatre Proj-
ect, tells this story about his own educa-
tion as an actor:

"In 1965, when I had completed my gradu-
ate program at Catholic University, I had a
meeting with my major professor and I'd fin-
ished the thesis and I was looking forward
to going out into the real world.

"He was going over my papers and he said
'Philip, you have not taken the speech diag-
nostic test.' I didn't know what that was.
So I said, 'Well, let me take this. What
do I do?'

"An appointment was made and the next
day I went over to the speech pathology of-
fices and I was ushered into a chamber.
There was a book of James Joyce open, a mic-
rophone, and two people sitting on the other
side of the glass with headphones. What it
was is you couldn't get an acting M.A. unless
you didn't sound like you were from someplace.

"And of course I was just an old Tennessee
boy that grew up in Memphis. In my first
acting, I had a walk-on in Othello. I said
'O-thello, Dezdy-mona wonts tew see yew' and

the director said 'Well, Philip, I'd like to see you' and there you are.

"Fortunately, I knew what they wanted, so I passed the test."

Eliminating the Unmeltable

Before the melting pot could do its work, the unmeltable had to be dealt with, beginning with the native American Indians:

"In the years from 1783 to 1812 the one consistent element in American Indian policy in the Old Northwest was the desire to acquire the land between Ohio and the Mississippi. The host of subsidiary objectives were all subordinated to this end...What had started out in 1783 as naked desire for land had, by 1812, been transmuted into lofty moral purpose. By 1812 American leaders were not only trying to convince others, but apparently had also convinced themselves that they were working for the ultimate benefit of the Indian.

"...The Indians (wrote George Washington in 1783) will ever retreat as our Settlements advance upon them and they will ever be ready to sell, as we are to buy; That is the cheapest as well as the least distressing way of dealing with them...the gradual extension of our Settlements will as certainly cause the Savage as the Wolf to retire; both being beasts of prey tho' they differ in shape."

-- Reginald Horsman, "American Indian Policy in the Old Northwest, 1783-1812," William and Mary Quarterly, (1961)

The continuous forced migration of the Indians compelled the Sioux chief Spotted Tail to say in 1868 "Why does not the Great White Father put his red children on wheels, so he can move them as he will?"

The inhuman treatment of American Indians was quickly followed by the rise in the United States of the unspeakable barbarism of slavery. From David Walker's Appeal to the Coloured Citizens of the World (1830):

"...to prove farther that the condition of the Israelites was better under the Egyptians than ours is under the whites, I call upon the professing Christians, I call upon the philanthropist, I call upon the very tyrant himself, to show me a page of history, either sacred or profane, on which a verse can be found, which maintains, that the Egyptians heaped the insupportable insult upon the children of Israel, by telling them that they were not of the human family."

A Heavy Burden

U.S. history is burdened with such shame. The Constitution of the State of California, adopted in 1879, included sections stating that:

"No corporation now existing or hereafter formed under the laws of this state shall, after the adoption of this Constitution, employ, directly or indirectly, in any capacity, any Chinese or Mongolian..."

"No Chinese shall be employed on any state, county, municipal or other public work, except in punishment for crime."

These provisions were not formally repealed until 1952.

In 1862, General Ulysses S. Grant issued General Order Number 11, expelling all Jews within 24 hours from the department under his command. Henry Ford, the auto magnate, maintained an anti-semitic museum, and used his newspaper, the Dearborn Independent, to quote from anti-Jewish propaganda and exhort his readers against what he called the "Jewish menace" -- and Ford was in good company in the ranks of big American industrialists.

The wave of Irish immigration in the nineteenth century also brought reaction.

"The natives responded in convulsive bursts of violence and prolonged withdrawals. A native mob burned a convent in Charlestown, Massachusetts in 1831; another mob sacked a Catholic Church in Philadelphia in 1846... Meanwhile, Yankee employers everywhere in the seaboard cities published advertisements, 'No Irish Need Apply.'"

--William V. Shannon, The American Irish (1963)

In 1972, the U.S. Civil Rights Commission reported that "Spanish Detention slips" were used to isolate and punish children who spoke Spanish in a school district near San Antonio, Texas. In the Commission's "Mexican-American Study Report III," students reported being compelled to pay fines to the teacher if they spoke Spanish in school -- in one case, 1¢ per word. Others reported being made to stand in a corner, being compelled to do extra homework, or being made to write several pages saying "I must not speak Spanish in school."

II. FREEDOM AND PEOPLEHOOD

Co-existing with this shameful history of melting-pot policy is another history of aspirations and acts on behalf of cultural democracy.

These are acts of courage in protest -- read the Spring, 1981 issue of Southern Exposure, "Stayed on Freedom," for a thousand statements as inspiring as Fannie Lou Hamer's 1966 interview in which she offers the quintessential statement of cultural democracy:

"...if we are free people as Negroes, if we are free, then I don't think you're supposed to tell me how much of my freedom I'm supposed to have."

They are also acts of courage in endurance, such as prompted John Collier, who was Indian Commissioner in the New Deal Administration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, to write in 1947:

"Indians and their societies disclose that social heritage is far more perduring than is commonly believed. On how small a life-base, on a diminished and starving life-base for how many generations, the motivations and expectations of a society and its worldview and value system and loyalties, can keep themselves alive; how these social possessions, which are of the soul, can endure, like the roots and seeds on the Mohave desert, through long ages, without one social rain; and how they rush, like these roots and seeds, into surprising and wonderful blossom when the social rain does come at last. Perhaps no other ethnic groups have revealed this old,

all-important truth so convincingly as the Indians have done. Indeed, this capacity for perdurance is one of the truths on which the hope of our world rests -- our world grown so pallid in the last century, and now so deathly pallid, through the totalitarian horror. The sunken stream can flow again, the ravaged desert can bloom, the great past is not killed. The Indian experience tells us this."

Land of the People

In his stirring article "Populism and the Left," (Democracy, April 1981), Harry Boyte invokes the concept of "peoplehood":

"The sense of a constituted peoplehood is the essence of what Simone Weil meant when she defined roots by saying 'a human being has roots by virtue of his real, active and natural participation in the life of a community which preserves in living shape certain treasures of the past and certain particular expectations for the future.' It is also the insight developed by John Schaar when he described the psychological bases of patriotism as 'a whole way of being in the world captured best by the word 'reverence,' which defines life by its debts one is what one owes, what one acknowledges as a rightful debt or obligation. The fit of the land, people, language, gods, memories and customs...the very tone and rhythm of a life, the shapes of perception, the texture of its dreams and fears comes from membership in a territorially rooted group.'

"Consciousness of a national peoplehood coexists with and is nourished by discrete communities that make up 'the whole people'; in turn, each community itself forms a 'people' of its own. This dual sense of peoplehood forms a striking theme through American black history, as Manning Marable has recently shown...Martin Luther King, Jr., especially was able to mobilize ordinary black people through appeals to the 'American heritage.' In King's terms, the movement represented 'the best in the American dream and the most sacred values in our Judeo-Christian heritage.' It was a great 'Crusade for Citizenship,' carrying 'our whole nation back to the wells of democracy dug deep by the founding fathers.'"

Cultural democracy is the idea that the people of the United States can work to remedy what is shameful in its cultural history, and can bring to the consciousness of all citizens and the deliberations of all policy makers a sense of peoplehood which comprises many peoples coexisting in freedom and equality.

The Idea of Cultural Democracy

The first use of the term cultural democracy was by J. Drachsler in his 1920 book Democracy and assimilation: The blending of immigrant heritages in America.

"Drachsler adopted the position that different ethnic groups should have the right to maintain an ethnic identity and even proposed a variety of ways this might be done... and felt that government should institute in the public schools a program emphasizing knowledge and appreciation of the various cultures. Drachsler argued, however, that whether or not some groups continued to maintain their separate communal existence would

be a course legitimately sanctioned by democratic values, since...(it)...should be a free one. This choice, which Drachsler felt should be added to the older American ideas of political and economic democracy, he labelled 'cultural democracy.'"

--Manuel Ramirez III and Alfredo Castenada, Cultural Democracy, Bicognitive Development, and Education (1974)

Most influential in developing the idea of cultural democracy -- which he called cultural pluralism -- was Horace Kallen. He began writing about cultural pluralism near the turn of the century, in opposition to the rise of the Ku Klux Klan and its assertion of a single true, American culture.

Kallen reiterated his thesis many times during the ensuing 70 years:

"On the record, the Klan seeks social and intellectual conformity and economic and political rascality. Such an objective... would eventuate in a philosophy of Kultur. Unopposed, it would render culture impossible in the United States. Its persistence from the beginning has been one of the most powerful obstructions to the prosperous development of American culture." (1924)

"...monists of every species are regularly engaged in waging a total war against alternatives. On the intellectual front they are perennially proving that what is not their culture either is not culture, or is unreal, unworthy and impotent. On the social front, they mobilize force to keep their peoples incommunicado to alternatives in every institution of the common life." (1956)

Cultural democracy is not nostalgia for the cultures from which American citizens have migrated -- voluntarily or under compulsion. Neither does it stand for a "balkanized U.S., made up of many official cultures. It is the right to own one's past and one's community's past. It is the right to free and equal interaction of the cultures which now exist. And it is the freedom to build as we choose the many cultures which will constitute our pluralistic society in the future.

To guarantee these rights, we must reform public policy.

III. POLICY BY DEFAULT

We have seen how U.S. cultural policy in the past has been nothing more than a set of by-products of other policies: A policy of rapid, cheap agricultural expansion encouraged slavery; a policy of ruthless land acquisition led to the genocide of American Indians; a policy which encouraged the centralization of public education led to the dominance in our schools of the melting pot myth. Cultural policy has been no more coherent in recent years.

In 1962, Paul Goodman (a lifelong advocate for cultural democracy under many different names) addressed a Carleton College class on city planning:

"All areas of planning must be treated as a unity. It can't be helped. If you're going to do any good physical or social planning, you'll find the areas will be unified because the human animals are unified...."

things hang together and you can't be very wise unless you are willing to let them hang together....

"As you know, most of the advanced and sociologically minded city-planners of the last generation have latched on to neighborhood planning as the right thing. There has been a resurgence of interest in community, the face-to-face group, as the basis for diminishing the anomie and loneliness of mass society -- and one of the crimes of big slum-clearance and big public housing has been the disruption of neighborhood ties. But this attitude too can become mechanical. It is felt that the meeting together of people in shopping-centers, for example, will take away the blight of the super-metropolis and megalopolis.

"But to make neighborhood planning work, the physical planning is only trivially important compared to the really important thing: neighborhood function. And in order to make any community-function work as community, you must give the community authority, power to make decisions. The only way you will ever get any neighborhood planning that amounts to anything is to dare to decentralize the administration and allow local initiative. Of course you can't give initiative; but you can give people the right to exercise initiative and make crucial decisions."

Planning Without People

Needless to say, city planners have mostly failed to heed Goodman's words, and public policy has certainly failed to guide them in that direction. Anyone who's seen the vast empty lots where San Francisco's Western Addition once stood, the concrete block-houses that replaced Southwest Washington, DC, the deserted-then-"modernized" downtown of Baton Rouge, Louisiana, or any of the other ghost towns produced by the "redevelopment" craze of the fifties and sixties can testify that at least as far as community planning goes, the U.S. has had a cultural policy that emphasizes profit over people and considers neighborhood cultural institutions and alliances dispensable in the face of "progress."

In another article -- a book review of former Harvard President James B. Conant's Slums and Suburbs -- Paul Goodman offers a radical, commonsense approach to the same planning problem:

"Our social policy must be...to get rid of the suburbs -- physically, if possible, but at least as a separate and separatist way of life. We must reverse our public policy on F.H.A. loans, which has encouraged the automobiles, the payment of sales-taxes at the point of delivery, etc., and use the accruing money to improve the urban neighborhoods; thereby shall we integrate and improve the schools. Dr. Conant treats the suburbs as if they were a long-established condition deeply engrained in social nature; he does not seem to realize that suburban flight has been an artifact of class-legislation spending billions of the public money for escape-roads and real-estate and tax advantages, that should have gone to make a good city....he astonishingly does not seem to know the newsy fact that our public hous-

ing, the work of fools, grafters and profiteers, has uprooted neighborhoods, built in income-segregation as a principle, driven out enterprises useful to the communities, created delinquency, and usually not bothered if there is a school at all...."

Culture as a Right

A policy of cultural democracy establishes a value that must be heeded in all decisions concerning public policy: In the terms of a resolution of the Venice 1970 UNESCO Conference on Cultural Policies, "Culture is an inalienable and indivisible human right, it pervades all aspects of life."

Culture should take precedence in public policy over the "right" of businesses to tear down neighborhoods. But just last month the Michigan Supreme Court ruled that it was legal for the City of Detroit to acquire more than 400 acres of private property in Pole-town, an historic Polish neighborhood, by invoking the power of eminent domain -- and that the City could then follow through with its plans to spend hundreds of millions of dollars in public money to tear down homes, churches and businesses and prepare the site for a private corporation, General Motors, to build a new Cadillac plant.

Under a policy of cultural democracy, the right to culture should take precedence over the "right" of business to use the "free marketplace" to gain complete control of the public airwaves. But last month the Supreme Court of the United States decided against a coalition of ethnic organizations, classical music fan clubs, religious groups and local governments and in favor of what the Washington Post called "a united front of virtually every major radio broadcast corporation in the United States," ruling that "market forces" alone should be allowed to determine the kind of music and talk that radio stations air.

Advocates of cultural democracy in the U.S. have historically argued that the Constitution is not correctly interpreted unless cultural rights fall under its protection. Drachler, Kallen and many others have argued that the Bill of Rights with its protections of free speech, religious belief, an assembly implies the demand that public policy foster cultural pluralism: Given the undeniable evidence that our society is in fact culturally diverse, any government action to suppress or discourage that diversity abridges citizens' fundamental rights.

Thus far, the voices for cultural democracy haven't been as persuasive or compelling to policy makers as those which oppose it.

IV. ARTS POLICY AND CULTURAL DEMOCRACY

The field of cultural policy touches many areas of social activity and concern. Were a policy of cultural democracy to be adopted in the U.S., it would have to inform the activities of many areas of government.

But policy for the arts is the area in which change and reform must first come -- not because so much power or money is at stake, but because arts policy is emblematic of cultural policy. The way in which a government treats the clearest expressions

of its peoples' heritages, values and aspirations -- the arts -- at once typifies and symbolizes its cultural policy as a whole.

Policy for the Powerful

In the United States, it wasn't until the 1960's that the government elected to take a formal and deliberate role in establishing arts policy. Put another way, it wasn't until the major cultural institutions -- the museums, symphony orchestras, ballet and opera companies in a few states -- decided they would be unable to finance their expansion without public funds that the U.S. government began in earnest to make arts policy.

But once this decision had been made, no time was lost: Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Ford and Carter appointed a succession of the members and employees of wealthy, prominent families to establish and then head the federal arts agency. They have seldom wavered from the tone set by the Rockefeller Panel report on The Performing Arts: Problems and Prospects of 1965, whose staff was led by soon-to-be Endowment Chair Nancy Hanks:

"We must never allow the central focus on quality to weaken or shift. Popularization in any realm often leads to a reduction of standards. In our effort to broaden the audience base, we must not be led to accept imitation as a substitute for creation, mediocrity as a stand-in for excellence. Democratization carries with it a peril for art, even as it does for education. There are no guarantees against the dilution of standards that often accompanies an expanding public, but a constant critical awareness of the danger can do much to prevent its consequences."

Read this paragraph carefully, because it contains all of the shibboleths and code-words which have characterized public policy since it was written. Read it again, substituting the words "our taste" for the words "quality," "excellence," "standards," when they appear in the text, and you will see that our arts policy is based on the idea of a "superior culture" just as clearly as Andrew Jackson's certainty of his own taste and superiority informed his policy on the relocation of American Indians.

Public arts policy in the United States was designed to shore up the failing finances of institutions whose primary role was to preserve and promote high culture. From the very first -- in the voices contributing to the development of policy, in the persons selected to fill positions of public responsibility, and in the very reasons for which policy was created -- the pivotal principle has been the institutionalization of the taste of those who support and protect these institutions.

Because the role of public policy has been to promote high arts institutions and not to promote cultural democracy, any progress made in obtaining access to the public arts support system by people outside the major institutions has been the result of a tooth-and-nail battle -- a string of petitions and complaints, task forces and inquiries as long as the history of the National Endowment for the Arts.

By and For The People

A policy of cultural democracy could ensure that the means and tools of cultural participation and creation are there for any members of society who wish to use them, instead of a privileged few. A policy of cultural democracy could mean that the life of an artist -- regardless of the artist's medium, subject, style or ethnicity -- might be productive, dignified, deserving of respect, instead of one long contest with different rules for different players.

No small group of experts of influential people should design the cultural policy for a nation; developing a policy of cultural democracy for the United States should be a task in which the people of United States play the largest part. Formulating such a policy will involve a great deal of careful deliberation. It will mean examining the cultural impact of past policies, and making every possible effort to redress the harm they did. It will mean altering current policies so they don't repeat or extend the errors of the past; and it will mean careful consideration to provide for cultural freedom and equality in the future.

V. LEARNING FROM OTHERS

This examination should draw not only on our own past and resources, but also on the experiences of other nations and regions of the world. Augustin Girard's Cultural Development: Experience and Policies contains remarks by UNESCO Director-General Rene Maheu inspired by the U.N.'s Universal Declaration of Human Rights section on culture: "Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of a community":

"It is not certain that the full significance of this text, proclaiming a new human right, the right to culture, was entirely appreciated at the time. If everyone, as an essential part of his dignity as a man, has the right to share in the cultural heritage and cultural activities of the community -- or rather of the different communities to which men belong (and that of course includes the ultimate community -- mankind) -- it follows that the authorities responsible for these communities have a duty, so far as their resources permit, to provide him with the means for such participation... Everyone, accordingly, has the right to culture, as he has the right to education and the right to work... This is the basis and first purpose of cultural policy."

We would like to offer a fundamental statement of cultural policy which we believe has exceptional relevance to the debate over cultural policy in the U.S. This is from the "Declaration of Bogota," adopted by the UNESCO-sponsored Conference on Cultural Policies in Latin America and the Caribbean in January, 1978. The governments of the region jointly:

Proclaim the following principles governing cultural policy in Latin America and the Caribbean:

1. All the cultures of the region possess the same dignity.
2. Every people or group of peoples has

both the right and the duty to determine independently its own cultural identity, based on its historical antecedents, its individual values and aspirations, and its sovereign will.

3. Each of the cultural components of Latin America and the Caribbean must be duly and justly esteemed, preserved and developed in accordance with its characteristics and without prejudice or detriment to the others.

4. Cultural authenticity is based on recognition of the components of cultural identity, whatever their geographic origin and however they have mingled.

5. Cultural autonomy is inseparable from the full exercise of sovereignty, territorial integrity and possibilities for broad communication with the world. It is therefore of vital interest to Latin America and the Caribbean that the enclaves and isolation of all kinds that still affect such autonomy in the region should be eliminated.

6. It is the responsibility of the State to promote and support cultural development in accordance with the specific characteristics of each people, and to guarantee freedom of creation.

7. Culture and cultural development are closely linked to communication, education, science and technology and consequently the policies for each should be concerted within the context of integral development.

8. Throughout the region there is a manifest determination to achieve integration which, while respecting the specific qualities of each people, will result in a common destiny for Latin America and the Caribbean.

9. Latin America and the Caribbean, a region that is open to contact with all the cultures of the earth, has a mission to serve mankind and the interests of true universality.

10. Latin America and the Caribbean share the yearning for justice, sovereignty, freedom, well-being and peace for all peoples, both within and beyond its ambit, and maintains fraternal relations with the other regions of the world which, like itself, are on the path to development.

11. In order to ensure the exercise of their sovereignty, the safeguarding of their interests and cultural identity, as well as their technological independence, the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean should strengthen and expand their own systems of communication and information, at both the national and regional levels, and thus contribute to the establishment of an international information order that is more just and more consonant with the aspirations of all peoples of the world;

12. Latin America and the Caribbean respect the cultural identity of all peoples, firmly demands respect for its own, and rejects all forms of cultural domination.

* * * * *
May is Cultural Democracy Month. Join the many neighborhood arts groups and friends across the U.S. who are speaking out in favor

of cultural democracy this month -- and in the many months to come -- as we work to ensure the basic, human right to culture for all.

Don Adams
Arlene Goldbard

A Note to Our Readers: We strive to assure that the language used in NAPNOC notes is respectful of all our readers, but this month we have been forced to quote from a great deal of historical material, much of which is sexist in vocabulary. We beg your forbearance.

You may wish to look into some of the periodicals we've mentioned in this article:

Southern Exposure is changing format -- from four issues a year to six issues. The six-issue price (which starts with the next issue) is \$16 per year. The single issue cited in this article, "Stayed On Freedom," is available for \$4.50. Write to P.O. Box 531, Durham, NC 27702. This issue also features an article by NAPNOC member John O'Neal on "Art and the Movement."

Democracy is a new quarterly which deals with issues of social policy and American history. The issue we quoted in this article, April 1981, Volume 1, Number 2, is available for \$4. A year's subscription is \$12. Write to Subscription Manager, Democracy, 43 W. 61st St., New York, NY 10023.

Democratic Visions: Progressives and The American Heritage by Harry C. Boyte is published by the Citizen Heritage Center, Station 19, 2001 University Avenue S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55414. Singles copies are \$1.50.

Cultures is published four times a year by UNESCO. The price changes, but at last call it was \$25 per year. Write to UNIPUB, Box 433, Murray Hill Station, New York, NY 10016. The issue which contains "The Declaration of Bogota" quoted here is Volume V. Number 3.

HISPANIC AMERICAN ARTS (Continued from page 1)

in Chicago, IL; Jacinto Quirarte of the Research Center for the Arts in San Antonio, TX; Elsa Robles of the Association of Hispanic Arts (AHA) in New York; and Lorenzo Trujillo of the Chicano Humanities and Arts Council (CHAC) in Denver. (For some background on these organizations, see NAPNOC notes #9.)

The plan calls for establishing a national Information Network for Hispanic American Arts. According to the Committee report, "the Network will provide information and assistance to Hispanic American artists and organizations and will inform others about the creative activities and circumstances of these individuals and groups. The Network will gather and disseminate information of interest to the Hispanic arts community, will serve as an advocate for strengthening Hispanic arts, and will provide technical assistance to Hispanic artists and organizations. The Network will also provide information to the National Endowment for the Arts, act as a liaison between the N.E.A. and the field.

and be useful as a model for others serving a broader arts constituency in the U.S." Among the projects mentioned in the report are a newsletter, pamphlets, resource lists, radio and tv publicity, acting as advocate for private funding, offering assistance in applying for public funds, presenting workshops, and serving as liaison with other organizations.

The report proposes that the Network be seen as a "spoked wheel," with a 17-person Board of Directors at its hub, and eight Regional Consultants, who will gather and disseminate information and provide technical assistance. The eight regions are: Southern Pacific Coast (Los Angeles); Northern Pacific Coast (San Francisco); Southwest (Santa Fe); South Central Plains (San Antonio or Houston); Great Lakes (Chicago); Northeast (New York); Southeast (Miami); and Puerto Rico (San Juan).

The work of the Regional Consultants is to be coordinated by a "Coordinating Unit," but the structure and location of this unit have yet to be decided. At the NCA meeting, Jacinto Quirarte (who represented the Advisory Committee) said that the project would be implemented in stages -- the Network and Board first, the Coordinating Unit last.

At issue here seems to be the autonomy of the organizations that make up the Network, and the question of leadership. notes readers will recall that a 1980 plan to establish an information center at Quirarte's Institution in San Antonio was quashed at the last moment in response to criticism from East Coast groups who felt any center should be located in Washington. Apparently, the issue has been temporarily resolved by tabling the question of the center and its location in favor of work on the decentralized Network. Some observers at the NCA meeting expressed concern about the ability of the Network to function effectively without solid coordination; it remains to be seen.

In the meantime, eight regional organizations which form NCHAAO -- ARTS, AHA, MIRA, CHAC, Ariztlan in Arizona, Cofradía de Artes y Artesanos Hispánicos in New Mexico, the San Antonio Consortium for Hispanic Arts (SACHA) in Texas, and the Concilio de Arte Popular in California -- will apply for funds from the NEA and other sources. A.B. Spellman, head of NEA's Expansion Arts Program and Human Rights Office, sat at the table along with Joe Rodriguez of the Office of Human Rights (who has acted as staff liaison for the Advisory Committee). Spellman assured the Council members that applications to NEA from these groups "can be reviewed in regular categories, without pressure, but based on merit."

During the report, there was much thanking of the Advisory Committee for being understanding and not putting pressure on NEA for money at this difficult time. It was noted several times that the Task Force process had been exceptionally lengthy -- beginning in 1977 -- but the ironic fact that the budget cuts looming have relieved the NCA of its obligation to respond to the report with money was not remarked upon. Some observers speculated that the Endowment would come through with support -- that the agency

would provide grant funds for the Network through its member organizations -- but that, too, remains to be seen.

MOSES MEETS THE GIPPER

Substantiating the allegation that all rumors about the Reagan administration eventually come true, the White House issued an announcement on May 6 of the appointment of a troika to head a task force on the arts and humanities. The three co-chairs are actor Charlton Heston (best known for his portrayal of Moses in The Ten Commandments); University of Chicago President Hanna Holborn Gray; and Daniel Terra, who Reagan had earlier designated to serve as ambassador-at-large for cultural affairs.

According to statements by Frank Hodsohl deputy to White House Chief of Staff James Baker, the role of the task force will be to "find ways the private sector might offset the cuts" proposed for the budgets of the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities.

President Reagan's statement concerning the task force is more general: "I am naming this task force because of my deep concern for the arts and humanities in America. Our cultural institutions are an essential national resource; they must be kept strong. While I believe firmly that the federal government must reduce its spending, I am nevertheless sympathetic to the very real needs of our cultural organizations and hope the task force will deliver to my desk by Labor Day a plan to make better use of existing federal resources and to increase the support for the arts and humanities by the private sector."

The Washington Post of May 7 quoted Heston, who will chair the arts portion of the task force, as saying he will endeavor to make the Endowments more effective: "There are an awful lot of filing cabinets and people who put things in them. But I don't mean we're going to go around with a meat ax."

Other possible task force members have been mentioned, but at this writing appointments haven't been made. Some of the prospects are Barnabas McHenry of Reader's Digest and the Wallace Foundation (the person who first suggested to the President the possibility of revamping the Endowments into semi-public corporations like the Corporation for Public Broadcasting); Beverly Sills, general director of the New York City Opera; Arthur Mitchell of the Dance Theatre of Harlem; Roger Stevens, head of the Kennedy Center; Henry Geldzahler, head of the New York City Department of Cultural Affairs; Franklin Shaffner, NCA member and director of the film Patton; and Margo Albert, member of both the NCA and the California Arts Council.

The House appropriations subcommittee concerned with the NEA held its scheduled hearings on the agency's budget on the days immediately following the announcement of the task force, a coincidence that prompted Rep. Sidney Yates (D.-IL) to wonder whether the President was trying "to remove pressure

from the White House engendered by the enormous support for the arts." Certainly Endowment-watchers are aware of the prospect that the President -- by the creation of the task force, by the appointments he makes or doesn't make to replace Endowment Chairmen Duffey and Biddle this fall, and by taking advantage of his opportunities to act by Executive Order or through the budget recision and deferral processes -- might have his way with the Endowments in spite of any Congressional action. And this awareness may take the edge off Congress' willingness to fight it out.

But at their May 9 and 10 meeting some members of the National Council on the Arts, alarmed by this prospect, began to talk of setting up what the Post describes as "a nonprofit organization of private citizens that would oppose any...recommendations" from the White House task force to change the structure of the NEA. Some Council members were quite upset by the establishment of the task force, coming as it has on top of heavy recommended budget cuts. NCA member Norman Champ said that the White House "said the Endowment has to pay for the task force," according to the Post, and that "you can make sure I'm going to do my part to see that they don't get a nickel." Chairman Biddle said that the White House hadn't asked for money yet, just staff -- and that he would give them staff support if they wanted it.

Current Year Cuts?

Meanwhile, the Senate subcommittee on education, arts and humanities recommended recisions in the current year budgets of the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities -- about \$11 million from NEH and \$9 million from NEA. The recisions would have to be approved by the full Senate and House to go into effect.

For the moment, Chairman Duffey at NEH has placed a temporary freeze on 300-400 new grant award notifications. And while Chairman Biddle at NEA has not frozen his agency's funds, he told the Post that if necessary he'll look at the various programs and see how much money has already been distributed. "It's going to be very complicated and there may be some injustices," said Biddle, "but we'll try to be as fair as possible."

We'll keep you posted.

With this, its twelfth issue, NAPNOC notes is one year old. Take a moment to drop us a line and let us know how you like notes. Do you have ideas for articles you'd like to write -- or see someone else write? Any criticisms, suggestions, helpful hints? Let us hear from you.

If you haven't been reading NAPNOC notes, you've missed regular coverage of resources for neighborhood arts work, current developments in cultural policy and politics, and news of the neighborhood arts movement across the U.S. -- and in other countries.

Sign me up for a year's subscription. Enclosed is my check for \$25.

Please send me information about becoming a NAPNOC member. (Members receive a free subscription to NAPNOC notes; membership fees begin at \$25 per year.)

I'm an angel. Enclosed is my tax-deductible contribution of \$_____.

Name	Organization name (if any)
Mailing Address	Zip
	Contact phone

Please return to NAPNOC, P. O. Box 3036, Washington, DC 20010, or telephone NAPNOC at (202) 667-4200. Thanks for your help.