

NAPNOC

notes

Issue number 6

P.O. Box 3036, Washington, DC 20010

November 1980

Round Two with the High Chiefs of Arts

"When I took, as we all did, the oath of office...swearing that I would defend the United States of American against all enemies, foreign or domestic...I didn't think I would have to ward off domestic enemies until today...!"

Who is speaking? Sen. Joseph McCarthy on the communist menace circa 1952? Richard Nixon on his enemies list? Guess again: The speaker is Theodore Bikel, a member of the National Council on the Arts (NCA), the Presidentially-appointed advisory panel to the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), and also President of Actors' Equity Association. The date is October 30, 1980, and the subject of his remarks is a report commissioned by the NEA to give it guidance on the question of support for community arts agencies. You ain't heard nothin' yet.

We were among three or four outsiders who attended this meeting of the NCA's Policy and Planning Committee; we went to hear the Committee discuss a report based on the work of David B.H. Martin of the Center for Responsive Governance in Washington. Martin has been commissioned to review NEA's previous deliberations on the issue of support for community arts councils, and to do additional research and come up with a recommendation on how NEA should handle this thorny problem.

The Local Arts Council Question

The issue is a fairly complex one, but some of the main points involved are these: Local arts councils have no program of direct subsidy from the NEA, unlike state arts agencies which get an annual bloc grant. While local arts councils can apply to various NEA grants programs and compete with other applicants (e.g., a local arts council might get a Theatre Program grant to support a production, or a Visual Arts Program grant for an exhibit), they can't get ongoing subsidy just for being local arts councils -- that is, for putting out a community calendar, doing an arts hot line, providing classroom and meeting space, running united fund drives for local groups, and so on. So a basic issue is quid pro quo: Local arts councils claim they raise lots of money for the arts and assert that all art work takes place at the local level; they support the budgets of the NEA and their state arts agencies; and they don't think they get enough recognition and support in return.

Other issues are involved as well. Many local arts agencies complain that the NEA's persistent emphasis on what the Endowment calls "professional excellence" leaves aside the most important aspects of their programs

Providing cultural opportunities for local people, both as audience members and as active participants. This emphasis makes it easier for a local arts council to get NEA funds to bring in a New York-based chamber ensemble or dance company than to involve local people in their own music and dance groups. Perhaps the most important question is the one often referred to as "decentralization" or "local autonomy": Should decisions about subsidy for local arts activities be made in Washington, by the federal agency or should they be made closer to home, by state and local agencies?

Three Ways of Looking at Cultural Policy

Martin's work is not yet complete, but some of his suggestions were delivered to this NCA committee meeting by Hank Putsch, head of the Office of Partnership, in a draft discussion paper entitled "Toward a

A Note to Our Readers:

This issue features articles on two federally-funded agencies whose programs may provide support for neighborhood arts work. To the best of our ability, we've provided up-to-date and accurate information on their operations. But Washington right now is in a state of flux, and in all its agencies people temper their comments about grants programs with cautions about the new administration. As to how the change in administration will affect federal agencies, your guess is as good as ours. But rest assured that we'll pass anything we learn on to you.

NAPNOC notes is published by the Neighborhood Arts Programs National Organizing Committee (NAPNOC). Copyrighted articles may not be reprinted without the 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. NAPNOC notes is a resource for the neighborhood arts movement. We urge you to post it on bulletin boards or reprint parts of it in your own newsletters. Use it to ask other neighborhood arts people for help or information, or to share information with them. Please put NAPNOC on your organization's mailing list. Please address all correspondence to NAPNOC, P.O. Box 3036, Washington DC 20010, or call (202)667-4200. NAPNOC notes is edited by NAPNOC Co-Directors Don Adams and Arlene Goldbard.

Policy for the National Endowment for the Arts Concerning Local and Community Arts Agencies." Most of the paper is devoted to laying out a construct -- a way of looking at the whole picture of cultural support -- that presents local arts agencies in a new light as far as the Endowment goes.

The paper says there are three differing views of government's role in relation to the arts, and that all of these views are supported by the NEA's enabling legislation. They are as follows:

1) "Promote Professional Artistic Excellence," which "holds that because the quality of life may be enhanced by the influence of artists of professional caliber through what they produce, there is an appropriate role for government to support their activities, as individuals and in groups, and to promote the availability of their work...Furthermore, given limited resources from which to provide support, efforts should be made to select, from among all who may seek support, those artists, arts organizations and arts activities which are of the highest quality."

2) "Promote Cultural Democracy," which says that "the arts are a form of cultural activity in which any and all individuals and groups in society might participate and, by so doing, will find enhancement and enrichment of their lives -- as individuals and as groups...In a democratic society, this view holds that individuals and groups should be free to participate (or not) in the arts in whatever way they choose...without limitations concerning either the professional caliber of such activity or its commercially profitable or non-profit character...As with any other activity that is part of the culture of a democratic society, the role of government is to assure that the will or preference of neither an overbearing majority nor a powerful minority will so predominate as to infringe the opportunity for artistic freedom and self-determination... Or, stated positively, the role of government is to promote a climate in which the fullest possible opportunities for pluralistic, artistic self-determination will exist."

3) "Promote Applied Arts" holds "that artists can and should, by specific and direct applications of their ideas and works, exert significant influence on the manner in which other societal activities are carried out. In this view, regardless of which of the other two views is held, there may be a role for government to promote applications of the arts to various societal endeavors, including, for example, environmental and building design and construction; ...service to youth, the handicapped and the aging..."

This discussion paper's thesis is that the Endowment's enabling legislation supports all three views, though in practice the NEA's programs have given by far the most support to the first -- to "promoting professional artistic excellence" -- and in doing so has implicitly limited others' freedom of expression and participation and become an official arbiter of "artistic standards." The paper recommends that the

NEA "strengthen its role as promoter of cultural democracy," and asserts that part of this new role should be to adopt "a positive and responsive policy relative to local and community arts agencies."

The Bottom Line

The discussion paper offers a recommendation for a policy toward community arts agencies that incorporates many ideas and values normally associated with neighborhood arts work. For example, it proposes that the NEA support local and state arts agencies which provide the following kinds of opportunities, among others: "participation by individuals of all ages and vocations in the process of artistic expression"; "participation in artist-audience relationships in which artists...help (people) to create ..."; "participation in activities...in which the expression of art...(is) expanded to infuse the total environment with new forms and creations"; "(participation) in community choices about the arts...as a necessity of life, a human and community right to which all citizens have access"; and "to celebrate and experience expressions of the diverse aesthetic forms and cultural traditions..."

It goes on to say "By adopting such a policy statement, the National Endowment for the Arts would -- as an essential feature of a broadly conceived policy of support for the arts in the United States -- provide a basis for the recognition and encouragement of democratically accountable local and community arts-support institutions empowered to undertake a role of providing community cultural planning and support for the arts."

Here are the specific actions the discussion paper recommends:

1. "Reaffirm and strengthen existing policies which allow direct access to the individual arts discipline programs (for local arts agencies)..."

2. "Reaffirm and strengthen existing policies which address the purpose of encouraging State Arts Agency support for the growth, development and program-effectiveness of the Local/Community Arts Agencies through State Programs and the Artists-in-Education Program; (both of these programs are part of the NEA's Office of Partnership)

3. "Take appropriate and feasible steps to develop a new Endowment program of assistance for Local/Community Arts Agencies through the State Arts Agencies...; (in terms of new initiatives, this is the major new action proposed in the paper)

4. "Establish within the Office of Partnership, through a position or other appropriate procedure, a mechanism providing special recognition to assure the development and implementation of the above-mentioned policies and programs; to provide a clearinghouse of information...and...assistance; to identify and encourage model demonstrations...; to assist and encourage... statewide and national assemblies of local/community arts agencies; to work with the art-discipline programs to maximize opportunities for Endowment encouragement of its

role as a promoter of cultural democracy; and to provide liaison functions for local/community arts agencies with other federal agencies."

In short, the discussion paper the Office of Partnership presented to the NCA's Policy and Planning Committee elaborated a way of looking at national cultural policy that is far more democratic and neighborhood arts-oriented than the ideas currently in favor with Endowment leadership. It asserted that the NEA ought to encourage and support local arts agencies in promoting cultural democracy at the local level; and it recommended that the Endowment take some small first steps in the direction of cultural democracy by creating a grants program to permit state arts agencies to support local arts agencies committed to cultural democracy, and by putting a liaison/technical assistance person on the Partnership Office staff to coordinate this effort.

The High Chiefs Freak Out

From a neighborhood arts perspective, this is clearly a modest proposal. While it's encouraging to see the idea of cultural democracy presented in the high councils of the federal agency, the program initiatives recommended -- a small grants program, a new staff person -- are cautious at best.

But to some of the National Council members who heard this proposal presented, it was "a bad document, ... a pernicious document, ... both in form and content" (Bikel again). Another NCA member, Martin Friedman of Minneapolis' Walker Art Center, suggested that one could "surreptitiously sell (the proposal) to the KGB, because I think it would do far more than any kind of powerful strategic missile system... It would be the first thing to erode a culture..."

What did the Council members find so threatening about this discussion paper? Another comment of Bikel's (by far the most dramatic and vocal speaker on this issue) provides the key: "I resent cultural democracy as a term," he said, "because it seems to use the term 'democracy,' which we all swear by to our flag and to our faith; it subverts the term 'democracy' into an autocracy of the uninformed -- cultural democracy meaning that we have to be dictated to by those for whom we toil..."

Bikel continued: "(T)he monies and the efforts of this agency are not meant for the people of the United States of America -- they are meant for artists of excellence, the fruit of whose labor is meant for the people..." He went on to draw a parallel between the role of the NEA vis-a-vis local arts agencies and the role of school administrators vis-a-vis students: "The Department of Education sets certain criteria for curricula -- I have yet to hear them consulting student bodies around the country, and that is basically what self-determination is all about... Whenever localities will show professional excellence, they will be supported as long as I have breath."

Most of Bikel's and Friedman's remarks were presented in a kind of stand-up comic style. They used much of their time to read quotes from the discussion paper and to look

indignant. Apparently, they expected their opinions to be shared by the other Council members, since neither man went to any length to explain his position. But then, no one seemed willing to brave expressing opposition to their assertions about the "pernicious" qualities of the discussion paper; most of the other committee members held their tongues, and Hank Putsch, who presented the paper, uttered scarcely a word in its defense.

How Would This Play in Peoria?

We found ourselves wishing that all of the NEA's constituents could experience this presentation for themselves, since it so eloquently summed up the principal issues in the current debate on public cultural policy. Bikel and Friedman were in such a frenzy over Partnership's cautious proposal because it called into question the cherished idea that the purpose of the Endowment is to support the major arts institutions, their values, and their notion of "quality." The discussion paper suggested that the Endowment has a broader responsibility to taxpayers, and the National Council members reacted as if it had called for an immediate and violent revolution.

In their eagerness to quash the proposal, the NCA members let slip a few remarks they may have occasion to regret, some of which we have already shared with you. Here are a few additional highlights.

Friedman: "People don't want double standards -- they don't want to be fooled. They're smarter perhaps than we're giving them credit for: They understand education, they understand amateurism, they understand community events -- but they don't for a moment confuse what they're participating in with art itself... Are we really in the business of supporting amateurism?... Where does it all end? The neighborhoods? With the streets?... The result can only be dilution, confusion, and chaos."

In response to the discussion paper's reminder that the NEA must heed Congressional guidance on the question of community support, Bikel complained that "it twists the arms of this committee and the Council by... intimating that because some people got to the Congress... and somehow made them write in some of their reports that some of our attention and a goodly share of our money has to go the 'local community' we must therefore follow suit." Bikel is saying here that the Endowment can disregard the terms Congress laid down in making its budget appropriation to the NEA, an opinion Congress would likely find interesting.

Babes in Toyland

We were struck by Friedman's and Bikel's ignorance about issues in the field of cultural policy, and by their apparent inattention to the substance of the document under consideration. It seemed to be the first time either of them had come across the term "cultural democracy," an idea with which cultural policy-makers might be expected to have at least passing familiarity. Friedman said he "learned a lot of new words" and "new phrases," including "artistic self-determination..."

don't quite understand their use in the context of all this..." He pooh-poohed the idea that the Endowment's obsession with "professional quality" might limit opportunities for cultural participation by dismissing the idea of "cultural preferences": "We know about political preferences, we know about sexual preferences, now we are hearing about cultural preferences." And he repeatedly criticized the discussion paper for proposing a "new cultural delivery system" whereby community arts agencies could apply directly to a new NEA program designed for them -- when the proposal under consideration never suggested such a system, recommending instead that NEA increase its support to state arts agencies so that they could develop a "state/local partnership."

Beyond all the quotable quotes and excessive zeal (at one point Friedland commented "I can barely control myself as I go through it") is a much more serious prospect. The committee dismissed out of hand an analysis of policy that could help it to resolve its longest-standing problem-- support for local programs -- and could, at the same time, introduce a far more satisfactory and consistent way of looking at government's cultural responsibility and authority. They dismissed this sensible proposal with the most shameless display of mud-slinging and red-herring-flinging we've seen since McCarthy and Nixon's aforementioned performances. Friedman: "Whoever wrote this thing, obviously, I assume is reflecting some sort of a guiding committee, and I am concerned about the philosophy behind this guidance. On page 20 we come across something called 'the will of the overbearing majority versus the tyranny of the powerful minority.' And in case you're wondering who the 'powerful minority' is, that represents the areas that our program chairmen are directing: We're talking about the institutions -- theaters, museums, concert halls, operas and so forth..."

More of the Same

In case this seems like an exceptional situation to you, let us offer an additional, chilling note. The first agenda item that morning was touring; the NCA members discussed a proposed new program of support for presenters of touring performances, for which a total of \$4 million is being requested. The bulk of the discussion focused on the issue of "quality" (or alternately, "professional excellence"), specifically whether the NEA could make grants to presenters who presented some performers or groups that hadn't received the Endowment stamp of quality. Willard "Sandy" Boyd, NCA member and President of the University of Iowa, asserted that "a principal function of the NEA is to support the national treasures" and the function of this new presenters' program would be to circulate these national treasures. Deputy Director Mary Ann Tighe, silent through most of the day's discussions, spoke up to add another item to the list of functions the program could fulfill. She said that the Endowment gives "Lincoln Center, the Kennedy Center and other major institutions shamefully little money now," and that the program for presenters would

be a way to help remedy that deficiency.

As far as the NCA members were concerned, Lincoln Center and the Kennedy Center are the bastions of quality in the arts; they are what the Endowment means when its guidelines and policy statements refer to "quality," and everything else is second-best -- or worse. Perhaps we who have a different idea should seize this opportunity to earn a little public exposure for this truly pernicious policy; we think it's likely that a great many people would be interested in reading the remarks of public officials who find cultural democracy abhorrent, who see the American people as schoolchildren and themselves as headmasters, and who think the monies of a tax-supported agency "are not intended for the people of America." Let's try to give Friedman's and Bikel's remarks -- and their disastrous effects on our hopes for improvement in the NEA -- the exposure they deserve.

Don Adams
Arlene Goldbard

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION: New Policy, New Possibilities

The Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) is the oldest and largest of twelve regional development commissions set up by Congress to funnel federal aid into economically depressed areas and to encourage cooperative planning among the states to address their region's special problems.

ARC was started in 1965. Decisions are made by a board composed of the Governors of the 13 states in the region (all of West Virginia as well as parts of Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee and Virginia, according to ARC), a fact that ARC staff people emphasize when they talk about the agency's policies. Projects or grants sponsored by ARC must be brought before the Commission by one of the member states, so a neighborhood arts groups in, say, West Virginia or Tennessee can't take its ideas directly to ARC without the state government fronting for them. In states where the Governor's office is unsympathetic to cultural programs, this can be an insurmountable stumbling block.

But if cultural groups in the region can mobilize statehouse support, ARC has adopted a policy that may make funding easier for them to obtain -- and might also set an important precedent for the other eleven regional commissions, none of whom, to our knowledge, has made community cultural support a priority. On September 17, ARC adopted "A Resolution Establishing Policies for Cultural Activities," intended to "broaden and clarify Commission policy in the cultural area and permit Appalachian assistance for cultural activities that provide employment opportunities, create amenities that will attract industry and promote tourism, and enhance the quality of life for people in the region."

ARC has mainly been a "bricks and mortar" funding agency; that is, most of its

money has gone for capital construction and renovation projects, in culture and in other realms of social endeavor. In a "Representative Listing of Arts and Crafts Projects" ARC funded from 1976-1979, the Commission included seven projects in as many states; five of these were for construction or renovation of buildings, while the other two supported crafts marketing projects.

The New Resolution

The resolution on cultural policy gives the Commission the right to support "research,...marketing,...building on existent programs, expanding existent facility utilization for cultural purposes,... providing cultural/educational experiences, and...giving greater visibility to the Region's cultural resources," subject to each state's determination of its own priorities.

The question in the minds of ARC watchers is this: Will the Commission and its member states act on this new resolution and use the authority it grants to broaden support for cultural programs beyond bricks and mortar to include support for all kinds of program activities?

The ad hoc advisory committee appointed in June 1979 to look into the whole question of cultural support clearly hoped so. Its recommendations, which led to the resolution adopted in September, included two specific actions the Commission should undertake:

"The researching and cataloguing of cultural resources" (for which the advisory committee recommended a grant to "the Mid-Atlantic States Arts Consortium for developing a design that would result in the completion and publication of a catalogue detailing cultural resources in the Appalachian Region"; and

"The performance of needs assessments in order to guide future investment policy" (which could be conducted under the States' technical assistance authority for planning, evaluation and program development)."

At ARC's next Board of Governors meeting on November 18, the Commission will consider funding a four to six month-long cultural resources/needs assessment study designed to accomplish both of these tasks. The study would be conducted jointly by the Mid-Atlantic States Arts Consortium and the Southern Arts Federation. If the study is funded an advisory body will be assembled and will include the Directors of all the state arts agencies in the region. So if you want a voice for neighborhood arts work in the results, now is the time to contact your state arts agency or regional arts organization about it.

ARC & The Arts to Date

When support has come from ARC in the past, it's been major support. ARC covered the largest portion of the money Appalshop, in Whitesburg, KY, is spending to purchase and renovate its new facility, which will include space for Appalshop's media produc-

tion enterprises as well as a community theater and other kinds of cultural programs. Appalshop is an important and successful neighborhood arts-type program, and without ARC support it would have had a far more difficult time securing adequate facilities to serve its own programs and the surrounding community.

On the other hand, ARC's largest arts-related investment to date is in the construction and operation of the Joe L. Evins Appalachian Center for Crafts, outside of Nashville -- a multi-million dollar fiasco according to our sources in the vicinity. Built to honor a local politician, the Center is apparently under-utilized and poorly-sited to house Appalachian cultural activities. The people we talked with regarded it as a monument to waste, and bitterly speculated about the positive impact the money might have had if used to help existing cultural projects.

According to the funding criteria adopted as part of the Commission's new resolution on cultural activities, grants for construction, renovation and equipment can cover up to 80% of the total project cost, while it appears that grants for "demonstrations and operations" can cover 95% of the total project cost in the first year and declining amounts for up to five years.

So it remains to be seen whether ARC's new cultural policy will encourage new support for neighborhood arts activity in the region, or whether it will be used, as one ARC staff member suggested, for projects like "building a summer home in the region for the Pittsburgh Symphony." By our reading of ARC's authority, the answer is up to the member states: If they can be persuaded that cultural programs are worth proposing and defending before the Commission, ARC's resolution on cultural activities can make a big difference to neighborhood arts groups in the Appalachian region. That is, if the new administration doesn't move to cut the budgets of the regional commissions; right now ARC is operating on a "continuing resolution" because Congress hasn't approved its new budget, so the future is up for grabs.

To find out about your own state's interest in this new cultural policy and ARC, contact the director of your local development district. If you don't know who that is, the city council, county government or chamber of commerce will.

Appalachian Regional Commission
1666 Connecticut Ave NW
Washington, DC 20235

Interior Department's HCRS: A Potential Resource for Neighborhood Arts

Neighborhood arts groups are nothing if not resourceful in their approach to public funding agencies. CETA, urban and rural development funds, transportation agency funds -- even the National Aeronautics and Space Administration -- have been tapped by enterprising cultural groups. The challenge these funding pioneers have faced is making the relevance of their

work clear to agencies whose own goals are only tangentially related to culture. But if they can clear this hurdle, the potential reward is great: Opening a new channel for funds for neighborhood arts work, without subjecting the work to irrelevant and parochial-arts world standards (such as "who do you know?" and "who knows you?").

Such is the challenge -- and the potential for reward -- presented by the Department of the Interior's Heritage, Conservation and Recreation Service (HCRS). HCRS' varied activities at first glance seem tailored to neighborhood arts' groups needs. A closer look at HCRS' output, however, offers a less sanguine view of its suitability as a source of neighborhood arts support -- at least right now. But the potential is there, and in the hope that it can be developed, we offer the following information.

HCRS was created by the Secretary of the Interior in January, 1978. It subsumed a number of programs begun in the 1960's -- the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, and the Natural Landmarks Program. HCRS' activities encompass coordination of public planning and policy development for recreation, preservation and conservation; grant-making to states and municipal governments in each of these three areas; and technical assistance in all three areas.

UPARR

The most important HCRS funding program with potential for urban neighborhood arts support is UPARR -- the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Program. Established by an Act of Congress in 1978, UPARR's central goal is "to enhance the quality of life in American cities" -- especially the 405 cities and counties identified by HCRS as "suffering from physical and economic distress" and therefore eligible to apply for UPARR grants. (Other municipalities may apply, but can be considered only in a smaller discretionary grants category.) UPARR grants are given to city and county governments, which may act as "flow-throughs" and channel the money to independent units of government or nonprofit organizations.

Most UPARR grants have gone to rehabilitate existing recreation facilities that are in need of repair -- a review of the grants to date reveals a heavy emphasis on swimming pools, playing fields and "tot lots." Among the facilities rehabilitated through UPARR grants, though, are a good many neighborhood and community centers, and some of their project summaries mention theaters and space for arts and crafts. One nonprofit theater was being rehab'd to allow handicapped access. In some cases, plans indicated that community-based organizations were going to administer and program the completed facilities.

The other main use of UPARR grants is to "encourage innovations in recreation programming"; up to 10% of UPARR funds may be used for this purpose. These grants are the only current HCRS funds that can be used for programming purposes, as opposed to facility construction or rehabilitation and land acquisition. "Innovation grants"

are designed to demonstrate effective methods of enhancing recreation opportunities at the neighborhood level. May UPARR "innovation grants" to date have been for joint programs involving local park authorities and community organizations that carry out recreational programs -- including some arts groups.

Aside from these two types of support (each of which requires a 30% match from local sources to 70% HCRS funding), UPARR also makes grants to support local planning efforts in eligible urban areas. Five-year plans (called "recovery action programs" by HCRS) are required of all grantees; HCRS matching grants can cover up to 50% of the cost of preparing such action plans. HCRS literature emphasizes the involvement of community members and groups that are potential users and contributors to recreation programs in such planning.

UPARR grants are always made to local municipal governments. In the first three rounds of UPARR grants-making 254 grants were made for a total of \$91 million. The average grant was about \$290,000, but the size of individual grants ranged from \$7,000 to \$5.25 million. UPARR was established as a five-year program, authorized to receive and dispense \$150 million in grants for each of four years, and \$125 million in the final year. Actual appropriations have not approached this ceiling so far, and the new administration is unlikely to call for appropriations at the full funding level.

Neighborhood arts groups interested in developing programs eligible for HCRS support should be in touch with their local recreation agencies. Find out if your city is eligible, if a "recovery action program" has been prepared, and if HCRS funds are already being received. Check the information at the end of this article first to learn more about the specific goals and programs of HCRS.

State Programs

The other main funding program for recreation at HCRS is drawn from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, mainly comprising revenues from offshore oil drilling rights. These funds are allocated to states according to a population-based formula. In Fiscal Year 1980, Wyoming received \$2,367,522; California got the largest share at \$21,801,545.

Grants can be used by the states to support planning, acquisition and development of outdoor recreation facilities or areas; they are administered mainly through "State Liaison Officers" (SLOs). Applications for Land and Water Conservation funds are submitted to SLOs (who are generally the heads of state agencies responsible for outdoor recreation programs). Each state prepares a Statewide Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP), which outlines recreational needs and opportunities, priorities and policies, and an action plan for the allocation on grant funds. Then funds are sub-granted -- just who receives the grants is up to each SLO, though all of the grants made by each state must fit into the priority areas identified in the SCORP. The action plan section of the SCORP must be re-done at least every two years.

Programs that have received grants from the Land and Water Conservation Fund vary widely, from small neighborhood playgrounds to massive natural areas. Most projects focus on physical development, all of which must be related to outdoor recreation (a provision that lessens the applicability of Land and Water Conservation Funds to many community cultural projects). Since this is a sub-granting program, HCRS in Washington doesn't have complete information on the projects funded by the various states, but did cite one example. New York state's Urban Cultural Parks Program was initiated in 1977 and supported in part by a planning grant from the Land and Water Conservation Fund. The Urban Cultural Parks Program focuses on coordinating community preservation efforts by local public and private entities; the State Parks Department has been working with local recreation authorities to help them develop varied "human-scale" parks throughout the state that reflect surrounding communities' social and cultural character.

If you are interested in finding out how these funds are awarded in your state, you should contact the state department for outdoor recreation and ask how to get information about the SCORP. Each SCORP is required to outline the role of various recreational officials and the general public in identifying state recreation opportunities; neighborhood arts participation in this process could bring cultural facilities into a priority position in the state plan -- if they haven't already been identified as such in your state.

Information Exchange

Aside from its grants-making and policy and planning functions, HCRS also provides technical assistance to agencies and groups concerned with parks and recreation, historic preservation and conservation. The main channel for HCRS technical assistance is the Information Exchange.

Information Exchange members (membership is free) receive regular "Technical Assistance Notifications," newsletters that list publications, conferences, training programs, and the like. The Information Exchange has also recently introduced SHARE, a computer retrieval system that yields project descriptions and contact information that HCRS staff will provide in response to requests (for example, a print-out of "arts programs for the handicapped" could be requested).

As is true with other HCRS programs, the main emphasis in the Information Exchange is on managing sports-oriented recreation programs and the like; but a good deal of other material is also included -- and HCRS seems to be looking more and more to cultural activities as part of overall recreation. Write to HCRS at the address at the end of this article to enroll in the Information Exchange.

Other HCRS Programs

The three program areas summarized so far are just some of the components of HCRS' program. Grants, planning and technical assistance work is also carried out in "conservation" (HCRS means conservation

of natural resources) and "cultural" (this refers to historic preservation and deals more with buildings than cultural activities) areas. Outlines of these activities are available through HCRS.

The agency's efforts to develop relationships between its programs and other parts of government highlight some other areas which might be ripe for neighborhood arts involvement. One which we made a particular effort to track down is the demonstration project resulting from a joint agreement between HCRS and the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), in which \$10,000 planning grants were given to each of six cities (Albuquerque, Detroit, New Brunswick, NJ, Oakland, CA, St. Louis, and Winston-Salem NC). Though the half-dozen other HCRS staff members we talked to freely shared information about their work, HCRS/NFA liaison Tom Noel said he was "not free to comment" about any aspect of these pilot cities' work. According to a press release issued one year ago, the cities were to have developed "strategies to integrate the arts and the communities they serve into the planning of park utilization," and were to have met with community and neighborhood arts groups to determine needs and to create and implement demonstration projects. A final report scheduled for release at the end of this month may shed some light on this program.

Also underway is a study of CETA use in recreation programs. Based on HCRS' 1978 finding that almost 50% of the federal funds going into recreation programs came from CETA -- and that local recreation officials often had problems with it -- the agency is identifying outstanding uses of CETA and plans to entertain proposals that combine UPARR funds with CETA funds, collaborating with the Department of Labor in reviewing applications and making awards.

Similar joint projects are also being carried out in the area of recreation for the aging and in relating recreation to the Housing and Urban Development Department's neighborhood programs. HCRS is currently studying recreation opportunities in rural areas and small towns; having completed the portion of this study concerned with federal support, HCRS is now looking at the ways a sample of state and local governments support rural recreation.

For More Information

For more information about HCRS, write to: HCRS, 440 G St. NW, Washington, DC 20243. For a start, ask for "All About HCRS" (a new brochure summarizing all HCRS programs) and for information and an enrollment form for the "Information Exchange."

HCRS maintains eight regional offices in addition to its Washington office; contact information is listed in each HCRS brochure. Regional staff could offer you an overview of the kinds of work HCRS is carrying out in your area, and could help you get in touch with local agencies who are involved with HCRS programs.

Time to Organize!

The handwriting is on the wall: Neighborhood arts people need to organize and support each other now, because the message is clearer than ever -- no one's going to do it for us.

We want to get NAPNOC notes into the hands of more of the people who need it-- and that can't be done without the help of our current members and subscribers. If you know people who should be working with NAPNOC, or who would benefit from a new perspective on cultural issues, send us their names and addresses and we'll send them sample copies and membership information.

If you can distribute NAPNOC information yourself, drop us a note and we'll send you a pile.

And keep on sending us news, articles, letters and opinions -- NAPNOC notes is the only national outlet for news about neighborhood arts work and new developments in cultural policy.

Individual memberships and subscriptions are \$25 a year; call or write for information.

Looking at Arts Collectives

Communities is a "Journal of Cooperative Living" published five times a year and concerned with intentional communities, collective and cooperative enterprises, especially those with a "new age" flavor. The October/November 1980 issue features a number of articles on arts collectives, including a short one on the Pickle Family Circus in San Francisco which features quotes from NAPNOC's National Organizing Committee member Zoë Leader. Single copies are available for \$1.50 from Communities Publications Cooperative, Box 426, Louisa, VA 23093.

More Ideas on Economic Development

The Pratt Institute Center for Community and Environmental Development has recently published a wall poster on "Neighborhood Economic Development Information." The fold-out poster lists 34 different publications pertinent to some aspect of neighborhood development work, along with information on prices and ordering for each one. Write to the Center at 275 Washington Ave, Brooklyn, NY 11205, or call (212) 636-3486.

NAPNOC

neighborhood arts programs
national organizing committee

P.O. Box 3036, Washington, DC 20010