

U.S. Arts & Cultural Policy: Understanding & Implications for  
Arts Administrators

Kate Huffman

MU 461 Capstone - Perspectives in Music

Final Paper

April 13, 2015

Cultural policy - what is it? Does the United States have one or any? If there is not one, should one be created? What falls under 'culture'? What policies exist that will help arts organizations to continue to exist or to thrive? These are a sample of the many questions that arts administrators, government officials, nonprofit professionals, music managers, and many others have about U.S. cultural policy. According to the Merriam-Webster dictionary, 'Policy' is defined as "a definite course or method of action selected from among alternatives and in light of given conditions to guide and determine present and future decisions" or "a high-level overall plan embracing the general goals and acceptable procedures especially of a governmental body" (Merriam-Webster, "policy"). Presumably then, cultural policy consists of the governmental decisions made about culture used to inform future situations and guide future decisions about culture. A problem in this definition - what does 'culture' encompass? A quick online search of 'cultural policy' brings forth a multitude of articles, websites, blogs, and more defining and discussing cultural policy, but many disagree on what it actually is and what it should be. This paper will take a closer look at the cultural policies that include and encompass the fine arts, including visual art, performance art, and, specifically, music performance (hereafter referred to as 'arts' or 'the arts,' usually included in the definition and use of 'culture').

How different countries and cultures around the world and through recorded history have treated the arts in regards to value, definition, and prestige is varied and complex. In the U.S. alone, the many changes that the arts, and contingently cultural/arts policy, have undergone has a long history shaped by immigration, technology, foundational U.S. belief systems/values, politics, the economy, and other factors. This paper will examine the history of cultural/arts policies in the U.S. and how they were shaped by historic, economic, and political influences. Regardless of where a person lives, understanding the cultural, political, and social frameworks

that disciplines such as music or visual art exist within is vital to ensuring their success.

Ultimately, this paper will serve as a *starting point* for arts administrators and policy makers in having a holistic understanding of what cultural/arts policy is, what it looks like in the U.S., how it affects arts organizations, and how this information can be used for advocacy and advancement of arts organizations.

### U.S. Definitions

There are many sources that discuss what cultural/arts policy is, and subsequently there are many different definitions of what it is. A common theme was that either the U.S. does not *really* have a cultural/arts policy, or it has not a singular policy, but rather many policies, often determined by each state. In his article “U.S. Cultural Policy - Its Politics of Participation, Its Creative Potential,” Roberto Bedoya quotes Evan Alderson saying, “If cultural policy is defined as a system of arrangements which, whatever its other purposes, supports artistic production, then the artist has some reason for interest in it as an indicator of where support lies” (3). The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), published an article by Charles Mark as part of its “Studies and documents on cultural policies” in 1969 entitled “A *study of* cultural policy in the United States.” This article offers the following as a definition:

...‘cultural policy’ is taken to mean a body of operational principles, administrative and budgetary practices and procedures which provide a basis for cultural action by the State. Obviously, there cannot be *one* cultural policy suited to all countries; each Member State determines its own cultural policy according to the cultural values, aims and choices it sets for itself (7).

The U.S. was formed by individuals with an inherent distrust of a centralized, national government. This distrust has been evident in politics since the birth of the country and is still obviously seen today in political parties, debates, and policies, including cultural/arts policies.

In April of 1999, Princeton University's Center for Arts and Cultural Policy Studies held a meeting on what exactly cultural policy is. Notes from this meeting are useful in the dialogue of what cultural/arts policy is and touch on how difficult it is to define. To help focus the discussion at the meeting, the group referred to Dr. Paul DiMaggio's 1983 paper on the topic, "What are Cultural Policy Studies: And Why Do We Need Them?" DiMaggio notes that 'culture' can mean many things and suggests that it is useful to think about cultural policy across many different fields and to compare public and private policy in the arts with communications policy, debates about education curricula, and other areas of cultural production. He also states that it is useful to think of cultural policy as having to do with decision about cultural goods. If there is broad public consensus about the public value of a cultural good, then policy is principally about how best to distribute or allocate the good in question. DiMaggio holds that this is social policy, not cultural policy. Commenting on the perceived value of the arts being regulated by policy, he states that perhaps cultural policy requires conflict over the value of the good itself. A final point that DiMaggio's paper makes is that there is a distinction between direct policies that are intended to shape cultural fields and indirect policies that do so unintentionally. He stresses that the cultural policy enterprise needs to pay attention to state and non-state actions that impact cultural outcomes without intending to do so ("What is Cultural Policy" Notes, Princeton University).

At the same 1999 meeting, now director of Princeton's Center for Arts and Cultural Policy Studies, Dr. Stanley Katz, provided further background in mentioning an essay he wrote for the American Assembly publication in 1984. In this he criticized the notion that because the U.S. lacks a centrally administered culture, as compared to Europe, we do not have a cultural policy. In his essay, Katz disputes this claim by showing how a variety of government policies

*create environments that affect which cultural goods and practices are carried forward*

(emphasis added). In this regard, says Katz, the U.S. does not have a singular cultural policy, it has cultural “policies.” At the meeting, the issue of the definition of culture was discussed again. One respondent felt that the term “culture” itself is often misused and misappropriated. This individual stated that arts administrators and policymakers must pay attention to the political side of cultural policies and the ways in which they can be used to legitimize certain groups and disempower others (“What is Cultural Policy” Notes, Princeton University).<sup>1</sup>

As one can tell from looking into just a few sources on U.S. cultural/arts policy - there are general agreements and disagreements. One agreement being that there is a lack of a definition about what cultural/arts policy is - both in general and in the U.S. Even though there may not be a clearly defined or named ‘cultural or arts policy,’ arts administrators and artists should be aware of the policies the U.S. has. These individuals should also be aware of public perception and value of the arts and how all of these factors shape the arts world (in regards to funding for the arts, value of the arts, attendance at arts events, etc.).

---

<sup>1</sup> This source, Princeton University’s Center for Arts and Cultural Policy Studies’ notes on “What is Cultural Policy? A Dialogue for an Emerging Field, records a great discussion between the meeting of minds in this department. Further points on the roles of nonprofit organizations in cultural/arts policy, differences between U.S. and UK methods of cultural/arts policies, and more are discussed. It is recommended for those seeking a greater understanding of the difficult and intricate questions needed to be asked about cultural/arts policy to read and consider this document.

History of Arts/Cultural Policies in the U.S.<sup>2</sup>

In 1968, UNESCO hosted a roundtable discussion on cultural policy in Monaco. At that time, the U.S. had no official cultural position (Mark, 9). One note from this round table discussion elaborated on the impossibility of an official cultural position or policy from the U.S.:

It is not possible for the United States to adopt officially a policy to govern any social enterprise without enormous effort involving almost the modification of the Constitution. The national government is a restricted one...The responsibility for cultural development was not one of the powers that the Founding Fathers saw fit to entrust to Congress or the President (Mark, 9).

This quote illustrates that not only did these decision-makers not want a national arts/cultural policy to reflect the view of the general U.S. public, but also that they did not believe it was possible to do while still staying true to the U.S. Constitution. Mark goes on to suggest that it was perhaps an advantage for arts/cultural policy to not be controlled federally saying, “By refusing the central government the right to set policy, the states and private sectors are forced to adopt concepts suitable to their aims, resulting in a pluralistic approach” (9). This statement creates cause for concern, the language alone causes one to wonder what it actually means. Who is *refusing* the central government the right to set policy? Something that *forces* states to adopt anything does not sound like an option that everyone would be in agreement with, especially those within the states having regulations thrust upon them. However, the idea that state level or local level arts/cultural policies could better suit the needs of the community and encourage a pluralistic approach is admirable, and, in an ideal U.S., the desired outcome for all arts/cultural

---

<sup>2</sup> In 2007, Aimee R. Fullman, visiting expert to the Canadian Cultural Observatory and formerly of the Washington D.C.-based Center for Arts and Culture, published an extensive list of U.S. Cultural policies entitled “Timeline of U.S. Federal Cultural Policy Milestones: 1787 to 2006.” This compilation was a result of the efforts of many individuals in the Arts communities of the U.S. and provides links to documentation of these policies, as well as a list of sources and related timelines. This list includes examples of culture outside of ‘the arts’ as described in this paper, including copyright laws, student rights laws, native studies and preservation laws, and more. Timeline found at <http://www.aimeefullman.com/American%20Cultural%20Policy%20Timeline.pdf> HYPERLINK  
"http://www.aimeefullman.com/American%20Cultural%20Policy%20Timeline.pdf"

organizations. Is this approach of not having a centralized, national arts/cultural policy or set of policies and instead allowing states or local communities to create their own policies more tailored and suited to their artists', musicians', and constituents' needs? This question is one that needs to be addressed in an assessment of the way the U.S. works with and creates policies for the arts.

Though many individuals have long argued against a centralized, national policy for arts and culture, the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) was created by an act of Congress in 1965<sup>3</sup> as an independent agency of the federal government. The NEA is "...dedicated to supporting excellence in the arts - both new and established, bringing the arts to all Americans, and providing leadership in arts education" ("Page Info" NEA FB). The main purpose of the organization when it was created,<sup>4</sup> was to be a grant making organization for the arts. To date, the NEA has awarded more than \$5 billion to strengthen the creative capacity of communities by providing all Americans with diverse opportunities for arts participation. The NEA extends its work through partnerships with state arts agencies, local leaders, other federal agencies, and the philanthropic sector ("About" NEA). This creation of a centralized funding source was a step in the direction of those who believed in a more active role taken by the federal government in fostering the arts in the U.S., while also appeasing those who wanted the control over arts organizations to be more localized. This is because although the NEA, a national arts organization, came into being, it had little control in the actual arts projects being created or supported aside from reviewing grant applications and allocating funds.

---

"An Act to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes." *National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965*. Public Law 89-209.

<sup>4</sup> With Pub.L 89-209, the National Foundation for the Humanities was also created as an independent agency of the federal government, separate from the NEA. See the National Endowment for the Humanities 'About' -- 'How NEH Got Its Start' for a more comprehensive history on how the NEH and NEA were formed and the political and cultural environment of the U.S. at the time of their creation, as well as the guidelines established for how the two entities should be run ([www.neh.gov/about/history](http://www.neh.gov/about/history))

According to Mark, before the 1965 act, fewer than five states had arts councils. After the 1965 act was passed, every state and four of the five state territories at the time managed to establish state arts councils within the first year. The way in which the state arts councils were intended to work, in regards to the NEA, was for each state to submit an application annually which describes intended arts programs and, provided the application was ‘reasonable,’ would receive “an equal share of the special appropriation.” About state arts councils Mark states:

The important purpose of this programme is the development of independent and strong sub-national agencies dedicated to the development and distribution of cultural resources. The measure of success is the ability of the individual state arts council to attract state funds for programme purposes, and thereby act as a cultural catalyst (12).

A present-day example of state funds acting as a cultural catalyst is the Scientific and Cultural Facilities District (SCFD) in Denver, Colorado. SCFD is a special regional tax district in the Denver Metropolitan area that provides funding for art, music, theater, dance, zoology, botany, natural history, or cultural history organizations.<sup>5</sup> In 1989, Denver-area voters approved the creation of SCFD to provide a consistent source of unrestricted funding to scientific and cultural organizations. It is funded by a 0.1% sales and use tax that currently provides over \$40,000,000 to 271 organizations in the Denver region (“About,” SCFD).<sup>6</sup> These organizations also can apply for and receive funding from the NEA.

As stated, not everyone agreed (nor currently agrees) with a national organization (the NEA) used to fund arts programs/projects. According to Livingston Biddle, author of “Our

---

<sup>5</sup> The state of Colorado also has Colorado Creative Industries, which, in 2010, merged the former Council on the Arts and Art in Public Places program to capitalize on the immense potential for the creative sector to drive economic growth in Colorado (“About” Colorado Creative Industries. Accessed March 20, 2015. <http://www.coloradocreativeindustries.org/about>)

<sup>6</sup> Highlights of how SCFD is impacting the communities in which it funds organizations: “The distribution budget for the scientific and cultural organizations in the seven-county area is approximately \$40 million annually. And we’ve discovered that funding on that scale, delivered to a local area, makes a profound impact. As a result, the Denver Metro area is now the national spotlight and has been elevated in stature to a world-class cultural center. Voters reaffirmed their support of the SCFD tax in 1994 and again in 2004 by voting to extend the SCFD tax with 65% voter approval. Voters will have another opportunity to extend the SCFD in November 2016 before the June 2018 sunset date. (“About,” SCFD).

Government and the Arts: A Perspective From the Inside” and former chairperson of the NEA during the Carter and Reagan Administrations, President Reagan wanted to eliminate the NEA when he came into office in 1981, but he dropped the plan when a special task force on the arts and humanities discovered “the needs involved and the benefits of past assistance” (Honan). In the late 1980s/early 1990s, there were further objections to and controversy surrounding the NEA. In 1989, Rev. Donald Wildmon of the conservative American Family Association of Tupelo, Missouri held a press conference denouncing the NEA funding of “anti-Christian bigotry,” referring to an exhibition by Andres Serrano.<sup>7</sup> The controversy later expanded to include the work of other artists, including Robert Mapplethorpe, Annie Sprinkle, and others; Mapplethorpe’s controversy gained so much attention that the entire dissention came to be known as the ‘Mapplethorpe Censorship Controversy.’ Many politicians spoke out in opposition of these artists’ work, and more specifically, NEA/national funding for their work, because they felt it was “anti-Christian, anti-American, and nihilistic” (Quigley). The Mapplethorpe Censorship Controversy brings up many important issues that must be considered when dealing with arts/cultural policy, such as censorship, freedom of speech, value of arts, and more. It also provides critical insight into the attitudes surrounding public funding for the arts and certain forms of ‘acceptable’ arts during this time period as well as how those attitudes affect the arts and cultural/arts policies today.

Margaret Quigley, Political Research Associates staff person and author of “The Mapplethorpe Censorship Controversy: Chronology of Events, the 1989 - 1991 battles,” quotes American theatrical critic, producer, playwright, and educator Robert Brustein on the matter:

The distinction between censorship and dictating the distribution of taxpayers’ dollars on moral grounds is one that eludes me....It was never the function of the Endowment to

---

<sup>7</sup> The exhibit being denounced included a work entitled *Piss Christ*, a photograph of a crucifix submerged in the artist’s urine.

subsidize popular taste, because the cultural demands of the democratic majority were thought to be adequately represented by the market -- by Broadway shows, best-selling books, platinum records, Hollywood movies, by mass art and popular culture. No, the Endowment was designed as a counter-market strategy, in the hope that by subsidizing cultural offerings at affordable prices the works of serious art could become available to those normally excluded by income or education (quoted in Quigley).

This brings up an important topic of who cultural/arts policies actually sets out to support and benefit.

Mark outlined the objectives and goals of the NEA when first created. These included a) to increase opportunities for appreciation and enjoyment of the arts through wider distribution of our artistic resources throughout the nation; b) to sustain and encourage individual performing and creative artists; c) to help sustain and develop existing independent institutions of the arts; d) to carry out special projects of research and undertake special experiments in arts education; e) to increase local participation in artistic programmes through co-operation with the states; f) to open new national opportunities in all aspects of the arts where such do not exist [underline added]; and g) to support projects of an international nature which will benefit artists and educators in the United States (12). The NEA's current website cut-down and simplified a statement of the goals and objectives stating, "...to strengthen the creative capacity of our communities by providing all Americans with diverse opportunities for arts participation. The NEA extends its work through partnerships with state arts agencies, local leaders, other federal agencies, and the philanthropic sector" ("About" NEA). The underlined point 'f' is important to note when evaluating the issues of censorship in cultural/arts policy and when addressing who cultural/arts policies aim to support.

Bedoya expresses his concern for these issues including 'where cultural policy stands and what it aims to deliver.' Earlier in this paper a quote by Evan Alderson used by Bedoya about the definition of cultural policy as a system of arrangements was cited. In conversations about

the ‘system of arrangements’ that is the U.S. cultural policy, Bedoya feels that there is a significant sector of the nonprofit arts community, specifically artist-centered and ethnic-specific arts service organizations, that are marginalized or left out. Sometimes, as was seen in the Mapplethorpe Censorship Controversy, different artists, works of art (including musical pieces/songs, performance art, etc.), or even arts organizations can be not only left out, but actively opposed.

In the 1990s, the U.S. saw the ‘Culture Wars,’ which focused on issues of “decency” in the arts. The Culture Wars played out as attacks on artists who were supported, either directly through fellowships or through organizations that presented them, by the NEA. Bedoya writes about the Culture Wars:

During Congressional campaigns and budget hearings, political and religious conservatives would launch an attack on the NEA and the national artists’ community, holding up a handful of artists that they characterized as “degenerates” and examples of the nation’s moral decay (4).

The artists community’s response to these attacks on the NEA took many forms, one including the Finley vs. NEA lawsuit. The community’s defense of its work during the Culture Wars was linked to the First Amendment right of freedom of expression and to cultural commentary and artistic freedom (Bedoya, 4). The Mapplethorpe Censorship Controversy and the Culture Wars of the 1990s give credibility for the ‘no cultural/arts policy’ belief (that the U.S. *should not* have a defined central cultural/arts policy or set of policies) by illustrating that by putting funding responsibilities and the power to determine artistic value and ‘decency’ in the hands of the national government, the door for discrimination and artistic censorship can be opened.

This sentiment is reflected in Don Adams and Arlene Goldbard’s 1995 report “Cultural Policy in U.S. History.” In this report, Adams and Goldbard begin when European settlers immigrated to the New World and describe the ideals and myths these people brought with them

concerning culture and the roles of the government in everyday life. After an in-depth look at the decades between then and the early 1990s, they conclude with a chapter entitled “Plausible Deniability: Do We Really *Have* a Cultural Policy?” In this chapter, Adams and Goldbard summarize how the studies of the early 1960s that concluded a passive role was most appropriate for the nation in relation to the arts and the belief that there should be no cultural/arts policy is still supported today. There is more than one school of thought when it comes to this belief outlined in this chapter:

The idea that we should have no cultural policy is an interesting proposition. The anti-policy argument comes down to three points: The first is that articulating coordinated policy would hamper individual agencies too much. The second argument is that government cultural policymaking would naturally lead to undue state interference in cultural development. Third is the conviction that there is no need to elaborate public policy since the government's cultural mission is to follow the lead of the private sector, that there are no other proper public goals in the realm of culture (Adams & Goldbard).

However, they go on to discuss why governmental avoidance of making cultural policy is impossible:

Whether one buys these arguments or not is moot. In fact, it is impossible for a government to avoid making cultural policy. No state can refrain from having cultural impact. And that impact, in the aggregate, will always constitute the national cultural policy -- whether or not it's explicit and articulate. U.S. national policy lacks coordination, clear aims and objectives. But it must be realized that every administration will make and implement policy, either as a carefully-considered element of public action, or by default, in bits and pieces, without public scrutiny or participation (Adams & Goldbard).

Adams and Goldbard finally conclude the report stating why they would feel uncomfortable with a national cultural/arts policy ‘in the current political climate.’

As one can ascertain from this brief summary of just a few sources on cultural/arts policy in the U.S., its history is complex - fraught with varying definitions; ideas on what it should be are shaped by political, religious, and cultural beliefs; and actions taken throughout the years. It is vital for arts administrators to have an understanding of what current policies, organizations,

groups, and belief systems shape the arts in the U.S., as well as the history behind these factors and how they came to be. This is important in understanding and working to shape how the public (including policymakers) view and value the arts. It is also critical in determining how to best obtain funding for an arts organization or arts project.

### Importance to Arts Administrators

Most arts/music organizations are nonprofits that obtain funding in a number of diverse ways (if they are well-managed). Therefore, it is vital for arts administrators to have an understanding of what role the government plays in supporting their organizations as well as how else money is raised to sustain the arts organization they work for. According to Michael J. Worth in *Nonprofit Management: Principles and Practice*, “This sector [arts nonprofits] receives substantial earned income from admission fees, gift shops, and other sources and also receives gifts from individuals, corporations, and foundations” (30). Other sources of earned income can include ticket sales, admissions, subscriptions, and program advertisements. Of course, as illustrated above, even with its problems, the U.S. government does fund the arts through grants via the NEA. According to Loren Renz in her article, “An Overview of Revenue Streams for Nonprofit Arts Organizations” published in *GIA Reader*, only about one-tenth of revenue for arts nonprofits comes from government sources, with earned income accounting for approximately one-half of revenue, and contributions from private donors (individuals, foundations, and corporations) accounting for about two-fifths (Overview of Revenue Streams, Renz).

Within the arts nonprofit sector, there is an imbalance in the share of funding for different types of arts groups. According to Renz, “the average share is estimated to be lower for performing arts groups - about 5 percent - but higher for museums - almost 28 percent, and considerably higher for small, community-based arts groups” (Overview of Revenue Streams,

Renz). Annual support from government sources, though less than private sector giving, has been seen in the past as a more equal-opportunity source of funding, though as seen in Bedoya's article, this is debatable.

Though nonprofit arts organizations receive the least amount of funding from government sources, depending on the organization's operating budget and amount of funding received each year, this could still be a significant amount. As illustrated by the Culture Wars and the Mapplethorpe Censorship Controversy, government funding can mean more than just money, it can also mean a stamp of approval or value. If an organization or artist meets all criteria needed for a grant application and puts forth an impressive description in applying for government funds, those allocated funds also are assured that their work is valued.

The monetary aspect of cultural/arts policies is not all that should concern arts administrators. The way policy is created, advocated for or against, or supported by the private sector plays an important role in how the arts are valued in this country both on large and small scales. Arts administrators must be conscious of all monetary, cultural, and social implications behind policies to be effective in their profession.

#### Cultural/Arts Policy Related Organizations/Institutions

As reiterated throughout this paper, it is important for arts administrators to understand the political and social history of cultural/arts policy in the U.S. as well as current ways in which nonprofit arts organizations obtain funding. It is vital to have a knowledge of what policies (at the national level or state level) do and do not exist in relating to arts organizations and to know what organizations exist to support an arts administrator's organization. Because the U.S. does not have one defined national cultural/arts policy, many nonprofit organizations and governmental agencies have been created to address cultural/arts policy and to assist arts

organizations and arts administrators in this area.<sup>8</sup> This portion of the paper is intended to serve as a starting point for arts administrators in their knowledge of such organizations in the U.S. that deal with arts/cultural policy and/or arts advocacy (listed in alphabetical order).<sup>9</sup>

### **Americans for the Arts**

Americans for the Arts is a registered nonprofit organization<sup>10</sup> whose mission is to:

...serve, advance, and lead the network of organizations and individuals who cultivate, promote, sustain, and support the arts in America. Connecting your best ideas and leaders from the arts, communities, and business, together we can work to ensure that every American has access to the transformative power of the arts.<sup>11</sup>

Americans for the Arts offers access to reports and data on arts; networks and councils, including an arts education network, business volunteers for the arts, emerging leaders' network, local arts network, private sector network, public art network, and more; and service and training for arts organizations including webinars, information on arts marketing, and more.

This organization also offers a wide range of information and services for arts administrators regarding cultural/arts policy. These services and information include a comprehensive introduction on what arts policy is, information on their Aspen Seminar for Leadership in the Arts, notes from their National Arts Policy Roundtable, and plans for their State Policy Pilot Program. This organization's website<sup>12</sup> has a wealth of important information on cultural/arts policy and advocacy and is a great asset for arts administrators.

---

<sup>8</sup> There are a number of undergraduate and postgraduate degrees in arts administration, cultural policy, and even some that combine the two fields (for good reason) in the U.S., UK, Canada, and a few other countries. There are arts administration programs accredited through the Association of Arts Administration Educators which can be found on their website: <http://www.artsadministration.org>

<sup>9</sup> This is by no means intended as a final list of organizations related to cultural/arts policy in the U.S. It is merely a list of the organizations known to the author at the time of the creation of this paper, created with the understanding that there is most likely other organizations/programs relevant and important to these topics.

<sup>10</sup> Legal name: Americans for the Arts Inc.

<sup>11</sup> "About." Americans for the Arts. Accessed March 20, 2015. <http://www.americansforthearts.org/about-americans-for-the-arts>

<sup>12</sup> [www.americansforthearts.org](http://www.americansforthearts.org)

## **The Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (ECA)**

From the ECA's website:

As mandated by the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, the U.S. Department of State's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (ECA) works to build friendly, peaceful relations between the people of the United States and the people of other countries through academic, cultural, sports, and professional exchanges, as well as public-private partnerships. In an effort to reflect the diversity of the United States and global society, ECA programs, funding, and other activities encourage the involvement of American and international participants from traditionally underrepresented groups, including women, racial and ethnic minorities, and people with disabilities.<sup>13</sup>

The ECA offers grant opportunities to arts and culture organizations and individuals specific to cultural diplomacy.

## **Cultural Policy & the Arts National Data Archive (CPANDA)**

The Cultural Policy & the Arts National Data Archive (CPANDA) was founded in 2001 as a collaborative effort of Princeton University's Firestone Library and the Princeton Center for Arts and Cultural Policy Studies. It is the world's first interactive digital archive of policy-relevant data on the arts and cultural policy in the United States. In 2014, the NEA began taking over content - by early 2015 all data will be available through the newly-created National Archive of Data on Arts and Culture (NADAC) and CPANDA will cease to exist.<sup>14</sup>

## **League of American Orchestras**

The League of American Orchestras<sup>15</sup> is a nonprofit organization founded in 1942 and chartered by Congress in 1962 [that] "leads, supports, and champions America's orchestras and the vitality of the music they perform." The League is "...the only national organization dedicated solely to the orchestra experience, the League is a nexus of knowledge and innovation,

---

<sup>13</sup> "About" Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. Accessed on March 20, 2015. <http://eca.state.gov/about-bureau>; [www.eca.state.gov](http://www.eca.state.gov)

<sup>14</sup> At the time of this paper's creation (March/April, 2015), CPANDA was still an active and functioning site: <http://www.cpanda.org/cpanda/>

<sup>15</sup> Legal name "American Symphony Orchestra League"

advocacy, and leadership advancement for managers, musicians, volunteers, and boards.”<sup>16</sup> This organization provides many resources including information on music advocacy, taxes, other information for nonprofits, how to obtain NEA funding, and more. The League also publishes a magazine, *Symphony*, and holds meetings and conferences for arts administrators in the orchestra field.

### **NAMM Foundation**

Founded in 2006, The NAMM Foundation is a supporting organization of NAMM, the National Association of Music Merchants. The NAMM Foundation supports grants and scholarship initiatives and funds music making and music education related research. The Foundation is also a source for music and music education advocacy.<sup>17</sup>

### **National Archive of Data on Arts & Culture (NADAC)**

The National Archive of Data on Arts & Culture (NADAC) is

...a repository that facilitates research on arts and culture by acquiring data, particularly those funded by federal agencies and other organizations, and sharing those data with researchers, policymakers, people in the arts and culture field, and the general public.<sup>18</sup>

NADAC is one of several archives hosted by the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR)<sup>19</sup>, the largest social science data archive in the world and part of the University of Michigan’s Institute for Social Research. NADAC is funded by the NEA contains datasets previously distributed by CPANDA.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> “About” League of American Orchestras. Accessed on March 20, 2015.

<http://www.americanorchestras.org/about-the-league.html>

<sup>17</sup> [www.nammfoundation.org](http://www.nammfoundation.org)

<sup>18</sup> “About” National Archive of Data on Arts & Culture (NADAC). Accessed on March 20, 2015.

<http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/content/NADAC/about.html>

<sup>19</sup> “ISPCR advances and expands social and behavioral research, acting as a global leader in data stewardship and providing rich data resources and responsive education opportunities for present and future generations.”

[www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/landing.jsp](http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/landing.jsp)

<sup>20</sup> Refer to footnote 19 and the section of this paper on CPANDA. According to the NADAC website, datasets from CPANDA will be posted to NADAC on an ongoing basis and should all be available through the NADAC.

Having data on arts and culture is extremely important for use in articles and papers and for to inform the decisions that impact arts and culture. This data can be used by arts administrators in grant writing to show the effectiveness and value of the arts as well as to help shape policy affecting artist occupations, arts industries, arts education, and participation in the arts.

### **National Endowment for the Arts (NEA)**

The National Endowment for the Arts has been discussed at length in earlier portions of this paper. It provides grants to organizations and individuals in artistic fields such as Accessibility, Arts Education, Folk & Traditional Arts, Local Arts Agencies, Music, Research & Analysis, and more.<sup>21</sup>

### **National Music Council of the United States**

From the National Music Council of the United States website:

Founded in 1940 and chartered by the 84th Congress in 1956, the National Music Council represents the United States to the International Music Council/UNESCO. The Council acts as a clearing house for the joint opinion and decision of its members and is dedicated to strengthening the importance of music in our life and culture.<sup>22</sup>

The Council is composed of organizations of national scope interested in the development of music in the country. In addition to providing member organizations with a forum for the free discussion of problems affecting national musical life in the U.S., the Council is very active in music and music education advocacy.

### **National Opera Association (NOA)**

The National Opera Association (NOA) was founded in 1955, under the National Music Council. The NOA “seeks to promote a greater appreciation of opera and music theatre, to

---

<sup>21</sup> [www.arts.gov](http://www.arts.gov)

<sup>22</sup> National Music Council of the United States. Accessed March 20, 2015. [www.musiccouncil.org](http://www.musiccouncil.org)

enhance pedagogy and performing activities, and to increase performance opportunities by supporting projects that improve the scope and quality of opera.”<sup>23</sup> As one can infer from the name, the NOA serves education and performance activities in academic institutions and small regional opera companies. This organization holds an annual convention featuring performances, panels, workshops, and other continuing education opportunities for opera educators, professionals, and students.<sup>24</sup>

### **The President’s Committee on the Arts and the Humanities (PCAH)**

Created in 1982 under President Reagan, the President’s Committee on the Arts and the Humanities (PCAH) is an advisory committee to the White House on cultural issues. The PCAH works directly with the NEA, the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), and the Institute of Museum and Library Services, as well as other federal agencies and the private sector to address policy questions and to support programs.<sup>25</sup>

### **U.S. Department of Arts and Culture (USDAC)**

The U.S. Department of Arts and Culture is not a governmental agency.<sup>26</sup> The organization describes itself as:

...the nation’s newest people-powered department, founded on the truth that art and culture are our most powerful and under-tapped resources for social change. Radically inclusive, useful and sustainable, and vibrantly playful, the USDAC aims to spark a grassroots, creative change movement, engaging millions in performing and creating a world rooted in empathy, equity, and social imagination.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> “About” National Opera Association (NOA). Accessed March 20, 2015. [http://www.noa.org/about\\_us.html](http://www.noa.org/about_us.html)

<sup>24</sup> [www.noa.org](http://www.noa.org)

<sup>25</sup> [www.pcah.gov](http://www.pcah.gov)

<sup>26</sup> The USDAC is unconfirmed as a nonprofit organization, though is (self) categorized on its Facebook page as a Nongovernmental Organization. The fiscal sponsor, Bowery Arts + Science LTD, is a registered nonprofit organization. Website for Bowery Arts + Science LTD: [www.boweryartsandscience.org](http://www.boweryartsandscience.org). The USDAC describes itself, “This is a democracy in action - citizens standing up for something they see as missing and needed. The USDAC is an act of collective imagination” “FAQS.” U.S. Department of Arts and Culture. Accessed March 20, 2015. [www.usdac.us/faqs](http://www.usdac.us/faqs).

<sup>27</sup> “About.” U.S. Department of Arts and Culture. Accessed March 20, 2015. [www.usdac.us/about](http://www.usdac.us/about).

The USDAC does not provide funding opportunities for arts organizations, but is involved in helping communities create and implement cultural policy. It describes its activities on three levels:

- 1) ***Local Initiatives***: The USDAC organizing structure empowers invested individuals (Cultural Agents) to build communities of Citizen Artists committed to tackling local issues through creative, collaborative means. The first step is hosting a local "Imagining"—from which an ongoing Field Office may emerge.
- 2) ***Translocal Infrastructure***: Our web platform and training calls connect communities across the country, building solidarity and collective power for artists and cultural organizers, and helping spread high-impact-low-infrastructure models for creative cultural development.
- 3) ***National Imagination***: The USDAC mines the performative potential of traditional governmental symbols and structures, staging press conferences and offering policy suggestions and visions for the world we wish to see.<sup>28</sup>

Obviously, with the number of organizations and agencies dealing with cultural/arts policy, this is a crucially important sector for arts administrators to understand. The fact that the majority of these organizations/agencies provide information, tool kits, and materials for arts advocacy in addition to information about arts/cultural policy cannot be overlooked.

Advocacy is a huge aspect of arts administration and cultural/arts policy. Arts administrators must be able to articulate and show the value of the arts in individuals' lives and in the prosperity and vibrancy of a community, city, state, region, or country. The general need for advocacy though, is because there is a force (or forces) working against the cause one is advocating for. Perhaps if there were a U.S. cultural/arts policy, or even a better defined set of policies, there would be less need for so many organizations that exist to help ensure the future of the arts and arts organizations.

---

<sup>28</sup> "FAQS - What does the USDAC actually do?" U.S. Department of Arts and Culture. Accessed March 20, 2015. [www.usdac.us/faqs](http://www.usdac.us/faqs)

## Conclusion

In his 1969 essay, Mark quoted President Lyndon B. Johnson's beliefs in regards to cultural policy and how these beliefs were acted out, saying, "President Johnson has declared that no government can call great art into being, but it can create a climate in which great art can flourish (Mark, 21)." More recent studies claim that the U.S. has not really taken a stance on cultural/arts policy or moved forward since the implementation of the NEA in 1965. The notion that the United States' policy is creating an environment in which the arts can flourish could be contested by the fact that so many cultural/arts policy organizations stress the need for arts advocacy.

There are many complexities in U.S. cultural/arts policies (or lack thereof) which stem from a multitude of sources such as a historical distrust of a centralized government with too much power; censorship in the arts; economic, cultural, and individual value of the arts in the lives of citizens and in communities; disagreement on what is acceptable in art; and more. However, these complexities and issues should not deter arts administrators from trying to achieve a holistic understanding of what cultural/arts policy is, what it looks like in the U.S., and how it affects arts organizations. A good starting point for arts administrators is to study the history of cultural/arts policies in the U.S. and the organizations that deal with cultural/arts policy and provide information on advocacy. The implications of this research and understanding is for arts administrators to best know how to advocate for their organization and help them to thrive.

## Bibliography

“About” National Endowment for the Arts (NEA). Accessed March 20, 2015.

<http://arts.gov/about-nea>

“About” Scientific and Cultural Facilities District (SCFD). Accessed March 20, 2015.

<http://scfd.org/p/about-scf.html>

Adams, Don and Arlene Goldbard. “Cultural Policy in U.S. History.” Webster’s World of Cultural Democracy. Last updated March 7, 2001.

<http://www.wwcd.org/policy/US/UShistory.html>

Bedoya, Roberto. “U.S. Cultural Policy: Its Politics of Participation, Its Creative Potential.” New Orleans, Louisiana: National Performance Network, 2004.

Honan, William H. “Book Discloses That Reagan Planned to Kill National Endowment for the Arts.” The New York Times Online. Last modified May 15, 1988.

<http://www.nytimes.com/1988/05/15/arts/book-discloses-that-reagan-planned-to-kill-national-endowment-for-arts.html?scp=1&sq=Reagan%20National%20Endowment&st=cse>

Mark, Charles. *A study of cultural policy in the United States*. Blanchard, Paris: Unesco, 1969.

*Merriam-Webster*. sv. “policy.” Accessed March 20, 2015

“Page Info” National Endowment for the Arts Facebook Page (NEA FB). Accessed March 20, 2015. [https://www.facebook.com/NationalEndowmentfortheArts/info?tab=page\\_info](https://www.facebook.com/NationalEndowmentfortheArts/info?tab=page_info)

Quigley, Margaret. “The Mapplethorpe Censorship Controversy: Chronology of Events, the 1989 - 1991 battles.” Political Research Associates. (n.d.) Accessed March 20, 2015.

[http://www.publiceye.org/theocrat/Mapplethorpe\\_Chrono.html](http://www.publiceye.org/theocrat/Mapplethorpe_Chrono.html)

Renz, Loren. "An Overview of Revenue Streams for Nonprofit Arts Organizations." *GIA Reader* 14, No. 2 (Summer 2003). Accessed March 20, 2015. *Grantmakers in the Arts*.

"What is Cultural Policy? A Dialogue for an Emerging Field" - Notes. Princeton University Center for Arts and Cultural Policy Studies. Last modified April 29, 1999.

<http://www.princeton.edu/culturalpolicy/dialogue.html>

Worth, Michael J. *Nonprofit Management: Principles and Practice, Third Edition*. California: Sage Publications, 2014.