

The State Arts Agency: An Overview
of Cultural Federalism in the United States
by Kevin V. Mulcahy
April 2001

Working Paper

Working Paper

The Cultural Policy Center

at the University of Chicago

**The State Arts Agency:
An Overview of Cultural Federalism in the United States**

By

Kevin V. Mulcahy
Louisiana State University

This paper was prepared for presentation at a symposium organized by the Cultural Policy Program of the University of Chicago, April 21-22, 2001. Much of the discussion herein is based on information provided by the National Assembly of States Arts Agencies (NASAA). The generous assistance of NASAA's director of information, Kelly Barsdate, and information research coordinator, Eric Olsen, is gratefully acknowledged.

The State Arts Agency: An Overview of Cultural Federalism in the United States

By

Kevin V. Mulcahy
Louisiana State University

This essay is a brief summary of the history of state arts councils (SAAs) of the United States. While these fifty-six agencies include the six special jurisdictions of the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam and Northern Marrianas, the SAA designation is conventional. The discussion is organized into five sections: (1) historical background; (2) organizational structure; (3) budget data; (4) intergovernmental relations; (5) the future of public culture. The overall finding is that the revision in the relative resources of the national and subnational levels of government for funding the arts requires a reconfiguration of policymaking roles and responsibilities. In particular, the programmatic elements of a national cultural policy need to be assumed largely by the subnational levels of government. The decline and fall of the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) is lamentable, but seemingly irreversible. If there is to be a future for public culture in the United States, a post- NEA policy-making paradigm must be constructed.

1. Historical Background¹

It is a truism of political science that to understand American politics requires an understanding of federalism; that is, the shared sovereignty possessed by nation and states. While political scientists have usually been critical of the states, a number of subnational innovations in public policy have helped to inspire and guide programs

subsequently adopted by the federal government. In this context, state arts agencies are especially noteworthy for what they tell us about nation-state relations and the process of public policymaking in the United States.

The Utah State Legislature established the first state arts agency in 1899. However, a more substantial commitment to public patronage was realized in 1960 when, with the encouragement of then Governor Nelson Rockefeller, the New York State Legislature authorized the creation of the New York State Council for the Arts (NYSCA). The NYSCA, operating with an initial appropriation of \$50,000, which grew to over \$500,000 by 1965, designed and implemented a series of programs intended to assess the state's cultural resources, promote touring programs, support individual artists and supply technical assistance to arts organizations.²

An innovative dimension of NYSCA's support of the arts involved a matching-fund mode of operation requiring local arts organizations to raise funds from private sources equal to the amount received from their NYSCA grant. The impact of New York's matching requirement was dramatic. Not only did other state arts agencies follow its lead; but, according to cultural economist Dick Netzer, the National Endowment for the Arts also adopted the matching requirement "as its standard grant procedure."³

By 1965, five additional states – California, Georgia, Minnesota, Missouri and North Carolina – had established SAAs; bringing the total to seven. Despite such innovation and growth, however, the catalyst responsible for the emergence of arts agencies in the other states was to come from the NEA with its "Federal-State Partnership Program." The program (which began in 1967) made block grants of up to \$50,000 available to each state (1) to establish a state arts agency; and, (2) to guarantee a continuing financial commitment to "furnish adequate programs, facilities, and services in the arts to all

people and communities in each of the several States.’⁴ As a result, by 1974, all the states— plus the District of Columbia and the territories—had created some form of an arts agency or, as some have described them, “mini-endowments.”

In effect, these “little NEAs” were established at the state level to complement the federal government’s programs. The 1967 annual report of the NEA noted that in its first year of operation the Endowment had provided the stimulus for the fifty states and special jurisdictions to survey their cultural resources and to provide cultural programs in the localities.⁵ In 1974 Congress took the significant step of amending the enabling legislation to require the NEA to allocate a minimum of 20 percent of its program funds to the states for local distribution.

The block grants, which the NEA offered to the states in 1967 and every year thereafter in higher increments, were difficult to refuse. Indeed, most block grants by their nature seem to employ a subtle form of coercion. Political scientist Michael Reagan argues, “It is hard to resist a program that enables one dollar to become two or three, when the same dollar has no ‘multiplier’ effect of this kind when used for some other area.”⁶ Such an inducement apparently helped to convince many states to establish SAAs. For some, like Dick Netzer, the federal inducement was so strong that an explanation of the rise of SAAs begins and ends with the NEA. “With a few exceptions, these state arts councils resulted not from an autonomous rise of interest in patronizing the arts on the part of state governments but from the availability of NEA funds for that purpose.”⁷

The general purposes expressed by most state arts agencies as their *raison d’etre* were:

- to stimulate and encourage presentations of performing arts and fine arts;
- to encourage public interest in the arts;
- to make surveys of public and private institutions engaged in artistic and cultural activities;

- to make recommendations on methods to encourage participation in, and appreciation of, the arts to meet the needs of the state;
- to encourage freedom of artistic expression.⁸

The mandates of state arts agencies emphasized the importance of providing citizens with the opportunity to view, enjoy and participate in the arts. From the beginning, programming stressed the importance of developing statewide efforts to facilitate a broad distribution of public funds. State arts agencies offered grants to organizations for performances and exhibits to tour; identified local companies and museums in order to provide technical assistance; sponsored arts exhibits and performances in schools and in adult education programs.⁹ There has also been a longtime commitment to strengthening local arts groups as cultural resources. Essentially, state legislatures articulated broad-based goals for their SAAs that stressed the cultivation of arts appreciation and the nourishment of artistic quality and creativity. State legislatures, however, provided little guidance in terms of specific policies and program activities.

2. Structural Organization

State arts agencies were created according the organizational principle that cultural institutions should be administered at a distance from the “intrigues of politics.” While enclaves of the arts in government, SAAs would not be governmental agencies for politicizing the arts. This “arm’s length” principle is a well-established tenet of arts administration especially in the nations that have followed the British Arts Council model; for example, the Canada Council and the NEA. In essence, this administrative process involves a delineation between the determination of an overall cultural budget by the executive and legislative branches of government and the allocation of resources to

institutional and individual recipients. Specific grants would be determined by the responsible cultural agency on the advice of advisory panels of experts to provide a layer of insulation from political interference.

Of course, the NEA's experience with its advisory-panel system illustrates that such arm's length policymaking is no insurance against either political attack or professional criticism.¹⁰ Furthermore, it should be noted that the arm's length principle is not the only administrative approach used in cultural policymaking. The social-democratic nations have often provided for a form of corporatist decisionmaking whereby artists' organizations have statutory representation in the grant-allocation process. In nations with strong ministries of culture, grantmaking is the preserve of the appropriate bureaucratic functionaries.¹¹

The majority of SAAs can be judged to enjoy some form of arm's length relationship with their state or jurisdictional governments. Twenty-eight SAAs are independent agencies. (The Vermont Arts Council is unique as a private, non-profit 501(c)(3) organization; this administrative arrangement is, however, typical with state humanities councils.) Eleven SAAs are located in departments of cultural affairs/resources. (For example, the Louisiana Arts Council is in the Office of the Cultural Development within the Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism which is headed by the Lieutenant Governor in her capacity as the department's commissioner.) In six states, SAAs are in Departments of Economic Development and three are in Departments of Education. In four states, the SAA is in the State Department and two are in the Governor's Office. The remaining two SAAs are placed within some other department. (See Table 1) Arguably, about seventy-five percent of SAAs enjoy a large measure of administrative autonomy.

Table 1. SAA Placement in State and Jurisdictional Grant

	%	Number
Independent Agency	50	28
Cultural Department	19	11
Economic Development Department	10.7	6
Department of State	7.1	4
Education Department	5.3	3
Governor's Office	3.6	2
Other	<u>3.6</u>	<u>2</u>
	100%	56

Source: NASAA, 1994 State Arts Agency Profile

It should be recognized that state arts councils are not the only public-cultural entities within the states. As noted, there are state humanities councils. There are also state historical museums, heritage and commemorative sites, archives and public broadcasting systems as well as arts and humanities education in state-supported school and universities. States also support music and movie production, promote fairs and festivals and cultural tourism and legislate on historic preservation. Without endorsing an “everything is culture” stance, there is certainly a legitimate reason to view cultural policy as involving more than simply the performing and visual arts.

SAA governing boards (councils, commissions) are typically appointed by the governor and serve *pro bono publico*. The average number of councilors/ commissioners is fifteen who serve on average for terms of four years with a maximum of two consecutive terms. (There is as range of three to five year terms and many states allow for an unlimited number of terms or have left the issue of terms-limits undefined.) The chairs

of governing boards are variously appointed by the governor or elected by the board's members. Council/commission members usually include members of the boards of cultural institutions, arts advocates, politically-active patrons of the arts and artists. All states have artists on their governing boards; six states mandate the appointment of artists or representatives of arts-service organizations. Six states mandate the appointment of state legislators.

SAA governing boards have broad policymaking responsibilities. These include long-range planning, the establishment of project categories and associated levels of funding and the formulation of criteria for the distribution of grants. Although primary responsibility over program design rests with the governing boards of each SAA, the actual distribution of grants is a task which is commonly shared with SAA-appointed advisory panels. Panelists, usually with expertise in a particular art discipline, are utilized by the vast majority of SAAs to review and evaluate applications and to recommend awards to the various state arts councils/commissions for final approval. Grants are usually awarded to artists and arts organizations whose productions satisfy standards of "excellence" devised by advisory panels. (Excellence as a criterion for awarding grants has often been a contentious issue especially when used as a synonym for "elitist." The NEA's enabling legislation actually refers to the "diversity of excellence" that should be a goal in grant-making.

State arts agencies are administered by public-sector professionals as well as contracting for outside consultants. Overall, SAAs had 774 full time employees in 1998; 803 in 2000. While full-time staff increased from 1998 to 2000 (the median staff size increased from 11 to 12 over this span also), staff has declined by 6.8% since 1991, even as appropriations to SAAs increased by 45% in this same time period. Put another way,

SAAAs employed 2.2 full time employees per 1,000 state employees in 1991 and 1.9 in 1998. The New York State Arts Council had the highest number of employees (63) and South Dakota had the lowest number (3) in 2000.¹² The Institute of Puerto Rican Culture, with a staff of 93, is excluded from the calculations because of its unique structure and mission.¹³

The median tenure for SAA executive directors has been 4 years. (As a point of comparison, this is roughly equivalent to the average tenure of the president of a state university.) Deputy directors for programs and grant officers had tenures of 9 and 6 years respectively. The tenure of other SAA employees averaged about 3 years, which would appear to reflect the normal peregrinations of a youthful workforce in entry-level positions. Staff increases have been in the areas of community development, arts education and information management, which have been major emphases of SAAAs in the past decade. Declines have been in the areas of general administration and grants management.

3. Funding Data

Legislative appropriations are the predominant source of funding of SAAAs (88% of their revenues). However, SAAAs budgets in FY 2001 also included; NEA funds (5.6%) other state funds (5.6%), and non-state funds (0.8%).¹⁴ NEA funding provided \$28.6 million to support the operations of SAAAs as well as to promote access to the arts in communities with limited cultural infrastructures and to support arts education. This represented nearly 6% of overall SAA budgets and for 19 SAAAs amounted to over 20% of their budgets. 30 states received funding from state funds, other than traditional

appropriations --such as percent-for-arts programs, license plate revenues and interest from state cultural endowments-- amounting to \$28.2 million. (See Appendix 1 for the details of alternative sources of revenue for cultural activities used by a variety of states and localities to complement traditional appropriations.) 28 states realized \$3.86 million from non-state sources such as corporate sponsorships and earned income.

As a proportion of total, general fund-expenditures by states of \$487 billion in FY2001, SAA legislative appropriations of \$446.9 million represented 0.087% or less than one-tenth of 1% of the total. This sum amounted to \$1.56 per capita (compared to \$.82 in 1991). The legislative appropriations to SAAs in FY2001 were an increase of 11.8% over the previous year and reflected an essentially steady rise in support: 52 percent since 1992 after controlling for inflation. These appropriations increases have been particularly striking in the years since 1997. (See Table 2.)

Table 2. SAA Legislative Appropriations; FY1992-FY2001

Year	\$millions
1992	213.4
1993	211.0
1994	246.2
1995	265.6
1996	262.2
1997	271.9
1998	303.2
1999	369.9
2000	396.5
2001	446.9

Source: NASAA, FY 2001 Legislative Appropriations Annual Survey

It should be noted that about 16 percent of total SAA appropriations are in the form of line-items that are not controlled by SAAs, but are passed directly to other entities. Line-items generally subsidize large cultural organizations (such as museums)

and rarely fund individual arts projects. Two states, Connecticut and California, account for nearly two-thirds of all line-item appropriations.

Among the 50 states, the top five on a per capita basis calculated on total SAA revenues were in descending order: Connecticut (1), Hawaii, Massachusetts, California, Vermont (for FY 2000 the order was Connecticut (1), Hawaii, Massachusetts, New York, Vermont); the bottom five in ascending order were: Texas (50), Wisconsin, Oregon, Georgia, Indiana. (See Appendix 2 for the per capita ranking of the states and jurisdictions calculated from total SAA revenues.) Overall, it should be recognized that the states and localities are the major public funders of the arts and culture in the United States, not the federal government and especially not the NEA. Indeed, as federal funding has declined from a high point in the early 1990s, state and local arts councils have become increasingly the more important public patrons of the arts and culture. (See Table 3)

**Table3. Total Arts Spending by Level of Government:
FY 1992, 1997, 2001 (in \$ millions)**

	1992	1997	2001
National Endowment For the Arts	175	99	102
State Arts Agencies*	213.4	271.9	446.9
Local Arts Agencies* *	600	900	1,000

*These data are total legislative appropriations only.

**These data are estimations based on reporting from the local arts agencies.

Sources: Executive Budget of the United States, National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, Americans for the Arts

This surge in subnational funding provides an important corrective to the widely cited commonplace that public support for the arts and culture has been declining

inexorably in the United States. This characterization is fairly accurate in reference to the national level, but does not reflect the reality of significant state and local governmental patronage. As NEA funding has declined dramatically in the past decades, state and local arts councils have increased their composite support and demonstrated their institutional and political resilience in sustaining the nation's cultural infrastructure. In sum, the pluralistic character of public patronage in the United States has belied the more dire predictions about the decline and fall of public culture.¹⁵

Finally, in any discussion of public support for the arts in the United States, it should be mentioned that the government is a decidedly limited partner as a source of support for arts organizations. (See Table 4) For the performing arts, government (largely state and local) accounts for about 6% of their budgets, compared to 36% from philanthropy and 58% from earned income. For museums, government accounts for about 30% of their budgets, which reflects a greater degree of public ownership and longstanding public-private relationships; philanthropy and earned income account for 23% and 47% respectively.

While the extent of privatization (and localization) is most fully realized in the American system of cultural patronage, multi-level government support and private philanthropy exists as sources of support for arts organizations in other countries. The most notable example is Canada. Canadian arts organizations receive subventions from the three levels of government, federal (28%), provincial (36%), local (36%). On average, the performing arts receive 34% of their revenues from governmental sources, while the proportion for museums is 70%. The performing arts receive 51% from earned

**Table 4. Support for Arts Organizations (as percentages)
in the United States and Canada**

	Government	Philanthropy	Earned Income
		<u>United States</u>	
Performing Arts	6	36	58
Museums	30	23	47
		<u>Canada</u>	
Performing Arts	34	15	51
Museums	70	10	20

Sources: Americans for the Arts; Statistics Canada

income and 15% from philanthropy, while museums receive 20% from earned income and 10% from philanthropy. (See Table 4) These proportions have been typical since the early 1990s as philanthropy and earned income have compensated for the decline in public policy for the arts in Canada. However, it should also be noted that public support for both the performing arts and museums remains substantially higher in Canada than in the United States. ¹⁶

4. Intergovernmental Relations¹⁷

Before the establishment of the NEA in 1965, there were seven state arts agencies and fewer than one hundred local arts agencies. At present, 56 states and jurisdictions and approximately 3800 local arts agencies (about 1200 with staff) are in existence. In short, since 1965, an extensive intergovernmental system for administering support for the arts and for distributing artistic benefits to the public has evolved. Federal money served as a

catalyst for establishing state arts agencies and for increasing state and local arts funding. In turn, state and local arts agencies have served as partners in reaching more artists, arts organizations and audiences, providing delivery mechanisms for national programs and, acting as an advocacy network for the NEA.

As discussed earlier, Congress provided the impetus for the creation of most state arts agencies when it stipulated in the Endowment's enabling legislation that the NEA make available grants to assist states in establishing a public arts agency. Also, the NEA made block grants to the states to help implement their arts programs. By 1974, the NEA was awarding \$12 million in block grants (of no less than \$200,000 each) to SAAs, or about 20% of its budget.¹ Changes implemented in the 1990 reauthorization of the NEA stipulated that the proportion of funds designated for the states was to increase from 20% to 25% in FY 1991 and further to 27.5% in FY 1993. Moreover, another 5% was earmarked for grants to the states for projects in rural, inner city and other artistically-underserved communities; this later rose to 7.5%. Additionally, the states annual funding from the NEA's Arts-in-Education program.¹⁸

During the 1970s, the development of local arts agencies (LAAs) in communities all over the country was spurred by access to funding made available by SAAs to support local arts activity. These funds were often allocated through decentralization plans that provided block grants to counties. In the mid-1970s, many states, with federal encouragement, joined together in Regional Arts Organizations (RAOs) to address their shared concerns. These included expanding public access through residencies and touring of arts performances and exhibitions as well as assisting cultural institutions in developing the administrative capacity necessary to implement national programs.

In sum, during the 1980s, the capabilities, range and resources of state, local and regional arts organizations expanded considerably. For example, the scope of partnerships with SAAs, LAAs, and RAOs and the federal agency grew. The NEA initiated a test program in support of local arts agencies in 1983 that developed into the Locals Program. The first 11 grant projects were able to generate \$12 million in new local and state funds in support of 46 LAAs that served 681 communities, 3,239 arts organizations and hundred of artists.¹⁹ At present, over 3,000 LAAs are acting as “cultural chambers of commerce,” by helping to animate the long-term cultural development of their communities and by devising strategies for incorporating the arts into the fabric of community life.

Furthermore, the SAAs and RAOs came to constitute a national distribution and implementation network for a number of programs and initiatives including arts-in-education, touring by performing-arts companies, regional visual-arts fellowships, folk-arts activities and technical assistance for local arts agencies. The states and their service organization, the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, created a National Standard for Arts Information Exchange to report on publicly-supported arts activities. This database is maintained through a cooperative agreement between NASAA and the NEA. Despite some problems with data-comparability, the National Standard constitutes a valuable resource for analyzing NEA and state grant information.

Another important factor contributing to the growth of state support for the arts has been emergence of state advocacy groups. The growth of these organizations is a logical outcome of the public-arts movement generally and is also a manifestation of the constituencies that have grown up around state arts agencies.²⁰ Virtually every state has an arts-advocacy group. Unlike the national-level advocacy groups, which typically

represent a specific artistic field (such as museums, dance, theater), a state arts advocacy group which seeks to speak for the general cultural constituency within its territory. On the other hand, while state-advocacy groups recognize the importance of national policies, these organizations generally focus on state-specific issues. Despite small size and minimal organization, state arts advocacy groups have helped to increase public support for the arts in individual states and, by extension, have generated more resources for the arts collectively. Since 1983, the State Arts Advocacy League of America (SAALA) has sought to strengthen the advocacy movement through the creation of a network to facilitate the exchange of information and to provide linkages among the various state organizations.²¹

The level of financial and public support for the arts at the state level increased significantly during the 1980s and, after a period of relative decline in the late 1980s and early 1990s, rebounded to surpass the NEA's appropriation level in 1992. By 1997, state arts appropriations were two and a half times the NEA's appropriation; by 2001, state appropriations were over four times greater than those of the NEA. (See Table 3) In other words, a dramatic reversal in federal and state budgetary resources for the arts has been occurring over the past two decades.²² In sum, SAA appropriations have grown steadily while the NEA's funding has declined and stagnated. The implications of this reversal for policy leadership, political support and program implementation have yet to be fully explored. Clearly, there is need for an "agonizing reappraisal" of the existing intergovernmental arts-support system in order to assess the appropriate roles, responsibilities and resources of federal, state and local arts agencies.

5. The Future of Public Culture

Figure 1 is proposed as a model for what a reconfiguration of responsibility for public policy and the arts and culture might look like. It must be stressed that this is one proposal and is introduced to stimulate discussion and not to represent a definitive resolution. It should also be noted that there are some basic assumptions that inform this model.

**Figure 1: PROPOSED FRAMEWORK OF PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR THE ARTS
IN THE UNITED STATES**

<u>Primary Mission</u>	<u>Primary Agency and Goals</u>	<u>Primary Advocates</u>
Criteria for excellence	<i>National Endowment for the Arts</i> Leadership and leverage Standards and evaluation	National art discipline associations
Support for excellence	<i>State Arts Councils</i> Institutional subsidy Arts Education	National Assembly of State Arts Agencies
Inter-state cooperation	<i>regional arts federations</i>	member states
Access to excellence	<i>Local Arts Councils</i> Arts development Individual artists	Americans for the Arts
Intra-state cooperation	<i>statewide arts alliances</i>	member localities

First, the NEA's diminished role in institutional prestige, political leadership and, especially, funding capacity is taken as a given. This is not to suggest that the NEA is irrelevant or dispensable, but it does recognize its marginalization as the prime mover in cultural policymaking. Given its limited financial resources and precarious political position, the NEA might do better to concentrate on symbolic activities such as articulating the strategic goals of a national cultural policy, formulating standards for

programs adopted to realize these goals and creating evaluation procedures to measure their success.

Second, the activities of public-cultural agencies should be informed by some sense of public purpose that constitutes the objectives of a cultural policy. At the risk of stereotyping its complex administrative history (and valuable contributions to public culture), the NEA operated for thirty years on four unanalyzed *a priories*. The first was that “culture was good for you.” The second was that the public almost universally recognized the value of the arts to their lives. The third was that, as “modern Medici,” the agency would distribute its every increasing (if always relatively modest) largesse to what was deemed by advisory panels to constitute excellence. Finally, that while specifically banned from commissioning works of art, NEA grants would confer imprimaturs on “good-housekeeping seals of approval” on artists and arts organizations. At least in retrospect, it is obvious that these assumptions did not constitute a policy. Moreover, the NEA’s seeming lack of a clearly-defined public purpose caused it to be seen by many as a “national endowment for (well-connected) artists” rather than an agency designed to address the aesthetic interests of the American public. For the most ideologically extreme, the NEA was also a convenient synecdoche for all that was wrong with modern society.

Third, there need to be specific goals to guide the decisionmaking of public cultural agencies. In particular, a public arts agency should be informed by goals that would serve the “public interest in public culture.”²³ Among the policy goals that might be pursued are: (1) institutional subsidy for basic operational and maintenance costs of cultural organizations especially those with strong public missions; (2) arts development that involves a strategy for the identification of regional centers of excellence especially

those providing accessibility to underserved cultural constituencies; (3) individual artist support to promote “diversity of excellence” in aesthetic endeavors especially among underrepresented art forms and cultural traditions;; (4) arts education, to provide the essential foundation for an informed cultural-citizenry capable of artistic appreciation and aesthetic choice.²⁴

As noted, the NEA could function, even with its minimal funding, as a voice for the nation’s cultural condition, the arbiter of broad cultural standards and an evaluator of the public-cultural programs of the states and localities. What the NEA cannot do in the foreseeable political climate is to purport to exercise comprehensive leadership in shaping the future of public culture in the United States. As the question was posed in 1991 by former NASAA research director, Jeffrey Love, “What collective, national effect might various state arts funding have upon the arts, independent of the status and structure of the NEA?”²⁵

As schematicized here, the state arts councils would assume broad responsibility for goals one and four: institutional subsidy and arts education. SAAs would broaden the coordination of subsidies for significant cultural institutions in their jurisdictions to guarantee the health of what have been called in another context “people’s palaces of culture.” (Given the number of line-itemized institutional subsidies in place in many states, this goal may be judged to have precedents.) Of course, states have long had a strong presence in K-12 education and support for higher educational systems of which arts-education programs are an integral element. Arts-education should be a central part of the core curriculum in K-12 and in the general education component of the university curriculum. (If state universities required arts education as part of their admissions requirements, the school systems would, of necessity, have to comply.)

Local arts councils would be the primary providers of cultural programming at the community level emphasizing goals two and three: arts development to increase artistic accessibility, especially in underserved cultural constituencies; and to support individual artists especially from the underrepresented arts through residencies, presentations and commissions. One should also keep in mind the regional federations that promote interstate cooperation and knowledge-sharing and state-wide alliances that do the same for the local arts agencies in realizing the four goals mentioned above.

Finally, even as this restructured cultural policy concedes the NEA's diminished capacity, nothing in this arrangement belies the importance of the public arts agency in promoting the aesthetic interest in public policy. While there is much to recommend private philanthropy and earned income, a more heavily privatized cultural world would be less likely to address issues of diversity and accessibility, equity and equality. States arts agencies may become increasingly responsible for the cultural programs that contribute to individual self worth and community development. An unanticipated consequence of the demise of the NEA's policy making primacy may be a cultural federalism that is better able to realize the principles of a cultural democracy.

In a system of mixed funding, the public arts agency serves in the capacity of "cultural extension agent." Extension service Of the U.S. Department of Agriculture distributes technical assistance and promotes the farmer's interests, similarly state and local arts agencies can nurture the arts groups and cultural activities that contribute to individual self-worth, group-definition and community-development and act as advocates for the aesthetic interest in public policy. It may be an unanticipated consequence of the demise of the NEA's policymaking primacy that, as SAAs and LAAs assume a greater

prominence, the result will be a public culture that better approximates a culture democracy.

ENDNOTES

¹ This section is adapted from Kevin V. Mulcahy, “The structure and politics of local support for the arts in the United States” in Mario Beaulac and Francois Colbert editors, Decentralization, Regionalisation et Action Culturelle Municipale (Montreal: Ecole des Hautes Etudes Commerciales, 1992) , pp. 59-78. See also, Arthur Svenson “States and Local Arts Agencies” in Kevin Mulcahy C. Richard Swaim, editors, Public Policy and the Arts” (Boulder, Co: Westview press, 1982) pp 195-205

² Dick Netzer “The subsidized muse: Public Support for the Arts In the United States” (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1978), p. 80

³ *Ibid.*, p.80.

⁴ U.S. Congress, House, Special Subcommittee on Labor, Committee on Education and Labor, Hearings, *Amendments to the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965*, 90th Congress, 1st Session, on H.R. 11308, July 18, 26, 1967, p. 81.

⁵ *Annual Report of the National Endowment for the Arts and National Council for the Arts*, National Endowment for the Arts, Washington D.C., 1967.

⁶ Michael D. Reagan, The New Federalism (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972), p. 87.

⁷ Netzer, The Subsidized Muse, p. 90.

⁸ William Howard Adams, The Politics of Arts, Forming a State Arts Council. (New York: Arts Councils of America 1966), p. 8.

⁹ *The First Annual Report for the National Endowment for the Arts 1964-1965*, Washington, D.C., 1965, p.72.

¹⁰ Ann Galligan, “The Politicization of Peer-Review Panels at the NEA” in Judith Huggins Balfe, editor, Paying the Piper: Causes and Consequences of Art Patronage (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993), pp. 254-270.

¹¹ Kevin V. Mulcahy, “The Government and Cultural Patronage: A Comparative Analysis of Cultural Patronage in the United States, France, Norway, and Canada” in Joni Maya Cherbo and Margaret Jane Wyszomirski, editors, The Public Life of the Arts in America (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 2000), pp. 138-168.

¹² These data are from Research Briefs: Human Resources Trends, NASAA, 2000.

¹³ The Institute of Puerto Rican Culture, with a staff of 93, is excluded from these population because of its unique structure and mission.

¹⁴ These data are from NASAA’s FY 2000 Legislative Appropriations Survey.

¹⁵ For a discussion of the American system of cultural patronage, see Kevin V. Mulcahy, “The abused Patron of Culture: Public Culture and Patronage in the United States,” *Boehmacahier*, 44, 200 (1999): 169-181

¹⁶ Kevin V. Mulcahy, “Cultural Patronage in the Unites States,” International Journal of Cultural Management, 2 (Fall, 1999): 53-55

¹⁷ This section is adapted from Margaret Jane Wyszomirski and Kevin V. Mulcahy, editors “The Organization of Public Support for the Arts” in Kevin V. Mulcahy and Margaret Jane Wyszomirski, America’s Commitment to Culture: Government and the Arts (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1995), pp. 121-143.

¹⁸ For a review of the evolution of the state and regional program at the NEA, see National Endowment for the Arts, "State and Regional Program Review: A Report to the National Council for the Arts," February 1993.

¹⁹ NEA, "Local Program Review for the National Council for the Arts," August 1992 p. 23.

²⁰ This point is made by John Urice in his article on "The Future of the State Arts Agency Movement in the 1990's," pp. 21-22.

²¹ See Dennis Dworkin, "State Advocacy in the Arts: A Historical Overview," *Journal of Arts Management and Law*, 21 (Fall, 1991): 199-213.

²² For a discussion, see Paul J. DiMaggio, "Decentralization of Arts Funding from the Federal Government to the States," in Stephen Benedict, editor, Public Money and the Muse, (New York: W.W. Norton, 1991), pp. 216-256.

23

24

²⁵ Jeffrey Love, "Sorting Out Our Roles: The State Arts Agencies and the National Endowment for the Arts," *Journal of Arts Management and Law*, 21(Fall, 1991): 215-226.