



The public obligation is to safeguard the integrity of the artistic process and heritage. Surely government has as strong an obligation to preserve the cultural environment against dissipation and destruction as it has to preserve the natural environment against pollution and decay.

—Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. 1988

IT IS A HIGH HONOR to be invited to inaugurate this series of annual lectures in memory of Nancy Hanks and in support of the cause she so nobly served — the sustenance and enrichment of the arts in America. And it is appropriate that this series should be sponsored by the American Council for the Arts, an organization that for nearly 28 years has given the artistic condition of our diverse and combative society searching analysis and vigorous advocacy; all the more appropriate because Nancy Hanks was president of ACA before she moved on to become the brilliantly effective leader of the National Endowment for the Arts.

Our concern this evening is the arts and public policy; and we meet, I believe, at a propitious time for stock-taking. For it was almost exactly 25 years ago that the first presidential Special Consultant on the Arts, August Heckscher, rendered his report to President Kennedy, *The Arts and the National Government* — a report that decisively advanced the movement which culminated two years later in the creation under President Johnson of the National Endowment for the Arts. Today, the more than two decades of practical experience under the endowment afford us the opportunity to see where we have been, what we have learned and where we should go from here.

The establishment of a governmental role in support of the arts has not taken place without argument. Still, such a role is not some hideous novelty of the 20th century. The idea that the arts are so vital to society that they are entitled to public support is an old one on the continent of Europe. Princes and prelates commissioned Leonardo, Raphael and Michelangelo, Haydn, Mozart and Wagner. Louis XIV subsidized the Comedie Française and the opera. Joseph I built the great opera house in Vienna. The small states of Germany nurtured music, theater and museums. The continental tradition of court patronage was readily adapted to the modern nation-state.

In Great Britain, they ordered this matter differently. There, 17th century Puritanism instilled suspicion of the arts, and 19th century *laissez-faire* left the arts to fend for themselves. As a result, public support, at least for new as against old art, took much longer to emerge. But Lord Keynes persuaded the British government to set up the Arts Council in 1945. The idea of the Council, Keynes said, “is to create an environment, to

breed a spirit, to cultivate an opinion, to offer a stimulus to such purpose that the artist and the public can each sustain and live on the other in that union which has occasionally existed in the past at the great ages of a communal civilized life.” Forty years later, Sir William Rees-Mogg, Mrs. Thatcher’s non-Keynesian chairman of the Arts Council, could declare that Britain has firmly “adopted the principle that the arts, like education, health and social security, are universal goods that ought to be generally available regardless of ability to pay.”

The United States has lagged behind both the continent and Britain in public support of the arts. Here the case against the public role has rested on four propositions:

- that public subsidy lacks constitutional authority;
- that public subsidy endangers the autonomy of the arts by making the artist dependent on government and thereby vulnerable to government control;
- that public subsidy represents a net transfer of income from the poor to the high-income and educated classes; and
- that public subsidy represents a paternalistic and elitist effort to dictate popular taste; if a cultural institution cannot please consumers and earn its way in a free market, then it has no economic justification, and, if no economic justification, no social justification.

I would suggest that the experience of the last quarter century has demonstrated these four propositions to be misleading, overwrought or simply wrong.

The constitutional objection is entirely devoid of merit. No one has seriously challenged the constitutionality of the 1965 act establishing the National Endowments. In view of the fact that Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution empowers Congress to provide for the general welfare, such challenge would be ill-advised. Enthusiasts for the jurisprudence of original intent might note that George Washington himself

**1988 Nancy Hanks Lecture
on Arts and Public Policy
April 13, 1988
National Academy of Sciences
Washington, D.C.**

Sponsored by the Gannett Foundation

**Arthur
Schlesinger, Jr.**

told Congress in his first annual message, "There is nothing which can better deserve your patronage than the promotion of Science and Literature." The Father of this country proposed especially the creation of a national university for instruction in the arts and sciences and even left money in his will toward the endowment of such an institution. The Founding Fathers were much influenced by the tradition of civic republicanism — a tradition that laid central emphasis on the inculcation of public virtue. Madison in *The Federalist Papers* held up the "public good" — "the permanent and aggregate interests of the community" — as the supreme goal of legislation.

John Adams, as we all remember, said he had to study politics and war so that his sons could study philosophy and science and his grandchildren painting, poetry, music and architecture — not a bad prediction, in fact, of the evolution of the Adams family. His son, John Quincy Adams, in his first annual message defined the "great object" of government as "the improvement of the condition of those who are parties to the social compact," described "moral, political, intellectual improvement" as duties assigned "to social no less than to individual man," and called for "laws promoting . . . the cultivation and encouragement of the mechanic and of the elegant arts, the advancement of literature, and the progress of the sciences." Failure to exercise constitutional powers for the elevation of the people, the younger Adams said, "would be treachery to the most sacred of trusts."

The civilized 18th century hopes of the men who founded the republic were disappointed in the 19th century for much the same reasons in America as in Britain — the dispiriting combination of a Puritan heritage with a *laissez-faire* creed. Only undertakings like the Smithsonian Institution, defensible because both educational and practical, secured congressional and presidential support. But our contemporary policy toward the arts can be reasonably seen as a belated fulfillment of the expectations of the Founding Fathers.

NOR NEED WE FEAR, I believe, that public support is *per se* corrupting or threatening for the artist. The argument that political pressure is bound to dominate any relationship between the state and intellectual or artistic endeavor is refuted every day.

The record of the two endowments and of such agencies as the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health shows that public support does not restrict professional independence.

The last two propositions — that public funding of the arts is income redistribution from the poor to the rich; and that it is an elitist attempt to prescribe popular taste — raise more interesting questions. "What justification is there," the Nobel laureate economist Milton Friedman has asked, "for imposing taxes on low-income people to finance luxuries for high-income people?" Note the assertion that the arts are luxuries like yachts and Rolls-Royces, and therefore inessential to civilized society. The argument further implies that public support of these luxuries violates the sacred principle of consumer sovereignty for the benefit of a snobbish minority and that only those things that can "earn their way" in the competition of the marketplace are worth having.

A moment's reflection shows, I think, how absurd these contentions are. I do not believe, by the way, that the defense of public support need rest on the spill-over effects of the arts boom tax revenues, jobs, business relocation, urban renewal, tourism, general commercial stimulus. These "vulgar benefits," as Professor William Baumol calls them, are all very well. But the case must be made on the intrinsic value of the arts to society as a whole. If the arts are worth pursuing at all, they are worth pursuing for their own sake.

And here one must ask: is it not the real elitism to suggest that low-income people have no interest in the arts and can derive no benefit from public support of the higher arts? Surely the poor as well as the better-off have appetites to be awakened, yearnings to be clarified, lives to be illuminated. The arts are, in Rees-Mogg's phrase, universal goods.

As for the argument that the arts, if they deserve to survive, must contrive to earn their own way, one can argue the reverse more persuasively: that the most precious institutions in society — our schools, universities, hospitals, clinics, libraries, museums, churches — are precisely those that do not earn their own way. All are characterized by the fatal gap between earned income and operating costs. Our civilization depends on activities that enrich the nation even if they do not meet the box-office test.

Government is, among other things — or should be — a trustee for future generations: a trustee of the national interest not only for the protection of military security and economic prosperity but for the protection of cultural legacies, choices and opportunities. Artistic creativity does not yield instant pay-offs. Sometimes decades pass before a society appreciates its own best art. The public obligation is to safeguard the integrity of the artistic process and heritage. Surely government has as strong an obligation to preserve the cultural environment against dissipation and destruction as it has to preserve the natural environment against pollution and decay. “We inherit a cultural structure,” Professor Ronald Dworkin has well said, “and we have some duty, out of simple justice, to leave that structure at least as rich as we found it.”

WE OWE THAT DUTY TO OURSELVES and to generations to come, and we owe it to the glory of the nation. The United States will be measured in the eyes of posterity not by its economic power nor by its military might, not by the territories it has annexed nor by the battles it has won, but by its character and achievement as a civilization. In the third year of the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln ordered work to go ahead on the completion of the dome of the Capitol. When critics protested the diversion of labor and money from the prosecution of the war, Lincoln said, “If people see the Capitol going on, it is a sign that we intend this Union shall go on.” Franklin Roosevelt recalled this story in 1941 when, with the world in the blaze of war, he dedicated the National Gallery in Washington. And John Kennedy recalled both these stories when he asked for public support of the arts in 1962. Lincoln and Roosevelt, Kennedy said, “understood that the life of the arts, far from being an interruption, a distraction, in the life of the nation, is very close to the center of a nation’s purpose — and is a test of the quality of a nation’s civilization.”

Our political process is often halting and untidy in its operations. But it seems indisputable that, over the last quarter century, the constitutional polity has weighed the various objections to public support for the arts and found them all wanting. In these 25 years the republic has at last made an apparently irreversible commitment to the goal of cultural improvement for the public good — the goal contemplated two centuries ago by the Founding Fathers.

The Great Depression first made arts and artists a concern of the national government. Early in his administration Franklin Roosevelt appointed the painter Edward Bruce as head of the Fine Arts Section of the Treasury Department charged with improving decoration and design in public buildings. Then on the 10th of May, 1935 — four days after his creation of the Works Progress Administration — FDR sent Harry Hopkins, the WPA chief, an historic, one-sentence memorandum: “Will you and Bruce try to work out a ‘project’ for the artists?” The WPA Arts Projects were emergency programs, regarded by many legislators with dark suspicion and abolished as soon as unemployment began to decline. In retrospect, however, the Arts Projects are accounted as among the New Deal’s notable achievements, and their memory has done much to invigorate later proposals for federal support of the arts.

These proposals came in the 1950s, paradoxically, from Congress — the very body that had killed the Arts Projects a dozen years before. It is invidious to single out individuals; but no historian can overlook the role played in these years by Frank Thompson and Charles Howell of New Jersey and Jacob Javits of New York, and in later years by Sidney Yates of Illinois, John Brademas of Indiana and Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island, among so many others. A majority of Congress soon came to see intrinsic value in the cultivation of the arts as a means of promoting the general welfare. In 1958, a young second-term congressman from Texas named Jim Wright observed, “All of us like to portray ourselves as real, sure enough corn-fed, homegrown log cabin boys.... In striking

The United States will be measured in the eyes of posterity not by its economic power nor by its military might, not by the territories it has annexed nor by the battles it has won, but by its character and achievement as a civilization.

such a pose, it is always kind of easy to ridicule and poke fun at things of a cultural nature. I plead guilty to having done my share of it, but I think, Mr. Speaker, that we have reached a state of maturity in this nation where that kind of attitude no longer becomes us. Sooner or later we have to grow up and stop poking fun at things intellectual and cultural.”

With the advent of John F. Kennedy in the White House in 1961, congressional advocates of a national arts policy received enlightened presidential collaboration and leadership. The Heckscher report of May 28, 1963, led on to the establishment of the endowments in 1965 and President Johnson’s designation of Roger Stevens as the first chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts. Roger Stevens avowed that his intention was to make Washington the artistic as well as the political capital of the United States; and, in the view of this envious if admiring New Yorker, I can testify that he has done his wicked work all too well. His labors in organizing the NEA and his benevolent dictatorship of the Kennedy Center have transformed and vitalized the cultural atmosphere of this city in ways the cliff dwellers of my youth could hardly have imagined.

THE FEDERAL ROLE IN THE ARTS thus began as a legislative-executive partnership, with each branch of government offering usable ideas on structure and program. At the same time, however, arts policy seemed the child of the Democratic party, originating in the New Deal and revived thereafter by Democratic legislators in alliance with lonely liberal Republicans like Jacob Javits and John Lindsay, men too often shunned by their own party. Republican members of the House Committee on Education and Labor denounced the 1965 bill for “creating Federal czars over the arts and humanities.” In 1968 Republicans in the House voted nearly 2-1 against the reauthorization of the NEA; among the opponents were such future party leaders as Gerald Ford, Robert Dole and George Bush. The crucial test of the new national cultural policy came when the 1968 election brought a Republican president to the White House.

President Nixon had hardly been the candidate of the artistic and intellectual community. Many in that community feared that his victory portended the end of the endowments. Instead, as we all know, the Nixon

administration embraced the new cultural policy and gave the endowments solid support and status. We owe this happy result to two people in particular — to Leonard Garment, a persuasive and public-spirited presidential assistant who made the arts his special charge, and above all to Nancy Hanks, who in September 1969 became the new chairman of the NEA.

Nancy Hanks was not only a great North Carolina lady. She was also a tough, tenacious, resolute and resourceful public servant who skillfully deployed southern charm, northern determination and astute political instincts to achieve her objectives. Before coming to ACA, she had worked for the Rockefellers in New York; and, as an administrator, she was reared in the Nelson Rockefeller school, which is to say that her creed was expansion. Leonard Garment persuaded President Nixon that support for the arts was good politics. Nancy Hanks then used White House baking to strengthen her case for bigger budgets and enlarged and diversified programs. The endowment budget under her seductive ministrations grew tenfold, and its challenge grants increased incentives for private giving. Most important of all, her leadership, cordially supported by Presidents Nixon and Ford, gave national arts policy firm and enduring bipartisan support. That policy now expressed partnership not only between the executive and legislative branches but between the two major parties as well.

Partnership between the two branches of government and between the two political parties was accompanied by a third partnership between the NEA and the state arts councils. Legislation setting aside 20 percent of NEA funds for state arts agencies stimulated state and community development, promoted local initiative and gave the public role in the arts the balance enjoined by our traditional federalism. The states have risen to the challenge. The aggregate budgets of state arts agencies now surpass the NEA budget by \$245 million to \$167 million for fiscal year 1988.

And the fourth, and most vital, partnership was with the arts community itself, cemented by the award of grants and the cherished NEA imprimatur through juries composed of artists — the so-called peer panel review process.

These four partnerships form the basis for the quiet revolution of the last quarter century in the relationship between government and the arts — an

incremental revolution shaped by experiment, participation and consent and resulting in a complex and ingenious system of public support. The intricate network of national, state and local arts agencies has further benefited from invaluable supplementary initiatives proposed and enacted by Congress, such as the Institute of Museum Services and the Arts and Artifacts Indemnity Act, the latter facilitating the exhibit in American museums of art from abroad (an act that should be accompanied by a domestic version for the circulation of works of art within the United States).

The evolving national policy has been most effective when vitalized by concerned presidents or at least by White House assistants with a keen sense of responsibility for the arts. Presidential interest is the surest guarantee of a strong and lively arts policy. But arts policy can now survive even the indifference or hostility of presidents — as demonstrated in 1981 when the arts programs withstood the severe budget cuts demanded, ironically, by the first president who was himself by vocation a performing artist. (All politicians are by avocation performing artists.) Congress even in the conservative 1980s has remained steadfast in its belief in the centrality of arts to a civilized society. Both political parties have joined to defend the endowment budgets against drastic retrenchment as well as the Institute of Museum Services against total abolition. The four partnerships have survived a time of adversity.

As late as 1958, William Faulkner could write, “The artist has no more actual place in the American culture of today than he has in the American economy of today, no place at all in the warp and woof, the thews and sinews, the mosaic of the American dream as it exists today.” I doubt that anyone would so depose 30 years later. The policy of public support certifies the value the republic has come to place on the arts.

But the consensus that sustains the policy of federal support does not by itself resolve difficult questions of priority — questions rendered the more difficult by budgetary deficits that will cramp and constrain the federal role for years to come. In considering these questions, we can draw once more on the experience and wisdom of Nancy Hanks. In a panel discussion at Columbia University on September 30, 1980, three years before her death, Nancy Hanks gave her view of

the major issues facing the arts community in the decade ahead.

“First and foremost” among the problems confronting the cultural development of the republic, Nancy Hanks said, is “our lack of understanding of the individual artist” and of “the importance of creating an environment in which the artist can flourish.” How right she was! It is banal to remark that the source of art is the artist; but it is a banality too often forgotten in our over-organized society. Universities and foundations are splendid institutions, and so too is government. But art results from the confrontation of experience by a disciplined, sensitive and passionate individual possessed of an intense interior vision and capable of rendering that vision in ways that will heighten and deepen the sensibility of others.

It is this individual, the artist, who must always remain in the forefront of our consideration. Creativity cannot be institutionalized. Art arises in conditions of individuality and diversity, even of doubt and estrangement. “Beauty will not come at the call of a legislature,” said Emerson. “It will come, as always, unannounced, and spring up between the feet of brave and earnest men.”

THE CREATION OF AN ENVIRONMENT in which the artist can flourish involves not only such lofty matters as the degree of honor accorded artists in a commercial society but such mundane matters as income, time, work space, health insurance, postal rates and the tax law. We must pay more attention to the unintended consequences of legislation indirectly affecting the arts. Sometimes these consequences can be benign. I suspect that the great subsidy to artists today is the system of unemployment compensation set up by Franklin Roosevelt in 1935 — a result that might have surprised FDR but would certainly have gratified him. And for a long time the major subsidy to artistic institutions came from provisions in the tax

**Art arises in conditions
of individuality
and diversity,
even of doubt and
estrangement.**

code permitting deductibility on gifts to nonprofit corporations. Writing the *Economist* in 1984, Simon Jenkins argued that the American system of financing the arts indirectly through tax expenditures was far superior to the British system of direct subvention. Among other considerations, a diversity of funding

There is a problem of maintaining a high level of discretion and expertise in arts administration, both private and public, remembering always that the function of the **bureaucrat** is to **serve the artist** and not the other way round.

sources is itself a guarantee of artistic freedom.

Alas, sometimes the unintended consequences of legislative action are malign. Congress, generally solicitous when dealing with direct support of the arts, has too often been cavalier when dealing with the impact on artists of revisions in the tax code. In the tax revision of 1969, Congress eliminated tax deductions for the donation of works of art and literature by the original artist or author to museums and libraries, while peculiarly retaining

the deduction for collectors. And the Tax Reform Act of 1986, whatever its other merits, is notably harsh in its treatment of writers and artists, thereby erasing much of the superiority that impressed Simon Jenkins two years earlier.

This act abolishes the charitable deduction for non-itemizers. It also contains the notorious provision placing writers and artists under a uniform capitalization rule designed for industrial manufacturers and forbidding them to deduct business expenses in the year when the expenses were incurred. I understand that no one has been able to find out how the footnote applying the capitalization rule to writers and artists ever got into the act. Congress last fall was prepared to

include a writer's exemption in a technical tax corrections bill, but this exemption was dropped under Treasury pressure in the budget reconciliation act. One must hope that Congress will act speedily to repair the grievous harm this provision will do to literary, scholarly and artistic productivity.

I might add that since the start of the republic, writers have provided a direct subsidy to the government by permitting the free circulation of their books in public libraries — and it is surely time to correct this inequity by following the example of Britain, Canada and the Scandinavian countries and passing an Authors' Lending Royalty law. The same principle calls for the enactment of Senator Kennedy's Visual Artists Rights bill assuring painters resale royalties. Government, instead of carelessly discriminating against writers and artists, should at least give them a fair shake in the tax code and elsewhere — especially when most writers and artists (and their families) live from hand to mouth anyway.

OTHER PROBLEMS CONFRONT THE ARTISTIC COMMUNITY in the years ahead. To list some of them is to illustrate the dilemmas of a national cultural policy. One of the proven successes of the NEA, or so one had supposed, is the process of peer panel review. This procedure relieved the artistic community's fears of bureaucratic control, extended participation and solidified a constituency in support of the endowment. Current proposals to confide grant making to the computer raise disturbing questions about the virtue of trying to quantify aesthetic judgment.

Then there is the problem cogently posed by August Heckscher 25 years ago and still unresolved — the problem of mobilizing government across the board in support of aesthetic quality. For government, in Heckscher's words, "is the great builder, the coiner, the printer, the purchase of art, the guardian of great collections, the setter of standards for good or for bad in innumerable fields where it is itself hardly aware today of its great influence" — hardly aware in 1963; much less aware in 1988.

There is a problem of maintaining a high level of discretion and expertise in arts administration, both private and public, remembering always that the function of the bureaucrat is to serve the artist and not

the other way round. In this connection presidents and Congress must be considerably more conscientious and exacting about appointments to the National Council of the Arts. Not all our recent presidents have resisted the temptation to use these appointments as rewards for political and financial support. These places must be reserved for persons with serious interest in and experience of the arts.

There is the perennial problem of decentralization — that is, the division of labor and harmonizing of functions among federal, state and community arts agencies and striking the appropriate balance between established arts capitals and artistically impoverished outlying areas. There is the problem of meeting the needs of an ever more ethnically diversified population without lowering standards, fostering ghettos, encouraging politicization, rip-offs and cultural babble and diluting the precious artistic heritage of the west that we in America are especially obligated to preserve and transmit.

There is the problem, recently dramatized in the understandable protest against the horrid Tilted Arc in New York City, of reconciling the rights of the artist and the rights of the audience. There is the problem, dramatized by the “colorization” controversy, of preserving the artist’s control over his own creations. There is the problem of assessing the artistic impact and exploiting the artistic possibilities of wondrous new technologies — television, the videocassette recorder, the compact disc.

All these problems arise, we must understand, at a time of crisis in the state of the arts. There is a crisis of funding. Federal budget deficits both foreclose an increase in subsidy and invite further discrimination against the arts in tax legislation, with tax exemption for nonprofit institutions and the charitable deduction itself becoming likely targets. Major foundations, like Ford and Rockefeller, which have contributed so much to the nurture of the arts, are withdrawing from the field. Economic uncertainty on top of tax changes will reduce individual giving.¹ Aggregate corporate giving has leveled out and may be declining; the merger mania reduces the number of corporate givers; and many corporations are shifting their charitable dollars

from cultural activities to other worthy areas that more directly advance business interests. So Exxon is abandoning “Great Performances” on public television and New York Philharmonic concerts in order to put mathematics specialists in public schools.

Leisure time, according to the Louis Harris poll, is contracting, and audiences for theater, opera, classical music and dance are diminishing. Observers report a falling-off in artistic interest among business and community leaders and also among younger people. “My judgment in 1988,” W. McNeil Lowry, whose intellectual leadership has contributed so much to the arts in America, said in a speech ten weeks ago, “is that . . . the reservoirs of good will on which nonprofit institutions largely relied have begun to dry up.” And this retrogression in finance and audience and attention and priority and participation is taking place in an age of implacably rising costs.

Yet the future is not entirely bleak. The Harris survey shows a surprisingly high degree of respect for artists, popular support for federal assistance to the arts and readiness to pay extra taxes for this purpose. It shows also an emphatic majority in favor of giving the arts a basic and continuing role in the school curriculum along with a mournful conviction that our schools presently fail to give our children adequate cultural opportunities. As one whose painter daughter teaches in New York City public schools in the Learning through an Expanded Arts Program, I know through her testimony of the responsiveness of even the children of poverty to artistic challenge. *Toward Civilization*, the recent NEA report, makes a powerful case for action in the field of arts education. What better way to create not only an audience but a civilization!

I have a deeper reason for a measure of optimism. As I have argued elsewhere, our political life, at least in the view of this historian, flows in cycles and displays a fairly regular alternation between private interest and public purpose as its governing orientation. From this perspective, the private-interest 1980s are a reenactment of the private-interest 1950s, as the 1950s were a reenactment of the private-interest 1920s. In the same fashion, the nation turns at 30-year intervals — the span of a generation — to public purpose, idealism and

¹ On further investigation, I conclude that it is a considerable overstatement. I am glad to report that since 1982 both the admirable foundations named have increased their support for the arts.

Public leadership
reinvigorates the
understanding of art as a
common participation,
a common possession
and a common heritage.

affirmative government: Theodore Roosevelt ushering in the Progressive period in 1901, Franklin Roosevelt the New Deal in 1933, John Kennedy the New Frontier in 1961. If the rhythm holds, and all indications are that it is holding, the 1990s should be a decade of innovation, experiment and idealism — a turn in the cycle of which the arts, which have thrived in earlier eras of public purpose, will again be a major beneficiary.

AS WE PREPARE to seize these new possibilities and as we contemplate the dilemmas of our present cultural situation, surely the time has come, if we are to renew and elevate the public commitment to the arts, for a serious reconsideration of national arts policy. The last thing we need or want is official state doctrine on artistic matters. But we do require, after these last rather static years, a rebirth of purpose and a clarification of destination. We do require an uncompromising rededication to artistic quality as the supreme object and justification of a national arts policy. We do require fresh thought on the enlargement of artistic opportunity for our multifarious country and our variegated people. We do require the raising of the national consciousness and priority on the issues of our cultural future. The time for reevaluation is upon us — and it should take place at the highest level.

Congress has recently established a National Economic Commission to seek remedies for our manifold forms of economic anguish. I would hope that the next president of the United States would ask Congress to

establish a counterpart National Commission on the Arts. This Commission should be composed of eminent scholars, writers, artists and arts administrators and also business and labor leaders with special artistic concerns. Its charge would be to examine the range of governmental activity affecting the arts, to propose a comprehensive arts agenda and to set goals for national arts policy in the 1990s.

You are here in Washington today because you deeply believe in the arts as vital to fulfilled lives, to civilized society and to the glory of the republic. Your devotion in the months and years ahead can do a great deal to persuade our masters to restore momentum and meaning to a national arts policy. Government cannot create civilization. Its impact is at best marginal on the adventure and mystery of art and on the creative solitude of the artist. But public leadership reinvigorates the understanding of art as a common participation, a common possession and a common heritage.

It may be too much to suppose with Walt Whitman that the salvation of the republic will come from “prophetic” art “radiating, begetting appropriate teachers, schools, manners, and, as its grandest result, accomplishing (what neither the schools nor the churches and their clergy have hitherto accomplished, and without which this nation will no more stand permanently, soundly, than a house will stand without a substratum), a religious and moral character beneath the political and productive and intellectual bases of the States.” Art will be only one, if an indispensable, strand in our salvation, if we are to be saved at all.

But we may at least more soberly conclude with George Washington: “The arts and sciences essential to the prosperity of the state and to the ornament and happiness of human life have a primary claim to the encouragement of every lover of his country and mankind.” ■

Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.

Born in 1917 in Columbus, Ohio, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. was educated at Philips Exeter Academy and Harvard, where in 1938 he received an A.B. *summa cum laude* and was part of the Society of Fellows from 1939 to 1942. He was also a Henry Fellow at Peterhouse, Cambridge University in 1938 and 1939.

Today, Schlesinger is Albert Schweitzer Professor Emeritus of the Humanities at the City University of

New York, where he has taught since 1966. Prior to joining the faculty of CUNY, he held numerous positions, including member of the Office of War Information (1942-1943) and of the Office of Strategic Services (1943-45); Professor of History at Harvard University (1946-1961); member of Adlai Stevenson's campaign staff (1952 and 1956); Special Assistant to President Kennedy (1961-63); and Visiting Fellow at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton in 1966.

Schlesinger is well known as the author of numerous books in the area of American history, including three volumes in *The Age of Roosevelt* series (*The Crisis of the Old Order*, 1957, *The Coming of the New Deal*, 1958, and *The Politics of Upheaval*, 1960), *A Thousand Days: John F. Kennedy in the White House* (for which he received the 1966 Pulitzer Prize for Biography), *Robert Kennedy and His Times* (1978), *The Cycles of American History* (1986) and *The Disuniting of America* (1992).

The recipient of many honors, Schlesinger was

awarded the Pulitzer Prize for History in 1946, the same year he received a Guggenheim Fellowship; the National Book Award in 1966 and 1979; a Gold Medal from the National Institute of Arts and Letters in 1967; the 1974 Eugene V. Debs Award in the Field of Education; the Fregene Prize for Literature, (Italy, 1983); and a Signet Medal from Harvard University in 1989. He also holds honorary degrees from many institutions in North America and Great Britain.

Schlesinger is an officer or member of many professional groups and associations, including the American Academy of Arts and Letters, the American Historical Association, the Advisory Board of the Arthur and Elizabeth Schlesinger Library on the History of Women in America (named in honor of his parents), the Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt Institute, the Board of Trustees of the Twentieth Century Fund, the Council on Foreign Relations and the Society of American Historians.