THE ARTS ARE FUNDAMENTAL TO LEARNING

JOINT HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AND THE

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS AND HUMANITIES

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES

UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-FIFTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C. ON MAY 25, 1977

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor
CARL D. PERKINS, *Chairman*
and the
Committee on Human Resources

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
92-171—O WASHINGTON : 1977

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

FRANK THOMPSON, JR., New Jersey
JOHN H. DENT, Pennsylvania
JOHN BRADEMAS, Indiana
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
PHILLIP BURTON, California
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM "BILL" CLAY, Missouri
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
MICHAEL T. BLOUIN, Iowa
ROBERT J. CORNELL, Wisconsin
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
EDWARD P. BEARD, Rhode Island
LEO C. ZEFERETTI, New York
GEORGE MILLER, California
RONALD M. MOTTL, Ohio
MICHAEL O. MYERS, Pennsylvania
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
JOSEPH A. LE FANTE, New Jersey
TED WEISS, New York
CEC HEFTEL, Hawaii
BALTASAR CORRADA, Puerto Rico
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan

ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota
JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois
RONALD A. SARASIN, Connecticut
JOHN BUCHANAN, Alabama
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
LARRY PRESSLER, South Dakota
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
BUD SHUSTER, Pennsylvania
SHIRLEY N. PETTIS, California
CARL D. PURSELL, Michigan
MICKEY EDWARDS, Oklahoma

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION

JOHN BRADEMAS, Indiana, *Chairman*

EDWARD P. BEARD, Rhode Island
GEORGE MILLER, California
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
CEC HEFTEL, Hawaii
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky,
Ex Officio

JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
LARRY PRESSLER, South Dakota
ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota,
Ex Officio

COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES

HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., New Jersey, *Chairman*

JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia
CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin
THOMAS F. EAGLETON, Missouri
ALAN CRANSTON, California
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, Maine
DONALD W. RIEGLE, Michigan

JACOB K. JAVITS, New York
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Pennsylvania
ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Vermont
ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah
JOHN H. CHAFEE, Rhode Island
S. I. HAYAKAWA, California

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS, AND HUMANITIES

CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island, *Chairman*

JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
THOMAS F. EAGLETON, Missouri
HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., New Jersey
(*ex officio*)

ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Vermont
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Pennsylvania
S. I. HAYAKAWA, California
JACOB K. JAVITS, New York
(*ex officio*)

CONTENTS

APPENDIX

THE ARTS ARE FUNDAMENTAL TO LEARNING

WEDNESDAY, MAY 25, 1977

JOINT SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS AND HUMANITIES, HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,

Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10:05 a.m., pursuant to notice, in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. John Brademas (chairman of the House subcommittee), presiding.

Present: Senators Pell and Javits; Representatives Brademas, Perkins, and Heftel.

Staff present: House staff: Jack G. Duncan, counsel; Thomas Birch, legislative assistant; Martin LaVor, minority legislative associate. Senate staff: Livingston L. Biddle, Jr., subcommittee staff director; Gregory Fusco, full committee minority staff director.

Mr. BRADEMAS. The Subcommittee on Select Education of the House of Representatives and the Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities of the Senate will come to order for the purpose of hearing testimony from the Arts, Education and Americans Panel on the role of the arts in education. Their report challenges us to recognize the fundamental relationship between the arts and education.

The report, "Coming to Our Senses," the result of a 2-year research effort by a panel headed by David Rockefeller, Jr., and comprised of prominent educators, artists, business leaders, and scientists, calls on the Nation to emphasize the arts as basic to an individual's development.

The changes in American education proposed by the report are profound indeed. The findings made by the Rockefeller panel bear significant implications on the educational policies of our country. We are all aware of the enthusiasm for the arts in the United States. Americans are visiting museums in record numbers, and the audiences for concerts, plays, and dance are expanding. Indeed, a Louis Harris poll shows that 89 percent of Americans agree that the arts are important to the quality of life. Yet, federally sponsored programs concerned with arts and education, such as the artists-in-schools program of the National Endowment for the Arts and the Special Arts Projects of the Office of Education, have been restricted in scope. And it was not until last year that the Federal Government began to spend money for arts education as an integral part of the teaching of academic subjects. The funds available for this new program for arts education are, however, limited.

Today we are very pleased to have with us Mr. David Rockefeller, Jr., the chairman of the Arts, Education and Americans Panel, and

members of that distinguished group to present their report on the significance of the arts for American education.

I, as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Select Education, on behalf of my colleagues welcome you, Mr. Rockefeller and all of your associates. I shall call on the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, the chairman of the counterpart Senate subcommittee, to make such remarks as he may wish to make at this time.

Senator PELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am indeed very pleased to be here with you, the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Select Education, and majority whip of the the House of Representatives.

I wish to take this opportunity to commend the initiatives you have taken, Mr. Chairman, in the House of Representatives over so many years. Joint hearings have been traditional, through our legislative cooperation, since the beginning of the arts and humanities concept.

Today we are broadening the scope of our endeavors to include, importantly, the field of education. We will be discussing the work of the Panel on Arts, Education and Americans, consisting of national leaders in these and closely related areas, chaired with distinction by Mr. David Rockefeller, Jr.

In going over the report, entitled "Coming to Our Senses," I was struck by its comprehensive quality, and by the almost 100 separate recommendations to integrate the arts fully within the mainstream of our educational process at all levels.

Last year the Senate took the initiative of passing legislation which was drafted by our subcommittee, which authorized $10 million annually for special arts and education programs to be conducted by the National Endowment for the Arts.

We envisioned demonstration and pilot type projects in various parts of the country to serve as models to illustrate the values of bringing the arts into significant educational focus.

The legislation, part of our comprehensive reauthorization of the arts and humanities program, was not incorporated in the final Senate-House bill. However, the concept was recognized and important legislative history was made. Many members of the conference also believed we should await the outcome of this panel report before we proceeded further with the specific proposal that had been approved already in the Senate.

I am thoroughly convinced that the time has come to act with dispatch. The arts should be grafted to the tree of education, but not as a minor appendage or as a treetop limb. The arts need to nourish the trunk of the tree and its roots.

The report advocates the establishment of a separate Department of Education. For the past seven years I have had this concept in mind. Education legislation which has emanated from the subcommittee, under my chairmanship, has been designed so that it would fit within the framework of a separate department, should one be established.

A Department of Education and Cultural Affairs seems a logical development. Eventually, as an ultimate goal, I foresee, perhaps, the establishment of a separate department dealing exclusively with cultural concerns and the whole spectrum of the cultural well-being of our Nation.

In other words, I would like to see a two-step approach. First the development of a Department of Education and Cultural Affairs, and then when we have overcome the obstacles of getting there, including the reluctance of the Secretary of HEW, then moving ahead and having the two separate departments or organizations.

Also, I see merit in the recommendation to activate or maybe reactivate the Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities, preferably under the chairmanship of Mrs. Mondale. I think it is important to mention that the Federal Council was authorized by law, which we wrote, to coordinate by advice and consultation the policies and operations of the two endowments, arts and humanities, and to promote coordination between the program and activities of the Arts and Humanities Foundation and related programs and activities of other Federal agencies.

We have recommended to the administration of President Carter that the Federal Council be activated as a means of implementing a more coordinated national policy for the development of our cultural resources. This is not to lessen the importance of the two endowments, but rather to strengthen their ability to serve our needs with the strong cooperative efforts of related agencies.

This Federal Council, consisting of the heads of these related agencies, has an immense leadership potential of which we have never taken advantage. The Federal Council has been more or less dormant over the years as the endowments developed their own programs and procedures. But now we need to think of unified action with all of our resources fitted together into a more effective whole.

I wish to commend the panel for its accomplishments and the chairman of the House subcommittee for arranging for these joint hearings.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Senator Pell.

Perhaps we could have Mr. Rockefeller bring his group up right now and save some time.

The Chair will yield to Senator Javits for such comments as he may wish to make, and then would call on Senator Pell to chair the proceedings while the House Members run over to the floor for a vote, and turn around and come back.

Senator JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I have come this morning in part as a response to David Rockefeller's invitation. I really wish to thank the panel for its work.

I happen to know a good many of the panel members. It is an extraordinarily gifted panel, and it is certainly on the right track in terms of the alliance between arts and education.

I might tell you that we are contemplating a similar idea in a youth bill which the Senate will consider today. We are planning to use the local educational agencies of the country in a new work-study type program. This will avoid dropouts before they occur. It will pick up the young people who may drop out and give them a job while they are still in school. They will both work and complete high school.

Comparably here, the utilization of our educational system will contribute to overcoming the lack of basic educational skills, including reading, which we deplore so much. You will intrigue more kids with the arts than you perhaps will with the blackboard instruction. Therefore, it has a tremendous ripple effect, and I am all with you on that.

92-171 O - 77 - 2

As to a Department of Education which Senator Pell discussed, I think that it is a very provocative suggestion. Personally, I don't wish to commit to it or against it. I would like to look it over and think about it very carefully, including the unity between the arts and humanities. Mr. Chairman, I think that this unity has been amply demonstrated. We should thank our lucky star that we had a Nancy Hanks and Ronald Berman, who worked very well together. So I think that we have the best, or almost the best of both worlds.

Senator Pell has given such brilliant leadership and dedication to this field. He is absolutely right. We can certainly use that unity which will come from creative advance thinking and planning. This is possible through the Federal Council or some other coordinating medium.

I would like to express for the people of my State, and I deeply believe, for the people of the Nation, our debt of gratitude to the panel and to its chairman, David Rockefeller, Jr. Their very fine work will have a permanent influence on the policies we adopt. We are no longer dealing only with forensic superficialities. We are dealing with very substantial amounts of money, and major actors in the private sector as well as on the local and State governmental level.

Thank you very much.

Senator PELL. Thank you very much, Senator Javits.

Mr. Rockefeller, would you proceed as you wish, and maybe introduce the members of your panel.

STATEMENT OF DAVID ROCKEFELLER, JR., CHAIRMAN, PANEL ON THE ARTS, EDUCATION AND AMERICANS

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My name is David Rockefeller, Jr., and I am chairman of the 25 member panel on the Arts, Education, and Americans. For the past 2 years, our group has been studying the role of the arts in society with particular reference to their place in the public school curriculum. Our report is contained in a 330-page book, called "Coming to Our Senses," published yesterday.

I am particularly cognizant of the need for public involvement at all levels, and for governmental and private cooperation in this field.

Funding for this report, as a matter of fact, came from 15 entities. Two-fifths of the total money was Federal money, and three-fifths was private. I think that this was a very important collaboration between these two sectors.

Including the final report, the report took 3 years to complete. It covers materials from all 50 States. More than 300 people were interviewed during the course of the study. The staff and panel jointly reviewed 782 articles, books, films, and special papers.

The theme of this report will be covered by my colleagues at this table during the morning, but I would like to make a few remarks about the underpinnings of the study.

We embarked upon it because we perceived that the arts while rising in importance as entertainment in America, and very sharply rising, I may say, were not generally recognized as an important part of learning or day-to-day living. It is this situation that we seek to correct.

At the panel's first meeting 2 years ago, it agreed upon the need for selectivity in the areas of its study. Thus, for example, we have

emphasized arts and education as they relate to children rather than adults; institutions funded publicly and not privately; programs originating in schools, not elsewhere; the training of amateurs and not professional artists; and direct creative participation in the arts, not simply observation of them.

I set this out as a list of priorities. We dealt with all of these subjects, but favored the first category rather than the second.

I will say no more at this time except that my colleagues at this table, with the exception of Pearl Bailey and Phyllis Wyeth, are all members of the panel, and I will be introducing them as we go along. The first panel witness I would like to call is Norris Houghton who will speak to the history of American education and how it is that we find ourselves in a situation in which it becomes important to give this testimony.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of David Rockefeller, Jr., follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT BY DAVID ROCKEFELLER, JR., CHAIRMAN OF THE PANEL ON THE ARTS, EDUCATION AND AMERICANS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committees, my name is David Rockefeller, Jr., and I am chairman of the 25-member Panel on the Arts, Education and Americans. For the past two years our group has been studying the role of the arts in our society, with particular reference to their place in the public school curriculum. Our report is contained in a 330-page book called "Coming to Our Senses," published yesterday.

This morning I am pleased to have the opportunity to share with you those recommendations of ours that impinge on public policy. First, however, I would like to take a moment to summarize our central thesis.

Imagine, if you will, two people in conversation using a Teletype machine instead of speaking to each other directly.

The words, all in upper-case letters, are a stammered outpouring from a mindless mouth. No gesture. No facial expression. No vocal rhythm or pitch. No emotion. Simply a procession of sterile symbols on a paper tongue.

Our Panel asserts that American education exaggerates the importance of words as transmitters of information. The fact is we send and receive a torrent of other information through our eyes, our ears, our skin, and our palate. We use all our senses to interpret and convey the complexities of daily life. Is a job interview settled on a written resume alone? What of the handshake, the style of dress, the mannerisms of speech and gesture?

Verbal and written language is essential, but all our sensory languages need to be developed as well if words are to fulfill their deeper function and deliver both subtle and vivid messages.

Perception and communication—both fundamental learning skills—require much more than verbal training. And since the arts (painting, dancing, singing, acting, and so forth) can send important nonverbal messages from a creator or performer to an observer, they are ideal vehicles for training our senses, for enriching our emotional selves, and for organizing our environment.

John Culkin, director of media studies at the New School for Social Research, New York, who will appear later this morning as one of our witnesses, has written:

Today the case for the arts is based less on the great things we see happening in the clasroom than on the great need imposed by the environment. The buzzing confusion of media and messages of all kinds threaten to overpower and stultify our senses and our psyches. We must develop powers of discrimination, selectivity, and expression to control and counter the one-way spate of images and sounds which constitute our communications ecology—the environment of our senses, our emotions, our minds.

Our environment is what we make it. And how we shape it depends upon how we perceive it. Through the arts we can learn to see our environment more clearly; to sense its color, song, and dance; and to preserve its life and quality.

Many of our schools and most of our cities and towns, however, bear testi-

mony to our general "senselessness." All schools could be galleries or supermarkets of wonderful information, but too many have become fearful, gray fortresses.

Our cities could be monuments to the creative interplay between nature and man, but they have become a gridwork of dismal frontage and automotive clamor. Yet most of us live in cities and all of us go to school.

Grayness and tension. Do we accept these as conditions of life? Must our surroundings homogenize our thoughts? Must cultural differences stimulate more suspicion than celebration?

Education, of course, is not primarily a cause but a reflection of social gloom and distress. Our formal schooling cannot be expected to provide a cure for what ails the nation. Parents are accountable too; and television producers; and Congress; governors and mayors as well; all all of us, in fact.

The roots of grayness and tension run deeper than our Report, which does not pretend to be a blueprint for schools or for society. We address ourselves to just one symptom of the problem: that the arts in America are viewed neither as part of everyday living nor as a legitimate part of education.

The official segregation of art from life and from education has a long history in America, althought this is not the case in other cultures, such as France, Indonesia, Nigeria, or Japan. It is the Panel's conviction that this segregation is unnatural and that art is indivisible from life and education.

Martin Engel, arts and humanities advisor to the National Institute of Education, said it forcefully:

Once the arts were an intrinsic part of the mythology—the system of beliefs—and filled the waking hours, as it did the dreams, through religion, magic and the host of symbols which reflected meanings and the knowledge of ourselves. But now . . . technology has usurped that function. The fine arts will play more than a superficial role in our lives only when our lives become more like art. The Balinese have a common saying: "We do not have any art. We do everything as well as possible."

This Panel supports the concept of "basic education," but maintains that the arts, properly taught, are basic to individual development since they more than any other subject awaken all the senses—the learning pores. We endorse a curriculum which puts "basics" first, because the arts are basic, right at the heart of the matter. And we suggest not that reading be replaced by art but that the concept of literacy be expanded beyond word skills.

The arts provide unique ways of knowing about the world and should be central to learning for this reason alone. But it is also significant that arts education can influence two elements of human behavior which concern every teacher: discipline and motivation.

Artists are often accused of being undisciplined, but quite the reverse is true. Art requires tremendous discipline—the dancer at the exercise barre, the pianist playing endless finger exercises, the meticulous editing of the filmmaker, the centering of the potter. Learning an art is learning to care passionately about tiny details as well as overall excellence.

On the other hand, the arts can bring enormous pleasure, and all of us are motivated to do what brings us pleasure. Think of schoolchildren completing a mural on the playground wall, producing a musical in the gymnanism, or videotaping a parade: these are arts experiences which can energize an entire school population, and which can teach principles of design, geometry, speech, carpentry, political science, electricity, and more. A successful art experience motivates the child to look further and deeper.

Panelist Ray Eames, designer and filmmaker, emphasizes that "the real task is to develop programs affecting all the teaching in the school (science, history, phys. ed.)—to raise the level of awareness, discipline, elegance, rigor, pleasure, appropriateness; and to establish a consistent concern for quality in the life of the student—in such a way that the question of art never comes up."

When we speak of "arts education," do we mean something broader than looking at art or listening to music? Yes. We mean making art, knowing artists, and using art as a general tool of learning. To give an example, theatre education can occur when a person writes a play; performs in one; rehearses for one; studies stage movement and voice production; plans costume, set, or lighting design; takes a social studies course in which historical events are acted out by the students; reads a play or attends a performance. We call this learning in, through, and about the arts.

Our Report, then, seeks to demonstrate that direct creative and recreative experience—learning in the arts—is of unique educational value. It asserts that learning about the arts is learning about the rich world of sensation, emotion, and personal expression surrounding us each day. It claims that learning through the arts has the potential to enhance one's general motivation to learn and to develop one's respect for a disciplined approach to learning.

Our Report begins by describing the crosscurrents which formed the culture and the educational goals of America and then goes on to describe arts education today. It is concerned not only with schools, but with institutions of higher learning and arts education programs run by community groups, city agencies, arts institutions, and other social institutions. The Report does focus on public schools, because that is where most young people are. And as such, it emphasizes the education of children while recognizing that education is a lifelong process and does not end with graduation.

We describe a variety of successful experiments, emphasizing that there is no single model which works for all, and recognizing the existence of many schools which already have excellent programs in the arts.

Finally, we suggest changes for the field of arts education, including philosophical, substantive, and structural changes.

The Report appears at a time of contradictory trends. On the one hand, the arts are flourishing as never before in America. For example, according to estimates by the National Endowment for the Arts, between 1965 and 1975, the number of professional orchestras doubled; resident professional theatres quadrupled; arts councils quintupled; and resident professional dance companies increased sevenfold.

On the other hand, arts education is struggling for its life. Music and art teachers are losing their jobs on a wholesale basis in some cities. Why? Because we have not made the connection between our desire for art and our need for art. Yet the resources are there, right next door. We have a profusion of superb artists, arts institutions, technology, and manifold cultural traditions: all the ingredients. The schools and their neighboring arts resources must be intertwined.

Panel witness John Edward Ryor, president of the National Education Association, makes this case for the arts as part of the fabric of education:

Quality education in its most fundamental sense cannot be separated from the culture of a society. The quality of the culture is expressed in its arts and its humanities. Those who say they can be removed from the curriculum are calling for the rape of education, for a return to "training" at the expense of "learning."

In the fifties, with a nudge from Sputnik, America recognized the central importance of science education.

In the sixties, with a lateral pass from the Kennedy clan, the nation reaffirmed that physical education was essential.

Now, in the seventies, it is time to acknowledge the power and urgency of arts education.

STATEMENT OF NORRIS HOUGHTON, DEAN EMERITUS AND PROFESSOR OF THEATRE ARTS, STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK; CO-FOUNDER, PHOENIX THEATRE, N.Y.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Norris Houghton, and I was born in Indiana. I am the vice chairman of this panel, and I have spent my life, since I graduated from college some 46 years ago, working in the two fields about which this panel is concerned: Arts and education.

My art is the theater, and after 30 years on and off in it I became a college progressor, and saying as I did so that I was the only man I'd ever heard of who went into teaching in order to improve his financial condition, a remark that incidentally perhaps sums up the relative security to be found in education vis-a-vis the arts.

I know then, at first hand the satisfaction that comes from creating an art. I know how much I have learned about life through practicing that art, and I know, too, at first hand what a tough time the art have had to become accepted and hold their own on college campuses, but I have no time to talk about that.

My job this morning is to open up the subject by looking back into the early days of our Republic, and trying to find at its roots why the arts have historically been given such a hard time in America, and why it is that we of this panel have to fight so hard to persuade the American people that good, indeed, essential things happen when children and young people grow up with music and dance and drama and painting and poetry as integral parts of their lives. Conversely, that lives in which those experiences play no part are tight, drab, unimaginative, and colorless.

It started with the Pilgrim Fathers, who as everybody knows, came to Plymouth Rock seeking religious freedom. Their lives were hard, and their Puritan religion was hard, too. It was adamantly opposed to music and dance and drama. What was good for you was to pray, and what was next best was to work. To be slothful was to practice one of the seven deadly sins.

So to begin with, the arts were considered evil. They also got in the way of work. When you arrived at the point, as they did rather more quickly in Virginia than in New England, where John Calvin's Puritans dominated—when you arrived at the point where you accepted that the arts were not actually sinful, you still had to cope with the idea that the arts were frivolous; no proper occupation for serious men.

In the 18th centry, the arts, especially architecture and portrait painting, began to acquire some respectability, but another idea then began to emerge. The arts were elitist. They belonged to the rich who could afford to build beautiful houses and had time to sit for their portraits. They were not for everybody.

These notions about the arts clung to most Americans down through the 19th century. We had too many important things to attend to, like opening up the continent, mastering our natural resources, and learning about the new sciences, making money.

Of course, as people made more money, they began to travel and they learned that in other countries the arts played a very important role in the quality of life. So we began to import culture. In Colorado, for example, in towns like Central City and Leadville we built opera houses and Jenny Lind and other artists turned up to perform for us.

So far I have been talking about the arts and America's historical preconceptions and prevailing attitudes toward them. What about the other components of our subject, education? That is another story.

Right from the start the American colonists believed in the power of the word, the importance of literacy. In fact, democracy could only work if its citizens had some education and the more education, the better the democratic process would function. So would the economy.

Consequently, schools were set up. Harvard was founded only 16 years after the Pilgrims came. Our Founding Fathers spoke eloquently on behalf of learning, and universal education was a battle that hardly seemed to have to be fought.

As with individuals whose childhood impressions stick with them longest, so with nations. "They all bear some marks of their origins," said the French historian Alexis de Toqueville. If we know our origins, then the pattern falls into place. So do America's priorities.

You can find them forming as early as 1643 in a pamphlet called "New England's First Fruits": first, to conquer the environment; second, to serve God and to build churches to that end; third, to form a viable government; fourth, to provide education or "to advance learning," as it was put. There is no mention in 1643, obviously, of the arts. But as our Nation became a nation, the arts found growing acceptance, as the 18th century turned into the 19th, but, to reiterate, as an ornament to life, not a necessity. No need, certainly, to make them part of the school curriculum. In consequence, as we trace the cultural history of America, we are forced to pursue two parallel lines. One on education, strong and straight; the other on the arts, wavering and uncertain. Only in the past few decades have we seen sure signs of the two lines converging, of a conscious effort to move the study of the arts through both appreciation and practice from the periphery of the educational experience toward its center.

Thank you.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. Chairman, the title of the report is "Coming to Our Senses," and an early chapter is "The Verbal and Written Language is Essential," but all of our sensory languages need to be developed as well if words are to fulfill their deeper function and deliver both subtle and vivid messages.

In keeping with this idea and with your permission, we will have a couple of brief interludes during our testimony which will include nonverbal presentations. At this moment, I believe, we have prepared an excerpt from Helen Keller's "The Miracle Worker," which I think needs no introduction.

[Film excerpt was shown.]

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call on the distinguished author of many books about this country and elsewhere, and of special interest to your committee his work on "America as a Complex Fabric," James Michener.

STATEMENT OF JAMES A. MICHENER, AUTHOR

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, my name is James Michener. Our panel believes that the film you have just seen summarizes what we are talking about so far as basics are concerned. We believe that every child ought to have the experience of approaching life through the senses as well as through the more traditional learning processes, so that some moment of illumination which will last throughout life, may be attained.

I am here because I am so vitally interested in the arts. I am a writer. I collect American paintings. I am a devotee of music. I am a broken-down tennis player, which is a form of art. I am here because I am vitally interested in the artistic education in the American system.

I travel a good deal abroad and I find that whenever Americans go abroad, they assess the nation they are visiting primarily as to what it has accomplished in the arts, what great buildings have preceding centuries left, what works of music has it created, what poetry, what

drama, and especially what paintings, and what operas. It is difficult for us to believe that 100 years from now the United States will be judged partially on what artistic work we accomplished. We forget that. Therefore, we insist that art is basic to the American life, to the American experience.

In a time when education is going back to the basics, as we all think it should, we want to be sure that the American public understands that one of those basics is the artistic experience. It affects everything we do. How we build our houses, how we organize our transportation system, how we design fabrics. Art is basic, not only as an entertainment value but as a system of looking at life and determining the values of life.

We have assembled a body of data which support our contention that in good schools artistic experiences help learning. There are many studies which indicate that the child who is happy in school with an artistic program learns to read better. He figures better in mathematics. He attends school more often. He is less likely to be involved in disciplinary problems. He is less likely to destroy the property around him if he has a sense of property.

Attendance goes up in schools that have good art programs. There are several examples of that in North Carolina and in the Detroit area. So that we are not at all hesitant in recommending to your committees that arts education be supported for very practical reasons as well as for the emotional reasons I have cited.

Finally, it seems to me that art has a spiritual quality that this Nation simply must not surrender. We are in a time of restricting budgets, a time of great change in education, and the members of this panel do not want the artistic experience to be diminished or in any way cheapened or denigrated. It is a fundamental aspect of our American pattern.

Other members of the panel will stress our conviction that the arts deserve more attention, more support, and certainly more participation.

Allow me to pose for you one rhetorical question. Can you imagine what it would mean to a school, or a community if it produced one glowing poet like Emily Dickinson, or a Nobel novelist like Ernest Hemingway, or an actor like Clark Gable who could catch the imagination of all people, an architect who would create a new visual image of America, or someone who would write the new "Roots," which would captivate the country for a whole week.

We believe that through attention to the arts, American education can help produce such luminous beings, but we also believe that justification does not depend upon the creation of geniuses. It is the ordinary person we are talking about, who can lead a full and better life if he has some experiences in the arts.

I was on a television program the other night with Peter Frampton, a very charismatic young Englishman, who last year in America earned himself $15 million because he was supplying an artistic experience to our young people which they don't get in schools.

The man running the program pointed out that Frampton last year had sold 12 million copies of his record, which had caught the imagination of the youth. He said: "Mich, have you sold 12 million copies of a book?" I said, "I haven't even sold 12 million pages."

There is that tremendous vitality in the arts, and we want to capture it. We want to have it represented in our schools.

Thank you.

[Prepared statement of Mr. Michener follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT BY JAMES A. MICHENER, MEMBER OF THE PANEL ON ARTS, EDUCATION AND AMERICANS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committees, my name is James Michener. I am a writer, a collector of art, a devotee of music and a broken-down tennis player. I mention the latter because a well-played game can be an artistic experience.

I am vitally interested in America's artistic expression because I have to travel a good deal, and I notice that when people like me enter a foreign country they assess it primarily according to what it has accomplished in the arts. What great buildings did the architects leave? What fine music was written? What immortal books were written? What plays still excite audiences? Five hundred years from now, whether we believe it or not, America will be judged by what it accomplished in two fields: a form of government which assured most citizens a good life, and its artistic heritage.

My message to your Committee is therefore a simple one. Art is basic to human life. It is basic to a good society. And it is certainly basic to the educational process. Another panel member (John B. Davis) spoke for me when he said: "When we look at the arts, we are looking at much more than the arts, we are looking at what a concerned society should do in improving the basic human condition."

The Panel enthusiastically supports the concept of basic education, but maintains that the arts, properly taught, are basic. They, more than any other subject, awaken all the senses—open the learning pores. We endorse a curriculum which puts basis first, because the arts are basic, right at heart of the matter. And we suggest not that reading be replaced by art but that the concept of literacy be expanded beyond word skills.

The arts must be considered basic because they utilize the most basic human reactions and perceptions. Some artists work with words, some with visual images, some with sounds, others with physical movement. Because these various symbolic systems are all ways of knowing, they reinforce one another. The point is that education, as one witness (John Gardner) reminded us, is "derelict and delinquent if it neglects ways of knowing."

We can learn from the example of Helen Keller. What she lost for lack of sight and hearing, she made up for through her other senses. Through touch, she discovered human communication. She used the environment as a learning laboratory and made personal connection between her sensory perceptions and her brain.

Frank Oppenheimer, a scientist and Panel member, said in our meeting in Los Angeles: "If you want to know what nature's like, you look at it through the eyes of somebody who calls himself a scientist, somebody who calls himself an artist or somebody who calls himself a philosopher and from the sum total of these, each of which observes and records and synthesizes, you find out what the world is like both present and past." And at the meeting in Minneapolis he asked the root question: "Doesn't anybody else feel the way I do: that the arts do the job of connecting the whole internal unspecified world with the whole external world?" The arts, like the sciences, influence the way we live and how we look at the world.

The arts are basic for another vital reason; they touch so much of what we do. Art determines the kind of clothes we select, or perhaps more accurately, the kind of clothes our artistic wives and daughters goad us into accepting as proof that we are living in the Twentieth Century. Art determines how we furnish our homes, the music we play in our leisure hours, the shows we watch on television, the kind of public housing we approve, the type of shopping centers we build, and the amount of urban space we demand. Ray Pierotti of the American Crafts Council informed the Panel that the American people, "must come to see the importance of design in the development of the American culture, design meaning all the visual aspects of our communities, from the objects we eat out of to the trash cans on the street corners."

In other words, the arts help determine the kind of mind we develop, the values we espouse. On this basis, Panel witness John Edward Ryor, president of the

National Education Association, makes a strong case for the arts as part of the fabric of education: "Quality education in its most fundamental sense cannot be separated from the culture of a society. The quality of the culture is expressed in its arts and its humanities. Those who say they can be removed from the curriculum are calling for the rape of education, for a return to 'training' at the expense of 'learning'."

Panelist Francis Keppel, former United States Commissioner of Education, agrees. He pointed out that at the present time educational funding can no longer be justified in terms of growth, or quantity, but on the ground of *quality*. "If we can teach knowledge about aesthetics—how to hear, how to see, how to feel, how to make judgments of quality—then we have provided the basic argument for coming to the aid of arts and education."

Of course, the major problem facing our Panel was: 'What shall schools do about the arts?' As schools tighten their budgets due to declining enrollments, inflation, and recession, the arts do not fare well. As the last subjects to be added to the curriculum, the arts tend to be the first to be excised. Faced with tighter budgets, school administrators move almost by reflex to cut the arts. The larger cities have been particularly hard-hit. In New York City, for example, 40 percent of the music teachers were fired last year. In most schools the arts tend to receive limited time and limited resources.

We testify without qualification that the arts must remain a part of the educational experience. People who question the value of so-called educational "frills" in public education should visit some of the model arts programs around the country to see the real and vital potential of the arts for educating our children. The federally funded IMPACT Project demonstrated that the arts can affect the motivation of both teachers and students. The final evaluation report of the six school systems that participated stated, "Students liked school in IMPACT schools." Absenteeism of both teachers and students was cut. At the Eastgate school in Columbus, Ohio, a school whose population is 100% minority with a 34 percent incidence of ADC (Aid to Dependent Children), scores in reading vocabulary went from 14 percent at or above grade level in 1972–73 to 79 percent in 1973–74, an increase of 65 percentage points. Scores in arithmetic computations and arithmetic concepts were close behind, going from 14 to 70 and 10 to 73 respectively. Reading comprehension showed a 41 percent increase.

Evelyn Jones, Principal of the school, maintains that the change was brought about by the arts IMPACT program. With the arts as an impetus, the teachers set about creating a program that was "one of making the whole world around them (students) come alive and meaningful to them," Jones said.

The Open City Project in New York City's East Harlem District #4 has demonstrated that poor readers can improve their performance by expanding the range and depth of their cultural experience. But the arts program in these schools has also affected the amount of vandalism. Terry Baker, Coordinator of Performing Arts in this district, says, "In a survey of the directors of art programs in the District, I discovered that they unanimously stated that their programs have had a noticeable effect in reducing vandalism in the schools and that they can point to specific students who were involved in vandalism prior to entering the arts program who are no longer involved in these kinds of activities."

In the "Total Arts Project" in Fayetteville, North Carolina, attendance went up from 92.6 percent in 1975–6 to 93.2 percent in 1976–7. Discipline problems were reduced. Suspensions during the first five months of school dropped from 70 during 1975–6 to 55 during the same period in 1976–7. The rate of failures was reduced from 4.8 percent to 2.7 percent during the same period.

Similar educational results from other model and experimental programs in the arts could be cited. These programs hold promise for the future. Testing results made available to the Panel bear out the basic hypothesis that learning capability in other subjects does increase when the arts are major components of the student's experiences.

How does this happen? Arts education can influence two elements of human behavior which concern every teacher: discipline and motivation. Artists are often accused of being undisciplined, but quite the reverse is true. Art requires tremendous discipline—the dancer at the exercise barre, the pianist playing endless finger exercises, the meticulous editing of the filmmaker, the centering of the potter. Learning an art is learning to care passionately about tiny details as well as overall excellence.

On the other hand, the arts can bring enormous pleasure. Think of schoolchildren completing a mural on the playground wall, producing a musical in the gymnasium, or video-taping a parade: these are arts experiences which can energize an entire school population, and which can teach principles of design, geometry, speech, carpentry, political science, electricity, and more. A successful art experience motivates the child to look further and deeper. Precisely because the arts deal with problems of identity and values, they provide an excellent context for self-discovery; they can also be an outlet for physical energy and a stimulant to the imagination. To develop people's creative capacities, of course, is one sure way to improve the quality of life. We need to have more people around who are capable of innovative solutions.

The Panel is convinced that the arts have enormous power to stimulate learning at any age. The process of making art—both creative and recreative—can give insight to all other areas of learning. Because the arts help people understand themselves in historical, cultural, and aesthetic terms and influence the way they do their work and live their lives, the Panel believes that the fundamental goals of American education can be realized only when the arts become central to the individual's learning experience. Educators at all levels must adopt the arts as a basic component of the curriculum deserving parity with all other elements.

The Panel has found that the finest arts programs are often those that offer the broadcast alternatives. The traditional curriculum consisting only of courses in visual art and music is no longer sufficient. Other arts should be recognized as valid components of learning. The curriculum should be expanded to include the disciplines of dance, film, drama, poetry, design, and so forth.

These other arts are poorly represented in American schools at the present time. Only one quarter of our high schools, for example, present what could be called strong programs in theatre. Of all art forms, dance undoubtedly fares the worst in the schools. Although dance performances have become more popular than ever, and though small dance companies are springing up all over the country, dance teachers at the secondary level represent less than 1 percent of all teachers.

Panel member O'Neil Ford, an architect, spoke about all the secondary school students in public schools who know nothing about the arts. He said, "They go home to their houses with their swimming pools, and drive through the commercial slums that exist in all cities. The poor kids go to a house without any floor, with no heat . . . . They go home—they see nothing, they have no perception of anything. And I'm outraged that this has been perpetrated upon them, that we have allowed this to happen. . . . The private schools think the same way. There they get Greek and Russian by the sixth grade and they get calculus in the ninth, but what happens is that they don't get any art at all."

In light of all the current budgetary pressures and the public demands to "go back to basics," the arts at present are fighting for survival in many school systems. The situation reminds me of the statement of the Red Queen in Lewis Carroll's *Through the Looking Glass:* ". . . It takes all the running you can do to keep in the same place."

Other members of the Panel will stress our conviction that the arts deserve more attention, more support, and certainly more participation. Allow me to ask one rhetorical question: "Can you imagine what it would mean to a school or a community if it produced a glowing poet like Emily Dickinson, or a Nobel novelist like Ernest Hemingway, or an actor like Clark Gable, or an architect who would create a new visual image of America?" We believe that through attention to the arts American education can help produce such luminous beings, but we also believe that justification does not depend upon the creation of geniuses. We can all live fuller and better lives if we have some experience of the arts.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you, Mr. Michener.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. The next panelist witness is the distinguished concert pianist, Lorin Hollander.

STATEMENT OF LORIN HOLLANDER, CONCERT PIANIST

Mr. HOLLANDER. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, anthropologists have studied thousands of different societies and virtually all have given central position to the arts. These arts—the play-

ing of musical sounds, the showing of pictures and symbols, the dancing to each other—these biological, neurological, psychological, social realities are fundamental to the being of animal man. They are as much a part of man's ascent as the search for meaning, for relationship with God, and for understanding man's relationship with man.

Music, the visual arts, the performing arts—deal with the most intimate, the most private, the most passionate elements of the human psyche, the intellect, the emotions, the undulatory functions of being human. In the music of Mozart, Schubert, Bach, Beethoven; in the paintings of Michelangelo, Rembrandt; in the manuscript illuminations of nameless medieval artists; in the plays of Shakespeare; the poetry of Blake; in the spray paint murals on the subway cars; in the stark likenesses of bush gods of so-called "primitive People"; in the novels of Dostoevsky—in all of these we deal with the essence of the spirit of man.

But, there is a darkness that threatens to inundate us. We have made a mistake—a mistake that virtually no other society has made—we are not nurturing our children in the arts. We view socialization in the arts, which in our society takes the form of arts education, as a secondary luxury, expendable and in the end discarded as we go "back to basics". It is quite clear that the dismissal of the importance of arts education represents a dismissal of, or ignorance of, the importance of art.

It is not difficult to see that art in this country is often seen as mere entertainment, pretty pictures or high society. It is not widely understood that when we speak of the arts we speak of emotion and mental health, one of the few paths toward emotional balance.

We have not nurtured our young people in the healthy ways in which emotional energies can be artistically channeled. What is missing is the transmission to our children that the arts address incredibly complex, almost unspeakably profound, questions that lay at the core of human experience. We have descended to the point where emotional confusion does not generate artistic search, but degenerates into rage and violence. Tragically, it is particularly the young who are torn by forces that lead one—seeing no alternative—to violence and alienation and emotional strangulation. They have never learned how to deal with terror, rage, longing, bewilderment, lust, tenderness, or need in abstract symbols—words, musical notation, shapes, numbers, gestures, proportions.

For all the talk of new lifestyles and new ways, our children and all that follow will face the same doubts and confusions that have faced all men since we gained sentience, because these doubts and fears are inherent in the human condition. We must give our children the knowledge of how to deal with these feelings as well as the experience of fufillment, the awareness of beauty and elegance, and the experience of sharing emotion without shame. If we fail we leave our young isolated, we will be mocked by the spectacle of a population that feels that it has no time for art because it must use all its energies forstalling the fear of death and the fear of touching—the very sources of the energy that generates art at its highest and the very pressures that art can relieve.

It is not to our credit—as artists, educators and policymakers charged with making the arts available to the public—that so many

people wander hopelessly looking for hope, not knowing that there are places—museums, concert halls, places of worship, libraries, universities—where one can go for hope, where one can go to get help in his search, help from the greatest minds and souls that we have produced, minds and souls formed in the search for answers to the very confusions that generate their state of hopelessness. When someone shares the search and humanity of a Bach he begins to overcome the desperation and the loneliness that had originally led him—with our acquiesence—to dismiss as emotional luxury his one chance for peace. Without art how can a young child deal with the death of a parent or a sibling? Without art where does a child who cries for the worm on the hook find a kindred spirit? Where does a child find an alternative to the competitive spirit so ingrained in our culture if not in sharing the attitude of the chamber music player? With what focus does the young mathematician recognize the elegance of a great theory or see the symphonic flow in a game of chess or a great novel? How will he ever understand the concept of "quality" or learn the most profound discipline? Most important, where can a child take those feelings and dreams that he only allows himself to experience alone in his room and share them with another human being? (Yes, there also exists love and religion).

If we can provide a way in which young people and their teachers share a pulsating artistic experience we would find mutual growth where now there is stagnation and retrogression. Creative channels would replace the stultifying blockage that precludes growth. If it seems that I have attributed to art an exaggerated healing power, we should remember that art has sustained man throughout his history not because it is "sophisticated", not because it is a sign of status, but because at its highest it is real—it is true. It is true as the cosmologists theory of reality is true and the molecular biologists discovery of the sources of the transmissions of life is true. All of these show us a beauty, an elegance, a simplicity that is truth.

And if there is one thing we can say is requisite for the good society, one thing that has infused our society throughout its history and made it a good society, it is that we believe in, we trust the truth. To deny art, a denial which can take the most pernicious form of a slow ignoring of arts education, is to deny truth. It is our task as arts educators and policymakers to see that this descent into ignorance and numbness does not occur.

We must view the arts in education as the most basic of the basics, the very center, the guiding spirit of all that we teach our young. Then may our children glimpse the glorious vision that it is indeed just their dreams, feelings and flights of imagination that being human is all about, and when they learn how these harmonies of childhood are structured and woven together with care and discipline then they may enter the world of art. They are our children. Let them create.

Thank you.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you, Mr. Hollander.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. The next speaker is Peggy Cooper, special assistant to the president, Post-Newsweek Stations, Inc., here in Washington.

STATEMENT OF PEGGY COOPER, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT, POST-NEWSWEEK STATIONS, INC.

Ms. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, although I am a lawyer by trade and not an artist, I must within acceptable limits make it clear that I came to my senses a good many years ago. This coming for me was not a difficult journey, but a gift.

In my grade school in Alabama, the teaching of the arts was ever present, and I learned of my people. Because of this by the time I finished the eighth grade, I had a sense of my own identity. I knew my roots were born of rich soil.

At home my parents taught me that the richness of our culture was a cornerstone of our heritage. My childhood was filled with such experiences. My father would demand our attention, and speak to us of the injustices of our society. He wanted us to feel and understand. If we understood, he proposed that we would never complacently accept our plight, nor would we ever be destroyed by it. Our understanding, he hoped, would drive us to achieve and to contribute, and to change.

As my father spoke to us of injustice, he did not dwell on the incident of white transgressions against us. He instead told us of our culture, the sum total of our history, the men and women who enriched it in spite of these transgressions. They were doctors, lawyers, scientists, and artists. There was no separation between the pursuers of these great achievements. Scientists and songmakers shared equal accolades. But our parents did impart to us a special feeling for our artists.

It was through their work that many generations would share in their riches. They are the cement that held the cornerstone of our culture together.

My childhood exposure allows me to make arrogant assertions. but my adult experiences in the world of the arts humble me all too often. Serving on the Arts, Education and Americans panel forced me to crystallize my thoughts and face some ugly truths.

The arts do not play a significant role in the education of most of our children, black or white. Our institutions do not encourage it, and when they do, those institutions are inadequately funded.

Congress cannot accept the insignificant position the arts currently hold in our educational system. The panel report notes over 100 exceptions to the current status. Surely the high rate of success produced by these exceptions have left too sweet a smell for us to deny any child a share in the bouquet.

In classrooms across America the arts are generally taught by regular classroom teachers, most of whom have little or no training in the arts. We must change this, but we cannot realistically ignore this group. We must consider them as a resource, and provide for them the vehicles that they need to provide arts for all of our children.

At the Ellington High School right here in Washington, D.C., many students began with poor preparation and little hope for success. but we have found by placing them in classrooms with practicing artists, who are also their teachers, that they can relate the concrete products to their own achievements and their own aspirations.

Beyond this there remain some very special problems for students, particularly minority students. The panel report concentrates primarily on providing arts learning experiences to every child. In this process there will always be a few children who exhibit special interest and gifts. For these children, it is not enough to simply expose and lift their spirits. We cannot tease them with new horizons, only to abandon them later.

It is clear that if the minority students are given the opportunity, they can succeed. There is a student in the high school right now whose name is Kim Staunton. She was a 17-year-old girl from the heart of the inner city with no father, and a mother who is on welfare. Because of her poverty, she held very low career expectations for herself, but she does have a burning desire to act.

She was recently admitted to Julliard with a handsome scholarship. She embodies the proof that given the chance, minority students can succeed.

National commitment to this area is important for another reason. As the report suggests, there is a serious gap in leadership in arts education, and this is true for all segments of society. But what is true generally is seemingly always more profound for minorities.

We recommend that a national task force be established to develop means to infuse the arts education community with leadership skills. This must be done, but in addition we must recognize that unless we provide vehicles through which young gifted minorities can be competitively trained in the arts, we will not have the skilled population from which to draw minority arts leaders. We must move swiftly to develop them. I gratefully acknowledge what you have done, particularly Senator Pell and Congressman Brademas, through the National Endowment for the Arts and other agencies, but I must point out that the home stretch is far, far longer. Every day that the Congress does not move toward materializing changes in the arts and education through its appropriation and legislative machinery, it is sounding a death knell for Americans, their history and their culture.

There is hope with proper leadership. The vast contributions that the arts and artists can make to education, civilization, and ultimately to the humaneness of our American society, is history yet unmade. Raise the artists to first class citizenship. Make the arts a part of the American dream, and through education let us now make that history.

Speaking for all the artists in classrooms, studios and streets who may be able to touch a child and turn him from human waste to national wonder, I will say it plain, as the great poet Langston Hughes said it, "America never was America to me, but you can make it so." I do hold America's dream deep in my soul, now I want to share in it through the arts.

Thank you.

[Prepared statement of Peggy Cooper follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF PEGGY COOPER, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT, POST-NEWSWEEK STATIONS, INC.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Peggy Cooper and I am the founder and Chairman of the Board of the Ellington School of the Arts (formerly Western High School) in Washington, D.C.

Although I am a lawyer by training, not an artist, I must, within the acceptable limits of arrogance, declare that I came to my senses a good many years ago. This coming was for me not a difficult journey—but a gift—a gift wrapped in the most durable of materials: knowledge. At a very early age my imagination took flight and my spirit was exalted, simply because the arts were a significant part of my education.

In my all-Black grade school in Mobile, Alabama the teaching of the arts was ever-present. There was, of course, the conventional approach of construction paper cut-outs, clay molding, finger painting and do-re-me sessions. But far more crucial was the inclusion of the materials of art and culture in my reading, English and history classes. Much of the material was of a European classical genre and seemed rather dusty and alien to me at the time. But some of the material immediately excited me. I learned of the writers, poets and painters of my people.

Because of this, by the time I finished eighth grade I had a sense of my own identity. I knew my roots were borne of rich soil. As such, in the 1960's I was able to avoid the destructive internal conflicts caused by the identity crises experienced by many of my peers.

At home my parents taught me that the richness of our culture was the cornerstone of our heritage. At nightly dinners cluttered with the chatter of six children, spiced with ripe strawberry-red Kool-Aid, my father would demand our attention and speak to us of the injustices of our southern existence. Brutal talk for kids at dinner—perhaps—but, no—he wanted us to know, to feel, to understand. If we understood, he proposed, we would never complacently accept our plight nor would we ever be destroyed by it. Our understanding—he hoped—would drive us to achieve, to contribute and to change.

As my father spoke to us of injustice he did not dwell on incidents of white transgressions against us. He instead told of our culture—the sum total of our history—the men and women who enriched it in spite of white transgressions. We would not read about these people in history books, learn about them on television, or at the movies, he said.

They were doctors, scientists, inventors and artists. There was no separation between the pursuers of these great achievements.

Scientists and song makers shared equal accolades in the kingdom of our heritage, but my parents *did* impart to us a special feeling for our artists. It was through their work that many generations would share in the riches. The artists were the cement that held the cornerstone of our culture together.

My parents, who were my first teachers, made a gift to me of that cornerstone, and for me it has been an enduring source of strength and creativity. Whenever on the verge of bitterness or frustration I slip back to those childhood diners and hear the echoes of my father quoting a great Black bard: "O yes, I say it plain, America never was America to me. And yet I swear this oath, America will be! An ever-living seed, its dream lies deep in the soul of me."

While, a childhood—special in many ways—allows me to make arrogant assertions, my adult experiences in the world of the arts humble me all too often. Serving on the Arts Education and Americans Panel forced me to crystallize my thoughts and actively focus on some ugly truths, truths not new to me, but ones which I would rather forget:

The arts do not play a significant role in the education of most of our children—black or white. Our institutions do not encourage it, and on the rare occasions that arts education is encouraged it is not adequately funded. My educational experiences—at home and in the classroom—were extremely rare.

Congress cannot accept the insignificant position the arts currently hold in our educational systems. The panel report notes over 100 exceptions to the current status. Surely the high rate of success produced by these exceptions emits too sweet a smell for us to deny any child a share in the bouquet.

The arts belong to everyone. They are not special or complex but they are ordinary and simple. But yet in their simplicity I have seen many wonders. With the educational travesties which exist in our schools today, an inner city child overcoming years of poor schooling and learning to read is quite an achievement. What a wonder when I see it happening to child after child in an arts program. But there are far too few!

The report underscores the importance of people in effecting change and specifically recommends steps which need to be taken by and for arts education providers, producers and receivers. I will alternately highlight, condense and expand upon those recommendations:

In classrooms across America the arts are generally taught by regular classroom teachers. Most have little or no training. This is not good for the student or the teacher. However, due to an over abundance of teacher college graduates and a shrinkage in the school-age population, it is projected that 80% of the classroom teachers presently teaching will still be in the classroom ten years from now. Thus we cannot realistically ignore this group.

We must instead consider it a great resource and institute in-service training programs for current classroom teachers so that they may improve their proficiency in the arts. Further we must provide these teachers with resource support from specialists and artists.

Prospective art teachers should be required to meet stringent new standards as a prerequisite for hiring.

Simultaneously with improving the quality of teachers we must require our school systems to make the arts such a key part of the core curriculum that related courses cannot be dismissed as frills when budget cutbacks are necessary.

Teacher certification codes must be specifically designed for art teachers and art specialists. These codes should heighten standards for new art teachers while dealing with the inherent peculiarities and providing entree for the professional artist into the teaching profession.

Practicing artists must be drawn from their stages and studios into the domain of teaching. A practicing artist can share actual product with the student and invigorate his interest not only in the arts but in school in general.

At the Ellington School of the Arts many students begin with poor preparation and little hope for success. But we have found that placing them with teachers who are productive artists has a consistently positive effect on the students.

When a student sees a teacher not simply talking about what might be—but actually producing and creating—the student can relate his teacher's concrete product to his own achievement.

Beyond this there remains some very special problems for students—particularly minority students. The panel report concentrates primarily on providing arts learning experiences to every child. In this process there will always be a few children who exhibit special interests and gifts. For these children it is not enough to simply expose and lift their spirits. We cannot tease them with new horizons—only to lose sight of them in the sunset.

Many parents cannot provide the special training necessary to satisfy the demands of a gifted student. This training needs to begin early. There are numerous professional conservatory training programs on the college level. They are very competitive and generally populated by students whose parents have been able to afford early training. Minorities are hard to find in these institutions and as a result have a more difficult time entering the professional levels of their respective fields.

It is clear that when minority students are given the opportunity that they can succeed. For example right here in Washington the Ellington School of the Arts and its predecessor Workshops for Careers in the Arts has a 90% student success rate in college and professional school acceptance.

Kim Staunton is now a seventeen year-old senior from the heart of the inner city with no father and a mother who is on welfare. Because of her poverty she had very low professional expectations for herself but she has a burning desire to act. She was recently admitted to Juilliard with a handsome scholarship. She is one of many who if given a substantive chance can add to that cornerstone of which my father spoke. Still, those chances are too few and many future artists are becoming the future waste of our society.

National commitment to this area is important for another reason: As the report suggests there is a serious gap in leadership in arts education. This is true for all segments of our society—but what is true generally is seemingly always more pronounced for minorities.

We recommend that a national task force be established to develop means to infuse the arts education community with leadership skills. This should be done. But, in addition, we must recognize that unless we provide vehicles through which young gifted minorities can be competitively trained in the arts we will not have a skilled population to draw minority leaders from and our major national and state arts institutions, which are pivotal in molding the arts future of this country, will remain totally white conclaves—alien territory for their Black and Brown American brothers.

We must move swiftly to galvanize those vested with the authority to effect change.

92-171 O - 77 - 4

In chiding the Congress I gratefully acknowledge the past gestures it has made through the National Endowment for the Arts and certain HEW programs but I must point out that the home stretch is far, far longer.

Every day that Congress does not move toward catalyzing massive changes in the status of the arts and the arts in education through its appropriation and legislative machinery it is sounding a death knell for Americans—their history and their culture.

There is hope. With the proper leadership the vast contributions that the arts and artists can make to the education, civilization and, ultimately, to the humaneness of our American society is history yet unmade. Raise the artist to first class citizenship. Make the arts a part of the American dream and through education let us now make that history.

Speaking for all the artists—in classrooms, studios and streets, who may be able to touch a child and turn him from human waste to national wonder—I say it plain as Langston Hughes said it—America never was America to me—but you can make it so—I do hold American's dream deep in my soul—Now—I want to share in it—through the arts.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you, Ms. Cooper.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. The next panelist to speak will be Glenn Seaborg, former Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, and currently a professor of chemistry at the University of California.

STATEMENT OF GLENN T. SEABORG, PROFESSOR OF CHEMISTRY, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA; FORMER CHAIRMAN, U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. SEABORG. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am a scientist and educator. I am a professor of chemistry at the University of California at Berkeley, and formerly chancellor of the Berkeley campus.

I am one of two scientists on the panel. The other is Frank Oppenheimer. I think that it is very appropriate that science be represented on the panel. This is because I believe that there is clearly a relationship between science and the arts. I believe that most scientists agree with me on this.

The symmetrics of natural science, the synthesis of new theories from new information, the design of experiments all have their counterparts in art and art forms. I think that one of the best examples of this relationship can be seen in The Exploratorium, the Palace of Arts and Science, conceived and operated by Frank Oppenheimer in San Francisco.

This shows in the most dramatic manner the way in which art and science can interact. Also there are many ways in which science and the arts can enhance each other. The radio, television, video tape, movie films, still photography, the renovation and preservation of classic paintings, high fidelity recordings, electronics and music, just to mention a few.

I believe it is clear that the quality and quantity of arts education is not commensurate with its importance, not equal to the potential of a field that can give insight to all other areas of learning. An increased emphasis in our educational system on all the art subjects is needed as we begin our country's third century.

I recall that there was a recognized need for a change in the science education system of our country 20 years ago, at the time of the Sputnik. At that time, with help from the government, Federal and State levels, there was a rather complete renovation of the systems

of education in science at the high school level, at the elementary school level, and a good deal also at the level of higher education.

I served as the national chairman of the committee that undertook this improvement in the chemistry courses in high schools. I think perhaps what we need is a Sputnik in art education, something that will motivate us as a nation to give this the support that it merits.

The cost of education in the arts is not as large as that in the sciences, and the impact per dollar will be even greater. It is hoped that the publication of "Coming to Our Senses," not only will point out the significance of the arts in American education, but as a consequence all art forms will receive appropriate attention, recognition, and implementation in our educational system.

Thank you.

[Prepared statement of Glenn T. Seaborg follows:]

STATEMENT BY GLENN T. SEABORG, MEMBER OF THE PANEL ON THE ARTS, EDUCATION AND AMERICANS

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committees: My name is Glenn T. Seaborg. As one of two scientists on the 25 member Panel on the Arts, Education and Americans, I have gained a special insight into an important facet of American education. The meetings, the briefings, the demonstrations, the conversations with my fellow Panelists have put into perspective the place that the arts hold today in our educational system at all levels. It is clear that the quality and quantity of arts education is not commensurate with its importance, not equal to the potential of a field that can give insight to all other areas of learning. An increased emphasis in our educational system on all the art subjects is needed as we begin our country's Third Century.

Art is all encompassing. And in the late Twentieth Century all subjects are interrelated. I can see especially clearly the relationship between science and the arts. The symmetries of natural science, the synthesis of new theories from added information, the design of experiments, all have their counterparts in art forms. The arts have their laboratories in the form of museums, art galleries, etc. Radio, television, video tape, renovation and preservation of classic paintings, lasers in art, holography, high fidelity recording, electronics in music are but a few of the ways in which science and the arts can enhance each other.

It is to be hoped that the publication of "Coming to Our Senses" will not only point out the significance of the arts in American education, but that as a consequence all art forms will receive appropriate attention, recognition and implementation in our educational system.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you, Mr. Seaborg.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. The next panelist is a well known and well loved entertainer, Pearl Bailey.

STATEMENT OF PEARL BAILEY, ENTERTAINER

Ms. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, it must be quite refreshing to sit here and listen to people. I know that you hear so many of us who come with our causes. I have been dying to sit at one of these tables for years.

It is nice to have a common cause. I bet you it is the first time that you have seen a long table like this filled with people with a common love. That is because of the arts. Music, singing, dancing, everything to me is an art. Life is an art. God is art.

Mr. Michener spoke of the spiritual part of it. I don't think that there are many, many entertainers left where their father was not a reverend. Certainly mine was, and he is buried in this city. I could name you so many, and you would say, "What is the common ground."

The common ground is because God gave us the right, God gave us the instinct to reach out and touch and feel, and live.

Children will read right, and they will do arithmetic better if they have that incentive to apply it. You know how you apply things, by the arts. I have watched children learn to say, 1, 2, 3, 4, better because they could dance or move to music, better than when the teacher tried to put it on the blackboard.

During my time with the United Nations last year, I went twice into Africa. I saw a great big giant spider, or I thought it was a spider. I started clapping my hands, and this great big spider jumped about 50 feet, and it was a human being on all fours, and he had been like that all of his life. The sound of the drums had made that human being jump around with joy.

Soon after that a funeral procession passed, and soon after they dropped the person into the ground, the drums started. My husband, who is a great drummer, started to play with the other people. We did not need to speak the language of the Africans. It is not necessary to speak any language, the language was love.

I have seen people of all races thank God for the theater. I have seen people of all races, religions, and creeds. We do not go around spitting on our finger, rubbing off on skin to find out who and what we are, simply because we have what I said.

I am a writer like Mr. Michener, and I did not sell 12 million pages either.

I don't know we can have these schools, and not have the doors open for the children who should be everyday participating in some form of art. Perhaps, then, they will put down the knives. They will put down the guns. They will put down the hatred. Children are not haters, but when they have nothing to do, no place to go, then they have to channel that energy some place.

One day they told me in Dallas, Tex., when I was in "Hello Dolly," "You are going to have some visitors." At the end of the performance, I heard this sound. The lights went up, and the sound was "Hoo, hoo, hoo." I thought, "My visitors are pretty loud."

When the lights fully went up, I saw that a ramp had been built on the back, and there were wheelchairs. There they were with all this sound pouring from their bodies. I left the stage, full of love, and I went in the back, and they almost choked me to death. That is what music does. That is what are does. That is what singing does. That is what dancing does.

You yourselves will feel better every day when you sit up there, and we will feel better sitting down here, if all our children come home happily because they have participated in life. We ourselves must admit that we feel pretty good when we have an evening out and hear art.

We do owe the children something. We owe ourselves something. We owe America something. It is called living and loving fully.

I woke up at 4 o'clock this morning. I have never faced you before, except on the stage. I poured it out, and I can pour it out even better here. You don't see any paper in my hand. I don't bother about it. I talk from the heart. I know that everyone here is talking from the heart. I think I have lived it for so many years. I don't think that there is a man or woman here who was not choked looking at the child with the discovery of water, and the thing of the teacher.

I think that it will help our teachers. It will help our school systems. I think that we will stop talking so much about whether we are getting on or off the bus if we know that we are going to something. Let us put the problems in another channel.

At 4 o'clock this morning I read something that I would like to finish with. The funny thing is, it was my graduation speech. Sunday I went to Georgetown University to deliver the commencement speech, and got a degree, isn't that something.

I have since Sunday run into so many children calling me Dr. Bailey, I keep looking around to see who it is, and it is me. These children remembered what I said, I captured their attention, and you know why? They saw art, they saw an entertainer. They saw somebody.

One of them said to me, "You talked to us. You told us what life was," and I will tell you where I got the life from. Artists have the knack, like doctors, of taking their hand and putting it on the pulse of humanity, and that is where you had better put it, and taste and feel what is real.

At 4 o'clock this morning, when I read my graduation speech, I turned the page, first Corinthian, 13th chapter. I will put it to what I have to say today and to all of my friends here, "Love nourishes all things." As we sit here, we hope that it is all things, and we certainly hope to God that you endure it.

Thank you.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Ms. Bailey.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. The next speaker is John Culkin, director of media studies, New School for Social Research, New York.

STATEMENT OF JOHN CULKIN, DIRECTOR, MEDIA STUDIES, NEW SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH, NEW YORK CITY

Mr. CULKIN. Since we are speaking about children, we have three short films that were made by 9- and 10-year-olds in Lexington, Mass., that we would like to share with you now.

[Films were shown.]

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am here to speak about the arts and the new media. I think of Walt Whitman who said: "To have great poets there must be a great audience." Then we have Thomas Alva Edison who makes it possible for us to reach those great audiences.

I might also bring you some feedback from a project that both of your committees were responsible for, the National Humanities Faculty. A number of years ago I visited a school as a member of the faculty and was invited to address the school in the auditorium. I asked the students how many of them considered themselves media-minded, a dozen raised their hands.

I asked one of them what he meant by media minded, and he said: "Well, I'm not too smart, and I'm not too stupid. I'm just media-minded."

I want to talk about the concept which I think is very, very new in this report "Coming to Our Senses." It is the fact that in communication technology today, the outer demands of the environment and the inner needs of the child call for a new definition of literacy, an all media literacy which will allow young people to decode and control all of the communication and artistic media within their environment.

In 1938, which is so far back, that was a year the Chicago Cubs won the National League pennant, E. B. White said, "I believe television is going to be the test of the modern world." He said: "We shall stand or fall by television, of that I am sure."

Two thousand years before that, in a remarkable essay, which reads as well now as it did then, Plato gave the analogy of the cave in which people would be chained facing a wall, behind are puppeteers acting in front of the fire, making shadows on the wall. The only world that these people knew were the shadows on the wall. Later these people were released, brought into the outer world which they rejected because it conformed not to the shadows on the wall.

I suggest that in a country where last year as a people we watched 289 billion hours of television, an accumulation of 33 million years of human time, we have got to pay attention to television.

I am not a panel member, so I am allowed to do a little cheering from the side lines. "Coming to Our Senses," I think puts the arts and education where they belong. They belong to the child, not to trips to museums. They start with the inner needs of the child—the sensory development of the child. All of our information comes through our senses. Therefore, the quality of our sensory life will determine the quality of our intellectual life.

We know more now about the character of the brain, the development of the cognitive and analytic powers and the development of the intuitive powers. On the other hand, we need a balance between arts. emotion, and knowledge development. The arts can do that. They are also uniquely geared to train the senses. They are extensions of our senses.

There are two things that I would like to briefly dwell on. One is the concept of the new literacy, which is endowed by this book, which I think is very, very important. We have to know as human beings all of the symbol systems that are part of our lives. We have to know what they can do and what their limits are. This is what the schools are for.

This is an extension of what we have tried to do in literature and what we have done a little bit in art and music. I think that this panel is to be applauded for moving into what I call the dirty media—photography, popular music, film and television, where a lot of the other art organizations and art recommendations stop.

These are the media that exist where the kids are. These are also the media which can extend our understanding and experience of all the arts.

I would like to share with you a very short excerpt of a tape which touches on the nature of the project. Many of you in this room are familiar with the pioneering work of Tony Schwartz in the use of radio and television in political campaigning. For 25 years, Tony has been one of the handful of people on the planet who have experimented with sound as a unique form of human expression and artistic expression. I am about to play for you a very short tape which is of his niece growing up over a 14-year period.

I would also like to enter this tape for the record.

If we are going to harness the new media for the benefit of the children, we are going to have to do better the second time around.

We gave it away the first time and the buccaneers got it. They developed it and we have had to fight to win back small pieces of the commercial spectrum for ourselves.

I am not a technologist myself, but I am interested in the implications for the things that we are talking about. We are getting a second shot at television and the public policy decisions which are so desperately important and will shape this medium and the nature of our people for a long time to come. This medium has access to the emotions, the minds and the value systems of most Americans every day.

There are three new technologies that I would like to allude to. The fabled and much written about video disk. This is a half-hour of "Jaws" which a $500 machine with a laser needle will play back through your television set. It sells for $2.50. There are 54,000 frames on there. It is a very important technology because that can go into the market place, and people can decide whether to buy it or not buy it, and what works best will win out. It is an interesting and fascinating medium, for our purposes, however, there are not many decisions about it that we have to make.

This is fiber-optic cable which is revolutionizing the concept of the number of channels of television that we can deliver. There are several thousand television channels that can move through this fiber-optic cable. Here the public policy decisions come in. Who shall control the number of channels in the multiple channel world of the future of cable television?

Shall we put aside x number of channels, x amount of time on cable television for children, for education in the arts? Shall we take revenues derived from the commercial applications of these new media and earmark them to support the programs for the children in the arts and education? Those are the decisions that are within our control.

The third piece of technology is the one that is behind the committee up there. That is a $1,000 land station which has been very graciously brought to us by NASA and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Placed on the roof of this building, it will bring in a signal directly from a satellite 23,000 miles above.

So we can now bypass all the brokers and intermediaries that have been involved previously in the communication experience. We can go through less expensive land stations. The implications for underdeveloped countries and rural areas are tremendous.

I suggest the public policy that has to be made about a new television system is very much apropos to what we are talking about here today. I endorse the panel recommendation that we use the existing television systems to create the best possible programing about the arts. I suggest that we add to that public decisionmaking, about the cable and satellite worlds of the future.

I close with another remark recorded by sound artist Tony Schwartz of the cab driver who said, after giving his philosophy of life, "That is my opinion and it is very true."

Thank you.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much.

[Prepared statement of Dr. Culkin follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DR. JOHN CULKIN, DIRECTOR, CENTER FOR UNDERSTANDING MEDIA, NEW SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH, NEW YORK, N.Y.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee: I am John Culkin.

INTRODUCTION

"I believe television is going to be the test of the modern world."

E. B. WHITE.

The above statement was written in 1938. Essayist and stylist, E. B. White, is not and has not ever been one given to trendiness or overstatement. The rest of his quote from *One Man's Meat* in Harper's Magazine also merits inclusion here. "I believe television is going to be the test of the modern world, and that in this new opportunity to see beyond the range of our vision we shall discover either a new and unbearable disturbance of the general peace or a saving radiance in the sky. We shall stand or fall by television—of that I am quite sure."

Predating White's prediction by 2318 years was the world's first TV critic—Plato. In *The Republic*, he presents the simile of the cave in which a whole generation of people is brought up shackled in a fixed position facing the back wall of a cave. Some thirty feet behind them is a row of fires in front of which people move and manipulate puppets to create shadows on the wall. Later on someone frees these people and returns them to the outside world. They reject it because it is unreal, because it does not conform to the shadows on the wall.

From the paintings on the cave walls of Altamira to the flickering shadows on the walls of our living rooms—this is the sweep of art, symbol and communication which defines modern man. Plato reminds us that "what is honored in a society will be cultivated there." In the information age any true concern for children and young people must be translated into a program of education which makes them smart and selective about all the media and messages which are part of their environment. The distinctive thing about the human species is that we are symbolmaking animals. The distinctive thing about education should be its response to that reality.

1979 has been proclaimed as the International Year of the Child. I would like to suggest two gifts which we might present to our children during that year: (I) A New Concept *of* Literacy and (II) A New Television System.

I. A NEW CONCEPT OF LITERACY

"No nation can be much better than its mass media."

MORRIS ERNST.

It has always made good sense for people who live on water to learn how to swim. In the age of communication, therefore, we should develop a program of public education for all forms of human communication. It should be a new literacy, a contemporary literacy, an all-media literacy including all of the traditional literacy, dramatic and artistic media as well as the new media (photography, film, radio, television). It is a form of consumer education for the minds, values and emotions of the audience.

Anthropologist Edmund Carpenter sums up this ecumenical approach to human communication: "English is a mass medium. All languages are mass media. The new mass media—film, radio, TV—are new languages, their grammars as yet unknown. Each codifies reality differently; each conceals a unique metaphysics. Linguists tell us it's possible to say anything in any language if you use enough words or images, but there's rarely time; the natural course is for a culture to exploit its media biases. . . ."

We have traditionally recognized the necessity for such programs in literature and, to a lesser extent, in art and music. The challenge now is to extend the concept of literacy to include the newer media, especially film and television.

It is hard to be balanced and fair about television. If we accept E. B. White's postulate that "television is going to be the test of the modern world," most observers would judge that the world has failed the test—and egregiously so. Yet, television has also provided a global vision of our world, documented the great events of our times, brought the arts to much wider audiences, entertained us with occasional brilliance. The writer contends that most of us can find ten hours a week of quality programming on television. For any other medium that is extraordinary, but for television it seems paltry. There is just so much of it.

The statistics (maybe sadistics would be more apt) are staggering: 160 million sets in 75 million (98%) homes; set is on an average of 6½ hours a day; average viewer watches 28 hours a week; by age 65 average viewers see 9 full years of TV; by 18 a student has been to TV for 15,000 hours; by 18 a student has been to school for 11,000 hours; by 15 the child has seen 13,000 TV killings; and in 1975 Americans watched TV for 289 billion hours.

This factors out to 33,000,000 years of annual viewing. Independent of the quality of this viewing experience, we have to be concerned, alarmed, even panicked about people spending so much time watching what is essentially a one-way, passive, short attention span medium, a medium which deals with our headaches and hemmorhoids in 30 second units and our heartaches and hopes in 30 minute modules. Instant solutions and instant gratification are the norm in TV land. In addition, the sheer volume of the medium serves to trivialize even the most sacred and human values by constant repetition, hyperbole and superficiality. What do we hear today of Biafra and Bangladesh? Everything has to be faster, gorier, louder in a constant escalation of the threshold level of the populace. It is precarious to be vicarious in the age of Aquarius.

Susan Sontag translates this concern into a plea for personal psychic survival in an age of sensory overkill.

"Ours is a culture based on excess, an overproduction; the result is a steady loss of sharpness in our sensory experience. All the conditions of modern life—its material plenitude, its sheer crowedness—conjoin to dull our sesory faculties. What is important now is to recover our senses. We must learn to see more, to hear more, to feel more."

Learning to see, hear and feel is the proper province of the arts. And it is within the context of the arts and humanities tradition that we must develop this mediacy—this all-media literacy. Students must be trained to experience, to discuss, to analyze, to create in all the forms of human communication.

The rationale for such an approach derives both from the inner needs of the child and the outer demands of the environment. The child needs to develop a healthy and balanced sensorium, to strengthen both the intuitive and rationale hemispheres of the brain, to test his/her powers against reality in a variety of ways, to express itself, to grow in the confidence and self-esteem resulting from every mastering of the environment.

This environment which today immerses the child in a buzzing confusion of media and messages of all kinds imposes new mandates upon the schools to help the child make wise choices—to help the child become its own TV critic, its own propaganda analyst, its own movie and music critic, its own consumer guide. It is no longer possible merely to protect the child from the outside. We must provide the child with the skills of judgment, perception, taste and selectivity necessary to deal with the new communications ecology.

And since all media respond to the tastes of their audiences, we will at the same time be building a constituency of quality in all the art and media forms. Walt Whitman said it: "To have great poets there must be a great audience."

Realistically, the goals for a new literacy cannot be reached through additions to existing resources. We must multiply these resources through the use of the new media, especially television. *Coming to Our Senses* is a report which for the first time establishes the need for an all-media literacy and promotes the use of television to achieve those ends. I strongly endorse its recommendations on the study and use of the new media. I also suggest that, in addition to a national television series on the arts, there be other series on the nature of television and on the nature of the communication process in all art and media forms.

[Some reflections on television follow:]

II. A NEW TELEVISION SYSTEM

"We shape our buildings and thereafter they shape us."

WINSTON CHURCHILL.

So with our television system. In the 1940's we opted for a limited-spectrum, commercially-supported TV system—and oh the difference to us. Possession is nine points of the law and once a system is in place it takes massive efforts to produce minimal reforms. We should waste little effort on reforming the existing system. We should, however, make sure that it doesn't happen again. If love, as the songwriter says, can be lovelier the second time around, so can television.

The systems of the future are now being set in place. They will be multiple-

channel (up to 100) systems, with recording and playback capacity, with dial-access potential, with large screens and fed directly or indirectly by satellites. Since I find it always more comfortable never to predict anything which has not already happened, it is only fair to point out that there are already 10 million American homes with cable television and that a number of satellites are already orbiting 23,000 miles above us.

Now is the time to make sure this new system will serve kids, the arts and education. Policy is now being established which will determine the future. Cable companies are eager to cooperate and to make commitments now when they are asking for something.

The new television system will make it possible to serve the television needs of audiences in numbers far less than the 20–30 million people required by network television. The new system will give us a way to let people pay for what they want. It will provide television with a turnstile and allow consumers to make direct choices as they do for books, films and plays.

The timing seems right. In addition to the awakening public concern about television, there are also development in technology and public policy which, if we respond intelligently, can give us a second chance at shaping and harnessing the power of television. Richard Goldstein states it vividly in a recent article: "Television today is a protectorate whose mandate is about to expire. The growth of cable and the introduction of home-video disks will soon reduce the power of the networks to that of AM radio stations, while offering us a range of alternative television which will render current notions about demographics and preferences of a 'mass audience' obsolete. At the same time, the increasing interest of the young in television as a medium which offers signals clues to their identity means that we may be due for changes in programming as drastic as the changes imposed upon music by rock 'n' roll.

So it behooves us to take television seriously at it is—to probe for its strategies, its ruses, its hidden meanings—while anticipating its possibilities for change."

Two steps can be taken now which cost nothing and which make everything possible.

(1) *Channels.*—Both cable and satellite systems should be required to allocate several channels and/or percentages of time for programming in the arts and education for children and young people.

(2) *Financing.*—A percentage of the taxes collected from television revenues should be earmarked for these same purposes.

CONCLUSION

The future isn't what it used to be.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BRADEMAS. If you would allow me to interrupt at this point to recognize Senator Pell because he must go to a meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee. We will allow the Senator to put any questions that he would like.

Senator PELL. I don't mean to interrupt this procedure, but thinking about Mr. Michener's famous work, "Tales of the South Pacific," and the song it inspired, "Some Enchanted Evening," I would suggest I have enjoyed an enchanting morning. I wish I could stay longer.

I am very interested, and I would ask you now if you have a brief response, or to address yourselves more fully to it afterward if you prefer, what would be your own reactions to a Department of Education and Cultural Affairs.

Also, if you make any followup remarks, I would like you to address the question as to what you found to be the most innovative ideas in arts in education that you have encountered in your inquiries.

I would also like to comment that in the map that you have shown, where you did your research, there is still a great concentration here on a rather few places. Even in my own State, which is a center of the arts, we believe, I notice there is documentation only from the Alliance for Arts Education and the Arts Council of Rhode Island.

I think that while we have done a tremendous job in these intervening years, since the start of the arts and humanities program, in broadening our base, in looking at that map, I would hope that you would also address yourself to the question of how the base could be even more broadened.

I am sorry that I cannot stay longer to say hello to old friends like Barry Bingham, James Michener, Phyllis Wyeth, and Peggy Cooper.

I hope that you will answer those questions in the followup. I don't want to interrupt the flow of your presentation on this enchanted morning today.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you so much, Senator Pell.

I want to express my own appreciation to Senator Pell for his unfailing cooperation with us. We have had a very good partnership across the Capitol in respect to art policy.

You may continue, Mr. Rockefeller.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Our next witness is Phyllis Wyeth, who is a member of the National Committee on the Arts for the Handicapped. She has agreed to join us here this morning in the spirit of what we hope will be continuing cooperation between the efforts of this panel and other similar efforts.

One of the remarkable things that this panel as individuals has observed is the tremendous power that the arts can have for the "special populations," as we have called them in our report. We assume that your committees and other agencies to whom we deliver our report will be asking for full facts and figures and connections between the arts and learning.

I must say that I think it is in this sphere where the relationship between the arts and learning may be most demonstrable.

STATEMENT OF PHYLLIS WYETH, MEMBER, NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON THE ARTS FOR THE HANDICAPPED

Ms. WYETH. Thank you very much. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you today concerning a subject that affects me deeply, art programs in our schools for handicapped children.

Respecting the time pressures, I will be very brief. Many people, unfortunately, feel that the arts are not important in a child's educational process. They regard reading, writing, and arithmetic as the only necessary tools. The arts, they contend, are merely recreational, busy work of no intrinsic psychological or educational value. If I felt that way, I would not be here today.

I am here because I wish to share with you my perception of the major values of our program for handicapped children. The values that I came to appreciate through my experiences as a teacher at the Terry Center at Wilmington, Del.

Let me give you a brief background of the center. The center opened in September 1969, and now provides services for approximately 50 emotionally disturbed schoolaged children from the State of Delaware. The primary goal of the center is to provide early intensive treatment for a child to gain enough emotional strength to function effectively in his community.

The children served by the Terry Center are very sad, or very angry. In some instances, they were born with a learning disability which

because of improper diagnosis or treatment became manifested as an emotional or behavioral problem. They are often aggressive and destructive. They come from both poor and well-to-do families which have bred rejection and low self-worth instead of encouragement and love.

Months after our school was founded, our program was created, and a full time art teacher was hired. The children began to finger paint and make simple ceramic dishes and figures. The arts program has served to determine whether these children were severely disturbed or retarded, but more importantly, art activities have played a significant role in that they provide a nonthreatening form of emotional release, an opportunity for the child to express his individual and emotional needs. They provide an avenue to renew confidence and self-esteem, a way to communicate without the use of words.

As a result of working closely with these children, I have witnessed firsthand the most extraordinary development in a child's self-concept. I would like to tell you about Jimmy Sinclair, a 7-year-old boy that I worked with. He is an autistic child, a child that has never responded to the caresses of his mother and father.

This child spent his life crouching under a desk, pounding his head endlessly against it, biting his fingers feverishly. He would not communicate with any human being. He related only to his miniature toy animals, whose sounds he could imitate almost perfectly.

Jimmy would go into a rage if you tried to interfere and play with his animals. He did not want any human contact, not even eye contact. However, it was through the arts program that we were first able to communicate with him.

He began to enjoy modeling with clay, and out of this clay came a beautiful vase. He painted it and glazed it, and how incredibly proud he was of his vase. This sort of activity gave Jimmy the opportunity to express himself without the use of words or direct contact with people. This was Jimmy's first step toward success, the first outward sign that his life has personal meaning. Beause of this dramatic breakthrough Jimmy's confidence and self-image improved immensely.

His success stimulated his interest in activity, thus improving his skills and his ability to communicate. This was the first time he realized he could actually do something on his own. Today, Jimmy is a superior student in school, despite the death of his mother due to a terminal illness.

However, he still has a problem relating to his classmates, but he quite freely discusses it.

From what I have said, you can see that through my experiences at the Terry Center I came to appreciate even further a child's capacity to derive extraordinary psychological and educational benefits from our arts program. Through these creative experiences, the children are rewarded with the ability to learn better and communicate.

Your support for arts programs can, indeed, be instrumental in helping to replace a child's perception of ugliness with beauty, and feelings of despair with hope, and rejection with love.

One last point I would like to make. Every child, handicapped or not, is endowed with the same creative spirit, the same potential for creative self-expression. The arts offer an opportunity for all of us to reach a deeper understanding and sensitivity.

Thank you again for providing me with this opportunity to appear before you today. I commend the efforts of the panel, and I would like to add any future support I can give.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Thank you and we appreciate that.

The next speaker is Elizabeth McCormack, former president of Manhattanville College, and currently associated with the Rockefeller offices in New York.

STATEMENT OF ELIZABETH J. McCORMACK, ASSOCIATE, ROCKEFELLER FAMILY AND ASSOCIATES; FORMER PRESIDENT, MANHATTANVILLE COLLEGE

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, Mr. Rockefeller has said who I am.

Higher education was not a priority of this Panel. We had to make choices concerning the scope of our report, to avoid the superficiality that can result from covering too broad a subject. But despite our choice to concentrate on the earlier levels of education, the fact remains that the arts are not educational priorities at any level; nor, I suggest, are they among the priorities of Congress. A comparison between the annual appropriations for the National Science Foundation and the National Endowment for the Arts will be instructive: as I read that comparison, the present NSF appropriation is eight times that of the NEA.

For my topic, post-secondary education and research in the arts, the Panel simply requests that the arts be afforded the recognition given to other areas of learning. The request is made in the face of certain facts. This is the decade of "back to basics," and these basics are defined primarily by the three R's. Also, this is the century of ever-advancing technology, when scientific progress is essential for national security, greater productivity, and the replacement of our diminishing natural resources.

Our technological society must not give up its humanity. If we are to remain a humane people, the emotions, sensitivity and aesthetic awareness must be cultivated at every academic level. For this reason, the Panel asks that the arts be included among the basics in education. College and university students are more aware of the necessity for this than we are; at this time, their desire for post-secondary arts courses far exceeds the offerings available to them. Although we may presently concentrate on elementary schoolchildren, we dare not skip the generation that is now in college. These students of the 1970's are demanding the arts. They know their need for them. This demand is much easier to meet than the student demands of the 1960's, and I suggest that we meet it.

Thank you.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much.

[Prepared statement of Elizabeth McCormack follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT BY ELIZABETH MCCORMACK, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT, ROCKEFELLER BROTHERS FUND

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committees, my name is Elizabeth McCormack. I am an associate at Rockefeller Family and Associates in New York City, and I was formerly President of Manhattanville College in Purchase, New York.

When the Panel undertook its investigation of arts education in postsecondary institutions, it discovered that there is a student demand for art that outweighs the available offering in colleges. Statistics collected by Professor Claude V. Palisca of Yale, for example, show that music students enrolled in institutions of higher education rose by 26% between 1971 and 1974; a more recent study, conducted in eighty universities by the International Council of Fine Arts, Deans, reported a 27% increase in undergraduate arts majors between 1968 and 1972. As Eric Larrabee, formerly Executive Director of the New York State Council on the Arts, testified before the Panel: "It is the experience of most university administrators that if students were free of restrictions imposed by limited course enrollment or of their anxieties about a career—there's no question in my mind that the number of students preferring the arts would increase even more."

Yet even as Mr. Larrabee's statement attests to the growing popularity of the arts among students, it also reaffirms the limitations of arts programming in higher education. Additional statistics demonstrate that at best, colleges have moved slowly to meet the demand. In 1976, only 1,134 out of 3,055, or 37% of all institutions of higher education in the United States offered majors in art, and still less (23%) offered majors in music; furthermore, only 233 institutions offered Bachelor of Fine Arts degrees, and just 130 offered Master of Fine Arts degrees. Perhaps most indicative of all, however, was the finding that almost 40% of all the colleges and universities across the country offered no more than a single arts course. This existing inadequacy is compounded by the fact that the economic pressures of the 1970's have forced many of our colleges and universities, if not to the brink of financial disaster, at least to the prospect of zero growth in the years ahead. At this time, most of them are facing a re-evaluation of their organizational structure and their priorities for liberal arts education.

Perhaps Harvard University's recent evaluation of its liberal arts program serves as an instructive example of the place of the arts among these priorities. In November 1976, Harvard concluded its two-year task force study, with recommendations which constituted the first major overhaul of the program since 1945. In essence, the task force proposed that an educated person have "an informed acquaintance" with academic areas including the natural sciences, the social sciences, and philosophy. Recognition of art was limited to the recommended knowledge of "*some of* the important scholarly, literary, and artistic achievements of the past" (emphasis added). The allusion is worth considering, because Harvard is one of the nation's wealthiest and most influential universities; its position serves as a sobering reminder that a vast distance must be traveled before the arts are admitted to full partnership in higher education.

An analysis of the six roles performed by postsecondary institutions in arts education shows that the arts are not only worthy of that partnership, but that the benefit of such an equal partnership for them would extend far beyond the mere enrichment of the art student:

(1) Colleges serve as patrons of artists, writers, composers and performing ensembles, through on-campus associations ranging from consultancies to full-time residencies. The presence of a Claes Oldenberg, a Leonard Bernstein, or a Twyla Tharp, whether hired to supplement the faculty or only to enhance the atmosphere on campus, reinforces the concept of the college as a modern-day Medici whose benefits are bestowed far more democratically than its historic prototype.

(2) Colleges perform an increasing role as sponsors and impresarios, hosting symphonies, opera, theatre, gallery exhibits and rock concerts. Such events benefit community residents as well as students; and, in smaller cities and towns, they often turn the campus into the cultural hub of the surrounding region.

(3) Colleges educate students to become appreciative laymen vis-a-vis the arts. By so doing, they influence the prospective legislators. school board members, and taxpayers who will be responsible for the future of the arts and, more importantly, for the quality of American life.

(4) Outstanding professional programs, such as the University of Indiana's school of opera or the film schools at UCLA and NYU, show that colleges have recognized a responsibility for the training of the specially talented.

(5) Colleges train scholars, historians and critics, and also support research in the arts. Additionally, they are beginning to offer programs in museum directorship and performing arts management.

(6) Colleges train the classroom and arts teachers who are often instrumental in forming the cultural values of their students.

Despite this multi-faceted promise of the arts on campus, however, the attitude shown in the Harvard evaluation prevails. College arts programs are generally underfunded, their faculties small, their offerings limited, and their studio courses often offered without credit. A re-ordering of priorities within post-secondary institutions is needed, to allow them to fulfill their dual potential as preservers and developers of American culture.

Too often, the axiom "It is easier to change the color of your eyes than your attitudes" is proved true. Yet the sustained federal support of science in higher education, and the resulting pre-eminence of postsecondary science departments, shows that government recognition can play a major role in focusing national concern on an educational field and altering attitudes toward that field. Today the government proves by its funding that it favors scientific accomplishment in education over the arts—which, the Panel believes, have a critical role in the development of a balanced human being.

A comparison between the proposed FY 1978 budgets of the National Science Foundation and the National Endowment for the Arts will illustrate the considerable discrepancy that still exists between government's recognition of the sciences and of the arts. Recently Congress approved an allocation of $885 million for the NSF, of which $75.7 million will be used for education. By contrast, the proposed annual appropriation for NEA, which remains to be passed by the Senate, is $123.5 million. The allocation for its education program has not been determined; but if it were to increase by the same percentage as the total budget (the annual figure has risen by about 44%, from approximately $86 million in FY 1977), it would amount to $7 million. It may be optimistic to hope that NEA will spend $7 million on its Education Program next year. However, even presuming that it did, the expenditure would amount to a mere one-ninth of NSF's education budget.

Although NEA may lag behind NSF both in budget and in influence, it offers a federal mechanism for restoring the necessary balance to postsecondary education. Yet in many respects, NEA's grant-making reflects one of the contradictory aspects of higher education and the arts: although universities were a main priority of our nation's founders and antedated formal elementary and secondary schools, today America puts too little emphasis on the education of young adults. In 1975, NEA allotted $4,753,638 to its Education Program. Of this amount, a total of $151,500, or 3%, went to eight postsecondary institutions through the Program's Arts Administration, General, and Alternative Education subdivisions. The third subdivision, which funds Artists-in-Schools programs in elementary and secondary schools throughout the United States, received $3,685,771—almost 78% of the entire Program's allotment. But a continued analysis of the 1975 Annual Report reveals that NEA has, in fact, supported arts education in post-secondary institutions through its eleven other Programs. For example, within the Programs relating to the artistic disciplines, it granted approximately $64,080 towards writer residencies in English departments of developing colleges; $14,195 towards pilot projects in professional theatre training; $897,703 towards scholarships, residencies and other activities in independent postsecondary music schools; and about $38,350 towards short-term artist residencies in several colleges. In addition, it awarded approximately $496,457 to college and university-sponsored summer projects, and $1,289,452 for community-oriented cultural events on campus. The statistics are promising, because they show that NEA has the capacity to reinforce at least five of the university's six roles in promoting the arts.

A closer look at these examples, however, proves the necessity for expanding this support. Most of the totals represent grants to only a handful of institutions. The allocation for visual arts residencies is the most far-reaching of them, affecting twenty-six institutions of higher learning throughout the country. But these residencies, at a cost averaging less that $1,500, can only have a limited effect. At best, they can enrich the arts programs of the twenty-six institutions, while a remaining 3,029 wait for a similar opportunity. NEA may have made a valuable step in strengthening arts education in colleges and universities, but much more needs to be done.

The National Institute of Education offers another means of shifting educational priorities to include the arts. Through its support of Harvard's Project Zero, NIE has affirmed its belief in the university as a laboratory for arts-related research. But while NIE considers the arts and humanities important enough to merit a special advisor in these fields, it does not consider them to be among its priority research needs. Of greater importance to NIE, for example,

is reading; yet increasingly, in programs such as Reading through the Arts and the Creative Reading Program at Children's Art Carnival, the arts are showing potential for improving reading scores. At this time, however, there is no way of knowing whether the positive results are due to the perceptual training or emotional satisfaction available through the arts, or simply to the individualized attention offered in the program.

Clearly, there is much to be learned about the arts' use in the instruction of other subjects, as well as its role in child development, the nature of creativity and aesthetic growth, and the interplay between effective and cognitive learning. Applied research is also needed to improve methods of teaching aesthetic sensitivity, to evaluate existing curriculum models, and to determine the effect of media on learning. If NIE sponsors university arts and education programs in their pursuit of such study, it will contribute not only to the understanding of creativity, but also to the understanding of human potential in other priority areas of learning.

Intensive research in the arts cannot proceed without basic information about curriculum content, facilities and equipment, enrollment figures, the number of available teachers, and funding sources. The Panel therefore recommends that a national study be undertaken to provide comprehensive and up-to-date statistics on the arts in education. Such a study should be designed cooperatively with national arts education organizations and appropriate state and local agencies, and should involve the collaboration of institutions of higher education.

In both postsecondary education and research, the Panel asks simply that the arts be afforded the recognition given to other areas of learning. As seen through the increased student demand for arts programs, much of this recognition already exists; and, as seen through the six functions of the university in arts education, postsecondary institutions have virtually unlimited potential to respond to it. But support must come from beyond the students, and perhaps beyond the university administrators. If the federal government exercises the same influence that has made science a priority since the fifties, art may finally be awarded its place in the development of a cultivated, well-balanced individual. The Panel requests this not only for artists or deans, or even for potential art students. It makes this request on behalf of the American people.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. If we may, we have two last witnesses.

The next speaker is Barry Bingham, who is the publisher of the Louisville Courier-Journal, and another distinguished panelist.

STATEMENT OF BARRY BINGHAM, SR., LOUISVILLE COURIER-JOURNAL, LOUISVILLE, KY.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am really, nowadays, the chairman of the board of the Louisville Courier-Journal, and Louisville Times, in Congressman Perkins' home State of Kentucky.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I might say, if you will allow me to interrupt, Mr. Bingham. Aside from also welcoming you as an old friend, Chairman Perkins has asked me to do the same on his behalf, and to express his regrets that he could not be here with us for the entire meeting.

Mr. BINGHAM. Thank you.

I have spent nearly half a century in the field of communication in press, radio, and television. It seems to me that it is a failure of communication that is causing the tragic losses in our schools here in America, and therefore our children and young people in this country.

I ask you to think back for a moment about your own first encounter with the arts in your own education at the beginning. Maybe some of you were lucky in this, but a great many of us, I am sorry to say, were not.

Thinking back to my own beginning, I can remember a music class which had me sitting pumping away at an old fashioned upright piano, butchering a tune called "The Happy Farmer". I was not very happy

while I was playing it, I am afraid, and certainly my listeners were not.

I also had an art class which consisted of my being asked to draw a coal skuttle. There were a few wavering lines that I was supposed to put in which were to indicate shading. I am afraid that none of it indicated much of anything.

Now, I mention these classes not because they were ill-planned and poorly taught, but because they were totally unrelated to each other, and totally unrelated to any of the subjects that we were studying in that school.

I did not at that time learn the joyous lesson that the arts were all around me, and everything I saw in nature and even in the classroom itself was art. I now know that the arts add an enormous pleasure to living, even to those of us who are untalented in the arts like myself.

They have a power to sustain the human spirit and to enrich life. The message that I would like to emphasize, that our panel wants to get across to you is, we want the schools to take fuller advantage of the resources in the arts that exist in their own communities. I think that there is a failure to do that today.

Most schools feel that their resources are inadequate, and indeed they are in many ways. But I think that part of that is a needless deprivation. There are resources of the artistic kind in their own communities which they are not at this time making any use of.

A closer conjunction between the community and its artists, and people interested in the arts, and the schools, I submit, would put the schools in better touch and in better step with our society.

I think that it is time for a change in the system. At a time of diminishing natural resources, there is one resource that we have hardly tapped, and it is leisure. The average American today has more time away from the job, than all but the most privileged aristocrats of earlier ages.

They have extra time, and they want to use it better than they have in the past. But they need some training from childhood up to use time properly.

People are getting more and more concerned about the quality of life, and not just getting through life. A Harris poll of 1973 showed that 89 percent of the American people want more museums and concert halls and theaters in their communities. The road that begins in that direction must start in the classroom.

Many schools, I am unhappy to say, seem to exist in a cultural vacuum. Many schools seem to exist on the thought that the various arts are barely on nodding terms with each other, and that the arts are totally unrelated to what are called the realities of life. This belief is unreal, but I am afraid that it is a popular belief in many people. This has got to stop.

The old isolation, I am happy to say, is beginning to breakdown. Today we have educationists embracing the idea of change. Education and the arts are embracing a new sense of unity. Soon all the schools over the country will respond to that. What this panel is dedicated to doing is promoting that kind of unity and hastening its pace.

There are practical methods for doing this in our report, which I commend to you for your study and consideration. We hear a lot about

92-171 O - 77 - 6

basics in our education. I think a lot about basics. I suggest that the basics in our education are not divorced from art. They are not antagonistic. They are not rivals in any sense. They are fully complementary to each other. Neither one is adequate, Mr. Chairman, without the other.

Basic education fully integrated with the arts is true learning, and that I must say is my idea of the pursuit of happiness.

Let me give you one specific that I would like to ask you to consider. We are going in the next year to hold regional hearings in all parts of the country. The sites are not yet selected, and we would appreciate any suggestions you may make to us as to where these regional meetings might be held.

At these hearings we plan to bring in people who are in favor of this report of ours, who are critical of it, whatever their views may be, so we can hear their views and consider them, and talk them over thoroughly.

At the end of that year, I would suggest that it would be most useful and helpful if you could help us to call a White House Conference on the Arts in Education. Mrs. Mondale, who spoke to us most effectively yesterday, said that she favored that idea and would be glad to give it her support. We ask you to consider it.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you, Mr. Bingham.

[Prepared statement of Barry Bingham, Sr., follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT BY BARRY BINGHAM, SR., LOUISVILLE COURIER-JOURNAL, LOUISVILLE, KY.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committees:

My name is Barry Bingham, and I am chairman of the board of the Courier-Journal and Louisville Times. I have served as a member of the Panel for this study.

I'd like to ask you to think back over your introduction to the arts in your own education. Most of us weren't very lucky in that way. In my elementary school days, I remember music lessons which consisted of my thumping away on an upright piano, caricaturing a tune called, "The Happy Farmer." As an art lesson I was asked to draw a coal scuttle, with some pencil scratches to indicate shading.

The point is not just that these introductory classes were taught with so little imagination. Their greatest fault was that they were so limited, so separated from the other subjects taught. What I did not learn then was the joyous lesson that art was all around me, in everything I saw in nature, and even in the classroom.

I now know that the arts can add enormous pleasure to living, even for those of us who are not particularly talented. And here I want to distinguish between mere entertainment and edification. The arts have the power to nurture and sustain our inner resources. They stimulate our sensory perceptions, our innate curiousity and our urge to explore, our capacities for dreaming and imagination.

In our Twentieth Century, we worry about exhausting some of our natural resources. Yet there are resources available to us which we have hardly begun to explore. One of them is leisure. I'd like to remind you that the average American today has more time away from the job than all but the most privileged aristocrat of any other age.

Quality of life in our times is a reasonable goal for all people. It carries with it not only the ability to obtain food, clothing and shelter. It also gives access to recreation, to the means for refreshing the human spirit. This is to me the true pursuit of happiness.

The arts complement the workaday world, and are necessary to give it vitality and meaning. In this sense the arts are full partners of science and technology. They are the rightful heritage of every human being.

Unfortunately, as you may surmise from your own experience in arts education, the arts have not always been taught so as to realize these larger purposes.

As one of the witnesses (Dennie L. Smith) told the Panel: "Our first and most important step in facilitating the change process is to convince teachers and administrators of the possibilities." This witness went on to say, "Instead of teaching the arts (music, art, drama, etc.) as separate entities, why not search for a 'common thread' and organize the content of curriculum under Aesthetic Education?"

Fortunately, there is a new tendency toward unity. Even though no one is quite sure how best to go about teaching the arts as a whole, most people agree that it should be done. The arts have common roots and a common philosophy. They share the same human concerns and purposes. A multi-arts experience is bound to be richer and more valuable than exposure to a single artistic discipline.

We have thought too long of the various arts as lonely, separate entities. We have seen them as barely on nodding terms with each other, and as totally unrelated to the so-called "realities" of life.

There is no question that each of the arts has its own special content that warrant individual study, but the sum of their values is greater than its parts. The arts have a dual role to play. They can be studied rewardingly for their own sake; they can also enhance the process of all learning and help to integrate the entire curriculum.

There are signs that the arts are beginning to get their own act together. They are questioning their isolation and insularity. As one witness (Scott Thomson) told the Panel, "This tendency towards compartmentalization breeds the outlook, 'Yes we have an art class,' instead of 'Yes, we have the arts in our school.' This is a terribly important difference." The multi-arts approach is under way in numerous schools. The professional associations in arts education are supporting it, which seems to signify that the old isolationism is dying.

To further this process of integrating the arts and education, the Panel recommends that, "Art teachers, art specialists, and artists take part in all phases of program planning and basic curriculum development for each school system." Heretofore, for the most part, arts teachers did not see this as their role, nor were they invited to assume it. The Panel further recommends that, "Classroom teachers be supported by an arts resource team composed of artists and specialists in such fields as music, dance, drama, creative writing, visual arts, and the environmental arts."

This new sense of cooperation, between the various arts and the arts and education, must extend outwards beyond the school. Too many schools still exist in a cultural vacuum. There is a wealth of arts activity, information, and education in most communities outside the schools. The arts can provide a useful means for the schools to connect to their communities.

The role community arts resources can play in arts education is a complex and controversial topic. These resources are distinct from the public schools and colleges, but they are often used to perform similar educational functions. Community arts resources include not only such institutions as museums, concert halls, theatres, and local arts councils, but also housing agencies, neighborhood associations, folk arts groups, churches, prisons, parks departments, libraries, private schools, teachers. The most vital element of all is the artists themselves.

After an extensive study of these resources by the Panel's staff, we are convinced that these agencies can serve as invaluable links between the larger community and the arts programming of the schools. Indeed, some community programs may guide schools to better arts education. In many cases these resources can be employed directly by the schools in an effort to provide all students with a broad and effective education in the arts.

Community resources can serve education in a variety of ways. They can provide a stimulus for learning at all levels. They make resources available to adults and young people who are already motivated and desirous of managing their own education. They serve as resources which traditional schools, colleges, conservatories, and institutes can orchestrate to reinforce their own classroom and workshop programs.

In addition, they are frequently, in their own right, educational institutions which offer formal learning programs.

In the course of this study, six major types of nonschool arts education programs have been identified according to their function. These are: apprenticeship programs, appreciation programs, cultural identity programs, therapeutic programs, leisure-time programs, and quality-of-life programs. Each of these areas offers a wealth of opportunities for students to study the arts from various

perspectives. Cultural identity programs, for example, provide minority students with the means to make them more aware of thier presence in the world, more aware of their historical origins and the vitality of their own culture—all through the arts.

The diversity of arts and the sectional differences in America suggested to one Panel witness (Scott Thomson) that arts education must be dealt with differently in different school systems, according to the meaning it has for those communities. "The roots, I think, are what is important," he told the Panel, "not some kind of a veneer that's put on afterwards. In my opinion, the program for schools must build on what we have in the local communities, whether it be a pioneer museum or something else."

The past two decades have seen a flurry of arts activity on the community level, from the building of community arts centers and museums to the development of regional theatres and new arts facilities on college campuses. The arts always have been both a cause and effect of the devolpment of communal life, and often they are deeply ingrained in a community. We know from the Louis Harris poll of 1973 that 89 percent of those polled wanted facilities "like museums, theatres, and concert halls in the community," and that 50 percent felt that there were not enough "places for cultural events . . . in the community where they live."

Yet we must realize that every community has cultural resources. Every community has adults who are engaged in some kind of arts activity. What is needed is a lively, open connection between the schools and these largely untapped resources.

The great diversity in our culture, and the tradition of local control of education, both suggest that there is no one answer, model, or program that will apply to all our school districts. Careful planning and coordination—drawing upon teachers, administrators, bureaucrats, artists, parents, students, and businessmen—are required to develop effective programs. Such programs will not only make the arts a part of general education in the schools, but make better use of what is available in the community.

Peter Marin has written that schools "don't help, as they might, to make the bridge between his (the student's) private and social worlds; they insist, instead, upon their separation. Indeed, family, community, and school all combine—especially in the suburbs—to isolate and 'protect' him from the adventure, risk, and participation he needs; the same energies that relate him at this crucial point to nature result in a kind of exile from the social environment."

Teachers, even those in the arts, have generally not learned to use community resources. This is why the Panel has underscored all its recommendations with the principle that, "school programs in the arts should draw heavily upon all available resources in the community: the artists, the materials, the media, and the total environment—both natural and man-made."

This appears to be one of the ways to get the schools in step with society. The American people appear to believe the arts are important, but simultaneously they are hard put to reconcile that view with their conviction that the schools should concentrate on reading, writing, and arithmetic. The disparity between what goes on in American society in the arts and what goes on in American schools points to a clear case of schizophrenia. There is a lack of synchronization between American schools and American culture.

The Panel has made a number of recommendations aimed at rectifying this situation. In order to ensure that the resources of community-based cultural organizations are used to the fullest by arts educators, the Panel recommends that, "An arts commission be established in each city or municipality where one does not presently exist," for the purpose of developing and supporting community arts projects that relate to education in the arts. We are asking that "Funding for community arts programs be generally increased," and that, "Federal, state, and local funds be made available for transportation to nonschool arts programs offering arts education to children who live far from them."

The Panel urges all levels of government to reaffirm the importance of good community arts programs, and exhorts granting agencies to develop policies which will assure that funds will be available to maintain these community centers. We further urge that schools take advantage of such programs to improve their own arts education efforts. We particularly want to see the artistic creations of our ethnic peoples viewed by the schools as invaluable resources for arts education.

To make certain that arts education programs benefit from collaboration with other elements of the community the Panel recommends that, "In each locality

responsibility for coordinating the use of local arts resources in arts education be assumed by the state arts council in cooperation with local arts councils." We want to see "regional clearinghouses created to provide information about resource personnel and materials, model programs, cooperative ventures, and financing alternatives." Wherever possible, we want to promote assistance to "those community arts organizations which reflect excellence in the art forms of minority people, and which serve the ill, the isolated, and the handicapped."

The critical issue here is the waste of opportunities and human resources that is now taking place. The challenge commands us to broaden our base, to burst out of our narrow specialities. We are talking about a new interaction—with the other arts, with artists, between different ethnic groups, other teachers and administrators, and with the entire community. To the degree we succeed, we will add an important humanizing dimension to American education. Wouldn't it be great, if you could remember your own education that way?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. One of the finest points of working with this panel is the sense of dedication of the individual panel members. Perhaps some of that has come across to you this morning.

Our next and final speaker is Edward K. Hamilton, who took the "red eye" special from Los Angeles overnight, to be with us. Mr. Hamilton is former deputy mayor of New York City, and is currently a management consultant on the west coast.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD K. HAMILTON, PRESIDENT, GRIFFENHAGEN-KROEGER, INC.; AND FORMER DEPUTY MAYOR, NEW YORK CITY

Mr. HAMILTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In this discussion, the issue arises, of course, how much and under what circumstances are arts likely to be able to compete for resources in order to get the kinds of things to happen, in larger numbers and greater richness, that we have tried to describe this morning.

I suppose that to a budgetee or somebody who allocates money, the interesting thing about the discussion this morning is that it would be very difficult to produce a panel that would counter these arguments. It is very hard to find anyone against arts in education, or against arts in general.

The difficulty is not that there is a lack of public commitment. As Mr. Bingham said, polls seem to indicate that there is a considerable innate public commitment to the arts; the difficulty is in translating that into something which will express this commitment on an ongoing basis, year after year, through the allocation mechanism by which we try to figure out what our national priorities are, and what we are going to put behind them. The issue is whether arts in education, in fact, can hold their own, and perhaps progress.

I think that if we were to take a realistic outlook at the moment, we would have to say that unless there is some conscious effort to keep arts and education in a reasonably high priority mode, or for that matter to increase it substantially, it very likely will lose ground. It will lose ground, essentially, for two reasons.

One, because education finance in the United States is under severe pressure, as Mr. Brademas knows probably better than any of us. We are in a retrenching mode. We have a great many facilities as compared with the number of children. The demographic trends are not such that one would expect to see a stable picture in education financing as one looks across the board.

The second reason is that it is really not in the mainstream of the school administrator's life to consider arts in education, as we have been trying to say this morning, as a basic. It is not in the mother's milk, as it were, in education.

To me that has three basic consequences which are outlined and explained in some detail in the report. First, it is very unlikely that movement in the direction of more emphasis on art in education is going to be a local function. It probably is not going to come out of the normal educative debate in school districts and localities across the country. It is not because teachers are uninterested. We had all sorts of evidence of interest from teachers who did not have any particular art training in their own histories, who had an appreciation of it once it was presented to them.

The problem is that the whole institutional bias and the intellectual history of most administrators does not include much opportunity for appreciation of the subject. It is just unlikely that in the context of budget stringency the arts will do very well, if left to their own devices.

It is, therefore, in my view, one of those relatively few cases where one can argue for a distinctive Federal role; if there were ever a case for a special Federal interest and Federal opportunity, it would seem to me that it would be in this area.

Therefore, the kinds of programs that the Federal Government is undertaking in other areas—facilities, equipment, finance—the kinds of things one finds in mathematics and science, seem to me fit very well here.

Second, the degree to which the programs that are offered, are offered without any clear relation to each other. Improvement in this regard is a critical element to any kind of success.

We do not have at the moment a well-coordinated program. What Federal programs there are are divided into seven operating agencies. There is some evidence that there is communication between them, but it does not overpower you.

In any event, the amount of resource allocated is so small that it is very difficult to expect any major result. It seems to me that both the result and the coordination are important as matters of national priority.

Finally, there is the question whether within the Federal framework, the bureaucratic arena as such, arts in education is likely to survive and prosper. That brings the issue to the fore, should there be a Department of Education and Cultural Resources; should it be broken out of HEW?

This is an argument familiar to the Members of the Congress who have watched its ebb and flow for the past 20 years. The majority of the panel feels very strongly that the education function ought to be pulled out of HEW. The Secretary feels otherwise. I would expect that to be a lively and, hopefully, fruitful debate over the next year.

I think the basic point that we want to make, beyond the organizational issue, which, of course, is always a sexy and attractive kind of thing to focus on, but is merely a device to an end. The thing that we want to focus on is that the test of any organizational nostrum ought to include the question: Is it likely to produce greater or lesser sensitivity to this basic element in what we regard as the educational spectrum that should be made available to every child?

If so, then to our mind there is a strong case for it. If not, if there is any absence or reduction in the competitiveness of the arts as against other objects of educational investment, it strikes us as an extremely short-sighted and ill-founded move.

We tried as best we could to sketch out in fairly specific terms what we think are the practical steps that would increase the priority of the arts, both in the educational perspective and in the general public expenditure perspective, at the Federal and local levels.

We hope that these ideas will be given consideration. In any event, we would like very much to be part of the lively debate on this issue, rather than simply allowing everyone to go along, wanting it in general, but not knowing in what way, or how much in particular.

Thank you.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Yesterday, at the Academy of Sciences, we indicated our desire to cooperate in other fields and also underscoring our feeling that the arts are in fact connected as subject matters to other fields. We were at the National Academy of Sciences for a conference before some 400 visitors in the education and the arts. I said before them that we were urging Congress to initiate and establish two new Federal centers. One to be a center, and one an institute. I might just briefly read what I said to them:

> We urge that our Congress assist in the establishment of a Center for the Arts in Education to coordinate Federal programs in the area where education and the arts intersect, and to render vital services to the field.

I think that one of the more shameful facts in the arts and education is that there is so much that is going on, but it does exist in isolation. Where the Federal Government, Congress particularly, can assist us is in the establishment of a center which would enable facts about the excellent programs to filter across the country.

I am mindful of what Senator Pell said, we need to reach out beyond the largest urban centers.

Second, we urge Congress to establish a national institute for the study of arts esthetics in education in order to develop and coordinate essential research. Again we recognize that no major dollar initiatives are likely to be forthcoming until there is some reasonable proof that the results will be what we say they are.

I think that this panel strongly believes that arts education can have really revolutionary and positive effects on education in this country, and with your assistance we will, within a few years, be able to prove it. We are convinced of it.

I will just say, in regard to Senator Pell's question, we would be happy to respond briefly here today, should you wish, otherwise we will be communicating with him directly.

I would like, finally, to thank Congressman Brademas and Senator Pell, and your respective subcommittees, for hearing us today. We are obviously open to any of your questions, and appreciate very earnestly the opportunity to appear. Thank you so much.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Mr. Rockefeller, and let me express my own warm appreciation to you and all of the members of your panel, and all of the witnesses, whether panelists or not, who have appeared today.

My own judgment, and here I speak for myself, but I feel sure that Senator Pell would not disagree, is that your report, "Coming to Our Senses," will prove to be one of the most significant studies of a crucial national issue that has yet been produced.

I think that you have planted seeds with the study that will, hopefully, bear fruit in the near future. For the long run, I think that what you have done is absolutely crucial, pointing to the indispensable role of the arts in the human experience and therefore in the learning process.

Having said that, let me go on and make another observation or two, and then put some questions to you.

I was very pleased to hear Mr. Bingham observe that you will undertake to have some regional meetings across the country. It would seem to me to be very important. If you are looking for places to begin, one of your distinguished panelists, and one of my constituents, Dean Bergin of the Center for Continuing Education at Notre Dame, would not, I hope, do me in if I proposed that that great university might well be a locale where you might undertake one of these meetings.

Second, I think that there is a great deal to be said for the proposition that we should have a White House Conference. I would ask you, however, to raise your sights beyond arts in education, because you have been talking about this for some time now, and I would say to make it a White House Conference on the Arts, so that one can consider the full range of issues that are involved as we try to make policies for the arts.

I hope also, Mr. Rockefeller, that you will do what I need not admonish you to do, and that is to distribute your report as widely as possible and to see to it that the President and those who are counseling him on these matters get it. He is a fast reader.

I would hope also that you would give it not only to the Endowments, but to such agencies as the National Institute of Education which considers fundamental issues like this, and to Secretary Califano. I am going to see him later this week and hand him a copy, so that he will have no excuse of not having gotten one.

I hope also that you will see to it that it gets distribution through the established educational associations, the NEA, ACE, the Land Grant College Association, the various organizations that deal with the needs of the handicapped, which are also, as you know, within the jurisdiction of this committee, and, in addition, the institutions that deal with the problems of the elderly and with very young children.

It seems to me that the impact of your report ought to range very, very widely.

Having said all of that, I would like to ask a few questions, if I may. Mr. Rockefeller, either you or anyone who wishes may feel free to respond.

One of the most sensitive issues raised in your report is one about which several of you have spoken, and I know that it is of interest to Senator Pell. That is the proposal for a separate Department of Education and Cultural Affairs. This is a variation on the theme of what some have suggested as the Department of Education, and others have suggested as the Department of Education, Science and Cultural Affairs. One can get a variety of proposals.

I am open minded myself to these several ideas, but I confess that I have a reservation with respect to putting cultural affairs within a cabinet level position so far as the Federal Government is concerned. The reason I say that is at least twofold. We, on this committee, who are responsible for the Arts Endowment and the Humanities Endowment, have really bent over backward to avoid trying to dictate the specific implementation of the law because we are very sensitive to political control of the arts.

There is always a danger, and I don't make this point to be critical of the Arts Endowment of which, as you know, I am an enthusiastic supporter, but there is always a danger in having appointed persons and those who may be making decisions being without the same kind of accountability and perhaps the same degree of accountability as people who have to get elected.

Again I look at Eastern Europe, and I look at arts policy in the Communist world—I am not usually considered as a Neanderthal conservative—I really have certain apprehensions about locating decisionmaking responsibility for all arts policy, at least so far as the Federal Government is concerned, in one department.

Maybe there is something to be said for being somewhat messy about it, and having responsibility spread all over the lot, which in fact is the present pattern. The Smithsonian makes art policy. The Arts Endowment makes art policy. Various museums make art policy.

Mr. Hamilton was right on target, if I understood him right, when he said that we should have a concerted debate on this whole question.

Would you like to allay my fears?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Maybe I could respond initially, and then if Mr. Hamilton would like to respond further.

The question of a separate Department of Education went through a number of changes during the course of the panel's study. Although originally we did recommend that the department contain cultural affairs, that portion was struck in the final draft.

It was our feeling that we should not take the position as to whether a separate department of education should contain cultural policy. It was, by the way, the only issue, the only recommendation in which there was serious dissent from a number of the individual panelists. I think that it is in this spirit that Mr. Hamilton spoke.

The attitude about the Department of Education is that both the arts and education, and education generally, need a higher priority in Federal funding. It was the majority feeling, but not the 100 percent feeling of the panel, that a separate department would be a way of getting that higher priority.

We recommend, in addition, that a special advisor for the arts in education be appointed to serve the Secretary of HEW, now the Secretary of Education if a separate Department of Education should be established.

Mr. Hamilton, would you care to respond?

Mr. HAMILTON. I was one of those who felt that the case was not proven to break out the Office of Education and make it a separate department. I want to make it clear, though, that a strong majority on the panel did not feel that way.

My own view, for whatever it is worth, is that the issue is not so much whether a department level or cabinet trappings are given to

education. It is what universe of competition arts and education, and education in general find themselves in.

As you know, Rufus Small and others who spent some time on this have long been concerned about what amounted to discretionary type expenditures against the medicaid, and the entitlements in general. I think that it is a very important question, and I don't think that one solves it by putting it as a separate entity as long as the Federal Government is involved.

I think that when the Federal Government gets to education and finance, it ought to be in a highly general way. A revenue-sharing type of thing rather than something that tries to dictate policy.

Therefore, my own view is that separating out education is not nearly as important as trying to work on a process in which we think about education and placing it in such a way that things such as the arts, which seem to have a very strong and special case for Federal interest, get emphasized. But this is not necessarily the majority view.

Mr. BRADEMAS. One of the concerns that we have is museum services which is authorized by the Museum Services Act which this subcommittee and Senator Pell's subcommittee wrote into law last year as part of the Arts, Humanities and Cultural Affairs Act. That program, as you know, would provide Federal grants to museums of every kind—art, history, science, technology, as well as zoos and botanical gardens—for general operating expenses as distinguished from the kinds of aid made available through the two endowments, mainly for special projects.

We were quite modest in the authorization. We wrote in $15 million for fiscal 1977 and $25 million for the next year. Those of you who know anything about museums will realize that this is not very much money.

We considered very carefully this organizational problem, Mr. Hamilton. Where do you put authority for administering a program of aid to museums in this country. Some said, "Put it in the Arts Endowment," but the Arts Endowment does not know anything about the science and technology centers, and certainly does not know anything about the zoos and botanical gardens, nor does the Humanities Endowment. It did not seem to make sense. You would be giving a whole to a part.

We thought of a separate agency, but separate agencies get into all kinds of difficulties in this city. Then we thought, there is a common thread that runs through all of the institutions that would be advantaged by this program, and that is that they are all educational institutions. So we decided that the best place for that, and because of the other reasons, would be to put it in HEW.

Even there, and I will now come in agreement with the point that Mr. Hamilton was making, if organization is important, the money is important too. The OMB people, many of whom are holdovers from the Ford administration, were strongly opposed to the Museum Services Act, and they have not yet been civilized into realizing there is a new President of the United States, and that they ought to be more sympathetic to really very modest programs like this one.

So I only take advantage of this hearing to say a word about that, because that particular program is an example of the kind of things that I think your report focused on.

By the way I was interested in seeing Mr. Rockefeller, in the New York Times, make the point that there are ways in which we can improve or strengthen the role of the arts in education without spending a vast amount of money, if we just use some imagination.

What have you to say a little more specifically to define your proposition that the arts belong within the basic subjects in education? What can you say to illustrate how the arts can be, as you wrote, Mr. Rockefeller, powerful aids for teaching the other basics in our educational system?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Again, I might begin by answering the question, and others may wish to join in.

We speak about in the report, Mr. Chairman, some 100 models, so-called model programs across the country. The staff has documentation that goes far beyond what appears in this report and would be glad to make that documentation available to the staff of the subcommitte.

We have discovered that there are an increasing number of instances in which particularly the relationship between strong arts learning and reading skills is being demonstrated. I would be delighted to share with you those instances. Some of them are in the report, and some of them are listed elsewhere.

Research in this field, and one could say in education in general has been flimsy, and one of the first things that this panel feels needs to be done is to develop more facts before the national strategy which we recommend can be undertaken.

Rather than do the research first, and then write the report, we decided that a report of this nature was necessary and we recognized that much more data should be forthcoming. We do have, I underscore, however, some impressive data of a scattered kind at this time.

Mr. MICHENER. In my comments I cite three specific projects, one in Columbus, Ohio, one in East Harlem, and one in Fayetteville, N.C. Among my papers, I bring quite a few studies in addition to that made. They carry over from arts education to total education.

The record is rather impressive that where we have good art programs, we have increased learning rates, and I will be very happy to submit this to the subcommittee.

Mr. BRADEMAS. We would be very grateful if you do that.

Mr. HOLLANDER. To take one small example because of the time, let us look at music and some of the concepts of music. To understand the sense of proportion in line, logical theory arises in the understanding of music.

In the field of psychology, and understanding how the human nervous system works, the latest studies on the human size of the brain, righthandedness and lefthandedness, we are talking about the very concepts of learning. These concepts are what the arts are about.

In searching for any type of quality or greatness in any field, when we deal with whatever field on a high level, we start dealing with the poetry of the theory, or the music of the theory, or the psychological wisdom of a theory.

Lately the ideas of such a man as Wheeler, an astrophysicist and philosopher, and all philosophers who are spending time in the study of music before they can advance their own art, I think that this shows us that the most profound among the thinkers realize that the concepts of the arts are necessary to a full grasp of their particular sciences.

Ms. COOPER. Congressman, right here in Washington, under the very nose of Congress, there exists a program which proves the connection between success in the arts and general learning, the Duke Ellington High School of the Arts. A large majority of our students come from the District of Columbia public school system, and many of them enter the ninth grade reading on the second grade level.

They have absolutely no ability to add and subtract. It is a very primitive source in which they start working. We have found in the art school that if the child is motivated, if the child wants to, for instance, become an actor or actress, he can be pushed toward reading that script, which will become a tool of his trade. Much faster he or she can be pushed to reading other works.

As a result of that, we have over the 8 years placed 90 percent of our students, and a lot of those with handicaps in reading and math, in some of the finest classes and professional training schools in the country. They are al over the world from Iran to Brussels to California. They are really everywhere. These are kids who were completely handicapped academically, and could only be motivated through the arts.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Let me ask another question before we close.

Mr. Rockefeller, you have spoken of the 10-year national strategy of the arts in education. Could you spell out the principal components of that strategy?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. We mention this under the 13th of the 15 categories of recommendations, Mr. Chairman, and that recommendation says that the Federal Council on the Arts and Humanities should oversee the development and implementation of a 10-year national strategy for the arts in education, and State art departments and departments of education should be consulted in the planning process.

We did not feel that we should lay out the strategy ourselves, but we felt that it was terribly important that there be such a strategy, so that we were not just wandering in the forest.

One of the purposes of the regional meetings that we did speak of earlier is to begin to formulate that strategy. We hope to have a better answer for you in a year's time.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Let me say, by the way, that I ask unanimous consent that any communications that you may send to Senator Pell in response to his questions, be placed at the appropriate point in the hearing.

I will allow the record to remain open for a suitable time so that any other statements that anyone wishes to insert, that are relevant to the subject matter of this hearing, can be inserted.

I would ask consent, myself, that a number of newspaper articles concerning the report, "Coming to Our Senses," be inserted in the record.

Let me say, Mr. Rockefeller, once again how much I think you and all of you ought to be commended for having produced, to reiterate, what will prove to be an historic document.

It has been of great interest to me, and I know to Senator Pell. I hope that we will have an opportunity to welcome all of you back in a year or so, to see how we are doing.

I will say one other point to which I am provoked by what my dear friend Peggy Cooper has said, the role of Congress in these matters.

What has been of some encouragement to me over the years is that we have seen Presidents of both parties giving support to the arts. We have seen, increasingly, how Members of Congress of both parties have been voting appropriations for the arts, not as much as I would like, or that Peggy would like, or I dare say most of you would like. You will have strong champions on this committee and on Senator Pell's committee.

I think now, however, that we ought to turn our eyes to the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue for a little while anyway, and see what the President and his associates may be thinking about on these matters.

Earlier this week I was with the President and Secretary Califano, when we spoke at the White House Conference on the Handicapped, which was made possible by a resolution born in this subcommittee and the Senate subcommittee, over the opposition of the outgoing administration, I might say, and I made the point then that it is very refreshing to have a President in the White House who is active in his support of the rights of handicapped persons and is responsive to initiatives that come from Democrats and Republicans in Congress.

So, despite what some people may have read, we have been very busy on the Hill on some of these matters. I think that the same is true with respect to the arts. The Arts and Artifacts Indemnity Act was born in Congress. The challenge grant program was born in Congress, and supported by both Democrats and Republicans.

So, we now look with longing eyes to the White House in hopes that we will get some vigorous advocacy from that great part of the leadership. I can think of few places where the opportunities are greater than the arts.

I am hopeful that your report will give greater impetus to decisions that are made down there.

Thank you again very much for coming, and we are adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:15 p.m., the joint subcommittees adjourned, to reconvene at the call of the Chair.]

APPENDIX

OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF MUSIC
11250 ROGER BACON DRIVE, NO. 5
RESTON, VIRGINIA 22090
TELEPHONE (703) 437-0700

Written Statement of Samuel Hope, Executive Director, National Association of Schools of Music; Executive Secretary, National Association of Schools of Art, to the Joint Hearing of the House of Representatives Special Committee on Select Education and the Senate Subcommittee on Education, May 25, 1977

Mr. Chairman:

I am submitting this Statement on behalf of the National Association of Schools of Music, the National Association of Schools of Art, the College Music Society, and the Music Teacher's National Association.

We recognize that these present Hearings have been convened to receive the Report of the Panel on the Arts, Education, and Americans. It is with great enthusiasm that we appear before this Committee today encouraged by an atmosphere of renewed and invigorated attention to ideas that the arts should be basic in American life, that all arts should be taught in elementary and secondary schools as well as in colleges and universities, and that a greater proportion of curricular time should be given to the arts, especially in the early years of education.

We commend the Panel on the Arts, Education, and Americans, and others of like mind who are now generating increased public attention to these ideas about education and the arts which have been the published objectives of arts educators and their national organizations for many decades., We support the generic idea that the arts should be more central in American education. Even though testimony was taken from numerous arts educators, neither the specific text of the Arts, Education, and Americans Panel Report nor that of its Recommendations were shared with national art education organizations during their development, nor extended for comment prior to their publication; therefore, the body of Recommendations made by the Panel does not necessarily reflect the views of the professional educators in the arts or their national organizations.

Because there has not been sufficient time for arts education organizations to develop statements based on thorough study of the Report, and because the arts education community is in the process of developing its own proposals, our purpose today is to present three concepts which we

believe should form a basis for Congressional and national consideration both of this Report and its Recommendations and other reports and recommendations which will be forthcoming in the near future.

We would urge the Congress to move immediately to solicit written comment about the Report and Recommendations of the Arts, Education, and Americans Panel from all nationally-recognized arts education organizations. Further, we would request that future hearings be scheduled on the question of education in the arts with representatives of all segments of the arts education community invited to testify. This would allow a more representative discussion of the issue than is possible in these hearings.

Before moving to the three points we wish to discuss, may I express our deep appreciation to you, Mr. Chairman, and to your Committee for providing us with this opportunity to share ideas and concerns. We hope that this is the beginning of a long and fruitful association between the Congress and the community of expertise represented by the national organizations of professional arts educators.

Whenever considering the development of Federal policy about the arts and arts education we believe that three guideline concepts are essential:

1. Successful work in the arts and arts education must be organized and done principally by skilled and trained professionals.

The arts community consists of three principal groups which have a close, symbiotic relationship: professional artists, general and professional educators in the arts, and arts patrons which include the political, social, and business support communities. The furtherance of actual working relationships among these groups should be a basic underlying principle of all government involvement in policy planning and project implementation in the arts and arts education. However, there are generic differences in the information and expertise each group can bring to bear on a particular facet of the total enterprise.

Professional artists are those whose principal source of income is the practice of an art. These individuals are primarily interested in producing works of art. Their educational background has most often been directed toward this goal; their total energies are usually harnessed to it; their expertise and experience reflect it.

General and professional educators in the arts are those whose principal source of income is the teaching of the arts. The philosophies and backgrounds of this constituency cover a wide spectrum from those devoted solely to the training of professional artists to those engaged in arts

education on the elementary and secondary schools. Educational backgrounds of professional educators cover the same spectrum. The arts educator must be dedicated both to the art and to discovering effective ways of developing understanding of the art in his or her students.

Arts patrons are those involved in business, political, and social life who support the arts financially and organizationally. The entire arts community is in their debt for the tremendous contribution they have made. Their specific educational backgrounds and interest cover a great range; however, their past educational involvement and specific current involvement in the arts is usually avocational rather than professional.

I know that the Subcommittee joins me in being very proud of the past achievements of the American educational system. I am sure the Subcommittee joins me in recognizing that improvements and adjustments in that system are necessary if we are to address the problems of the future successfully. I would hope that in its deliberations concerning future arts and arts education policy and in the implementation of actual projects, this Subcommittee and its colleagues in the Congress would develop programs in the arts and arts education which better utilize the tremendous professional resources that are available in America's educational community.

I make this statement because I am troubled by proposals which suggest that solutions are to be found in a pro forma transfer of administrative responsibility for programs in arts education from the professional community of arts educators to the arts council community.

I would submit that the arts council concept is still in the early stages of its evolution. One fundamental weakness is the lack of a sophisticated national accountability structure. By contrast, the American educational system has a broad range of long-standing accountability procedures administered by both public and private agencies. Systems such as accreditation, licensure, certification, and eligibility determination which operate in education need constant adjustment and improvement; however, the arts council community has no such highly developed institutions for demonstrating accountability. For example, there are nationally recognized standards about the qualifications of a faculty member in various educational settings, but none concerning qualifications for membership on an arts council. One could continue with similar comparisons for quite some time.

We support the generic concept of arts councils and look forward to their future development. However, considering the current state of arts council development in most situations throughout the country, it does not seem well advised to advance the notion that arts council control of policy development and co-ordination for arts education would be any sort of step forward.

Any Federal, State, or local structure which fails to recognize that successful work in the arts requires professionalism as much as in any other field is doomed to failure from the beginning. No matter what the structures are called, no matter what committees are named, this fundamental principle must underly all policy development, and project implementation in the arts and arts education.

2. Professional arts educators and their national organizations must be substantially involved in Federal policy decisions about the arts and education in the arts.

The process of Federal policy development in the arts within the past decade has provided a forum for two of the aforementioned groups, permitting an opportunity for the special expertise and experience of professional artists and arts patrons to bear upon questions of the arts which face the Federal government. In the future, the process of Federal policy development should provide a larger forum for all three groups with general and professional arts educators joining their colleagues on an equal basis. From my own knowledge of proposals under development in the arts education community and a cursory review of the Recommendations of the Arts, Education, and Americans Panel, it seems clear that those who have studied the problem believe that the total current Federal structure for dealing with the arts is inadequate to address the broad problems of the arts and arts education which face this nation. It seems that unless some reorganization, reorientation, and expansion is accomplished, the current Federal arts structure will be even less able to fulfill this responsibility in the future.

Let me be clear in asserting that this reorganization should not reduce funding for professional arts activities. This is neither the short-term objective nor long-range goal of the arts education community. If anything, funding available to professional performers and presenters of the arts should be expanded. The role played by the National Endowment for the Arts in this area should be commended, encouraged, and strengthened.

However, funding for projects which assist professional and general arts education has been almost non-existent during the decade of Federal involvement. When arts education programs have been forthcoming, the emphasis most often has been on developing these programs within a government agency without formal consultation with the arts education organizations rather than providing support for the development of ideas and projects using existing programs. This practice is analagous to the Federal government's starting an orchestra in Boston rather than encouraging the efforts of the Boston Symphony, and it has produced growing discontent among arts educators at all educational levels.

We believe that arts educators throughout the nation recognize and fully appreciate the great resources and contributions of professional artists and arts patrons, not only in the cultural forum but also in the government forum provided them during the last decade. However, it is unfortunate that during the past decade, individuals representative of general and professional education in the arts and the national organizations of these individuals have been afforded only minimal participation in shaping Federal arts policies, even those which deal substantially with education.

In the policy planning of the National Council on the Arts, the arts education organizations have been virtually bypassed. In the past two years none of the organizations for which I am speaking have ever been asked to participate in any policy discussion, nor have their views been solicited in any form as contributions to an on-going discussion. These organizations represent the accrediting agencies for art and music recognized by the U.S. Office of Education and the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, and the associations representing studio music teachers and college and university music faculties. These individuals and institutions train both professional artists and educators in the arts.

Although the development of the Report and Recommendations of the Panel on Arts, Education, and Americans included conversations with a broad range of arts educators, the Panel also bypassed these national organizations in the crucial process of developing the language of policy recommendations which could affect the livelihood of thousands of educators in the arts and perhaps do profound damage to positive programs which have been built after many years of work.

If the goal of developing greater emphasis on the arts in education is to be accomplished and a rational policy is to be developed to achieve this goal, it is crucial that these attitudes be reversed and that the resources available in the community of arts educators be joined with those of the other two major constituencies on an equal basis and in a structure which induces cooperation rather than polarization.

We estimate that the arts education constituency represents approximately 150,000 professionally-trained and engaged arts educators. Using a median salary of $15,000 per year this repesents a $2.45 billion investment in the future of American art with almost none of the total being funded by the Federal government. In addition, the institutions and facilities in which these individuals work represent additional financial contributions in buildings and equipment, stage presentations, concerts, exhibit space, etc. that would add considerably to the previous figure. In financial terms alone it would seem that the total annual contribution made by the community of general and professional educators in the arts would speak for itself concerning its importance, especially when compared to the total Federal annual authorization for the arts, some $90 million for 1977.

More important than financial statistics is the fact that national organizations of arts educators have developed a wealth of research, developmental, and organizational expertise. Many have maintained longstanding research efforts in committees which serve both as initiators and evaluators of research in their respective fields. Moreover, these organizations have direct contact with the individuals working as arts educators at all levels and in every part of the country. Government and private ad hoc policy planners must begin to recognize that these individuals and their national organizations already have the most direct influence on the future of arts education, that thereby they exert a major influence on the future of the arts in this country and that they should be involved when policy is being developed and promulgated.

As educators in the arts, we support the generic concept of artists in the schools working cooperatively with professional educators in a curricular effort to teach the arts; however, we also support a reciprocal concept of appropriate educational involvement in performing arts policy. A local arts council, museum board, State arts commission, or symphony committee which does not include the best available expertise from the surrounding arts education community is missing one of the three essential components of any successful arts enterprise. The same is true for policy committees at the Federal level.

I would hope this Subcommittee and its colleagues in the Congress would move as soon as possible to encourage all existing administrators of Federal programs in the arts to involve in a substantive way the broad range of expertise available in the arts education community. More than ever before nationally-recognized organizations of arts educators are seeking the opportunity to be involved in policy discussions with their professional and patron colleagues so that the variety of resources available to the aation for the furtherance of its artistic life can be brought to bear in moving forward cooperatively.

3. A national study should be undertaken under the auspices of the Legislative and/or Executive Branch which would assess national needs in the arts and arts education, develop long-range goals and short-term objectives for Federal programs in arts and arts education, and recommend specific alterations and enlargements to the current Federal structure dealing with the arts and arts education based on those goals and objectives

Such a study should be undertaken by a committee chosen for professional experience and expertise in the arts, arts education, and the support sector. Nominations should be solicited from all national arts, arts education, and support organizations, and the committee should reflect a

spectrum of views. The committee should be independent of the National Endowment for the Arts and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The committee should be charged to maintain a continuous working relationship with professional artists, arts educators, arts patrons, and their national organizations. This cooperation must include the development of information which would lead to an assessment of needs and recommend specific alternatives and enlargements to the Federal structure based on meeting those needs. It is absolutely essential that the committee allow opportunity for comment and revision based on comment before the final recommendations are presented.

This assessment of national needs in the arts and arts education would necessarily include a review and evaluation of current resources. The education system, professional organizations of artists, arts educators, and support organizations of arts patrons, government systems on all levels, and the resources of arts-related business must all be considered. It is important that such a review be realistic, developing organizational structures to deal with current problems, not solely on what the future promise of a particular organizational concept might be, but rather what the actual current resources are for assisting the nation in reaching the goals and objectives which have been developed.

I suggest that such a committee accomplish the agenda as outlined using the following six basic questions to be asked regarding any present or future program:

1. Does the program maintain and enhance the environment for individual enterprise and creativity in the arts and arts education?

2. Does the program maintain and enhance the number and variety of public and private funding sources for the arts and arts education?

3. Does the program and its organizational structure foster cooperation among professional artists, arts educators, and arts patrons?

4. Does the program have clearly defined objectives and credible means of evaluating its achievement of those objectives?

5. Does the program provide an effective method, both politically and organizationally, of disseminating and implementing the ideas and concepts it develops?

6. Does the program and the organizational structure which supports it reflect a professional approach?

With specific attention to the Federal structure dealing with education in the arts I would emphasize that any program which calls itself an education program must have the educational welfare of students as its first priority. In that regard, I would offer the following concepts as being basic to any Federal program in arts education.

1. There should be a program of categorical aid seed money support from the Federal government to aid the development and dissemination of new program ideas in arts education.

2. In a program of Federally-supported aid to education, professional arts educators as identified by peers must be substantially involved at the policy making and management levels.

3. The representative leadership body for a proposed arts education program should be able to organize itself and conduct its business according to a pattern which emphasizes the utilization of the professional expertise of its members.

4. The program must utilize the resources and opportunities for improvement available in all types of educational settings, preschool through adult education, public and private, studio and institutional.

5. There should be a provision for the support of research in arts education and for the dissemination of the results of such research.

6. The Federal program in arts education should provide support but not control for the operation of other government or private agencies, institutions, committees, or associations.

7. Federal support for the development of projects in arts education should be provided in such a way as to encourage more effective interaction and unity of purpose and view among the organizatons representing specific professional arts and arts education constituencies in each local community as well as more effective interaction and cooperation among the national constituencies of professional artists and arts educators, this especially with respect to the development of specific programs in arts education.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to request an opportunity to appear again before this Committee when its deliberations about education in the arts resume. At that time, I would plan to bring a more detailed articulation of specific concerns and proposals.

It has been suggested that a ten-year plan be developed for a national policy and objectives in arts education. The organizations for which I am speaking would prefer to join with their colleagues in the government

sector and the private sector in a cooperative effort to develop such a plan. However, if the opportunity to do so is not forthcoming we are prepared to develop and promulgate a ten-year plan of our own within the immediate future.

Again, Mr. Chairman, may I express appreciation to you and your Committee for your kindness in considering our presentation. We urge you and your colleagues to join us in seeking to achieve a more democratic representation of views in the development of Federal arts policy.

Written Statement of Robert Klotman, National President, Music Educators National Conference for the Conferences, The National Art Education Association and The National Dance Association

To the Joint Hearing of the House of Representatives Special Sub-committee on Select Education and the Senate Sub-committee on Education, May 25, 1977.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Music Educators National Conference, the National Dance Association and the National Art Education Association, I would like to begin by expressing our appreciation to you for the opportunity to make this presentation. We are deeply honored and duly aware of our considerable responsibility with respect to our colleagues in the other national organizations of professional arts educators.

It is our understanding that the principal purpose of this May 25 hearing is to hear a presentation from members and representatives of the Arts, Education and Americans Panel. The Panel, having published yesterday its long awaited report, Coming to Our Senses, wishes to present their recommendations, which are a part of the report, to the Congress. Mr. Chairman, it seems most appropriate at this time for us to make some limited observations about the Report and some of its recommendations, adding several suggestions of our own. Because we have been engaged in a number of joint activities with our colleague organizations, and are mindful of the repeated urgings of key staff members of both sub-committees and of representatives of the Carter administration that we make every effort to represent a consensus among our organizations, this statement has been prepared for review and reaction by The National Art Education, The National Dance Association and the American Theatre Association. Our invitation to prepare this statement was received on May 20 four days before publication of the Panel Report and five days before the Joint Hearing. Given the constraints imposed by that tight schedule, it has been necessary to organize this presentation listing a number of positions and recommendations. Each organization and individual with an opportunity to review the draft has been free to endorse or support specific points without being committed to the entire set of positions.

Position #1 -- Commendation to the Arts, Education and Americans Panel.

On behalf of the Music Educators National Conference, National Dance Association and National Art Education Association it gives me particular pleasure to commend the members of the Arts, Education and Americans Panel and Panel Chairman David Rockefeller, Jr. for their commitment to a difficult and challenging task and, together with their very able and dedicated staff, for their monumental accomplishment in producing their Report with its recommendations for long overdue efforts to improve the quality of arts education and of the arts in education in America. The Music Educators National Conference, a member organization of the American Council for the Arts in Education, is particularly pleased to cite its record of participation and cooperation with the Panel, including the commitment of numerous officers and present and former staff members to serve as resource persons. I am sure that the Panel Report will be as eagerly studied and will prove to have much the same order of impact upon music education as the Tanglewood Symposium Report published by MENC nearly a decade ago.

Position #2 -- Consideration of the Panel's Recommendations

Although many arts educators, some representing the organizations represented by this statement, served as resource persons to the Panel, and are so identified in the Report, it should be noted that neither they nor their representative resource persons were given an opportunity to react in any way either to the Report while it was being prepared; or, more importantly, to the recommendations based on the report. There has been no adequate opportunity in the development of this statement for us to conduct a careful review of the recommendations, nor could such a review be accomplished within the limited time available between publication of the Report and the Panel's presentation at this Joint Hearing. For that reason, Music Educators National Conference, National Dance Association and National Art Education Association and their representative resource persons cannot accept responsibility for the specific contents of the Report

and any of its particular recommendations. I hasten to add that no slight is intended; certainly no rejection of the Report or its accompanying recommendations. Specific endorsement of recommendations and related portions of the Report cannot be made until there has been an adequate opportunity for study and review.

Position #3 -- The Role of the Professional Associations

In his closing statement of the conference at which the Panel's Report was presented to the nation on the afternoon of May 24, 1977, Chairman David Rockefeller, Jr. issued a charge that was extended specifically to government leaders at state, local, and national levels, to television networks, to school administrators, to colleges and universities and, indeed, to many other elements of the arts education scene. In his prepared statement for this Joint Committee, Panel Member Barry Bingham noted that "the professional associations in arts education are supporting" the multi-arts approach, "which seems to signify that the old isolationism is dying." At several points throughout the Panel's Report,however, excerpts from our publications are quoted or references are made to articles or testimony representing a contribution by our organizations to professional leadership in arts education and yet neither in Chairman Rockefeller's public charge nor in the Panel's Recommendations are there specific statement of duties or responsibilities to be undertaken by the professional associations in arts education. Music Educators National Conference, National Dance Association, and National Art Education Association hope that those Panel members and staff now organizing a permanent successor to the Panel will carefully review their findings and sources of information. The experience should enable them to prepare specific suggestions for needed contributions of professional leadership and program development that the national professional associations in arts education can best provide.

Position #4 -- Awareness of Professional Association Contributions

Considerable attention is paid to the Interdisciplinary Model Program in the Arts for Children and Teachers (IMPACT) in the Panel's Report, but in the text on page 80 where the first extended reference is given to IMPACT no mention is made of the joint responsibility of the four major arts education national professional associations for organizing, directing, and monitoring that effort. In its second major cluster of recommendations the Panel seems to be unaware of the efforts mady by MENC towards an ever greater acceptance of electronic music as a significant element of music to be studied and experienced. In the sixth cluster of recommendations the Panel seems to be unaware of the initiative of the four professional arts education associations to involve school administrators and prominent lay school board members in the Arts Advocacy Program. I have directed the staff of the Conference to conduct the most searching review of the Panel's Report in order to identify all such instances where the panel and its successor organization seems to need to be apprised of the contributions of the four major arts education professional associations. Appropriate materials are to be collected and forwarded to Chairman Rockefeller.

Recommendation #1 -- Solicitation of Response

On the basis of the positions stated above, a more searching and careful review and reaction to the Panel's Report and Recommendations appears justifiable. The Music Educators National Conference, National Dance Association, and National Art Education Association recommend that Chairman Brademas and Chairman Pell request of all interested professional associations of arts educators to prepare a written report containing a summary review and reaction to the Panel's Report and Recommendations. Further it is recommended that sufficient time be allowed for the preparation of such reports, so as to ensure an opportunity for a reasonable consenses; the time limit should also provide, however, that the report be received in time to be a useful resource document for future activities of either committee to draft new or amended legislation affecting federal programs in arts education and/or the arts in education.

Recommendation #2 -- Re-authorization of Section 409, P.L. 93-380

According to the present schedule of Congressional activity, action must be taken by the Congress with the approval of the President to re-authorize the Arts in Education Program established under the provisions of Section 409, P.L. 93-380. Such action must be taken no later than May 15, 1978 according to the current Congressional budget procedure. To attempt to substitute major new arts education programs as recommended by the Panel in place of the only current evidence of a Congressional commitment to the arts in education per se could well result in loss of that minimal support program with replacement by a more effective successor. The Music Educators National Conference, National Dance Association, and National Art Education Association recommend to both sub-committees of the Congress that hearings be scheduled on the re-authorization of the current Arts in Education Program to consider such action on its own merits and independent of any other needed program developments to improve the quality of federal support for arts education. Further it is recommended that such re-authorization hearings be scheduled at the earliest possible opportunity and that both the professional associations of arts educators and representatives of the Panel be provided opportunities to testify about the worth and quality of the current program and any needed amendments.

Recommendation #3 -- A White House Conference on the Arts

With respect to the exchange between Chairman Brademas and Panel Chairman Rockefeller regarding a possible White House Conference, it should be noted that while there has been a regularly scheduled White House Conference on Children and Youth and while there have also been White House Conferences on Education in past years, there has never been a major White House Conference on the Arts. The Music Educators National Conference, National Dance Association, and National Art Education Association recommend that the appropriate Congressional committees encourage President Carter to convene a White House Conference on the Arts at the earliest possible time. Much more importantly to arts educators, however, it is our recommendation that arts education be major theme of the next White House Conference on Education whenever that may occur. Further, it is recommended that an opportunity be provided at future public hearings to consider the state of the arts in the nation so that testimony may be given to the need for such a White House Conference on the Arts. It is also recommended that the role of the arts in the education of American children and youth, plus the opportunities for experiencing the arts in the lives of American young people, be the central theme for the next White House Conference on Children.

Recommendation #4 -- Alternative Federal Legislative Proposals

The position of Chairman Brademas emphasizing the unique organizational advantage of the new Museum Services Institute, couple with Chairman Pell's continuing interest in the Arts Education Program approved last summer by the Senate in Title IV of Senate Bill 3440, suggest that there are viable alternative legislative proposals that might be as effective or possibly more effective to accomplish the goals sought by the Panel than the legislative proposals that the Panel has recommended. The Music Educators National Conference, National Dance Association, and National Art Education Association recommend that both sub-committee chairmen provide an adequate opportunity for the presentation of alternative legislative strategies to accomplish the goals of increased effective federal support for improving the quality of arts education for all Americans and particularly for young people in the schools of the nation.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the more than one hundred thousand members of our organizations and their major national affiliations which I represent in this statement, we wish to extend our appreciation for the opportunity to be part of the record of the Joint Hearing. We look forward to similar opportunities to be of assistance in the future.

The National Committee☆Arts for the Handicapped

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
WENDY PERKS

INFORMATION SHEET

A BRIEF HISTORY

In June 1974, the Joseph P. Kennedy Jr. Foundation provided the funding for a National Conference on Arts for the Mentally Retarded, which created a tremendous national interest in the concept of integrating the arts into the education of the mentally retarded child. As a result of several conferences and funding by the Kennedy Foundation and Alliance for Arts Education, a National Committee was organized to coordinate the development of a nationwide program of arts for all handicapped children. The National Committee, Arts for the Handicapped (NCAH) is composed of leaders from major national arts organizations, organizations representing handicapped citizens, general education organizations and private foundations.

GOALS

The National Committee has established three major goals to direct the growth of its programs and activities:

To research and disseminate information about curriculum and instruction in the arts for the handicapped.

To exemplify model arts programs that may be successfully used with the handicapped.

To increase the number of handicapped students served by arts programs by 200,000 per year for five years.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

During 1976-77, the National Committee will foster the growth of arts programs for handicapped children and youth through three major implementation strategies:

1. VERY SPECIAL ARTS FESTIVALS:
   NCAH will select twenty pilot sites to develop and implement Festival programs. Each site must reflect a strong capability to provide quality arts experiences for handicapped people.

SUITE 805, 1701 K STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006 (202) 223-8007

2. MODEL SITE PROGRAMS:
NCAH will identify and support model arts programs. Each model site will emphasize a particular aspect of arts programming, as well as provide a wide range of arts experiences for all handicapped children and youth.

3. NATIONAL AWARENESS PROGRAM.
Through publications, media presentations, and a series of special projects, NCAH will develop a greater public awareness of the need for expanded opportunities in the arts for handicapped children and youth.

CURRENT FUNDING (FY 77)

Source	Amount
HEW, Division of Arts and Humanities, Special Projects Appropriations	$250,000
Alliance for Arts Education	64,000
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped Research Division	68,000
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped Personnel Preparation Division	20,000
Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr. Foundation	11,515
TOTAL	$413,515

BUDGET JUSTIFICATION

Operational Costs	$100,000
Very Special Arts Festivals	95,515
Model Sites	70,000
Research	68,000
Teacher Training	33,000

NCAH
Information Sheet
Page Three

Special Projects	37,000
National Awareness	10,000
TOTAL	$413,515

NOTE: The projected budget for FY 78 is $250,000 from HEW, U.S. Office of Education, Division of Arts and Humanities. It is anticipated that other support may continue, or be identified, but no other funds have been appropriated to date.

CURRENT IMPACT

Very Special Arts Festivals: 27 Sites

Estimated number of people involved:	100,000	children
	5,000	teachers
	1,000	adminstrators
TOTAL:	106,000	

(Program implementation began January 1, 1977; therefore, only statistical estimates are available.)

Model Sites: 9 Sites

Estimated number of people involved:	9,000	children
	450	teachers
	200	administrators
TOTAL:	9,650	

(Program implementation began April 1, 1977; therefore, only statistical estimates are available.)

Special Projects: 5 Sites

Estimated number of people involved:	4,300	children
	300	teachers
	150	administrators
TOTAL:	4,750	

(Same note as above)

NCAH
Information Sheet
Page Four

Research: 1 Site

Number of people involved:

	160	children
	8	teachers
	25	administrators
	10	specialists
TOTAL:	203	

National Awareness

Activity	Average number of people involved per month
Regular Mailings	600
Information Requests	300
Conferences	200
Meetings	100
TOTAL:	1,200/month

TOTALS

Children:	113,460
Teachers:	5,758
Administrators:	3,175
Others (Teachers, Parents, Administrators, etc.)	28,800
Total number of people directly impacted 1976-77	151,193

(Note: These figures do not include those people who have been contacted by NCAH program coordinators. Figures indicate only those people that are in regular contact with the NCAH office or NCAH program coordinators.)

CURRENT FUNDS GENERATED

At this date, it is estimated that an average of $50,000 is generated in local and/or state support for each of the 41 established state and local programs. Therefore, approximately $2,050,000 in private and public funds has been generated due to NCAH support. This does not include in-kind support services supplied by state and local agencies which include: salaries, office overhead, communications, transportation, etc.

This also does not include public and private support generated for such special projects as the Little Theatre of the Deaf week-long engagement at the Kennedy Center.

PROGRAM NEEDS

In order to accomplish the established goals of the National Committee, substantial and continual funding support must be identified. The National Committee will continue its efforts to obtain private and public financial support for special programs and projects. However, these funds do not provide adequate operational and program support. If the National Committee were to receive funds as a Special Project, model research projects, demonstrations, staff development programs, instructional packages, curriculum materials would be developed. The NCAH would act as an initiator of a rich variety of model programs that could be replicated in each of the fifty states.

Current funds have permitted the appropriation of modest grants ($1,500 - $8,000) to state and local education agencies in only twenty-seven states. The National Committee intends 1) to increase the number of handicapped people served by arts programs by 200,000 per year for the next five years. 2) to establish arts programs in all fifty states 3) provide technical assistance to these programs 4) develop model research, curriculum development, and training projects 5) document and disseminate information pertaining to arts for the handicapped 6) evaluate the impact and effectiveness of arts programs for the handicapped.

The continuation and expansion of the National

Committee efforts is dependent upon specific authorization from the Congress of the United States.

A draft of an appropriate authorization Bill to assist in the efforts of the National Committee, Arts for the Handicapped is attached.

DRAFT

A BILL

To authorize the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to distribute funds to the National Committee, Arts for the Handicapped, Inc. to assist such corporation in carrying out certain projects.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That (a) there are authorized to be appropriated $1,500,000 to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter in the Act referred to as the "Secretary") for distribution to the National Committee, Arts for the Handicapped, a corporation incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia (hereinafter in the Act referred to as the "corporation) in order to carry out the provisions of subsection (b).

(b) Any sums distributed to the corporation by the Secretary from sums appropriated under subsection (a) shall be used by the corporation for the establishment and support of model and demonstration centers to be located regionally throughout the United States, the purpose of which shall be

(1) the development of curricula for the training of handicapped persons and teachers of the handicapped in the arts,

(2) the development of programs for the training of handicapped persons for employment as professional artists, as teachers, of the handicapped and in arts related areas,

(3) the establishment of repositories of information regarding arts programs for the handicapped and the sharing of this information with persons who are handicapped, persons presently employed to work with the handicapped, persons preparing for employment in handicapped programs, and persons from organizations representing the handicapped,

(4) the development of publications and media presentations for use in training and and for public awareness,

(5) the conduct of research,

(6) the exhibition and performance of the works of handicapped children and practicing artists in the arts, and for

(7) the payment of salaries and expenses involved in the management of programs described in this subsection.

SEC. 2 The corporation shall, before receiving any sums from the Secretary under this Act, provide satisfactory assurance that such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures will be adopted as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, such sums.

SEC. 3 (a) Except as provided by subsection (b), the provisions of this Act shall cease to be effective upon the effective date of any appropriations Act which makes an appropriation to carry out the first section of this Act which, together with any other such appropriation, is equal to the authorization made by subsection (a) of the first section of this Act.

(b) Any appropriation made to carry out the first section of this Act shall remain available until obligated or expended.

Prepared by: Wendy Perks
Executive Director
National Committee, Arts
for the Handicapped
April 28, 1977

STATEMENT ON THE REPORT OF

THE PANEL ON THE ARTS, EDUCATION AND AMERICANS

by the National Endowment for the Arts

The National Endowment for the Arts is very pleased to have been one of the supporters of the Panel on Arts, Education and Americans. We have looked forward to the report, Coming to Our Senses, since our first discussions with David Rockefeller, Jr., over two years ago. We will do all we can to be sure that it is widely disseminated and have already arranged to have copies sent to the National Council on the Arts, the Artists-in-Schools Panel, and our task force on the Arts and Higher Education.

The Report of the Panel has called attention to both the importance and the needs in arts education. The recommendations will, and should, be the focal point of serious debate. This discussion will help to further raise arts education in the public's conscience. Taking the steps that are required to change priorities will, as the Panel has recognized, take time. But, it is surely time to begin.

The commitment of the National Council on the Arts to the purposes of the Panel goes back to the early days of the Endowment. Its concerns in regard to the arts in

education lead to its support of the Panel's activities. Further, we have recently established a task force on Higher Education and the Arts to be co-chaired by Council members Martina Arroyo, opera singer, and Willard Lee Boyd, Jr., President, University of Iowa. The task force will look at three questions inter-related to the area of arts education: professional training of artists, career development, and the training and re-training of the arts educator. Dr. Joe Prince, a member of the Steering Committee of the Deans of Fine Arts, and currently dean of fine arts at Murray State University in Kentucky, will start in July to provide professional support to this task force.

This review, which includes the role of higher education in the training and retraining of the arts educator, seems especially timely in light of the Panel report which so clearly indicates that the major changes in art education will have to come from the current art teachers in the schools.

We are very pleased that the Commissioner of Education, Dr. Ernest Boyer, is personally and professionally very committed to the value of the arts in education. This is especially important since no effort to change

priorities in our schools can be successful without the involvement and leadership of the Office of Education. We look forward to continued cooperation with that agency and to being as helpful as we can in bringing the insights of the artists to all planning for the future of the arts in education.

We note with interest the references in the report to the Artists-in-Schools program of the National Endowment for the Arts and the state arts agencies. This national program has been developed in cooperation with the Office of Education and the states. John Hoare Kerr, with the assistance of a panel chaired by Dr. Thomas Bergin, Dean, Center for Continuing Education, University of Notre Dame, has given the program leadership and a dedicated sense of the importance of quality. The Endowment is gratified the Panel recommends expansion of the Artists-in-Schools program. On the Council's recommendation, we recently established a task force, under Dr. Bergin's chairmanship, to develop a national program that would advocate expansion of the concept. In addition, we plan to continue the support of pilot efforts in Learning Through the Arts which can become models for arts in education.

We congratulate the Panel on its efforts and look forward to furthering its principles and to participating in the debate..

THE NEW YORK TIMES, SUNDAY, MAY 22, 1977

Wanted: A New Policy for the Arts in Education

By DAVID ROCKEFELLER Jr.

For two years I have been preoccupied with a paradox: Although we Americans are packing our theaters, concert halls and galleries in record numbers, why is it that as a matter of policy we accept the arts as neither an integral aspect of everyday living nor a legitimate part of public education?

The contradictions abound. On the positive side, there is the highly publicized report of the National Endowment for the Arts: Between 1965 and 1975 the number of professional orchestras doubled; resident professional theaters quadrupled; arts councils quintupled; and resident professional dance companies increased sevenfold. In Washington, seven thousand people stand in line eight hours, waiting for entry to an exhibit of Egyptian art at the National Gallery. According to a Louis Harris poll, 89 percent of us agree that "the arts are important to the quality of life."

On the other hand, we continue to give little weight to esthetic values in institutional decision-making. As a consequence, we seem to have condemned ourselves to an environment in which our schools are gray, fearful fortresses and our cities a gridwork of dismal frontage and automotive clamor. Consider especially the low importance we have assigned to the arts in the education of our children. In most public schools, training in the arts is still limited to painting and music. A survey of 67 schools in major population centers shows that after kindergarten, arts instruction virtually disappears. Faced with increasing demands and tighter budgets, school administrators move almost by reflex to cut the arts curriculum. (In New York City, I'm told, 40 percent of the music teachers were fired last year.)

And apparently this is the way most Americans want it. About the same time that Louis Harris was taking his poll, the Gallup organization reported that a majority of parents prefer schools that emphasize the three R's and strict discipline. Only 33 percent of the United States population thinks it important for our children "to know something about . . . the great leaders in art and literature."

•

To regard arts education as a frill is as ingrained in most Americans as the conviction that a man's first obligation is to earn a living. First things first, as John Adams said so wistfully in his now famous letter to Abigail: "I must study

David Rockefeller Jr. is chairman of the Panel on the Arts, Education and Americans.

politics and war so that my sons may have liberty—liberty to study mathematics and philosophy, geography, natural history, naval architecture, navigation, commerce, and agriculture, in order to give their children a right to study painting, poetry, music, architecture."

Now, however, the time has come to fulfill Mr. Adams's dream—not because we can now afford it but because, as a more mature nation, we must acknowledge a historic and crippling error. The truth, implicit in the current culture boom but which United States education policy has yet to embrace, is simply this: Full human development requires that the pursuit of pleasure and enlightenment be at one with the drive for economic and physical security. Training in, about, and through the arts is essential to learning both how to live and how to make a living.

This is not my opinion alone but that of a panel of 25 distinguished business leaders, scientists, artists and government officials who have just completed the most comprehensive study of the arts and education ever undertaken. On Tuesday we will publish our findings in a 330-page book with a title that we hope will be quickly comprehended in both its meanings: "Coming to Our Senses: The Significance of the Arts for American Education." With it, we offer a proposition for national debate—that cultivation of the arts be recognized as a defining element of the last of the three "inalienable rights." The time has come, we contend, to grant "the pursuit of happiness" the same weight of public policy and institutional support that has traditionally been given the rights of life and liberty.

In considering this proposition, we chose to focus our study on the public schools and on the need to make the arts a tool for general learning. The schools are where most young people are, and it is with them that we must begin.

We advance this idea not in opposition to the back-to-basics movement but in the conviction that the arts properly belong among the basics. Rather than being something apart from the three R's, we say, the arts should be used as powerful aids for teaching them. Beyond this, we see a crying need to expand the concept of literacy to include the language of gesture (theater), image (the visual arts), sound (music), movement (dance), and space (architecture). Extraordinary powers of discrimination are required to guide us through the buzzing confusion of contemporary America. There is no more telling indictment of our schools than that they concentrate on word skills to the almost complete neglect of the nonverbal.

Senator Birch Bayh's committee on juvenile delinquency puts the cost of school vandalism at $600 million a year. I am not surprised. In school after school I have seen padlocks on restroom doors, barred windows and uniformed guards in the corridors. In schools like these, with dwindling budgets and seemingly no choice but to spend huge sums on the maintenance of order, "the arts" may consist of one music teacher for every 3,500 students. Nothing more.

And yet there are other schools with equally serious budget problems and similarly high rates of vandalism where arts education has not been sacrificed. Indeed, our panel reviewed a number of innovative programs in which the arts were effectively present throughout the curriculum. The tentative evidence is that they have had a remarkably constructive effect on both learning and behavior. Some examples:

In Oakland, Calif., Mosswood Mini-School allots six to eight times more art periods than do most other schools, with the result that children from the fourth through sixth grades have regularly shown an average reading gain of two times the normal rate and an average math gain of one and a quarter times.

> 'Cultivation of the arts should be recognized as the last of the three inalienable rights.'

In one school in Columbus, Ohio, in which the arts have been infused into regular subject-matter teaching, vocabulary scores for sixth graders went from 14 percent at or above grade level to 79 percent. The truancy rate went down correspondingly.

The strong arts programs in the schools of East Harlem have had such a marked effect in reducing vandalism that guidance counselors in nearby schools are now recommending that their most delinquent students be transferred there.

Two years ago in Roosevelt, N.J., vandalism was so epidemic in the K-12 school that the town fathers seriously considered closing it. Then a special program in environmental design was introduced, in which students and teachers worked together to map out and reshape the classroom space. The vandalism stopped. Why? According to the program coordinator, it was largely be-

cause the experience served to eliminate a communications gap. "In most public schools," she told us, "teachers and students have such different vocabularies that they can hardly be said to speak the same language. Through the arts they have their only chance to communicate nonverbally. This involves an entirely different part of the brain and it's a part that's almost entirely neglected in conventional education."

•

Fortunately, a concentrated experience in the arts can also heighten awareness and broaden perspective for adults. At our hearing in Memphis, Joe Warlick, a middle-aged executive in the Division of Supplementary Education Services, appeared before the panel. He told us he was the son of a switchman, that he'd grown up next to the railroad tracks and that art had never been a part of his background. But the previous summer he'd been chosen to attend a special arts workshop for school administrators. "As a non-artist, a pragmatic administrator," he said, "I could just see myself being put in the position of doing something artistically that would frighten me. . . . I took part, and I was resisting, but I really enjoyed it. I did ballet." And as he talked he began to demonstrate. "I did movements. I lay on the floor. I made film. We did something I have been wanting to do all my life. Sculpture. Modeling—and we did it with baking dough."

Joe Warlick's story is important because by and large it is the attitude of the school administrator that determines how much support arts education gets in the local school system. If the administrator has had no personal experience in the arts, he (and it still is mostly "he") is likely to think of art as sissy or frivolous and to relegate the subject to the kindergarten playroom.

Our panel makes 98 recommendations for change. We based them on interviews with 300 artists, educators, and policy makers; regional hearings in Minneapolis, Los Angeles, and Memphis; and reports describing some hundred community arts programs. Although several recommendations are addressed to the need for additional funding, our primary appeal is for better planning and coordination, for the kind of imagination that will not only make the arts part of general education within the schools but make better use of the resources available in the community. "What can you do on a budget of no dollars and no cents?" asked one of our witnesses. "A lot. If you want to help students analyze the moving images of film and television, they can look at TV programs and come back and talk about them. . . ." And, after all, what costs less than song, dance, and sculpture in baking dough?

Not unexpectedly, our recommendations are expansive: "That opportunities for creative participation be provided all students, not just the gifted and talented. . . . That all prospective classroom teachers have experience in a variety of arts and learn to relate them to each other and to other disciplines." Some recommendations are directed quite specifically to government. We propose, for example, that the United States Office of Education be reconstituted as a Department with Cabinet status and that a Special Adviser for the Arts and Education be appointed to serve the new Secretary of Education; that each state create Cabinet-level positions for the arts; and that every municipality have an arts commission that concerns itself with education.

•

In sum, our panel is saying that a coherent national policy is needed for the arts in education as much as for the performing arts. We do not suggest, however, that the realization of such a policy will be easy. It will require, first, agreement and vigorous cooperation among the various professional associations in arts and education. The policy must ultimately be written into laws and regulations, a political process with which artists and arts educators have had limited experience. Perhaps most important, it will require that Americans revise their posture toward the Protestant work ethic, which until recently has barred the arts as serious subjects for public policy even though the images, poetry, and sounds of the arts are obviously persuasive and often decisive influences on policymakers.

There is, of course, one action that could accelerate formation of arts-education policy: a strong commitment from the President. In the 1950's, after Sputnik, a decision by the White House moved science education into a position of preeminence. It was the initiative of another Administration that caused the nation in the 1960's to reaffirm the importance of physical education. Will the same be done for arts education in the 1970's? John Adams, I believe, would have hoped so. ■

The Washington Star May 22, 1977

Making Sure The Arts Survive in Our Schools

By Philip M. Kadis

Conjure up that 1620 landing at Plymouth Rock. Out shoots the gangplank. But instead of a deckful of stern Puritans in basic black, the trans-Atlantic vessel disgorges a band of brilliantly garbed Venetians or Florentines.

Where would America — named after an Italian, anyway — be today?

No one knows, of course. And speculation about the course of history if the Mayflower had been the "Fiore di Maggio" is probably pointless.

Except that a point is made with this example in "Coming to our Senses," a report released today on the significance of the arts for American education that is destined to have a major impact on educators, legislators and public policy in the next few years.

The point is a simple one. If the country had been settled by 17th-century Italians "brought up in the golden glow of the Vatican or of the Medicis and doges who surrounded themselves with the greatest painters, sculptors, and artificers of the day," the arts in America would have had an easier row to hoe.

Whatever the Pilgrims' virtues were, a zest for the arts was not among them. Their stark stamp, given added weight by the rigors of frontier life well into the last century, was deeply embossed on the American character and the nation's institutions, not excluding the schools in which Americans since the Age of Enlightenment have placed an abiding faith.

The arts never found secure lodging in the vast educational edifice built to enshrine a belief in human perfectibility, at least human teachability, enunciated by the Founding Fathers. Puritan prejudices against the arts prevailed, along with the utilitarian preoccupations of Yankee peddlars, pioneers and early industrialists. One might also add (although the report does not) that the heavy burdens placed on the schools of "Americanizing" successive waves of immigrants and of urbanizing rural migrants, white and black, hampered the development of an arts curriculum.

But the times, they are a-changin', in a way that John Adams, among others, saw that they would.

"I must study politics and war," he once wrote to his wife, "so that my sons may have liberty — liberty to study mathematics and philosophy, natural history, naval architecture, navigation, commerce and agriculture; in order to give their children a right to study painting, poetry, music, architecture . . . "

Adams may have been rushing things a bit. The Rockefellers don't believe they are. They are the primary backers of the research that went into the $300,000, 330-page report, and young David Rockefeller, Jr., a member of the fourth generation of the Rockefeller dynasty, served as chairman of a 26-member ad hoc panel of prominent businessmen, scientists, artists and educators that oversaw production of the report.

Rockefeller, son of the chairman of Chase Manhattan Bank, is doing what Adams hoped his grandsons could do, and in a big way.

He has served in several capacities as an arts administrator, and was former chairman of the Associated Councils of the Arts. He performs with a choral group, and appears to have made a life's mission out of what other Rockefellers (Uncle Nelson, for example,) see as a fascinating avocation. That mission is to see that the arts become more widely dispersed, accessible to more people.

The thrust of the panel report, the outgrowth of a proposal by the American Council for the Arts in Education, is that the arts be relocated from the periphery to the center of American education, alongside the three R's.

"FOR THE ARTS TO become an integrating force in American life, they must first assume a higher significance in the training of our children," says Rockefeller. "The arts must, in fact, be seen as one of the basics, not merely as a subject distinct from the three R's, but as a tool for teaching the fundamentals and almost anything else we want our children to learn."

There is evidence, says the report, that the arts can help in the acquisition of reading and mathematical skills, that they are helpful in reducing the incidence of juvenile delinquency.

They are essential for insights into the "affective" or feeling and emotional side of life. They enhance sensory experience, the exploration of sensations and the senses; hence, the play on words in the title "Coming to our Senses." The arts — though commonly contrasted with cognition, with knowing the world through intellect and reason — may simply be another, non-verbal of gaining knowledge about the world in the view of some experts.

But whether or not any of this has been conclusively demonstrated by research to date is beside the point, according to the report.

"Perhaps, if some of these basic questions were studied and answered, art would become essential to education, to the individual and to American society. But we cannot afford to wait for these answers," the report says.

Then, in a deafening understatment, it adds:

"We must proceed on the basis of the past history of humanity which indicates that art has always been central to civilization."

PHILOSOPHICAL TIDYNESS may not be the strong suit of the Rockefeller panel. But it does recognize contradictory trends when it sees them. At the same time that arts courses are being whittled down or striken from the curriculum as the first victims of shrinking budgets, every other indicator shows that the public interest and support for the arts is experiencing the most dramatic growth during any period in the nation's history. Something is out of sync, and it's not the public, according to the panel.

To get the arts where the panel believes they should be in education, a 10-year strategy is proposed, detailed in 98 recommendations to every level of government, to all educational institutions, to arts organizations, educational researchers, foundations, even to parents.

Some of them are extraordinarily broad

"Making a work of art is a powerful act of learning that should be available to all people," the panel recommends. It decries the distinction often made between appreciation and participation, affirming that "art education is most effective when the student actively engages in both. Only 20 percent of the secondary school population, it was estimated, get any instruction in the arts, let alone participation in them.

There is a recommendation that the U.S. Office of Education be removed from HEW and made a cabinet-level department with a special adviser for arts and education to serve under the new Secretary of Education. (Sen. Abraham Ribicoff has already introduced a bill to create a separate Department of Education). Also a recommendation that the President appoint a Special White House Advisor for the Arts, who would include among his concerns the role of the arts in education.

THE PANEL CALLS FOR the formation of a new federal agency called the National Center for the Arts in Education to coordinate federal programs that lead to an intersection between the arts and education.

At the same time, the Federal Council on the Arts and Humanities (a relatively dormant body created by Congress to coordinate the activities of the arts and humanities endowments with nine other federal agencies which support cultural activities) should be delegated the task of developing and implementing the 10-year plan for strengthening arts education, according to the panel.

A National Institute for the Study of Arts, Aesthetics, and Education should be created to conduct badly needed research in such areas as: the role of the arts in child development, the nature of creativity and aesthetic growth, the interplay between affective and cognitive learning, and the relationship of the arts to other areas of learning and to American social and cultural life in general.

Other recommendations include the following:

● Expand the arts curriculum beyond music and visual art to include the dance, drama, poetry, design, and the new media (television, radio and film.) Encourage courses that cut across several of the arts.

● Make available in-service arts education programs for teachers to update and upgrade instructional skills. It was estimated that 80 percent of the teachers who will be teaching 10 years hence are already in the classrooms, because of shrinking enrollments resulting from a change in demographic patterns. There are approximately 1.3 million elementary school teachers alone.

● Employ practicing artists more widely in all aspects of education, enlarging the artists-in-the-schools program of the arts endowment. Waive teacher certification requirements for artists in residence.

●Exploit intensively the resources of community arts groups and institutions such as museums, theaters, orchestras and dance companies as part of the educational process.

One of the criticisms already voiced by those who have received advance copies of the report is that too few arts educators were involved in the report.

Rockefeller says in the report's introduction that panel members were selected "not for their professional experience in the field of arts education, but for their concern about the arts, their concern about education, and their concern for the way Americans live." Among the panel members were Thomas Bergin, dean of the Center for Continuing Education at Notre Dame and chairman of the arts endowments' artists-in-schools panel; Barry Bingham, Sr., board chairman of the Louisville Courier Journal; Walter G. Davis, director of education for the AFL-CIO; Melissa Hayden, dancer and choreographer; Lorin Hollander, pianist; John J. Iselin, president of the Educational Broadcasting Corp., WNET-TV in New York City; Francis Keppel, former U.S. Commissioner of Education; author James A. Michener; Patsy Mink, former Congresswoman from Hawaii; Glen T. Seaborg, former chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission; A. B. Spellman, chairman of the expansion arts panel of the arts endowment, and Frank Stanton, former president of CBS and current chairman of the Red Cross.

JOHN MAHLMANN, executive director of the National Art Education Association, is unperturbed at the paucity of arts educators on the panel.

"I think the report will have greater impact coming from a lay panel of politically prestigious people," said Mahlmann. "Everybody already knows what arts educators would say. But this is like bringing in an outside consultant. Often he doesn't tell the executive board anything different from what you've already told the board 20 times. But the fact that he is an outsider saying it carries more weight."

Mahlmann wasn't keen on the recommendation to waive teaching certification standards for artists brought into the schools.

"One of the reasons for certification is to maintain the quality of instruction. It does always work. But does it help to eliminate it? What does the recommendation really mean? That artists will be employed as teachers?" he asks.

Another recommendation that is certain to raise a ruckus is the one calling for expansion of the arts endowment's artists-in-schools program. And the report acknowleges that it has been roundly criticized by some educators, and educational researchers although it has been a popular program in part because the endowment maintained a heavy public relations campaign in support of it.

The critics says the program has no proven educational value although it may be diverting for youngsters in the schools. At the same time, the critics say, it encourages school boards to think they can cut costs by dismissing full-time arts teachers and supplanting them with federally funded resident artists who are available for only a fraction of the time that teacher is.

"BASICALLY, IT'S AN income redistribution program for artists," said one educator. "Which is okay, I guess. Except that if you only have a limited number of federal dollars available, they would be better spent on in-service training for arts teachers. If education is what you're really interested in."

There will be searching questions on how to finance the recommendations.

Panel member Keppel observes that a shift has occurred in Washington with respect to educational funding. Appropriations can no longer be justified on the basis of growth or quantity, he says. The watchword now is quality, and this is more difficult to establish.

But the louder the criticism, the more likely it is that the report will have the desired effect of moving the arts closer to center of attention in education.

The Rockefeller connection is already working its magic.

David Jr. has already made some prepublication forays into Washington to meet with selected media representatives and arts educators.

On Tuesday, a morning news conference at the Watergate Hotel complete with audio-visual presentations will be followed by another presentation in the afternoon to some 500 professional and community leaders by members of the panel at the National Academy of Sciences. Joan Mondale, the vice president's wife and the Administration's top spokesman on the arts will also speak to the group. A reception for the panel will be held in the evening at the National Portrait Gallery.

Then on Wednesday, Rockefeller and several members of the panel will appear before a joint hearing of House subcommittee on select education and the Senate subcommittee on education, arts and humanities chaired by Rep. John Brademas, D-Ind., and Sen. Claiborne Pell, D-R.I, respectively.

In addition to three Rockefeller foundations, the report was supported financially by the arts endowment, the Office of Education, and several other foundations including Atlantic Richfield, Disney, Exxon, and Ford.

It will not be ignored.

The Washington Post STYLE Entertainment / The Arts SHOW

SUNDAY, MAY 22, 1977 L1

"In the '50s, with a nudge from Sputnik, America recognized the central importance of science education. In the '60s, with a lateral pass from the Kennedy clan, the nation reaffirmed that physical education was essential. Now, in the '70s, it is time to acknowledge the power and urgency of arts education."

Poet Robert Frost at the 1961 presidential inauguration of John F. Kennedy. Photo by AP.

'Coming to Our Senses'

Is It Time for a Change in National Arts Education?

By Alan M. Kriegsman

THE LIFE OF the arts, far from being an interruption, a distraction, in the life of a nation, is very close to the center of a nation's purpose—and is a test of the quality of a nation's civilization."

The words are John F. Kennedy's, and they're typical of the kind of lip service Americans in high places are fond of paying to the arts. But when we're honest with ourselves, we're forced to admit that we don't do as we say. In the practical life of the nation, the arts are treated as "frills"—pleasurable, perhaps, and even illuminating, but essentially disposable.

Crosscurrents

We teach our kids readin', writin' and 'rithmetic, and all the pragmatic skills to insure their "getting ahead," and the arts wedge themselves into our educational fare, if at all, as a kind of fancy trimming. They're "electives," i.e., something we may want, but feel we can well do without.

This week, however, there will appear a manifesto that challenges this national policy, and summons us to a drastic reordering of priorities. Called "Coming to Our Senses: the Significance of the Arts for American Education," it's the report of a panel of eminent citizens chaired by David Rockefeller Jr., and will be published Tuesday by McGraw-Hill as a 330-page softcover book.

"There is clearly a need for a fundamental change in education . . . In the '50s, with a nudge from Sputnik, America recognized the central importance of science education. In the '60s, with a lateral pass from the Kennedy clan, the nation reaffirmed that physical education was essential. Now, in the '70s, it is time to acknowledge the power and urgency of arts education."

That's the much reiterated theme. The heart of the book, though, and the culmination of the panel's two years of interviews, site visits, statistical studies, discussions, research and pondering, is a list of 97 "recommendations," designed to give the arts educational parity with such traditional disciplines as mathematics and science.

Among the most ambitious and sweeping proposals are

See CROSSCURRENTS, L6, Col. 1

THE WASHINGTON POST
L6 Sunday, May 22, 1977

Arts Education: A New Manifesto

CROSSCURRENTS, From L1

those calling for a Secretary of Education in the nation's Cabinet, along with a Special Adviser for the Arts in Education; the appointment of a Special White House Adviser for the Arts; the drafting of a "10-year national strategy for the arts in education"; a pilot program in three model cities "to make the arts a central concern of the schools"; and a national television arts program modeled on "Sesame Street," to be produced by a major commercial network.

Prepared at a cost of $300,000, and funded by 15 sources including the National Endowment for the Arts, the U.S. Office of Education, the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations, and such corporations as Exxon and Atlantic Richfield, the report is undoubtedly the most comprehensive study ever published on the topic of arts and education.

But panel chairman Rockefeller, a 35-year old arts enthusiast and former chairman of the Associated Councils of the Arts, isn't expecting the world to change instantly with the release of the report.

"It certainly won't happen automatically," he commented in an interview last week. "This isn't the sort of report one can adopt like buying a TV set after seeing an ad—it will take a long time to be properly implemented. But what's encouraging is that many things can be done immediately. The decentralization of our educational system is a minus in one way, because no single federal mandate can change the entire structure at once. But it's a plus from another standpoint, since all kinds of gains can be made locally without waiting for the massive federal machinery to move itself.

"There's no way of putting a price tag on this kind of project, or setting a timetable either. But a lot can be done for very little incremental cost—it's really more a matter of changing priorities, than of big spending. I would certainly hope that the report would increase the numbers of committed people, and fortify the position of those, mostly in the minority on local school boards, who are already convinced. In the final analysis, what the report signifies to me, and I hope to everyone who reads it, is that the arts are the great underutilized resource of this country."

Along with businessmen, publishers, broadcasters, educators and public spokesmen, the panelists included such notables of the arts as pianist Lorin Hollander, dancer Melissa Hayden, designer and filmmaker Ray Eames, author James Michener, architect O'Neill Ford, and Washington's Peggy Cooper, founder of the Workshops for Careers in the Arts. Though the recommendations represent a consensus of their views, the panel was far from unanimous on every issue.

Like so many committee reports, this one sometimes conveys the strain of trying to satisfy too many conflicting pressures at once. If the panel's prescriptions were carried out literally, the resulting proliferation of studies, agencies, committees, coalitions and programs would amount to bureaucratic overkill—hardly the original intention.

On the other hand, the report gives voice to a widespread trend of thought about the neglect of the arts in general education. There's nothing much new or startling in the panel's research findings or its survey of the present state of arts education. What is new is the coherent statement of goals, backed by solid argument and a combined weight of opinion from many diverse quarters. The breadth of concern is also impressive. "Coming to Our Senses" is not merely about the way the arts are taught in our schools, but about how our esthetic deprivation may be deeply affecting the "quality of life" for all, in school and out.

"Our cities could be monuments to the creative interplay between nature and man, but they have become a gridwork of dismal frontage and automotive clamor. Yet most of us live in cities and all of us go to school. Grayness and tension. Do we accept these as conditions of life? Must our surroundings homogenize our thoughts? Must cultural differences stimulate more suspicion than celebration?"

The arts alone, of course, no matter how well integrated into our upbringing, are not going to eradicate the grayness and tension of our blighted environs. But their neglect may well be contributing to our inability to cope successfully with larger civic and social ills. The trouble with the recent "back to basics" movement is not with its emphasis on fundamentals, but in the narrowness of definition of what to count among our educational necessities. This is where "Coming to Our Senses" is especially persuasive. "The arts, properly taught, are basic to individual development since they more than any other subject awaken all the senses—the learning pores. We endorse a curriculum that puts 'basics' first, because the arts are basic, right at the heart of the matter. And we suggest not that reading be replaced by art but that the concept of literacy be expanded beyond word skills. The arts provide unique ways of knowing about the world and should be central to learning for this reason alone."

In a study of innovative arts programs already under way in nearly 100 American communities, the panel finds evidence to show that the arts not only foster "sensory awareness," but may even improve reading abilities. And though present results are far from conclusive, other studies also suggest a link between arts education and a reduction in violent or antisocial behavior.

Disregard for our esthetic environment may well have its roots in the exaggerated emphasis our culture has historically placed on literary and discursive modes of consciousness, as opposed to intuitive or holistic modes. In this respect, "Coming to Our Senses" allies itself with Marshall McLuhan and other critics of our communications systems who see education failing to accommodate to the new, non-linear, "electric" age of TV. "American education exaggerates the importance of words as transmitters of information . . . Verbal and written language is essential," the report continues, "but all our sensory languages need to be developed as well if words are to fulfill their deeper function and deliver both subtle and vivid messages." And it is to the arts that one naturally looks for such development, since they are "ideal vehicles for training our senses, for enriching our emotional selves, and for organizing our environment." By "arts education," moreover, is to be understood not just learning *about* the arts, but direct, creative participation in the arts.

"Coming to Our Senses" may also prove relevant to the issue of the survival of the arts themselves, in a society increasingly burdened by such implacable dilemmas as joblessness, urban decay, runaway inflation and energy shortages. The surest way to insure the well-being of our creative and performing artists and arts institutions is to make sure they have a healthy and growing contituency. People will only care for the arts to the extent that they care about them, to the degree they feel they matter. The most direct, obvious way to generate such a constituency is through the nation's schools, and by extrapolation, through the whole range of educational experiences available beyond schoolyard walls. It is precisely these channels that the country has, by and large, ignored, and to the harnessing of which "Coming to Our Senses" is primarily addressed.