

The Origins of American Public Arts Policy: Path toward Establishing the National Endowment for the Arts

Nobuyuki KAWAUCHI *

Introduction

Under the federal political system, the current public art and cultural policy of the U.S. is composed of four support systems: (1) the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), (2) regional arts organizations, (3) state arts agencies, and (4) local and community arts agencies.¹

However, the art and cultural policy in the U.S. relies more on private support than on direct government funding. The government's role has been to supplement private support and increase the incentives for private contributions. Thus, America has a wide variety of funding sources assisting artistic and cultural endeavors, including individuals, businesses, foundations, and universities, as well as cities, counties, states, and the federal government.²

Furthermore, in the midst of the civil society's maturation process, the development of the U.S.'s public art policy has coincided with a discussion of how people should be served in public places. As a result, the art and cultural policy referred to as public art has changed gradually with the times, from a clientelism led by the government to the one in which citizens participate independently.³ This shift was caused by people's growing realization that they must assess and criticize the nation's public art and cultural policy as well as their increased ability to judge whether a particular public policy would benefit them.

I Significance of the New Deal Arts Programs

In the U.S., the government-led art and cultural policy to use art, such as sculptures and murals, in public spaces began with art programs of the Treasury Department and the Works Progress Administration (WPA) under the New Deal policies created in response to the Great Depression of the 1930s.

The New Deal's plan to support the arts began with the short-term program known as the Public Works of Art Project (PWAP). In the midst of the unprecedented social crisis of the Depression, several pioneering programs were developed, such as the Treasury Department Section of Painting and Sculpture's mural project, and the Treasury Relief Art Project, as well as the WPA's Federal Art Project, a part of Federal Project Number One. Federal Project Number One contained five arts programs: the Federal Writer's Project (FWP), the Historical Records Survey (HRS), the Federal Theatre Project (FTP), the Federal Music Project (FMP), and the Federal Art Project (FAP). The FAP offered public support for the visual arts (painting and other visual artworks).⁴

Federal Project Number One gave relief, in the form of work assignments, not only to visual artists but also to people in other artistic fields. Moreover, this was also a social policy

* Department of Comparative Cultures, College of International Studies, Chubu University

that made contributions to artistic activities and groups tax-deductible. Under the FAP, a wide variety of posters, murals, pictures, and sculptures was created. These works decorated not just federal buildings, but also other public institutions such as schools and hospitals. The FAP gave rise to many pieces of public art that are still known today. Moreover, it encompassed art production, education, and research. For example, “the Index of American Design” was created as a result of the FAP’s artistic investigations.⁵

However, these New Deal arts programs were terminated in June 1943 because of World War II and the ensuing wartime regime. From the end of the war through the 1950s, importance was placed on creating local historical monuments and ones dedicated to national heroes; hardly any artistic policies that encouraged artistic creativity were implemented. Accordingly, scholars such as Gary O. Larson have offered the negative assessment that the 1950s saw no development in American artistic policies.⁶

However, in the 1960s, the federal government reenacted cultural policies that encouraged placing works of art in public spaces, and the concept of public art became solidified. The art historian Harriet F. Senie called this change as “the revival of public art.” This explains that the New Deal art programs enacted during the Great Depression were unified with the American Renaissance style that had been seen in public architecture until the beginning of the 20th century. From this, she stated that the public art became an important part of public policy in the 1960s.⁷

II Art, Culture, and American Society in the 1950s

Most American public spaces prior to the 1950s displayed monuments commemorating wars or statues in honor of heroes, but this emphasis was no longer aligned with popular thinking or with most people’s daily lives. At this time, Americans were seeking to shed their memories of war, and thus the traditional statues and war monuments were losing their functions in urban spaces. This proved to be an opportunity for the creation of modern public art.

In the 1950s, the U.S. was enjoying hegemony within the international community following its victory in World War II. The country saw unprecedented economic growth, and approximately 60% of the American people reached a standard of living considered to be middle-class. Access to televisions expanded rapidly among general citizens. As the media provide information on lifestyle of “wealthy America,” citizens’ interest in pursuing more prosperity and a higher standard of living increased.⁸

Under the industrial system of mass production and the postwar Employment Act of 1946, 1950s’ America saw the establishment of stable relationships between labor and management, employment guarantees for core workers, and high levels of real income. An increase in real income of core workers provided a stable marketplace for consumer durables and helped expand demand for such products. This increase in income resulted in the formation of a large middle class, whose typical consumption patterns created a surge in demand for homes, as well as durable goods such as automobiles and appliances. As the result, the 1950s saw the realization of an affluent society enjoying the so-called American way of life.⁹

This golden age in America coincided with the development of a global postwar political and economic order dominated by the U.S., the hegemony of postwar *Pax Americana*. This led to the formation of the framework for a system of free trade, including the International Monetary Fund (IMF), which uses the U.S. dollar as its reserve currency, and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). The GATT–IMF system assured America’s economic

superiority. Furthermore, in order to implement its policy of containing socialism during the Cold War, America constructed a global, political, and military system to support the *Pax Americana*. In addition, it also introduced the policy of “disseminating dollars” on a large scale to support other Western countries.¹⁰

As the Cold War structure hardened around the two opposing superpowers, the Soviet Union and the U.S., Americans emphasized the slogan, coined after the nation declared its independence, of “freedom and democracy.” They also invested in actions that reinforced the superiority of the American culture over socialism. American films had been exported since the 1920s, and people all over the world were attracted to American society. In 1927, a film division was established within the U.S. Department of Commerce, and a strategy stating that “trade follows the film” was adopted.¹¹

The main factors that strengthened American influence in the art world and provided the backdrop for the establishment of an American public art policy had already been cultivated in prewar America. The rise of fascism in Germany and Italy exacerbated the social unrest, and European avant-garde artists exiled to America escaping from Nazi persecution. These artists had a large impact on American culture and art, which became a catalyst that explored new ground through the unification of American and European art.

For example, both Josef Albers and Hans Hofmann came to America in the 1930s and worked at Black Mountain College,¹² which produced many modern artists. Then, during World War II, Surrealists such as Piet Mondrian, André Breton, Max Ernst, and Raymond Georges Yves Tanguy came to America. Moreover, others who had emigrated to America even earlier used their new country as their base for artistic activity, such as Arshile Gorky, Willem de Kooning, and Mark Rothko. Many domestic American artists, including Clyfford Still, Jackson Pollock, and Philip Guston, gathered in New York.¹³

As a result, in America after the Second World War, the combination of Surrealism and European abstract art was widely sought after. The artistic world of Abstract Expressionism became a mainstream. Then, the latter half of the 1950s saw a gradual shift in the place of origin of modern art, from Paris to New York. American art exhibits centered on Abstract Expressionism became internationally acknowledged.¹⁴

Accordingly, in the 1960s, America expanded the world of pop art within its mass society, which had achieved large-scale production and consumption. Alvin Toffler proposed the analysis that a culture shock occurred when cultural desires were expressed all at once. This pop art was supported by the middle class, newly equipped with disposable income, as well as the affluent elite class. Toffler called this artistically sensitive middle class the “culture consumers.”¹⁵

As the number of culture consumers increased and a cultural boom took place, the U.S. became more proactive in its support of the arts. If the people enjoying art were limited to a handful the elite class, it would be very difficult to allocate a large amount of public fund as such an allocation would exhibit a significant inequity. Expanding the number of beneficiaries of art and culture made the foundation for giving large assistance payments to artistic organizations via state governments and local self-governing bodies more solid than before. Thus, widespread cultural support was exercised, and many cultural education programs were planned.¹⁶

III The Theoretical Rationale Surrounding Public Assistance for Art and Culture

No matter how large a middle class society has become, there would be no public support for the arts without acknowledging rationale for such support. This rationale has generally

relied on the perceived social value and/or economic benefits of art and culture.

In the U.S., art up until the 19th century were done by Romanticist. In the 20th century, the types of jobs requiring various artists increased in conjunction with the development of cultural industries such as advertising and media. This trend led to an emergence of artists and designers who developed cultural products to satisfy consumer demand.¹⁷ As a result, the economic foundation for culture and the arts changed greatly, further opening up the road to public support of the arts in the form of subsidies to artists and art organizations and funding assistance for specific projects.

The presence of economic ripple effects was often cited as a basis for public support of culture and the arts on grounds that this may have a broad social consensus. The logic of this argument is that because support for culture and the arts creates a positive economic effect, the government, local governments and municipalities, and private groups should provide assistance. However, in reality the economic ripple effects created by art and culture are not very large compared with those offered by, for example, major sports events. Today, the general consensus seems to be that it is unsuitable to give public support for the primary purpose of creating an economic result such as expanded employment or a better economy.¹⁸

In the 1960s, a theory advocating public assistance for art and culture originated due to its social value, rather than economic effects. The groundbreaking research of economists William J. Baumol and William G. Bowen provided a theoretical rationale for the public support for art and culture and contributed to the establishment of the NEA.

Baumol and Bowen in 1965 published their initial work, entitled “On the Performing Arts: The Anatomy of their Economic Problems,” in the *American Economic Review*. In the following year, they released their book *Performing Arts: The Economic Dilemma*. Baumol and Bowen identified three reasons for encouraging public support for the arts and culture: (1) the necessity of insufficient income and revenue, (2) the externality of social benefits, and (3) the attributes of the audience.¹⁹

The first issue, inadequate income and revenues, was seen as an instance of market failure in resource allocation. In the performing arts, personnel expenses constitute a relatively high portion of total expenses. Therefore, inadequate income and revenue are virtually inevitable due to the limited possibility of increasing manufacturing efficiency and productivity through information reforms and innovation. In other industries, increase in productivity leads to a rise in wages. The performing arts experience the influence of this effect: in the arts sector, growing expenses elevate the prices of commodities, a sudden price jump results. In short, as productivity increases in other industries, the performing arts face the dilemma of falling into relative poverty.

The second characteristic of social benefits offered by the arts and culture is its contribution to the public interest. This functions in external economies²⁰ and has beneficial positive externalities. That is, art and culture are not just for the people who directly enjoy them. They also provide benefits to regional and peripheral communities by improving the quality of the industrial sector and people's lives; thus, they serve public purposes. This argument has become a mainstay in undergirding the social value of the arts and culture as public goods.²¹

Baumol and Bowen listed four specific positive externalities: (1) artistic activities give a nation dignity, (2) cultural activities have advantageous effects for the businesses in their areas, (3) art and culture are beneficial to future generations, and (4) artistic and cultural activities bring about educational contributions to the community.²²

The importance of these kinds of positive externalities was analyzed by political scientists and economists including James Heilbrun, Charles M. Gray, Bruno S. Frey, and Werner W.

Pommerehne. Along with the items identified by Baumol and Bowen, the following were emphasized as important positive externalities: the option value of culture and art that can potentially be received in the future even if it is not consumed immediately; the value of the existence of art and culture that cannot be restored such as structures and historic heritage; and the value of the power of art and culture to maintain national pride and identity.²³ Therefore, arts and culture were seen as having positive externalities for society and considered valuable social assets and public goods.

The third characteristic identified by Baumol and Bowen includes the so-called attributes of the audience, such as the academic background, income, and occupation of those who receive art and culture. This audience tends to be comprised of people with high academic achievement, high income, and professional jobs who serve as the primary bearers of cultural consumption. The attributes of this type of audience were analyzed from a sociological perspective by Pierre Bourdieu who referred to the people who undertook and maintained cultural consumption as the cultural class.²⁴

Bourdieu argued that differences in cultural customs, preferences, and appreciation appear because of differences in people's academic and socioeconomic backgrounds. For example, he contended that the ability to appreciate art and culture is largely influenced by one's academic background, and cultural activities are largely influenced by the organization, class, or occupation to which a person belongs.²⁵ From the standpoint of audience attributes, the reality of the inequality of the reception of art and culture became clear even though a large middle class was created. Thus, the need for public support for art and culture was further encouraged from the perspective of social equality and redistribution of public goods.

Moreover, this type of discussion made it clear that problems were developing for the reception of art and culture because of regional differences and disparities in the scale of cities.²⁶ Needless to say, many cultural facilities are concentrated in large urban areas, and as a result many artists live there. As Heilbrun and Gray's research indicated, because of the existence of regional and income differences, it was deemed necessary to give public support to art and culture. Public support for art was thought to increase the value of a regional community's amenities. It was increasingly argued that everyone had the social right to experience culture and art and that it was necessary to redistribute art and culture throughout a region as a public good. These considerations broadened the justification for public support of art and culture.²⁷

IV The Political Debates Surrounding Support for Art and Culture

Shortly after the end of the Second World War, in 1948, Republican Senator Jacob K. Javits of New York State introduced a bill to Congress in an effort to establish a national art organization. In 1952, a democratic member of the House of Representatives, Charles R. Howell of New Jersey, proposed a more polished version of Javits's plan to establish national art organizations. However, both proposals faced substantial opposition, and the legislation did not advance.²⁸

There are several reasons for this. First, the establishment of the Cold War structure gave rise to fears and intolerance of communism and encouraged a related boom in conformism. Increasingly, modern art was viewed as communist. American conformism resulted in an altered understanding of the self and others. In America, the social realism of the Stalin administration was strongly perceived as eliminating the autonomy and purity of art (in other words, the freedom of expression). It was believed that national regulations like framing art, as

observed in the work progress administration (WPA) during the 1930s, should not be taken.²⁹ Moreover, the storm of McCarthyism that struck in the early 1950s cast a complex shadow over public support for art in the U.S. McCarthyism, by questioning the idea and role of the state, strengthened the insular viewpoint as to how art and culture should be supported.³⁰

The second such reason was the lack of a sufficiently cultivated attitude toward receiving public assistance among the artists themselves. After Howell proposed his plan, the House of Representatives held a public hearing on support for the arts in May 1952. The artists who attended this public hearing not only doubted whether programs supporting the arts, like those carried out under the New Deal, were essential but also had misgivings about a possible interference of the federal government into artistic expressions through public funding. This was clearly not the stage where unified claims for public support of the arts would be developed.³¹

Nevertheless, the very holding of this public hearing had great significance, as it initiated congressional discussion related to official government support for the arts. In the artistic world as well, an energetic discussion of the meaning of accepting public funds and the contributions offered to society by artistic activities began. Although Howell's plan did not win approval in Congress, the discussion of support for the arts did not fade away. Frank Thompson, Jr., another representative from New Jersey, proposed eight cultural bills in the House in 1956. Thompson was an influential liberal congressman who put considerable effort into creating bills related to civil rights and social security and who also had many connections with well-known cultural figures.³²

President Dwight D. Eisenhower, inaugurated in January 1953, initially opposed federal support for the arts. However, as it became clear that the U.S. was lagging behind the Soviet Union and France in support of arts, his attitude gradually changed.³³ The movement to cultivate public support for the arts and culture in the U.S. became stronger, and President Eisenhower called for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts in his State of the Union Address in January 1955. Then, in 1958, President Eisenhower signed the National Arts Service Act and indicated his interest in expanding artistic and cultural facilities across the U.S.³⁴

Furthermore, as demonstrated by the proposal called *Art and Government*, presented to Congress in 1953 by the Commission of Fine Arts, policy discussions had begun to consider the commissioning of art works (consignment policy), the construction of artistic and cultural centers, and the provision of artistic scholarships.³⁵ In 1956, after deliberations and hearings by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senate was heading in the direction of establishing a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts, which discusses the allocation of public funds to support arts.³⁶

V Systemization of Support for Culture and the Arts

In this way, the movement seeking support for the arts was strengthened in Congress. The establishment of a national foundation on the arts started to be widely discussed. The road to systemization of support for culture and the arts quickly opened up with the beginning of President John F. Kennedy's administration in January 1961.³⁷

National support for the arts was included in President Kennedy's New Frontier policy. Now, the policy of federal support for public art and culture was not simply for the purpose of disseminating art within the U.S. itself, but was also linked to a foreign policy that could

display externally the political dignity and social superiority of the U.S. under the Cold War.

In October 1957, the Soviet Union launched Sputnik 1, the world's first artificial satellite. This caused a sense of impending crisis and shock in the U.S., known as the Sputnik shock. For this reason, Kennedy emphasized the importance of space development and advanced with the Apollo program. However, it was also necessary to show American superiority in the artistic and cultural realms, as well as in science and technology.³⁸ In other words, public art was not only about the beautification of urban environments or the decoration of construction projects, but was also a strategy of cultural diplomacy designed to oppose the Eastern bloc.

The Kennedy administration hosted many public hearings in Congress on the significance of art policy, and the President asked people like Max Isenberg to propose a policy aimed at supporting culture and art. Isenberg was a State Department official who submitted a report entitled "A Strategy for Cultural Advancement" in 1961. This report sought to expand support from federal government for art and culture, and it emphasized that doing so would offer the large political advantage of raising the nation's standard of living.³⁹

In 1962, Kennedy appointed August Heckscher, Jr. to serve as the first White House art consultant. Heckscher produced a report entitled "The Arts and the National Government" in May 1963 in which he proposed the official employment of an art consultant and the creation of both the President's Advisory Council on the Arts and the National Endowment for the Arts.⁴⁰

President Kennedy accepted the report and, one month later, issued Executive Order 11112, which established the President's Advisory Council on the Arts for the purpose of investigating and promoting artistic activities. Moreover, Kennedy stressed the importance of protecting culture and art to the national interest at the opening ceremony for the new library at Amherst College in October 1963. He stated that the development of art and culture was a way to show the world the superiority of American democracy.⁴¹

When President Kennedy was tragically assassinated in November 1963, the actualization of support for culture and the arts was left to his successor, Lyndon B. Johnson. President Johnson created the Great Society programs and also showed a strong commitment to reviving support for culture and the arts.

President Johnson took over the cultural and artistic support policies started by Kennedy, and he signed the National Arts and Cultural Development Act in August 1964. This act authorized creation of the National Council on the Arts, composed of 26 art specialists appointed by the president. This group would decide the procedures and policies for artistic support and would make recommendations for the support of artistic groups that applied for assistance in the form of a matching grant. The matching grant system, as it is well known today, requires other sources, such as private entities, to provide conditional funding commitments in order for the applicant to qualify for federal funds. This is in contrast to the traditional provision of government subsidies and assistance payments to target projects regardless of the presence of other funding sources.⁴²

In September 1965 the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act was passed, and the NEA and the National Endowment for the Humanities were formed. The *Washington Post* called this action "a significant advancement." However, it was the establishment of the NEA that marked a large step forward for public art policy.⁴³

The NEA continued to implement subsidy policies for artistic activities and projects based on the matching grant system. In doing so, it increased the incentives for private contributions, and it has also greatly impacted on projects' ability to seek funds after gaining NEA support. Moreover, the NEA's assistance payments function as a social guarantee for nonprofit

organizations concerned with art and culture. These organizations have been given favorable treatment within the tax system (i.e., tax-deductibility of contributions), creating a synergy between public funding and donations gathered from the private sector.⁴⁴ In this way, public art policy in the U.S. has been constructed around the two key pillars of favorable treatment by the tax system and subsidies for projects.

Conclusion

The NEA has improved the level of artistic innovation and performances across the U.S. by managing and operating the assistance payments in the form of matching grants used to support projects proposed by artists and artistic groups. Thus, the NEA has raised the quality of “high art” (such as opera, classical music, classical music, and modern art) based on the guidance of the National Council on the Arts, with the aim of socially elevating art and culture to a national level.⁴⁵

The NEA established the Visual Arts Program, headed by Henry Geldzahler, in 1967. This is a support program focusing on modernism in art. Public support for sculptures and murals like this opened the way for the Art in Public Places Program (APP), which was associated to the implementation of a wide range of public art policies.⁴⁶ The APP program has promoted public art plans through regional city initiatives, and developed the approach of pursuing the installation of works of art in public spaces. The art critic Arlene Raven stated that “public art has completely changed” due to the visual arts program and expressed high praise for the establishment of the APP by the NEA.⁴⁷ Raven made this comment because this development was a catalyst for the federal government to adopt public art as a public policy agenda.

Around the same time as the NEA was forming the APP, other government agencies also created an art and culture program: the Fine Art in New Federal Buildings Program started by the General Services Administration (GSA) in 1962. This initiative encourages placement of public art in federal facilities and courthouses nationwide, and it demonstrated to people in the U.S. and elsewhere the high level of culture in government buildings.

The NEA is completely independent of any government agency, and it delivers assistance payments to projects carried out by local governments, municipalities, nonprofit organizations, and semi-public agencies. The GSA, on the other hand, has adopted a system whereby the direct creation of artworks is consigned by a government agency. The GSA’s early public art policy had the primary purpose of decorating buildings and beautifying the urban environment. However, at the same time it used art as part of its diplomatic strategy to appeal to foreign countries, displaying the U.S.’s modernization and prosperity.⁴⁸

Notes

1. Taisuke Katayama, *American Artistic and Cultural Policy* (Tokyo: Nihon Keizai Hyoronsha, 2006), pp. 298–311; Yasuyo Kudo, *Public Art Policy: The Change in the Public Nature of Art and America’s Cultural Policy* (Tokyo: Keisoshobo, 2008), pp. 62–63.
2. Accordingly, the system for supporting American art and culture is the most decentralized among the advanced nations. It is a distributed model based on regional and local communities. The Center for Arts and Culture, *The Politics of Culture: Policy Perspectives for Individuals, Institutions, and Communities* (New York: The New Press, 2001).
3. Yasuyo Kudo, *op. cit.*, p. 70; Taisuke Katayama, “American Cultural Policy,” in Yukihiko Ueno, *For People Learning Cultural Policy* (Kyoto: Seikai Souzousha, 2002), pp. 298–311; Hiroshi Shibuya and

- Taisuke Katayama, *America's Art and Cultural Policy and Publicness: Private Leadership and a System of Decentralization of Authority* (Kyoto: Showado, 2011); Susan C. Stokes, Thad Dunning, Marcelo Nazareno, and Valeria Brusco, *Brokers, Voters, and Clientelism: The Puzzle of Distributive Politics* (London: Cambridge University Press, 2013).
4. Nobuyuki Kawauchi, *The New Deal as a Social System: American Society under the Great Depression* (Tokyo: Gakujutsushupankai, 2005), Ch. 12; Nobuyuki Kawauchi, "Ben Shahn and the Federal Art Project," *Chubu International Review* Vol. 7 (April, 2012).
 5. Martin R. Kalfatovic, *The New Deal Fine Arts Projects* (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1994); Robert Atkins, *Art Spoke: A Guide to Modern Ideas, Movements, and Buzzwords, 1848–1944* (New York: Abbeville Press, 1993). For example, the opening of the picture-creating classroom for children at the Walker Art Center in Minneapolis is well known. Moreover, the Walker gallery was reorganized as a public art center to function as an educational facility for citizens. This took place after the Minnesota Arts Council made a proposal to and received support from the WPA. <<http://www.walkerart.org/about/mission-history>>
 6. Gary O. Larson, *Reluctant Patron: The United States Government and the Arts 1943–1965* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1983), pp. 10–12.
 7. The American renaissance was also called as the Beaux style. This was because American architects (starting with Richard M. Hunt) who had studied at the French École des Beaux-Arts played a central role. Harriet F. Senie, *Contemporary Public Sculpture: Tradition, Transformation, and Controversy* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), pp. 14–15.
 8. "The Culture of the 1950s" <<http://countrystudies.us/united-states/history-117.htm>> Natsuki Aruga, *20th Century America* (Tokyo: Chuko Shinsho, 2002), pp. 39–40; Yasuki Hamano, *The Media Century: The Creators of American Myths* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten Publishers, 1991); Karal Ann Marling, *As Seen on TV: The Visual Culture of Everyday Life in the 1950s* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996), p. 328.
 9. The strong economic performance during the 1950s made attempts to maximize employment, production, and buying power the government's duty. This was largely influenced by the Employment Act of 1946, which provided the basis for U.S. macroeconomic policy following World War II. "Public Law 79–304, 79th Congress, S. 380: Employment Act of 1946" <<http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/publication-series/?id=1099>> Tetsuji Kawamura, *The Modern American Economy* (Tokyo: Yuuhikaku, 2003), ch. 2.
 10. Eisaku Kihira, *The Road to Pax Americana* (Yamakawa Publishers, 1996); Eisaku Kihira, *The Formation of Pax Americana: An Analysis of the American Economic System during War-Time* (Tokyo: Toyo Keizai, 1995).
 11. <<http://www.terramedia.co.uk/Chronomedia/years/1927.htm>> After the Second World War, many ministries and government offices were established for the purpose of a cultural revival not just in America but also in various European countries. For example, in France Charles de Gaulle's Ministère des Affaires Culturelles was established in 1959; it became the origin of the current Ministère de la Culture et de la Communication. Eve Reynold, translation supervised by Ueki Isamu, *Culture and Society: Modern France's Cultural Policy and Culture Economy* (Tokyo: Maruzen Publishing, 2001); Xavier Greffe, translation by Emikio Kakiuchi, *French Cultural Policy-Cultural Practice and the Creation of Works of Art* (Tokyo: Suiyosha, 2007).
 12. Black Mountain College was established in Asheville, North Carolina in 1933 near Black Mountain. Eva Diaz, *The Experimenters: Chance and Design at Black Mountain College* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014); Mary E. Harris, *The Arts at Black Mountain College* (Boston: MIT Press, 2002).
 13. Fukushima Art Museum, "Traces of Immigration: Artists Who Went to America" (1993), p. 31; Yasuyo Kudo, *op. cit.*, p. 65; David Anfam, *Abstract Expressionism* (New York & London: Thames & Hudson, 1990); Marika Herskovic, *American Abstract Expressionism of the 1950s: An Illustrated Survey* (New York: New York School Press, 2003).
 14. Marika Herskovic, *American Abstract Expressionism of the 1950s An Illustrated Survey* (New York: New York School Press, 2003), pp. 12–13; Marika Herskovic, *New York School Abstract Expressionists Artists Choice by Artists* (New York: New York School Press, 2000), pp. 11–12.
 15. Junichi Kimizuka *The Great Men Who Made Up the American Pop Culture of the 60s: Music, Art, Literature and Cinema* (Okayama: University Education Press 1999); Alvin Toffler, *The Culture*

- Consumers: A Study of Art and Affluence in America* (New York: St. Martin Press, 1964; translation by Okamura Jiro, Keiso Shobo, 1997), pp. 190–206. Toffler gives the examples of doctors, engineers, and business managers with annual income of about \$40,000 at the time as being culture consumers. Alvin Toffler, *Future Shock* (New York: Random House, 1970).
16. The support for culture and the arts that came from multiple sectors from the 1960s onward allowed artists to avoid being too dependent on any single wealthy patron and gave a sense of belonging to artists and artistic groups. The multifaceted support system also gave the artists a high level of expressive freedom. Yasuyo Kudo, *op. cit.*, pp. 61–62.
 17. Janet Wolff, *The Social Production of Art* (New York: Macmillan Press, 1992), pp. 53–55; Takashi Sasagawa, *Art Sociology* (Hachioji: Tamagawa University Press, 2003), pp. 63–64. Wolff described the new types of occupations that arose in the 20th century such as graphic artist, designer, advertising artist, and community artist. Cf. also Janet Wolff, *Aesthetics and the Sociology of Art* (New York: Macmillan Press, 1993).
 18. Taisuke Katayama, “Cultural Economics and Cultural Policy,” in Yukihiko Ueno, *For People Learning Cultural Policy* (Tokyo: Seikai Souzousha, 2002), pp. 66–67. Culture and art do not adapt to market principles, so it is difficult for them to survive in the market system. However, the issue of the economic ripple effects is still raised in discussions of public support for art and culture as social policy.
 19. Kazuko Goto, *Public Art and Culture Policy* (Tokyo: Keiso Shobo, 1998), pp. 99–112; William J. Baumol and William G. Bowen, “On the Performing Arts: The Anatomy of their Economic Problems,” *American Economic Review*, 55-2/1 (March 1965), pp. 495–502; William J. Baumol & William G. Bowen, *Performing Arts: The Economic Dilemma* (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1966; translation by Moriaki Watanabe and Jun Ikegami, *Performing Arts: The Economic Dilemma* (Tokyo: Geidankyo, 1994).
 20. *External economies* is an economic term coined by the British economist Alfred Marshall. Alfred Marshall, *Principles of Economics*, Vol. 4 (London: Ulan Press, 2012), ch. 13.
 21. Andreu Mas-Colell, Michael Dennis Whinston, and Jerry R. Green, *Microeconomic Theory* (London: Oxford University Press, 1995); Neil Hart, “Marshall's Theory of Value: The Role of External Economies,” *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, Vol. 20, No. 3 (May, 1996), p. 353.
 22. Kazuko Goto, *op. cit.*, p. 112; William J. Baumol and William G. Bowen, “On the Performing Arts: The Anatomy of Their Economic Problems,” pp. 499–501.
 23. Bruno S. Frey, “State Support and Creativity in the Arts: Some New Considerations,” *Journal of Cultural Economics*, Vol. 23, Issue 1–2 (1999); Bruno S. Frey and Werner W. Pommerehne, *Muses and Markets: Explorations in the Economics of the Arts* (New York: Basil Blackwell, 1989); James Heilbrun and Charles M. Gray, *The Economics of Art and Culture: An American Perspective* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1993).
 24. Pierre Bourdieu, “Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction,” in R. Brown, ed., *From Knowledge, Education and Cultural Change* (London: Tavistock, 1973); SSM investigative research group edition, *Culture and Social Class*; SSM investigative series of 1995, 18th edition (1998). This type of research was taken up in Japan by people like Kataoka Emi. Cf. Kataoka Emi, “The Sociology of Art and Culture Consumption and the Features of Capital: The Structure and Characteristics of Japanese Culture through the Lens of Bourdieu's Theory,” *Cultural Economics*, sixth edition, Vol. 1 (March 2008), pp. 13–25; Mike Featherstone, *Consumer Culture and Postmodernism* (London: Sage Publications, 2007).
 25. Pierre Bourdieu, *Algeria 1960: The Disenchantment of the World* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1979; translation by Tetsu Harayama, *The Contradiction of Algeria and Capitalist Habits* (Tokyo: Fujiwara Shoten, 1993).
 26. The difference among cities is not just due to the scale of their population, but is also related to their social system and economic functions. Kazuko Goto, *op. cit.*, pp. 119–120. The following research by Stark et al. report was published on October 31, 2013. It states that current cultural policy in Great Britain is overly concentrated in London, and an example illustrating that no steps have been taken to make the policy fairer for the taxpayers. It is proposed that Great Britain's overly concentrated cultural policy should be redistributed to other areas. This is an extremely noteworthy argument. Peter Stark, Christopher Gordon, David Powell, “Rebalancing Our Cultural Capital,” <http://www.theroccreport.co.uk/downloads/Rebalancing_FINAL_5mb.pdf> Arts Council England, “Response to Rebalancing

- our Cultural Capital Report,” 2013 <http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/media/uploads/pdf/Arts_Council_England_response_to_Rebalancing_our_Cultural_Capital_Report_October_2013.pdf>
27. James Heilbrun and Charles M. Gray, *op. cit.*, pp. 44–46; Victor A. Ginsburg and David Throsby, *Handbook of the Economics of Art and Culture*, Vol. 2 (San Diego: Elsevier, 2014).
 28. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jacob_K._Javits> Yasuyo Kudo, *op. cit.*, page 66. John Wetenhall, “Camelot’s Legacy to Public Art,” Harriet F. Senie and Sally Webster, eds., *Critical Issues in Public Art: Content, Context, and Controversy* (New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 1992), pp. 143–144.
 29. “Postwar Conformity and the Seeds of Dissent in the 1950s” <<http://www.flowofhistory.com/readings-flowcharts/the-world-since-1945/the-post-war-world-1945-60/fc142>> In the Soviet Union, during the Stalin era, the autonomy of art was restrained. It is well known that Andrei A. Zhdanov, who oversaw cultural policies, suppressed many intellectuals and persons of culture. Ikuo Kameyama, *Crucifying Russia: Stalin and the Artists* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2010); Ikuo Kameyama, “Historical Research Surrounding the Censorship in Cultural Policy during the Stalin Era.” (Report of Research Results for a Grant-in-Aid given by MEXT: fundamental research C)(2004).
 30. Albert Fried, *McCarthyism, The Great American Red Scare: A Documentary History*. (London: Oxford University Press, 1997); Ellen Schrecker, *The Age of McCarthyism: A Brief History with Documents* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002); Saburo Kugai, *Hollywood and McCarthyism* (Tokyo: Chikumashobo, 1990).
 31. Yasuyo Kudo, *op. cit.*, page 66; “Fine Arts Programs in Colleges” <<http://www.lib.muohio.edu/multifacet/record/mu3ugb3436757>>
 32. Biographical Directory of the United States Congress <<http://bioguide.congress.gov/biosearch/biosearch.asp>> Donna M. Binkiewicz, *Federalizing the Muse: United States Art Policy and the National Endowment for the Arts, 1965–1980* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004), pp. 30–31; Cynthia Koch, “The Contest for American Culture: A Leadership Case Study on The NEA and NEH Funding Crisis” <<http://www.upenn.edu/pnc/ptkoch.html>> <https://www.govtrack.us/congress/members/frank_thompson/410779> <<http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=t000200>>
 33. In the Soviet Union, when Stalin died in 1953, the path of “peaceful coexistence” was adopted. After the 1955 Geneva summit meeting, France (1957), the U.S. (1958), and Great Britain (1959) signed cultural exchange agreements one after another. This led to a liberalization of the artistic field that accompanied the dispatch of cultural delegations. Yoshiomi Saito, “The History of Cultural Exchange between the Realist British and Soviets: A Discussion of Diplomatic History of the Political Dynamics Surrounding Cultural Permeation from 1953 to 1959,” *Kanazawa Hougaku*, Vol. 53, No. 2 (March 2011); “Cultural, Social, Artistic and Sporting Delegations to and from Soviet Union during 1954,” undated, FO371/116824, The National Archives of the United Kingdom; Richard J. Aldrich, *The Hidden Hand: Britain, America, and Cold War Secret Intelligence* (London: Overlook Hardcover, 2002).
 34. “Annual Message to the Congress on the State of the Union January 6, 1955” <http://www.actorsequity.org/aboutequity/timeline/timeline_1950.html> Takuya Sasaki, *The Eisenhower Administration and the Cold War* (Tokyo: Yuhikaku 2008). The John F. Kennedy Center Washington, D.C., officially called the The John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, was constructed in 1971 three years after the assassination of John F. Kennedy in 1968 based on the National Arts Service Act.
 35. Donna M. Binkiewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 22–23; U.S. Commission of Fine Arts, *Art and Government: Report to the President by the Commission of Fine Arts on Activities of the Federal Government in the Field of Art* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1953). This work investigates the process by which artwork is entrusted to an architect or sculptor. At this stage, no new directions were proposed. John Wetenhall, *op. cit.*, pp. 143–144.
 36. US Congress. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Federal Advisory Council on the Arts: Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, Eighty-fourth Congress, second session, on S. 3054. April 14, 1956.
 37. Kennedy was keenly nervous about the political aspiration of the multi-millionaire Nelson A. Rockefeller as the Republican Party’s presidential candidate in the 1960 election. Rockefeller was a prominent politician and a great patron of the arts. He became the governor of New York State in 1959, and in the following year the New York State Council on Arts was established. *US Congressional Records*, 87th.

- Cong. 1st Sess, 20499 <<http://www.nysca.org/public/home.cfm>>
38. <<http://nssdc.gsfc.nasa.gov/planetary/lunar/apollo.html>> “Apollo: Humankind’s First Steps on the Lunar Surface” <http://www.nasa.gov/mission_pages/apollo/missions/#.VBbIT_l_tjY> Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum, “The Apollo Program,” <<http://airandspace.si.edu/explore-and-learn/topics/apollo/apollo-program/>>
 39. Donna M. Binkiewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 31–35. This was an unofficial report, but it had a large impact on proposals for artistic support and systemization.
 40. “The Arts and the National Government” <http://books.google.co.jp/books/about/The_arts_and_the_National_Government.html?id=04kVAQAIAAJ&redir_esc=y>
 41. “Establishing the President’s Advisory Council on the Arts” <<http://www.thecre.com/fedlaw/legal13/eo11112.htm>> “The National Endowment for the Arts, A Brief Chronology of Federal Support for the Arts 1965–2000” <<http://www.NEA.gov/pub/NEAChronWeb.pdf>> Papers of President Kennedy, President’s Office Files, Speech Files, Box 47.
 42. <http://www.NEA.gov/about/NCA/About_NCA.htm> <<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=26736>> Nancy Einreihof, *The American Art Museum: Elitism and Democracy* (London and Washington: Leicester University Press, 1997), pp. 71–72.
 43. “How NEH Got Its Start” <<http://www.neh.gov/about/history>> William J. Baumol and William G. Bowen, *Performing Arts*, pp. 121–134; Kazuko Goto, *Public Art and Culture Policy* (Tokyo: Keiso Shobo, 1998), pp. 103–104.
 44. Art and cultural organizations received the guarantee of nonprofit organization status, and this effectively allowed them to get donations from the private sector, which would get favorable treatment in the tax system. This was called the seal effect, and it gave a type of social guarantee to those who received the NEA subsidies. Yasuyo Kudo, *op. cit.*, p. 63.
 45. Mark Bauerlein, ed. with Ellen Grantham, *National Endowment for the Arts: A History 1965–2008* (Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts, 2009). <<http://arts.gov/sites/default/files/NEA-history-1965-2008.pdf>>
 46. Stacy P. Harris, *Insight/On Sites: Perspective on Art in Public Places* (Washington: Partners for Livable Places, 1984), pp. 9–11; Donna M. Binkiewicz, *op. cit.*, p. 119.
 47. Arlene Raven, ed., *Art in Public Interest* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1993), pp. 11–12. The first chairman of the NEA was Roger S. Stevens, who was appointed by President Johnson from 1965 until 1969. Also, Stevens was the first chairman of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, founded in 1961.
 48. Yasuyo Kudo, *op. cit.*, pages 51–53; *Growth, Efficiency & Modernism: GSA Buildings of the 1950s/ 60s/ and 70s* <<http://www.gsa.gov/graphics/pbs/GEMbook.pdf>>

*Acknowledgement

This text is partially the result of research performed with the help of the Japan Society for Promotion of Science (JSPS) KAKENHI Grant and the Grant-in-Aid for Challenging Exploratory Research: No. 25580165.