Messaging I: Constructing the Argument
Messaging II: Arts and Culture Redefined

Two Sessions of the 2009 WESTAF Symposium:
Engaging the Now: Arguments, Research,
and New Environments for the Arts

The 2009 Symposium of the Western States Arts Federation
The Aspen Institute, Aspen, Colorado | October 15-17, 2009

Contents

Messaging I: Constructing the Argument

Presentation by Danielle Endres, University of Utah **1**

Response by Douglas McLennan, *ArtsJournal.com* **7**

Discussion **9**

Messaging II: Arts and Culture Redefined

Presentations by Joaquín Herranz, Jr., University of Washington; Jennifer Hahn, Douglas Gould and Company; and Jennifer Mello, Brandeberry McKenna Public Affairs **15**

Response by Ann Markusen, University of Minnesota **21**

Discussion **23**

References **34**

Symposium Presenters and Discussants **35**

Bibliography of Symposium Preliminary Readings **37**

Editor's note: The following selection is an excerpt of forthcoming printed proceedings of the 2009 WESTAF symposium on arguments, research, and new environments for the arts. WESTAF is releasing this portion of the symposium proceedings in advance of the publication of the full proceedings, which will be available in August 2010. For more information, please contact Erin Bassity at WESTAF at erin.bassity@westaf.org or 303.629.1166.

WESTAF
Western States Arts Federation
1743 Wazee Street Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80202
www.westaf.org | (303) 629-1166

Messaging I: Constructing the Argument

A Session of the 2009 WESTAF Symposium
Engaging the Now: Arguments, Research, and New Environments for the Arts

Presentation

Danielle Endres
My expertise lies in argument and rhetorical theory, not the arts. Rather than focus on arguments about the arts and cultural policy, I will focus on how to construct good arguments in any situation. I would like to begin by talking about what argumentation is and why it is useful. Then I will give a short case study that outlines my research on cross-cultural argumentation in the context of American Indian activism.

From an academic perspective, argumentation is the process of making arguments intended to justify beliefs, attitudes, and values in order to influence others. Arguments are the building blocks of persuasion, and they follow a basic structure. In this context, argumentation obviously does not refer to the kind of argument you might have with your partner or your child.

To illustrate, assume you want to persuade others to create a community arts center. Your argument will contain three parts: a claim, support, and reasoning. The claim is what you would like to persuade others to believe. In this case, you would claim that there should be a community arts center. The next piece of your argument is the support, which is the evidence or research that substantiates your claim. You could have many different forms of support. For instance, you could present examples of successful community art centers, statistical data, or evidence of existing support for an arts center in the community.

The research and data you present as support will not be accepted automatically by an audience. Reasoning is the component of the argument that connects the claim and the support in a way that makes sense to the audience. For example, if you supported your claim by providing examples of other successful community arts centers, you would then provide reasoning by illustrating similarities between your community and other communities with successful arts centers for your audience.

Reasoning also allows us to cross what is known as “the level of dispute.” When you begin the argument, the assumption is that you have a claim that is disputed by your audience. The best way to begin reasoning is by applying evidence the audience already accepts. Using this method, you can use an existing agreement to persuade the audience to agree with your claim. The structure of an argument—a claim, support, and reasoning—may seem obvious; however, argumentation becomes more complicated when considering the audience and the context.

The rhetorical approach to argumentation includes a few main characteristics. The first characteristic is known as “phronesis” or practical wisdom, which is the notion that we still make decisions even if there is more than one correct answer. For example, there is no universal answer to questions about arts policy or health care. There is no single truth. Phronesis is the ability to enter a situation and see the available arguments, weigh the options, and then make the best decision for that situation.

The second characteristic of argumentation is that it is contextual and situational. Last night, Doug McLennan explained how the broad context for arts policy is changing. We have new media, new audiences, and new situations that are changing the arena in which we create arts policy. On a more specific level, the policies we create exist within their own contexts. These different situations may require that we make different arguments.

Argumentation is audience based, which is a third characteristic. While engaged in persuasion, you are most likely dealing with an audience. Arguments for economic development are more likely to persuade an audience of legislators or business people than an audience of other constituencies. There are many different audiences. Your audience could be a legislature that cuts funding for the arts, or it could be an undecided public. Perhaps your audience already supports the arts, but you want to persuade it to take a particular action. The key is that you construct arguments to fit each particular audience.

There are many arguments to choose from in any given context, which is a fourth characteristic of argumentation. Although there is never a single “silver-bullet” argument that will persuade everyone, the best strategy is to analyze the potential arguments and choose the ones that work best for that situation.

Argumentation usually takes place across the private sphere, the public sphere, and the technical sphere. The private sphere is interpersonal argumentation. The technical sphere is expert argumentation, with its own audience and standards for how arguments are evaluated. The conversations taking place during this symposium lie in the technical

sphere of argument. Grant writing is another technical sphere of argument with its own specific guidelines for how arguments must be made.

However, most policy is created and discussed in the public sphere, where the standards for good arguments are less clear. This ambiguity makes it difficult to argue in the public sphere. The public is also very diverse. One misconception is that we can generate one argument to persuade all of the public, but, of course, the public is made of multiple constituencies, so there are multiple publics. Some of them are counter publics that are in resistance to the dominant public.

Ultimately, argumentation is an art form involving a particular context, a particular audience, and the appropriate arguments that will be persuasive to that group. The following guidelines for making arguments apply to most situations that require persuasion.

The first guideline may seem obvious: Decide what it is that you want. Determine what it is you are trying to persuade others to believe. This step is sometimes overlooked when we assume others know what we want.

Next, consider whether your argument lies in the context of the public sphere or a technical sphere. Making this determination will help you decide which arguments are useful. An important consideration is the audience: Who are you trying to persuade? The audience may be legislators, the public, voters, or other stakeholders.

Earlier, someone suggested that the arts and cultural policy field has strong data for illustrating the importance of the arts. In this case, those seeking to persuade decision makers and the public using such data should gather as much information about the audience as possible. There are many strategies for audience analysis, such as learning about demographics and interviewing audience members.

Once you determine the composition of your audience, you can select from the pool of possible arguments. For example, if you are advocating for an exhibit on Latina murals and your audience is completely unfamiliar with murals as an art form, you could begin by making arguments about the importance of murals. If your audience already accepts murals as an art form, you could make other appeals. You might emphasize the prestige of the artist or talk about the uniqueness of the particular murals or the experience of viewing the murals. That is an example of how you would select different arguments for different audiences.

Another strategy is to borrow ideas from other successful campaigns as long as they are comparable to your own campaign. An argument that appeals to an audience of urban youth might not appeal to an audience comprised of rural landowners. Another guideline is to acquire strong research in support of your argument. A final guideline is to employ multiple strategies. There is no single compelling argument that will persuade all audiences in all situations. Multiple argument strategies and campaigns for different audiences are often required.

I would now like to talk about my research as a way to illustrate some of the points I have made about argumentation. Generally, my research covers cross-cultural argumentation in environmental controversies. I follow a broad definition of culture: “A socially constructed system of symbols, meanings, premises, and rules” (Philipsen, 1997, p. 25). This definition is somewhat different from the idea of high culture or culture as activities, such as painting, opera, or theater. The definition I use represents culture as a community that shares language, ways of knowing, and symbol systems.

My research is largely focused on the Yucca Mountain nuclear waste controversy. You might wonder why I am telling you about Yucca Mountain at an arts and cultural policy symposium. In the Yucca Mountain controversy, American Indians—particularly the Western Shoshone and Southern Paiute—had to argue for cultural preservation of their land. The land on which Yucca Mountain sits is traditionally American Indian sacred land. The land is actually covered in a treaty that the Western Shoshone made with the federal government, but the treaty has been violated.

The American Indians' opposition to the Yucca Mountain site was almost solely grounded in their arguments for preserving their culture and for preserving their ability to be in that land. Yucca Mountain would have destroyed their artifacts and excluded them from the land. Unfortunately, their arguments were not successful with their non-American Indian audience. I am going to use some of these unsuccessful appeals to demonstrate how to be more successful when making a cross-cultural argument.

One of the areas in which the American Indians did not argue successfully was the area of values. Argumentation does not only include facts and statistics, but values always enter at one stage or another. Values often serve as underlying support that connects with our reasoning or our claims. An example of competing values was demonstrated during the Mapplethorpe censorship controversies, in which the value of free expression competed with the value of protection from obscenities.

In the Yucca Mountain case, both the federal government and the American Indians actually valued the same thing—land. What should we do in a controversy where both sides claim to support the same value? This situation can happen in arts policy as well because art has so many meanings. The statement “I value the arts” can mean very different things to different people, which can cause problems in argumentation. Understanding the high-order assumptions that underlie these values is required.

Chaïm Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969) are two theorists who talked about loci, which are high-order abstractions that allow us to understand what supports the value being discussed. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca argued about many loci, but I am going to talk about two—the locus of quality and the locus of quantity. The locus of quality is valuing things for their uniqueness. The locus of quantity is valuing something for utilitarian purposes—a numerical assessment of the greatest good for the greatest number of people. This contrast between values of quality and quantity is a common thing—it came up several times in yesterday's discussion.

In the case of Yucca Mountain, the American Indians focused on the locus of quality. They argued that the land was sacred and unique, that the land was part of their being, and that if Yucca Mountain came, there would be irreparable damage to the land. The federal government saw the land as a sacrifice zone. Not many people lived there, and it could be used for the benefit of the entire nation because we need a place to store nuclear waste. Both sides purportedly agreed that land was the key value, but by analyzing their higher order assumptions, we can see that their perspectives were very different.

Contributing to the halt of argumentation in the case of Yucca Mountain were competing worldviews. A worldview is a set of beliefs, and values can be part of a worldview. In the Yucca Mountain controversy, the American Indians and dominant Western culture had very different perspectives on land. In the American Indian worldview—and particularly in the worldview of the Western Shoshone and Southern Paiute—land is a sacred gift of the creator. If you are a traditional American Indian, leaving the land is not an option. Of course, American Indians must leave the land for jobs and other obligations, but those tribes are fundamentally connected to that piece of land. However, the Western perspective is that land is a resource. We are also a very transient people, and although we do sometimes develop place-based connections to land, we are not as fundamentally connected. We are usually willing to move for a job, for example.

In the controversy over Yucca Mountain, the American Indians could not understand why the federal government would force them to move away from the land. The federal government could not understand why the American Indians were unwilling to move and

recreate their cultural and spiritual experience elsewhere. This difference in worldviews caused a major point of stasis, and argumentation could not continue.

Finally, more problems arose due to institutional constraints that come into play any time a cross-cultural conflict exists. When I say “institutional constraints,” I am referring to large belief systems such as colonialism, racism, and hegemony. Because many dominant U.S. Americans do not understand sovereignty and the situation of American Indians, the American Indians' arguments did not have widespread acceptance.

This case study provides a key lesson for discussing art and cultural policy using argumentation strategy. Because argumentation should be constructed for specific audiences, it might be more fruitful to move research in the direction of audience analysis.

Response

Douglas McLennan

In political environments, a general understanding about framing exists: if you frame the question, you will win the argument because you are able to define it in your own terms. If there is a clash among cultures, the player setting the ground rules will win the debate. In a broader context, we must more clearly define the goals for our arguments in order to frame them property. I found earlier discussions about making the economic case for arts education somewhat frustrating because I did not find the arguments for arts education very clear.

When the National Endowment for the Arts was created in 1965, its mandate was to bring great art to all parts of the United States. By that definition, it has succeeded spectacularly, given the growth of the arts. However, the cultural landscape is quickly changing in some interesting ways, and to discuss arguments for the arts in older traditional terms is a construct that I find largely ineffective at this point.

When I created *ArtsJournal.com*, I had an initial theory about how people might use it. By compiling many stories about various art forms, I thought I could make it possible for people to stumble across things that they might not otherwise find. What I quickly discovered, however, is that people generally only want what they want. The people who are interested in music only go where music is—and I know this from when I was a music critic. Early on, people who went to rock concerts would not be caught dead going to the symphony. Despite this, we talk about the arts and the broader arts community as though commonality is a given. Given the diversity and fragmentation of culture, talking broadly about the arts and non-profit arts and even entertainment is not necessarily appropriate or applicable any longer.

I can offer a few thoughts from a journalistic standpoint. Journalism is in crisis right now—particularly journalism in the United States. One of the reasons for this, in my opinion, is that we have fallen into this trope of what we call “objectivity.” Objectivity in journalism does not truly exist when you come down to it, and yet every argument is framed as having two legitimate sides. This results in privileging even the most illegitimate argument by awarding credibility to it. Currently, in terms of policy in the United States, we are experiencing a rash of odd arguments that might not even exist without the obsession with perceived objectivity.

Public discourse about the arts has been largely absent from the journalistic sphere for the last 25 years. There once was a time when multiple voices talked publicly about art, but

that was mostly not the case in the later part of the 20th century. Now we are entering a period in which, according to Technorati.com, there are 300,000 arts blogs in existence. That means 300,000 people are putting their opinions about art and the art community into blogs. Many of these blogs are not frequently updated and are poorly written; however, what is significant is that people care about the culture they care about, and they argue passionately to make the case for what is important to them within that culture. Naturally, you see a certain level of fragmentation in that kind of discourse.

In closing, I find it problematic to talk about constructing an argument for the arts that does not accommodate what is happening in a very dynamic culture. Of people under the age of 21, some 85 percent are creating art online—which is a staggering number of people. They are creating videos and all kinds of art. In the public policy sphere of the arts, we do not have a way of capturing that kind of phenomenon. Yet, in a strange way, that may be where most of the art is happening these days. We must define our audience—especially if our audience is not who we normally expect it to be, determine our topic areas, and decide which questions we actually need to answer.

Discussion

Lynn Waldorf
Earlier, someone mentioned that as arts advocates, we have all that we need in terms of research to make the case for the arts. This might be true for making a broader, general argument in support of the arts. There are numerous arguments about why the arts are valuable, and the issue of those arguments being fractured is valid, watering down the whole case for advocacy. However, while we may have enough research, people do not make decisions based on data as much as on deeply held values and beliefs. In education, the underlying beliefs about the purposes of education play a central role in policy making, and that reflects back on Doug McLennan's comment that we need to define the underlying purposes of the arts in the local context. Before we even begin building an argument, we can use those underlying purposes as a basis for planning and identifying the targets for advocacy.

And I agree that this is what we are finding through the work of the California Alliance for Arts Education led by Laurie Schell. The Alliance is building a state-wide network of local advocacy coalitions, and the communities involved are faced with similar questions. What is our purpose? How can quality arts education address local needs and values? For example, if a community's needs are around workforce development, advocates will need data and arguments that show how studying the arts in school leads to career preparation in a variety of economic sectors. You can reframe arts education research as seeking answers to real-life concerns in a community, which creates a relevancy for the arts that has not been there in the past for many people.

Larry Meeker
One person I wish I had met during his lifetime is Wendell Chino. He was chairman of the Mescalero Apache in Ruidoso, New Mexico, for over 30 years, which is extremely rare in American Indian country. He suggested that nuclear waste be buried under the reservation at Ruidoso, which is a beautiful ski area overlooking the White Sands Desert. After a lengthy debate, the tribal council finally agreed to Wendell Chino's plan.

Wendell Chino was later quoted making what I believe to be the most focused economic-development statement I have ever heard—perhaps this is the kind of statement we need in the arts. Chino said, “The Zuni make jewelry, the Navajo make blankets, and the Apache make money” (Selcraig, 2008). The government of New Mexico was very upset about the notion of nuclear waste being trucked through its state, so it negotiated with the Mescalero Apache. It turned out that what Wendell Chino really wanted was a casino, and he got it. And everybody else went home happy.

I agree with Doug McLennan's suggestion that we should articulate what we want before we construct arguments for the arts. We shouldn't scatter the broad support for the arts, but perhaps we can mimic the support structure of the sports industry. The sports industry has a triangle of support. At the peak of the triangle are the professional sports teams, something we would equate to top-tier symphonies and ballets. That support then trickles down through the players and ultimately all the way down to kids practicing sports.

Maybe we need to start thinking about the arts in a similar context and create focused messages for the arts in general. Doug McLennan has suggested that we not respond reactively to the mass media. Further, if people are uninformed in an area like the arts and are asked what they want, the answer they give is not necessarily what they really want because they do not know the options. Our experience, expertise, and relationships in the arts put us in a unique position to create broad but focused messages for the arts much like how Wendell Chino accomplished so much for his tribe. In general, if we do that well, each of our organizations can go out and do the things they are best situated to do.

Ilona Kish
Like the American Indians in the Yucca Mountain controversy, we in the arts are not in a strong position. Moreover, we do not perceive ourselves to be in a strong position. Much of our argumentation is defensive—we are small, we do not generate much money, we have little political weight. Our perception of ourselves as marginalized prevents us from moving beyond the first step, where we insist that we are important but not valued. Something must shift in terms of our power and our perceived power before we can get what we want.

Danielle Endres
American Indians have struggled consistently with issues of marginalization such as low self-esteem, alcoholism, and depression. They feel marginalized because they are not a valued community and are subjected to racism and colonialism.

Despite their marginalization, Native American movements have taken completely non-defensive positions. They believe that they are survivors and that they have value, and they try to make their points as consistently as possible. There are reasons for Native American movements to make some defensive arguments, but their starting point is not defensive. Their assertiveness turns their right to survive into a reality for them. This illustrates the concept of constitutive rhetoric, which suggests that language used to describe the self leads the self to actualize the description. If we in the arts begin with the assertion that we are survivors and that we are respected, then we can take a non-defensive posture.

John Holden
Culture has fundamentally changed over the last decade. The not-for-profit arts used to define themselves in contradistinction to the popular arts, but they had much in common. Both the not-for-profit arts and the popular arts had gatekeepers—the not-for-profit arts had a bureaucratic class, and the popular arts had a commercial mandarin class. Now, not only can everybody make their own culture, but they can collaborate and communicate with each other, so those gatekeepers are gone. What is quality in culture and who decides what is quality have changed. The not-for-profit arts can no longer say they are the best in contradistinction to the worse commercial world. They are swimming in a sea that has changed.

The non-profit world must decide if it will either live in the past and remain self-defining or if it will learn that people create their own culture now and help them to express themselves. As Danielle Endres said, in order for the not-for-profit arts to prosper, this argument has to move from the technical sphere to the public sphere.

André Pettigrew
Crafting an argument in support of the arts seems to me a daunting task. First, we need to craft a cogent and sticky argument in order to pierce through the noise from other communications. The arts message must be widely heard. Second, we need to consider the importance of relationships. I find it a bit too academic to frame all arguments as two sides battling against one another until a decision is made. Foundational work in building and reinforcing relationships must be done in order to win arguments. Relationships are inherently important considerations.

The big argument for the arts must be broken into segments, and the segments need to be prioritized. For example, do we place an emphasis on funding? Education? Access? We cannot make all of the arguments with everyone at the same time, we must consider how our audiences vary.

Jennifer Novak-Leonard
John Kreidler and Philip J. Trounstine (2005) developed the idea of the “cultural ecology.” They represent the idea with a triangle, but rather than rank things in the triangle by importance, they rank them by the proportion of people involved. The bottom of the triangle represents the simple awareness of culture. The middle of the triangle represents participatory cultural practice. The top of the triangle represents professional cultural goods and services. Non-profit and professional arts only account for a sliver of the triangle. There is a movement toward valuing these activities in many traditional arts organizations, but how do we move people into our doors?

Before we can answer that question, we need to examine our values. Should we simply engage people and foster their creativity in whatever realm they may be expressing themselves? Or do we want to move people along a trajectory of activities toward one of the more traditional art forms? In order to set these priorities, we must define the ecology in which we function and clarify what we value.

Steven Tepper
Social movements start off with a frame—a way of understanding an issue. Snow, Burke Rochford, Worden, and Benford (1986) talk about frame alignment, which is a question of whether or not the frame resonates. In order for a frame to resonate, it must align with the preoccupations and interests of the audience it targets. There are four ways the frame can become aligned.

The first part of frame alignment is “frame bridging.” Imagine a frame that says the arts make people creative. Frame bridging is an attempt to make that frame relevant for people by tying it to something to which they are already ideologically sympathetic. If we say the arts make children creative, we create a bridge to parents who care about their children.

Another technique is “frame amplification,” which makes the frame more relevant by connecting it to something extremely important within the frame's context—usually a problem. For example, if our frame says that art is about individualism and expression, we can amplify it by connecting it to the Cold War and our relationship with the Soviet Union (as the United States did in the 1960s and 1970s).

Another strategy for aligning a frame is “frame extension,” which is stretching your frame to align with people who are not already in agreement with you but who might be sympathetic to your position. For example, if we talk about the value of art for localism, we can connect our frame to the local media movement or the environmental movement and sustainability. Then we can build alliances with people who have different versions of the localism frame.

Sometimes, a frame cannot be bridged, amplified, or extended. This happens when the frame is too different from how the culture currently thinks about an issue.

The last strategy for aligning the frame is “frame transformation.” An example would be to take the NEA's framing of the arts—“a nation deserves great art”—and its ability to bring great art to citizens, and change it to “we enable the creative capacities of our citizens.” Part of argumentation and advocacy is identifying the current frames we use in the arts, but we also must decide which of these framing tools to use with various audiences.

Danielle Endres
The key to the framing strategies outlined by Steven Tepper is that they push the argument across the level of dispute from accepted ideas to unaccepted ideas. Each framing strategy persuades the audience by connecting the frame to an accepted idea.

When you make arguments across cultures, particularly to a more powerful audience, you should know what you are willing to sacrifice. One easy way to persuade a dominant audience is to tell them you fit with their values, but sometimes that fundamentally undermines your own values and position.

An example of this situation is Indian gaming in California. In San Diego in the late 1990s, there was a campaign to expand the amount of gaming that could be done. The campaign ads said that American Indians needed more gaming in order to fulfill their *American Dream.* But by saying they are part of the American Dream, the American Indians undermined their ability to be recognized as a sovereign nation. As you construct your arguments for a dominant audience, think about what you are willing to sacrifice and what you are not.

Ann Markusen
I am currently finishing a project on Native American artists in Minnesota. My draft is massive and is based on many interviews with artists and gatekeepers of casinos and museums. It begins with information about how the artists' careers developed and continues on to discuss Native American culture. I sent it to several highly placed people in the non-profit arts world—people whom I respect enormously.

The non-profit arts people told me to only use the section on Native American culture and leave the rest out. They were only interested in reading about the ways in which Native Americans are different from themselves. A Native American partner of mine was upset by this response. She told me that Native American artists want the study to show that they are like other artists—they need to eat, and they need access to space and resources. I am in a difficult situation because the project has multiple audiences. We are writing for Native Americans, we are writing for the gatekeepers, and we are writing for funders.

Addressing multiple audiences with one document is a struggle. We certainly won't cut the section about the artists' careers from our project because the main thing we want to say is that the non-profit arts community needs to listen more than they do.

Julia Lowell
One reason the arts are in a defensive position—at least in the public context—is because arts-policy makers are constantly supplicating without appearing to offer anything in return. A few years ago, the Texas Commission on the Arts was going through a difficult time. The executive director, Rick Hernandez, came to speak at a WESTAF session. He said he was tired of going to the governor and the legislature and begging for money, so instead he went to the governor and asked him what the Texas Commission on the Arts could do to help the state meet its goals. The governor was quite surprised and had a number of suggestions that helped anchor the agency more firmly within the state government structure. Perhaps it is better to say, “We have something to offer” rather than “Give it to us, give it to us.”

Ilona Kish
As an advocate, you have to know whom you are representing. In the arts, we suffer from the corporatist approach. The question of whether I am advocating for the public benefit or the benefit of my arts community is a question that bothers me a lot. I advocate for my constituency to get something for them.

Larry Meeker
I would like to build on Jennifer Novak-Leonard's and Steven Tepper's comments. Regarding the notion of cultural ecology as a triangle that goes from simple awareness up to participants to professionals, perhaps we should add unaware people to the bottom. Our mission is to help people move up through the triangle so they can enrich their own lives through the arts. A companion to our research on argumentation could be research on how people decide to move up the triangle. There is a blossoming body of literature—books such as *Predictably Irrational* by Dan Ariely (2008), *The Black Swan* by Nassim Nicholas Taleb (2007), and *How We Decide* by Jonah Lehrer (2009)—that brings together economics, neurology, and psychology. If we knew more about how people decided, then we might be able to construct better arguments for the arts.

Messaging II: Arts & Culture Redefined

A Session of the 2009 WESTAF Symposium
Engaging the Now: Arguments, Research, and New Environments for the Arts

Presentations

Joaquín Herranz
As Doug McLennan mentioned earlier, the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) and the state arts agencies have been spectacularly successful at accomplishing their intended goals. Great art has been brought to the far corners of the United States, and President Barack Obama has signaled that he will increase funding for the NEA. One could argue that there is no problem. We are simply doing business as usual, which means going to the governor and trying to get a bigger piece of the pie. We all know how to do that very well.

Although there is a question of whose interests we should serve. Whose interests were being served when the NEA and the state arts agencies were set up to privilege and share high art? Paying attention to how symbolic and political interests shape the frame around which arts agencies work is important.

As Doug McLennan said earlier, things change. This is not 1965. The political environment has changed, the economic environment has changed, and, most important, the cultural environment has changed. What is culture and creativity? It has all changed, and we need to rethink the purpose of the NEA and state arts agencies.

In the last ten years, there have been two main political concerns at the federal level. The first is security—national security, individual security, health security, and food security. The majority of our federal tax dollars go to defense. The second main political concern is economic security. If we want more federal resources, those two areas are where we can get them. How do we make reasoned arguments and create a frame that allows us to tap into those resources?

Jennifer Hahn
Why do we have no traction? I do advocacy work in the area of arts education, and from what I see, the problem is not relevance or value but urgency and priority. I have worked

on many campaigns for social issues, and I have learned that the arts are a popular product. There have been successful public advocacy campaigns for clean-needle exchanges and abortion rights, which are much harder things to sell. Set aside your concerns about whether people can define the arts, how they should be delivered, and what qualities people want. You are selling something the public likes. They want it, and they think it is good. We have seen this numerous times in research, so we should not dwell on the feeling that we are not on the side of good and people do not want what we have to sell.

I work with districts in cities and try to give tools to local advocates all around the country. I recommend www.keepartsinschools.org as a resource. It is an online community for advocates doing this work, and there is good information there.

Many arts education advocates do not have enough chutzpah. They are sympathetic to other arguments, and they back down too easily. They say, “The state legislature is broke. What would we have them do? How are they going to make these tough choices? Do we really want to take money away from physical education programs?” As an advocate, you should not be concerned with that. You do not need to make decisions for the legislature—they are elected to those offices for a reason. You need to make your case. Some people make their cases by using very bold messages. For example, there is an organization called Art is Education. In that framing, then you need art. Otherwise, you are not educating your children, and the state constitution says you must.

The issue of relevancy has a history. In the 1970s, the legislature said it was taking the arts away because there was no money. In the 1990s, the problem was an issue of standards and testing, so there was no time. Now there is no money or time, but my arguments about arts education are focused on mobilizing parents. I have done the opinion research to find out how to get parents to fight for arts education.

Start with the parents who are art lovers because it is not hard to get them. Next, find the doers and the organized parents, which is a good place to start whenever you are trying to organize people. For example, if there is a group of parents who organized to get rid of the soda machine in the lunchroom because they thought it was bad, then educate them about why arts learning is good. Those are the people who are most likely to get involved. I recommend using arguments that are more on the education side than the arts side not because I do not believe in the intrinsic value of the arts but because as long as the arts community is begging to be let in the door of the education establishment, we are never going to get where we want to be. We want arts education as a core, integral part of a quality education for every child.

Instead of begging, we recommend that people mobilize the education establishment to value arts learning. This recommendation obviously exacerbated tensions within the arts community, and, in the very beginning, people did ask, “What are we doing for cultural providers and arts providers?” But I do not hear about people wishing to build audience nearly as much now as I did when we started doing that work.

I encourage my clients to learn about and adopt strategies from successful education-reform movements in local communities. I ask people to focus on local communities for a reason. The vision and space taken up by the No Child Left Behind program has confused people about how things happen in schools. The truth is that school-board trustees decide what children do during the school day, not congressional representatives, Arne Duncan, or anybody else. The NCLB says that states must test students, but they do not tell states how to test—states come up with their own instruments. Decisions about seat time, teacher training, what to teach, which staff are retained and which are let go—these are local decisions. They are made at the district level and the school level, and nothing works like rabid parents who show up and make noise. That is advocacy.

Messages do not wag the dog, but you are not going to be an effective advocate if you do not have a good message. For example, the Obama campaign was a single-message campaign with as many as 250 surrogates out in the media at any given time. Every single person could tell you what the campaign was about. That type of clarity and saturation are very effective.

Is it possible that we could get our message out by creating a persona for parents? If there is a soccer mom and a NASCAR dad, why couldn't there also be a mom or dad for the arts? We could develop a set of tools, values, experiences, and language that come with a persona.

One way in which we are very blessed in this community is that we have a lot of passion and a lot of people who can communicate passionately. Passion really matters.

Jennifer Mello
I am a contract lobbyist with many clients. I do not only represent Arts for Colorado. I also represent the Brain Injury Association and the American Cancer Society. My firm represents the city of Denver and our regional transportation district. That breadth is important because it helps us understand what works and with whom. We often say to a client like Arts for Colorado, “We understand that you really feel passionate about this idea, but it is not going to work. Let's move on and talk about what actually is going to work.”

I want to be clear that I am talking about legislators and the executive branch in Colorado because every state is different. We have 100 legislators in Colorado, and my job is to persuade them on behalf of my clients. One overused strategy is to talk about data. Unfortunately, research studies often do not matter to legislators. Research studies matter very much in other worlds but not at the state capitol. That is partly due to a limited ability to evaluate them. Legislators are teachers and attorneys and retired people. They are a cross section of society. If we went out and did a survey, how many people in Aspen would know what *r squared* or a *margin of error* means? They cannot evaluate research data, and in Colorado, we do not have a legislative staff that can do it for them. Some of the more blessed states actually invest in their public sector in a way that allows for that. We are not one of them. Of course, if the other side has a big stack of data, you need to come in with a stack of equal size. However, after each side spends five minutes presenting its data, the legislators will say, “Okay, it's a draw. Now let's move into the things on which we are actually going to base our decision."

The second strategy that does not work is to make vague or theoretical requests. For example, some arts advocates come to the capitol and ask their legislator, “Do you support the arts?” or, even worse, “Do you support arts education?” That doesn't mean anything, and it is way too easy for the legislator to just say “yes.” Then the advocate walks away thinking the legislator is going to do whatever the advocate wants, even though she or he has not committed to anything. It is much more effective to say, “I need you to vote yes on Senate Bill 123 that will ensure that the statute on arts in public places applies to all capital construction projects in the state.” That is a conversation you can have with legislators. Simply asking them if they support the arts does not work.

The final strategy that does not work is moralistic certitude and handwringing. I want to look at something Jennifer Hahn said earlier from another angle. In my experience working with arts advocates, I have seen a lot of self-righteousness. However, I think it is legitimate to debate whether or not the government should support the arts. I would argue “yes,” and I think we can win that argument, but we often don't even consider whether we have committed the sin of not respecting our audience. In any legislative body, there are likely to be conservative legislators who simply do not believe that the government should support the arts. If we start by talking to them in a way that disrespects them, we are not going to get very far.

The messenger is just as important as the message. In fact, it can be more important. We have talked about about having a high-profile champion, as in the case of the governor's sister-in-law in California. However, using a high-profile champion is a very high-risk, high-reward strategy. It is not something you can count on, and it will not last forever. Other

important messengers are people in a legislator's district. It is popular to talk about all the problems in American politics and call politicians awful. However, in reality, elected officials respond to people in their districts.

I am going to talk about two kinds of people within a legislator's district. The first are “grass tops.” Grass tops are not people who just vote. They are the people who run local arts agencies or who run organizations like the Arvada Center for the Arts and Humanities in Colorado. Grass-tops people tend to know the legislators already because that is the kind of people they are. They are engaged. We are doing a series of meetings with legislators around the state on behalf of Arts for Colorado. When we go to the legislator's district, we bring people from the district in to help us argue that we need to continue funding for the state arts council. When we bring in grass-tops people the legislator has known for 20 years, it is particularly powerful. They say to the legislator, “Oh, it's good to see you! How are your kids?” And then they say, “This is what I want you to do at the capitol.” It makes a significant difference.

One idea of Jennifer Hahn's that I completely agree with is that the voters and the grassroots are also very important. That causes a prioritization problem for legislators and legislative candidates. When I was a candidate for the state senate a couple of years ago, I knocked on about 10,000 doors in a district in Denver, Colorado. This was not the suburbs but an urban, core area. I only remember one person who brought up the arts. However, this one person was very adamant about determining my level of support for the arts. He wanted to know what boards and performances I attended, and he even wanted me to write a whole essay about my support for the arts. Those are the two extremes—voters either say nothing about the arts or they want a personalized five-page paper. Something in between would be more effective.

Every year, arts groups get together on one specific day for an advocacy event at the capitol. As the lobbyist, it is my job to connect people with their legislators. This is my problem every year: If 100 people come to the capitol, 84 of them are from two districts in Denver and two districts in Boulder, and those legislators already support us. The other 16 people are scattered throughout the state, so even though they are more valuable, there are not enough of them. We need people from Grand Junction and Colorado Springs, not just from the state's urban core. The messenger matters, and as a community, we need to do a better job with the broad population.

There are no isolated arguments in the legislature. Everything happens in context. The existence of term limits in Colorado has made a huge impact on that context. In 2008, we had 15 to 20 new legislators coming in, and I had to find out about them. What do they

care about? Do they know anything about the arts? Do they hate the arts? Then we had five or six legislators resign during the legislative session, and there was a replacement process for those people. We had to do a lot of work to find out where those legislators are on the issue of the arts. Arts is not a partisan issue, but politics matters.

We have a new state senator, Pat Steadman, who was appointed through a vacancy committee. I met with him a couple weeks ago, and he said that the arts are going to be his issue. I said that was great and asked why. He said the reason is that the voters in his district care about the arts. He is right—he is from a downtown district. There are people who want to be your champions, and that is great, but remember that their interest is partly for political reasons. They believe in the arts, but, more important, they think their voters believe in it. The same is true of our enemies. Whenever the arts come up, many legislators stand up and say, “This is absolutely not a public function, and we should not be funding erotica at the library in Boulder.” But they say those things in part because their voters want them to, so do not forget about politics.

School boards run school districts, so it is difficult to sell the legislature on arts education. Legislators consider 200 to 300 issues every single day of the session, and we have to present our argument with that context in mind. We cannot ignore the fact that they have other issues to deal with. We have to be quick, we have to know what we want, and we have to give individualized messages.

It is healthy to debate about which message is better, but the economic development message is working on the ground now in Colorado. The education message works with the people whose votes I will get no matter what. But the economic development argument gets the swing votes.

You must remember that state budgeting is a zero-sum game. Every dollar you get is a dollar someone else does not. That is why our message has not been “Do not cut the budget for the Colorado Council on the Arts.” Instead, we say, “Do not cut us disproportionately.” Legislators thank us for not being another group begging not to be cut because the legislators have no other option right now. Everything will be cut. Our message is that we understand, and we want to be partners with the legislators. We are willing to share the pain with everyone else. What we are not willing to do is to disappear, which is what almost happened in 2002, and we are not willing to take a 50 percent cut while everyone else takes a 10 percent cut. And our message is working.

Response

Ann Markusen

Before I became engaged with the arts, I worked in the military industrial complex, and I was the chair of the Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy for the American Association for the Advancement of Science. We should look to their advocacy model for elements missing from our approach. Science, engineering, and medicine have golden auras around them. I do not think our issues are any less important, but we do not just have a messaging problem—there is also a coalition-building problem.

The biggest part of the problem is our failure to organize beyond the non-profit arts world. We are in silos—the non-profit world, the cultural industry world, the arts faculty and presenters at universities, and the community-arts world. Even when the community-arts world gets organized as non-profits, which is uncommon, they do not get funding, and they are not considered to be high art. I would like to build on the work of Kreidler and Eng (2005) by talking about how we can broaden our notion of what arts and culture are in our economy. Earlier, Laura Zucker said that our role is to go and knock on the economic development door. Our role is also to knock on the cultural industry door.

In 2006, I published a study on Los Angeles and San Francisco Bay Area artists called *How Artists Build Careers Across Commercial, Non-profit, and Community Work,* at the request of the major arts foundations in California. The foundations receive no money when Hollywood uses the artists they train, so they wanted data that would show people that the art world and Hollywood are cross fertilizing. We looked at how common it is for artists to cross over into different spheres and what they gain from that. They frequently cross over to cultural industries—most music venues and recording, publishing, commercial theater, film, TV, video, media, and so on, and all communities have some variant of cultural industries.

Another area is the vast world of community arts and culture. Many immigrant communities do not call it “arts,” but they certainly call it culture. Thirty percent of all professional musicians work for religious groups, but the non-profit arts and cultural world has been very squeamish about embracing music and visual art in the religious sector.

A third important and untouched constituency is working-class people. Some legislators are hesitant to support the arts because white working-class people do not think they have anything to gain by supporting the arts. The largest attendance ever at the Guggenheim in New York was for the motorcycle exhibit. The Guthrie Lab Theatre in Minneapolis had its best ticket sales when it performed Barbara Ehrenreich's *Nickel and Dimed* (2001). The

theater was filled with working-class people who wanted to see working-class people and problems depicted on a major stage. So why are white working-class people so anti-art?

Another problem is the segmentation of arts constituencies in universities. Steven Tepper and Bill Ivey have done good groundwork on this issue, and they are going forward with some initiatives. At my university, there are five initiatives on my president's desk, and they are all about science, engineering, and medicine. Arts initiatives are missing because the visual arts, theatre and drama, media and journalism, architecture and design, and creative writing are all organized in separate departments. Furthermore, none of the people who do policy are in those schools.

I am in the public policy school, and I have been working to build those bridges on my campus. I advise people that we need to get together and increase our visibility on campus and in our communities. There are practically walls around university arts faculties —they relate to the rest of the arts academic world but not to their local communities. There are important performances at universities, and they serve important archival functions, but many universities get bad raps from their local non-profit arts organizations and artists. Fixing these relationships is part of redefining arts and culture.

Discussion

Frank Hamsher
Jennifer Hahn made an important point earlier about how data relates to messaging. Messages are really not about facts; they are about value statements. The most effective ones are forward-moving value statements that you want to support.

Laura Zucker
But legislators want to know you have the data. They do not want to actually see it. They just want to know it exists.

Frank Hamsher
Right. For each value statement you make, you need a couple of strong pieces of data. The data can be in the form of a research study, factual information, anecdotal information, hero stories, or however else you want to present it. Just be sure the data make your message more true than it would be on its own. If you have no data to support your message, perhaps the message needs to be rethought. Earlier, when Laurie Schell listed the parade of messages for arts education, I realized that some of them are simply conjecture, which could be problematic.

If you are talking to a legislator or anyone who can influence the resources that you need to move forward with an artistic project, you need research. Some legislators will ask to see it, but most will simply want to know that you have it. Either way, you should have it, and you should be conversant with it.

Ned Rightor
Earlier, Ann Markusen mentioned that working-class people are alienated from the arts. That raises a broader question about whether the arts actually illuminate the human condition if they are missing huge segments of human beings. However, no one has talked about how you start conversations about the arts with working-class people, in a legislature, or any people for that matter. One thing I have learned from doing numerous interviews is that people love to talk about themselves. Does anyone ask these people what art they do? What art they like? What art they did once upon a time? My advice would be: Start with them.

Ilona Kish
Joaquín Herranz, Jr. has asked the key question for me: What is the problem? If what you are asking for is not linked to an impact, perhaps you should try negative messaging. At a facilitator session we held a few years ago, the facilitator pointed out that we cannot talk

about what happens if everything goes wrong the way the environmental movement can: “If you do not act now, the planet will die in five years' time” or “If we do not change the way we work in development, 500 million African children are going to suffer.” What happens if we do not get arts education? We can start creating an answer to that by talking about the impact of the arts on society. As Laurie Schell mentioned yesterday, it is a bad idea to say that the arts will solve all our problems. However, we could start making a case with research, such as a study on arts participation in some specific delinquent area.

There is another question about what problems we are trying to solve. Is having a vibrant arts community an intrinsic good? Who does it serve? There is much resistance to that instrumental argument in our arts community. We have to get over that.

Frank Hamsher
Joaquín Herranz, Jr. mentioned that security is a major issue in our current context. Fifty years ago, our nation launched construction of an interstate highway system that now blankets the entire country. It was the first time the federal government had ever spent serious money on a national infrastructure in what was then considered to be a state and local province. Was it justified? This was done during the height of the Cold War. We were building a national defense system. Whether or not that was the real reason is irrelevant to us. It is an example of frame shifting, which Steven Tepper talked about earlier. We should think about shifting the frame for the NEA. Is our goal to bring great art to the entire country? Or is it to unleash the creative talents of all our citizens? Those are two related but distinct messages to consider.

John Holden
Ann Markusen and Jennifer Hahn both made points about the importance of how we describe ourselves. In the U.K., we describe ourselves using terms such as “not-for-profit,” we talk about “subsidies,” we talk about the “right to fail,” and we say we have to be governed by “trustees” who are presumably trustworthy while we are not. However, the whole world receives public money in one form or another. The defense industry calls it “public procurement.” Farmers call it “top-up payments.” The automobile industry gets “investments.” Why do we use this self-loathing, apologetic language that completely lacks confidence about who we are and what we do?

Jennifer Hahn
I want to respond to Ilona Kish's question about the possibility of using a negative frame. Can we tell people that if they do not do what we want, something bad will happen? Generally speaking, that is a dangerous course. Unless you can show a direct causality,

you risk losing the trust of your audience. Using a negative frame also does not build on people's better angels. People want to solve problems and make decisions based on their values.

The other issue with using a negative frame is that you will undermine your frame if you define your problem around the same system you are counting on to deliver the solution. For example, if you say that schools are failing our children by refusing to integrate the arts into education, then you are also saying that the schools fail. If your solution is to get more arts education into the school, you are undermining the vehicle that you need to succeed.

One alternative to using a negative frame is to raise the specter of opportunity cost. For example, we say that arts education develops the whole child and is integral to the well-rounded education that every child needs. Then we talk about sustaining that commitment to allow kids to have a successful future. This raises urgency by talking about good things that may not happen. It is a better strategy than saying, “You better do what we want or there will be dire consequences.”

André Pettigrew
Joaquín Herranz, Jr. made two points that made me think. First, he asked, “What is the problem?” The pie is growing. NEA has essentially accomplished its mission. It is important to declare victory when you accomplish your mission. If you do not, there is an assumption that you are still working on it. This is a subtle messaging piece related to what John Holden talked about. There is a significant difference between saying “Our plan hasn't worked and we need more resources” and “We have succeeded, and we are ready for round two.” I have worked in the venture-capital industry, investing in early stage technology companies, and I learned that it is crucial to declare and promote every milestone in those early stages. Declarations of victory add value in the long term.

Today, at the federal level, the focus is on defense and economic recovery. Defense has always been the biggest piece of the pie in the federal budget. There is tremendous uneasiness around security—there are even whole sets of drugs being prescribed just to calm people down. Perhaps you can make a case that the arts provide emotional security. Highlight what local arts do to provide a level of calm, and tell people why they should make that relatively small investment instead of building a B-1 bomber. That is where the money is.

Frank Hamsher
To add to André Pettigrew's point about declaring victory, I would like to say that all of us—whether in our individual, collective, or public lives—like to be associated with winners. The public often gets the impression that the arts community is a poor, bedraggled, beleaguered group, always on the brink of disaster. Although there may be some truth to that, that image is hard for the public and legislators to associate with. However, there are many victories to declare, particularly when you start talking about individual institutions, activities, and programs. Make sure those events are declared and celebrated not as end points but as launching points for what is next.

Laura Zucker
Danielle Endres made a point about asserting a positive identity. Our messaging is all being framed as argumentation, which is oppositional. I prefer to change the paradigm and get the people I would be arguing with to carry my water. I want to get them on my team of people who want to move the initiative forward. That takes more person-to-person work up front, but it makes things easier later. A few years ago, we doubled our grant program from $2.25 million to $4.5 million. We did it by talking to a key point staff person from each of my five decision-making offices. We told the staff people that we thought grants for arts organizations could help with the issues we were dealing with. We gave them a long list of reasons why this was true, but all we really wanted was to double the grant program. Eventually, we told them that if they doubled the money, we could address unincorporated areas and could fund service organizations to help support the infrastructure. We said we could support arts education in the particular ways that they cared about. We gave them a very detailed list of things they could buy. When we finished, they discussed the pros and cons, saying, “Wow, we could do this! Wow, we could do that!” Finally, one of them said, “I think we should just double it.”

They all talked to their bosses and the next thing we knew, the money was in the budget. It took no advocacy. It took building ownership. That is a key alternative to being oppositional.

Kwende Kefentse
Ann Markusen's comments about audiences reminded me of something I experienced recently in Toronto. I saw a play that came over from London called *The Harder They Come*. For those of you who do not know, it is based on a Caribbean piece of cinema. You could call it a “yardie” film, something that was never intended to go anywhere beyond the Caribbean diaspora. However, Caribbean people have immigrated to London *en masse*, and they put together a play based on *The Harder They Come*. When it came to Toronto, it sold out every night.

I never expected to see anything so personal on a stage. The whole Caribbean community and everyone they were affiliated with had all come out and filled the theater. I have been to the Pantages for *The Phantom of the Opera*, *Ragtime*, and many other musicals, but I have never felt anything like the feeling of community in that theater. It came from the strong connection with the audience, and the performers understood that.

There is a huge Caribbean population here, and they will plug into this. And kudos to the Pantages Theatre for putting it on and to the city of Toronto for promoting it as they did. That was a time where “high art” met “low art” for profit for everybody. I was blown away by the way they connected with the audience. It was amazing.

Keith Colbo
Those working in the arts have a difficult time framing the discussion. Arguments are framed by what we face at a state level. What is the revenue picture that will frame your arguments? As you come down, you face reality. Are you going to be defensive? Are you going to ask for reasonableness? Are you going to support a cut to be reasonable and work with your fellow legislators? I have done it. Many people distrust the legislature, and in some cases with good reason.

I watch parties perform across the aisle from one another. I know by mid-session that if I can convince one particular legislator to support the arts, I will have two more automatic votes sitting beside them. I do not have to talk to those people. There are other people I do not want to talk to because I do not want to inflame them. That narrows the audience that I address as a lobbyist.

We lose influence when we do not follow our champions as they leave the decision-making bodies, whether they are elected officials or legislators. Keeping them engaged in the discussion is important. They know the arguments, and they support you. We occasionally ignore elected officials. State policy decides much of what local governance does, and we do not pay enough attention to them.

We also often ignore political party platforms. Some legislators have no particular positions other than, “I am running to change things.” If those legislators are running within party platforms, then we will be driven by those platforms. And if the whole platform is silent on the issue of the arts, those legislators will look to their peers.

Economic development is the current focus, and it will be the focus for some time, but I see an approaching trend that will be difficult for the arts and culture to deal with: the tax issue. As we change to meet these new challenges, our arguments and presentations will be most important.

Larry Meeker
Ann Markusen is correct in saying that we have isolated ourselves within silos. We also have a strong resistance to getting out of those silos. But if we argue that the arts message is self-evident, we are also telling the politicians we argue with that they are uncultured. And if they do not buy into that, then we send them a very negative message.

To get out of those silos, we must link ourselves with other causes. Nearly all causes are linked to other causes in some way. For example, would we be for public education if it did not produce higher incomes, make lives better, and keep people out of prison? The case for education would be far weaker if we could not link it to social benefits. Think of all the businesses that support charter schools because they know they need an educated workforce to compete in the world economy.

We need to focus our attention on legislators and advocates like Jennifer Mello. What do they need? If I can link strong arts programs to keeping people out of prisons, that will carry the day for some legislators interested in incarceration issues. If I can link the presence of arts and cultural amenities to economic development, that will carry the day for others. We need to link the arts to every other area of political and human interest we can find.

We can and must do much of that linking through research. I am president of the Kansas City Jewish Museum. We have an art gallery space in an assisted living facility. We are currently exploring how we can better use our art exhibitions and programming to improve the lives of senior citizens. We hope to demonstrate that improvement with research. If we can make that link, I think our gallery will be open for more funding from the medical arena as well as the arts arena. It also gives us another message for people interested in assisted living facilities and the issues of senior citizens. That in turn gives us another constituency to which we can link the arts argument. These linkages are extremely important, so we have to resist staying in the silo. It is easy to talk to our own, but we have to branch out.

Frank Hamsher
Your point is a reminder of one of the beauties of talking to legislators about the arts. You can probably find a relevant link for all legislators, no matter how disconnected they seem from the arts as a whole. There is probably an art organization that supports something in which they are interested.

Jennifer Mello
What I need are bodies. It is great to spend time working on the arguments and the message, and it will certainly help me if you can prove some connection between the arts and keeping kids out of prison. But what would be more helpful is to have 100 people in every legislator's district who will make the phone calls and show up. That is the piece we are missing in Colorado.

We have done tours around the state where we meet with the legislators in their district, and then we pull in people from the district. In one legislator's district, there is a woman who runs a high-end framing company. She does most of the framing for the art museum here in Denver, and she does also framing for the Air Force Academy, which has a big art collection. She was able to say to her legislator, “I live and work in your district. There are three jobs in my facility.” That specific story is more powerful than big-picture arguments.

Ned Rightor said we should start with legislators wherever they are, and he is right. It is helpful for me to find out whether a legislator goes to the symphony or if they are on the board of a small museum in their district. Elaine Mariner, the director of the Colorado Council on the Arts, is a great source of that type of information. She knows what is happening in every community in the state, and we can go to her and say, “We need to talk to Sean Marshall in Broomfield about the arts. What is going on up there?” She will tell us who to call, and they will say, “Oh yeah, Sean Marshall came to our performance last week.” After that, you are already halfway to reaching the legislator. The personal level of argument is critical.

Ann Markusen
To respond to Frank Hamsher's analogy of the construction of the interstate freeway system, I would like to talk about the Works Progress Administration (WPA) period in the 1930s and what happened with arts at the time. At the beginning of the WPA, arts projects were included as either infrastructure, like putting something on the walls of a post office, or to employ an artist. The federal government quickly realized that in order to sustain these projects, it needed messages for the whole American population. The first message it developed was about celebrating and fostering American art and distinguishing it from European art. The second message was a diversity message. For the first time, the

government said that the United States is a land of immigrants—although this did not include African American or Native American people. The leaders in Washington used these new themes to support the work on the post office walls, the living theatre project, and even music.

In this time of deep economic displacement, is there something the arts can offer? Can we address unemployment and despair with our talents and creativity? We are not talking about this opportunity. It is likely that the economy will not improve as it did in the WPA period, so the issues ahead of us are daunting. How can arts and culture help those in our communities who are suffering and trying to figure out how to go forward?

Frank Hamsher
Much of the work that was done 70 years ago has a long-lasting shelf life. A lot of archival work, historical work, and descriptive work about our artistic legacy is a result of investments made to fight the Depression by putting artistic people to work. The long-lasting nature of those efforts goes well beyond what a lot of us have been involved with more recently.

Ann Markusen
We would not have written records of the oral histories of slaves if it were not for the Federal Writers' Project in the South. And some historians opposed it at the time because the oral histories were not written down and did not seem real to them. So you are absolutely right in many different spheres.

Laurie Schell
One problem we encounter is that our messengers are often too self-interested to be convincing. The arts community goes in to protect its own turf, programs, and budgets. Another example is education, where teachers are often forced to stand up in front of the school boards to protect their own jobs. Those are not great messengers. We need to get out of the silos and get the public engaged in the conversation. They will do the advocacy work for us.

Danielle Endres
Although the issues of language and relationship are important considerations, it is also important to remember that we do not need to persuade every audience. There are times when it is appropriate to say, “That person is never going to be persuaded, and I am going to leave them out.” Both in a legislative context and in a public context, you do not need a 100-percent vote. An important part of audience analysis is figuring out who are the

persuadable people. So if you find out that a legislator does not care at all about the arts and has never done anything artistic, you should cross that legislator off your list.

Doug McLennan
Orchestras are having a leadership crisis. Attracting board members with stature is difficult. That is partly because we do not have enough ways to engage people. You cannot just go to people you do not know and ask them to be on your board. You have to have a relationship with them. Our arsenal of methods for promoting engagement with organizations and communities is too small. Our strategies are even misaligned in the sense that we do not allow people to support us in a variety of ways. And when you finally want something big from somebody and you do not have the kind of relationship or context that allows you to ask for it effectively, then you have a problem.

To respond to Jennifer Mello's point about needing more bodies, we need to incentivize people so they are not just supporting the arts because it is right or because we want them to. What else do they get out of supporting the arts? People love to contribute in a variety of ways, and we should explore more ways for people to get involved. If you want 100 bodies from each district in the legislature, start with a smaller goal. First, find ways to engage people so that when they participate, they are not solely giving something—they should also be getting something. Incentivizing people to become more engaged with what you want to do is much more powerful than asking them to keep giving and giving. Realigning incentives for people might be part of the paradigm shift that needs to happen.

Larry Meeker
Ann Markusen raised the question of what we can do to take advantage of our weak economic times. I concur that the next few years will be long, protracted, and difficult. Perhaps this is an opportunity for us to look at the cultural diversity in this nation. I believe we are undergoing an economic paradigm shift; what we are experiencing is not simply part of a cycle where things return to where they were before. Much of the consumption is going to take place in other countries and with other groups of people, and our cultural diversity can give us an advantage in addressing their needs. We have an ability to put money into ideas and create businesses far exceeding any other nation, in part because our cultural diversity keeps us in touch with global markets. I suspect we could construct an argument that the arts help us understand our differences better, making us more competitive in the business world.

On a different tract, we ought to step up to the challenge of constructing the arguments of our opponents for them. The only thing my parents asked me to do in high school was to take a semester of debate. I did and went on to take all the semesters of debate. That

form of argumentation is valuable because it forces you to argue one side of an issue for an hour and then switch to arguing the other side for an hour. Forcing ourselves to argue against the arts may strengthen us in our convictions for the arts. It would also show us that there are many answers to what we want. We might then soften or better adapt our approaches, thereby becoming more helpful to people like Jennifer Mello when trying to convince others.

John Holden
The arts have to be relevant if we are going to get people standing behind us. Earlier this year, I thought there were three things the arts ought to be doing. One is providing a source of comfort, support, and solidarity in these troubled times. I do not think it is a coincidence that the latest Bond film had this curious title, *Quantum of Solace*. I did not know what it meant at the time, but now I think I do. A lot of the arts have become about comfort, reassurance, and helping people cope.

The second thing I thought the arts should be dealing with is anger. The public is legitimately angry with the political process and the economic structure. The arts ought to explore that. There have been a few plays and some music on the London stage that expressed that anger.

The third and most important thing the arts should be doing is exploring new territory. The arts should think of ways to develop from where we are—not to get back to where we were but to create something better for the future.

Susan Steinhauser
How do we shift this paradigm of the arts community as marginalized? What are the first three steps we need to take to appear more like the Canadian or U.K. models? We would no longer be focused on whether we are valued and how to become essential. How do we remove ourselves from this victimization, and how much time will it take? Who will be the players? What are the three key questions we need to answer?

Larry Meeker
The victimization of the arts community comes from us. That is clear. We carry that victim image when we tell legislators, “You need to support the arts because they are good for you,” but then we do not explain why. If our political constituents demand that we show a link to educational achievement or economic development, then we ought to respond to that, but we do not have to enter that exchange as victims. We create those links, we support those links, and we get others to support our cause because it is a linked cause and because they know we support their causes as well.

Jennifer Mello
The economic development argument is powerful in part because it casts the arts in a helpful light. The argument says that we are an important part of the economy, and we know that because the Colorado Council on the Arts did a great study that quantified a significant number of jobs in the creative economy. It is the fifth largest industrial sector in our state.

The Colorado governor is up for reelection this coming cycle, and one issue he will run on is renewable energy. He has done a lot of work around renewable energy, and it has been framed in a job-creating perspective as well as an environmental perspective. Elaine Mariner and others have worked hard to position the arts and the creative economy in a similar light. If we were the next renewable energy solution, we would be giving politicians what they want and need—politically popular things they can go out and talk to voters about.

Julia Lowell
We have to rely on economic arguments because they appeal to all the people who do not highly value the arts. We can persuade those people that the arts are worth supporting because the arts create jobs in their communities.

To answer the deeper question of why people in the United States do not value the arts, we have to look at children. People do not value the arts because they are not taught to value them from a young age. That problem dates back at least 150 years in the United States. If you do not get the kids, how are you going to get the grownups?

References

Ariely, D. (2008). *Predictably irrational: The hidden forces that shape our decisions*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

Ehrenreich, B. (2001). *Nickel and dimed: On (not) getting by in America*. New York: Metropolitan Books.

Kreidler, J. & Eng, M. (2005). Cultural dynamics map: Exploring the arts ecosystem in the United States. Version 1.0. Retrieved July 10, 2005, from www.culturaldynamicsgroup.org.

Cultural Initiatives Silicon Valley. (2005). Creative community index: Measuring progress toward a vibrant silicon valley. San Jose, CA: Kreidler, John and Philip J. Trounstine.

Lehrer, J. (2009). *How we decide*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Markusen, A., Gilmore, S., Johnson, A., Levi, T., & Martinez, A. (2006). Crossover: How artists build careers across commercial, nonprofit and community work. Minneapolis, MN: Project on Regional and Industrial Economics, Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota.

Perelman. C. & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1969). *The new rhetoric: A treatise on argumentation*, trans., J. Wilkinson and P. Weaver. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Philipsen, G. (1997). A theory of speech codes." In G. Philipsen and T. Albrecht (Eds.), *Developing Theories of Communication* (pp. 119-156). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Selcraig, B. (2008). Tribal golf. *Southwest Airlines Spirit Magazine.* Retrieved from: http://www.spiritmag.com/2008_09/features/tribal-golf.php.

Snow, D.A., Burke Rochford, L., Worden, S.K., & Benford, R. (1986). Frame alignment processes, micromobilization, and movement participation. *American Sociological Review,* 51: 464-481.

Taleb, N. (2007). *The black swan: The impact of the highly improbable*. New York: Random House.

Symposium Presenters and Discussants

Danielle Endres
Professor of Communication, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah

Jennifer Hahn
Principal, Douglas Gould & Co., New York, New York

Frank Hamsher
Public Policy Consultant; former Senior Vice President and Partner of the civic policy and public affairs firm Fleishman-Hillard, St. Louis, Missouri

Joaquín Herranz, Jr.
Public Policy Professor, Evans School of Public Policy, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington

John Holden
Visiting Professor, School of Arts, City University, London, England; Associate at Demos, a think tank focused on power and politics, London, England

Kwende Kefentse
DJ, Journalist, and Scholar, Ottawa, Canada

Ilona Kish
Secretary General of Culture Action Europe, Brussels, Belgium

Julia Lowell
Economist and Consultant, The RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, California

Ann Markusen
Economist; Professor and Director of the Project on Regional and Industrial Economics, Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota

Douglas McLennan
Editor, *ArtsJournal.com*, Seattle, Washington

Larry Meeker
Professor of Economics, Western New Mexico University; former Vice President of the Federal Reserve Bank, Kansas City, Missouri

Jennifer Mello
State Legislative Lobbyist, Denver, Colorado

Jennifer Novak-Leonard
Senior Consultant, WolfBrown, Chicago, Illinois

André Pettigrew
Executive Director, Denver Office of Economic Development

Ned Rightor
Researcher, Writer, and President of New Economy Dynamics, Boston, Massachusetts

Laurie Schell
Executive Director of the California Alliance for Arts Education, Pasadena, California

Steven J. Tepper
Assistant Professor of Sociology and Associate Director, Curb Center for Art, Enterprise, and Public Policy, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee

Lynn Waldorf
Executive Director, Griffin Center for Inspired Instruction, Denver, Colorado

Jon Hendry
Film Technicians of New Mexico (Representing Eric Witt, Senior Policy Advisor to New Mexico Governor Bill Richardson, Santa Fe, New Mexico)

Laura Zucker
Executive Director, Los Angeles County Arts Commission; Director, Arts Management Program, Claremont Graduate University, Claremont, California

Bibliography of Symposium Preliminary Readings

The items presented below served as background reading for symposium participants and observers of the 2009 WESTAF Symposium. Readings appear in the order in which they were presented to readers in the original symposium reading packets.

Christopherson, S. & Rightor, N. (2010). The Creative Economy as “big business”: Evaluating state strategies to lure film makers. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*.

Rollins Saas, D. (2006, October). *Hollywood east? Film tax credits in New England.* New England Public Policy Center at the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston. Retrieved from http://www.bos.frb.org/economic/neppc/briefs/2006/briefs063.pdf.

Weiner, J. (2009, January). *A memo regarding the cost-benefit analysis of Connecticut's film tax credit.* New England Public policy Center at the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston. Retrieved from http://www.bos.frb.org/economic/neppc/memos/2009/weiner011609.pdf.

The Western States Arts Federation. (2008). *Film and economic development.* Proceedings of the 2008 WESTAF symposium, San Diego, CA.

Ernst & Young. (2009). *Economic and fiscal impacts of the New Mexico film production tax credit.* Retrieved from http://www.nmfilm.com/locals/downloads/nmfilmCreditImpactAnalysis.pdf.

Paul, D. (2009, September 9). In Michigan, dream factories aim to replace auto sites. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2009/09/09/realestate/09film.html.

Hancock, J. (2009, September 22). With or without abuse, value of Iowa film incentives is difficult to measure. *The Iowa Independent.* Retrieved from http://iowaindependent.com/20038/with-or-without-abuse-value-of-iowa-film incentives-difficult-to-measure

California Alliance for Arts Education. (2005). *Quality, equity, access: A status report on arts education in California public schools grades pre-k through 12*. Retrieved from http://www.artsed411.org/advocate/docs/CAAllianceforArtsEd_AccountabilityArtsEd_2008.pdf

Fiske, E. (ed). (1999). *Champions of Change: The Impact of the Arts on Learning*. The G.E. Fund and the John D and Catherine T. Macarthur Foundation, p. XVIII-XII; 91-98.

LaFleur, J., Russell, C.A., Scott, T.A., & Reisner, E.R. (2009). *Evaluation of the Beacon Community Centers middle school initiative: Report on the first year.* New York: The Wallace Foundation. Retrieved on October 1, 2009, from http://home.nyc.gov/html/dycd/downloads/pdf/beacon_middle_school_initiative _report0609.pdf

Serrano, J.M. (2009, July 6). Saving arts education from politics. *Gotham Gazette.* Retrieved from http://www.gothamgazette.com/article/fea/20090706/202/2958.

Arts education: Creating student success in school, work, and life. (2006). Retrieved from http://www.artsusa.org/networks/arts_education/arts_education_015.asp

International Economic Development Council. (2006). *Chapter 1: Introduction to Economic Development.* Washington D.C.

Meeker, L. (1996). *Doing the undoable deal.* Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City Monograph. Retrieved from http://www.frbatlanta.org/invoke.cfmobjectid=DC6AD6E0-8061-11D5-897D00609459DBE6&method=display

Meeker, L.G. (2004, January). The arts as economic development. *BANKNEWS.*

Tepper, S.J. (2002). Creative assets and the changing economy. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society,* 32 (4), 159-168.

Markusen, A. & Gadwa, A. (2009). Arts and culture in urban/regional planning: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, forthcoming.

Markusen, A. (2009). The economics of arts, artists, and culture: Making a better case. *Grantmakers in the Arts Reader.*

Litvak, I.A., & Litvak, M.A. (2009). Economic development and U.S. Film incentives. *Economic Development Journal,* 8 (1), 14-21

Pages, E.R., & Toft, G.S. (209) Benchmarking innovation. *Economic Development Journal, 8* (1), 22-27.

Nivin, S., & Plettner, D. (2009). Arts, culture, and economic development. *Economic Development Journal,* 8 (1), 31-41.

Endres, D. (2009). The rhetoric of nuclear colonialism: Rhetorical exclusion of American Indian arguments in the Yucca Mountain nuclear waste siting decision. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 6 (1), 36-60.

Inch, E.S., Warnick, B. & Endres, D. (2006). *Critical thinking and communication: The use of reason in argument (5th ed.).* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Endres, D. (2002). Responding to multiculturalism in the real world: Re-envisioning argumentation pedagogy to Include culturally diverse methods of argumentation. *Proceedings of the Fifth Conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation, eds., F. H. van Emerson, J. A. Blair, C. Willard, & A. F. S. Henkemans*. (Amsterdam, Sic Sat, 2002).

McCarthy, K.F, Ondaatje, E.H., Zakaras, L. & Brooks, A. (2004). *Gifts of the muse: Reframing the debate about the benefit of the arts*. RAND Corporation: Santa Monica, CA.

The New Economics Foundation. (2009). *Seven principles for measuring what matters: A guide to effective public policy making.* Lawlor, E., Nicholls, J. & Neitzert, E.

Killacky, J. (2009, May 10). Survival strategies for the arts. *Blue Avocado.* Retrieved from http://www.blueavocado.org/content/survival-strategies-arts.

Tepper, S.J. (2004). The creative campus: Who's no. 1? *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/The-Creative-Campus-Who-s/4870.

Cohen, P. (2009, August 10). Arts programs in academia are forced to nip here, adjust there. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2009/08/10/arts/10cuts.html.

The James Irvine Foundation and WolfBrown. (2008). *Cultural engagement in California's inland regions*. San Francisco, CA: Brown, A.S., Novak, J.L., with Kitchener, A.

Silver, D., Clark, T. & Rothfield L. (2007). *A theory of scenes*. (Manuscript, University of Chicago). Retrieved from http://tnc.research.googlepages.com/atheoryofscenes

Jones, T. & Wood, T. (2008). *Sites of resistance: All-ages music venues in their local and theoretical contexts*. (Working paper, University of Chicago). Retrieved from http://www.scribd.com/doc/19209922/Sites-of-Resistance-Jones-and-Wood-CCE

Tepper, S.J. & Ivey, B. (eds.). (2008). *Engaging art: The next great transformation of America's cultural life*. New York: Routledge.

Touve, D. & Tepper, S. (2007). *Leisure in America: Searching for the forest amongst the trees.* Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Trust.

Ivey, B. & Tepper, S.J. (2006). Cultural renaissance or cultural divide? *The Chronicle of Higher Educatio*n. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Cultural-Renaissance-or/6435/.

Kefentse, K. (2009). *The uprising of public man: On the emergence of youth culture from young spaces.* (Working paper, Carleton University).

National Endowment for the Arts. (2009). *Arts participation 2008: Highlights from a national survey*. Washington D.C. Retrieved from http://arts.endow.gov/research/NEA-SPPA-brochure.pdf.

Holden, J. (2008). *Democratic culture: Opening up the arts to everyone.* London, U.K.: Demos.

Lowell, J.F. (2004). *State arts agencies 1965-2003: Whose interests to serve?* RAND Corporation: Santa Monica, CA.

Lowell, J.F. (2008). *State arts policy: Trends and future prospects*. Rand Corporation: Santa Monica, CA.