

BIOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY: Naomi Morita

"I've seen great improvements [in the State Foundation on Culture and the Arts]. I think we're at what I would consider that teenage syndrome, where a child goes through finding out what he or she really is about. And they would rebel or be able to grow and try to find out what their strengths or abilities are. I think that's where we are now. I don't think we have quite reached that point where we can say, 'Okay, here is a mature organization that can look at all of these programs and be able to fully function successfully in everything.' I don't think we've reached that point yet, but we've come a long ways."

Naomi Morita was born in Hilo in 1932. After graduating from Hilo High School in 1950, she attended Syracuse University and earned a bachelor's degree in speech arts. She then entered Columbia University and earned a master's degree in education.

Morita taught for a number of years in public schools in Hilo, Honolulu, and Honoka'a, as well as in New Rochelle, New York. She later became an elementary curriculum specialist for the Department of Education [DOE] on the island of Hawai'i.

Morita first became acquainted with the State Foundation on Culture and the Arts [SFCA] in the 1970s, when the Big Island became part of an arts in education pilot project. She became a board member of the SFCA in 1979 and served as chair from 1982 to 1986.

Morita retired from the DOE in 1988 and presently works part-time with the After-School A-Plus Program.

Tape No. 20-17-1-90 and 20-18-1-90

ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEW

with

Naomi Morita (NM)

August 7, 1990

Hilo, Hawai'i

BY: Joe Rossi (JR)

JR: This is an interview with Naomi Morita, conducted August 7, 1990, in Hilo. The interviewer is Joe Rossi.

To begin with, Mrs. Morita, could you tell me where and when you were born?

NM: Where and when?

JR: Yeah.

NM: Okay. I was born in Hilo in 1932. And I was born in a very small private hospital that is still existing. So it's a wonderful thing, you know. It's still there. The doctor who delivered me has since passed on, but his son has taken over the practice.

JR: And what did Mom and Dad do at that time?

NM: My mom and dad were both teachers. I think they taught---when I was born, they were in the country, Pāpa'ikou, which is only four miles outside of Hilo, but at that time was country. And I was born and raised in a very middle-class attitudes, values, Oriental-push-for-education kind of background.

JR: Did you have any brothers or sisters?

NM: No. We adopted a boy when I was fifteen. But I grew up in my neighborhood with a family of eight next door---eight children---so that's where I spent all of my time. (Chuckles) It was fun.

JR: Because your parents were educators, did you have an early interest in pursuing that?

NM: I don't think I had any other option. I think I was brainwashed from the time I was little, that, "You will become an educator, okay?" If I were to do my life over, I think I would go into law. I really enjoy law. But at that point---and I do not regret all of my life, because it's brought me many rich experiences. But I was

brainwashed. I mean, there was no question.

JR: What kinds of things were you interested in, in elementary school and high school?

NM: Elementary school and high school. . . . When you talk about a pure liberal arts background, that was—I mean, that was my whole life up to the point of the second year in college. But I think I had a very broad background. Of course, part of it was that we had to—you know, you had to take piano lessons. You had to do this kind of stuff, yeah? And we had a very rich—I had a very rich childhood, because my dad was interested in anything to do with nature. We had a bamboo grove in the back, we had honey bee—you know, whatever you called those hives. We had bantam chickens, we had rabbits, we had all of this. So I had a very rich childhood, pure liberal arts.

JR: Well what about cultural practices that your parents may have partook in, like with the neighborhood or community . . .

NM: Mm mmm. No. My parents were sports-minded, so we did a lot with tennis—and this was in the 1930s—and my mother, then, went into golf. So we were very active. I'm trying to think of—no, nothing in particular. You have to think, too, that when I was a child that was part of World War II, so a lot of things were curtailed. But we did have a lot of cultural things come in just about the time—the end of the war. Big opera stars coming into Hilo. Did you know that?

JR: No, I didn't.

NM: They had a tour of the [territory], and they would go from island to island. And we were involved in—we were usherettes at these concerts. And we had a lot of big-name people come in.

JR: Were these well-attended events?

NM: Oh, very well attended, because these would be very. . . . Well, you might have three or four concerts a year or performances a year. And so it would be very well attended. So that would be our orientation.

JR: You mentioned the mandatory piano lessons.

NM: Yes, I hated it.

(Laughter)

NM: I hated piano, so I'm not that good. I have a good ear, but in terms of actually performing, I hated to practice. And I hated to do this, but I finished. When I was a senior in high school, we had our recital, and I said, "Bless you. That's it."

JR: Was music a big part of your home life? Did your parents have the radio on a lot?

NM: Yeah. Well, we did. That was our only form of entertainment. But, not---I don't know. It was just normal, a part of normal living.

JR: And the visual arts, part of your liberal arts . . .

NM: Yes.

JR: . . . background. Were you encouraged to try your hand at painting . . .

NM: No.

JR: . . . or drawing?

NM: No. See, I may not have that creative skill or artistic skill. But like I used to say when I was on the State Foundation [on Culture and the Arts] board and I would meet people, I'd say, "I'm a consumer of the arts, and I appreciate any kind of creativity." And I used to spend, when I was in New York City [attending college and teaching], a lot of time in the museums, you know, enjoying that, just sitting there enjoying all of the art. But no, I do not have any. . . . I've tried. (Chuckles) There's nothing there.

JR: So you graduated from [Hilo] High School [in 1950], then what?

NM: Then I went to Syracuse University, and spent two years in liberal arts, and then moved on to speech arts, which had to do with the education of—it's education in speech—oral interpretation, a little drama, literature and that kind of thing, very general. I finished that in three years, then went on to a master's in one year.

JR: At Syracuse?

NM: No, at Columbia University in New York City, at which time I did not have money to enjoy all of the performances and things. So I came back [to Hawai'i] and worked for three years, then went on to take a professional improvement leave, at which time I taught in New Rochelle. I had money, so I could take in all the opera and, you know, plays and the museums and all of that. Once, we tried to see how much you can do in New York City for one day without spending money. And do you know, you have to spend money to go to anywhere—to travel, for one thing, to get from one place to another, to pay your admission fee. You have to. You have to.

JR: What particular kind of art attracted you back then?

NM: Visual arts. I really enjoyed going to the museums.

JR: Contemporary visual arts or . . .

NM: Both, okay. I liked the really—the masters. I liked some contemporary, not all. There's a period---my favorite artist was [Claude] Monet. When his painting burned—that was my favorite, the *Water Lilies*. That was burned, and I was so

upset. But then, (chuckles) he has other things.

JR: You mentioned that you were back in Hawai'i working before you went, again, to New York. What were you doing in that interim period?

NM: You mean teaching? I was teaching. And I taught in Hilo at two schools. One year, I taught at Waiākea Kai School, which no longer exists. That was wiped out by the tsunami [1960]. And then I taught two years at Keaukaha Elementary School, which I loved. Those students are just wonderful. Then when I went back, I taught in New Rochelle in a junior high school, Albert Leonard Junior High School. And I enjoyed that. That was a different experience. I was a remedial reading teacher, so that was fun. Then I came back, after one year, and where—I forgot where I taught. I taught all over. I taught in Honolulu, I taught in Hilo, outside of Hilo. Then I got married, so I moved to the country. I went to Honoka'a [in 1960].

JR: In your various teaching experiences in these different locations, especially in New York, did you notice any differences in the way—I'm interested in the arts, particularly—how the teachers were instructed to teach subjects, or the kinds of support that a teacher teaching arts would get versus one teaching math?

NM: Well, I would say that Hawai'i in the last, maybe, ten to twelve years has given more support to the arts in education. In New Rochelle, the art program had a lot of support, I think, because of the accessibility to the metropolitan area. I think you are more apt to give support. I think Hawai'i has come a long ways in providing arts in education. But I don't know. As in anything, I think it takes us a while.

JR: Teaching in Hilo, is there any handicap that you face? You mentioned New Rochelle's proximity to metropolitan New York City. How about Hilo's lack of proximity to Honolulu?

NM: Okay. I would say, in terms of the students, our students do not have as many options for experiences. In some cases, we depend on parents to take their children to the big city, to the museum, to whatever. But I think that our children on the neighbor islands have a big plus. Today at least they have the media, you know, to expose them to things. Although it's not a direct experience, at least they can—through the media, through television—learn some things. I think, too, that we have a lot of cultural things—Hawaiian studies, for example—that our kids know more about than another island—I mean, O'ahu. O'ahu---they might have the Bishop Museum, they might have the—what else do they have?

JR: [Honolulu] Academy of Arts.

NM: Yeah. Maybe our kids don't have the academy of arts, but they would have that Hawaiian studies, a very rich cultural experience. So it balances out. You might have something. You might not have the total thing, but you have some form of—some component of culture and the arts. That's something to think about.

JR: How did you get involved with the Artists-in-the-Schools program?

NM: Okay. My title was elementary educational specialist or elementary curriculum specialist. I had under my supervision art, music, physical education, Hawaiian studies, early childhood, social studies. All of these, you know, I took for the whole island. It just fit perfectly when in nineteen—I forgot the year—seventy-six, when they first started with the Arts in Education program, the comprehensive program, Mr. [Alfred] Preis asked if we would volunteer to do a comprehensive arts in education program as a pilot, so we said sure.

So we had all the components of the Arts in Education program on this island, throughout the whole island. And we had the visual artists come in and work with teachers, with students. We had the dance component residency at one of our schools for one or two weeks, I think it was. I forgot the details. But we had the whole thing. So we piloted this for the whole state. Then, after that, they moved to the other districts.

What it did, then, was to get me exposed to arts in education from a total standpoint. And this was before I was even thought about to be a member of the State Foundation on Culture and the Arts (commission). So it just—I guess the timing just worked perfectly. So I was able to organize, for this district, all of that. Enjoyed it, really enjoyed it. Met all these artists. And I really cultivated a very close relationship. So that was exciting. Then right after that—when did I get on the board? I got on the board in '79. So it was three years after that that I got to be on the board.

JR: Now, prior to this pilot project, did you have any contact with previous SFCA attempts to work with the DOE [Department of Education] in terms of art in education, things like that?

NM: No. Mm mmm. At that point, the arts in education was not the focus, because they were still worried about math and science, and that was the focus. So slowly the arts in education came through. And then '76 was the time—I think in the seventies was when they said, "Hey, a child, to be a whole child, should have not only"—I won't mention the other content areas—"but they've also got to have the arts." And I still feel very strongly about that.

JR: Did you ever find yourself having to justify that belief . . .

NM: Yes.

JR: . . . to parents, or principals, or whoever?

NM: Yes. To the bosses. (Chuckles) Yeah, I really did. And they would say, "There she goes again."

JR: Did you feel like you were alone sometimes?

- NM: Yes, very alone and very set apart with. . . . I mean, was I really off base? I would question myself after a while. But I felt very strongly about that.
- JR: Did the, quote, big shots from Honolulu ever come here and support you in that respect? Say, people with the DOE, like the superintendent, or people like Alfred Preis?
- NM: Alfred Preis was a gem. And that's why he asked us if we would volunteer for this. I marvel at that man. He did the state the greatest service in setting up what we have today. I mean, that's the foundation. He and Pundy [i.e., Masaru Yokouchi], I think, set the foundation, and they did what they had to do. Now, the little problems that we had within that, I think. . . . Well, anything has to go through metamorphosis. And I think we—the state foundation—did. We're still going through that. I think about the time of Pundy and Al Preis, they were the best two who could ever get this foundation for the state. I think what happened afterwards, we're building on that. And I think what we have today is a very good evidence of what they started. It's not in its original form, but it's what we would expect at this point in our lives, I think.
- JR: Do you have any memories of when you first met either of these two gentlemen?
- NM: Yes. Well, Pundy I met briefly when they came over for a visit to see how the Arts in Education project was going. Al Preis I put on a pedestal. I was always in awe of this wonderful man. For one thing, he was so—and I told him this many times—he had a gift of using words that would just [make me] say, "Wow, I wish I had said that." I just marveled at how he was able to do that. I think he took on a task that was just so huge. And I think some things that were needed, at that time, got in his way, like the PR [public relations] kind of things. He was such a wonderful man. I really admired him. Have you had a chance to interview him?
- JR: Yes, I have.
- NM: I just adore that man. So to this day, you know, I will never forget how I always put him on a pedestal, how I always was in awe of—how did he say that? I mean, why did he. . . . How could he choose the right words to say—to so concisely tell us what we needed to do. He's just wonderful.
- JR: Regarding that pilot program, I'm interested in finding out a little bit more [about] how you were told about it—or asked—or who you worked with in setting it up. Was it someone with the DOE? Was it Ray Okimoto? Was it . . .
- NM: All of the above. I worked with Ray, I worked with Stanley Yamamoto, I worked with Mr. Preis. Who else did I work with? Then we planned together what a comprehensive arts in education program should include. And I organized all the workshops, and I did all the—I worked so hard. (Chuckles) Anyway, it worked out beautifully. Everything worked out well. And we had---the impact, I thought, was really good for this island. I think it opened up a lot of new things that we could do

with children. And I see traces of it in what is happening today, in terms of programs in arts in education, like the residency, like the workshops with artists. So I think that was really good.

JR: They were interested in the pilot program to someday be applicable to the rest of the state?

NM: Yes.

JR: Did you have to make adjustments for the Big Island's peculiarities when you were doing these planning sessions?

NM: Yes. I would say the only thing that would be difficult would be the accessibility, because if we put a dance program in Hilo, what would happen to West Hawai'i? But we were able to take some of our artists and do a short, one-day workshop. So it would be exposure, not a residency. But we could---we had that flexibility, and we had the money. We could do that. We could take artists---like I took artists from here, and we had a workshop in Kohala. So it was really good. We kind of shared what we had. And we organized it so that we would not concentrate only in one geographic area. If we had a program in Kona, we would bring part of that to Hilo. So we had a wonderful---a good working relationship.

JR: You mentioned the strength that Hilo kids may have in Hawaiiana and things like that.

NM: It's not only Hilo, the whole island.

JR: The Big Island.

NM: Yeah, the Big Island.

JR: Did you have to, then, concentrate more on Western-type arts that you were bringing into the Big Island?

NM: Mm hmm [Yes]. You want them to have a broader perspective.

JR: And how long do you think that pilot program lasted?

NM: Well, it lasted for at least---what was it---four or five years, because they took it to each district after that. Then after four or five years, then they split up the components, and every island could---or every district could bid for certain components.

JR: The components that they felt weak in or . . .

NM: Yeah.

JR: . . . that they lacked?

NM: Whatever we felt we needed at that time. So that's the way it is today, which is good.

JR: In 1979, you were appointed to the SFCA.

NM: Right.

JR: How did that all happen?

NM: I have no idea. (Chuckles) I'm very naive when it comes to political. . . . What's a good word? Politics, period. Very naive. In fact, I like to stay in the background, which did not help SFCA, I think. I think they needed someone more who could do that. I'm not sure. I think the reason why I was selected as chair [in 1982] was because of Bea Ranis. I think she recommended me to be chair. And I think the reason why she recommended me to be chair was that she felt that I could be strong enough to pull the group together. I don't know. Why don't you ask her. (Chuckles) Did you interview her yet?

JR: No, not yet.

NM: Yeah. Well ask her, because I don't know. I adore that woman. And she was---I thought she was great. I guess she was the one. I remember vividly when this happened. It was at the celebration of the twenty-fifth—not the twenty-fifth. Was it twenty-five years? Yeah, twenty-five years. You see, we started in '66, when they first had that Arts in [State Buildings law]—1 percent legislation in '66. Was it '66 or '67?

JR: That came in '67.

NM: Okay, '67. So the twenty-five years—no, it must have been fifteen, because '80-something, huh?

JR: Yeah.

NM: Okay, fifteen years, yeah. We had this big celebration at the state capitol building. And at that time, Bea asked me, she said, "Would you be willing to take on this chairmanship?"

So I go, "Wow, I guess so. (Chuckles) I don't know." But, of course, it was very difficult, because I was a full-time state employee now. And I thought, oh, it won't be too difficult, because I'm good at organizing. It shouldn't be a problem.

(Laughter)

NM: Ho, ho, ho. I didn't realize until after my term expired how I managed to do both. And I must have not done well in either one, because I feel that—my goodness, look at all the load. Really, it was hectic. And I had---my job was really hectic, too, because we were implementing new programs and stuff. I really don't know how I

did it. I think in some cases I did a good job. In other cases, I could have done better.

JR: Were you surprised to even get appointed . . .

NM: Yes.

JR: . . . to the board?

NM: Yes, I was. I'm not sure---I know a lot of people were supporting me. I think they wrote letters. They wanted me on the board. And this is from people on O'ahu---the DOE people---and some of the local people involved in the arts.

JR: But you were unaware of . . .

NM: No, they told me they wanted me.

JR: Oh, okay.

NM: Yeah. I said, "Oh, all right," you know. I did not pursue it in that way, but I said, "Oh, wonderful. That would be a great experience."

JR: And then one day you got a phone call or. . . .

NM: No, they write you a letter saying, "We are very happy to. . . ." And then you have to be approved by the senate. Now I think it's a little bit formal, more formal. You have to be present at that time when they do appoint---I mean, review your credentials. But at that time, I didn't even have to go to Honolulu to be asked any questions or whatever.

JR: What were your first impressions of an SFCA board meeting when you joined up?

NM: Well, for one thing, I thought that we could have a little bit more organization, more structure, and more *Robert's Rules of Order* (chuckles). I'm trying to think now. But we had some strong members of the board. The group that I was with. . . . I really enjoyed that original group. I really enjoyed working with them. There was Margaret Cameron and---was Joanne Trotter on? I think Joanne was on at that time also, maybe not. [Trotter became a board member in 1981.] Wayne Chang was on the board, David Penhallow. . . . We had a good, strong working relationship.

JR: Were you familiar with any of these names prior to . . .

NM: Oh, Margaret. Margaret, because Margaret is a Hilo girl, and her brother and I were classmates. But the others, no. I'm trying to think of who else was---there were some people who never showed up. Yeah, there were members of the board who never showed up for meetings. But I thought we---at that point, we had some---yes, we went through some hard times. That's right, because towards the

end, I think, we were going through the ED [executive director] selection. That was in '80.

JR: As we mentioned earlier, Bea Ranis was the chairman when you came on. How would you describe her as a chairperson?

NM: Okay. As a chairperson, I think she was very—she seemed to be a very low-keyed. . . . She was very knowledgeable about the different community people, because she's on O'ahu. So she knew all of these people. She was. . . . I think, from where I sat, she did a lot for state foundation, because she went to the legislature, she lobbied. She also attended a lot of community events for exposure. I think that she did have a task, that she had to shape up the state foundation because of all the criticism. And we did have that legislative auditor's report that we had to contend with. [In 1976, a Management Audit of the State Foundation on Culture and the Arts was submitted to the governor and the legislature. The audit, requested by the legislature, was very critical of SFCA operations.] So she had a huge job. She was also part of that CPAC, which was a Consortium for Pacific Arts [and Cultures]. And she was involved in that part, so she was really organizing—after Pundy's term—organizing the state foundation to address the critical needs that had been surfaced. I think she had some good ideas. I think she had some problems with our board. I don't know. You'll have to ask her that part. What was her perception of her board, the members of the board? Did she have the support? I know we supported her. The three or four of us really supported her. I'm trying to think. It was so long ago.

JR: You mentioned Ms. Ranis having a lot of community contacts . . .

NM: Yes.

JR: . . . and attending a lot of community functions. Did you regret, since you're from Hilo, not being able to attend those same functions or have those same . . .

NM: I don't know if I regretted it. I went to the critical ones. Anything that they had to have me there, I was there. But I think that I can still do it at the local level, that it gives this island. . . . The arts councils or the arts organizations feel good when—if I was the chair at that time—"Hey, the chair was here to see us doing our activity," and that we would share it with the whole board. I think that one of the things that we tried to do on O'ahu—because I lived here, I asked all of the members of the board to be visible, so that we could share, then, what they had gone to see. Or we would send a representative from the board, and they would come back and share. So I don't think—no, I don't think I would regret that part. I think it was a blessing that I didn't have to go to all these (chuckles). . . . I don't know. But I think, then, it would put some responsibility on all the members. Because I couldn't be there, the other members of the board had to participate. I think that was good.

JR: Coming from Hilo and being involved with—actually, an employee of the Department of Education, did you ever feel that you should lobby on behalf of the

Big Island or lobby on behalf of the DOE in terms of getting programs implemented or things like that?

NM: You know, I was---that point is something that I glanced over in some of my notes. And I was pushing for—not for a particular area or expertise. My push with the board—and that had to come, I had to do the same thing—was that we were there for the whole state, and we were there for all the arts. And if you have an expertise in an art, we would use that to help us promote, or lobby, or whatever. But all of us are there for everybody. And that was my big push. And I notice that in my message to the board that that's what I told them. I would bring to the state foundation expertise in the arts in education, but I would not use that only as a narrow focus. You see, I didn't want a narrow focus, I wanted a broader push. And everybody had to work towards that. We would use that expertise, but we would not push only for that.

JR: Earlier you mentioned that search committee . . .

NM: Yes.

JR: . . . for the executive director's position. If we could just back up a little . . .

NM: Sure.

JR: . . . from that. Was Alfred Preis' retirement a surprise to the board when he announced [in February 1980]?

NM: No, I don't think it was a surprise. No. I don't think it was a surprise, but it was, maybe, the right time for the organization to look at other ways of developing and, you know, promoting and organizing. That search [for Preis' replacement] was a big thing. I mean, I volunteered, as a member of the board, to be a part of this search committee. And Margaret Cameron did, too. And we had good community people. I'd like to think that I brought to this committee state requirements that community people have no idea about—how to interview, some laws and regs [i.e., regulations] of a state employee. At least I could bring that to the board, because I had access to state departments that would have handled this. So it was very interesting how little community people know about—"Hey, you can't ask that question," that kind of thing. Or, what are the processes of accepting applications, and what can you do to make sure that everybody qualifies, and, you know, all this. These are state laws, now, that you have to go through.

So we were able to finally get our list [of candidates]. And then we were able to interview. One of the things that one of the community members mentioned was that—this is a private organization administrator. He said, "Oh, I learned so much from being on this committee." He said, "I want to use your interviewing techniques when I interview employees for my organization."

I said, "Great." So we did expose private people—people in the private sector—to our public(-sector requirements and the) needs or constraints. . . . And I thought

we did a good job.

JR: What was your task, as you understood it? Who were you supposed to look for out there?

NM: Okay, okay. Now, I said that there was a transition, right, in terms of the organization and what the organization needed. Our organization needed someone who could work (with) the legislators. We needed somebody who could be a positive image to the community organizations. We needed someone who would be able to do the kinds of things of—oh, what do you call those things? State requirements for all that paperwork? We needed somebody who could pull that together. And those were the three areas that we looked for. And so you can see that in all of our—the questions that we asked all led to these three things. Because the foundation had been laid already by Al Preis and Pundy, now we could move on.

JR: From looking back at the newspapers, I think you got something like thirty-five applications. It was an outrageous number.

NM: Outrageous. I still remember that. Some we could—see, we had qualifications. Some we could weed out. Some met the qualifications, so we were able to interview. I don't remember how many we interviewed at the end. Was there any record of that? Maybe about twelve?

JR: At some point it was—twelve sounds like a familiar number.

NM: Yeah.

JR: I think it was narrowed down to five.

NM: Yes. And so we interviewed several times. That was a lot—a big job. But we felt good at the end. Mm hmm. I think for what we needed at that time, I think we did a good job.

JR: Okay. If we could just take a break.

NM: Sure.

JR: I need to turn the tape over.

END OF SIDE ONE

SIDE TWO

JR: After Sarah Richards was selected, how did things change? After Preis, now Sarah Richards.

NM: Like I said, we had to address the legislative auditor's report. We had to answer some questions on why the state foundation had not done this, had not done that. I felt Sarah met those needs in terms of coming up with an annual report that we had never come up with. I had asked Sarah to follow up with the auditor's report and respond, which had never been done before. They wanted to know, "Why are you doing this? You don't have to do it." Well, I felt that we needed to do it. As chair, I wanted to have all of these questions answered, and then we could move on from there. So we tried to address the issue of having a clear organization for arts organizations to ask for money, to have that very down pat and very clear, to have our bookkeeping straightened out so that everything would be clean and people would get paid on time. And that was one of the criticisms. And then, of course, our annual report. So the first one came out—I forgot when. During Bea's time, I think.

JR: Yeah.

NM: Yeah.

JR: I think it was . . .

NM: That was not in my chair.

JR: My guess is that it was mid seventies.

NM: Yeah.

JR: . . . late seventies.

NM: So that's when the first one came out. So, I think Sarah met those needs. She also was visible in the community with organizations, but not all organizations. So, I think, with the big organizations, she's great. With the little ones, she may not be as visible. But that's okay, you know. That was all right. Sarah also—she looked good, physically. I mean, she's pretty, right? And she's very attractive. And she has the ability to verbalize. So she was able to go to the legislature. I'm not saying that that was—that was a big plus, to me, in the beginning. But then we needed to look at. . . . Sometimes you can say too much, and that might be a minus. So there were pluses and minuses to this skill. Another thing that. . . . Sarah was also good about getting more—the timing was right so that we added more people, like we did absorb the humanities division and the. . . . What was the other group that we absorbed? History and humanities. So that would be . . .

JR: Yeah.

NM: Yeah. So our organization was growing. So she had to absorb that [after the legislature dissolved the Hawai'i Foundation for History and the Humanities in 1980]. She had to organize that during my tenure as chair. Are we at that point now?

JR: Yeah.

NM: Yeah, okay. There were many other changes, one of which was the organization in relationship to regional organizations. And maybe we're not ready for that. At the time when I started as chair, the state of Hawai'i—the State Foundation on Culture and the Arts—was part of CPAC. This included six different territories and states. It's American Samoa, [Northern] Marianas, Guam, Alaska, Hawai'i, and California, would you believe? As a regional organization, it was just geographic. But our needs were so different that there was some hassle there. And National Endowment for the Arts gives you money to work as an organization on projects, on needs. And we put on some exciting things. We had the basket makers exhibit that went on throughout Alaska and Hawai'i and California. It was a great thing. We had workshops, joint workshops. And, I think, we had some very good common projects.

But that wasn't the only—native arts is one part of our total focus. Hawai'i, as a state, was developing in many ways in the arts. And native arts was also being covered by OHA [Office of Hawaiian Affairs], which was a new, developing agency. So our—you know, we had to look towards another organization. So we belonged to CPAC for about two or three years, and then we had to search for another organization that met the total needs of the state. And this is when Sarah, as the executive director, helped us search for an organization. And we ended up as a member of WESTAF [Western States Arts Federation], which is the western states—Arizona, Colorado. . . . California and Alaska finally joined them, and Washington and Oregon. [WESTAF also includes state arts agencies from Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.] So that kind of—geographically, we just moved. And I think the needs in the arts was more in line with the other western states. Not saying that we're going to forget the native arts. No. We do have that, but it's not our total focus. So Sarah met that need.

We had some minor problems. And as chair, I recognized that we had some minor problems. Some of it was supervision on Sarah's part. Some of it was basic management and supervision, the theory of. And we've had a lot of background in that. I'm not saying that what I've had is what is good. And I'm not saying I'm the best supervisor or administrator. But I could see that there were some problems. There is also a problem of staff. I think some of the staff took it too personally. I'm not saying that's right or wrong. But I do know that there was some conflict, to the point where it erupted worse than our volcano. It was terrible. I mean, we had meetings after meetings. And we'd get these—you know, we'd try to resolve it. And because there was such a conflict, I think, eventually—what's happened now may have been the best solution, that Sarah would, you know, find—do something. . . . And we have a new ED. Because we tried to resolve it for about three or four years, and I think it was beyond salvage, if there's such a thing. But we tried. We even had a consultant come in. That didn't help. We had two or three people come in on a contractual basis to help us resolve the problems. I don't know.

JR: Well, some of these problems became very public . . .

NM: That's right.

JR: . . . in the newspapers. What kind of an effect did that have on your ability as chairman or on—just morale on the board.

NM: The board. . . . See, the board was a very interesting group, too. I kept telling the board, "We have to look at everything objectively. You cannot be emotional, or you cannot listen to only one side. You have to look at both sides. You have to be able to weigh this." We had some members of the board who could not do this. On the whole, most of the board members were very conscientious, very good about looking at objective—being objective. But there were a few that I had a hard time with, to the point where I was accused, one time, of cutting people off in meetings. And I did. (Chuckles) I did cut them off. But I had that prerogative. But then it was brought back to me that I needed to let each member verbalize exactly how they felt. So I said, "To a point." I mean, if they start repeating, forget it. But I was criticized on that part. But I could live with that. The main thing was that the organization would function. At points, I think the interaction or the negative influence of people's feelings interfered with our progress. And that's when it annoyed me. I wouldn't say I was upset. I was annoyed, because, to me, the organization comes first. And the function of the organization should be first, not people. Is that cold-blooded or what? So I think, in that sense, my frustration was evident. I don't know. You have to ask me more specific stuff.

JR: Okay. Well, I wanted to back up a little. Earlier, you mentioned the audit and that you had to deal with the audit. And you spoke about a few of the audit's recommendations or criticisms. Another one was that the board didn't take a strong enough stand. And the term that was used was rubber stamp.

NM: Yes.

JR: The board simply rubber stamped things like the director's decisions . . .

NM: Mm hmm. Yes.

JR: . . . and that the board should get more involved in that process.

NM: Good point.

JR: Would you care to speak about that?

NM: Yes, I would. One of the things that Bea Ranis started and I carried on and. . . . What we tried to do was to make the board an active, working board, which would mean that they would be more involved in helping the organization and in making decisions. And I think the original criticism was well taken. We were able to better make decisions. And we would not so-called rubber stamp. So our meetings were very long. But I think that's good, because as a transition period, we had to do a lot of that.

I think that the reason why this comment was—you know, rubber stamping and stuff—like I said, Mr. Preis was so wonderful. He was so good about verbalizing that you would say, “Oh sure, anything you want.” So I think that would be one of the things. He was the most knowledgeable. So I think, although the criticism was there, it would probably be. . . . Sure, in the initial stages, why not? He was making the decisions. We need this. The timing was all right. But then, after a while, the organization has to move on. So, I think the timing—it all fit together.

JR: You also spoke about the history and humanities coming aboard after the Hawai'i Foundation [for] History and Humanities was dissolved. What do you remember about that and having to integrate this whole other area or discipline into the. . . .

NM: The only thing I remember is that we were told, “You will absorb this.”

And we said, “All right.”

I don't remember it as being a problem. I think there was a problem in terms of—we had to also absorb the people in the positions. That may have been a problem. You know, you take everything. I found a letter from someone based on that, that it was one of our problems, that we had to also absorb the warm bodies that came with that responsibility. We did not have a choice on that one. I'm going to hedge on that, okay? (Chuckles)

JR: I wanted to read a quote that I found in one of the annual reports. It was the year you assumed chairmanship. [It was actually the following year, 1982.] I just want to get your reaction.

NM: Sure.

JR: This is you speaking—or in writing—“Our principal task for the future is to link our work and expertise with other agencies of the state, so the arts can be used as a vehicle to enhance the quality of our lives. Through more cooperative endeavors, we can enlarge the opportunities and audiences for the foundation.”

NM: Mm hmm. I think I meant--at that time in my life, we were dealing with moving from one department to another department in terms of jurisdiction, in terms of supervision, in terms of administration. We were moving from [the Department of Budget and Finance to DAGS [Department of Accounting and General Services], and DAGS because of our Art in Public Places. So the statement that I made was, because we had to deal with so many agencies for promoting our programs, that I felt that we needed to work more positively and more closely with these agencies instead of being in conflict, that we needed to establish a more working, warm relationship, so that we would facilitate some of our goals, like Art in Public Places, for one, and then another would be the budget and finance (chuckles). To help us, not to stop us, (chuckles) but to support us, help us, and to make us a better organization.

JR: Do you feel that you were successful?

- NM: Partially. Mm hmm. I think partially, but I still think that SFCA has a long ways to go. I've seen great improvements. I think we're [at] what I would consider that teenage syndrome, where a child goes through finding out what he or she really is about. And they would rebel or be able to grow and try to find out what their strengths or abilities are. I think that's where we are now. I don't think we have quite reached that point where we can say, "Okay, here is a mature organization that can look at all of these programs and be able to fully function successfully in everything." I don't think we have reached that point yet. But we've come a long ways. I mean, I think I was with the pre-adolescent period, and now they're going through the ending of the adolescent period, if you want to have a good comparison. But it's been—I see the organization as really having grown. And, I think, I see the arts organizations blossom and—beyond what we can offer now. I mean, they've grown, grown. So, I think it's wonderful.
- JR: As chairman, did you have to attend national . . .
- NM: Yes.
- JR: . . . arts meetings?
- NM: I went to three or four. And I went to three regional organizations. When I left the state foundation chair, one of the comments I made was, "I think I have gained more than I put in," because I was able to meet all of these great people. And I think I grew in terms of knowledge of the arts. So, as selfish as it was, I think I really gained more than I put into this organization, as much as I'd like to say that we did make an impact.
- JR: What about those national meetings? What did you bring back from those meetings?
- NM: Bring back from those meetings. . . . I think the national meetings, we would bring back—we would meet people where we could exchange ideas. We also were able to share what we had done, and we traded off. That was a big thing. Another thing that we, I think, gained was that we brought to the organization a different perspective about Hawai'i and the arts. When we came back to the board, we were able to share some new directions, some new ways of operating, I think, in terms of the national organization. Of course, from the time that we were involved—now, I guess, they're under fire, and I think they've lost some monies, too. [At the time of this interview, the National Endowment for the Arts was at the center of a national debate concerning public funding for the arts.]
- JR: Yeah.
- NM: That's too bad. I think that it's a shame that that has happened. I'm not saying it's right or wrong. It's too bad that they still don't have the same kind of support, because I think I was there when it was the peak of the support.
- JR: How did Hawai'i compare to the other states at those national meetings, in your

opinion?

NM: In terms of---well, let's talk about per-capita [state funding] towards the arts. We were number one for a long time, you know, which was great. They were just amazed at how much money we were putting into the arts. Organizationally, I think we were towards the upper one-third of positive impact. I think that our Arts in Public Places program was really looked upon as a model. Mr. Preis had many times [been] asked to go and speak to groups about that. So we were looked upon as being pioneers. And that was because of Al Preis and Pundy. Arts in education, I think, we were looked upon as being very innovative. And we were able to provide a lot of arts programs. Arts organizations---we did have a lot of support, so we were looked upon as being. . . . Let's say, we were comparable to other arts organizations. Now, we're talking about comparative size in terms of population. We cannot compare ourselves with New York state, and Kitty Carlisle [Hart] and her organization [i.e., New York State Council on the Arts], no way. But you could compare us to, say---we could be compared to Washington, Oregon, some parts of the California system, in terms of their ethnic needs, arts needs and stuff. But I thought we were in high regard as far as the arts. What else?

JR: Just now you mentioned the Art in Public Places. In the seventies, I know that it was criticized for poor management. Did you ever have any sense of that by the time you came on?

NM: I don't know what---when they talk about poor management, I don't know. By the time I came on board, there was a system (or) a process that was put into practice. I still think that we have some problems with Art in Public Places. I don't know whether it's the process that we go through or what it is. There is one thing about the Art in Public Places program that I think needs to be continued to be put into practice, which is public knowledge of what it's all about. There are so few people who understand what that 1 percent law is, the process through which the receiving agency has to go through to get their Art in Public Places project in cement, installed. So there are still some areas that need to be cleaned up. Poorly managed, I think, because it was not clearly defined in terms of how an agency gets a project. The monies were put in a pot and distributed according to where Mr. Preis felt that they needed works of art, which was the beginning stages. That's okay. I can live with that. Now, I think we need to work on a little bit more systematic approach. The generated monies---you can still put it with that agency that generated the money, but also you can use that money for someplace else, but not totally in a pot and just distribute it at random, yeah.

JR: During your tenure, the Folk Arts program was introduced [1983]. What do you have to say about that program and its early years?

NM: In the early years, as in anything, there's a lot of problems. I think it was exciting. In terms of what came out of it, we had quite a few good things happen. I think, for one thing, we all began to know what folk arts was all about. It was still in its infancy. I think, here, management and supervision maybe may have interfered with its growth. I don't know. I really couldn't say. I don't know where it is now. I

think it did have its problems. Because it was so new nationwide, we had some. But I feel that with whatever programs we brought over were just outstanding, you know. [Folk arts coordinator] Lynn Martin is still there, right? Yeah. I don't know. What did she say about it? Would you have a chance to . . .

JR: No, I haven't spoken to her.

NM: Yeah. I really don't know. It just started when I was there. I don't know. I think the whole thing ties to good supervision from the ED, and how can you get the most out of programs. Or there needs to be a planned projection on what you hope to accomplish. And that's one of things that we had a hard time with, to project, to plan, and to get the staff to do that, too. I don't know. And that's my orientation, see, that you do project and you have a systematic plan of organization of implementation. But we tried to do that, but we had a hard time.

JR: In the media's critique of the SFCA while you were on the board, a lot of times it seemed that you had folk-ethnic arts on one side and Western arts on the other. And somehow they were competing against one another, and one may be favored at the expense of the other. Did you have any sense of that dynamic?

NM: I think that came out because they were looking at Sarah, and Sarah was more the big arts organizations [e.g., Hawai'i Opera Theatre], her orientation. And, I think, the ethnic arts group. . . . I don't think that there was too much trouble. Are you talking about the Hawaiian community?

JR: That was one of the

NM: Yeah. And I don't know. Because I was involved in Hawaiian studies, and I could see a lot of things happening at that time that I felt were very positive things. And I don't know. . . . Are you talking---I know what you're talking about. The Pacific arts festival? Is that the kind of thing . . .

JR: I think these were all things that were brought up in the newspapers at one time or another.

NM: Yes, yes. We did have some problems with that.

JR: There were Hawaiian artists who were criticizing the SFCA for not supporting, you know, native Hawaiian artists. There was that Tahiti festival [i.e., Festival of Pacific Arts, 1985] where . . .

NM: It was a mess.

JR: Yeah. And there were some prominent local—one politician that I know of [Representative Kina'u Kamali'i], and the other one, I think, was Gladys Brandt, former regent at the University [of Hawai'i. They] were very critical of the way the SFCA handled itself. And again and again, the perception that one comes away with is that, "Oh, the SFCA is favoring Western arts at the expense of our own

arts.”

NM: Okay, gotcha.

JR: And maybe not even Hawaiian though, maybe, you know, cultural groups . . .

NM: The other cultural groups, sure.

JR: . . . in the community—Filipino groups or Samoan groups, things like this. And I think anyone who looks at these newspaper articles is going to come away with that impression, at least. And as someone who is intimately involved with the SFCA’s affairs, I was wondering if you had a perspective on that.

NM: Well, I have a perspective in this sense. We did have problems. (Chuckles) And it was in the organization and in the development of planning to take a group to this Pacific arts festival. And in terms of providing for increased funding for arts organizations with ethnic ties, I didn’t see it as a problem. But I guess some of the individual members of these organizations did feel there was a problem. But you had to think that Sarah’s not local, she married someone local. So maybe the perception is that she doesn’t understand. But then, she has to take the heat for that. I’m saying that the board should have been more supportive of this. And we could have been taking a more active role. But the Pacific arts festival thing, that was a real big thing. I think that there was criticism about Sarah in terms of that—her involvement. I didn’t go to that, she went. Gladys Brandt is a very verbal, knowledgeable person. And she’s on the board now, right?

JR: Yes.

NM: So she would be somebody perfect to talk to, find out—I mean, it’s her perspective. But I do know that there were some problems. And I don’t know how we could have handled that, outside of just going with it, with all the criticism. I mean, just---we had to deal with the criticism, but what could we do, really? I don’t know.

JR: But in terms of being on the board then, you didn’t really sense that on the one hand you had Western arts and on the other hand you had local ethnic arts, and somehow they competed for the same funds.

NM: No, no.

JR: And you didn’t necessarily have to grapple with. . . .

NM: No, because I felt that everybody had to have opportunity. And that’s what we kept saying. Now, if the perception is that, we have to deal with that perception. We tried to include people. And I think that as we had more people on the different panels—see, that was one of the things that we instituted, the [review] panels.

JR: Maybe you could talk a little more about that.

NM: Sure. That, I thought, helped community people to understand the process. And they would go away with saying, "Okay, now I know. And now I know how objective it is and how we make decisions." So that was the biggest plus as we got these panels to work. Now, we started that [just prior to] Bea Ranis' time, and we carried it on. And that was one of the legislative auditor's thing, too, to get more involvement of community people. And we had these different panels for the different funding clusters, and decisions were made. Before that, the criticism was that even if the recommendation came from the panels, that the board would do their own thing. But then, with Bea, we made sure that we didn't do it that way, that the recommendations—it had to be really bad before the board would overturn or make adjustments. So that was one of the things that we worked on.

We had quite a few, I thought, ethnic groups involved in decision making, which I thought was good. I think any time—let's be honest. Any time there's money involved for organizations, there will be criticism. Nobody will ever feel that they're getting a fair shake, until they get involved and until they're able to say, "Oh, but that's not true." How long will it take us to reach everybody? So the best we can do now is to take on people who can help us make good decisions and be able to share that with the community.

JR: Not only did groups come to you for funds, but you, in turn, had to go to the legislature and lobby for funds. Were you involved in the lobbying process at the legislature?

NM: Some of it, not too much of it. We did have someone excellent who was. . . . At one time, Eloise Tungpalan helped give us a lot of money for the arts in education. She really did a good job that year she was there. And it was a little lobbying, but not that much, because she, from her side, felt the need. And she asked us for information and stuff. Yes, we did have to lobby, but not that much. Charles Toguchi was there, so I had to meet with him. We had good support, really good support. I don't know. We didn't have too much lobbying at that time. I think the original people—Preis and Pundy—had the most, that they had to lobby, yeah. And we also had a lot of support from the National Endowment for the Arts. So when we came in, it wasn't that much of a lobby thing.

JR: We need to take a short break.

NM: Sure.

END OF SIDE TWO

TAPE NO. 20-18-1-90; SIDE ONE

JR: Mrs. Morita, for the record, I wanted to get your opinion of the chairman's role, the board's role, and the director's role in the SFCA.

NM: Okay, let's start with the board. The board's role is to carry on the mission in policy, the mission of the State Foundation on Culture and the Arts. You have to come up with a policy.

Executive director's role is to implement that policy that the board acts on, through using the expertise of the staff.

The chair's role is to be the bridge, to help the commissioners follow their role and be able to come up with policy decisions that are good for the state, and to also be able to bridge—to work with the executive director, so that the executive director and the chair can pull the two groups together to improve whatever we want to do for the state (in) the arts. It's in simplistic terms, but it's not that easy.

One of the things that we really need to do is to remind the board what their role is, to set up directions, and to be able to let them work so that each board member uses his or her expertise—because they've been selected for that reason—and to complement each other. They also have to be very objective in terms of developing policy. Board members also have to be very calm—is that a good word? Because with objectivity, you can look at—when different people come to you with problems or with concerns, you are able to deal with it in a very objective, very calm way and bring it to the board.

The staff needs to pull together, to work together. They need to be a team. I don't see this, still. I think the executive director has to be able to supervise and manage the staff. They don't all have to—they still have their own expertise. They need to know what's happening in the other areas. But they need to work together. They need to support each other. I haven't seen this yet. I could be wrong. Maybe they're at that point now. I'm not sure.

I think that both the executive director and the chair have to be able to use all the talents of the people, so that everybody—throughout the whole state, everybody will know what the state foundation is all about. It's been my dream to have SFCA be known in very positive terms. And slowly, I think, we're getting there. But everything—you know, it's normal for positive things to be very silent. And I think that's what is happening. It's too bad. I think this [oral history] project is very good, because this might be one way in which we can show what we've done, what all the people have done up to this point, in a very positive way.

I don't know what else to say about that, except that I would hope, eventually, that the executive director, the chair, staff, and the board will be a very good working group. And when I say working group, that the task and the organization are number one, and that individuals and your own feelings are way down the list, not even considered. But I really feel that task and organization got to be number one. I don't know how else to do it, except through good management.

JR: Where was the SFCA when you left it? What was the status of the SFCA then, if I wanted to ask for a status report?

NM: I think they're better off now. I think that they're better off because they—from what I see, or what I have heard, the makeup of the group, of that board itself, is very good. We had some minor problems. I had some members of the board that would forget what our mission was, in terms of as a total organization, as a total group. So it was very difficult, frustrating at times. I think that the group now is at least more positive. I could be wrong, but I think they seem to be more positive. The staff is still the same with a few minor changes, additions. The ED is different, so I don't know how things are working out. I have to go say hello to Wendell [Silva] one of these days. I wish him well.

JR: Well, what was your feeling when you left in '86?

NM: Thank God. (Chuckles) No, no, no. Thank God it's over. No. I was sad, because I thought that things were just beginning to move, and things were beginning to look like they were going to start looking at SFCA in a very positive way. But I had to leave, my term was over. Isn't that true though? Just when you think, "Okay, everything is going to be good," then you've got to leave. Same thing with my job, I retired just at that point. But that's a good sign. Leave while you're up, (chuckles) and more things will happen better, positively. I hope that things are going well. I don't know.

JR: You're still involved with the Department of Education.

NM: I'm a part-time employee with A-Plus, the After-School [A-Plus] Program. And what's exciting about it is that the A-Plus after-school program deals with the areas that I was working with when I retired—art, music, physical ed[ucation], the arts, all of that. I'm concentrating in one area, in the after-school program.

JR: How was that relationship, between the DOE and the SFCA? Initially, in 1966, I think it started as (an) "experiment," and it's continued through to today. What do you see today, and what do you, maybe, hope for the future with arts in education?

NM: Let me give you a little idea of what I, as chair—what I saw was the deep involvement of education in implementing the arts. And when I say that, [I am referring to] the total, comprehensive arts program. SFCA, I think, was very supportive and was able to get us national monies for this.

There were two things that annoyed me. And when I say annoyed me, I felt very strongly, as a member of the Arts in Education panel. And when I saw proposals that would deal with arts for children, I wanted to make sure that the children would really benefit and that they weren't being taken advantage of, in terms of getting monies so that artists could do things with kids. I don't know if I'm making myself clear on that, but I wanted children's development in the arts to be number one, and that was not the secondary objective.

The other thing that I always questioned, when I was on this Arts in Education panel, was—if artists were trying to develop a project and they wanted to give the kids everything free, I said no. It's okay to provide arts in education for kids. But

even if it's just a token, even if a performance—the kids need to pay for it, even if it's ten cents. We shouldn't give kids free anything in the creative arts. For them to go and participate or to see that they would have everything given to them—I think they should have this experience, but they should pay for it. Because I want kids to learn that they have to pay for admission. It was a prejudice that I had, because some groups wanted to just develop their performance and give it to kids, and let the kids come for free. No way, nothing is free. Kids today can spend twelve dollars to go see or hear a rock concert. They can pay ten cents or twenty-five cents for an artistic—I'm not saying that rock concerts are not artistic. (Chuckles) Maybe I am saying that. But I wanted them to get to learn to pay for admission, okay.

So those [were the] two very minor prejudices that I had in terms of the arts, that I didn't want, you know, them to be. . . . The kids had to be number one, and they had to also pay for admission. So those two things. But I think that in terms of SFCA and arts in education, I think the SFCA did a lot to give to kids opportunities. There was a lot of money in that panel for artists to apply. I don't know. That's just one component, you know. It was a big component in the SFCA. But I think we learned a lot. Is there anything else we need to talk about?

JR: I just wondered, where is it headed? Where do you . . .

NM: I have no idea. Since then, I think the DOE has really moved ahead the last seven or eight years. They increased personnel. They supported arts in education. I'm not saying that we've reached the end. But in terms of arts in education, there's still a lot more to do. But now the emphasis is someplace else, right, in DOE, so arts in education is at a plateau, I think, now. Can I tell you what my dream is?

JR: I'd like to hear it.

NM: Eventually, I hope that funding will be—and I've said this in my last annual report, I think. I hope someday we can fully support a state symphony orchestra, a state performing arts group, a state museum, and anything else that the state can provide, so that we can have these things for the whole place. You know, we're small, but that's why we need these things, so that the different organizations don't have to go scrounging and have problems with being able to bring to the rural areas some of these programs. If they would have concerts all over the place, I think that would be super. I think that's great. That's my dream. I hope that at least one phase of it will occur for our—you know, for the whole state. But I don't think we'll ever get to that point. But wouldn't that be wonderful? I think since we started, we have seen legislation, or the DOE, come up with—now we have learning centers. We have performing arts learning centers. I was part of the one here, organizing. So we've come a long ways. I think that I'd like to see real opportunities for kids to come up, so that they can actually do all the different phases of the arts. I think we're almost there, almost. (Chuckles)

JR: I don't have, really, any more questions for you. I just wanted to ask—I'm curious to know how your involvement with the SFCA maybe has affected your role as an

educator, or vice versa.

NM: Before I retired, it was a big plus being a member of the board, or even as chair, because I would be actively involved in any of the schools throughout the state in terms of the Art in Public Places program or any of the other arts in education programs. So that was a big plus. I could pull together this information. I could also bring back to our education system some of the things that we learned at the national level. I think that one of the things that I really—when I look back at my career and the different people that I have worked with and supervised, top-notch educators. . . . We have things even in the Library of Congress, you know. We developed, from this island, this art guide for our elementary schools. And they did such a good job—the resource teachers did such a good job, we have it in the Library of Congress.

I say, "Wow, I think that's great. I think we've made an impact." If ever we can say, okay—but we have no proof that we've made an impact. We feel we've made an impact. What proof do we have? I think we have to wait maybe about five or six years to see where the kids that we exposed to the different arts, where they are, and what attitudes they have, and how they are faring. And I think until we see that, we won't know.

And we don't want any more surveys, do we? To ask (them), "How did we make an impact in your life?" So I really don't know. Personally, I think we've made a big impact, but who knows?

JR: Time will tell.

NM: Time will tell. I know that, personally, I've made an impact on my kids with this SFCA background. I've talked to them and we've discussed. And I see their choices today, they're going into more of the cultural stuff. I think, personally, it's really helped me. Professionally, I think it helped me. Like I said, I think I've learned more than I gave. I really feel that.

JR: Well, thank you. It's been a pleasure talking to you.

NM: Well, it's been my pleasure. I just hope something comes out of it. I can't wait to see the transcript. I'll probably say, "I didn't say that." (Chuckles)

END OF INTERVIEW

•
•
•
**The State Foundation
on Culture and the Arts**

•
•
An Oral History

•
•
•
•
•
•
•
**Center for Oral History
Social Science Research Institute
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa**

•
•
May 1991