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Abstract

I have based this study on the idea that providing art for the people is a legitimate responsibility of government, which must make aesthetic experiences available for all. By its very nature, art for the people raises broad political and aesthetic questions that often result in controversy. If the state of the arts and their support by government are to remain healthy and vital, such controversy is important as a catalyst for discussion.

As Hawaii’s official agency, the State Foundation on Culture and the Arts assumed a significant role as art patron. Its role expanded when the legislature passed the percent-for-art law establishing the Art in Public Places program. This program was responsible for the purchases of portable, relocatable works as well as permanently installed, commissioned works of art. Its goal was to enhance public enjoyment of art, develop public awareness of art, encourage professional artists, and preserve the multicultural heritage of the people of Hawaii.

Using the case-study method, this research focuses on how the program’s commissioning process demonstrates the cultural democracy that is the basis for its policies. The Foundation democratized the arts by bringing fine art traditions of the East and the West to the people. Such a dissemination of fine art conveys an aesthetic standard that values high culture as the best or most appropriate for the people. The Foundation also democratized the arts by expanding the definition to include ethnic and folk art as well as the crafts. It considered all aesthetic expressions art. This melding encouraged popular participation. Thus, Western abstractions incorporating Asian and Hawaiian
forms competed for resources with ethnic representations of mythical Hawaiian deities.

In addition, the Foundation accommodated two different visions of art. One involved a multicultural synthesis within a Western concept. The other included various expressions of the different cultural enclaves striving to preserve their heritage. Both visions of art were valid, as were the two approaches to cultural democracy. They helped to explain how the Foundation operated its art program.
# Table of Contents

Acknowledgments ........................................ iv
Abstract .................................................... v
Preface ..................................................... xi

Chapter 1: Public Art, Public Participation ............... 1
  Introduction ........................................... 1
  Thesis and Perspective ............................... 3
  Research Methodology ................................. 7
  Emphases and Limitations ............................. 10
  Synopsis of Chapters ................................ 11

Chapter 2: National Arts Legislation: Cultural Democracy 13
  Government Support of the Arts: Early America ........ 13
  New Deal for the Arts ................................ 15
  Federal Legislation Prior to 1960 .................... 21
  Art and the Phenomenon of the Sixties ............... 23
  Kennedy's Invitation to the Arts ..................... 26
  The Arts Lived in Camelot ............................ 27
  A New Frontier for the Arts ......................... 28
  The Great Society Constructs an Arts Foundation .... 34
  A Federal-State Partnership .......................... 39
  Summary .............................................. 42

Chapter 3: Creation of the State Foundation on Culture and the Arts 45
  The Rise of Ethnic Diversity .......................... 45
  Hawaii's Arts Awakening ............................... 47
  The New Hawaii .................................... 50
Chapter 6: Whose Art Is It? ........................................ 131
  Art Advisory Committee in Action: Three Case Studies ............. 131
  The Artist: Satoru Abe ........................................ 134
  The Work of Art: *Spring, Summer, Autumn* .................... 136
  Art for the Community ........................................ 141
  The Artist: Laura Ruby ........................................ 142
  The Work of Art: *Cromlek* .................................. 144
  Art for the Community ........................................ 146
  The Artist: Sean Kekamakupaa Lee Loy Browne .................... 149
  The Work of Art: *Spirit Way* (Ke Ala O Ka Uhane) ............. 151
  Art for the Community ........................................ 156
  Art in Public Places: A Dissenting View ......................... 158
  Summary ...................................................... 162

Chapter 7: Art for the People ........................................ 166
  Introduction ................................................ 166
  Cultural Significance of the Commissioning Process ............... 167
  Some Communal Values ........................................ 171
  Conclusion .................................................. 174

Appendix ......................................................... 178

Notes ........................................................ 184
  Notes to Chapter 1: Public Art, Public Participation ............... 184
  Notes to Chapter 2: National Arts Legislation: Cultural Democracy 186
  Notes to Chapter 3: Creation of the State Foundation on Culture
   and the Arts ............................................. 192
  Notes to Chapter 4: The SFCA Outreach ........................ 196
Preface

I was born on the island of Lanai, a place where rows and rows of pineapples grew and forests of pine trees flourished. Before state funding, the residents of the island had little opportunity to see or touch original works of art. Lanai had no art galleries, no original works of art for the enjoyment of the common person—typically a plantation worker in the pineapple fields—until the creation of the State Foundation on Culture and the Arts (SFCA or Foundation) and its percent-for-art program in 1967. The people of Lanai received their first commissioned sculpture in 1976. The work, *Trees, Vines, Rocks, and Petroglyphs* by Satoru Abe, cost $15,000. Thus, the people of Lanai benefited almost immediately from government support of art.

Public subsidies expanded in 1967 when the City and County of Honolulu established an ordinance in direct response to the state’s enactment of the art legislation. The municipal percent-for-art program was an attempt to broaden visual arts experiences for the people through acquisition and commission of art for public spaces. Because the state law was the precursor, I decided that my dissertation would concentrate on the Foundation as it administers the Art in Public Places (APP) program. The state legislation mandated that visual arts experiences be available to all the people, regardless of socio-economic class or ethnicity. Cultural democracy was one of the goals.

Despite the state and municipal intent to expand the availability of the arts to the people, problems arose. During 1980–85, when I was a program assistant in the Mayor’s Culture and Arts office in City Hall, one of the priorities of the office was program development—specifically, how to encourage more
people to attend the cultural events the city offered, such as the various performing arts programs or art exhibitions. During my five years with the office, a solution for the need to expand and diversify the audience was elusive.

On a recent trip to Lanai, I noticed that since the construction of the luxurious Lodge at Koele, more artworks have appeared. But the Lodge houses these pieces in a private building, setting them apart from the populace. The works of art are primarily for the enjoyment of the guests at the Lodge. Would the average Lanai resident be one of the guests? At $175 per night, the special discount rate for residents of the state, the average, now-retired plantation worker is unlikely to spend a night at the Lodge. In fact, the average Lanai resident—Filipino, former plantation worker, senior citizen—is unlikely to venture past the imposing driveway and intimidating doorways because of a feeling of inferiority, of not quite belonging in such a place. Hence, for these people, the APP program offered the first opportunity, perhaps the only one, to view an original work of art. This personal recollection and first-hand observation attest to the success of the Foundation’s attempt to bring art to the common people.

With the mandate of the percent-for-art legislation and the aims of the Foundation as its basis, my study examines the commissioning process of the APP program as it works towards achieving cultural democracy in the arts for Hawaii.
Chapter 1
Public Art, Public Participation

Art would be completely alone, alone unto death, unless it finds a way to the people. Only then would art see itself as the servant of a community, a community that would not have a culture, but which perhaps would be one.

Thomas Mann, *Doctor Faustus*

Introduction

For more than two decades, government support for art in America has increased its visibility. Public subsidies have expanded possibilities for viewing art, freeing it from the confines of museums and galleries. Many of the art works the government has funded are monumental sculptural pieces in outdoor places the public frequents. These allow people to experience art in the normal course of daily routine: going to work, jogging downtown, rushing to catch a plane at the airport, or driving by a courthouse. Thus, art has become a part of life, a part of the world of social issues and public dialogue. Government support makes public art possible.

The concept of public art rests on three assumptions. First, developing an aesthetic environment and providing the public the opportunity to experience art are legitimate responsibilities of government. As Edward Arian, former state arts council chair and panel member for the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), writes in *The Unfulfilled Promise*, “All citizens in a democracy have the right to such experience, and its provision is a public responsibility not unlike
health and education. This public responsibility also includes an obligation [to] the creative artist."

Second, because the extent of citizen participation is a measure of the success of a democracy, public art must be for everyone, not merely for the privileged few. The opportunity to experience public art, as well as the opportunity to create public art, must extend to citizens of all ethnic groups and social classes, women as well as men. Most people respond to artistic experiences if they have the opportunity. Some citizens may even demand such opportunities. However, they will do so only when they have a chance to express their desires and needs to experience art that represents their unique cultural identities.

Third, by its very nature, public art raises broad political, economic, and aesthetic questions that often result in controversy. Indeed, one of the values of public art is its capacity to challenge people and demand that the work become the focus of attention—optimally, as a source of aesthetic contemplation, and minimally, as a catalyst for dialogue. Sculptor Athena Tacha (whose Curving Arcades the University of Arizona installed amidst controversy in 1981) claims, “No sculpture has ever been hurt by controversy. If anything, controversy improves the climate for public sculpture.” The implication is that controversy, as a catalyst for dialogue, is essential if the state of the arts and their support by government are to remain vital and healthy.

Public art demonstrates the extreme diversity of American tastes, beliefs, and values. Controversy can be stimulating and educational, and it has the potential to raise people's cultural awareness. People are capable of learning to be more responsive to new perceptions of social reality. One way that
government can help its citizens expand their responsiveness is through 
support of the arts.

Thesis and Perspective

Throughout the nation, promoting art for the people has been the 
motivating force behind government support of the arts. As Hawaii's official 
arts agency, the State Foundation on Culture and the Arts assumed a significant 
role as patron of the arts. The legislature further expanded this role when it 
passed the Art in State Buildings law, which we now generally refer to as the 
percent-for-art law. It mandates that the state appropriate for works of art one 
percent of expenditures for the original construction of any state building. 
Hawaii is the first state to pass and implement mandatory percent-for-art 
legislation. It served as a model for other states to emulate.

The SFCA administers the percent-for-art law in its Art in Public Places 
program. It expends funds to purchase portable, relocatable works of art as well 
as to commission works to place permanently at specific locations within the 
state, such as schools, libraries, courthouses, airport terminals, and office 
buildings. Workers in state offices, visitors conducting business in state 
buildings, and tourists passing by all have the opportunity to view works of art. 
For some, this experience will be their first and will be a stimulus to seek out 
more opportunities to view works of art.

The purposes of the APP program are varied: to enhance public enjoyment 
of and enrichment from art, to develop public awareness and appreciation of the 
visual arts, to develop and recognize the professional artistic community, and to 
preserve the multicultural heritage of the people of Hawaii. The basis of the
program is the belief that art should be an integral part of life for all the people. According to Alfred Preis, the first executive director of the SFCA, when public art becomes "a part of life, people may begin to appreciate art and find personal enrichment and growth as human beings." Thus, the legislative mandate and the goal of the APP program were to broaden opportunities in the arts for all the people of Hawaii.

The thesis of this research is that government support of the arts in Hawaii resulted in a democratization of art. It has sought to transcend invidious ethnic, class, or gender distinctions and privileges, and to further social and cultural equality by providing artistic experiences for all citizens who have desired to participate. This study focuses in detail on the APP program's commissioning process from 1967 to 1987 as a demonstration of the program's policies of cultural pluralism here, in a pluralistic society, where members of diverse ethnic or social groups participate in their traditional culture within the confines of a common civilization.

According to program guidelines, the SFCA favored talented local artists. In order to ensure that the work of art met "the aspirations of the local people," a panel comprising the project architect and landscape architect, representatives of the building, and local arts councils would serve as advisors. The SFCA wanted a very democratic process, so it had to involve the people. But who were the people? More precisely, who would be the members of the selection panel? Who would choose them, and how? Who would be the artists the selection panel chose, and how would it choose them? Would the community
be involved from inception to completion of the project? For such a process to be truly democratic, it must include members of the various ethnic groups, and it must be sensitive to local artists.

Hawaii has long been and remains ethnically diverse, but in the past, the approved art forms and official high culture derived from Caucasian, usually Western European patterns. Some of the residents refer to such culture as “haole (Hawaiian for ‘foreigner’) culture.” The presence of this pervasive Caucasian culture traces back to Captain James Cook’s discovery of Hawaii in 1778. The natives’ reaction upon first meeting the foreigners was astonishment. The technological superiority of the explorers impressed the natives and helped to establish Caucasian prestige. After all, if the foreigners were technologically superior, they must be so in other ways. 7

Subsequently, Caucasian cultural dominance resulted from the firm control of Hawaii’s economy by five corporations: American Factors, Ltd.; C. Brewer & Company, Ltd.; Alexander & Baldwin; Castle & Cook, Ltd.; and Theo. H. Davies & Company, Ltd. Their owners and managers, all upper-class Caucasians, controlled the plantation system as well as auxiliary financial and shipping enterprises. The same economic interests also controlled politics and government. 8 Cultural power as well was in the hands of this elite group of middle- to upper-middle-class Caucasians. The lower classes comprised the several other ethnic groups, each with its own separate cultural tradition.

The philosophical motivation behind the APP program was to expand visual arts experiences for all ethnic groups; it aimed to promote all talented artists. Additionally, the program intended to encompass all forms of art, not merely fine arts. Did the APP program respond to all talented artists and their
diverse forms of art? Did it present opportunities for the people to enjoy and gain enrichment from the various art forms: crafts, popular arts, folk and ethnic arts? Or did the fine arts based on Western European traditions dominate? One of the assumptions of my research is the potential for controversy that characterizes public art. Examining the nature of the controversy surrounding the APP program and its commissioning process will help to determine what is unique to Hawaii concerning priorities, aesthetics, and value systems.

Interest in the subject of public art is growing, but much scholarly research is still necessary. However, I found the following writings to be of great help. Grace Overmeyer wrote one of the standard texts, Government and the Arts, in 1939. More directly concerning public art's controversial nature, The Reluctant Patron by Gary Otto Larson covers the period from 1943 to 1965; and the excellent The Arts at a New Frontier by Fannie Taylor and Anthony L. Barresi is the first text to document the history of the NEA. Since the late 1970s, a spate of research has scrutinized the economics of public subsidies: The Subsidized Muse by Dick Netzer is a critical study of federal aid to art; in Patrons Despite Themselves, Alan L. Feld, Michael O'Hare, and J. Mark Davidson Schuster investigate indirect government subsidies and implications of changes in tax laws pertaining to artists and institutions; The Democratic Muse by Edward C. Banfield evaluates government subsidies, focusing on economic justifications. Information is also available in journals and periodicals, specifically those relating to the arts and architecture. Art News, Magazine of Art, Art in America, Landscape Architecture, and Dance Magazine, have been some of the most helpful. Popular magazines such as Vogue, Saturday Review, and Harper's have also
discussed government support of the arts. No one work focused on the process of commissioning artists, particularly pertaining to Hawaii. To date, no one has documented the history of the SFCA or its APP program.

A review of the available material concerning public art clearly demonstrates its controversial nature. This conflict raises further questions. What exactly was the nature of the conflict? Did the parties to the conflict resolve it? If so, how? What values or priorities can we extrapolate from these resolutions? These questions will be pertinent to my research into the commissioning process of the APP program.

Finally, this study will document the origins of the Foundation, specifically, its early years and the enactment of the percent-for-art legislation.

Research Methodology

The research methodology is inter-disciplinary, with an emphasis on the humanities and social sciences. The special circumstances surrounding state arts councils in America prompted the method of inquiry for this study. The States and the Arts\(^{15}\) (1971) by Mel Scott, whose interests are urban planning and art, was extremely helpful. Another important text for this research is Place Makers\(^{16}\) (1981) by Ronald Fleming and Renata von Tscharner, both design principals of The Townscape Institute, a non-profit, public-interest planning organization in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Using the case study method, the authors analyze various works of art, which they designate as "placemakers," in several states, although Hawaii was not among them. Some of the placemakers include carved tree trunks, a mechanized race horse clock, play sculpture, murals, and fountains. The commissions came from both the public
and the private sectors. I base my case-study method loosely on the Place Makers format. Art Research Methods and Resources\(^{17}\) (1984) by Lois S. Jones is excellent as a basic art research text. Complex Organizations\(^{18}\) (1984) by Ron Westrum and Kahlil Samaha provided the basic principles for a theoretical background and understanding of organizations and how they function. According to the authors, "the most common practice in organization research" is to use interviews to elicit information about past and current events, rules, and structures.\(^{19}\) To prepare for the interviews, I used The Voice of the Past: Oral History\(^{20}\) (1978) by Paul Thompson and How to Do Oral History\(^{21}\) (1985), a publication of the Center for Oral History at the University of Hawaii.

The interview method provided an immense amount of information, particularly about the early years of the SFCA and the inception of the arts legislation. I obtained highly selective interviews from individuals whom arts advocates in Hawaii recognize as significant participants in the formation of the Foundation and the creation of the percent-for-art law. These interviews were essential because of the lack of scholarly research about the SFCA or its APP program, both inaugurated in the mid-1960s.\(^{22}\)

The commissioning process itself includes an aspect of human relations, the determinants of values and tastes. How do people make choices within an institutional, cultural, or ethnic context? Specifically concerning the different members sitting on the Art Advisory Committee (AAC), why did they select certain artists and not others? Did the AAC members represent the broad spectrum of the community? Or did the SFCA rely on the same group of professionals and artists—a closed circle of advisors? In order to answer some
of these questions, I interviewed artists, members of the AAC, and SFCA board members.

I applied certain rules to the interviews. Before the meeting, I prepared questions; and during the taped interview, I asked the respondent for a perception of what happened and the extent of participation. By establishing an empathetic relationship—non-confrontational and non-judgmental—I encouraged respondents to go into detail concerning their opinions. I took notes only to serve as future questions or for clarification. Whenever possible, I checked information against other sources, including other interviews. In the two instances when respondents requested that I keep selected portions of an interview off the record, I assured those respondents of confidentiality. Most interviews lasted for two hours.

I did a major portion of the research at the Hawaii State Library, reviewing issues of Paradise of the Pacific and back issues of the two major newspapers, as well as at the Hawaii State Archives. The documents I examined at the Archives consisted mainly of Hawaii statutes pertaining to the arts legislation; annual reports of the SFCA, from its inception to the latest reports; and correspondence concerning the Foundation. I also reviewed the papers of Governor John A. Burns and any other documents concerning the SFCA. The Municipal Reference and Records Center was an excellent source of information concerning the Model Cities projects.
Emphases and Limitations

This study traces the origins of the SFCA, but it is not a definitive history or an in-depth examination of the internal workings of the organization and its various programs. Instead, it concentrates on the APP program and how it has administered the percent-for-art law—specifically, how it has commissioned works of art for permanent locations, works the SFCA characterizes as “site-specific.” Site-specific sculpture is a form the artist creates for the environment in which the APP will install the completed work.

The program guidelines stress public participation. Thus, my argument asks whether the program under the direction of Preis and then Richards achieved the existing goal of broadening arts experiences for all the people. If so, how did it do so? How did it define and accomplish guidelines? How did the process ultimately work out?

This study is not a comparative one that explores both government support and private funding. The support of corporations, businesses, and private foundations is extremely important if the arts are to flourish. Support for public art is a valid activity for private enterprise, but this study focuses only on the government because of the particular emphases of my research. The dearth of historical documentation on the Foundation—a leader in mandatory percent-for-art legislation—makes essential my focus on this form of government support.

In my study, I limit analysis to works of sculpture, partly because of the Foundation’s decision to commission only monumental sculptural works. The Foundation selected sculpture because of its potential for high visibility—its usual installation outdoors makes it more easily accessible to the public.23
Selecting which artist or work of art to analyze is rarely simple, and the large number of accomplished artists only compounded the problem. Therefore, the choices by no means represent the only significant names in the arts community. The final selection embodies a personal interpretation of currents in the commissioning of works of art. Such a representative selection of artists should give insight into other works the SFCA commissioned. The key question remains: Whose art is it?

Exploring the experiences of those artists the Foundation did not select as finalists for a commission is another study. My research does not directly address their situation because I decided to look at artists who received commissions in order to determine whether the Foundation followed the program guidelines or not.

Synopsis of Chapters

Chapter 1 discusses the subject of public art and its potential for controversy, the purposes and perspective of this study, research questions, and methodology.

Chapter 2 presents an overview of various arts legislation on the national level, with an emphasis on events leading up to the formation of the National Endowment for the Arts. The legislative mandate for the different arts proposals has nearly always been to make the arts accessible to all the people.

Chapter 3 examines the status of the arts in Hawaii and the events that eventually led to the formation of the State Foundation on Culture and the Arts. This chapter highlights Alfred Preis, the acknowledged architect of Act 269, the legislative mandate creating the Foundation.
Chapter 4 is an examination of the SFCA organization, an overview of its goals and selected projects and activities. It looks at the first SFCA board under the leadership of Masaru (Pundy) Yokouchi, whom Governor John A. Burns appointed as chair. It also explores the partnership of Yokouchi and Preis as they work to implement the new arts program for Hawaii.

Chapter 5 discusses the introduction and passage of the percent-for-art legislation. It examines the roles of Governor Burns, Preis, Yokouchi, and the different legislators as the bill passed from introduction to its final reading. It presents procedures and guidelines for the program from their conception to their revision in response to a legislative audit.

Chapter 6 focuses on the case studies of three sculptors—Satoru Abe, Laura Ruby, and Sean Browne—and their Art Advisory Committee. This discussion concentrates on how the committee selected the artists, the level of community involvement and participation, and an interpretation of the completed work of art. Because an assumption of this study is that controversy will surround public art, the discussion includes a dissenting opinion of artist Rocky Jensen.

Chapter 7 concludes this dissertation with some remarks about the commissioning process of the APP program as it applies to the case studies and an interpretation of the values the artworks convey about the participating communities and their significance for Hawaii as well as the rest of the nation.
Chapter 2
National Arts Legislation: Cultural Democracy

... as a great democratic society, we have a special responsibility to the arts. For art is the great democrat, calling forth creative genius from every sector of society, disregarding race or religion or wealth or color. ... In our fulfillment of ... responsibilities toward the arts lies our unique achievement as a free society.

John F. Kennedy

Government Support of the Arts: Early America

In America, public art has a long and somewhat erratic tradition. Even an overview of the history of public art in America shows that some of our leaders were convinced that government should be involved with art. As the first president and the first voice for government support, George Washington believed that arts and sciences were essential to the prosperity of the state and the happiness of the people.¹ His philosophy was more than rhetoric, and when planners were designing the future federal city, Washington asked them to include an arts center.² Thomas Jefferson was also convinced that art was important. He viewed art as he viewed science, education, and matters of state: essential requirements in freedom’s struggle. He contended that freedom was the first step towards happiness, and “art was the first step toward freedom.”³ In his role as patron of the arts, Jefferson commissioned sculptures for the Capitol. Giuseppe Franzoni and Giovanni Andrei were two Italian sculptors he
brought to America in the spring of 1806 to carve decorative designs in the interior of the capitol building. Franzoni carved an eagle in stone for the frieze of the House and a piece of sculpture to stand between the columns of the colonnade behind the Speaker's chair. Andrei was responsible for sculpting the capitals of the columns and designing the frieze. Jefferson also envisioned a public art gallery and fine arts department. In contrast, John Adams was ambivalent. He believed that the arts enriched life but were not essential to everyday living. Adams proposed that the arts should assume importance only after the resolution of social, political, and economic matters. His views reflected general public sentiment of the time. The idea that government should support the arts was not pervasive; government had other urgent priorities.

James Buchanan established the first Commission of Fine Arts in 1859 as a response to a petition from 127 artists calling for such an agency. The petition declared that the time had come for America "to assume a position in the world of art as enviable and exalted as . . . we have attained in our social and political relations." A year later, Congress abolished the Commission by refusing to appropriate the funds necessary to establish it. In January, 1909, as a result of an appeal by the American Institute of Architects, Theodore Roosevelt established by executive order the Council of Fine Arts. The order called for a commission of thirty members. This commission eventually dissolved when Congress refused to appropriate funds for its maintenance. In 1910, William Taft inaugurated the National Fine Arts Commission. The panel consisted of presidential appointees—an architect, a sculptor, a painter, a landscape artist, and a lay person—all with four-year appointments. It functioned primarily in an advisory capacity on matters concerning the national capital. The inclusion
of arts experts and a lay person on the panel indicates that Taft recognized the importance of public involvement. The lay person had the opportunity to participate as a representative of the public at large in aesthetic concerns affecting the national capital.

Early efforts to provide government support of art concentrated either on beautifying public buildings or on setting up arts councils and departments. Significantly, the icons of public art enshrined European forms from the classical tradition, as Jefferson's commission of sculptures from Italy illustrates. The advisory panels also emphasized fine arts, as the names of the various councils or departments imply. Their major responsibility was the aesthetic quality of the national capital. Taft's arts council was notable for involving a lay person as one of the advisors. These early efforts consistently stressed the elitist fine arts of the Western European traditions the first settlers brought to the New World. Successive generations passed on the traditions of the Old World. Despite various attempts by some of our presidents during the early years, we had no comprehensive or extensive program for the arts until Franklin Roosevelt assumed the presidency during the Great Depression.

New Deal for the Arts

Franklin Roosevelt dealt swiftly with the problems confronting his new administration. The most urgent need was relief for the nation's unemployed. The government proposed two methods of achieving this relief: state grants from the federal government to enterprises that would not interfere with private industry, and a program of public works. To accomplish these goals, the
government created a plethora of agencies, from the Civil Works Administration (CWA) to the Works Progress Administration (WPA).

Basing the work relief program on the right of the worker to earn a living, government extended its support by providing special projects for artists. The American government had finally committed itself to intensive patronage of the arts. The first program for the arts, the Public Works of Art Project (PWAP) for professional artists, began in November 1933 under the aegis of the Treasury Department. It became one of America's greatest art patrons, responsible for building and embellishing post offices, court houses, and similar federal facilities. Edward Bruce, who was a lawyer as well as a professional artist and collector of art, took on the task of organizing work projects for the artists. Coming from an elitist background and education, he believed in acquiring "good art." His influences included both the Renaissance ideal and a personal taste for realistic art.  

The work relief program for artists became controversial as questions arose concerning its administration. Was it a relief program or a project to acquire works of art for the government? Bruce's answer was relatively simple: the PWAP was a work relief program employing professional artists to beautify public buildings in America. In contrast, Harry Hopkins, who administered the program, believed the purpose of the art projects was work relief for all destitute artists. The public's perception of the art projects was mixed. Some viewed the program as a relief project for particular unemployed workers, while others believed the government provided an outlet for "undiscovered American genius." The question of elitist art was at the center of this controversy. Bruce insisted on hiring only professional "superior artists" who created images
of the American scene. He based his concept of “good art” on his training and his taste for classical traditions deriving from the Renaissance ideal. His stress on excellence provoked charges of elitism. In contrast to Bruce, by emphasizing the need to provide opportunities for all artists, Hopkins represented populism. Because Hopkins was sensitive to the special plight of the Negroes, work relief projects included them. Hopkins issued an order declaring that no one should discriminate against any qualified workers because of race, religion, or political affiliation. When the PWAP ended in the summer of 1934, its employment rolls listed 3,749 artists, among them Stuart Davis and David Smith.

A second program followed the demise of the PWAP. In October 1934, the Treasury Department organized the Section of Painting and Sculpture (the Section) to embellish public buildings, especially post offices. Artists such as Thomas Hart Benton, George Biddle, and Maurice Stern were responsible for an outpouring of mural art portraying and criticizing American life. These expressions of social protest art seemed to be concerned predominantly with strikes by workers, breadlines for the poverty-stricken, and the plight of the sharecroppers. The Section was the first government-sponsored art program that attempted to involve the community in the selection of artists. It asked for “the cooperation of people throughout the country interested in the arts” whose judgment the Section would respect in selecting artists to create the works, and whose criticism and advice it would respect concerning their production. But the Section would be the ultimate judge, because the government was responsible for disbursing funds. However, the government had finally attempted to involve the people in the production of public art. For the first time, the public would have a say regarding the kind of art it preferred. The
Section ended its art program in July 1943 when Roosevelt asked for budgetary cuts.

The last and most extensive program was the WPA's Federal Art Project (FAP), which opened its doors in 1935, functioning almost concurrently with the Section. Of all the New Deal art programs, the FAP was the most expansive, and it exerted the greatest influence on American consciousness. The FAP would be enormously influential, although indirectly, in future arts programs for America. Holger Cahill, a museum curator and expert in American folk art, coordinated the FAP, which provided work relief for all unemployed artists. However, beyond providing work relief, it fostered a cultural revolution in America. Cahill envisioned a program that would have permanent value for the people. His aim for the FAP was to "work toward an integration of the arts with the daily life of the community, and an integration of the fine arts and practical arts." His outreach program included art education and community service. Under his direction, traveling exhibitions depicting the American scene—Edward Hopper's deserted streets, John Sloan's New York sidewalks, and Georgia O'Keefe's perceptions of southwestern plateau-country—visited rural communities with no previous exposure to the arts. The program integrated art with the people's daily lives by stressing education and increasing public awareness of the arts. It was responsible for bringing artists into the community through classes and community involvement. Artists taught classes in the arts and crafts, such as painting, textile design, printing, and photography. Carl Degler characterizes this period of government involvement in the arts as the "first time the American audience and the American artist were brought face to face for their mutual benefit."
American folk art was Cahill's primary interest and area of expertise. Thus, he attempted to create a "general movement to maintain art activities and . . . a great reservoir of art in many forms as a vital function" of the FAP. As a result of Cahill's influence and direction, the FAP encouraged and recognized both arts and crafts as art. The significance of this integration is that for the first time there was no demarcation between the fine arts and the practical or functional arts. Because of Cahill's leadership, another significant aspect of the FAP was an emphasis on grassroots themes and the preservation of local culture. The FAP made its most important effort to sustain the nation's artists during the dark years of the Great Depression. At its highest point, its projects maintained more than five thousand artists on its rolls. Before the program ended in 1939, the free art classes averaged sixty thousand students per month. Its sixty-six community arts centers attracted about six million visitors.

Despite its success in broadening opportunities for artistic experiences for people who had previously had none, the FAP generated its share of criticism and controversy. Conservatives and opponents of the New Deal characterized the art program as boondoggling. The most severe critics saw absolutely no value in the works the program produced. Others dismissed them as exercises in mediocrity. Conversely, supporters of the program and the works it produced believed the government was providing opportunities for young or new artists. They saw at the heart of the program not the creation of art for art's sake but a belief in art as a vital part of the life of all citizens. The New Deal art program was able to draw together the arts and crafts, recognizing both as aesthetic forces in America. In addition, it encouraged individual responses to the
American scene. Social realism and avant-garde abstractions were just two of the many styles that resulted. An increasing number of artists were producing a distinctively American art. The work of David Smith is an excellent example of the new aesthetic awareness.

In 1943, the New Deal for the arts ended. The basic premise of the program had been its temporary nature. It was primarily for economic relief during a time of crisis, and art was a by-product. In The Reluctant Patron, Gary Larson argues that the program was an anomalous contingency plan; therefore, any legislative attempt to give it permanent status would be unsuccessful. No precedent existed, nor did any art coalition attempt to persuade congressional members that the program should continue. Although President Roosevelt spoke privately of the importance of continuing the program in some fashion, he believed that the opposition of legislators reflected the opinion of the public at large. The lack of consensus that support of the arts was a function of government, implying puritanical refusal to indulge in the luxury or frivolity of subsidizing the fine arts for the enjoyment of an elite, was a deciding factor in ending the program, particularly in light of the near certainty of war. By 1941, aesthetic concerns had given way to preparations for war. Other than a puritanical dismissal of art, America's unwillingness to continue the art program is attributable to a belief that culture, like education, was a state or municipal concern. The American tradition of individualism and strong reliance on private enterprise and an opposition to an overly centralized government are further explanations.

One of the important consequences of the New Deal art program was its demonstration that support for art was a feasible function of government. The
significant confrontation between the artists and their audiences, plus community involvement, resulted in an increased appreciation of and interest in the arts. "Art was no longer a stranger in thousands of communities."22 America witnessed "lively artistic ferment" despite the Great Depression, because art had the support of the greatest art patron—the federal government.23 Two of the most important considerations in a successful art program for the people were community involvement and public education about the arts. In spite of its impermanent nature, the New Deal art program left behind an important legacy for future arts policies.

Federal Legislation Prior to 1960

When the New Deal art program ended in 1943, the federal government ceased playing a role as patron of the arts. Until the 1960s, various congressional attempts to pass arts legislation were unsuccessful. Although these attempts failed, they were still important because they reminded citizens and politicians of the need for a federal arts program. A summary of the failed legislative attempts will convey the nature of the struggle that finally resulted in the formation in 1965 of the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities.

In January 1937, Representative William Sirovich (Democrat) from New York, introduced legislation to create an executive department of science, art, and literature, which was an attempt to make the art program of the New Deal permanent.24 His resolution provoked extensive debate over the question of government control of the arts. Critics feared that such a move toward "officialdom and a ministry of art" would produce mediocre and uninspired institutional art. Artist Charles Burchfield complained that the New Deal art
program was a response to an economic crisis and therefore should remain temporary.\textsuperscript{25} Supporters argued that such a department would encourage the development of art. It would also perpetuate American cultural traditions and promote enlightenment for all the people. The bill failed to pass. In January 1938, Representative John Coffee (Democrat) from Washington and Senator Claude Pepper (Democrat) from Florida co-sponsored legislation that proposed a Bureau of Fine Arts. As with Representative Sirovich's bill, opponents of this bill raised concerns about political control and the danger of an official art.\textsuperscript{26} Some opponents complained that an official bureau would not concern itself with questions of education or quality.\textsuperscript{27} Supporters of the legislation claimed that such a bureau would encourage a cultural awakening, producing a body of "great works" of art. Once again, the arts legislation failed.

During the 1940s, legislation in support of the arts did not fare any better, and the federal government did very little to further the arts. Much of the government's activity focused on cultural exchange programs. For example, an exhibition of American paintings the State Department had purchased circulated abroad. The situation for the arts remained virtually unchanged during the 1950s, the period of the Cold War. The federal government still regarded as vitally important the mobilization of cultural assets for circulation abroad in order to promote international communication and understanding. It also circulated cultural assets abroad in response to European critics who claimed that, as a nation, Americans were indifferent to the arts.\textsuperscript{28} Europeans charged that despite its apparent material wealth and power, America was a nation of unregenerate Philistines. According to British poet and critic Stephen Spender, the Europeans felt that the Americans were concerned merely with expanding
their own political and economic influence. The Americans would not allow the Europeans to maintain their way of life and culture. Therefore, America had to impress upon its dubious allies that indeed it did have culture and did care about cultural freedom. Promoting culture and arts abroad would help to disarm critics and dispel fears about America as a nation of materialistic Philistines.

In 1954, during Dwight Eisenhower's presidency, the government inaugurated the Program for Cultural Presentations Abroad. The new program sponsored overseas tours of American performing and creative artists. In 1955, Eisenhower proposed a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, but Congress refused to act on the proposal. However, in 1958, Congress did act when Senator William Fulbright and others urged support for the establishment of a National Cultural Center of the Performing Arts (which ultimately became the John F. Kennedy Center). Clearly, America had no continuous or consistent policy or program for the arts before the 1960s.

Art and the Phenomenon of the Sixties

The decade of the 1960s saw remarkable support for the arts. With President John Kennedy in the White House, support for the arts steadily increased. During the first two years, Congress considered several wide-ranging bills—for example, one establishing an advisory arts council, and another, a program of grants to states for art projects. The 1963 session examined various bills to establish a national arts foundation.

A discussion of some of the social, political, and economic factors affecting America in the new decade will shed light on this phenomenon. First,
Americans claimed the world's highest standard of living. The economy was strong; the U.S. dollar reigned supreme. Unemployment was down from previous decades, and in more than ten million households, both spouses were employed. As a whole, Americans had more money to spend than in previous years. They had increased leisure time to enjoy their affluence, and most seemed to recognize that life was more than the acquisition of material goods. Some people were gaining the awareness that the world would judge America not merely on the basis of military or economic power, but by the quality of its civilization as well. Art gained in importance as it became a part of the life and the spirit of the people and of the future of American civilization. The American people’s concern for the arts influenced representatives in government.

Second, demand for and interest in cultural and artistic activities was increasing, as rising attendance figures at performances and museums demonstrated. Despite the demand, artistic enterprises were unable to cope with rising financial deficits and increasing production costs.

Third, the sixties also bore witness to civil rights activism. With the emergence of the Black Power movement and its emphasis on cultural consciousness, Black Americans joined forces to advocate change. Other ethnic groups, each unified within its own community, also formed coalitions in order to attain political and social equality. The Black American’s cry for cultural pride and dignity, for community action, struck a responsive chord in the various ethnic communities. Increased ethnic consciousness and pride resulted in a proliferation of multicultural aesthetic tastes and values. Another result was the emergence of social protest art, similar in certain respects to some
of the art of the Great Depression. Artists who were socially or politically motivated focused on simple, direct visual messages and downplayed sophisticated, abstract aesthetics. The major difference between the two periods is that the heightened ethnic consciousness of the sixties accompanied an urgent sense of militancy. Perhaps the most graphic representation of both the activism and this militant stance was the raised clenched fist of the Black Power salute.

Fourth, like the other social movements of the period, the arts became a cause: the arts community banded together and presented a united front before congressional hearings. Art advocates were learning how to testify and gaining practical experience in exerting pressure on behalf of the legislation they favored. As a lobbying group, the arts community was gaining political sophistication.

Finally, the mood in Congress was changing. Long-time advocates of the arts, Representatives Frank Thompson (a leader in proposing arts legislation) and John Lindsey and Senators Jacob Javits, J. William Fulbright, and Hubert Humphrey, gained the support of Senator Claiborne Pell, one of the “strongest advocates of new government programs.” According to Lindsey, the mood was definitely changing: "More than 100 bills have been introduced in this 89th Congress" for the purpose of supplying federal financing for the arts on a matching basis. Film critic Stanley Kauffman claimed government subsidy was inevitable.

Thus, activism best characterizes the decade of the 1960s. Critics of social injustice advocated change. These critics generally emerged from groups with little or no political weight or power: ethnic minorities, women, and the arts
community. The rhetoric of the period emphasized raising the quality of life for all, and government support of the arts increased in importance.

Kennedy's Invitation to the Arts

On January 20, 1961, John Kennedy took the oath of office as the nation's 35th president. Just before Kennedy's swearing in, Robert Frost, the dean of American poets, stepped up to the lectern and recited "The Gift Outright." Frost had written the patriotic poem in the 1930s as a benediction to America. Kennedy suggested the poem after Frost declined to compose a verse for the inauguration because he didn't write "occasional pieces." Frost would become the most prominent symbol of the fact that, for the first time, the arts would be welcome in both the White House and the affairs of state. Not since the days of President Jefferson, who claimed art was as important as statecraft, had the arts enjoyed such prestige.

In all, 155 leading figures in the arts and sciences received invitations to the inauguration. The list read like a who's who of significant people in the arts community, among them e. e. cummings, Archibald MacLeish, Ernest Hemingway, William Faulkner, Alexander Calder, Stuart Davis, Paul Hindemith, and Igor Stravinsky. Each of the artists, among the most creative, eminent, and world-renowned in their fields, received a telegram that stated, in part, "During our forthcoming administration, we hope to seek a productive relationship with our writers, artists, composers, philosophers, scientists and heads of cultural institutions. As a beginning, in recognition of their importance, may we extend you our most cordial invitation to attend the inaugural ceremonies in Washington." The significance of Kennedy's
invitation to the artists on such a memorable occasion was, according to Frost, "a moment of enhancement." Frost asserted that recognition of the arts was an action most becoming an administration, "just as it becomes a reign."41

The Arts Lived in Camelot

The Kennedys brought youth and glamour as well as substance and elegant refinement to the White House. Kennedy attracted to his administration a cadre of young people who, like him, exuded charm and intellect. His administration had definite beliefs concerning the need for government to do more for the arts. Jacqueline Kennedy, an avid supporter of the arts, aided the administration's cause. She showed great interest in historic preservation. With the assistance of private donations to acquire original early nineteenth century pieces, she refurnished the White House to reflect the period of its initial construction. She helped to establish a White House Fine Arts Committee and a White House Historical Association. In 1962, the government published a guidebook to the White House, which Congress had declared a national monument.42

President Kennedy was firmly convinced of a direct link between the health of the arts and the health of a society—the arts symbolized a nation's purpose; they were not merely a distraction. Echoing the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson, Kennedy claimed the arts to be a presidential responsibility.43 He supported his rhetoric with action. One of the most exemplary actions occurred on August 7, 1961, concerning the Metropolitan Opera. The cancellation of the 1961–62 opera season was imminent because of a dispute over musicians' wages. Opera lovers made a public appeal to Kennedy to save the Met season. A few days later, Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg initiated a successful
arbitration of the dispute. Goldberg advised that in order to survive, the performing arts needed the support of business, private companies, and government—a prescription for a future arts policy for America.\textsuperscript{44} The president highlighted his identification with the arts during a series of White House state dinners where artists and intellectuals shared the place of honor with scientists and statesmen. Never before had the White House been so receptive to artists and intellectuals. For the first time in history, the White House became a cultural center, as “State dinners came adorned with an extra service of culture—a Shakespeare performance, Igor Stravinsky, Bach, and Mozart, or a cello recital in the East Room.”\textsuperscript{45} Kennedy had firmly established himself as a president for the arts, and culture thrived in the White House.

A New Frontier for the Arts

Lobbying for the arts intensified, and in 1961, in one of the earliest bills of the new decade, Representative Frank Thompson (Democrat) of New Jersey and Senator Hubert Humphrey (Democrat) of Minnesota proposed to create a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts. Its purposes would be to encourage private initiative in the arts, to work with all levels of government to promote the arts, and to increase the cultural resources of America. Representative Thompson was well aware that opponents of the arts bill feared government control and censorship. Critics were concerned that government support would ultimately lead to mediocrity and that diversity and competition would wither. Thompson argued that the government was most unlikely to engage in any activity that would degrade American artists or compromise artistic taste. The all-encompassing federal aid that most of the opposition assumed such a bill
would require was not a consideration in his legislation. Instead, the bill would be a congressional cachet to the arts as well as recognition, long overdue, that the arts are important to Americans. Calling for enactment of the legislation, Thompson stated, "The time is now."47

Advocates in the arts community agreed. Thompson, New Jersey Democrat Charles Joelson, and Connecticut Democrat Robert Giaimo held hearings November 15 and 17, 1961, in the Court House of New York City. They invited representatives from opera, the concert stage, and both management and labor, as well as writers and critics, to present testimony. Representatives of the arts community focused primarily on the urgent need for government support of the arts. Sol Hurok, arts entrepreneur and producer, argued that government did not hesitate to subsidize commercial industries and farmers, so it should not treat the arts any differently.48 To counter criticism from opponents who claimed that subsidies would result in fostering mediocrity, advocates such as George Balanchine of the New York City Ballet and W. McNeil Lowrey of the Ford Foundation contended that support could only improve the artistic and cultural scene of America. Furthermore, it would not only encourage but ensure artistic excellence.

Passage of the arts legislation would indicate that the arts are vital to American life. William Schuman, president of the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts, concluded his testimony by saying, "as a matter of national pride, if for no other reason, we can no longer delay involvement of the federal government in the support of the arts."49 Still Congress delayed. But the mood of the country concerning government support for the arts was definitely changing.
Besides the Thompson-Humphrey bill, Congress considered two other major bills in 1961. Senator Joseph Clark (Democrat) of Pennsylvania introduced a bill to establish a program of state grants for the development of an arts program. Matching funds from the federal government would help the various states evaluate any existing programs, survey future or additional program needs, and develop or broaden new activities and projects. States could also use funds to help build arts centers for performances, exhibitions, and classes. Additionally, funds could go toward preserving historical sites. Senator Jacob Javits (Republican) of New York proposed a bill to establish a United States Arts Foundation. Its goals would be to promote the study and advancement of the arts by providing financial aid to non-profit groups and to subsidize state arts organizations with matching funds. Javits argued that government support of the arts is “a widely accepted method of stimulating artistic enterprise.” He believed that we might never hear from some of the greatest artists without such support. He also predicted that federal expenditures for the arts would stimulate financial support from private foundations, corporations, and businesses.

As congressional members worked slowly for passage of various arts bills calling particularly for an arts council and a program of matching state grants, a group of the White House staff expressed similar interest in subsidizing the arts. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., who was special assistant to the president, was foremost among these arts advocates. He also served as the liaison between the administration and the intellectual community. Other individuals who demonstrated great concern for the arts included Presidential Press Secretary Pierre Salinger, Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs
Phillip Coombs, Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg, and his assistant secretary, Daniel Moynihan. Schlesinger and Salinger organized the White House advocates to devise an arts policy for the administration. During a meeting on July 20, 1961, Coombs circulated a memo calling for establishment of a steering committee comprising White House representatives and government agencies with a special interest in a cultural program. The White House never formed such a committee, but many of the individuals at the meeting suggested that the White House staff should include a full-time special assistant for cultural affairs, whose main task would be to come up with a national cultural policy. Schlesinger countered that the administration should recruit someone outside of the White House as a consultant on a part-time basis to come up with a general program. He also recommended the man for the job: August Heckscher, director of the Twentieth Century Fund. Various art groups, as well as the press, applauded Heckscher’s appointment to the White House in 1962. Heckscher believed in the basic assumption that government must support the arts. He said, “To hold otherwise would go against the experience and the example of every civilized society.” When he accepted the appointment, he claimed his job would be successful if he could help establish a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts, recommend future policy concerning the arts and government, and permanently institutionalize the role of special assistant to the president for the arts.

As special consultant, Heckscher monitored legislative activities concerning the arts. He discovered that Congress had considered at least 40 bills in the last session. Several other significant pieces of art legislation were under discussion. He also undertook a survey of arts activities in which various
government agencies were already involved. One of his major accomplishments was the compilation of a report concerning the arts and the federal government. It contained important, far-reaching ideas and would become a blueprint for government arts policymaking. Most important, he argued, the position of special advisor should continue permanently. He loosely defined the role as being available for advice on all matters relating to the arts. The advisor would serve as liaison between the White House and the National Cultural Center. Second, he recommended creation of an advisory council within the executive office of the president. It would be responsible for reviewing federal policies for improving all matters pertaining to design—for example, minting of coins and stamps. It must recommend long-range programs and assure active participation of the artistic community. The council should provide advice to the various agencies of government and organize art competitions for the commissioning of design projects. The council could help to stimulate the cultural activities of the nation. Heckscher endorsed the National Arts Foundation that Congress was considering. Such a foundation would administer grants-in-aid on a matching basis to states in the process of setting up arts councils or arts institutions.

Having accomplished what the White House commissioned him to do, Heckscher resigned in the spring of 1963 to return to his position as director of the Twentieth Century Fund. During an interview, he told a reporter that America can “combine numbers with excellence.” That idea, he said, is as bold as that of the Founding Fathers, who affirmed that freedom and democracy were compatible. A nation that is committed to combine culture and democracy would find its life changed as it pursued its goals. Heckscher submitted his
report to President Kennedy on May 28, 1963. Kennedy characterized the report as opening up a new and fruitful relationship between government and the arts. Although government can never take over private enterprise's role of patronage and support, the president said, it can play a significant role in helping to establish the conditions wherein art can flourish.\(^{57}\) The significance of the Heckscher report is its influence on future national arts policies. Ultimately, other arts legislation would incorporate a majority of Heckscher's recommendations.

However, first, on June 12, 1963, by executive order, President Kennedy established the President's Advisory Council on the Arts. In response to the reluctance of the House of Representatives to give the Council legislative endorsement, Kennedy signed the order at the urging of Heckscher and Schlesinger. He claimed that creating such a council meant that the public, "for the first time, would have some formal government body concerned with all aspects of the arts. Artists and arts institutions have somewhere to go to present their views and air problems."\(^{58}\) Kennedy favored the council because "adequate concern for basic cultural institutions" did not always accompany widespread public interest in the arts. More and more people were attending museums, but the rising expectations for more public services had increased financial strains. Although demand for concerts was increasing, Kennedy saw no evidence that employment opportunities for professional artists would increase. The arts needed a stable financial and institutional base. Government must not neglect them. "Government agencies are concerned with the welfare and advancement of science and technology, education, recreation and health. The arts must receive similar attention."\(^{59}\)
President Kennedy intended to announce the names of the nominees for the Advisory Council on the Arts as soon as he returned from a scheduled trip to Dallas. The Council never met. Kennedy was assassinated in Dallas on November 22, 1963.

The second recommendation in Heckscher's report called for the creation of a full-time position for a special advisor on the arts within the executive branch. Ironically, the New York Times published the announcement of Kennedy's appointment of Richard Goodwin as special advisor on the morning of Kennedy's death in Dallas.60

The Great Society Constructs an Arts Foundation

With the death of Kennedy, the presidency passed to Lyndon Johnson, a direct inheritor of the New Deal tradition and philosophy, who believed that government existed to help people unable to help themselves.61 Johnson also inherited the legislative proposals of the New Frontier. Almost immediately, he announced he would complete the art program Kennedy had begun. Heckscher joined Schlesinger and others in urging Johnson to carry out Kennedy's program for an arts council.62 In May 1964, Johnson appointed Roger Stevens special assistant to the president, the first full-time arts coordinator in America's history. Stevens began lobbying for legislation for a permanent arts agency. Partly because of his successful lobbying, partly because of an enthusiastic arts coalition, Congress would finally pass an act establishing the first arts council.

On October 29, 1963, subcommittee chairman Senator Pell opened hearings on the National Arts Legislation, which proposed a National Council on the Arts and a National Arts Foundation. Senator Humphrey spoke of frustrating efforts
in the past to enact arts legislation. He said that such legislation was important and that the people should not have to rely on a directive from the White House, a reference to Kennedy's executive order establishing an advisory arts council. He concluded, "We ought to have this thing deep enough in the social fabric of our country that there is a continuing support of the arts."63

The hearings ran for five days. Approximately forty witnesses testified, including, for example, Albert Bush-Brown, president of the Rhode Island School of Design; Francis Keppel, United States commissioner of education; and Stewart Klonis, director of the Art Students League of New York City. Much of the art advocates' argument focused on the need for government to support the arts because they were essential to further individual development. For a free people, art was essential to life, not an incidental part of it.64 John D. Rockefeller III, who introduced himself as "a director of several organizations active in the field of arts," emphasized the need for educating the public to accept responsibility for the arts as important and significant for the community. He argued that "when [government places] a new emphasis . . . on the arts in our national life," sources other than government would become aware of the needs of and responsibilities for the arts. "As in other fields where something is so basic to the well-being of our people, the government along with others has a very definite responsibility."65 In addition to the oral testimony at the hearing, the subcommittee received messages in support of the legislation from artists such as concert pianist Rudolf Serkin and composer Richard Rodgers. Their testimony also became part of the Congressional Record.

A notable exception to the enthusiastic support for the legislation came from Wheeler Williams, president of the American Artists Professional League,
Inc. He said the legislation had good intentions, but the result would be disastrous. He compared government support of the arts to the communist "use of art as a weapon pursuant to Stalin's directive." However, Chairman Pell discouraged the discussion by interjecting that he wanted the record to show that he fundamentally disagreed with the witness "when it comes to relating alleged political belief with the virtues and values in art."  

Congress finally passed the bill creating the National Council on the Arts in September 1964. President Johnson now had a congressional mandate to assemble the council. On February 23, 1965, Roger Stevens announced the names of the 24 nominees. The stage was set for expanded arts legislation. Focus shifted to the creation of an arts agency. The Great Society administration had already tried to determine which was more feasible to ask Congress to establish: a foundation for the arts and humanities or two separate foundations. The final legislation joined the arts and the humanities under one foundation, with two separate but equal councils and endowments. Accounts pertaining to the history of the legislation vary, but they generally acknowledge that congressional leaders Pell and Thompson worked with the Johnson administration to push legislation for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. On March 10, 1965, Pell and Thompson asked President Johnson to transmit the administration bill for congressional action. Special subcommittees in the Senate and House worked on the bill. The amended version passed swiftly in the Senate on June 10, 1965. The House hotly debated pros and cons of the legislation on September 15, 1965. Controversy raged over the fear of government interference, the major concern of opponents of support for public art. The arguments concerning government control raised
three general objections: first, subsidies foster mediocrity; second, government has the potential power to dictate standards and compel artists' conformity; third, such control holds the potential for censorship or propaganda, resulting in official art. The Republican-led opposition repeatedly raised fears of government intervention and the production of mediocre art. For example, William Broomfield, representative from Michigan, claimed that, in addition to mediocrity, such control by government could lead to a "Federal straitjacket over creativity." Arizona Representative John Rhodes expressed concern that the proposed legislation was a "threat to the very foundations of our Nation's cultural activities." As an example, he cited the Soviet Union's domination of the arts, which he believed should serve as "sufficient warning against experiments of this nature." The inference is that the arts could not thrive under the weight of government bureaucracy.

While the fear of government intervention was a contentious issue, the elaborate bureaucratic structure of the proposed foundation provoked equal dispute. Charles Jonas, representative from North Carolina, worried about the cumbersome structure, especially with its potential for rising costs and growing bureaucracy. This concern was particularly worrisome because the national budget was already operating at a deficit. Furthermore, the increasing demand for art activities would aggravate the potential for another bureaucratic nightmare. Advocates of the proposed legislation were also apprehensive about the elaborate structure of the proposed foundation, which would act as an umbrella for the two endowments. Pennsylvania Democrat William Moorehead informed critics that the drafters of the legislation considered one foundation with two separate but equal endowments "the most simple and effective
structure possible." This concept also had the "approval of persons in the arts and letters, bipartisan support in Congress, and the backing of the Johnson administration." 72

By maintaining that the bill afforded adequate protection from government control, Moorehead was able to mollify critics who feared such intervention. The bill included a provision for matching private donations; therefore, Moorehead said, the private sector served as a deterrent. He further argued that the chairmen of both endowments as well as the members of the federal council would act as deterrents. As individuals of stature, completely independent of government, they would not submit so easily to government control. The House finally passed the legislation.

On September 29, 1965, President Johnson signed the act into law at a Rose Garden ceremony. To the 250 congressional, humanist, and cultural leaders in attendance, Johnson proclaimed:

Art is a nation's most precious heritage, for it is in our works of art that we reveal to ourselves, and to others, the inner vision which guides us as a nation. And where there is no vision, the people perish.

We in America have not always been kind to the artists and scholars who are the creators and the keepers of our vision. Somehow, the scientists always seem to get the penthouse, while the arts and the humanities get the basement. 73

Before the passage of legislation creating the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities, some congressional members were either indifferent or openly hostile to government support for the arts. Such negative attitudes may
have reflected the attitudes of the people they represented. Controversy surrounded the arts legislation. Some of the most heated debate concerned government control. Critics equated government subsidies with intervention and regulation. They were concerned that great works would eventually give way to mediocre or substandard art, or worse, propagandistic works the federal bureaucracy sanctioned. Inevitably, government would be the arbiter for the arts. Implicit in this fear of control over the artists and their works was a concern with censorship and the loss of expressive freedom. Historically, Americans pride themselves on their sense of individualism and self-reliance. Hence, the idea of giving up a sense of control to an impersonal, centralized bureaucracy is distasteful to most Americans. Likewise, they would not respond favorably to the idea of a government-dictated style of art or taste.

However, America and its people were in a period of transition. Americans no longer were indifferent to the arts; they did not merely support the rhetoric of the importance of art in life; they demanded action, and they got it when Congress enacted legislation creating the national foundation. Credit for passage of the bill must go to President Johnson, who, early in his presidency, vowed to support the Kennedy art program. Passage of the legislation stands as a memorial to John Kennedy, the first president to extend an invitation to the arts.

A Federal-State Partnership

The National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities serves as an advisory body to two equal but separate entities, the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). Each endowment has its own presidentially appointed panel of 21 private citizens
widely recognized for their expertise or interest in the arts and related
disciplines.\textsuperscript{74}

The structure of the endowments is very complex, and their numerous
programs are beyond the scope of this work. The aspect of NEA activities that
is germane to this study is the Grants to States program. Congress authorized
the NEA to make matching grants to states to strengthen existing projects and
programs that were making a significant public contribution and to aid in the
development of programs to provide arts experiences for all the people and
communities.\textsuperscript{75}

When it established the national foundation on September 29, 1965,
Congress authorized an appropriation of $10 million for the fiscal year ending
June 30, 1966, and an additional $10 million for each of the next two years.
The annual appropriation included 2.25 million for the NEA, and an additional
2.75 million to the NEA for the state arts agency programs, subject to matching
provisions, effective in fiscal year 1967.\textsuperscript{76} In \textit{The Arts at a New Frontier},
Fannie Taylor and Anthony Barresi state that congressional appropriations
have "great political and public relations impact." But the actual amounts the
budget department allots may be considerably lower than the ceiling figure
Congress approved.\textsuperscript{77} The budget department did not apportion the actual
funding for the NEA to carry out state programs for fiscal year 1966; and it
allotted only $2 million for fiscal year 1967 as opposed to the $2.75 million
Congress had authorized.\textsuperscript{78}

The purpose of federal assistance to the various state and local arts
agencies was to motivate them to expand their own resources. The
government believed that an inherent interest in and desire for the arts must
stimulate the different agencies and communities. Their incentive to establish an arts program or to expand existing programs must be the underlying force in their taking such action. Government subsidies could be crucial in helping to strengthen existing programs or develop new ones and broaden an audience base, but federal initiative always aimed to encourage local support and ultimate independence for the arts.

The original legislation authorized a program of grants-in-aid to the various states to develop projects that would provide arts to all the people and communities. In order to qualify for funding, each state had first to establish or have in existence a state agency to administer the program; second, to guarantee that the program would expend federal funds solely on projects the state agency approved using criteria and guidelines similar to those that applied to federal grants-in-aid; and third, to furnish status reports. The legislation allotted a maximum of $25,000 to conduct a study for the development and establishment of a state agency. Almost from its inception, the NEA subsidized the different arts agencies then in existence or in the process of organizing, to the tune of 20 percent of their annual appropriations. In 1973, Congress would legislate that this allocation be mandatory.

Throughout the nation, state arts agencies would ultimately become a potent political force, especially after they began to receive more than token support from their respective legislatures. According to a 1967 NEA annual report, only 17 states and Puerto Rico had an arts agency in place before 1965. Nineteen states and the District of Columbia created agencies in 1965. Hawaii created the State Foundation on Culture and the Arts on July 12, 1965. By the spring of 1967, nearly all the states had organized arts agencies.
Summary

The struggle for public art has been long and precarious. Several of our presidents stressed the importance of art in the life of the people. In the early days of the republic, the emphasis was on elitist fine art of the Western European traditions—from the artistic icons in the national capital to the various proposals for advisory art councils. Successive generations of Americans passed down this tradition of high art. The New Deal brought about a significant change, as the federal government embarked on its most extensive program of arts patronage. Controversy surrounded the art program, which provoked charges of elitism and boondoggling. Despite these charges, the administration of Harry Hopkins made the work relief projects accessible to all, regardless of race, religion, or politics. Furthermore, the Section encouraged public involvement by seeking public opinion concerning the selection of artists. The art program was most expansive under Holger Cahill's leadership of the FAP. Cahill emphasized community involvement and participation by all artists and other citizens. The program held art classes and activities for the public in community art centers. Educational opportunities brought the arts and crafts together, recognizing both as art. The combination of elitist fine arts and populist functional arts represented the federal government's first major step to bring the arts to all the people. Although the New Deal art program ended with economic recovery, it was noteworthy because it demonstrated that supporting the arts was a feasible function of government.

During the 1940s and 1950s, government support for the arts was dormant. Much of the focus was on international cultural exchange programs.
Partially in response to European criticism that America as a nation was indifferent to culture and the arts, the government sponsored American performing groups and art exhibitions abroad. It hoped the cultural program would encourage international communication and understanding. Legislative attempts to establish an arts bureau failed repeatedly until the 1960s.

The sixties was a propitious time for the arts. With Americans as a whole enjoying affluence and increased leisure time, many turned to cultural pursuits in an attempt to improve the quality of their lives. They developed a heightened awareness of the importance of the arts in the lives of all people. A demand for equal opportunity pervaded the various social movements, including the arts movement. As Congress became attuned to these concerns, it considered a number of arts bills—at least 100 new ones in the 89th Congress. For the first time, America had a special assistant to the president for arts, when President Kennedy appointed August Heckscher. Heckscher's report concerning the national government and the arts served as the foundation for future arts policies. Also for the first time, and despite the controversy surrounding the legislation, Congress established the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities. Some recognize the Foundation as a monument to President Johnson, who signed the bill in September 1965; it also serves as a memorial to President Kennedy, who brought the arts to a New Frontier.

Government's role as patron of the arts has reached two high points in American history. The first was in the 1930s, a time of economic adversity; the second was in the 1960s, a time of militant activism. The two periods have remarkable similarities. Both decades saw the emergence of social protest art, a response by artists, as one segment of the general populace, to the turbulent
times. Furthermore, the leadership of Presidents Roosevelt and Kennedy played a significant role in the government’s willingness to get involved with an arts program. Roosevelt, an activist president, dealt swiftly with the massive unemployment problem facing his administration, thereby supporting all artists, whereas Kennedy, through executive action, responded to a public demand for an advisory arts council. He also appointed a presidential arts assistant. Both presidents were from an elitist background, were well educated, and were Democrats. Hence, they believed in the value of opportunities for all citizens, including equal access to arts experiences. Both were ideal leaders for their times and were able to articulate as well as carry out arts programs for the people. Apparently, periods of great stress to the social and economic structure of America can produce great arts patronage.
Chapter 3
Creation of the State Foundation on Culture and the Arts

Hawaii's artists and institutions have benefited as a result of legislators who believe that cultural activities must be supported in order to protect the well-being of society.

State Foundation on Culture and the Arts, Annual Report 1988–89

The Rise of Ethnic Diversity

In America, the 1960s were a time of prosperity and optimism, with pockets of poverty generally comprising women and minorities. One of the most explosive issues of the decade was the civil rights movement. The impact of the black community's solidarity and militant activism in advocating social changes swept the nation. Black Americans united and in one voice demanded full political, social, and cultural equality. The emphasis on cultural consciousness and pride spread from the black community to other ethnic Americans, as they too searched for personal roots. Black power represented an affirmation of the "worth and dignity of the black man without references to the white ideal." Tremendous social and cultural transformations occurred nationwide. The decade was a period of "communal ethnic encounters." It was a time when the various ethnic groups began to examine their personal identities in an affirmation of cultural heritages and values. Amidst the social turbulence and pluralism that was America, diversity increased and tolerance of the different cultural expressions grew.
According to Herbert Parmet, "The civil rights movement helped elevate Jack Kennedy to Lincolnesque proportions." He campaigned as a supporter of civil rights. One of his outstanding achievements was a civil rights bill that proposed to protect "the right of all Americans to be served in facilities which are open to the public—hotels, restaurants, theaters, retail stores, and similar establishments." President Lyndon Johnson signed the bill in 1964.

When Johnson addressed the nation for the first time after Kennedy’s assassination, he said, "Let us continue." His message was clear: the Great Society would carry out the programs of the New Frontier. In his first State of the Union address, he declared that he intended to keep the economy growing, "to open for all Americans the opportunity that is now enjoyed by most Americans and to improve the quality of life for all." Johnson signed 60 federal aid to education bills. His other priorities were civil rights legislation, which his administration expanded, and the war on poverty. The expanded civil rights legislation was evidence that an organized community of people with similar interests and goals was capable of bringing about social and political changes through protest.

The people of Hawaii took part in the social activism and protest that reverberated throughout the country. For example, when student protest against the Vietnam War raged across the nation, students at the University of Hawaii demonstrated with peace signs, protest songs, and sit-ins against the national call-up of army reservists and national guardsmen. The experience of Hawaii’s various ethnic groups, women, and youth was similar to that of the black community. They, too, were at a disadvantage because those in power
were not considering them. They had few, limited opportunities for aesthetic experiences—either Western or non-Western.

But a new Hawaii was in the making. Under the leadership of Governor John A. Burns, the Democrats who controlled the legislature called for the adoption of the governor's ethnic doctrine of a "balanced ticket." Ironically, Japanese-Americans dominated the party. The Burns administration comprised individuals who viewed the young and growing state as an exciting challenge. They were convinced that they could bring about social transformation. According to then state representative Hiram Kamaka, altruism, the need to accomplish a greater good, motivated the legislators. He claims they saw themselves as implements of community desires. The actions of the legislature responded to the people's wants. Kamaka says, "This was a time for Hawaii's chance at Camelot." Two of the most progressive bills this legislature passed established the State Foundation on Culture and the Arts and the percent-for-art in state buildings law.

Hawaii's Arts Awakening

In the sixties, Hawaii was still in its infancy as the 50th state. It experienced affluence and an arts awakening, but with a difference. Although it was and remains unique because of its diverse ethnic groups and multicultural richness, artistic expressions of the various ethnic groups—for example, Hawaiians and Filipinos—were nearly invisible. The pervasive art forms and dominant culture derived from Western traditions, what some ethnic groups referred to as haole culture. Both the visual and the performing arts heavily emphasized Western, high art traditions.
One of the high art traditions was the Honolulu Symphony, purveyor of classical Western music, which attracted the widest audience, while performances of non-Western music or instruments were rare. The audience attending a symphony performance was typically overwhelmingly Caucasian, with only a smattering of people from other ethnic groups. The musicians in the orchestra were also Caucasian. Another high art tradition, community theater, presented a similar pattern. On the island of Oahu, combined figures for the Honolulu Community Theater, the Honolulu Theater for Youth, the Magic Ring Theater, and the Windward Theater Guild totaled 338 performances of 41 separate productions for an audience of approximately 119,000. Both audience and performers were nearly always Caucasian.

Despite these disparities, the arts were in demand. Attendance at the Bishop Museum for 1963 was nearly five times as great as for the previous decade. Attendance at the Honolulu Academy of Arts for the same period also increased. Although the population of Hawaii was 5.6 percent greater than in the previous decade, audiences for the arts were significantly greater. The Department of Education, the Young Women's Christian Association, and the Young Men's Christian Association sponsored adult education classes such as ceramics, photography, and painting, which created further interest in and demand for the artistic experiences.

Hence, although Hawaii had its arts awakening, the different ethnic communities its population included did not experience the benefits of the mainstream American culture. Of the various ethnic groups in Hawaii, the arts greatly underrepresented Hawaiians, Filipinos, and Samoans as artists and performers as well as members of the audience. No educational outreach
programs existed to enable these groups to understand and appreciate Western high art.

The tendency of the major institutions of culture, such as the Academy of Arts and the University of Hawaii, as well as of the media, to promote and support mainstream American culture to the detriment of the various ethnic groups compounded the problem. This historical colonial point of view would look upon a work by Gustave Mahler as art but would fail to see the art in the performance of a hula to an old Hawaiian mele (song). Rather than affirm and strengthen the different ethnic cultural roots and identities, Western bias dismissed or negated ethnic aesthetics. Thus, the diverse ethnic groups had few, isolated opportunities for artistic experiences, Western and non-Western.

However, events such as the Kamehameha Day festival and the Fiesta Filipina celebrated, respectively, Hawaiian and Filipino music, dance, costumes, and traditions. For example, during the Fiesta Filipina, residents from both the plantation community and the white-collar professions came together to share traditional foods, fashions, customs, and music with the other people of Hawaii and the tourists alike. Such cultural festivals attracted a diverse audience, a cross-section of Hawaii's population; yet this audience was not visible at a performance of the Honolulu Symphony or the Honolulu Community Theater. Did ethnics feel socially or culturally inferior in the presence of haole culture? Or did Western art forms simply not appeal to them?

According to a Model Cities program report, some residents perceived cultural events such as the Honolulu Symphony or a classical ballet too formal or intellectually demanding. Such activities were outside their social realm; they also saw them as “playthings for the idle or as status symbols of the upper
class. Other members of ethnic groups hesitated to participate in or attend Western cultural activities to avoid embarrassment or anxiety that might result from their difficulties with the English language and their inability to express themselves.  

In The Unfulfilled Promise, Edward Arian challenges the assumption that people who did not appear at artistic events lacked interest. He says that a Louis Harris study in 1975 demonstrated that a large number of Americans desired arts experiences for themselves as well as their children. Their failure to attend such events was due to the formal atmosphere, lack of nearby facilities, insufficient leisure time, and cost. The prices of the tickets for most high art activities were exorbitant and prohibitive for members of the lower socioeconomic group. These reasons help to explain the absence of Filipinos or other ethnics at Western high art events in Hawaii.

Hawaii underwent a cultural reawakening similar to the one taking place in the rest of the nation. But the dominant culture was Caucasian, and the pervasive art forms followed Western high art traditions. The people supporting the different cultural activities were predominantly Caucasians; ethnic minorities were in the audience only infrequently. Cultural life in Hawaii did not offer a range of meaningful choices.

The New Hawaii

In the sixties, Hawaii was just emerging from its territorial status. Statehood meant no more presidially appointed governors; Hawaii's voters could also help select the president of the United States. The new decade also ushered a so-called "new party" into power: the Democrats. Except for the
temporary loss of the state senate from 1959 through 1962, they have controlled the legislature since 1954, the year of the "Democratic Revolution." In his 1966 inauguration address, Governor Burns spoke of the "New Hawaii." Gavan Daws' Shoal of Time, Lawrence Fuchs' Hawaii Pono, and Francine du Plessix Gray's Hawaii: the Sugar-Coated Fortress present notable discussions of John Burns and the Republican downfall. The intent here is not to retell the story but to focus on concepts of education for the people of Hawaii, especially those in the Democratic Party platforms. For the Democrats, art was another tool for learning. This concept is important because it influenced future arts legislation for the state of Hawaii. A cursory examination of the relationship between Burns and his supporters helps explain the ease with which the state House and Senate passed legislation enacting the SFCA.

Governor Burns identified with the common people. As their standard bearer, he had a reputation for favoring those outside the haole oligarchy. The Democratic Revolution offered them hope and opportunity to participate in the political process and enabled them to gain entry to political and economic power, as well as social equality. Burns had the unconditional respect and trust of the Japanese community (the mainstay of his political base), which he reciprocated. Some have argued that the basis of this reciprocal relationship, which developed during World War II, was a psychological or spiritual bond. In People and Cultures of Hawaii, John McDermott describes such a close, reciprocal relationship as おん, the Japanese word meaning a sense of obligation. This loyalty became the foundation of Burns' political strength. He devoted his career as governor to the pursuit of equal opportunity for all the
people of Hawaii, regardless of race. He favored raising the standard of living and providing the best education for all. Burns' summed up his political philosophy in a 1959 speech to the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (ILWU). He said the ILWU had laid "the foundations for democracy in Hawaii because [it] freed the working [men] on the plantations . . . from the economic and political control of management; because [it] enabled [them] to realize that they had dignity, that they were citizens who had a right to participate in . . . government."28

In addition to providing Burns a loyal force of campaign workers, the Japanese, like Burns, were strong advocates of education, a highly significant measure of the revolution. As Lawrence Fuchs points out, after the Democrats' victory in 1956, the legislature increased expenditures to the public schools by $1.2 million over the previous Republican government's budget, increased teachers' salaries, and lowered University of Hawaii tuition.29 Francine du Plessix Gray argues that expending funds for education was symbolic of the "oriental veneration for learning."30 This veneration has some basis in the Japanese value of seiko (success drive), which is closely related to family pride and obligation. The children had to study hard and work hard in order to succeed for the family, which valued professional jobs (especially teaching) as well as the cultural esteem associated with learning. The family emphasized education, frugality, hard work, and perseverance. Because of the close resemblance of these values to those of the Protestant work ethic, seiko would ease the assimilation of the Japanese into the mainstream of American society.31 Thus, Burns and the Japanese community strengthened their
existing bond through a mutual respect for education. Both believed that education should be accessible to all the people of Hawaii.

Perhaps more than any previous or succeeding administration, the Burns administration consistently demonstrated interest in and support for education. The governor believed that the people of Hawaii were just as capable as their mainland counterparts. All they needed was the same educational opportunities, which the legislators could provide. Burns predicted that a bright future lay ahead for Hawaii if the young had a good educational foundation.32 In Jack Burns: a Portrait in Transition, Samuel Amalu claims that a youngster from Hawaii had difficulties competing with youngsters from the mainland; so the governor was “determined to reduce these difficulties by giving the young people of Hawaii all the necessary tools of art, science, and craft.” Only education could provide these tools. With Burns as head of state, education and the arts rapidly gained support.

Burns had no formal theory or approach to art. He was a high school graduate who identified with the common man. According to Dan Boylan, a history professor and a biographer of Burns, if the governor had articulated his philosophy of art, he would have based it on a “working man’s aesthetics.”34 The governor was concerned about the beauty and comfort of his home and yard. Flowers usually filled his house. Boylan says the governor would have felt awkward trying to express a philosophy of art, mainly because he did not have one. The governor’s son, James Burns, agrees. “That was not his way.” Although he enjoyed the arts, “The old man was not an art collector,” and he had no works of art in the house. “But he knew what he liked and what he didn’t like.” According to the younger Burns, the governor loved The
Submerged Rocks, a work artist Tadashi Sato installed in the Capitol. Sato also designed the color schemes for the house the governor built in 1967. The focus of a wall in one of the rooms was another version of Submerged Rocks that Sato made specifically for the governor.35

James Burns asserts that what motivated his father and the Democrats to support an arts program was the conviction that art as a tool, as another way of learning, would help to expand perceptions and educational opportunities for the citizens of Hawaii. Dan Boylan argues that altruism, not thoughts of political advantage, was the primary motive behind the governor's support of the arts legislation.36

A Master Builder of the SFCA

In 1965, Governor Burns selected Alfred Preis to be the first executive director of the newly established State Foundation on Culture and the Arts. An architect by profession, Preis is generally acknowledged as the master builder of the legislation creating the SFCA, Act 269. Preis was highly qualified to plan and implement art programs for Hawaii because he understood well the problems and concerns of the various art groups and empathized with his fellow artists. He also thoroughly comprehended and sincerely appreciated the arts. A biographical sketch including his background in, philosophy of, and attitudes about art will help to explain his pivotal involvement in the formation of the organization and the direction it would ultimately take. Preis was to have a compelling effect on a future arts policy for Hawaii.

Alfred Preis was born on February 2, 1911, in Vienna, the city of Freud and Mahler, and home to intellectual innovators in philosophy and architecture.
Vienna had a long history of affinity for the fine arts. For the Austrians, art was almost a religion. As Ilsa Barea writes in *Vienna: Legend and Reality*, the Viennese considered art "food for the soul." For Preis, expressions of art provided a source of value and meaning in life. Such a philosophy of art would be the opposite of the belief, common in Hawaii, that the arts were for the elite or the Caucasians. Preis's father was in the military, and the family was constantly on the move. As a youngster, Preis acquired his lifelong habit of reading. Books were a great influence during his formative years. Preis attended public schools, and one of his fondest schoolboy memories is attending performances of Wagner's *Der Ring des Nibelungen*. Attendance at such cultural events as the opera was a normal part of the Viennese education. The arts were a natural part of life available to everyone, not just the elite. However, public school education emphasized elitist high art.

The magical world of opera captivated Preis. As a young man, because he was a student and could not afford the price of a ticket, he joined the claque. The opera paid this group, usually students, to initiate applause at appropriate pauses in the music. He left the claque after three years, but music and the opera remained a part of his life. He also developed skills in negotiating, although he was not aware of them at the time, which he would put to the test when he took over as executive director for the SFCA.

Preis wanted to be an actor, and attended the apprentice program of the Deutches Volk Theater, an acting conservatory. He found that acting as a career was unrealistic because students always outnumbered available acting jobs. He decided to study architecture instead, and in 1932, he enrolled in the Institute of Technology. The most stimulating area of inquiry for him
concerned design elements, especially aesthetics and social or humanistic factors. The first design problem that confronted him involved the hypothetical conversion of the entrance gate to the Court Palace in Vienna into a war memorial. The major objective of this class assignment was to add spice to a drafting problem, but Preis knew nothing about war memorials or how to draft a baroque building. He learned, and this project would be helpful to him when, years later, he received the commission to design the USS Arizona Memorial at Pearl Harbor.

On March 14, 1938, Preis married Janina Wernikowska. 1938 was the year of the Anschluss, Hitler's annexation of Austria, and Preis's wedding day was also the day Hitler entered Vienna. Two months later he graduated from the Institute with a degree in architecture and engineering. The following year, Preis, now 28, fled his homeland for America, bringing with him a public school education that emphasized high art and his professional, elitist training in architecture. On June 22, 1939, the Preises arrived in Honolulu, where he joined the architectural firm of Dahl and Conrad. The small size of the firm taught Preis to work independently and to manage an office like an executive, a combination of skills that would prove useful in his future position with the SFCA. Preis remained with Dahl and Conrad until December 7, 1941. At the outbreak of World War II in the Pacific, the U.S. Immigration Service interned Preis, who had fled the Anschluss for freedom in America. He did not regain his freedom until March 1942. The following year, Preis started his own firm.

By 1949, the American Institute of Architects (AIA) was becoming increasingly active. That year, the AIA provided consultant services to the Pacific War Memorial Commission. Preis, a former war internee, became a
member of the subcommittee that worked on the memorial plans. Although the AIA task force that received the design contract for the USS Arizona Memorial was dedicated to preserving the memory of the men who had lost their lives, a difference of opinion arose concerning the form this memorial should take. One group proposed that the memorial be functional, a facility people could use. Preis and others preferred a contemplative memorial to promote the meaning of the loss. Recalling his first design problem as a student at the Institute of Technology, Preis stressed that his main purpose was to pay homage to the dead. His student project had focused on the necessity for creating a transition from the world outside to the inner world, an escape from the noise of the world to a secluded place for inner thoughts. For Preis, memorials were capable of changing one's consciousness. They provided an opportunity to reflect and to respond. How would he translate this concept into a memorial over the final resting place of the 1,102 American servicemen who lost their lives on December 7, 1941?

An enclosed bridge spans the sunken half of the USS Arizona. Preis describes the form of the structure, which dips in the center but stands strong and vigorous at the ends, as expressing initial defeat but ultimate victory. Sunlight floods the memorial through wide openings in the roof and in the walls, which also permit a close view of the sunken battleship, both fore and aft, eight feet below. At low tide, as the sun shines upon the hull, the barnacles that encrust it shimmer like jewels, transforming the rusting metal into a beautiful sarcophagus. Lack of funds delayed work on the memorial, which took almost two years to complete. The private sector raised money and
Congress appropriated additional funds for its completion. The dedication took place on Memorial Day 1962.

Before the sixties had ended, several of Preis's designs dotted the architectural landscape of Hawaii: the First Methodist Church, the ILWU buildings in Honolulu and on the outer islands, the entrance building at the Honolulu Zoo, to name a few. Public schools and private homes also bear the Preis imprint. His architectural achievements have earned him both local and national recognition.

The time had come for a new challenge. Preis gave up a lucrative business when he accepted the position in the Bums administration. When he fled the Anschluss, he claimed coming to America saved his life. Repaying a debt to America became more important than the pursuit of wealth. Preis dedicated a major portion of his time and energy to public affairs and volunteer work. He served as executive director for the SFCA for nearly two decades.

In 1963, prior to accepting his SFCA position, Preis served as state planning coordinator in the Department of Planning and Economic Development (DPED). The path to that appointment was circuitous. In 1961, Preis headed a volunteer committee of environmentalists, architects, and landscapers who opposed the governor's proposal to merge the Department of Planning and Natural Resources with the Department of Planning and Economic Development. They were concerned that the merger would adversely affect environmental programs. The governor was sympathetic to their concerns and also receptive to the suggestion of Aaron Levine, Director of the Oahu Development Conference, to have an advisor in his administration to address social and aesthetic issues. The following year, during an
environmental committee meeting, the director of the Department of Planning and Economic Development, Shelley Mark, asked Preis to consider the position of aesthetic advisor in the Burns administration. Because Preis was already involved in volunteer civic work, specifically environmental and urban planning, he decided to accept the appointment, which he received in 1963. Burns was not actively involved in any of the discussions concerning the appointment. Clearly this was not a matter of placing a Burns man in the position. Mark was the person solely in charge of the appointment. Preis was never involved in any of the Governor's political campaigns. The implication is that Burns appointed Preis because of his interests in the environment and aesthetics, because Burns respected his expertise, and because Burns respected Marks's judgment.

As state planning coordinator, Preis was responsible for reviewing all materials pertaining to environmental, urban, and cultural affairs. In 1964, he received a copy of the federal legislation creating the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities and a copy of the Rockefeller report, which he described as a "national survey of the financial sanity of the arts." The report examined several non-profit organizations that sponsored professional opera, drama, music, and dance and their continuing financial difficulties. It found that despite an increasing demand for the arts, most of the organizations were struggling to survive. The report recognized the need to broaden the base of support, and it recommended that the various organizations conduct programs of community service and outreach, as well as energetic campaigns of education. Such programs would help to raise funds, but more important, they offered the potential for recruiting a body of volunteers who would be future
audiences for the arts. Although the study concentrated on traditional Western high art forms, it was significant as an economic rationale for government subsidies. It served as a vital source of information arts advocates referred to often—for example, when proposing legislation to establish a national arts foundation.

The Rockefeller report served as an excellent guide for the members of the art community whose major goal was to make the arts available to all who wanted to enjoy them. Its primary thesis was that the time had come for a common allegiance to the arts, and broadening citizen participation was necessary. Ultimately, Hawaii's arts program incorporated some of the findings and recommendations of the report, particularly a campaign of community education and outreach. Under Preis's leadership, the art community of Hawaii responded to the call for a common allegiance to the arts. According to national legislation and the Rockefeller report, the motivating factor behind government subsidies for the arts was broadening citizen participation, which would result in a democratization of art. What follows is a discussion of how Preis, with his elitist, high art background, influenced legislation establishing the State Foundation on Culture and the Arts.

Legislative Consensus for Act 269

After reviewing the federal bill creating the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, Preis believed the time had come to make a similar effort in Hawaii. The arts became his mission. His conviction that "Arts are a part of life," as well as his interest in architectural and environmental questions, and his belief that people in the art community expected him to support the federal
arts legislation, motivated him to approach Shelley Mark and Dan Aoki, the governor's administrative assistant. Both men encouraged Preis to prepare a short-form bill, which was a standard administrative form requesting an explanation of any proposed new legislation. Basing his draft on the federal bill, Preis prepared a proposal for a "Hawaii State Council on the Arts and Humanities." He sought informal responses to his draft from legislators and members on the governor's staff. One of their primary concerns was the proposal's inclusion of the humanities. Some people felt that Hawaii's uniqueness was its ethnic diversity and varied cultures. The general feeling was that expanding the scope of the newly proposed legislation beyond the traditional, narrow Western emphasis was necessary in order to consider the different ethnic arts and organizations. Preis changed the language of the bill to reflect this concern. This broadening of the proposed legislation's scope reflected significant government and art community recognition that aesthetic expressions of the various ethnic groups must be on an equal level with those of the Caucasians. However, the emphasis remained on fine arts: on February 23, 1965, House Speaker Elmer Cravalho introduced the bill (H.B. No. 10) proposing a State Foundation on Culture and the Fine Arts.

Preis asserts that the bill was very general, and its main objective was to promote culture and fine arts in Hawaii. The governor would nominate and appoint a director, with senate confirmation. According to the 1965 House Journal, the bill did not describe the duties and qualifications of the director, nor did it appropriate any funds for the program.

Cravalho referred the bill to the Committee on Public Institutions and Social Services. Chairman George Toyofuku says the members of the committee
approved and supported the bill because "Culture and arts [are] an extremely worthy function of the State, particularly because of the . . . various cultures in Hawaii." Their support extended to granting the director considerable freedom to accomplish the purposes of the bill. Furthermore, they decided that the word "fine" in "fine arts" was ambiguous, open to misunderstanding and confusion that could hinder accomplishing the purpose of the bill. They amended the bill to delete the word "fine." The name of the proposed agency became State Foundation on Culture and the Arts. This change made possible broader interpretation of the scope of the bill, to include, for example, folk arts of the various ethnic groups. The bill defined the terms "culture" and "arts" liberally, in order to allow the director substantial leeway. Culture included the arts, customs, traditions, and mores of all the various ethnic groups of Hawaii. Arts included architecture; crafts; dance; drama; industrial, interior, and fashion design; drawing; music; painting; photography; poetry; prose; sculpture; television and motion picture arts; and all other creative activity of imagination and beauty. Representative Hiram Kamaka and his Committee on Appropriations also reviewed and approved the bill. Both committees appeared to support the bill wholeheartedly. Their amendments did not radically alter its spirit or intent; instead, they would facilitate a more efficient and meaningful implementation of the arts program.

When Shelley Mark testified in favor of the bill, he announced that the president of the United States had recently signed into law a bill establishing a National Council on Arts. A bill to establish a National Arts Foundation was pending in Congress. According to Mark, if Congress enacted that bill, "Hawaii
could qualify for annual grants of approximately $100,000, and the passage of H.B. No. 10 . . . will facilitate the receipt of federal grants."57

Preis surmises that because H.B. No. 10 originated as an administration bill, the legislature recognized that Governor Burns wanted the bill to pass. H.B. No. 10 moved swiftly through the House. It moved with equal ease through the Senate, where the Committee on Economic Development, Tourism and Transportation received it warmly. Senator Nadao Yoshinaga, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, gave a glowing account of the bill, commending the House for its initiative in providing for the state’s systematic participation in the arts—an area long the victim of governmental indifference.58 His report continued:

Culture and the arts are too important, in terms of our heritage, our present growth, and our future development as individuals, as members of social and art groups, and as a state and society, to be so long ignored. The Senate is proud to join the House of Representatives in providing for active and coordinated state participation in this field and thus to take another major step in achieving the "New Hawaii."59

Committee members proposed minor amendments only to facilitate state participation, because they recognized that such an activity was new for Hawaii, and few states had much experience in the arts. The Senate passed the bill on May 24, 1965.

Looking back at the legislation, Preis recalls that when it came up for hearings it was "somewhat in danger because of the over-enthusiasm of a small number of witnesses."60 These people viewed art from a classical
Western high art tradition. They lacked understanding of the cultural needs of the different ethnic groups and the diversity of art forms, such as folk arts and crafts. A small number of legislators looked askance at government subsidies for the arts. But according to Mark, these legislators “eventually fell in line because they knew this was a Burns bill.”

When Preis dealt with the legislators who questioned public expenditures for art, he merely pointed out that the institutions of culture—for instance, the Honolulu Symphony Society and the Academy of Arts—typically received their support from Caucasians who were in the audience or present at board meetings. He also informed the legislators, a majority of whom were Japanese, that when he sat on the Board of Directors of the Honolulu Symphony Society, “not a single director on the Board . . . was not haole.” Preis asserts that the vacuum, the under-representation of ethnic groups at cultural events, was obvious to all the legislators on both sides of the aisle. Preis is convinced that one of the greatest assets of the Japanese culture is a deep belief in the value of education and a high respect for learning. According to Preis, for the Japanese, “Art was the highest form of education.” All he needed to do was to point out that a vacuum existed. The implication is that the Japanese legislators understood that the arts legislation was one way to expand the opportunities for aesthetic experiences to all the ethnic groups of Hawaii who desired them. Thus, on May 28, 1965, when Representative Kamaka moved that the House pass the final reading of the bill, the members agreed unanimously. Legislative consensus resulted in the establishment of the State Foundation on Culture and the Arts.
Summary

Hawaii was and remains unique for its diverse ethnic groups and multicultural expressions. During the 1960s, like the rest of the nation, Hawaii experienced an arts awakening. Its dominant culture and art followed Western high art traditions, which some of the ethnic residents called haole culture. Elitist arts organizations and institutions often overlooked the various ethnic groups. The ethnics lacked cultural opportunities. In addition, an elitist attitude failed to see the art in ethnic folk arts and crafts.

The 1960s also saw the new Democrats, under the leadership of John Burns, take control of Hawaii’s politics. As a result of the Democratic Revolution of the prior decade, the formerly dispossessed gained political and economic power, as well as social equality. Burns and his new Democrats, with the Japanese as the mainstay of his political base, had an unshakable conviction in education as the way to social and professional success. They supported education for all the people of Hawaii. A corollary of this support for education was support for art. Despite the lack of documentary information concerning the governor’s attitudes towards the arts or a Democratic treatise on art, indications were that the new Democrats viewed art and education as one. Both were avenues to achieving excellence, and all the people of Hawaii must have equal access to both.

Support from the governor and the legislature eased Alfred Preis’s work to establish a State Foundation on Culture and the Arts. Preis’s Viennese background and his elitist high art education and training were bound to influence his approach to arts legislation. When he based the short-form bill on the national legislation, its focus was the humanities and fine arts. Because of
the general feeling that Hawaii's uniqueness was its ethnic diversity and multicultural richness, the House amended the bill to broaden its scope.

Little controversy surrounded the arts legislation. The bill passed swiftly in the Senate. It faced minor opposition in the House, where it ultimately passed unanimously. When the legislature created the SFCA, it publicly recognized that every citizen had a right to experience the arts. This right was as much everyone's social right as the right to education. The legislature's passage of the bill was also recognition of Governor Burns's consummate leadership, his ability to draw together various groups with their different objectives and make his objectives theirs. Creation of the SFCA made art accessible to all who desired to participate: non-Caucasians as well as Caucasians.
Chapter 4
The SFCA Outreach

People think that art is something that they have to have after dinner. I don't want the artist to be the after dinner mint. I want him to be part of the main meal. . . . I want art to be part of the whole community.

Gian-Carlo Menotti

The Reluctant Chairman: Pundy Yokouchi

The State Foundation on Culture and the Arts came into being on July 12, 1965, when the Hawaii State Legislature passed Act 269. The SFCA’s legislative mandate was to encourage and promote culture and arts activities for the citizens of Hawaii. State and federal monies would fund projects. But who would Governor Burns appoint to head such an innovative and challenging new foundation? No one in Hawaii would have guessed Masaru “Pundy” Yokouchi; not the culture and arts community; not even Pundy himself.¹ He was the governor’s long-time friend and confidant, as well as his unofficial campaign manager and advisor on the island of Maui.²

Yokouchi was born in Wailuku, Maui, on August 25, 1925. A graduate of public schools, he attended Cannon’s Business School in Honolulu for one year, then entered the military. After his discharge from the army, Yokouchi worked in his family business. In January 1960, he founded Valley Isle Realty, and for the next 30 years, he developed and served as a consultant for such projects as the Lahaina Square Shopping Center, the Manoa Marketplace Shopping Center,
the Maui Prince Resort, and the Four Seasons Hotel in Wailea. As George Cooper and Gavan Daws claim in *Land and Power in Hawaii*, Yokouchi's company was one of the organizations on Maui with a "concentration of politically successful men in the Democratic years." During the sixties, promoting land development was a way to prosperity and influence for the former "outs."³

How would such a warm and gentle person, whose demeanor violates the stereotype of the corporate president, a person with no formal education or administrative experience in the arts come to chair the most important arts organization in the state of Hawaii? Although he had no formal training in the arts or in education in general, Yokouchi had always been a strong believer in education because "It was the key to betterment for all."⁴ He served on the first Advisory Council, which worked closely with the Board of Education. As a child growing up on Maui, he had no opportunities to see a play or attend an orchestra concert. In high school, he took art for one year. The Yokouchis had no artworks in their home. Growing up during the Depression, Yokouchi had no money for the so-called "better things" in life. He recalls "dabbling in oil painting," which allowed him to splash on colors at will, "because I lacked the discipline for drawing or watercolors."⁵

His youthful enjoyment of splashing on colors may have subconsciously led Yokouchi, as an adult, to acquire a taste for artworks by abstract artist Tadashi Sato, who also lives on Maui. During the early sixties, Yokouchi discovered Sato's studio, which contained artworks that conveyed an oriental sense of peace and tranquility. Coincidentally, Yokouchi had just received $1,000 in interest from land speculation. The fledgling collector, who worked
at his parents’ bakery for $300 a month, spent the entire $1,000 on an oil, a
gouache, and a watercolor. Yokouchi says, “I wondered what I was doing, but
I couldn’t help myself; I just couldn’t stop with the one painting.” Ultimately,
the painting was the catalyst for Yokouchi’s long involvement with the
Foundation. As he relates the incident, one evening during the early years of
the Burns administration, the governor was visiting Yokouchi’s home in Maui.
Referring to the Sato painting, Burns facetiously asked, “What is that?”
Equally facetiously, Yokouchi told the governor that he, of all people, a strong
believer in education, should be supporting the arts, because they were just
another form of education. The arts and education should work together. A
long discussion ensued. Yokouchi told the governor about his belief that the
arts should be universal and belong to all the people. Art should no longer be
an “elitist sport,” as it had been in the past. The arts should be available to the
common people, because they had the right to get involved, and the best way
to encourage that involvement was through government support.

The governor respected Yokouchi and his opinion. And, clearly, the
governor listened. After that propitious discussion, Yokouchi walked into the
governor’s office one day in 1966, and Burns informed him that he was to
represent Hawaii’s official state arts council as its chairman at the national
council in Chicago. Burns explained the federal arts legislation and the purpose
of the conference. In disbelief, Yokouchi reminded the governor of his
inexperience and lack of education in the arts, as well as his lack of connections
with any arts groups. The governor reminded him of the conversation the Sato
painting had precipitated.
Yokouchi was reluctant; he argued that others more qualified and capable than he would “give their right arm to become chairman.” Burns persisted: if the common people had to get more involved with the arts, what better way than for them to identify with the arts organization’s first chairman, who is a commoner. Yokouchi was unable to refute this argument. The governor asked if he was acquainted with Alfred Preis and had any opinions about him. Yokouchi did not know Preis. The governor suggested that Preis, who was actively involved with the arts legislation during its formative stages, might be able to offer some guidance. Yokouchi and Preis both could attend the Chicago conference.

That Burns even considered Yokouchi as chairman of the new Foundation says much about the governor. Yokouchi’s was one name among several on a list of commissioners the governor’s staff proposed. Preis recalls that he and the governor’s staff each prepared a list of names to propose to the governor. Burns told Preis his list disappointed him: “I thought you knew better,” Preis quotes Burns as saying. “You’re giving me the same old names of people in the arts. Are you telling me there are no other people in Hawaii who can do something?” Preis says he was embarrassed because the governor was absolutely right. Thoughtlessly, Preis now states, he had taken the line of least resistance. He had gone to the arts community that was most familiar; many were friends or former clients of his architectural firm. Re-examining his list and his admitted bias in favor of Caucasians and high art, Preis came up with a new proposal. This time, he made sure to include representatives from each island, from different ethnic groups, and from every art form. He conscientiously avoided “the same old people.” He wrote to Tadashi Sato for
recommendations of representatives from Maui; Yokouchi's was one of three names Sato gave Preis.¹⁰

Although the governor gave Preis the opportunity to propose names, he did not consult Preis about the final selection. Preis contends he was not a "Burns man," despite his appointment as state planning coordinator; neither was he a "political person."¹¹ An inference is that the Burns administration may have viewed Preis, who was not a political insider, as an elitist, which was a disadvantage. The governor wanted a program that was diverse, not merely high art, so that the various ethnic groups could identify with and support it. The fact remains that the governor did not consult Preis in the final selection of the chairman of the SFCA. Preis learned of Yokouchi's appointment and pending trip to the Chicago conference through a local newspaper. According to Preis, Yokouchi was a natural choice because he was the "most loyal and strongest political advisor to Burns on Maui."¹²

Preis's assessment of Yokouchi's selection may be partly correct. But the appointment was not a political reward. Although Yokouchi had been a close political associate and family friend of the governor, he neither asked for nor wanted the SFCA position. In fact, the position intimidated him because he lacked the experience and training he believed the job required. The governor had previously offered him cabinet positions, but he had always refused because his interests lay elsewhere. This offer was different. Burns selected Yokouchi because he recognized that his friend's perception of and sensitivity to the arts went farther than any formal schooling might take them. A self-educated man himself, Burns understood that Yokouchi's dedication to the arts was a way to encourage education and personal development. The governor
also appreciated the value of the educational aspects of art. Most important, both men believed that the arts should be more accessible to the common people.

In addition, the governor recognized the prestigious value of art. He envisioned greatness for Hawaii and worked to promote the state and to gain prestige for its name. For example, he lobbied the legislature for more money in order to raise the height of the capitol. He felt that the added height would enhance the symbolic uplift and dignity of the building. Hence, the commanding structure would convey a prestigious image, evoking feelings of pride in the people, similar to the feelings the nation's capitol stimulated. Similarly, he anticipated that the new state arts program would also help to achieve prestige. After all, the new program reflected a national trend and implied that Hawaii was not a provincial island in the Pacific. It had the power to project a prestigious image of art in Hawaii as well as for Hawaii to the rest of the nation.

The Yokouchi appointment was a politically astute decision, a significant affirmation of the governor's commitment to being a man of the people and for the people. Yokouchi would be an excellent role model for the various ethnic groups. Here was someone from a working-class family, formerly of a plantation community on Maui, who grew up during the Great Depression, achieved success in business, and now was chairman of the board of the prestigious State Foundation on Culture and the Arts. Because Yokouchi had no connections or affiliations with any arts groups, the governor trusted that he would carry out the legislative mandate to make the arts accessible to all the people of Hawaii, specifically the various ethnic groups. Burns had complete
trust in and respect for his friend. For instance, when Yokouchi and Preis returned from the Chicago conference, and Yokouchi recommended that the governor name Preis as executive director of the Foundation, Burns did so.\textsuperscript{14} Clearly, the governor selected Yokouchi because he believed Yokouchi was the ideal candidate for the position. Burns was confident that Yokouchi would get the job done. This appointment was not a matter of the governor's placing his own man in a position to ensure his own control over the agency. On the contrary, Yokouchi contends, once the governor installed him as chairman, he gave him (and Preis) complete responsibility for the program. The governor believed in a hands-off management style, and although he gave his support, Yokouchi claims, "He never imposed himself or interfered with the program."\textsuperscript{15} Although Burns might generalize about an overall policy, he refrained from interfering with a program's administration. A consummate leader, he knew when to relinquish power.

The Odd Couple in Chicago

Before leaving for the Chicago trip, Preis received a phone call from Yokouchi. As he recalls, Yokouchi discussed his reluctance to become the new chairman. Preis responded by stressing the importance of Yokouchi's accepting the position. He argued that because he was Caucasian and spoke with a German accent, some people might not believe him.\textsuperscript{16} They would believe Yokouchi because he was an experienced businessman and had standing in the community. One inference is that the people of the various ethnic groups were more likely to respond to Yokouchi because he was a locally born Japanese, whereas Preis was a Caucasian from a foreign country. Another is that
Yokouchi was in a strong position to negotiate with the legislators, when the time arrived, because, first, he was Japanese, as were the majority of the legislators; second, he was one of Burns's most trusted confidants, and people were aware of that fact; and third, he knew and had working relationships with several of the legislators, because they all were part of the same network. Preis understood that Yokouchi would be extremely valuable to the new arts program because people saw him as a "Burns loyalist." In contrast, people would view Preis as an outsider. He was not in the Burns camp, he was from Europe, and he was an artist with elitist values.

The newly appointed chairman of the State Foundation on Culture and the Arts attended the National Conference of Governor's Representatives of State Arts Agencies at the Ambassador Hotel in Chicago on January 27 and 28, 1966. One-hundred-sixty-eight delegates participated; of these, 56 were official delegates of 48 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. South Carolina was the only state in attendance without an official representative. Utah was the only state without a delegation. Roger L. Stevens, chairman of the National Council on the Arts and the National Endowment for the Arts, Charles C. Mark director of state and local operations for the NEA, and Ralph Burgard, executive director of the Arts Councils of America were also present.

With temperatures averaging between minus-three and minus-seven degrees, Chicago was the site of the first meeting between Yokouchi and Preis. Yokouchi remembers that the contingent from Hawaii was the object of curiosity. Hawaii, with its connotation of "magic," was an attraction for many of the conferees, who sought out both men. Conferees were curious to see
what people from Hawaii looked like. "We were the original odd couple,"
Yokouchi recalls, "because they expected to see Polynesians or Hawaiians."
What they saw instead was "a guy with slant eyes; the other guy stood like a
ramrod—typical Austrian soldier." These two apparent foreigners represented
the State of Hawaii.

A group of high-powered individuals with a zeal for the arts led the
conference. They clarified the federal arts legislation and explained procedures
for funding. Preis and Yokouchi came away with several valuable ideas that
became specific activities for the SFCA—in particular, coordinating a state arts
conference and various workshops to exchange ideas; conducting a survey to
determine available assets and resources; and proposing policies following the
state conference, which the Foundation could amend whenever necessary and
as it accumulated experience.

Thus, two individuals from radically different educational, social, and
cultural backgrounds were responsible for conceptualizing and coordinating a
comprehensive art program for Hawaii. How would their different world views
affect their approach to the program? One characteristic the two men had in
common was success in their chosen fields: Yokouchi in real estate and Preis in
architecture. They also shared a dedication to expanding opportunities in the
arts for all the people of Hawaii. But the populace of Hawaii was cosmopolitan,
comprising various ethnic groups with their multicultural diversity. Where
would Yokouchi and Preis even begin to respond to the various needs? The
ultimate question would have to focus on the kinds of arts. The Preis-Yokouchi
relationship, which began in Chicago and lasted for two decades, would bring
about a transformation in the arts in Hawaii.
The First Commissioners

The first SFCA commissioners the governor appointed were people either Preis or the governor's staff suggested. The governor based his selections on ensuring representation from the various ethnic groups, from the different art forms, and from the major neighbor islands. Thus, the commissioners were ethnically and socially diverse. The board included representatives from the humanities (literature), crafts (ceramics) and popular arts (movies and television). It included teachers and administrators of public and private organizations. In March 1966, the first four commissioners took office: Reuel Denney, poet and professor of American Studies at the University of Hawaii (Honolulu); William Ichinose, Jr., ceramist and geophysicist (Honolulu); June Kanemitsu, housewife (Hilo); and Alvina Kaulili, high school music director (Honolulu). In April, three more commissioners joined the original four: Charlotte Cades, patron of the arts, who was active in cultural affairs (Honolulu); Thelma Hadley, head of the Kauai Library System (Lihue); and Edward Tangen, ILWU official (Honolulu). The final member of the first board, film and television actor Richard Boone (Kailua-Kona), took office in July 1966.

The commissioners were as diverse as the population at large. They were also inexperienced. They had no precedents. But they would learn, and so would Preis and Yokouchi, who, in their respective roles as executive director and chairman, would have to guide and lead the board. The subsequent sections present an interpretation of their leaderships roles on the basis of observations of the various commissioners and selected major projects that resulted from this unique partnership.
The first full-scale meeting of the new commissioners took place on April 20, 1966, with members Charlotte Cades, Thelma Hadley, Edward Tangen, June Kanemitsu, Reuel Denney, and William Ichinose, Jr., attending, and Alvina Kaulili and Richard Boone absent. Each commissioner received a copy of the act that established the Foundation and a copy of the federal legislation. They also received copies of Yokouchi and Pries's report on the Chicago conference, drafts of the NEA applications for study grants and program grants, and minutes of the meetings of the various Hawaii councils on culture and the arts. After Preis explained Act 269, he and Yokouchi informed members about the application for NEA funds, which would provide an outright federal grant of $25,000 to conduct a study for the development and establishment of the state agency and another $25,000 in matching funds from the state to help implement programs upon conclusion of the study. Both men stressed the SFCA's intent to stimulate community interest in the arts, as well as the necessity to widen aesthetic and cultural opportunities for all the people of Hawaii, including members of the various ethnic groups and different social and economic classes.

A primary goal of the Foundation was to seek as much participation as possible from the various members of the community, and one way to accomplish this goal was to involve advisory citizen councils in the different arts. This emphasis on community involvement and citizen participation would be important in the Foundation's various undertakings, particularly the Governor's Conference on Culture and the Arts, the Model Cities program, and the Art in Public Places program. Another aim of the Foundation was to assist; as Yokouchi stressed, it had no intention of "meddling." He intended his
statement to disarm those critics who equated government subsidies with interference and control. In order to involve the community and stimulate citizen participation, the Foundation also envisioned a cultural exchange throughout the state, taking artistic events to the neighbor islands and bringing their activities to Oahu.

One of the primary responsibilities of the Foundation was to provide cultural and artistic experiences for the "mental, moral, and spiritual health, for the highest attainable educational levels and for the prosperity, welfare and pursuit of happiness" of all Hawaii's citizens. Culture and arts would no longer remain the privilege of a few well-to-do Caucasians who supported primarily high art. The Foundation would devise programs and provide opportunities for the common people who had never attended a performance of a Shakespeare play, never heard a Bach concerto, or never visited an art gallery. Ethnic aesthetic activities, such as Peking opera, Kabuki performances, and ancient Hawaiian dances untainted by commercialism were generally lacking. So the Foundation sought to preserve and cultivate the different cultural heritages of the people, particularly the Hawaiians, which encroaching modernism and commercialism endangered. The Foundation also intended to influence the design of public buildings and spaces so that the architecture and surrounding landscape preserved and reflected the natural beauty of Hawaii for all the people to enjoy.

Board members echoed the conviction that the arts should be accessible to all the people, not just the elite. At his swearing-in ceremony, Edward Tangen said, "the arts are for the working people and not restricted to the privileged few." He argued that the ILWU had always tried to promote the worker's
economic standard of living, but now the union intended to improve the entire quality of life. One of the effects of low wages and long hours had been to "cheat workers out of cultural experiences and the beautiful things which add to the joy of life."26 As far as the union was concerned, the Foundation should try to make the arts available to the poor and uneducated and the rural communities.

Yokouchi claims the entire board supported an art program that afforded equal access to the different ethnic, social, and economic groups of Hawaii.27 Reuel Denney says the board did not see a "great deal of conflict in the early years on any issue."28 It viewed Preis as the arts expert and strong executive director, and Yokouchi as the facile negotiator and political ally in legislative dealings. The best demonstration of the two men's remarkable ability to work together and accomplish the Foundation's goals is their effort to secure passage of the percent-for-art law, the subject of the next chapter. Preis was an assertive leader. During our interviews, the members of the board almost unanimously referred to Preis as a "strong, skilled persuader,"29 someone with a "tendency to take charge,"30 a person with "definite ideas about art."31 Yokouchi believes that Preis had a tendency to dominate discussion. But he deferred to Preis on artistic decisions and policies because Preis was the expert. According to Preis, the board looked to him to take the initiative, which he did.32

In 1967, one of the first SFCA purchases, Maybe Blue, a minimalist painting by Jim Rosen, resulted in public controversy. Preis had anticipated strong public reaction. As he relates the incident, during its formative years, the SFCA wanted to demonstrate its support for the artists; so the board decided
to purchase works of art in order to become acquainted with the different artists and their works. The artists could also familiarize themselves with the Foundation as a potential source of funds. The relationship would be beneficial for all concerned. At one of the board’s meetings, Preis suggested viewing an exhibition of minimalist art at the Contemporary Arts Center, but he warned the members that they had to be prepared for a "public scandal." He told them this would be an excellent opportunity to learn about their level of taste and to test personal reactions to "alien, hostile art." This would also be an opportunity to confront public response to the Foundation and its selections. As devil’s advocate, he asked what the committee would do: "Side with the Philistines? Crucify the artist?" He ventured that this could be an opportunity to establish the SFCA as a protector of artists. The board members decided that their task was to learn about the level of public taste. The selection of Maybe Blue was unanimous. As Reuel Denney says, “we were content with the piece.”

However, as Preis had predicted, the media roundly criticized the board. He also came under attack as its executive director. Most of the adverse comments came from legislators. Senator Sakae Takahashi demanded that the governor investigate an unwarranted expenditure of state money. The work had cost $600. Senator Eureka Forbes contended that the taxpayers were not getting their money’s worth. Representative Tony Kunimura threatened that if the SFCA was spending “money on things like this, [it] wouldn’t get any more money.” He charged collusion and insisted that someone should investigate the panel who chose the painting. A rare assenting opinion came from Representative Hiram Kamaka, who liked the work and said, “You can’t put a price tag on art . . . you can’t put a value on a painting—it is only the artist’s
value." Preis answered his critics and defended the purchase by asserting that the SFCA's role was to involve the public: "Controversy means conversation . . . one means to confront the public with the essence of art." Governor Burns also defended the Foundation's decision. Despite the legislators' denouncement, he would not attempt to veto the purchase. He stood behind the SFCA: "It has been doing an excellent job" increasing community awareness of culture and arts resources in Hawaii. Yokouchi said the Foundation did not expect everyone to approve of everything it did.

Preis's decision to confront the public with Maybe Blue is not surprising. When he first accepted the position with the Foundation the previous year, he anticipated that selecting works of art for the people would be a difficult problem. Inevitably, some works would create controversy, but the options were either to try or to do nothing. In an attempt to turn aside criticism of government interference and control, he argued, "Apathy is a greater enemy of art than the possibility of government oppression." Although the Foundation had the power to select or reject, citizen's advisory groups would make the final decisions.

Clearly, Yokouchi and the commissioners respected and deferred to Preis's effective leadership. Preis's role as a leader fits within the context of Max Weber's theory of charismatic movements. Weber theorizes that during certain times in history, charismatic leaders and their followers are able to produce revolutionary transformations. The ascendance of such a leader is a result of the person's being endowed with exceptional powers or qualities. The charismatic leader possesses an extraordinary ability to exhort or demand cooperation from followers. People follow a charismatic leader because they
accept or identify with the leader's vision, mission, or philosophy. The charismatic leader's compelling personality may also win over followers. Preis had the sort of personality Weber describes as charismatic. The commissioners viewed him as the arts expert, the arts professional; they identified with his mission to make the arts a part of life. He was able to articulate in a forceful yet disarming manner his philosophy of expanding opportunities for artistic experience to all the people. His almost military bearing made him a commanding figure, whom Yokouchi described as a "ramrod—typical Austrian soldier." Preis had an elitist education and training in the arts, yet he espoused a populist concept of art for all the people. In Vienna, Preis asserts, art "simmered to everyone," not only the aristocrats. This populism was due to the social democratic form of government in Austria. Preis claims the government was completely subservient to the people. Government expenditures were always for social needs. Humanism motivated the government.45

In Dionysian Art and Populist Politics in Austria, William McGrath says the Viennese socialists distinguished themselves by the success of their cultural work. They became the most "highly cultured and instructed body of proletarians in the entire world." One of Viennese socialism's most important roles was in opening the world of beauty and culture to the appreciation of the worker, "To carry art to the folk."46 In Vienna, socialism became a way of life and developed its own intellectual and artistic cultural institutions. This humanistic approach to government motivated Preis during his tenure at the Foundation. He also credits his Austrian sensibility for his personal aesthetics. In 1983, when he returned home for the first time since fleeing Hitler's
Anschluss, he rediscovered his love for the Viennese baroque; he became reacquainted with the gentle, good, and "not too powerful style." Thus, Preis saw the arts as a part of everyone's life, from childhood to maturity. He believed the arts gave an added dimension to his life; why shouldn't the people of Hawaii have a similar experience? Rosen's Maybe Blue was one of Preis's early attempts to provide opportunities for others to have the same enrichment.

The Rosen work also represented one of the board's most controversial decisions. This sort of conflict was a unique experience for the first board. Its decision-making process was consensual. Incredibly, the board had no factions—as Denney stated, "not a great deal of conflict," which he attributes to Preis's assertive leadership. Preis employed a crown-prince manner to keep the members focused. He may also have relied on such a manner for its shock value. This behavior may have irritated some commissioners, but Denney believes Preis would have backed down if he hadn't had Yokouchi. Moreover, Pries admits he would not have survived "in the dealings with the legislature" without Yokouchi. Preis claims he encountered "real resistance" because he was "a haole and an egghead." Denney says Preis and Yokouchi worked in artistic cooperation—"Preis was Esterhazy and Yokouchi was Metternich." Preis was responsible for coordinating the different arts projects or addressing concerns about aesthetics. When problems not related to aesthetics came up, such as dealing with the legislature, Yokouchi handled them.

Other commissioners also say Preis ran their meetings with the "certain amount of intellectual aggression" Denney describes. But Preis's attempts to steer the board in the direction he thought best did not disturb William Ichinose,
because, in most cases, he agreed with Preis. "Lots of good things happened because of Preis," he says—in particular, "the amassing of a giant art collection." Ichinose recalls that sometimes the commissioners' preference for avant-garde works aroused protest. But because his ideas reflected "little political realities," Yokouchi was able to temper some of the potentially controversial choices. Ichinose contends that compromise was the basis of the decision-making process. "Friendly argument," is how Charlotte Cades describes it. Despite the fact that Preis was an assertive leader with definite ideas about art and the selection of works of art, she says, he always left room for discussion; and although she did not always agree with him, she learned much from him. Edward Tangen asserts that the decision-making process was a group one, with lots of discussion at the meetings," despite Preis's attitude that "what he wanted to get done, would get done." Tangen always understood that Preis's recommendations were merely suggestions for consideration.

The Yokouchi-Preis partnership and their relationship with the commissioners were compatible. Yokouchi and Preis agreed that the arts should be universal and accessible to all the people. Both had a soft spot for the commoner. Hence, when they embarked on a program to widen participation in the arts, both knew it would include various ethnic groups and people from all social and economic levels. The board agreed. If the board seems almost complacent during its formative period, it was still learning and gaining experience. Despite the commissioners' sophistication and knowledge in their own fields, the concept of government support for the arts was an innovation to them. They would have to define and clarify guidelines, policies,
and procedures through experience. In the beginning, they may have relied heavily on Preis, the arts expert, and Yokouchi, the political facilitator. The SFCA's assignment to the governor's office for its first four years may have insulated it somewhat from the vagaries of bureaucracy. Preis was an assertive leader with a tendency to dominate the discussions, and some of the commissioners may have preferred to remain passive, as Yokouchi suggests. Of course, others deferred, as Yokouchi did, out of respect for Preis because he was the art professional. Yokouchi claims the meetings were democratic and encouraged participation, but some commissioners still chose to remain quiet. He theorizes that some were passive because of inexperience with such a new concept as the SFCA.

The new commissioners were ethnically diverse, generally educated, and from the middle to upper social and economic classes in Hawaii. They represented various art forms—ceramics, music, poetry, and the popular arts—and numbered among them a patron of the arts and a labor union representative. Experienced in their own fields, all were new to the Foundation and its concept of a state government-subsidized arts council. The inexperienced commissioners looked for guidance and direction from the leadership of art professional Alfred Preis and political liaison Fundy Yokouchi. Preis also acted as a buffer between the artists and government, while Yokouchi served in a similar capacity between the Foundation and the legislature. This remarkable partnership succeeded in carrying out the Foundation's primary goal of serving the people of the various ethnic groups and broadening opportunities for aesthetic experiences for all.
Community Involvement, Citizen Participation

Alfred Preis and Pundy Yokouchi are responsible for several of the Foundation's achievements. The two partners encouraged and promoted many of Hawaii's artists and provided financial support for several arts organizations. Most significant, they brought the arts to the people of Hawaii and increased community involvement and citizen participation by forming community arts councils on the neighbor islands, which definitely filled a need. As of 1980, more than 2,000 arts councils throughout the nation were successfully responding to "public arts needs as well as serving professional artists, arts institutions, non-traditional arts groups, and non-professional artists." The proliferation of arts councils demonstrates that the arts are essential to community life. The arts councils can most effectively assess needs or develop culture and arts programs for their communities. They can also "help to identify and support local artists and encourage people to participate in and experience the arts." The arts councils throughout the state of Hawaii would provide valuable information that the SFCA eventually integrated into its art program. When the Foundation created the arts councils in the different counties of Hawaii, beginning in February 1966, a major objective was to bring the arts to residents in rural, low income areas and to other people who lacked opportunities for arts activities. The Foundation exercised great care in order to strengthen, rather than replace, existing interests and to encourage activities that had inadequate representation. The intention was to broaden aesthetic experiences of all kinds for all the different ethnic groups throughout the state. What follows is a brief description of the formation of the various arts councils and their response to the Foundation's outreach.
The Foundation created the first arts council on February 28, 1966. A loose organization, formerly "The Green Turtle Group," it eventually became the Oahu Community Arts Council. At its inception, the arts council comprised middle- to upper-class, well-educated Caucasians who either were associated with one of the professions or were professional artists. The membership included Barbara Engle, artist and vice-president of the Hawaii Arts Council; Bruce Hopper, graphic artist and representative of the Artists and Art Directors Club; and Stuart Brown, professor at the University of Hawaii and chairman of the Humanities Council. Clearly, this council was elitist. It was instrumental in helping to formulate tentative policies for the Foundation, which the new board informally ratified at its first full-scale meeting on March 30, 1966. The greatest achievement of the Oahu Community Arts Council was coordinating and implementing the Governor's Conference on Culture and the Arts in September 1966.66

No organized arts groups existed on the neighbor islands. Preis and Yokouchi traveled to the different islands and conferred with citizens and legislators seeking participation and assistance in setting up an arts council. They also asked for suggestions concerning future programming activities for the Foundation and the upcoming statewide culture and arts conference.67 On each island, a Foundation commissioner who lived on the island chaired the tentative arts council. In an effort to stimulate interest in culture and arts for all the people of the state, the Foundation sought representation from every island and from the various ethnic groups and art forms. More than 50 people attended a meeting on June 4, 1966, to form the West-Hawaii Community Council, which commissioner June Kanemitsu chaired.68 The East-Hawaii
Community Council on Culture and the Arts held its organizational meeting on June 5, 1966. The council incorporated as a non-profit organization on May 2, 1967, and changed its name to the Hawaii Community Council on Culture and the Arts. The County of Hawaii allocated $4,000 to the new corporation for its "projects of predominantly local interests."\(^{69}\)

Commissioner Thelma Hadley chaired the meeting to establish the Kauai County Committee on Culture and the Arts, on June 27, 1966.\(^{70}\) The following year, the Kauai board of Supervisors officially recognized the committee as a county function. Yokouchi chaired the Maui Community Arts Council meeting on June 28, 1966.\(^{71}\) The Lanai Community Association Arts Council, an expansion of the existing Lanai Community Association, met on November 18, 1966. It decided to deal with the Foundation directly, so it formed no arts council.\(^{72}\) The Molokai Community Arts Council formed on January 3, 1967.\(^{73}\)

The arts councils from Oahu, Hawaii, Kauai, and Maui held meetings between July 18 and 22, 1966, in Honolulu, Hilo and Kealakekua-Kona, Lihue, and Wailuku, respectively. NEA representative Charles C. Mark and Milton Carman, executive director of the Arts Council of the Province of Ontario, Canada, who conducted the meetings, provided information about the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities and discussed the success of community arts organizations through the nation. Members of the various community arts councils, as well as state legislators, attended the meetings, which resulted in an increased interest in and understanding of the federal program and its benefits for Hawaii. The legislators from Hawaii, Kauai, and Maui showed their support for government participation in the arts by agreeing to set aside $10,000 for their respective community arts councils.\(^{74}\)
Thus, the first organized attempt to bring all the different ethnic groups and splintered arts communities together was extremely successful. Although a majority of the Oahu arts council members were Caucasians, the councils from the neighbor islands included members from the different ethnic groups. Because of the tireless efforts of Preis and Yokouchi, the arts community on each island formed a cohesive group. Moreover, the arts community finally gained recognition as worthy of government support, as several of the councils received funds from their respective legislators. Members of these new councils would be active in the upcoming statewide culture and arts conference. They would also contribute to future programming activities of the Foundation. The Foundation's initial grassroots and ethnic outreach was off to an auspicious start.

A Statewide Conference on Culture and Arts

During their first board meeting, the commissioners learned of plans for a Governor's Conference on Culture and Arts scheduled for September 22 through 24, 1966. The conference would allow artists and arts groups to meet leaders from the various national arts councils and from agencies such as the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, as well as from the community arts councils throughout the state. The aims of the conference were, first, to encourage the exchange of information and ideas among the various community arts councils in the state; second, to consolidate the new councils; third, to evaluate the condition of the state's culture and arts resources, and fourth, to coordinate performances and exhibitions of all the arts at their
"highest standards in order to aim towards and measure growth and progress." 75

"Creativity—Key to Hawaii’s Growth" was the theme of the conference, which was open to the public. The actual cost of the conference was $53,066.04, of which $22,638.02 came from the NEA study grant: $24,428.02 from the Foundation; $2,000 from the Department of Planning and Economic Development, and $4,000 from the City and County of Honolulu. 76

In his opening address, Governor Burns said the conference aimed to gather together those interested in the practice, furtherance and enjoyment of the arts in the state of Hawaii and to plan for the further development of the rich and cosmopolitan cultural heritage of the peoples of Hawaii. . . . In order to succeed in our highest goals, imaginativeness and creativity must rise from inner resources. . . . Our deep concern for safeguarding natural beauty and our care for the esthetic growth of our man-made environment must be paired with our dedication to the development of the cultural climate of Hawaii. 77

The key word in the governor’s speech was “plan,” for out of the conference would come innovative ideas and suggestions that served as the basis for future SFCA programming.

Hawaii’s first statewide conference on culture and the arts was noteworthy for bringing together a number of arts leaders, both local and national. The four-day conference began on a high note with the keynote address by Roger L. Stevens, who expressed a hope to develop increased knowledge about the
arts through education, which, in turn, would produce "better audiences of intelligence and quality." Stevens called for
more involvement on all levels—federal, state, metropolitan, institutional and local. . . although the federal role is a definite and responsible commitment, government must limit itself to a creative assistance in mutual partnership. We must help guide, but not dictate. We must assist, but not dominate, We must cooperate, but not demand. Above all, the long tradition of freedom in the arts must be our foremost concern. . . . Hawaii and her arts . . . would prove invaluable to the rest of the nation. This fact cannot be too highly emphasized, for your cross-cultural heritage has no equal in any of our other states. Your present and future contributions to the introspection and diversity of our arts can and should be a most significant one.

Before the conference opened, the community arts councils formed committees representing the various visual and performing arts. Their purpose was to plan workshops that would form the basis of a future arts program for the state as well as serve as a tentative agenda for the governor's conference. The workshops included dance, theater, visual arts, art education, crafts, applied and environmental design, and film. At the start of the conference workshops, Governor Burns informed the participants that their role was to suggest specific ways that the state could better use existing resources in the arts as well as specific methods for adding intelligently to them. He also asked for recommendations on how the public policies of the state could ideally
respond to the growing needs of artists and audiences. And he asked the conferees to recommend plans to improve the quality of arts throughout the state, to suggest ways to make the arts accessible to people from the various ethnic groups and areas the arts did not currently reach—for example, the economically depressed or the residents of rural Oahu and the neighbor islands, and to propose methods to strengthen and perpetuate the various ethnic and traditional arts of all the people in Hawaii.

Leaders in their respective areas of expertise from the mainland as well as Hawaii conducted the workshops. Yokouchi reported that the conference generated "considerable enthusiasm . . . and much of the participants' efforts concentrated on the preparation of programming activities" for the Foundation. The Foundation consolidated the findings and recommendations that resulted from the conference workshops into tentative plans for its future programming. Of the many programming activities and projects that emerged from the conference, I will discuss two: the Arts in Education program and the Cultural Heritage Development program.

The Arts in Education program resulted from the art education workshop that Richard Nelson led, which attracted 30 conferees. Preis recalls that the representatives from Maui loudly demanded arts activities for their students. They were adamant that their students must become intellectually and visually responsive to art. As part of the training, students must see how artists create as well as see the final results. Workshop recommendations stressed the importance of establishing communication among the major arts institutions, the various agencies in Hawaii, and the people. They also proposed seminars for teachers for continuing professional improvement. Murray Turnbull and
visiting consultant June Wayne led another workshop on art education, which attracted 50 participants. They emphasized the need to develop awareness and creativity in children.

The SFCA started the highly innovative Arts in Education program that same year as an outgrowth of the conference. Ten years later, it was still the only statewide program of its kind throughout the nation. In cooperation with the state Department of Education, the Foundation provided students opportunities to observe and interact with professional artists and performers in a classroom situation. It also inaugurated a touring program that included the Honolulu Symphony and the Opera Theater for Youth. Hence, every public school student in Hawaii would have access to a range of aesthetic experiences as both a viewer and a participant. Such a program had the potential for broadening the audience base for art and preparing a new community of future artists and art patrons.

According to Yokouchi, conferees were concerned that the ethnic arts, specifically Hawaiian and Filipino, were weakening or even dying. Participants also expressed concern about the need to make the arts more attractive to the various ethnic groups. A majority of the conferees were Caucasian. The Foundation aimed to make "art more public." The Cultural Heritage Development program attempted to "preserve and perpetuate the cultural heritage of the various ethnic groups of Hawaii, and to strengthen appreciation for and pride in the origins and heritage of their members." Some of its activities included workshops in lauhala weaving, tapa and lei making, hula, and Hawaiian music. Other workshops focused on Samoan dance, music, and crafts, as well as Filipino music and dance. The
program also supported the Pamana Philippine Dance Company and the Kahuku Philippine Cultural Association.94

The most dramatic testimony about the state of the arts in Hawaii came from the actual performances and art exhibitions. A highlight of the conference was a festival of arts, which treated participants to a variety of cultural and artistic exhibitions. They witnessed the backstage workings of Kennedy Theater during the day and attended the opening reception of the 17th Annual Artists of Hawaii exhibition at the Honolulu Academy of Arts that same evening. For the first time in Hawaii, a special exhibit at the Honolulu International Center exhibit area recognized the work of artisans of the crafts. The exhibit featured ceramics, jewelry, weaving, and Ikebana (Japanese flower arranging). The Department of Education sponsored a children’s art exhibition. The significance of the various art exhibitions is their inclusion and acceptance as art on the festival calendar as well as in the arts community. Before the statewide conference, people would have categorized functional and decorative works such as weaving and flower arranging or jewelry making as crafts and would have displayed them at crafts fairs or designer boutiques. Primarily as a result of the conference and the arts festival, all creations and fabrications would reflect clear aesthetic standards and would come under the umbrella of art. Restricting the arts to the fine arts has the potential for conveying discriminatory attitudes.95 Conversely, displaying raku pottery by a Japanese artisan next to an abstract bronze welding by a Caucasian sculptor blurs the lines between arts and crafts. This acceptance implies that arts are open to all, not merely the elite, and that art forms other than high art are also capable of eliciting an aesthetic response.
East met West in the performing arts, as well. The festival included performances of the Harkness Ballet Company of New York, which came to Hawaii especially for the conference; Halla Huhm and her Korean dance troupe; and the Honolulu Theater for Youth, which presented a Peking opera. One of the most significant and symbolic events was the Honolulu Symphony’s performance of *The Waters of Kane*, a contemporary choral work its composer based on Hawaiian music. This was a first for Hawaii: an almost all-Caucasian orchestra, which the ethnic community generally associated with high art, playing Hawaiian themes in a work it had specially commissioned for this performance in a formal concert hall for a diverse audience.

Culture and Arts for Model Cities

One of the major accomplishments of the Foundation was its involvement in the Model Cities program. When the Honolulu city government applied to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for a grant, it was the first applicant in the nation to request a culture and arts program. This discussion focuses only on this aspect of the Model Cities program, as another example of the Foundation's attempt to make the arts accessible to people from the various ethnic groups, as well as the different social and economic levels.

On June 23, 1967, HUD recognized the City and County of Honolulu as the governmental agency responsible for coordinating the grant program and expending federal monies. The two Model Cities Neighborhood Areas qualifying for the federal grant were Kalihi-Palama and Waianae-Nanakuli. Both areas qualified on the basis of economic need. For example, of 7,002 families living in the Kalihi area, 2,221 earned annual incomes of less than
$4,000, and 1,175 received public assistance. Of 3,125 families in the Waianae area, 1,093 earned less than $4,000 annually, and 640 were on public assistance.\footnote{In addition to being economically depressed, both areas comprised mainly non-Caucasians, particularly Hawaiians, Filipinos, and Samoans, groups cultural and artistic events under-represented.} According to Yokouchi, the Model Cities program was a perfect format for the Foundation to carry out its mission of involving the common people in the arts.\footnote{When he first suggested the idea to the board, some members resisted, primarily on the basis of economics. The infant Foundation suffered from limited budget, staff, and time.} Some of the commissioners questioned whether the Foundation could afford to get involved and whether it had the funds for such a project. Preis, who was responsible for the budget and expenditures, was concerned that by spending money in the Model Cities neighborhood areas, the Foundation would overlook other needy program areas. The board wondered what the SFCA would do in the Model Cities neighborhood areas.\footnote{Yokouchi replied that such a Foundation project would help to uplift the people through economic and educational means. It would be an ideal way for the Foundation to recognize the underprivileged and to accomplish its mission to broaden accessibility to the arts for the common people. He argued that if the board truly believed in the arts as vital tools in education, it should introduce them as part of the educational process. Further, since the federal government was attempting to address economic, social, and urban concerns, the Foundation, as a state government agency, should play a role.} Ultimately, the board gave its unanimous support; and after his initial hesitancy, Preis understood Yokouchi's concerns, endorsed the idea, and
followed it to completion. As Preis recalls, the Foundation had an obligation to reach people even in the lower income groups. "Here was an excellent opportunity," he says; "the groups were accessible, and federal money was available."  

The purpose of the culture and arts project, which the Foundation assisted in coordinating and developing, was to help identify and strengthen local ethno-cultural resources and activities, and to provide accessibility to diverse cultural and arts activities in the community at large. The Foundation designed its program activities to increase participation in the traditional culture and arts of the Hawaiians and Filipinos, and eventually extended the program to reach out to the Samoans, Koreans, and Okinawans. The program set up culture and arts offices in the field, with residents of the areas as staff, in the hope of increasing resident participation and stimulating interest in the activities. Preis worked with the staff, who planned and designed the projects. This discussion will cover only selected projects from the first year of the program.

When the Foundation entered into a contract with the city for culture and arts services, it set out to "enrich the cultural lives of those whose economic circumstances have allowed them little or no exposure and experience." Specific goals of the program were, first, to enrich the cultural climate of the communities; second, to enhance community cultural achievements; third, to increase individual achievement; and fourth, to strengthen community identity. The Foundation also proposed a plan describing goals and their implementation. For instance, in order to promote ethnic organizations or institutions fostering traditions and culture of Hawaii, the Foundation would
administer grant funds. The SFCA would sponsor dance and theater productions for presentation within the community. It would also provide support through Research Grant Funds in Hawaiian and Filipino cultures. And it would present between 40 and 70 productions by professionals in the performing, visual, and traditional arts through Performance Grant Funds. To assist in carrying out these goals, the Foundation received $110,184 from the Model Cities administration. The SFCA contributed $32,321, for a total budget of $142,505. Personnel and facilities used up $64,990 of the budget. Programming took the remainder. These figures are for the first contract year only.

The Model Cities culture and arts program for the first year covered a spectrum of activities. Kalihi-Palama held a Kamehameha Day celebration on June 20, 1970. The program gave the Kalihi-Palama Hawaiian Civic Club an organization grant to cover activities that included a display of Hawaiian crafts, a luau, and a pageant. Waianae-Nanakuli held a similar celebration, and the Nanaikapono Hawaiian Civic Club received a grant. A month earlier, the Kaisahan Dance Company appeared at the Santa Cruzen Festival in Waianae. An organization grant covered production costs. The Filipino festival attracted 1,000 people. Also during May, a Filipino festival in Kalihi, a pilot project featuring folk music and dances, was so successful that the Foundation continued it as an ongoing statewide program. In addition, in response to the interest the residents expressed, the Foundation established classes in dance and the rondalla (Filipino string orchestra). The major goal of the program was to keep traditional ethnic culture alive.
In addition to organization grants, the program gave awards for research. For example, a Hawaiian cultural development consultant conducted a workshop in ancient Hawaiian hula, with classes in both Model Cities communities. The participants performed at the Waikiki Shell during Aloha Week, 1970. The students enjoyed both the dancing and the ancient history, which was a part of the workshop. The Foundation presented dance and theater productions in both Model Cities neighborhoods, such as The Star-Spangled Girl, a comedy by Neil Simon, which the audience enjoyed, according to Preis. The Hawaii Arts Company presented a production of No Exit, an existential play by Jean Paul Sartre, which, Preis says, “the people just ate up.”

In the visual arts, an innovative project involved island-born sculptor Satoru Abe, a resident of New York at the time, who served as artist-in-residence for the Waianae neighborhood from October 1970 through June 1971. He conducted classes and workshops and together with the residents held an exhibition at the Waianae Library. In addition, his studio was open to the public so that interested passers-by could walk in and watch the artist at work. Response to the artist-in-residence project was generally favorable; students, teachers, and residents who had exposure to the project endorsed it.

Even this brief description of some of the projects makes clear that the Model Cities arts councils succeeded in stimulating interest and encouraging resident participation in culture and the arts. Unfortunately, no method exists for evaluating how successful the program was. No one consistently monitored audience counts or formally surveyed people’s responses to the various
activities. However, if changing the system was one of the purposes of the Model Cities program, as the Foundation's proposal suggests, and if the program has strengthened the SFCA, and the SFCA continues to respond to residents of these areas, then the program has accomplished institutional innovation; it has changed the system. As the Model Cities evaluation report states, the "SFCA appears to have an ongoing commitment to cultural activities in disadvantaged areas." However, "there is excessive optimism in anticipating that large numbers of people of any area will actively participate in cultural and artistic endeavors."\textsuperscript{119}

One can argue that the Model Cities culture and arts program was successful. Offshoots of the two arts councils exist today, which attest to the success of the program. The former Waianae-Nanakuli arts council incorporated as a non-profit organization on October 12, 1971, as soon as the Model Cities program ended.\textsuperscript{120} Today it is the Waianae Coast Culture and Art Society. Kalihi-Palama residents incorporated their arts council as a non-profit organization and renamed it the Kalihi-Palama Culture and Arts Society.\textsuperscript{121} Both of these organizations continue to serve the cultural and artistic needs of the people in their communities. Their main purpose is to preserve the various ethnic cultures of Hawaii. Both programs commission visual and performing arts experts to conduct workshops in various subjects such as hula, ukulele playing, and lauhala weaving. One of the most successful programs at the Waianae Coast Culture and Art Society takes place during the Christmas season. Carolers and hula dancers perform at various shopping malls and banks in the community. Executive Director Agnes Cope estimates that between 1,500 and
2,000 people have either participated in or attended the programs. She continues to receive requests to perform every year. Further argument that the Model Cities culture and arts programs succeeded comes from Yokouchi, who claims, "Today, these arts councils demand their rights to the arts; people are no longer sitting back and saying, 'What is this?'" Instead, people are saying the arts are an important part of life. The SFCA believes it fulfilled a real need when the Model Cities program began. According to the Foundation's annual report for 1970–71, "If the people won't come to you, go to them."

Summary

The winds of social change and activism swept through the nation during the sixties, as ethnic peoples demanded equal political and social opportunities. The various ethnic groups reaffirmed and celebrated their cultural heritages and values. Hawaii, the 50th state, followed this national trend. Specifically, the different arts activities needed to recognize the different ethnic groups, which they under-represented. The basis of the dominant culture was traditional Western high art. But under the leadership of Democrat Governor John Burns, a New Hawaii was in the making. The new Democrats, now a majority in the legislature, created the SFCA. Burns selected his friend and political confidant Pundy Yokouchi to head the new Foundation. A novice art collector, a firm believer in the arts as educational tools, and a populist, Yokouchi was a reluctant chairman of the board. His relationship with arts expert and elitist Alfred Preis, whom Burns would appoint as executive director of the SFCA,
lasted for almost two decades. This partnership resulted in the creation of some of the most original art programs in the state, perhaps in the nation.

Under the direction of Preis and Yokouchi, the first board included people who were ethnically diverse and generally educated and who came from the middle to upper social and economic classes in Hawaii. They represented various art forms and organizations. A common philosophy bound the members: that the arts should be accessible to all the people of Hawaii, not merely the elite. This philosophy meshed well with the attitudes of Preis and Yokouchi. In order to embark on a program to broaden aesthetic activities and to increase citizen participation, the SFCA reached out into the rural and neighbor island communities. One of its first achievements was the formation of community arts councils throughout the state. These councils provided valuable information that served as the basis for future programming activities of the Foundation. In addition, the councils were helpful in coordinating a statewide conference on culture and the arts. Although the community arts council on Oahu was primarily Caucasian and elitist, the membership of the neighbor islands' councils represented the various ethnic groups. Hence, the SFCA's initial ethnic outreach was off to a good start.

The Foundation's next achievement was the statewide Governor's Conference on Culture and the Arts. This conference provided the people of Hawaii with an opportunity to meet national arts leaders as well as members of the different community arts councils. National and local arts specialists and conferees agreed that Hawaii was unique because of its ethnic diversity and multicultural richness. With partial funding from an NEA grant, the conference conducted workshops in the visual and performing arts, education, and
environmental design, among others. The Foundation consolidated some of the findings and recommendations of these workshops into an arts program for Hawaii, including the Arts in Education and the Cultural Heritage Development projects. The highlight of the conference was a festival of the arts. East met West in the performing arts, and a combination of the fine arts with crafts was the most visible indication that arbitrary distinctions no longer existed. The Foundation would recognize all of the various art forms and cultural expressions as art.

One of the Foundation's major achievements was its participation in the Model Cities program. With the assistance of the SFCA, the Model Cities neighborhoods, Kalihi-Palama and Waianae-Nanakuli, formed separate arts councils to increase participation in aesthetic experiences for the Hawaiians and Filipinos. Artistic activities ran the gamut from ethnic festivals and workshops in ethnic music and dance to presentations of Western high art. No documentation exists to confirm the success of the Model Cities culture and arts program. However, one indication of its success is the residents' reception of the Filipino heritage program, a pilot project, which was so favorable that the Foundation continued the project as an ongoing statewide program. In addition, the residents of both communities incorporated their arts councils, which continue to function today.
Chapter 5
Art in Public Places

Art legislation enjoys bi-partisan support on a very broad basis. There is no noticeable political obstructionism, disinterest, political in-fighting or lack of progress. The arts . . . are integrally contributing to the mental, physical, and . . . economic welfare of Hawaii. We must support them.

John A. Burns

The Stage Is Set

One of the major accomplishments during the Preis-Yokouchi partnership and their attempt to bring art to the people was the Art for State Buildings project, which became the Art in Public Places Program. On June 12, 1967, the Hawaii legislature became the first governmental body in the nation to enact mandatory percent-for-art legislation. This law required that the government expend one percent of all state building funds on works of art, on a project-by-project basis. The legislature passed the law in the belief that opportunities for arts experiences were important for the “mental, moral and spiritual health as well as for the prosperity, welfare and pursuit of happiness of the people.” Governor Burns and the legislators were committed to an arts program for Hawaii. The new law, Act 298, was an attempt to democratize the arts. Its intent was to spread works of art to all the islands in the state and to areas that were easily accessible to the public.
At the time the law passed, the Foundation had existed for two years. One of its main objectives was to devise programs and establish ways to broaden aesthetic activities so that all citizens would be able to participate. The new program would significantly expand visual arts activities by (1) enhancing public structures and spaces statewide for the people's enjoyment and enrichment, (2) developing and recognizing the works of professional artists, (3) preserving the diversity of art experiences in Hawaii's multicultural and multiethnic society, and (4) increasing awareness and appreciation of the arts. This chapter focuses on Alfred Preis and his efforts to create the APP program, Fundy Yokouchi and his role as liaison between the Foundation and the legislature, and the Foundation's administration of the APP program, especially the process of commissioning the art.

Genesis

On March 22, 1967, State Representative Elmer Cravalho introduced H.B. No. 859: A Bill for an Act Relating to Works of Art for State Buildings. Governor Burns signed the bill, establishing Act 298. Thus, Hawaii became the first state to pass a mandatory percent-for-art statute requiring beautification of state-funded structures as a means of bringing art into the lives of the people. Passage of the law indicated the government's recognition that state buildings could be places for art and did not have to be barren structures of poured concrete that merely provided offices for government employees. Instead, state buildings should incorporate the arts in order to help improve the quality of life, bring a sense of beauty to the people, and create pride in Hawaii's urban landscape. According to Bernard Perlman, author of 1% Art in Civic...
Architecture, when the arts are an integral part of public buildings, the buildings attain a special character, “an element of beauty and harmony which elevates the spirit.”

Since the passage of Act 298, other states have based their percent-for-art legislation on the Hawaii model. But how did the legislators come up with Hawaii’s visionary bill? Much of the credit must go to Preis. As an architect and an artist, Preis was concerned about environmental design, and saw the bill as an opportunity to improve the cultural and urban landscape of Hawaii. The legislation would ensure that contractors could not consider government structures complete until they included a work of art such as a mural or a sculpture.

According to Yokouchi, discussion of the percent-for-art bill first occurred in the fall of 1966. Preis informed him of a national bill mandating the expenditure on the arts of one-fourth of one percent of federal building funds. Preis proposed a similar program for Hawaii. Yokouchi thought it was a good idea and encouraged Preis to prepare a bill. Preis drafted a short-form bill, which he presented to the SFCA and to an informal advisory committee of artists and architects for suggestions or additions. The advisors disagreed about the exact percentage to request. According to Preis, some of his overly enthusiastic colleagues on the advisory committee believed the figure should be two percent. He compromised at one-and-one-half percent. As far as he was concerned, the actual figure was not a major problem, especially because funding would depend entirely on the number of new buildings. At the time, the construction industry was booming. The major problem Preis envisioned was putting together a funding proposal that the legislators would find feasible,
as well as "something they could handle" administratively. As architect of the bill, he described general objectives and possible methods of funding. The language was purposely general, he admits, partly because of a lack of clarity, both his and the Foundation's, about such a new program and its potential. They were still uncertain about the kinds of limits to impose, or whether limits were even desirable. The vague language would also allow for flexibility. On one point they all agreed: percent-for-art had to become law. 7

On December 22, 1966, Preis transmitted his short-form bill to the governor's office for review. Its purpose was to authorize the appropriation of a fixed, determined percentage of the construction budgets for all public works for the acquisition of works of art. Such art may be an integral part of the structure; it may be attached to the structure; it may be placed near the structure; or it may be portable, to be used within the structure or as part of a travelling State art collection. 8

The short-form bill requested an appropriation of one-and-one-half percent for the inclusion of fine art in public buildings: libraries, state office buildings, schools (including universities and colleges), transportation terminals, community facilities, and any other public buildings accessible to the people. Justification for the bill was the idea of cultural democracy:

The frequent exposure to elements of artistic expression and integrity will contribute to the educational, spiritual and cultural welfare of the peoples of Hawaii and to its visitors. It will inspire the people with civic pride, creative and productive energy and a sense of belonging and rootedness. 9
The primary purpose of the bill was to make works of art accessible to the public, preferably outside of a building, although some art could be inside. The governor gave the bill his full support.

Legislative Testimony for the Arts

Yokouchi believed the Foundation should make "art more public." Accomplishing this goal required making opportunities for visual arts experiences available to all people. Yokouchi favored the rationale for the bill. Hawaii's artists also supported the legislation. According to Yokouchi, they believed the new bill was "the greatest thing that happened to the arts." The major question seemed to concern selection: Who among the arts community would the Foundation choose to fund, and who would make the selections?

Preis says that coordinating a group of artists to lobby in favor of the bill was not difficult. In addition to having a vested interest in the legislation, the artists were citizens "who were able to spread the message to the community." Preis solicited written testimony from the various arts groups. They focused on the educational aspects of the arts and on the need to recognize the diverse cultures of Hawaii.

On behalf of the Hawaii Craftsmen Council, Jean J. Williams wrote, "The bill will help Hawaii acquire a piece of leadership in educating the public [about] art." University of Hawaii Art and Architecture Department Chairman A. Bruce Etherington stressed that the bill was a necessity. "Naturally," he wrote, the department "has a great interest in this bill."

Others applauded the legislature's foresight. Architect Thomas O. Wells insisted that the bill was the only sure way to provide a consistent
accumulation of "meaningful works of art in public buildings" on a long-range basis. He commended the legislature for its "increasing sensitivity" and contributions to these areas. The secretary of the Hawaii Handweavers Hui, Alexandria M. Frankhauser, also appreciated the committee's help in getting the bill passed. Peter M. Bower, executive secretary of the Leeward branch of the Young Men's Christian Association argued that viewing cultural works as an "integral part of our lives" has definite value compared to "viewing art at traditionally and expensively constructed edifices which simply isolate the cultural assets and the artistic talents of the people of Hawaii." Artistic works should be readily available to all the people.

Other advocates expressed similar sentiments and encouraged support for the artists as well. James W. Foster, Jr., director of the Honolulu Academy of Arts, pointed out people's need for the enriching experience of encountering art in the environment, particularly in "a highly technological society with mass production." Contemporary buildings can achieve "greater distinction through the inclusion of artistic products," he said. The bill would affect the community as a whole, residents and visitors. In addition, it would support the artists in their important role in society. The arts are a necessary part of life, especially in Hawaii, with its "confluence of many old cultural strains." He urged passage of the bill in order to give "dramatic evidence of the maturing process in the growth of this state now so much in the eyes of the world." Edward Sullam, president of the Hawaii Chapter of the American Institute of Architects (AIA), said the world needs "a new generation of people who will not abide ugliness." Enlightenment will produce a civilization of people who care about the appearance of their surroundings. "They will seek beauty." To enhance the
environment, society must create in its young people an awareness of beauty. Make their school buildings handsome, and “quality will stick in the children,” he said. “Once the new generation becomes imbued with a sensitive regard for its surroundings, then it will exert its political influence to keep homes, buildings, grounds, roadways and parks attractive.” He urged passage of the bill and said the AIA endorsed the principle of including art work in state buildings.19

Advocates were hopeful the bill would serve as an “incentive to other governmental bodies and to the business community to participate more in the artistic embellishment of Hawaii.”20 Additionally, the bill could help stimulate artistic creativity and activity by encouraging artists to participate in the process of commissioning artworks. Opponents of the bill, if any existed, apparently chose not to submit testimony.

The lobbying effort had other positive results for the arts groups. Previously, each group’s vested interests had divided the arts community into factions. But their joint lobbying efforts created a united community of advocates for the arts, an indication that all of the arts would be under “the same umbrella of art.”21 Preis hoped the program would create an expanded market for artists in the form of future commissions.

The Legislature Takes Action

The effectiveness with which Preis and Yokouchi worked together for passage of the bill demonstrated their successful partnership in action. While Preis marshaled the arts coalition for legislative testimony, Yokouchi turned his attention to political lobbying. The two legislators principally responsible for
ensuring passage of the bill were Senate Labor Committee chairman Nadao Yoshinaga and Hiram Kamaka, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations. They received important support from Senate Ways and Means Committee chairman Vincent Yano and from the governor's press secretary, Don Horio, a close friend of Kamaka. Governor Burns kept a watchful eye over the entire lobbying effort.

Yokouchi recalls that after Cravalho introduced the bill in the House, some representatives talked of killing it. The major problem was economics. The appropriation of one-and-one-half percent involved a potentially large sum of money. Horio, who monitored the progress of the bill for the governor, informed Yokouchi that the percentage involved "just too much money." He insisted that a compromise was the only way to save the bill, and suggested cutting the percentage in half, to three-fourths of one percent. Yokouchi countered with one percent, which Preis also believed was adequate. According to Yokouchi, at this point, the governor became personally involved, telephoning Kamaka, who found the compromise satisfactory. Kamaka says, "The one percent made more fiscal sense, and when the funds are pooled, that would generate adequate funds."

Kamaka presented a report for the appropriations committee, which amended the bill by

1. reducing the portion of appropriations to be set aside for acquisition of art from one-and-one-half percent to one percent
2. substituting the Foundation as a voting member in lieu of its director
3. deleting the provision relating to compensation for the professional artist on the committee.
After careful consideration of the amendments, the House unanimously voted for passage of the bill.

The following month, the bill moved through the Senate, which supported it as a body. Yoshinaga personally assured Yokouchi that the bill would not encounter problems in the Senate, and it did not. When the bill came before the Committee on Ways and Means, Senator Yano recommended passage with only one minor amendment: to provide that the Foundation and the state comptroller both be responsible for determining the amount available for the purchase of art, and also be responsible for the selection and commissioning of artists. They could use other interested organizations or individuals to serve in advisory capacities. The percent-for-art legislation passed the Senate unscathed.

Passage of the Percent-for-Art Legislation

More than 25 years after the fact, accounts of the passage of the arts legislation may vary slightly. What remains clear is that the partnership of Preis and Yokouchi, coupled with the leadership of Senator Yoshinaga and Representative Kamaka, resulted in the relatively smooth passage of the bill. Of course, Governor Burns's personal involvement assured passage. Yokouchi is quick to state that the arts bill would not have passed so easily without Kamaka's strong leadership in the House. Despite his concern over the original percentage figure, Kamaka supported the arts. Yokouchi calls Yoshinaga, who "championed the case of the underdog," one of the staunchest advocates in the legislature for the arts. A firm believer in education, Yoshinaga saw the value in the arts. He also saw that non-Caucasians in Hawaii had limited access to
culture. The new legislation would be another avenue towards the improvement of the lives of all the people. 

Preis agrees that Yoshinaga was one of the most ardent supporters of the arts legislation. Preis says that because Yoshinaga was Japanese and a Democrat, he believed in education for all. Yoshinaga was also in the Burns inner circle; Governor Burns was convinced that the bill should pass. Both felt that “If art was good enough for the rich, it was good enough for everyone.” In fact, the legislation encountered no problems, specifically because it came out of the governor's office. The Burns administration comprised individuals who were exited about the New Hawaii. These individuals were convinced that they could bring about social changes. The percent-for-art legislation, with its potential for expanding an arts program for all the people, was a major innovation. It was recognition of the value of art to the general populace. The administration bill came before the legislature at a time when the governor and the legislature were still in a honeymoon period and no splits were obvious in the Democratic Party. If problems arose, Yokouchi had “the ears of the Governor.” He was able to deal on a personal level with him as well as with the members of the legislature, if clarification was necessary. However, a majority of the legislators were Japanese and had firm convictions that art was something almost sacred and the highest form of education. Thus, support for the arts was support for education.

Kamaka’s recollection of the arts legislation and the ease with which it passed is strikingly similar to that of Yokouchi and Preis. The legislation encountered no major opposition. Kamaka is convinced that the legislators then were “generally good people with the same set of ideals.” The issues they
raised were “always for the good of the majority.” At the time, the general mood was “uplift”; Kamaka and his committee members felt that support for culture and the arts was important in order to improve Hawaii as a whole. Their motivation was the desire to accomplish a greater good. They saw themselves as “implements of community desires,” and their actions reflected people’s wants. This was the time for “Hawaii’s chance at Camelot.”

Thus, the stage was set for the passage of the percent-for-art legislation. Skillful behind-the-scenes lobbying, written testimony from arts advocates, legislative compromise, and gentle prodding from Governor Burns, all contributed to the eventual enactment of this significant bill. Whether the legislators accomplished a greater good, as they intended, will become apparent in the following examination of the percent-for-art law in action.

Provisions of the Legislation

Act 298 served the Foundation and its Art in Public Places program as a basis for action. The legislation included a minimum of detail. It had only three brief sections. The legislation clearly established that the state recognized its responsibility to further culture and the arts on behalf of the people of Hawaii. Furthermore, its intent was to encourage the development of craftspeople as well as artists. The legislation established as state policy that “a portion of appropriations for capital expenditures be set aside for the acquisition of works of art to be used for state buildings.”

The second section of the bill provided that the government should set aside for the acquisition of works of art one percent of all appropriations for the original construction of any state building. The percentage was mandatory and
non-deductible. Focusing on the integration of art with architecture, the legislation provided that the works of art can be "an integral part of the structure, attached to the structure, detached within or outside of the structure, or can be exhibited in other public buildings." If the government did not expend the total appropriation on a specific building, the remaining funds could accumulate for application to other projects.

The legislation mandated that, after consultation with the Foundation, the comptroller determine the available sums for the purchase of works of art for each project. Both the comptroller and the Foundation would be responsible for selecting and commissioning the artist and reviewing the design, execution, placement, and acceptance of the works of art.

The final section of the bill simply stated that the Act would take effect upon its approval, which was June 12, 1967.40

According to Preis, because the language of the bill was not specific, it allowed the program great flexibility. However, the provisions making the expenditure of one percent on works of art mandatory was quite specific. This detail was important, one can surmise, for it anticipated the potential problem of having to rely on the quixotic nature and goodwill of department heads or staff. A mandatory program avoids this sort of undesirable dependency. The Hawaii law is unique, Preis asserts, because the one-percent appropriation is non-deductible and mandatory. Most important, no building is complete unless it "consumes its allotment for art."41
Art in Public Places: for the People

The primary goal of the Art in Public Places program was to enhance public buildings and spaces throughout the state for the cultural enjoyment and enrichment of the people. Since the public must see the works of art in order for them to provide enrichment and enjoyment, the main criteria were visibility and accessibility. The art works should be installed in places people frequented. The works could be either relocatable (purchased and portable) or permanent (commissioned to remain on site). This study focuses on the permanent works.

When the Foundation began to administer the percent-for-art law, it had no precedent to follow. Guidelines for the program evolved slowly over a period of time. Preis and the Foundation groped for proper criteria. The difficult learning process finally resulted in guidelines two years later. The process took this long, Preis says, because “We wanted a very democratic system. We always knew we had to involve the people in the selection process.”

Early on, the Foundation inaugurated a procedure allowing the head of the department or agency under consideration for the artwork to participate in the decision-making process. The Foundation encouraged the department director to set up an advisory committee including staff members and people who used the services of the facility or conducted business there. If a school was involved, the principal would act as the head of the committee and encourage teachers, parents, and people from the neighborhood to join. If any committee desired, it could invite a professional artist or arts specialist to serve as an advisor.
Because the process was democratic, the SFCA aimed for as broad a representation of the community as possible. It set no limit on the number of people sitting on any committee. Diversity was the goal, and the Foundation tried to involve people from all levels of society and the different ethnic groups. It required screening procedures for selecting artists to involve the community that would receive the work of art. Involving the community from the start was an important step in the selection process. Preis and his SFCA associates demonstrated insight when they decided that community involvement was the top priority.

Another priority was education. As far as the Foundation was concerned, most people were unfamiliar with art. The selection process would serve to educate all participants, including artists. Ideally, if the Foundation succeeded in this goal, the community in question (courts, schools) would inform artists about the agency's role, goals, and expectations. Thus, the participating individuals would interact with the artists who were attempting to make changes in the environment of that community and would express opinions concerning art and potential problems. The artists could teach the community about the values of contemporary sculpture. Such an exchange would allow the artists to consider the tastes of their public. Few artists would disagree that art they created "to serve the public ought to take into account public taste." 46

Because of what it learned in the selection process, the public would have increased understanding of, responsiveness to, and appreciation for an art form that was previously unfamiliar. The controversy over Marisol's sculpture of Father Damien for the Capitol demonstrated the importance of and need for public information and education. An experience such as this one shows that
when the government places works of art in "a community which consists of people unfamiliar with or having little or no experience with contemporary art forms," the people have difficulty accepting them, not to mention enjoying, understanding, and appreciating them. Public participation in the selection had the potential for anticipating problems, such as a work of art that does not relate to the building or to the needs and demands of the users—workers or visitors. Most important, such a process could help create among users of the building a pride of ownership. The work would be their art.

Implementation of the Art in Public Places Program

Preis prepared an implementation plan, and the formal guidelines for commissioning a work of art evolved slowly over time. When the governor approved the plan, Shelley Mark declared, "This program of providing art works can be an effective teaching tool in the high school and lower levels and could be the laying of a good foundation for public art appreciation." The concise implementation plan laid out three phases. First, the Foundation would allocate funds equitably among the various islands of the state. Second, the basis of allocation would be specific types of art for the various buildings or areas. The Foundation would distinguish between major works of national impact and smaller works of local importance, determining also the general location, size, and medium. Third, consulting with the project architect and others, the Foundation would select appropriate artists, who would submit proposals for the work. This implementation plan strove for cultural equality, equitable distribution of works of art, diversity in the kinds of art, and community participation.
The Foundation attempted to follow the guidelines in the implementation plan well as it could. Preis and the Foundation were determined to distribute the commissions of art equitably throughout the state. The goal was to provide aesthetic experience to all citizens. To stress geographical diversity, the Foundation instituted a program of outreach to the neighbor islands. It sent invitations to all agency heads, encouraging them to express priorities and choices, including whether they wanted to commission a work of art. After thoughtful deliberation, the Foundation would select the artist on the basis of scope and scale of the piece, environmental factors, and aesthetics—symbolic meaning, texture, color. According to Preis, the emphasis was always on quality. The Foundation viewed both arts and crafts as art. The goal of Preis's implementation plan was to involve the architect and the artist from the initial phase of the construction of the building.

Public Art, Public Participation

The selection of artwork for the public requires careful thought. A lack of meaningful initial communication among the users of the building, the artist, and the architect might result in unwanted complications. For example, the completed object might not fulfill the wants or needs of the building's occupants or visitors. The public might end up with a work of art it could not understand, appreciate, or enjoy. It might reject the work as a waste of taxpayers' money, or worse, ask the Foundation to remove it.

The most graphic example of a problem resulting from a lack of public participation concerned the Tilted Arc, which artist Richard Serra created and installed in the plaza of the U.S. Customs Court and Federal Building in New
York's lower Manhattan on July 16, 1981. Patricia Fuller of the National Endowment for the Arts chaired the elitist panel of arts experts that made the selection. The panel did not involve users of the building and the plaza in the selection process. Soon after the installation, citizen complaints poured in, characterizing the sculpture as an eyesore. It prevented public use of the plaza because it was an obstacle to pedestrian traffic. It was also a good hiding place for vagrants and muggers. Thirteen hundred employees signed a petition requesting the removal of the sculpture. The sculpture continued to be the center of a heated debate that finally culminated in a public hearing March 6–8, 1985. In April, the panel that presided over the public hearing recommended relocating Tilted Arc.

This controversy demonstrates the importance of communication among the artist, architect, and potential users of the building and space. Practically speaking, the users of a facility are clients; the artist or architect provides an art product in a contractual transaction. The ideal communication occurs when all parties, the clients and the providers of services, come to a meeting of minds. All must respond to new ideas and be willing to listen. Only under those circumstances will the results be a work of art that people create for people.

Art Advisory Committee Guidelines

The Foundation believed that if the designated community was not knowledgeable about art or had little experience with contemporary sculpture, it would be unlikely to understand or want the artwork. For that reason, the SFCA learned to “rely on the advice and guidance” of persons working or living in the vicinity of the building about to receive a work of art. The people the
Foundation selected formed an Art Advisory Committee (AAC), which a representative of the agency and building chaired. One of the purposes of the advisory committee was to familiarize people with art; if some of the members were knowledgeable about art, so much the better. In order to ensure that the “work meets the aspiration of the local people,” the Foundation sought the advice of the project architect, landscape architect, representatives of the designated facility, and local art councils.60

In its 1973–74 Annual Report, the Foundation published specific criteria, which noted that separate advisory panels for each project should make recommendations to the Foundation board, which was responsible for all decisions.61 The highest officer of the designated facility would chair the panel, which would include users of the facility, as well as workers and members of the neighboring community.62 The panel could request special consultants as necessary. The panels decided whether they wanted an artwork for their building, then discussed their expectations of the work and artists whom they considered suitable.63

Before making a final decision, and after considering the artist the panel had selected, the board determined whether the artist was available for the work, the number of previous commissions the artist had received, the artist’s performance record, and the approximate cost of the work the panel proposed. The Foundation negotiated the terms of the contract by applying for funds to the Department of Budget and Finance through the Department of Accounting and General Services (DAGS). Then the Foundation made a contract with the artist, who was responsible for conceptualizing, designing, constructing, and installing the work.64 These were the guidelines that were in place in 1976,
and that the Foundation was following, at least in theory. Was it following them in practice?

Management Audit of the State Foundation on Culture and the Arts

In 1975, on behalf of the legislature, the House of Representatives requested an audit of the Foundation. The legislators were concerned about the art-in-state-buildings program, as the APP program was then known, because of the “number of major construction projects which were pending and which would yield substantial 1 percent monies. The legislators also wanted to find out whether the Foundation was operating efficiently and effectively. House Resolution 647 authorized a financial and management audit of the Foundation and a review of the APP program.

According to the report,

As of November 30, 1975, the foundation had commissioned 113 works of art and had purchased over 900 portable works of art for an approximate total of $1.9 million. We find inadequacies in the foundation’s management of the collection of portable works of art and commissioned works of art. The following section summarizes the major findings and recommendations of the audit as they pertained to the on-site, permanent, commissioned works of art—particularly as they affected the process of selecting artists—and the Foundation’s response to the recommendations.

The percent-for-art law requires that the board of the Foundation, in collaboration with the comptroller, be responsible for the final decision in selecting the artist for a commissioned work. Although the legislature required
that a panel of interested citizens and organizations serve in an advisory capacity, the audit found that contrary to legislative intent, the comptroller and the board were not participating in the selection process. The dominant figure in the selection of artists was Preis, who by law had no authority to render decisions about selections. The audit found that the "roles of the comptroller and the commissioners have been superficial. Five commissioners have never participated in any project advisory panels." No interaction took place among the comptroller, the board, and the advisory panels, or among the comptroller, the board, and the artists. The comptroller and the board functioned primarily in granting formal approval for the final selection and issuing a contract to the artist.

The audit also found a lack of community participation in the selection process. The report declared, "The role of the project advisory panels is vague, and their involvement is often less than meaningful." For example, the Foundation asked a school principal to chair a panel, but it had already selected an artist before he organized the panel. After the artist completed the work, the principal said that the panel had no function, the Foundation never consulted it, and it had no opportunity to make recommendations. He concluded that the "acceptability of the completed work of art [to] the people in his community was open to question." The audit concluded that the Foundation "sometimes overlooked" community participation. The report recommended that the comptroller and the board of the Foundation assume more active roles in the selection process, as the law dictated. The Foundation should develop clear guidelines specifying functions and responsibilities of the advisory panels in order to maximize public participation.
Both the comptroller and the Foundation received copies of a preliminary report and opportunities to respond to the findings and recommendations. Neither the comptroller, Kenam Kim, nor any representative of DAGS chose to respond. As Foundation board chairman, Yokouchi discussed the report with Legislative Auditor Clinton Tanimura. Foundation staff members also met with staff members of Tanimura's office to discuss the findings and recommendations. On March 23, 1976, the Foundation board met in special session to study the report. The commissioners agreed to "accept the report," despite its adverse comments, "in a spirit of constructive and helpful criticism, and as a valuable tool for continued planning." They concurred with the audit recommendations concerning their taking a more active role in the artist selection process, as the law intended, and the need to develop "guidelines clearly delineating the functions and responsibilities of the project advisory panels . . . to maximize public participation." Tanimura concluded that, in its response, the Foundation, had "demonstrated its understanding of the problems" the audit pointed out and its commitment to "implementing most of the recommendations."

Revised Guidelines for the Art Advisory Committees

On the basis of the recommendations of the legislative audit, the Foundation established policies and procedures for the art-in-state-buildings program. The guidelines explained that the Foundation maintained a photographic slide registry containing photographs of every SFCA purchase and a "visual artist profile" (curriculum vitae) on all artists registered with the Foundation. Each committee should review the artists' profiles and slides of
their work. If the committee was interested in artists whose portfolios were not on file, it could contact them to determine if they would like the committee to consider them. The committee would then submit the names of three artists, in order of priority, to the SFCA board for final selection. This process resulted in a direct commission. Another method the committee could use, limited competition, required the committee to invite a limited number of artists to present proposals for the project. If none of the designs was acceptable, the committee would repeat the selection process. 74

According to the program guidelines, competition (open and other forms) included all artists in the community, not only those who had registered with the SFCA. 75 Preis says the Foundation ruled out open competitions in the beginning as not being the best method for selecting artists. A limited number of artists participated, and the program was still so new that competitions would be even more limiting. 76 Competitions would not always “bring out the unknown or fledgling artists.” The Foundation was concerned that the commissions be accessible to all artists. It also was concerned about encouraging young and new artists. A danger in open competitions is that the winning artist may be inexperienced and unable to complete the work as the committee expected. The artist’s experience may be limited to studio work. Open competitions might be too cumbersome to administer—particularly with a small and often overworked staff.

The Foundation strongly recommended commissioning local artists, except when the artworks were for the State Capital District. 77 Preis says the intention was to have the Capital District appeal to civic and national pride, as do other civic centers throughout the nation. 78 Therefore, he stressed the importance of
avoiding “anything provincial” in selecting artwork for the Capital District. The Foundation also preferred nationally known artists for commissions at institutions of higher learning, so that the students—including future artists—would come in contact with recognized figures. In order to qualify for a commission, the artist had to demonstrate an ability to work under “contractual strictures” and conditions. The artist must “possess or otherwise provide structural and technical skills” necessary to protect the work of art, its environment, and the public “from harm and damage.”

The SFCA board made the final selection at a general meeting or annual meeting. Before rendering a decision, the board reviewed the priorities of the advisory committee’s recommendations, determined the availability of the artist, and looked at the artist’s past performance record. The board also considered the artist’s “technical, financial, and administrative competence; the number of previous or current commissions the artist had received from the state; and the probability of the artist’s reaching the expected artistic goal.”

As part of the commissioning process, the advisory panel had to decide whether it even wanted a work of art, and if so, where it wanted the artist to install the work. The Foundation informed the panel that the artwork must be visible and accessible as well as within the environs of the building. The members of the panel had to visit the facility to familiarize themselves with the site. Depending on the site, they recommended the type and character of artwork they preferred. The guidelines pointed out that discussion should focus on aesthetics—views on the symbolic meaning or social purpose of the art—as well as on the technical aspects—size, scope, and materials. The Foundation
hoped that public participation would make the process of selecting the artist as easy as possible.82

Following the board's review of the advisory committee's recommendations, the Foundation entered into a contract with the artist. The contract called for the following phases of work. First, the conceptual phase required the artist to prepare a written description of the work he or she envisioned, taking into consideration the public's preferences. All parties involved in the selection process attended a meeting to discuss the artist's report. A Foundation staff member served as mediator in the case of any differences of opinion. If these differences were irreconcilable, the Foundation could pay the artist for the submittal and end the process.83

Second, if all parties approved the artist's concept, the design phase began. The artist prepared preliminary designs depicting the form, materials, and color of the work, as well as a site plan indicating location and proposed environmental conditions that might affect the work. The artist submitted both to the advisory committee and the Foundation for review and discussion. After all parties accepted the preliminary designs, the artist prepared the final design. This step involved scale drawings, maquettes, plans for installation, and specifications for the artwork: location, means of support, size, form, structure, material, color, and finish.

Third, the construction phase required the artist to submit a production program and schedule describing the materials, where to purchase them, collaborators (if any), technical aspects, and structural procedures. The artist also submitted a time schedule estimating the various stages of the work-in-progress and the dates the artist expected to complete each stage.84
The final phase was installation. This phase included placement of the artwork and completion of the site work.

When installation was complete, the Foundation officially transferred the artwork to the designated facility and sent a letter containing a brief statement of transference. The facility could acknowledge the official transfer by holding an opening ceremony to recognize participants and special guests. The members of the advisory committee served as coordinators. If the committee preferred, a religious, moral, or spiritual leader could bless the work. If a shroud concealed the work or a lei encircled it, “an actual unveiling or the loosening of the lei’s ribbons [would] take place.” Any of these events would be the perfect opportunity to recognize the artist and to convey the philosophy or purpose of the art, thus fulfilling the educational component of the commissioning process.

Summary

When the Hawaii legislature enacted the percent-for-art law in 1967, it mandated that the government set aside for the acquisition of artworks one percent of the budget for original construction of any state building. Supporters of the new legislation believed it would expand aesthetic opportunities, not only for the elite, but for all the people of Hawaii. The purpose of the legislation was to extend “visual culture” into public spaces by adding beauty and grace to state buildings. Supporters of the legislation also hoped to increase public awareness of art and to encourage artists and craftspeople throughout the state by creating an expanding market place for future commissions.
The SFCA administered the percent-for-art law by establishing the Art in Public Places program and mandating that it bring art to the people. One of the most significant aspects of the Foundation's attempt to carry out this mandate was the establishment of citizen advisory groups to participate in the commissioning process. By working with a voluntary panel comprising members of the participating community, the Foundation virtually assured public participation in the program. This discussion uses the terms public and community interchangeably to include workers in the building, visitors who conduct business there, people living in the neighborhood, and businesses in areas adjacent to the site of the artwork. When a community becomes actively involved in the commissioning process, people have an opportunity to see the connection between government and citizens, as both work to enhance the environment in which people live, work, and play. The SFCA learned early on that seeking public participation and educating the people about the artwork increased understanding, enjoyment, and eventual acceptance of the art. The Foundation reached out into the community seeking participation from as diverse a public as possible, without racial, gender, or class distinctions. Public education about the artwork is important because people must be able to understand it; then they will learn to enjoy and ultimately to accept the piece of art as their art. The artist and the architect also benefit from such an education, which offsets any potential for the community to dismiss or reject the art. In an extreme case, when the public does not participate in such a way, a fiasco such as the removal of the Tilted Arc can occur.

The Art in Public Places program tried to provide a forum for the exchange of information and ideas among the Foundation staff, which served as liaison,
the participating community, and the artist and project architect. Guidelines of
the program stressed community participation as an ongoing process, from
inception to completion of the artwork. The facility’s users and visitors must
have the opportunity to express their opinions before the program commissions
an artwork. Does the community even want a work of art? What kind of art?
Who is to be the artist? The commissioning process has the potential for
spirited public discussion, which can result in creation of an artwork acceptable
to all participants, definitely art for the people.
Chapter 6
Whose Art Is It?

However we treat them, the arts are not a frill. They influence self-discipline. They educate the emotions. They focus desires. They train the senses. They stimulate intuitive explorations and invention. They stir the moral imagination. They are the stuff of which character is made. And, at best, they are the makings of democracy.

Joseph Polisi, president, Julliard School of Music

Art Advisory Committee in Action: Three Case Studies

In response to the critical 1976 legislative audit, the Foundation revised guidelines for the APP program. Two years later, in response to the report's recommendations, the Foundation specifically described the functions and responsibilities of the AAC in order to maximize public participation. The members of the SFCA board agreed that they should assume an active role in the artist selection process, as the law intended. Theoretically, the Foundation and the AAC would closely review and monitor the commission-in-progress, allowing ample opportunity for community participation. In order to determine the effectiveness of the commissioning process, this chapter examines case studies of three sculptors the Foundation selected following the revised guidelines.¹

These case studies will present the ideas and thoughts of three distinctly different sculptors and interpretation of one of each sculptor's artworks that the
The works differ from one another in style and conceptualization, but the cases studies reveal similarities. All three sculptors are professional artists living and working in Hawaii. They received their formal training either in an art school or at a university. They have exhibited their works widely both locally and nationally, and in some cases internationally. Most significant, their artworks convey an immediate sense of place and sensitivity to Hawaii's unique multicultural diversity and environment. Art is an expression of culture; thus, the creative expressions of these sculptors will shed some light on what we citizens of Hawaii value in our society. Historically, the dominant art forms derive from Western European traditions, which some residents called "haole culture." Are these Western European traditions still pervasive? Examining some of the works of these three sculptors should help to answer that question. In addition, it will answer the question of whether the APP program responded to ethnic aesthetics. The works are representative; they should offer some insight into or understanding of how the SFCA has commissioned other works: Was the selection process democratic?

In the early years, the Foundation often commissioned monumental pieces, usually sculptures, for installation in exterior sites, because of the greater visibility and ease of access. Thus, I chose to examine sculpture in these three case studies. Choosing the artists to study was not as simple. After preliminary personal interviews with various artists, I selected Satoru Abe, Laura Ruby, and Sean Browne. They are representative of the multicultural and ethnic diversity of Hawaii. Abe is of Japanese descent and was born and reared in Hawaii. Ruby, a self-described "American mutt," is from California and has lived in
Hawaii for several years. Browne is part Hawaiian and was also born and reared in Hawaii. All consider Hawaii their home. As sculptors, they have completed Foundation commissions for the benefit of their respective communities: Castle High School in Kaneohe, Oahu; the University of Hawaii at Hilo; and Kapiolani Community College in Honolulu, Oahu. The artists understand the aesthetic concerns of their respective communities; they truly are public artists creating art for the people.

This series of case studies would be incomplete without an accompanying examination of the AAC. Who represented the community on the advisory panels? Did the panels provide opportunities for community participation? Was the process educational? An examination of the commissioning process from the inception of the artwork to its installation should provide an understanding of the interactions among the AAC, the artist, the Foundation, and the comptroller. Whenever possible, I interviewed the participants. Understanding how the Foundation selected the artist, the level of public participation, and the extent of the Foundation's involvement will help to answer the question, "Whose art is it?" Any conclusions resulting from this examination of the commissioning process apply specifically to the APP program, first under the Preis and then under the Richards regime. They are not generalizations about the APP program after the period under discussion (circa 1987). The conclusions do not apply to the SFCA as an organization or to its many other programs.

The case studies present profiles of the sculptors, including their education and training, mentors who were most influential in their development, and their exhibitions, which will further our understanding and appreciation of the
commissioned artworks and their contexts. I asked the artists for statements about creating a work of art for the public, including their recollections of their respective advisory panels. The case studies also present reviews by art critics, and my perceptions of the work. A comparison of some of the AAC members' recollections of the commissioning process complete each case study.

The concept of cultural equality was a motivating factor in the establishment of the APP program; the legislature intended the percent-for-art law to broaden opportunities for aesthetic experiences for all the people of Hawaii, including artists, regardless of race, gender, or class. An assumption of this research is the controversial nature of any attempt to provide art for the people; therefore, this chapter offers the dissenting viewpoint of Rocky Ka'iouliokahihiokolō 'Ehu Jensen, a local sculptor who has worked primarily with wood for almost two decades, and who has never received a commission from the Foundation. The chapter concludes with some remarks about the commissioning process and its cultural significance.

The Artist: Satoru Abe

One critic calls him, "A man of genius, a sculptor of the front rank," and says his works, usually welded metal, are "totally original, imbued with an indefinable sense of life, of growth, and of time." Satoru Abe was born in Honolulu in 1926 and graduated from McKinley High School. He studied at the California School of Fine Arts and at the Art Students League in New York, under Louis Bouche, Jon Corbino, and George Grosz. In order to return to his roots and to discover his heritage, Abe traveled to Japan in 1950. Because he is nisei, he says both the Oriental and Occidental worlds influenced him and
During the fifties, he met Isami Doi, an abstract expressionist painter who served as an artistic and spiritual mentor. In 1956, Abe returned to New York, which he characterizes as the American arts scene, and worked for several years at the Sculpture Center, a place to sculpt and exhibit his completed pieces. He returned to Hawaii in 1968.

Generally recognized as a sculptor, Abe also paints because, he says, "neither medium is totally satisfying." In fact, he says some of his "paintings are like sculpture." For Abe, "Sculpting is mostly labor, with three moments of ecstasy—the moment the idea is conceived; halfway through, when I realize that it will turn out all right; and the moment of elation when it is completed." He creates as he feels the need, whether an idea or forms and colors motivate him. The most frequent iconography in his art derives from nature: tree branches, leaves, or roots. "I make a lot of tree forms," he says, "and think of them as extensions or transformations of the human form." He attributes this way of conceptualizing to the influence of his Japanese heritage and the Zen philosophy of reincarnation. He continues to search for answers to the mysteries of life: where he came from, where he will end. For him, art is an outlet for personal expression and a voyage of self-discovery. Eventually, all things must come to an end, he says, but art has the capacity to extend beyond the life span. Art brings immortality. In his words, "It is of some comfort that as an artist I can leave something of value behind."

Abe is a prolific artist; he has had one-man shows and group exhibitions at the Honolulu Academy of Arts, the Tokyo Museum, and the Virginia Museum in Richmond. His artworks are part of the permanent collections of the Contemporary Art Center in Honolulu, the Twentieth Century Fund, and the
Whitney Museum of American Art, both in New York City. He has received a private commission from the First Hawaiian Bank in Honolulu. In 1963, he received a John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation Grant, and in 1970–71, the National Endowment for the Arts Artist-in-Residence Grant. In 1984, the State of Hawaii nominated Abe as one of Hawaii’s “Living Treasures.”

The Work of Art: Spring, Summer, Autumn

In 1979, Alfred Preis notified Abe of his commission to create a sculpture for the theater lobby of Castle High School. The expenditure was $20,000. Abe recalls that the project architect, the school principal, and a student were members of his AAC. During one of their meetings, Abe presented a watercolor rendering of his concept, which the committee approved. He recalls that the discussion focused primarily on the appropriateness of the work for its site. Spring, Summer, Autumn reflects Abe’s personal aesthetic, including the influence of his Oriental heritage and of Zen philosophy. But Abe was also sensitive to his community; and he eliminated the winter season from his concept as inappropriate for Hawaii. The AAC agreed. His reasons for eliminating the winter season were practical, as well: the site had inadequate wall space. After two meetings, the committee gave Abe complete freedom to create. As Abe recounts it, the commissioning process sounds bland because of the lack of controversy. A possible explanation is that the AAC deferred to him out of respect for his talent and expertise. According to Preis, who is one of Abe’s fans, Abe was very popular because his art forms, although abstract, were organic and conveyed earthy and natural textures so that the viewers could identify with the art. Abe’s popularity was one of the reasons for his
selection. Department of Education Arts Specialist Stanley Yamamoto says the AAC submitted two other names to the Foundation, but the committee preferred Abe because "he was the most prominent and in much demand."\(^{16}\)

In fact, this commission was the eighth the artist had received from the Foundation. Besides Castle High, Abe had artworks pending—because of bureaucratic delays over the previous four years, 1975–1979—for Eleele Elementary School on Kauai, Waiakea High School on the island of Hawaii, and the Aloha Stadium in Honolulu.\(^{17}\) Preis admits that for an artist to be doing so many commissions at one time was unusual. Abe says some artists receive more commissions than others—Bumpei Akaji is another sculptor who received commissions frequently—because for many years, the community of sculptors was a small one: only Akaji, Mamoru Sato, Edward Brownlee, and Abe. "But times are changing," he says, "with the upcoming generation of young artists."\(^{18}\) Preis says an advisory committee selected Abe for each of the seven commissions preceding the one at Castle High School. Abe presumes that to be the case. Looking back at the Castle High School project, Abe thinks the entire process was a good one. He remembers responding to the committee if questions arose.

According to Yamamoto, the committee members definitely had opportunities to express their ideas and concerns. As the Department of Education representative, Yamamoto was involved with all advisory committees dealing with art commissions for the public schools, and he formed the AAC for Castle High School. He says the Castle AAC based its selection on the direct commission. The members included faculty, students, and interested people from the community at large. They viewed slides of various artists.
After discussion about the theme and medium, the committee agreed unanimously on Abe. The committee preferred him because he was the most prominent artist. But they also liked his work, and they believed his style and technique were the most appropriate for the Castle site. As Ron Bright, drama instructor, says, "It must be art with quiet beauty; it must provide enough aesthetics without shouting at you." During a discussion about aesthetics, Avis Nakamoto, who was the art department chairwoman, expressed concern about the choice of medium. Although the committee agreed that the work should be a sculpture, some members preferred to see it wrought in enamel. Nakamoto expressed her concern that creating a large enough wall sculpture in enamel might be impossible; the committee listened and decided on metal.

Abe's Castle High School commission is a special case study because Abe also served as Castle's artist-in-the-school. The Artist in the Schools program began in 1966 as a cooperative undertaking of the Foundation and the Department of Education. It was the first program of its kind in the nation, and it affected directly "the most people during a period of their greatest receptivity." As artist-in-the-school, Abe conducted workshops for the students. Nakamoto was pleased with the project because it enabled students to see the artist at work and allowed them to participate in the making of an artwork. Abe created a new and separate sculpture for his classes. Students helped with the welding. Such hands-on experience enabled them to appreciate the completed Spring, Summer, Autumn.

Yamamoto says public art must be for the people. When they become involved with a project, the artwork belongs to them. The art instills a sense of pride in the community. "When schools care about what happens to their art,"
Yamamoto says, “they take care of it.” Yamamoto was responsible for including student representatives on the advisory committees. He says getting students at all levels, including elementary and junior high, involved in caring for the artwork is important because active participation “minimizes the potential for malicious vandalism to the artworks.”

Yamamoto says the APP program succeeds in raising public awareness of art by increasing people’s exposure to art and educating them about the role that art plays in their community and lives. He says people are showing more appreciation for art than they did formerly, and he credits the Foundation for making this change possible. As far as Abe and his advisory committee are concerned, the commissioning process at Castle High School succeeded. The following section examines the Foundation’s role.

The Foundation most often used the process of direct commission. Following a presentation of slides of various artists’ works, which the APP program staff selected, and discussion of the artists and their works, the AAC narrowed its choices to three names, in order of priority. It transmitted its choices to the SFCA board, which generally followed the committee’s recommendations.

According to Preis, occasionally the artist of first choice either would be too busy or would have received “too much SFCA work”; so the Foundation would disqualify that artist from receiving the commission. Another reason for disqualification would be that the artist’s design was disappointing to the board or the artist’s concept was not what the board had envisioned. But generally the committee got the artist of its choice. What makes the Art in Public Places program unique, Preis says, is its highly democratic nature. “After all,” he
says, “it was the people's choice to have art or not.” The main purpose of the advisory committees was to familiarize people with art; “it was their decision to have art in or around their building.”26 Although the board and the state comptroller collaborated to make the final decisions, the Foundation says the AACs for the different projects advised the board.27

According to Franklin Odo, who became a commissioner in 1981,28 the board followed the advisory committee's recommendations, but “it was not merely a rubber-stamp decision.”29 The board made final selections after much consideration. The decision-making process is difficult, “because the people on the board are citizen representatives”; the governor does not appoint them for their expertise in the arts. Whenever the board needs additional information before rendering a decision, the staff of the Art in Public Places program provides that information. Usually, the board has no major concerns to deal with because the committee has addressed them satisfactorily.30 Odo says some of the board's questions concern maintenance and whether the piece will stand up to weathering; another concern is the artist's ability to complete the work.31 While by law the Foundation and the comptroller share final responsibility, Odo says that the comptroller usually defers to the board.32 He does not recall ever seeing a representative from the Department of Accounting and General Services at a selection decision meeting. The members of the board “almost always” choose the artist according to the priority ranking of the advisory committee.33 Former executive director Sarah Richards agrees.34 She says the advisory committees also “almost always” want a local artist, preferably from their island. They usually request a master artist because of the “name recognition value.” Generally, the Foundation grants their requests.
Richards adds that the committees are interested in Hawaiian forms, which are popular because the committees believe the art reflects their sense of community. Their pride is most apparent during the ceremony dedicating the artwork. Because the people are part of the process, they can relate to the art. Richards says their experience is positive and educational.  

Art for the Community

When Abe completed the Castle High School artwork in 1980, the school held a formal dedication ceremony and asked Abe to discuss his work. He does not remember what he said. Although he is knowledgeable about art, he has difficulty expressing his ideas because, he says, he is "a poor speaker." He also says that some of his difficulty articulating ideas about his art results from his formal training. Like other art students of his generation, he believed that art spoke for itself and no explanations were necessary. Art critic Marcia Morse characterizes Abe's work as displaying a "reverent attitude toward the nature of nature." She describes his style as a "well-defined vocabulary of forms derived from nature and stylized and permuted with exquisite variations" and says he deals with "direct observation of forms of nature rather than an idealized conception of it." Even Abe's large works convey a sense of intimacy because of the "densely constructed surfaces of small components and patination," she says; "the metal seems to be . . . organic matter." Morse's generalizations about Abe's work certainly apply specifically to Spring, Summer, Autumn. When play-goers enter the lobby of the Castle High School theater, they encounter a monumental piece that completely dominates one wall. At first, the work seems aggressive, yet it conveys a sense of
intimacy. Under careful scrutiny, the highly textured copper-bronze work, with its rich shades, seems to come alive; it invites touching. Abe says Zen philosophy influenced his art. *Spring, Summer, Autumn* demonstrates this influence, particularly as it relates to the life cycle of birth, death, and rebirth. I saw a multitude of swirling leaves of varying sizes in the differing shades and hues of nature. These leaves are in the formative and mature phases—symbolic manifestations of birth, maturity, and death. This work is an excellent example of Abe’s talent for creating a painting that looks like sculpture. Although the massive piece is two-dimensional, its highly textured nature imparts a sense of three dimensionality. By creating an illusion of depth, the piece appears sculptural. Despite its permanence, an organic quality pervades it. A refined and subdued elegance (*shibui* in Japanese) suffuses the work. The people on the advisory committee asked for and received a work of art with quiet beauty. According to Ron Bright, they wanted art that provided enough aesthetics without shouting. *Spring, Summer, Autumn* succeeds. Abe created a work of art that was site-specific and accessible to the public—both physically and intellectually. This commission was successful.

The Artist: Laura Ruby

Laura Ruby was born in Los Angeles in 1945. She graduated from the University of Southern California with a degree in English and completed her graduate work in English at San Francisco State College in 1969. A writer and educator as well as a self-taught artist, she has no specific alliances to a particular school or style of art. Because she is self-taught, Ruby considers herself to be outside the mainstream of Western European artistic traditions.
Fine arts elitists may indeed view her popular art and cross-cultural artifacts as non-mainstream. When she moved to Hawaii in 1974, the multicultural and ethnic diversity, particularly the Hawaiian and Asian cultures, captivated her. Some of her art forms reflect this interest: for example, her serigraphs of Diamond Head; the local plate-lunch, a concept peculiar to Hawaii; and the Nancy Drew series integrate elitist and non-elitist expressions. Ruby sees no contradiction in the integration of ethnic and popular art forms into her concept of fine arts. She expanded her works from the initial ceramics and sculpture to include serigraphy because she felt a need to explore and stretch her creativity. Literature remained a part of her work, as she demonstrated with a number of collaborations with writers, such as the Painted/Read invitational exhibition in Honolulu.

In 1978, Ruby earned an M.F.A. degree from the University of Hawaii. A brief discussion of her graduate thesis will help to explain the iconography of the sculpture the Foundation commissioned her to create, as well as the cultural context within which she created it. Her thesis focused on sculptural pieces based on Neolithic structures "tempered by a Twentieth-Century world view." She says that the Neolithic monuments are capable of revealing the particular world view of the various peoples who made them—their knowledge of science, place in the universe, and mythologies. "The Neolithic monuments are a record of primordial images," she says. "They are a synthesis of a particular view of the universe, an attempt to memorialize that view in architectural monuments." The transformation of the images of antiquity into a twentieth-century monumental sculpture is the subject of a subsequent section.
Hawaii's visual arts audience has had several opportunities to see Ruby's outpouring of art. Her extensive list of exhibitions includes the Contemporary Arts Center, Bishop Museum, the Honolulu Academy of Arts, the Hawaii Loa College's Merinda Lee Gallery in Kaneohe, and the Waialea Art Gallery on Maui. Nationally, her art has been on display at the Cerritos College Gallery in California; the University of North Dakota Art Galleries; the Downey Museum of Art in California; the Zaner Gallery in Rochester, New York; the Cincinnati Museum of Natural History; and the Cain Memorial Art Gallery in Corpus Christi, Texas. In 1981, one of her pieces earned the Best in Show award at the First Annual Word Exhibition of Poets and Artists at the Columbus Museum of Arts and Sciences in Georgia. She won an Award in Sculpture at Art Quest '86 in California. Ruby has also received private and public commissions. These include a ceramic wall relief for the Musicians' Association of Hawaii in Honolulu (1978), a serigraph commemorating the 60th anniversary of the Richards Street Y.W.C.A. in Honolulu (1986), and a serigraph for the Honolulu Printmakers (1988).

The Work of Art: Cromlech

In 1979, Alfred Preis and program specialist Ronald Yamakawa notified Ruby about a commission for the exterior of the theater building on the Hilo campus of the University of Hawaii. The expenditure was $12,500. As Ruby recalls, the advisory committee had about 23 members. The committee members were long-time Hilo residents who were interested in their community and therefore interested in the project. They were also interested in new ideas and asked the APP staff for a wide representation of artists in order to avoid
reviewing the same individuals who usually received commissions (for example, Abe and Akaji). The committee was diverse, with representatives from the community at large as well as the student population; half were Caucasian and half represented various ethnic groups.

The advisory committee had previously seen a slide presentation of Ruby's work, but for her first meeting with the group, Ruby brought more slides in order to demonstrate what she envisioned for the site. During one of our interviews, Ruby said she believes the artworks from public commissions must be accessible to the people. She said the commissioned artists have "an obligation to the public they serve." In an interview with Cultural Climate, she said,

The best public art . . . functions for the community. The best of these art works can spark us time and again and set us thinking and wondering. It embodies an iconographic content recognizable to many people, and . . . to many generations. It should aspire to become the highest cultural manifestation of a community.

Ruby wants people to like what she creates for them and their community. She infuses her conceptualization of art with her various experiences and her world view. Hence, the work of art encompasses her values. Ruby characterizes her relationship with the advisory panel as "participatory." Because she views herself as a participant along with her audience in the arts experience, she says she may be more of "an egalitarian than other artists."

Ruby is also on the faculty of the University of Hawaii at Manoa, and as an educator, she may be motivated to encourage participation in the arts.
However, she is sincere in her desire to “get art to the community.” She says she wants the people on the committee to feel confident that what they are proposing is “for the community.” The committee members must feel confident in their judgment, confident that the community will not reject the work of art. At Hilo, the advisory committee members and Ruby walked through the site, which she visualized as a performance area in addition to the theater. She says that because the members were interested in her art, they had no disagreements about style, medium, or any other aesthetic questions. They merely “worked off” what she had already conceptualized. The committee deferred to her artistic decisions, and she was free to create. The committee’s chairwoman, Ellen Schroeder, assistant professor of art at UH Hilo often traveled to Honolulu on business; thus she was able to ensure public participation by maintaining communication between Ruby and the committee. Ruby further expanded the opportunities for public participation by involving members of the Hilo community at large and using its resources. She seldom imports out-of-state materials.

Art for the Community

Ruby completed and installed Cromlech, an icon she derived from Neolithic monuments, in 1980. The University of Hawaii at Hilo unveiled the sculpture during a formal dedication ceremony. The work graphically embodies what Ruby values most highly—ideas. She says ideas are particularly important in conceptualizing art because they stimulate communication with others. She believes her art is a voyage of discovery for the viewers, as she tries to tap into their curiosity. People come to Cromlech with their innate curiosity and
attempt to determine their personal interpretation of the work. This search for aesthetic or cultural meanings results in self-discovery for the viewer. Ruby does not call her art uplifting because for her, "art is not proselyting"; instead, an effective or satisfying art experience motivates people to further their discovery. And this sense of discovery can carry over to other aspects of life.

In her M.F.A. thesis, Ruby argued that Neolithic monuments can reveal the particular world view of a people. These structures attempt to memorialize that world view. Similarly, Cromlech etches in ceramic stories about people. But it also conveys certain values of the artist as well as her interpretation of what the Hilo community considered important.

On a grassy knoll fronting the theater building, Ruby's ceramic sculpture resembles a Stonehenge monolith. Two five-foot columns support a fifteen-foot crossbar as a symbolic gate to welcome theater audiences. The asymmetrical lines and warm colors of Cromlech help to relieve the unyielding architecture of the building. The landscaped grounds enhance the dioramic effect of the space, creating the performance area Ruby envisioned. The natural beauty of Hawaii serves as a dramatic backdrop. As I see the sculpture, it conjures scenes from Shakespeare—it could be an integral part of Macbeth. I can easily visualize the mad Scot standing before Cromlech, especially on one of Hilo's typical cold and soggy days. The piece has great potential for integration into the community. Critic Frank Stewart says the work creates an appropriate site for community festivals and religious reflection.52 Cromlech is a part of the Hilo community. According to drama professor Jackie Johnson-Debus, the sculpture is a functional piece of art that frequently serves as a backdrop for concerts. It is
integrated into the life of the college and is one of the “best-liked” works of art on campus.53

To paraphrase Ruby once again, the best public art belongs in the community. It embodies or evokes images or ideas that people recognize. One of the values Cromlech incorporates concerns the nature of changes. According to Ruby, viewers can interpret the sculpture as a story about changing forms.54 The sculpture demonstrates textural and tactile changes as the material progresses from rough-hewn peaks and valleys to smooth geometric surfaces. Ruby executed the work in ceramic, which represents change of a different sort: the Neolithic monument of antiquity was stone. Ruby wanted to show how successive generations of artisans might have worked. As she explains, one generation might render a rough-hewn monument; another might produce a geometric or smooth form; still another might carve human faces.55 Still others would use different media. The representation of these changing forms may extend further to a symbolical portrayal of a society in transition. In this instance, it may represent a community that experienced transformations: Hilo was an old country town, but an influx of tourists and new residents has energized it. The face of the community is changing.

Another value the artwork conveys is the plurality of entities. Ruby attempts to portray the various ethnic groups and the multicultural diversity of Hawaii. For example, some viewers may interpret the sculpture as portraying an old Hawaii: people fishing for food, planting taro, or tending animals. Others may see old Hawaiian trail markings. But the work of art is also a universal expression. Viewers may interpret it as a depiction of people at work during different periods in history and in various societies throughout the
world. For example, the artwork contains a rendering of a water jug, which ancient Hawaiians might have crafted in koa, while ancient Greeks would have used goatskin. The overriding human concern the artwork portrays is nourishment and the work necessary in order to obtain food and drink. According to Ruby, a universal expression has a “connectedness” to many people; the work of art tries to reach out to all people. It attempts to address pluralistic interests. Cromlech addresses the questions of what a culture is and what it does.

Ruby says artists who receive commissions from government agencies subscribe to the idea of public art’s being for the people. She says she doubts that the art will be confrontational, particularly because, for her, the process of making the artwork is participatory. She says her artwork is there for the people and to stimulate discussion. She also understands that her work is not necessarily for all the people, because some of them will ignore the piece or ignore art in general. But the most significant value Cromlech embodies is to symbolize, according to Ruby, that “We, the people, owe it to people who ordinarily would have no experience [of] or exposure to art to [give them] an opportunity for viewing.” The implication is that all people have the opportunity to participate in art, if they so choose. Public art democratizes aesthetic experiences.

The Artist: Sean Kekamakupaa Lee Loy Browne

The art of Sean Browne pays homage to two diverse cultures. His sculptures derive from Hawaiian and Western European aesthetic traditions, resulting in a contemporary form with overtones of the traditional. His works
project the majestic quality of the Hawaiian spirit arising from ancient cultural artifacts. His creations find expression in the earthy tones of cast bronze and stone or the pristine polish of marble.

Born in Hilo, Hawaii, in 1953, Browne grew up in a household filled with art. His parents collected primitive art—primarily Polynesian, Asian, and pre-Columbian works. He began sketching and modeling at an early age and "always enjoyed working with [his] hands." He says he also enjoys the freedom that comes with creating art. When he was a child, petroglyphs fascinated him—particularly when he discovered them in the sand. He used to visit the quarries where Hawaiians fashioned stone tools whose intrinsic beauty "mystified" him. Browne graduated from the Kamehameha Schools in Honolulu and attended the University of Redlands in California, where he earned a B.A. in studio art in 1975. That same year, he held his first one-man show at the Peppers Art Gallery in Redlands. The following year, he did field work and researched pre-Columbian sites in Columbia, Peru, and Mexico. He returned to Hawaii and in 1978 submitted a visual artist profile to the SFCA. Three years later, he received his first public commission. He taught sculpture as a lecturer in the art department at the University of Hawaii at Manoa. He decided to continue his graduate work in art, earning an M.F.A. in 1983. Browne studied under Paoli Silvero in Italy and in 1985, as a Fulbright Scholar, under Isamu Noguchi in Japan. In spite of his travels, his Hawaiian roots are evident in his artworks.

His works are on view in Honolulu in the Contemporary Arts Center, the Bank of Hawaii, and Pacific Resources Incorporated; on Kauai and Maui at the Westin Hotels; and in private collections in California, Hawaii, Maryland,
Missouri, New Mexico, and Japan. He has had one-man shows at the Yamada Gallery in Japan and Gallery EAS and the Pauahi Gallery in Honolulu. His works have appeared in group shows at the Honolulu Academy of Arts, Northern Illinois University's Swen Parson Gallery, ABC Gallery in Japan, and Galleria Communale d'Arte Moderna in Italy. Hawaii Public Television has featured Browne in two programs: Spectrum, an educational television series (1986), and Hawaiian Contemporary Artists, an educational program (1989).62

The Work of Art: Spirit Way (Ke Ala O Ka Uhane)

The SFCA commissioned Browne to create an artwork for the Diamond Head campus of Kapiolani Community College in 1985. As Browne recalls the selection process, the advisory committee invited several two-dimensional and three-dimensional artists to a meeting.63 The committee discussed the variety of commissions that were potentially available for the campus and conducted a walk through the grounds so that the artists could better envision the sites. Approximately 30 artists showed up, and the committee asked each to submit a proposal, which Browne did. He enclosed an invitation to one of his exhibitions, which would open a few months later. Later, he learned that Pat Snyder, assistant to the provost and co-chair of the committee, and some other members of the group had attended the exhibition and seen a maquette of Spirit Way, which impressed them. Ultimately, they decided that Spirit Way was the artwork they wanted for the Diamond Head campus.

Browne says the experience at Kapiolani Community College was “not a normal procedure” but an ideal situation. The project architect, Robert Matsushita, was still involved, and either he or his representative participated
as a member of the committee. The members wanted to assume an active role in the art project and supported Browne because of his vision as an artist. They respected his work as well as his opinion. For example, the final site for the sculpture was Browne's choice of what was most appropriate, although the committee had been considering other sites, including a large, open lawn area that would have overpowered Spirit Way. After Browne explained why the sculpture belonged in the site he favored, all—including Matsushita, the architect—agreed. Public participation resulted in communication and education.64

Browne credits Snyder for solving any problems that cropped up. Michael Molloy, instructor in humanities and co-chair of the committee, says the commissioning process was successful because the group included "an administrator [Snyder] with an interest in the arts, who could also conduct the business end of it, and a faculty who care."65 According to Matsushita, Snyder had her "heart and soul" in the art project.66

A major concern that came up early in the process was the height of the sculpture. The committee wanted the piece to be 18 feet high, for a more dramatic visual impact than the original projection of 15 feet. Browne informed the members that he would be unable to increase the height for the $75,000 the Foundation had allotted. Snyder appeared before the SFCA board and lobbied for an additional sum. The board, in turn, met with the Department of Accounting and General Services, which agreed the increase in funds was justifiable. The final allotment for the artwork was $90,000.67

Some of the extra funds were necessary to redesign the walkway approach to the sculpture, as well as the configuration of the pedestal for the work, which
had originally been a planter box for a tree. The seating area at the edge of the pedestal also required design work. Although the project cost more than the original allotment, the changes produced a more site-specific work of art. These changes, which arose out of the concerns of the AAC, demonstrate how effectively public participation can accomplish results. Kapiolani wanted and acquired art with visual impact.

Browne says public art must “pique a person’s interest.” Sculpture must be a “moving experience”; it cannot be merely sedentary or “do nothing for the people.” People may not completely understand art, but if it is something different, it may provoke reflection. Browne also believes that because taxpayers’ money pays for public commissions, the artists must respond to the desires of the community and be sensitive to the people. As a public artist, he recognizes that not all people will understand his work, and not everyone will like his sculpture for Kapiolani Community College. “If the majority come away with a sense of our Hawaii, of ourselves, our civilization,” he says, “that is the ultimate goal.” He considers the piece successful if the viewers reflect on their heritage and “get our sense of place.”

In order to determine whether the community that received Spirit Way believed that the sculpture succeeded, I turned to the committee responsible for the selection. Who were the members? What was their perception of the commissioning process? Did they have opportunities for public participation? Was the experience educational? The Art and Environment Committee included staff, faculty, and students of Kapiolani Community College, and members of the community at large; it was a composite of people living and working in Hawaii. According to committee member Roy Benham, who was a
trustee for the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, the diversity of the group was impressive. It crossed racial, social, and generational lines. Benham was also impressed with the group's sincerity in selecting an artist whose work would integrate with their concept of the campus—a place where “learning will be a pleasure and where education will have the surroundings it deserves.” The committee believed that the location deserved artworks that would “live up” to its natural beauty. Snyder agrees that the committee knew what it wanted, and it was creative and aggressive in accomplishing its goal. The committee was distinctive because the project architect was still involved; arts consultant Lalla Twiggs-Smith, a former art gallery director and an avid patron of the arts, was also a member. How did the committee achieve such a diverse membership? Molloy says race, class, gender, and age were not requirements for participation. But the college was “already such a varied and diverse community,” he says, that the composition of the committee couldn’t help but reflect that diversity. The goal was to “get people who are really interested in art and want to be involved”; he says the concern with the aesthetics of the art and the campus was always the priority. Former secretarial sciences instructor Hazel Tominaga agrees that the question of ethnicity had no bearing on the selection of the members. She says the priority was to involve people who frequented the campus—students, faculty, visitors—and the committee’s “mission was to select art for the campus.

The original AAC first met with Yamakawa in March 1985. He showed them slides of the works of various sculptors. He also explained that the committee should select the artists in order of priority. This method of selection, the direct commission, was typical. According to Snyder, the direct
commission was "too confining." The committee preferred an open competition so that it could express to the artists its vision of the campus and the work of art, and the artists could present proposals to fulfill that concept.

Yamakawa informed the committee that its plan was a departure from standard procedure of the APP program, and that he thought asking artists to participate in a competition without compensation would be unfair. Snyder and the rest of the committee believed the artists would be happy to participate just for the opportunity of being considered for a potential art commission. The committee discussed the situation with Sarah Richards, the Foundation's executive director, who suggested forming a separate committee. Thus, the members organized the Art and Environment Committee. This example shows the importance of ongoing public participation and communication and their potential for bringing about change—in this case, abandoning standard operating procedure in favor of a procedure the committee requested.

The new committee invited as many artists as possible to a reception where they could meet committee members and obtain information about the art, the site, and the development of the new campus. The committee told the artists that any artworks for the campus (1) must properly relate to the natural beauty of the environment, (2) must be of high artistic quality in order to educate and inspire those who contemplate them, and (3) must be the works of artists of Hawaii and must "harmonize in a general way with the identity of the college," since the campus was attempting to project a distinctively Hawaiian identity—the buildings have Hawaiian names; the campus is located on the slopes of Diamond Head, a symbol of Hawaii throughout the world; and the college is
named after Queen Kapiolani."78 After reviewing several proposals, the committee unanimously selected Browne.

Art for the Community

On August 26, 1987, Charles Manu Boyd commemorated Spirit Way with a Hawaiian blessing; then participants untied a lei of maile leaves that draped the sculpture. The surrounding landscape provides a background that focuses attention on the site, inviting passers-by to stop and look. The sculpture extends its invitation to the community at large; for example, play-goers at Diamond Head Theater, across the street, may also view the piece as they leave the parking lot.

Spirit Way rises from its pedestal, imperiously reaching up to the sky. The abstract bronze sculpture comprises two free-standing columns, one of 18 feet, the other 13–1/2 feet.79 Flowing smoothly from two massive, asymmetrical bases, the columns narrow to the serrated edges at their tops, suggesting a phalanx fanning outward and upward. The sculpture is a ritual shape, a welcoming sign to those wishing to attain knowledge and self-betterment. It projects visual power. The sculpture inspires the imagination; it invites introspection, whether one walks around it or decides to stop, sit on a bench, and contemplate the work. Its aggressive physicality challenges the viewer to touch it.

Browne created Spirit Way to represent a “psychological space of awareness.”80 The artwork symbolizes the entrance to a sacred place, similar to torii (a gateway to a Shinto temple).81 An uplifting feeling pervades the space, as people pass through to get an education and leave with a sense of
accomplishment. For this artwork, the traditional icon the ancient Hawaiian used—a composite of the shank and barb of the fish hook—takes on new life. As Browne has rendered it, the form assumes a contemporary meaning.

According to Browne, the work includes representations of volcanic forms: the sides of the sculpture rise up to the roughened and serrated edges at the top. Browne also envisioned the depiction of a mother and a child, the larger and smaller columns. One can infer from this depiction of a nurturing and nourishing tie the relationship of educational institutions to those who enter them: The instructor—the symbolic mother—encourages, challenges, and confronts the student—the symbolic child, who learns to express opinions and expand interests for personal or professional development. According to art critic Marcia Morse, Browne’s works explore cultural symbols, which he places “securely in an island context by their titles in Hawaiian.” She says, “They achieve [an] elegant synthesis of traditional and contemporary forms . . . in materials that despite their solid and unyielding nature appear smooth and sinuous.”

Spirit Way elegantly synthesizes forms. Roy Benham says Browne was able to “capture the spirit and essence of the Diamond Head-Leahi site” because he is part-Hawaiian. The work provides “an uplifting feeling as one strolls through the entrance.”
Art in Public Places: A Dissenting View

The legislature created the percent-for-art law to expand visual art opportunities for the citizens and artists of Hawaii, to increase public appreciation of art, and to encourage the development of artists and craftspeople. The case studies reveal that the communities of Castle High School, University of Hawaii at Hilo, and Kapiolani Community College approved of and appreciated the artwork they received through the APP program. The AAC members agreed that the program had enriched the lives of the people in their communities. The artists also believed the program was effective. Contrary to this view, artist Rocky Ka'io-liokahihikolo 'Ehu Jensen has claimed that the Foundation neither supported nor encouraged Hawaiian artists; in fact, Jensen says, it has been guilty of "a great deal of suppressing of our style of art." 86 He cites as one example the Foundation's purchase of 92 artworks during 1981 and 1982. 87 Of that number, only 3 were the works of Hawaiian artists. 88 Jensen says the Foundation did not respect, fund, or commission Hawaiian artists, or purchase their works. Jensen's is not the only dissenting voice. Other critics had charged Sarah Richards with being unsympathetic to and uninterested in activities that are outside the traditional Western arts.

In response, Richards says the Foundation based selections primarily on aesthetics and quality, and that ethnicity was never a criterion by which the Foundation acquired a work. 89 Figures for the 1984–85 fiscal year show that the Foundation allocated $45,377 to the Ethnic Heritage program, $30,000 to the Folk Arts program, and $183,325 to the Performing Arts program, which includes symphony, ballet, and theater arts. 90
Critics also have contended that "some of the agency's board are cultural 'mucky mucks' who don't understand their role and have failed to oversee foundation operations aggressively." Has the Foundation emphasized traditional Western arts and been unmindful of the needs and wants of the diverse cultural groups making up the state? Speaking from personal experience, Jensen says it has.

Jensen sincerely loves Hawaiian culture. He descends from an ancient line of wood sculptors. As a Hawaiian, he believes he is responsible for carrying on the talents and traditions of his kupuna (ancestors who served as the source of knowledge) and for spreading that knowledge to the young, in order to perpetuate the art. Jensen received formal training in Western traditional art at Compton College and Otis School of Art in California. He also studied at the University of Hawaii at Manoa and the Honolulu Academy of Arts. His mentors included Joseph Fehr and Louis Pohl. In 1978, as director of Hale Naua III, Jensen organized the first contemporary Hawaiian art exhibit at the Bishop Museum. His works have appeared in exhibits on the mainland and in Europe and New Zealand.

Jensen creates what he describes as "native abstract expressionism," a conceptual art he bases on Hawaiian tradition and symbols and "personal incantations." His iconography usually consists of a Hawaiian figure he conceives as a "true interpretation of someone from the past," and envisions from a thoroughly Hawaiian aesthetic. His artworks involve a sense of "spirituality, of mana or divine power." For example, one of his pieces, Hina, is a conceptualization of Hina, the goddess of the moon, incorporating all the folklore surrounding her. The work embodies her iconography and stories in a
modern interpretation. It reflects the heritage of the Hawaiian people.94 Does Hina represent contemporary art or Hawaiian art? Depending on the viewer's perception, it may represent one or the other, or both. But Western purists would relegate it to a crafts show, folk arts exhibit, or anthropological display. One may legitimately characterize such arbitrary categorization by fine arts institutions or curators as a form of suppression of Hawaiian aesthetics. Jensen says suppression results when "the powers that be, the Foundation and the University of Hawaii, consider Western arts to be the only art." He says that a majority of the art classes derive from Western traditions. Although the university frequently offers Asian art classes, it offers no separate courses for Hawaiian art. Jensen says this kind of "indoctrination" is suppression.95

Jensen's charges of suppression by fine arts institutions, particularly the Foundation and the University of Hawaii are serious. Are they valid? Like art education programs of universities and colleges throughout America, the university's art department derives its areas of concentration primarily from Western traditions. Hence, the department's philosophical approach, aesthetic perspective, and social values appear to be at odds with the multiethnic, multicultural society of Hawaii. This traditional approach to art education does indeed indoctrinate students,96 the future connoisseurs, in Western art traditions. Classical art is important, but art education in Hawaii must not neglect non-Western perspectives, especially those of the various ethnic groups that make up the state's art audiences. Although the department frequently offers classes in Asian art, to date, it has offered no separate course specifically in Hawaiian sculptural art. Thus, Jensen's criticism of the art department is justified.
Jensen's criticism that only 3 of the Foundation's 92 purchases of artwork during 1981 and 1982 were the works of Hawaiian artists is equally justified. Furthermore, for that time period, the Foundation listed no Hawaiians in its records of completed commissions. However, since then, the Foundation has made changes. The Sean Browne commission is an example. The Art and Environment Committee of Kapiolani Community College held an open competition and specifically requested an artwork that would reflect the Hawaiian identity of the campus. The committee's main interest was in selecting the best qualified sculptor who was able to incorporate the natural beauty of the site into a concept of art that was appropriate for the community. As committee member Benham says, Browne was able to capture the essence of the place because of his part-Hawaiian background. The following considerations help to explain why the committee selected Browne. He received his education in the fine arts tradition of the East and the West, both in Hawaii and on the mainland, and in Europe and the Orient. He has earned acceptance and gained credibility as a professional artist in the eyes of the art world, as his numerous local and national exhibitions demonstrate. In addition, the commissions Browne has received from the Foundation are evidence of its respect for him as an experienced sculptor of monumental works. He knows how to obtain commissions. Hence, as far as the Foundation is concerned, he is definitely an insider. And the art world grants him similar insider status. His works—a synthesis of cultural traditions mainly of Hawaii and Japan—reflect the desires and aspirations of his audiences and integrate easily into their aesthetic worlds.
In contrast, Jensen is outside this art world, which consists generally of such arts specialists as critics, scholars, curators, and artists who trained in the Western tradition of fine art. Paradoxically, Jensen also trained in this tradition; but he has chosen to remain outside it. For the past 15 years he has aggressively worked for the acceptance of contemporary Hawaiian art based on traditional Hawaiian symbols reminiscent of ancient figures. His detractors have viewed as confrontational his aggressive persistence in practicing and promoting his art. But he prides himself on being his "own man" speaking for "those who cannot speak for themselves." Jensen claims he knows that he is outside the typical Western-trained, academically-respected art world of some other artists such as Browne. But Jensen chose to remain outside because by speaking for the silent voices (his kupunas), he shares his people's voice with the rest of the world.

Summary

In 1978, in response to the legislative audit, the Foundation redefined formal guidelines for the Art in Public Places program and the functions and responsibilities of the Art Advisory Committee, and the board agreed to take an active role in the commissioning process. In order to determine whether the Foundation followed these guidelines, and whether the guidelines were effective, this chapter presented three case studies. Satoru Abe, Laura Ruby, and Sean Browne are professional sculptors who have exhibited widely. They represent Hawaii's multicultural, multiethnic society. The diversity of the sites for the artworks is also representative: Castle High School in Kaneohe, the University of Hawaii at Hilo, and Kapiolani Community College in Honolulu.
The schools’ sites are geographically diverse, and the schools represent different educational levels, from high school, through junior college, to university. The artists received their commissions from advisory committees who acted as representatives of the public. The membership of the committees included students, faculty and staff, and people from the community at large.

According to the results of my case studies, the commissioning process was democratic; it required ongoing public participation and resulted in ongoing education, from the inception of the art to its dedication. The completed works convey a sense of place—the island connection—and a sensitivity to the special environment and ambiance that are uniquely Hawaii. Art reflects culture, and the artists’ creative expressions help to convey values, beliefs, and attitudes about art in a society. What do these works—Spring, Summer, Autumn, Cromlech, and Spirit Way—say about us?

First, each sculpture reveals or expands the identity and purpose of the particular community. The works help to enrich campus life or create a feeling of community and harmony with the physical environment as well as the emotional landscape. The art of Spirit Way enriches and gives meaning to the student’s life by projecting a psychological gateway to knowledge, self-improvement, and accomplishment. The serrated phalanx points to the sky, implying that students should strive for high goals, and that the only limits are those the individual imposes. The abstract rendering of a mother and child signifies that success is possible in the nurturing environment of the college. Spring, Summer, Autumn, creates a sense of harmony and a feeling of peace with oneself and the physical environment. Leaving the hectic traffic on Kamehameha Highway, the student or play-goer enters the Castle theater lobby
and is able to escape to a place of calm and begin a search for quiet beauty.
*Cromlech* suggests the possibility of escaping modern society altogether and entering a cultural landscape of old Hawaii. The art is also capable of evoking pride, with the realization that the work preserves forever the Hawaiian way of life for future generations to appreciate. These works of art help to strengthen the identity of their campuses. Further, they emphasize the different goals and values of their communities: educational achievement, quest for beauty, and cultural preservation.

Second, the Western tradition, as well as Asian or Hawaiian influences, inspired the works. The textures of the works convey a sense of place. As mediators between the viewer and nature, the works evoke a desire to be as one with the land. Another characteristic common to all the works is quiet beauty—to paraphrase a committee member, aesthetics without the shout.

Aesthetics was always the priority of these advisory committees, as was a reflection of the community. For instance, the Art and Environment Committee at Kapiolani Community College asked for a work of art that would reflect the Hawaiian identity of the campus. The art must be appropriate and must capture a sense of Hawaii.

People generally preferred interpretations of Hawaiian forms because they believed the art was a projection of their sense of community. By insisting that the sculpture be appropriate for the site and the environment, the advisory committees showed their respect for the natural beauty of Hawaii, their desire for art that is harmonious.

Rocky Jensen's is a dissident voice in this atmosphere of apparent harmony my case studies demonstrate. Despite the change in attitudes the
commissioning of the Sean Browne sculpture showed, the APP program was slow in responding to ethnic art that remained outside the mainstream of Western fine arts. The Foundation has yet to commission Jensen's native Hawaiian abstract expressionist works.
Chapter 7
Art for the People

... the support that a society gives to the arts is ... significant. It is by our art that we will be remembered in the future, long after political, economic, and social institutions have changed beyond recognition.

Mel Scott, *The States and the Arts*

Introduction

This study contends that the Art in Public Places program of the Foundation (1967-87) has, in large part, succeeded in providing a democratic dimension to the arts in the state of Hawaii. Before the legislature created the program in 1967, no statewide program existed to broaden visual arts opportunities, to reach out to involve the poor, the socially and culturally underprivileged, or the various ethnic groups. Neither the government nor private corporations commissioned artists on a regular basis. At the time the legislature was considering the percent-for-art legislation and the APP program, a majority of the people perceived art as an indulgence for the connoisseur, usually Caucasian, educated, middle- to upper-class, and professional. In the two decades since the passage of the landmark legislation, the Foundation and the public it serves have accomplished major changes. Works of art occupy public spaces throughout the state, from Waianae, Oahu, to Lanai City, Lanai. This geographical dispersion of art matches the ethnic diversity of the artists who completed the commissions and the communities to which the artworks
now belong. A random listing of artists who completed commissions between 1970 and 1980 might include Bumpei Akaji (Japanese), Edward Brownlee (Caucasian), Mamoru Sato (Japanese), Kim Chung (Korean), John Wisnosky (Caucasian), and Joseph Hadley (Hawaiian).\textsuperscript{1} A random listing of artists who have completed commissions to date (1992) would show increased ethnic diversity.\textsuperscript{2} Thus, the APP program added a new democratic dimension to the visual arts. What does this fact say about Hawaii—its people and its culture?

Cultural Significance of the Commissioning Process

My evaluation of the APP program (under Preis, then Richards) shows that its commissioning process was open to all interested people of the community. The Foundation approached the head of the agency that was to receive an artwork. In the three case studies, the provost of Kapiolani Community College appointed his assistant to chair the advisory committee; the provost of the University of Hawaii at Hilo appointed an assistant professor of art; and the Department of Education's arts specialist chaired the Castle High School committee.

These committees were not closed circles of arts experts, although some of their members were arts specialists. The major requirement for membership was a sincere interest in the art project and a desire to be involved. The committees also invited participation from members of the community at large: a trustee from the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, a retired person, the wife of a former mayor. The members were ethnically diverse: Caucasian, Japanese, Chinese, Hawaiian. They crossed generational lines, from young students to senior citizens. And they came from different social classes. Most of the
members were formally well-educated or, in the case of the student representatives, in the process of becoming educated.

My evaluation of the APP program also shows that the actual process of selecting artists was democratic as well. The Foundation did not impose an artist or work of art on any of these communities. One of the decisions the committees had to make was whether they even wanted an artwork. Thus, they knew about the potential artwork ahead of time, and they were receptive to art. This first step, involving the people from the beginning of the commissioning process, is important because the people's taxes pay for the artwork. The keys to successful public participation are ongoing communication and ongoing education. Because the community must make decisions concerning art in a public place, the community must become educated about the artwork. With education, understanding, appreciation, and enjoyment can only increase. When public art is successful, it encourages the participation of the viewers; ultimately they will project their feelings, perceptions, personal ideas, and interpretations onto the work. Then the work truly becomes the people’s art. Such was the case with some of the members of the committees I discussed. For example, the people of Kapiolani Community College wanted art with visual impact in an open space. Artist Sean Browne explained his financial and aesthetic concerns to the committee, which eventually resolved the potential problems to the satisfaction of all parties involved. The committee also wanted an artwork that projected the school’s educational goals of personal and professional achievement and yet was capable of harmonizing with the natural beauty of the campus. The committee
and the artist worked and learned together in order to produce an artwork for the community.

Education and discourse took place at Castle High School and the University of Hawaii at Hilo as well. Castle High School was a unique example of broadening education, because Satoru Abe served as artist-in-the-school. Laura Ruby's work at UH Hilo is distinctive for its successful integration into the community. It serves as a backdrop for campus activities such as concerts. In addition, Ruby took her artwork into the community at large by using Hilo's construction resources and materials.

The commissioning process of the APP program demonstrates that the ordinary citizen participates as a right and a responsibility. The public made the decisions, not arts experts or bureaucrats. A graphic example of the people's right to decide is the decision of the AAC at Kapiolani Community College to hold an open competition despite the initial hesitancy of the APP program specialist. The committee prevailed and conducted an open competition so that members could communicate their ideas to the artists and the artists could express their concepts of art to the committee. The different advisory committees were similar in this respect: they knew what kind of art they wanted, and they selected artists who were capable of translating that vision into works of art. In each instance, the committee acted as populist-experts by bringing to the fore their personal experiences, open minds, responsiveness to new information, and willingness to learn about art. The members recognized the importance of making aesthetic decisions because they would have to live with the results. Public discourse produces public art. If people leave decisions about the commissioning process to the arts experts or the bureaucrats, the
results are not democratic. Without public participation, with an official agency dictating decisions from behind its closed doors, an official state art arises. A democracy encourages participation of as many of its citizens as possible. The APP program under Preis was an example of democracy at work, although more patrician than grass-roots democracy because of Preis's charismatic leadership.

These three communities based the commissioning process on consensus. A bond developed both among the members of the committee, mostly commoners rather than arts experts, and between the committee and the environment. The common goal was art for the community. The pervasive attitude was respect for the natural beauty of the place and a desire to preserve that beauty. The lack of vandalism of the artworks, even to this day, is evidence of the pride of ownership the communities feel towards their works of art. The works have become part of their communities.

In response to the question “Who decides?” the answer is “Clearly, the people decide.” Because of the educational aspects of the APP program, citizens are most likely to make well informed decisions. The commissioning process is a result of the involvement of a diverse population with various points of view. Thomas Jefferson argued, “I know of no safe repository of the ultimate power of society but the people. And if we think them not enlightened enough, the remedy is not to take the power from them, but to inform them by education.”
Some Communal Values

The selection of artists reflected the diversity of the advisory committees. Satoru Abe, a nisei, received his art training in New York. Laura Ruby, in her words an “All-American with no ethnic remnants,” was self-taught. Sean Browne, a part-Hawaiian, trained in California and Europe. All rejected a view of themselves as hyphenated-artists, and none expressed the need or desire to be identified racially within the context of the art. They agreed with their description as public artists. At least for this group, the work of art—conceptualization, creation, installation—is more important that an emphasis on identification as an ethnic artist. Poet and writer Tony Quagliano says that ethnicity as a construct may be essentially artificial—useful, perhaps, to anthropologists, but as a “category to describe, much less understand, writers or artists in any medium, ethnicity is a worse-than-useless idea.” \(^5\) To paraphrase Quagliano, the danger lies in searching out the material context of the artist rather than addressing the art itself.\(^6\)

The artists in my case studies are acutely aware of the various aesthetic expressions of the different peoples of the state. Often, cross-cultural references appear in their concepts of art. Their art captures the essence of Hawaii, and the aesthetic dimension encompasses cultural variety. These artists’ works are symbolic representations of Hawaii as a place where people can choose to retain their original culture, to reinterpret it, or to meld with other cultures. For example, Browne retains the use of Hawaiian names and phrases in the titles of his works. These artists do not see themselves as Hawaiian-artist, Japanese-artist, or woman-artist. They intended their art for their audiences at Castle, Hilo, Kapiolani. The works interpreted and reinforced the cultural backgrounds...
and values from which the art emerged. Abe, Ruby, and Browne are sculptors living and working in Hawaii who understand the aesthetic concerns of their communities. When the Foundation selected them for APP commissions, each acted as a public artist who created art for the people. As representative art, their works exhibit certain values. The works capture a sense of place. All the sculptural forms derive from the Western fine arts tradition; yet at the same time, the works are abstractions with strong Hawaiian or Asian aesthetic influences. They are cross-cultural interpretations within the context of specific geographical locations as well as mental landscapes that are uniquely Hawaii. This physical and psychological sense of place results from the artists' being born and reared in Hawaii, being educated or trained in Hawaii's schools, living in Hawaii, calling Hawaii home.

A majority of Hawaii's residents believe in the natural beauty of their specific communities as well as the surrounding environs. This appreciation for the beauty of the natural landscape has a precedent in the Hawaiian concept of 'aina, love of the land, of the earth. Abe, Ruby, and Browne capture this Hawaiian spirit and warmth through their use of artistic elements. For example, sinuous forms and warm colors characterize the swirling, dance-like movements of Abe's leaves in Spring, Summer, Autumn. In contrast, Browne uses earthy textures and natural forms to shape the volcano-like structure of Spirit Way. And Ruby's Cromlech is an earth form out of antiquity. The works are symbolic representations. All evoke nature. They integrate into rather than intrude on their environments.

The works synthesize cultural diversity. The people of Hawaii value its various ethnic groups and different cultures. Despite the uniformity of Western
fine art forms—modern abstractions—multicultural synthesis is the glue. In
this study, the cultures are primarily Hawaiian and Asian. The works are
Western expressions, but each represents visual and cultural diversity. The
artists’ vision demonstrates the ethnic richness of Hawaii. Abe infused his art
with his cultural roots and Zen influence; the softly vibrant colors, the naturally
shaped leaves, a manifestation of reincarnation through the work—all show an
Asian influence, with Hawaii as background. However, this sculpture that
resembles a painting definitely derives from a Western tradition. Ruby’s work
contains several cross-cultural allusions, such as the depiction of a water jug,
which might be koa in Hawaii, goatskin in Greece. The textural renderings
sometimes resemble Hawaiian petroglyphs. In Browne’s work, the fish hook,
an ancient Hawaiian cultural artifact, is apparent, as is the cultural allusion to
the Japanese torii, a gateway to a sacred place.

The cross-cultural interpretations in these works represent an important
iconography for Hawaii. The sculptures stand as symbols of diversity as well
as reflections of the diverse peoples themselves. These differences tend to
strengthen the feeling of community and unity. Difference can result in friction
or resentment. The fact is inescapable; Hawaii is not immune. But people in
Hawaii generally live, work, and socialize in an atmosphere of respect and
tolerance for one another. Hawaii remains unique in its successful integration
of multicultural and ethnic diversity.

The works, particularly those of Ruby and Browne, convey a sense of
community and a respect for the family, ‘ohana. Each work reflects the value
Hawaii places on the family and the sense of community. In fact, Ruby’s
Cromlech may represent the family of man. Her figures and cultural artifacts
can represent Hawaiian expressions, but they can also represent various cultures throughout the world. The work activities, such as the cultivation of food, symbolize our connection to a wider community of people from the different cultures of the world. Browne's work portrays the figures of a mother and child: a nurturing relationship of a different kind. *Spirit Way* stands as a gateway to the attainment of knowledge in a place that will encourage and nourish the mind and the spirit. Both works depict a sense of 'ohana.

Conclusion

Art for the people was the motivating force behind government support in Hawaii as it was throughout the nation. As our public spaces became outdoor galleries, and all of the people gained access to contemporary art, art became democratized. According to the findings of my case studies, the APP program was educational and democratic; its commissioning process helped to integrate art into society by involving the community that was to receive an artwork. The program extended visual arts opportunities for more of the people more of the time. It brought art to the people, and they had the option to participate in it, ignore it, or even reject it. This study contends that the main objective of public art is to afford all people this option, regardless of their ethnic group, social class, or economic status. Repeated encounters with public art create the potential for developing or broadening a person's taste for art. The hope is that when people receive this opportunity, they will ultimately seek to have a rich offering of art in their public places.

In Hawaii, through the APP program, the Foundation democratized the arts by bringing fine art to the people. It educated the people by exposing them to
the fine art traditions of the East and the West. This emphasis on disseminating fine art may have resulted, particularly in the early years of the Foundation, from the influence of Alfred Preis, with his elitist leanings. The dissemination of fine art forms spread an aesthetic standard that values high culture as the best or the most appropriate for the people. Fine art does address abstract social and philosophical questions, and it does have the potential to challenge its audience. Some construe these qualities as good for all.

In the early years, many of the commissioned works were monumental sculptures because of the visibility and accessibility they could provide. Because the Foundation installed these pieces in public places where local people and visitors alike could view them, the artworks would ultimately become reflections of Hawaii. Hence, the works had to be sophisticated, not provincial. Preis said the artworks the Foundation commissioned for the civic center had to reflect a certain character in order to compare favorably with their counterparts in the rest of the nation. Young artists' education in the fine arts tradition is another explanation for the proliferation of these sculptural forms. They would serve as models for the upcoming art students who needed exposure to the contemporary trends in America. The proliferation of monumental sculptural forms required artists who were experienced, knowledgeable, sophisticated, and capable of executing such works. These artists had generally trained in the tradition of fine art—Western or Eastern.

The Foundation also democratized the arts by expanding the definition of art to include ethnic and folk art as well as crafts. According to Preis, all aesthetic expressions would fall under the umbrella of art, without distinction between arts and crafts. Quality would be the only distinction. This melding of
arts and crafts would broaden artistic activities and enhance popular participation. Multicultural and ethnic diversity are the essence of modern Hawaii. The Foundation recognized that the different ethnic groups and social classes—women as well as men—all had unique qualities, and it invited all to participate. Its programs were pluralistic, and any differentiation among arts and crafts and ethnic art became apparently meaningless, particularly in the later years, because the Foundation officially deemed all aesthetic expressions equal. However, within the APP program, the different creative forms all competed for resources, and those in the Western tradition tended to win the expensive commissions. For example, Sean Browne's artistic synthesis of Asian and Hawaiian forms in the Western Tradition triumphed over Rocky Jensen's ethnic abstractions.

These two approaches to democratizing the arts were never completely separate, nor did they ever fully harmonize with each other. The Foundation stressed both. The two approaches involved two very different visions of art. One has sought to synthesize diverse cultural elements, such as an Asian aesthetic, a Neolithic antiquity, and a Hawaiian cultural artifact. The forms Abe, Ruby, and Browne created were artistic conceptualizations deriving from different cultural traditions, which expressed a unity of the people. The three sculptors do not consider themselves hyphenated-artists. They all trained in the fine arts of the East or the West. Their creativity produced a multicultural synthesis within a Western framework. Rocky Jensen, who identifies himself as a Hawaiian-artist although he also has Western training, represents the other vision. He wants each cultural enclave to compete for support as a separate entity. In its early years, the APP program brought to the people fine
art that made innovative use of multicultural elements. Jensen’s works did not represent or seem to be part of this vision of multicultural synthesis. Therefore, viewers did not see his artistic conceptualizations—which derived from his ethnic roots—as original or creative. They considered his abstract expressions as craft, or as ethnic or native art. Viewers immersed in the other vision tend to see Jensen’s art as reproduction because of its native origins.

The vision of art as the synthesis of various traditions—specifically, Asian and Hawaiian—within a Western framework helps to explain how the Foundation continues fundamentally to operate. However, if both visions of art are valid as approaches to democratizing the arts, the Foundation must hear Jensen’s voice and other voices outside the traditionally Western trained, academically respected art world. After all, state funds belong to the public, and the Foundation must serve the public interest. This public includes individuals like Jensen, who continues to speak out for those unable to speak for themselves. A cultural democracy that invites all citizens to participate must give talented artists—Hawaiians as well as other ethnics—the opportunity to express their creativity.
Appendix

Art in Public Places: Completed Commissions (as of FY 1980)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Akaji, Bumpei</td>
<td><em>The Sun God</em></td>
<td>State Office Building, Wailuku, Maui</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Brownlee,</td>
<td><em>Pili Pu</em></td>
<td>State Office Building, Hilo, Hawaii</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Marozzi, Eli</td>
<td><em>The Cat</em></td>
<td>Leeward Community College, Oahu</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Okino, Hideo</td>
<td><em>Untitled</em></td>
<td>Kapiolani Community College, Oahu</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sato, Mamoru</td>
<td><em>Hawaii II</em></td>
<td>State Office Building, Kona, Hawaii</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tovish, Harold</td>
<td><em>Epitaph</em></td>
<td>Hamilton Library, University of Hawaii, Manoa, Oahu</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Abe, Satoru</td>
<td><em>Among the Ruins</em></td>
<td>Leeward Community College, Oahu</td>
<td>12,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Abe, Satoru</td>
<td><em>Tree of Knowledge</em></td>
<td>Nanakuli High School, Oahu</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lux, Gwen</td>
<td><em>Synergy</em></td>
<td>State Office Building, Lihue, Kauai</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Akaji, Bumpei</td>
<td><em>Pupu A‘o Ewa</em></td>
<td>Ewa Beach Community School, Oahu</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Belshe, Mirella</td>
<td><em>Huli-Wahine</em></td>
<td>Waimea-Kohala Airport, Hawaii</td>
<td>5,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hadley, Joseph</td>
<td><em>Buffalo’s cloak</em></td>
<td>Waianae Library, Oahu</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Liberman, Alexander</td>
<td><em>Gate of Hope</em></td>
<td>Holmes Hall, University of Hawaii, Manoa, Oahu</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mitchell, William</td>
<td><em>Mayan Ruins</em></td>
<td>Niu Valley Intermediate School, Oahu</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ochikubo, Tetsuo</td>
<td><em>Untitled</em></td>
<td>Hilo Intermediate School, Hawaii</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sato, Mamoru</td>
<td><em>Dyad</em></td>
<td>Honolulu International Airport, Oahu</td>
<td>20,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Yamada, Shigeharu</td>
<td><em>Mana</em></td>
<td>Honolulu International Airport, Oahu</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Akaji, Bumpei</th>
<th><em>Wai Ho’ola a Lono</em></th>
<th>Koloa Community School, Kauai</th>
<th>12,500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Akaji, Bumpei</td>
<td><em>Pule O’o</em></td>
<td>Molokai Library</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Charlot, Jean</td>
<td><em>In Praise of Petroglyphs</em></td>
<td>Moanalua Intermediate School, Oahu</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Chung, Kim</td>
<td><em>Maui</em></td>
<td>Maui Community College</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Hepworth, Barbara</td>
<td><em>Parent I</em></td>
<td>Hawaii State Library, Oahu</td>
<td>43,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Hepworth, Barbara</td>
<td><em>Young Girl</em></td>
<td>Hawaii State Library, Oahu</td>
<td>21,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Hopper, Bruce</td>
<td><em>Krypton: 1x16x18</em></td>
<td>Watanabe Hall, University of Hawaii, Manoa, Oahu</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Mura-Davidson, Kay</td>
<td><em>Play Forms</em></td>
<td>Likeliike Elementary School, Oahu</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Watson, Charles</td>
<td><em>To the Nth Power</em></td>
<td>Business Administration Building, University of Hawaii, Manoa, Oahu</td>
<td>10,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Zarins, Valdez</td>
<td><em>Hawaii #4</em></td>
<td>University of Hawaii, Hilo, Hawaii</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1974

1. **Abe, Satoru**  
   *Three Clouds*  
   Honolulu International Airport, Oahu  
   17,500

2. **Akaji, Bumpei**  
   *Eternal Flame*  
   State Capitol, Oahu  
   25,000

3. **Brownlee, Edward**  
   *The Clouds of Pele*  
   Honolulu International Airport, Oahu  
   50,000

4. **Hadley, Joseph**  
   *The Struggle*  
   Kauai High School  
   4,500

5. **Horan, Claude**  
   *Na he’ enalu o kailua maluna o ke kilohana a na naulu*  
   Kauai High School  
   4,500

6. **Ochikubo, Tetsuo**  
   *Harmony*  
   Waiakea-waena Elementary School, East Hawaii  
   10,000

7. **Takaezu, Toshiko**  
   *Growing*  
   Maui High School  
   8,000

8. **Takaezu, Toshiko**  
   *Orbit*  
   Lahainaluna High School, Maui  
   9,500

9. **Wisnosky, John**  
   *For the Tribe*  
   Campbell High School, Oahu  
   25,000

### 1975

1. **Abe, Satoru**  
   *Five Logs on a Hill*  
   Ka’u Community School Library, Hawaii  
   13,000

2. **Abe Satoru**  
   *Three Rocks on a Hill*  
   Honolulu Community College, Oahu  
   15,000

3. **Akaji, Bumpei**  
   *Hana Hiti-u O na Makani Ika-Ika O Hono Kaa*  
   Honokaa High School, Hawaii  
   10,000

4. **Belshe, Mirella**  
   *Supercube*  
   Leeward Community College, Oahu  
   10,000

5. **Clurman, Gregory**  
   *Hino-O Nalani*  
   Campus Center, University of Hawaii, Manoa, Oahu  
   4,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Clurman, Gregory</td>
<td>Sumotori</td>
<td>Orvis Auditorium, University of Hawaii, Manoa, Oahu</td>
<td>5,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Ochikubo, Tetsuo</td>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>Kona Hospital, Hawaii</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Peter-Stern, Jan</td>
<td>Artic Portals</td>
<td>Pealeus Hall, University of Hawaii, Manoa, Oahu</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Sato, Mamoru</td>
<td>Woodscape</td>
<td>Honolulu Community College, Oahu</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Shutt, Ken</td>
<td>Heritage Growing</td>
<td>Laupahoehe High School, Hawaii</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1976

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Abe, Satoru</td>
<td>Early Spring</td>
<td>Aiea High School, Oahu</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Abe, Satoru</td>
<td>Trees, Vines, Rocks, and Petroglyphs</td>
<td>Lanai Community School</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Abe, Satoru, Akaji, Bumpel Horan, Claude</td>
<td>4 Sculptures and Landscape</td>
<td>Leilehua High School, Oahu</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Akaji, Bumpel</td>
<td>Moanalua</td>
<td>Moanalua High School, Oahu</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Bal, Peter</td>
<td>Alakahi</td>
<td>Maui Community College</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Giddings, Evelyn</td>
<td>Poha Wawalo Kaino O Ke Alii Ika Lewalani</td>
<td>Lunaiilo Elementary School, Oahu</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Higa, Charles</td>
<td>Alchemy</td>
<td>Bilger Hall, University of Hawaii, Manoa, Oahu</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Higa, Charles</td>
<td>Puka Pohaku</td>
<td>Honolulu International Airport, Oahu</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Horan, Claude</td>
<td>Ho'olaulea</td>
<td>Red Hill Elementary School, Oahu</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Piene, Otto</td>
<td>Pleiades</td>
<td>Astronomy Building, University of Hawaii, Manoa, Oahu</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Shutt, Ken  
*Waialua*  
Waialua High School, Oahu  
12,000

12. Wisnosky, John  
*Double Waves*  
McCully-Moliiili Library, Oahu  
1,500

1977

1. Abe, Satoru  
*A Path Through the Trees*  
Maui High School  
24,500

2. Akaji, Bumpei  
*Untitled*  
Pope Elementary School, Oahu  
not listed

3. Akaji, Bumpei  
*Untitled*  
Hana High School, Maui  
12,500

4. Bruce, Jean  
*Untitled*  
Campus Center, University of Hawaii, Manoa, Oahu  
1,250

5. Harvey, Donald  
*Na Aumakua*  
Honolulu Community College, Oahu  
12,000

6. Mura-Davidson, Kay  
*The Pool Committee*  
Lanai High School  
10,000

7. Shut, Ken  
*Lanai Ohana*  
Lanai High School  
2,500

8. Smith Tony w/ Sato, Mamoru  
*The Fourth Sign*  
Art Building, University of Hawaii, Manoa, Oahu  
45,001 (state)  
17,500 (federal)

9. Takaezu, Toshiko  
*Moon Pots*  
University of Hawaii, Hilo, Hawaii  
15,000

1978

1. Abe, Satoru  
*A Community Surrounded by Sugar Cane*  
Kaimiloa Elementary School, Oahu  
10,000

2. Akaji, Bumpei  
*Gushing Waters*  
Waipahu Elementary School, Oahu  
12,000

3. Chung, Kim  
*Untitled*  
University of Hawaii, Hilo, Hawaii  
25,000

4. Clurman, Gregory  
*Ka Hanauna O Molokai*  
Molokai High School  
12,500
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>School/College</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Flynn, Robert</td>
<td><em>Kauai Counterpoint</em></td>
<td>Kauai Community College</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Lee, Gordon</td>
<td><em>Untitled</em></td>
<td>Hilo Union Elementary School, Hawaii</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Sato, Mamoru</td>
<td><em>Tunnelscape</em></td>
<td>Kilohana Elementary School, Hawaii</td>
<td>9,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Shutt, Ken</td>
<td><em>Four Valleys</em></td>
<td>Waianae High School, Oahu</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1979**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>School/College</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Abe, Satoru</td>
<td><em>Boulders, Salt Pond &amp; Taro Fields</em></td>
<td>Eleele Elementary School, Kauai</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Giddings, Evelyn</td>
<td><em>Above Hanapepe</em></td>
<td>Eleele Elementary School, Kauai</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Giddings, Evelyn</td>
<td><em>The Great Search</em></td>
<td>Kaimiloa Elementary School, Oahu</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Horan, Claude</td>
<td><em>The Stallion and His Crew</em></td>
<td>Pukalani Elementary School, Maui</td>
<td>9,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1980**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>School/College</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Akaji, Bumpei</td>
<td><em>Ke mau ne ke Ea O Kauai, I Puhi Aina Malu</em></td>
<td>Kauai Community College</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Hokushin, Randy</td>
<td><em>Spiritual Stones</em></td>
<td>Kauai Community College</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Hokushin, Randy</td>
<td><em>Aerial Vision I</em></td>
<td>Nanakuli Elementary School, Oahu</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Horan, Claude</td>
<td><em>Moby Dick and Friends</em></td>
<td>Kekaha Elementary School, Kauai</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Page, Donald</td>
<td><em>Kua Kua Lua</em></td>
<td>Pearl City High School, Oahu</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Shutt, Ken</td>
<td><em>Konohiki</em></td>
<td>King Intermediate School, Oahu</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Yamada, Shigeharu</td>
<td><em>Silent Sounds</em></td>
<td>Moanalua High School, Oahu</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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35. Richards interview.
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36. Abe interview.


41. Ruby 2.

42. Laura Ruby, curriculum vitae.

43. Ruby cv.

44. My attempts to locate AAC members were unsuccessful; hence, Ruby is the only source of information.

45. Laura Ruby, personal interview, 10 April 1991.

46. Ruby interview, 2 July.

47. Ruby interview.


49. Ruby interview.

50. Ruby interview, 10 April.

51. Ruby interview, 2 July.


54. Ruby interview.

55. Ruby interview.
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56. Ruby interview.
57. Ruby interview.
60. Sean Browne, curriculum vitae.
61. Browne interview.
62. Browne cv.
63. This situation was atypical. A subsequent discussion of the AAC will detail the reasons for the changes.
64. Browne interview.
67. Browne interview.
68. Browne interview.
69. Browne interview.
70. Browne interview.
73. Pat Snyder, telephone interview, 10 May 1991.
74. Molloy interview.
75. Molloy interview.
76. Hazel Tominaga, telephone interview, 22 May 1991.
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77. Snyder interview.
78. Statement on the Selection, 1.
79. Browne interview.
81. Browne interview.
83. Morse C7.
84. Benham interview.
85. Benham interview.
87. Jensen is founder and director of Hale Naua III, Society of Hawaiian Artists. To date, he has not received a Foundation commission.
88. Watanabe A1.
89. Watanabe A8.
90. Watanabe A8.
91. Watanabe A8.
93. Jensen interview.
94. Jensen interview.
95. Jensen interview.
96. This is Jensen's characterization.
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97. I reviewed the document State Foundation on Culture and the Arts, Art in Public Places Program, Completed Commissions as of 30 June 1990 in the Foundation's office.


99. Jensen interview.
Notes to Chapter 7: Art for the People

1. See the list of selected sculptors in the Appendix.

2. A demographic fact: ethnics are a growing majority, particularly on Oahu. According to the 1990 census, 74.3 percent of Honolulu's population belongs to different ethnic groups. The so-called minorities make up a majority. See Sunday Star-Bulletin & Advertiser 20 October 1991: B9.

3. In one of my interviews, artist John Wisnosky informed me that the Foundation rejected one of his proposals because the community preferred a landscaped garden. The decision to accept or reject art lies with the community.
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