The "Culture" in U.S. Cultural Policy:
Culture as Content, Identity and Practice

Carole Rosenstein
Ph.D., Research Associate, The Urban Institute Center
on Nonprofits and Philanthropy

Carole Rosenstein studies semiotics, cultural policy and the social life of the arts and culture. Her past research projects have examined how culture influences the mission and roles of ethnic arts organizations; museums, festivals and markets as sites for negotiating ethnic and class identity; the structure and effectiveness of the support system for U.S. artists; and ways of promoting economic development through the folk and traditional arts. Currently, she is investigating the organization of cultural heritage nonprofits and ways to build equity through culture-based development in the U.S.. Dr. Rosenstein has contributed to numerous Urban Institute research monographs on arts and culture, and her work has been published in Ethnologies, Semiotica and The Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society. She received a master's degree in cultural anthropology from the University of Chicago and a doctorate in anthropology from Brandeis University.

Abstract

The paradigm for cultural inquiry has irrevocably shifted away from the hierarchical logics that grounded its founding theories, demanding refreshed understandings of culture. This paper explores ways in which the term culture is operationalized in cultural policy discourse, arguing that the discipline continues to view culture as positive and external to cultural policies. A comparison of several key frameworks for establishing U.S. cultural policy as a coherent and autonomous area of inquiry against observations from a set of meetings that were held as a part of *Investing in Creativity,* an Urban Institute study investigating the support system for individual artists in the United States, points up the need to shift toward concepts and analyses that can better account for the ongoing social construction of culture.

> *"There are certain terms that have a peculiar property. Ostensibly they mark off specific concepts, concepts that lay claim to a rigorous objective validity. In practice, they label vague terrains of thought that shift or narrow or widen with the point of view of whosoever makes use of them, embracing within their gamut of significance conceptions that not only do not harmonize but are in part contradictory. … Suppose we ask ourselves, then, what is "culture"? I propose to show that here is a term of the very type just mentioned: a label that seems to mean something particularly important, and yet, when the question arises of just where to put the label, trouble begins…"* (Sapir, 1994: 23).

There is broad recognition that an understanding of what cultural policy is and does is made ambiguous by the complex character of the notion of culture itself. This ambiguity has added salience in the U.S. because there is no national Ministry of Culture; cultural policy's boundaries cannot simply be set as the actions implemented by such a ministry. Discussions about this fact have tended to present various definitions of culture and to hopefully suggest that policymakers, researchers and practitioners pick a definition and

make clear which one they are using as they engage in cultural policymaking and cultural policy inquiry. Of course, this assumes that a consistent and coherent definition is being used, and can be readily articulated. Preliminary processes to codify and ratify particular definitions may gain momentum as U.S. practitioners return from hiatus and become better integrated into UNESCO and the international cultural policy community but, currently, there exist few venues where such definitions might be collectively debated and formulated.

In the U.S., when people use the term "cultural policy", they generally have meant "arts policy". The arts are considered self-evident and exemplary cultural goods, and production and consumption of artworks remain the most clearly identifiable objects of cultural policy. For a variety of historical and sociological reasons, this emphasis on the arts tends to privilege an aestheticized notion of culture as cultivation (Bourdieu 1984) and institutionalized high culture (DiMaggio 2000). While these associations continue to shape the ways in which we characterize our subject, they are outdated and incomplete. Current attention to the social capital value of cultural participation emphasizes the social and civic functions of expressive forms, rather than their aesthetic or cultural functions. Economic impact studies of arts and culture are ubiquitous. Battles over ownership of intellectual property unbalance working assumptions about the relations between authors and audiences, originals and reproductions, culture workers and the products of culture industries. Corporatization of culture by multinationals undermines clear connections between culture and national identities. These political, social, civic, economic, labor, industry and globalized facets of contemporary cultural policy inquiry require a refreshed understanding of culture that is at once more nuanced and more pragmatic, better informed by recent work in cultural studies yet tuned to policy-relevant questions.

But, how to arrive at such an understanding? Even without having defined culture as an analytical term, we do, of course, formulate and implement cultural policies, describe arts and culture systems, assess strategies and debate priorities based on shared frameworks and working definitions of culture. This paper explores such ways in which the term culture is operationalized in cultural policy discourse. I'll consider several key frameworks for establishing U.S. cultural policy as a coherent and autonomous area of inquiry, pulling out definitions of culture they incorporate. But cultural policy is an emergent field with a relatively young literature, and the concept of culture is under renewed scrutiny as its complex relation to community is a subject of intense current interest. With this is mind, I also want to consider notions of culture in play where cultural policy is in the process of being constituted and negotiated. To do that I'll incorporate observations from a set of meetings that were held as a part of *Investing in Creativity,* an Urban Institute study investigating the support system for individual artists in the United States.[1] These meetings were held to introduce the study, vet initial findings and seed recommendations to arts professionals, artists, funders and community leaders in nine cities where fieldwork was being conducted. Additional meetings explored the situation of rural artists, national artist policy, policy-relevant data on artists and artist associations.[2] Thinking about these contexts is particularly valuable (cf. Tepper and Hinton 2003) because it provides a sense of the consequences entailed by deploying different culture concepts in real-time policymaking: how different points of view on the appropriate definition of culture are institutionally situated, how different notions of culture influence priorities and strategies, and how lack of agreement about "what culture is" may impact the effectiveness of cultural policies or cultural policy advocacy.

Three Culture Concepts: Culture, *Kultur* and *Culture*

While we neither require nor desire somehow to legislate a definition of culture, some more refined analytic tools would surely prove valuable. Those can be found in the three normative but significantly different notions of culture anthropologist Edward Sapir identified in his classic lectures on *The Psychology of Culture* (1994).[3] What he called the traditional English use of the term "implies a standard pertaining to an individual or group. To be 'a man of culture' involves participation in special social values clustering around tradition. It is not the particular content of those traditions that is vital in distinguishing the cultured person from others … but the fact that they *are* traditional and valued" (1994: 24). This "evaluational term referring to the activities of the elite" Sapir distinguishes from the German notion of *Kultur* which "seems always to have something mystical in its meaning. It somehow embraces the idea of the *geist* of a people, the underlying soul or spirit. … *Kultur* is a unified or integrated conception of culture, emphasizing its complex of ideas, its sense of the larger values of life, and its definition of the ideal (for example, the Greek ideal of calmness and the perfect, static image)" (1994: 28). Finally, Sapir offers an anthropological definition of culture: "Any form of behavior… which cannot be directly explained as physiologically necessary but can be interpreted in terms of the totality of meanings of a specific group, and which can be shown to be the result of a strictly historical process, is likely to be cultural in essence. 'Historical processes' means the conveyance of forms of behavior through social processes, either by suggestion or by direct instruction to the young" (1994: 37).

These three distinct culture concepts share that they cohere around ideas about value, sameness and difference, and continuity. Yet, Sapir argues, they differ in focus and emphasis. With its focus on esoteric knowledge and exclusivity, what Sapir calls the English notion of culture emphasizes the contrast between the elite and the folk. Since Bourdieu, it is difficult to think of this culture concept as "English"; I'll refer to it as Culture with a capital-C. *Kultur* focuses on "peoples" or "nations" and emphasizes the ideal forms through which they distinguish themselves from other "peoples" and the natural world. The anthropological notion of culture focuses on meaningfulness and emphasizes processes through which meanings come to be shared and continuous through history. I'll refer to this concept as *culture* (an item of terminology, placed in italics). My concern is not to choose among these concepts of Culture, *Kultur* and *culture*; of interest here is less a definition of culture and more the circumstances under which differing emphases on hierarchy versus holism versus meaningfulness are invoked. This should contribute to developing an understanding of the ways in which themes of value, sameness and difference, and continuity might be approached in reference to the specific concerns and goals of cultural policymaking and cultural policy inquiry.

The Boundaries of Cultural Policy: Culture versus *Culture*

Paul DiMaggio's "Cultural Policy Studies: What They Are and Why We Need Them" (1983) is a founding document because it established that the examination of public policy is an essential dimension of analysis for questions then being posed in the field of cultural economics. For DiMaggio, cultural policy is policy that affects "the marketplace of ideas": "Cultural policies influence the barriers to entry and the chances of survival and adoption of ideas, values, styles, and genres. They do this, for the most part, by affecting industries that are involved in *cultural production:* the production of materials that are *primarily* expressive, ideational or aesthetic, like books, paintings, television programs, scientific research reports, school textbooks and curricula, sermons, dramatic

productions, or videocassettes" (1983: 242, emphasis in the original). Twenty years on, the continuing strength of this approach lies in DiMaggio's recognition that the environment of conditions in which expressive forms may be encouraged to circulate, may stagnate or be repressed – conceived here as a "marketplace" – affects all sorts of artistic, humanistic and scientific expression. In this broad field, the scope and relevance of regulatory policies such as those restricting access to public space and cyberspace, governing freedom of speech or apportioning rights to intellectual property become more readily apparent to a discipline that tends to focus narrowly on subsidization programs.

But such expansiveness met with disturbance in *Investing in Creativity* meetings. The more familiar sort was a reactionary stance against pressure to broaden and diversify the categories of cultural product considered relevant to cultural policy. Some advocates claim that rejecting categories that reflect primarily the institutionalized high arts means embracing an amorphous, incoherent domain impossible to account and advocate for. And in one case, at least, this characterization is justified. It is another kind of closure to suggest that cultural policy should come to be recognized simply as "community policy", an often-made suggestion. This unfortunately erases the dimension within which something we're calling culture can be recognized as an autonomous realm with institutions, practices, histories and politics into which policies might intervene.   For those who view cultural policy as a mechanism of state control or simply a tool for streaming public resources into elite high arts institutions, that probably seems a worthy endeavor. Throughout *Investing in Creativity* meetings there was a recurring tendency to consider only these two options, in opposition: the historically dominant Culture concept versus a quasi-anthropological concept of *culture,* often characterized (negatively) as "culture as everything".

Classificatory schemes have provided reference points through which we define the boundaries of an autonomous cultural sector. These classifications might take the familiar shape of distinctions between high versus low forms or elite versus popular forms, or a less obvious shape found in the distinction between aesthetic or ideational versus other, presumably, utilitarian or instrumental forms. But, to take DiMaggio as an example, if we only examine how policy affects expressions constituted as primarily aesthetic or ideational, other expressive forms given more prominent instrumental or socially utilitarian functions – forms such as language choice, computer programming, sport or public protest – appear less relevant and may be neglected. In social life, individual products are assessed, categories rise and fall in esteem, understandings about the relation between certain forms and certain social groups shift, expressions serve multiple functions. In the pluralistic, weakly bounded cultural field created after the undermining of centralized cultural authority, it is increasingly difficult to identify central or core classifications in reference to which the contours of a domain of cultural policy relevance can be drawn (DiMaggio 2000). Without them, we are left to search for other inclusion and exclusion schemes and justifications for basing the discipline's boundaries on one scheme versus another.

Instead of debating classification schemes, we might grapple with a recognition that social life presents all kinds of contexts within and around which communities ratify, recognize, debate and negotiate values, sameness and difference, and continuity – these themes around which culture concepts cohere. These are times, places, events, practices and spaces where classifications are reenacted, put into motion, change, are cemented or undermined.   They can be regularly occurring or cyclical, some are prompted by singular, transformative events, some by social or ideological change. These are systematic contexts of ongoing, real-time social action, what Bourdieu called the domain of "practice" (1977).   Arts and cultural products – objects, texts, images, performances – often serve as catalysts, motivating and centering contexts within which this kind of practice takes place. In specific times and places, products will have varied

potencies in this regard. The value given that kind of potency also is historically contingent. We might ask: How does policy influence whether these contexts are recognized or ignored or feted? How does policy influence whether they are inclusive? Or repeatable? Or repressed? In his defense of UNESCO's Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage, Richard Kurin suggests that processes of cultural policy formation, implementation, analysis and development themselves can represent an increasingly influential arena for self-conscious reflection on what culture is and does, whether and why culture is valuable (2003). As such, we might further ask: How does policy influence whether, to what degree and in what senses these contexts are construed as being cultural (for example by subsidizing them through an arts council as opposed to an economic development agency)? This pragmatic dimension remains inadequately addressed in our thinking about culture as it relates to cultural policy.

The Organization of the Cultural Sector: *Kultur* versus Culture

The American Assembly's seminal statement on the arts and public purpose considers inclusiveness and exchange between different art forms and practices and for-profit and non-profit entities to be necessary foundations for both the publicness and the purposefulness of the arts (1997). Following the American Assembly statement, Cherbo and Wyszomirski map an arts industry that encompasses the informal arts and both large and small organizations from the nonprofit and the private sectors (2000 and see Wyszomirski 2002; National and Local Profiles of Cultural Support 2002). Thinking about the cultural sector as a marketplace tends to foreground the senses in which these forms and entities are operating within a unified field: consumers are omnivorous across varied forms, styles and genres, and there is competition among culture producers for a share of leisure time. But forms less well understood as products than as shared or communal expressions circulate in an arena that is not well conceived as a marketplace. This is particularly true for community, traditional and folk modes of organizing the production and consumption of expressive forms. The problematic character of their inclusion is apparent from the perspective of the core industry functions Cherbo and Wyszomirski delineate: for example, presentation and marketing functions are relatively unimportant for more communal forms and are often actively subverted in many modes of traditional and community production and consumption. It is also true from the perspective of policy affects: for example, policies providing access to safe, well-resourced public space and policies encouraging volunteerism (such as employment training and service learning credits for structured voluntary activity) are markedly important for promoting these forms.

This disjuncture was apparent in Investing in Creativity meetings where, in stark contrast to the American Assembly statement's inclusive vision, discourse about public purpose often evoked tension. Philanthropic funding programs for youth and community arts were characterized as vulgar social utilitarianism, economic development schemes were construed as just another means for local elites to monopolize political access and capture resources, "contemporary" artists and arts organizations defended themselves as protectors of art for arts' sake. Participants in these meetings strategically employed the term "community" for non-elite forms and "public" for the institutionalized high arts, leaving the avant-garde in a marginalized, defamed position as representatives of an elite aesthetic. Only in Los Angeles were the commercial culture industries discussed as an integral part the cultural sector and, even then, generally in terms of attempts to build affinities and connections acknowledged to be lacking. Little attention has been paid to the ways in which discourses of community and public purpose seem to cement accepted fragmentation between the institutionalized high arts, representatives of

community and traditional arts, contemporary and avant-garde artists and their advocates, and the commercial culture industries.

The assumption that the "serious" arts represent common values was dismantled during the Regan-era culture wars and concurrent rise of cultural democracy. The cultural community's long-term response has been to frame discussions of value in terms that have to do with community and public life. However, the ideology that effectively collapsed notions of community, public and nation into one common identity has lost its potency (cf. Brustein 2002), and the conceptual gap remaining demands clear thinking and long discussion about differences between these ideas and the sites of their social construction (see Zolberg 1999).[4] Although both culture warriors and cultural democracy advocates assert that certain forms are exclusive, rather than shared, and therefore may not lay claim to contributing in the expression of a holistic, common *Kultur,* the forms characterized in this way differ, of course. Neo-conservatives target the avant-garde while cultural democracy focuses on the institutionalized high arts. As arguments for public purpose are elaborated, it is useful to distinguish between the primarily exclusive character of the avant-garde versus the elitism of the high arts. Explanations of the contributions these forms might make to a public domain should take these distinctions into account. Similarly, it is useful to keep in mind that in their popular character, the forms of commercial culture have enormously potent claims to contributing to a common *Kultur.* Recognition of the ongoing salience of these distinctions serves to remind us that talk of public purpose does not address the fundamental problem raised by the culture wars and cultural democracy: the problem of establishing some basis for comparing diverse expressive forms and practices in order to make legitimate, defensible decisions about subsidization.[5]

A two-dimensional mapping of the cultural sector is insufficient to the task of describing these distinctions among different types of cultural institutions, organizations and groups. Tony Bennett argues that the "shift from a culture and democracy perspective (striving to equalize conditions of access to an accepted standard of high culture) to one of cultural democracy (aiming for dispersed patterns of support based on an acceptance of a parity of esteem for the aesthetic values and tastes of different groups within culturally diverse societies)" compels a new focus on "measuring and assessing the value of the different kinds of publicness associated with different cultural sectors and apportioning public support accordingly" (2000: np). This is a valuable contribution to the conversation as Bennett suggests that we not only must acknowledge different kinds of "publicness", but also must assess whether some particular sort of publicness resonates with the kind of public – or audience or community or nation – we envision. Additionally, comparative cultural policy study can help to inform developing understandings of how these values and affiliations given to arts and culture are influenced by their private, corporate, community or public sources of support (see Mulcahy 2000). A narrow focus on private, philanthropic resources and initiatives has obscured that fact that such a relation exists (although it is often acknowledged and even highlighted in the case of corporate support). Resources have an aspect that, rather than being purely abstract and quantifiable, lends social and political valiance.[6] The direct contribution of community resources creates ties to a community; a public source of support in itself contributes to producing whatever publicness arts and cultural forms and practices possess. These investments are different both in kind and in value, and may require different and even contradictory policy interventions. Better accountings for different types of support, means of promoting and delivering them and their varied social, economic and political values can provide our mappings of the cultural sector with an essential third dimension.

The Character of Public Culture: *Culture* Versus *Kultur*

A fresh image of the domain shaped by cultural policy surfaces in the map of state-level cultural policy Shuster et al. have drawn for Washington State (2003). By explicitly defining cultural policy as encompassing humanities policy and heritage policy as well as arts policy, Shuster et al. highlight key indirect policy mechanisms that are typically overlooked when arts policy dominates our thinking. Where discussions of arts policy tend to emphasize the importance of direct public financial support, heritage policy emphasizes other issues such as control of public space and stewardship of common resources. The fascinating areas of affinity found between cultural policy and environmental policy in Washington State attest to the salience of these issues. The humanities also provide a valuable counterpoint to the arts, having an infrastructure that incorporates mature connections between the public and nonprofit sectors, educational institutions, applied scholarship, amateur activity and public access. The primary focus on public agencies and programs illuminates how proactive public policy is in these areas; the perception that cultural policy is ideally reactive is belied as they are uncovered. Further, the necessity for public sector leadership is made apparent when these policies come to our attention. Thus, the targeted yet inclusive approach taken by Shuster et al. contributes important insights about how we might uncover the principles of a "commons" implicit in public sector cultural policies (see Hyde 1998).

In Investing in Creativity meetings the public sector was discussed not so much in terms of subsidization but rather in reference to pressures posed by gentrification, urban redevelopment and other issues surrounding proximity to and distribution of access to urban space. An important difference in perspective was voiced in these meetings. Some participants spoke of the displacement of long-term residents, culture workers and small-scale culture producers fostered by gentrification and urban commercial development as inevitable, part of the "ebb and flow" of the city and urban neighborhoods. Others highlighted means through which public policies might help to preserve and promote ethnic and economic diversity, the retention of artists, smaller nonprofits and independent businesses in the central urban spaces associated with the production and consumption of culture.[7] Participants in the *Investing in Creativity* meetings often attributed this difference in perspective to activist versus complacent attitudes to change grounded in assymetrical resources, prestige and degrees of institutionalization. But there is an important sense in which it is informed by a shifting conception of urban space itself. The "street" is posited as part of everyday, non-reflexive *culture* yet is also today a site made increasingly self-conscious by changing patterns of residency, redevelopment and marketing. The need to purposefully create, develop and protect contexts that not only are accessible and shared, but consciously engaged as shared contexts of *Kultur* is becoming increasingly clear. At the same time, there is significant skepticism about the legitimacy and authenticity of these practices and contexts.

These contrasting images of public space as natural versus constructed dovetail with opposing characterizations of cyberspace and the mediasphere as a utopian, open commons versus a place restricted in a variety of ways: by lack of access to technology and education, dominant linguistic practices, nested communities, etc.[8] A gap in the powerful model built to map cultural policy in Washington State is the exclusion of communications and media policy, which rests at the cutting edge of such questions and negotiations about the character of the public sphere and rights in relation to it. Of course, the core infrastructure of media and communications policy rests not at state and local, but at national and international levels. There also are good reasons for keeping

parts of the sector heavily influenced by subsidization distinct from those heavily influenced by regulation. However, it is necessary to grapple in a more assertive way with the impacts cultural policies have on defining and maintaining the public sphere as a site of public culture. As McGuigan points out in his work on communications policy and the public sphere:

It has now become common for "culture" to be resituated within the economistic and technicist discourses of public policy and in this way tied to the governmentality of communications media on industrial and economic grounds. In many respects this is a major advance for cultural policy… placing [it] much closer to the center of politics. What tends to get lost, though, is the specifically cultural, culture as communication and meaning, practices and experiences that are too complex and *a*ffective to be treated adequately in the *e*ffective terms of economic and bureaucratic models of policy (1996: 18).

Continuing to understand the "publicness" of culture in terms of public support structures for culture distracts from the essential work of developing our abilities to conceive public culture – its boundaries, functions and relations to other cultural forms – as a vital object of cultural policy and cultural policy study. The development of a transnational public sphere grounded in global production and distribution of mass culture influences concepts of culture through the realignment of spatial boundaries and growing prioritization of locality (Gupta and Ferguson 1992: 19). How culture is conceived as specific to a given locality with particular boundaries, and supported at state and local levels with this situated identity in mind is intimately tied up with emerging senses of national and global identity. Maps are probably not the most powerful tools we have to describe and analyze these forces that bind cultural decentralization in dialectic engagement with globalization. Obviously, the institutional frameworks through which policies are implemented are an important component of how locality comes to be conceived and reenacted. But as important to delineate are ways in which distinct policy strata contribute differently to the overall environment in which expressive forms are produced and circulate. The federal level may emphasize diversity, regional infrastructures may focus on increasing access, the state may serve as a primary funder of presenters and other institutionalized consumption contexts, cities and localities may increasingly support production. Activities that resonate with these themes or goals may be associated with those policy strata, whatever the level at which they are directly implemented (this appears to be true in the case of diversity initiatives). All of these roles require investments, but compel quite distinct policy priorities. Further, they may rest on fundamentally different notions about the efficacy of policy in relation to culture – viewing policy as external to culture or constitutive of culture, or somehow complexly, situationally related in ways that must be carefully unpacked and examined in all of their historical and political specificity.

Conclusions, with some Comments on the Culture of Cultural Policy

Somewhere in the introduction to nearly every cultural policy treatise, a sentence or two will be included remarking on the discipline's lack of agreement about what the "culture" in cultural policy refers to. There does at least seem to be agreement that such acknowledgements will suffice, and a sense of distaste or discomfort with arguments made to further some particular definition of culture.[9] But as the discipline matures, there is an emerging need for greater clarity about what aspects or dimensions of culture hold particular relevance for cultural policy's specific concerns and goals. Culture wars, globalization and the rise of cultural democracy, cultural studies and multiculturalism appear to have irrevocably shifted the paradigm for cultural inquiry away from the

hierarchical logics that grounded the founding theories of the social and political lives of culture. Understanding culture as different from and broader than "the arts", as diverse and contested, aesthetic and commodified, with aspects that are unselfconscious as well as those that are purposeful demands analytic frameworks that contain the conceptual space to explore the ongoing social construction of culture.

In cultural policy thinking and analysis, that conceptual space has been narrow. The misapprehensions and resistance that were in evidence during Investing in Creativity meetings suggest that it has been too narrow. It is pried open when culture concepts are challenged: when the ascendancy of Culture is undermined by other scales of value, the reach of *Kultur* is denied by new social distinctions, or the boundaries of *culture* are questioned by changing senses of affiliation. These challenges, I've suggested, require a shift toward notions that can better encompass the pragmatic domain, that is, meaningful social practice as it unfolds in systematically occurring contexts. Substantial attention should be focused not only on classificatory schemes, but also on contexts concerned with aligning and fixing products within such schemes; not only on organizational structures, but also on ways in which they function to reflect and reinforce social associations and differentiations; not only on distinguishable political or policy goals, but also on the distinct forms of practice through which those goals are addressed and met. I label these three areas of interest in regard to culture content, identity and practice, domains within which more structural and more pragmatic approaches to the themes of value, sameness and difference, and continuity together might be considered together.

A pragmatic notion of culture will serve another use. I have argued that studies of cultural products, institutions and sectors must be complimented by studies of the ways in which these phenomena come to be considered cultural, in what senses they are considered to be cultural, how and whether they remain so. Policies impact each of these dimensions. The uncomfortable task facing a field that continues to view culture as positive and external to cultural policies: to understand how our own *means* – i.e., defining and legitimizing particular contexts, developing and delivering resources, promoting certain practices – contribute to constituting the *object* of our studies and actions.

Acknowledgments

Pew Charitable Trusts, Prince Charitable Trusts, Rockefeller Foundation, Andy Warhol Foundation for the Visual Arts, and anonymous donors.

Notes

[1] Meetings and fieldwork for the study began in February 2001 and were completed in March 2002. Fieldwork was conducted in Seattle, Boston, Houston, Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Cleveland, the District of Columbia and New York. Data collected for this study include over 450 transcribed interviews. For further information on *Investing in Creativity: A Study of the Support System for U.S. Artists* visit www.usartistsreport.org.

[2] The *Investing in Creativity* study approached analysis of the support system for artists in the U.S. using an ecological model composed of eight elements: first, sense of place including local identities and aesthetic traditions; second, cohesiveness and liveliness of social and critical communities; third, policy infrastructure and civic engagement; fourth, demand for arts and appreciation for artists; fifth, development of professional skills and networks; sixth, money, income and benefits; seventh, time, both in terms of pace and flexibility; eighth, space for living and for working. This expansive framework, along with the study's explicit goal of making actionable recommendations for change, catalyzed a great deal of collective thinking about the character of the cultural sphere and relations among individuals and organizations within it, thinking that went beyond what might be expected in a study focused on support for artists.

[3] These lectures, given over a period spanning from 1931–1937, were never published by Sapir, but have been reconstructed by linguistic anthropologist Judith Irvine. Please refer to her introduction to the edited volume (Sapir 1994) for a detailed explanation of that reconstruction process. Irvine's editing includes extensive notations that indicate original sources for the text. I have not included those notations as they are not relevant to this discussion.

[4] See Warner for an important related discussion of the distinctions and affinities between concepts of "the public", "a public" and an "audience" (2002).

[5] Impact statements of whatever sort are essentially hierarchical, and whatever their validity as measures, are in danger of proving ineffective policy tools because their hierarchical logic resonates with a denounced notion of elite Culture and is dissonant with the holism of the *Kultur* concept now in ascendancy.

[6] This point has direct relevance to a recent argument that public funding becomes less "attractive" as cultural diversity increases (Ruston 2003). Setting aside that Ruston provides no evidence of an increase in cultural diversity (as opposed to an increase in the political potency of the ideology of cultural democracy) and that insufficient data exist about the consumption practices of various ethnic groups to support his claims, I would simply suggest that public funding has other than purely economic functions and must answer to goals other than and at least as important as efficiency.

[7] For example, policies governing busking laws, zoning enforcement and the surplusing of publicly owned buildings. The emerging salience of proximity to central urban spaces underscores the critical importance of public transportation. Tax exemption policies that promote investments by large nonprofits in property and capital development also gain influence. (Moreover, they enhance inequalities within the cultural sector because assymetrical levels of institutionalization and rootedness reinforce the power of larger cultural institutions as they become integral to cities' branding campaigns.) In this context, it is vital to note that elites "naturalize" access to space as a means of cementing social stratification, and to recognize related the policy relevance of historical and diverse claims to the public sphere represented by urban spaces.

[8] This opposition is best engaged in discussion of Habermas' conceptualization of the public sphere, a voluminous debate I can only reference here (see Habermas 1989; Calhoun 1993).

[9] A prominent instance of this took place in 2001 on the Center for Arts and Culture list-serve when a participant critiqued the culture concept he saw implicit in a World Bank Development Portal query about the positive relation between culture and development. A flurry of debate, sometimes heated, ensued over both the definition of culture and the need to define culture.

References

The American Assembly. 1997. *The Arts and Public Purpose.*
http://www.columbia.edu/cu/amassembly/programs/theartPP_report.htm.
Accessed March 2004.

National and Local Profiles of Cultural Support. 2002. Americans for the Arts and the Ohio State
    University Arts Policy and Administration Program.

Bennett, Tony. 2000. "Cultural Policy Beyond Aesthetics." Working Paper of the Cultural Policy
    Center   at   the   University   of   Chicago.
    http://culturalpolicy.uchicago.edu/workingpapers/Bennett2.pdf. Accessed January 2003.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Trans. R. Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge
    University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste,* trans. R. Nice.
    Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brustein, Robert. 2002. "The Four Horsemen of the Anti-Culture". *Partisan Review,* Vol. LXIX,
    n° 4, 2002, p. 1-9.

Calhoun, Craig (ed.). 1993. *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Cherbo, Joni Maya and Margaret Wyszomirski. 2000. "Mapping the Public Life of the Arts in
America," in *The Public Life of the Arts in America,* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press,
    p. 3-21.

DiMaggio, Paul. 1983. "Cultural Policy Studies: What They are and Why We Need Them,"
    Journal of ArtsManagement and Law, Vol. 13, n° 1, 1983, p. 241-248.

DiMaggio, Paul. 2000 [1991]. "Social Structure, Institutions and Cultural Goods: The Case of the
    United States, " in *The Politics of Culture: Policy Perspectives for Individuals, Institutions and
    Communities,* G. Bradford, M. Gary and G. Wallach, eds., NY: The New Press, p. 38-62.

Gupta, Akhil and James Ferguson. 1992. "Beyond 'Culture': Space, Identity, and the Politics of
    Difference," *Cultural Anthropology,* Vol. 7, n° 1, 1992, p. 6-23.

Habermas, Jurgen. 1989. *Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere.* Cambridge, MA: MIT
    Press.

Hyde, Lewis. 1998. *The Created Commons*. The Andy Warhol Foundation for the Visual Arts
    Paper   Series   on   the   Arts,   Culture,   and   Society.
    http://www.warholfoundation.org/paperseries/article8.htm. Accessed November 2002.

Kurin, Richard. 2003. "Tangible Progress." Center for Arts and Culture Cultural Comment
    essay. http://www.culturalcommons.org/kurin.htm. Accessed December 2003.

McGuigan, Jim. 1996. *Culture and the Public Sphere.* London: Routledge.

Mulcahy, Kevin. 2000. "The Government and Cultural Patronage: A Comparative Analysis of
    Cultural Patronage in the United States, France, Norway and Canada," in *The Public Life of
    the Arts in America,* Cherbo, Joni Maya and Margaret Wyszomirski, eds., New Brunswick, NJ:
    Rutgers University Press, p. 138-168.

Rushton, Michael. 2003. "Cultural Diversity and Public Funding of the Arts: A View from Cultural
    Economics," *The Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society,* Vol. 33, n° 2, 2003, p. 85-
    97.

Sapir, Edward. 1994. *The Psychology of Culture,* Judith T. Irvine, ed. Berlin: Mouton de
    Gruyter.

Shuster, J. Mark (ed.). 2003. *Mapping State Cultural Policy: The State of Washington.* Chicago:
    The Cultural Policy Center of the Irving B. Harris Graduate School of Public Policy Studies,
    University of Chicago.

Tepper, Steven J. and Stephanie Hinton. 2003. *The Measure of Meetings: Forums, Deliberation,
    and Cultural Policy.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Center for Arts and Cultural Policy
    Studies Working Paper #28.

Warner, Michael. 2002. "Publics and Counterpublics," *Public Culture,* Vol. 14, n° 1, 2002, p. 213-
    223.

Wyszomirski, Margaret. 2002. "Arts and Culture," in *The State of Nonprofit America,* Lester
    Salamon, ed., Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution Press, p. 187-218.

Zolberg, Vera. 1999. "What Does 'Community' Mean for Cultural Policy?" Paper presented at
    the Cultural Policy Network meeting, Center for Arts and Culture, Washington, D.C.