Persuade and Provide

THE STORY OF THE ARTS AND EDUCATION COUNCIL IN ST. LOUIS

By Michael Newton and Scott Hatley

With an introduction by Nancy Hanks

PUBLISHED BY ASSOCIATED COUNCILS OF THE ARTS
Nancy Hanks, chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, begins her introduction to this book:

"This is the story of the arts in one city in America—an admittedly unusual town with problems and prospects of its own... it is an important story for anyone to read—certainly anyone interested in bettering his own community, making it a more rewarding place in which to live."

The story goes on from there.

It is the story of one of the very best arts councils (and one of the few fundraising councils) in North America: The Arts and Education Council of Greater St. Louis. An arts council does not have to do with art. It deals, as the authors point out, with "money and power and vision." It is an enterprise nicely balanced between reality and hope. Its function is to persuade people and provide support. Its story begins in the middle—in the middle of America in the middle of the century.

The story includes the Council's early years as the Spirit of St. Louis Fund, when it had only four members and a promising future. How that future became an integral part of St. Louis life, how stability was assured, how the country's most publicized cultural auction came to be, how successful fund campaigns for the arts were fashioned for the
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This is not a book about Art. Or Culture. Or Education. It is a book about money and power and vision and concern, and about the pragmatic approach some people took toward making their city a better place to live. It tells how the Arts and Education Council came to life in St. Louis and what it has set out to do.

Nor is this a book of judgments on the quality of St. Louis educational and cultural institutions, or an evaluation of the part the Council has played in the artistic development of the member agencies. However, few actions are free from implied value and thus, judgments appear simply by the Council's operations. We believe that the Council has contributed to an improved cultural climate that did not exist in St. Louis ten years ago, but there are far too many factors in such an improvement for the Council's own contribution to be singled out.

This is not a book of attempted definitions on the nature of art, or the effect of art in enriching lives, or transforming a society. It does not endeavor to say what art or education can or cannot do, should or should not do. It simply accepts the premise that the arts and education are important to the lives of twentieth century Americans, and any reader whose first inclination is to dispute that premise might do well to stop here. Finally, this is not a how-to-do-it book. We hope that some of the
experiences and the debate they stimulated may be of use in other communities, but what follows here is certainly not a prescription for all to follow. Rather, the book explores how events happened in one place at one particular point of time—how the Council came into being, its early struggles, the mechanisms that make it successful, and the challenges that face it in the future.

Although it is difficult to keep away from the subjects this book is not intended to cover, it is perhaps even more difficult to cover with justice what is its rightful province. Because little is known about the relationship of art to money and power, the story of the flexibility demonstrated in St. Louis is more important than ever to tell clearly. It emerges from the narrative that pragmatism has been the guiding principle underlying the Council’s actions.

On the whole, philosophy appears to have followed action rather more than the reverse. General sentiments occurred. “We ought to do something about aesthetic education in the schools . . . about the inner city . . . about development . . . about sharing resources.” Out of these sentiments, programs developed. It is possible that, when people take for their concern territory as broad as arts and education, to act, learn, modify, and improve may be the only courses open to them. This is certainly an acceptable way to work provided always there is self-criticism about the value of the activities. This means mounting constant guard against continuing activities for the sake of seeming to fill a role or because to give up a program might cast doubts on the wisdom of having started it in the first place. There is a classic Peanuts cartoon in which Lucy talks of starting some new hobbies. Linus assures her that this is a good idea because
the people who get most out of life are those who really try to accomplish something. "Accomplish something," exclaims Lucy, "I thought we were just supposed to keep busy." There are hundreds of different activities in which any arts council can busy itself. The challenge is to separate busyness from true accomplishment.

For all that it is not and should not be, this book must be a story of people. Whatever success the Council has achieved is owed to the vision which prompted its creation and the quality of the many people involved in transforming that vision into specific accomplishment. From its beginning the Council has had an endowment of farsightedness and applied energy. Originally this came from Mr. and Mrs. Morton D. May, MacLean Johnson, Robert Brookings Smith, and Louis Schaefer. In time, other community leaders, people of the calibre of William A. McDonnell and C. Powell Whitehead, contributed their many strengths of leadership. The mid-sixties were unsteady times for the Council, and Homer Sayad as president did much to hold the organization together by tactful persistence and commitment. Throughout, a group of board members maintained a steady faith in what the Council could accomplish; special among them were Howard Baer, Merrimon Cuninggim, Leigh Gerdine, Roy Jordan, Malcolm Martin, Mrs. Eric Newman, and Richard Weil. It is pleasing that in the most recent years new support is developing among younger business leaders like George Rosborough, Jr., Warren Shapleigh, Tom K. Smith, Jr. and Eugene F. Williams, who were not present at the Council's early beginnings.

This book owes much to many good friends: to Miss Nancy Hanks, chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, Ralph Burgard of the Associated Councils of
the Arts, Charles Mark, the St. Louis Council's first executive director, and Peter Spackman, a considerate and thoughtful editor. In St. Louis particular debts are due to the board of directors of the Council, to Homer and Elizabeth Sayad, George and Kitty Hoblitzelle, and Bill and Gertrude Bernoudy. Special thanks for time donated to the preparation of the early chapters are given Howard Baer, Miss Adelaide Cherbonnier, Gilbert Harris, Malcolm Martin, Mr. and Mrs. Morton D. May, Mrs. Eric Newman, Louis Schaefer, Lemoine Skinner, Robert Brookings Smith, and Morton Werner. The Ernest Trova cover gives the book a distinction for which we are most grateful. Miss Suzanne Balotti assisted with the editing and Mildred Birkett with the typing. Finally our warmest thanks are due to all the staff of the Council for their patience and indulgence while we wrote.

Michael Newton and Scott Hatley
January 1970
INTRODUCTION

This is the story of the arts in one city in America—an admittedly unusual town with problems and prospects of its own. But it is an important story for anyone to read—certainly anyone interested in bettering his own community, making it a more rewarding place in which to live.

Although this book contains practical ideas and suggestions on promoting the arts and community fundraising in general, it is not a generalized volume of abstractions; it is admirably specific. Yet if it is not a manual to follow step by step, it is, nonetheless, a most valuable documentation of the process whereby St. Louis evolved its sound, dynamic communitywide Arts and Education Council. The overall emphasis, quite properly, is on experimentation, as it has been in the past and will, undoubtedly, be in the future.

A distinguishing characteristic of this volume, and of the St. Louis experience as a whole, is the almost total absence of gloom and doom-saying which so often appears in current writing and talk about the arts in America. There isn't a panic button in sight in this book. Nor in the experiences of the hundreds of citizens on which it is based. There is no doubt that many of our major arts institutions are in desperate need of new money. And so are our schools, our hospitals, and all of the orga-
nizations that contribute to the quality of our existence. There is no doubt that fundraising is difficult. It is, and it very likely won’t get any easier.

Then how do we meet the needs of our citizens for artistic productions of high quality and for better educational programs in the arts? Not, it seems clear, by a constant harangue that we must have millions more tomorrow or doors will be closed.

This kind of crisis thinking makes for good headlines—once or twice. But it loses its news value very quickly. Those scare headlines, after all, are competing daily with news from all over the world—in large part, news with somewhat more sinister implication than the cancellation of a season or a cutback in public visiting hours at a local museum.

The authors of this book say succinctly that the arts seem inherently shrouded in crisis and chronically facing financial doom. But they do not waste a moment in hand-wringing or playing dirges. The book is an expression of hope, courage, and a plea for realism. The authors know that significant arts institutions and programs must survive in the community. When arts institutions and organizations have proved their genuine worth to the community, when they have become an active part of the community’s life and provided services that are badly needed by citizens, there is little likelihood that the community will do nothing while their doors shut or their performances decline into mediocrity.

St. Louis came fairly early to a recognition that its major arts institutions were a valuable community resource—valuable not only for the enjoyment they provided, but for their economic effects, their educational power, and their importance as part of the foundation of
a growing, vital community. Other communities have reached this same understanding—and when they have, their arts institutions have moved toward achieving permanence and a degree of financial stability.

It was barely twenty years ago that the first community arts council was formed in the United States. The movement was gradual in the beginning, but there are now some 600 cities, towns, and villages in this country that have some form of cooperative organization that expresses the concern of citizens for their total cultural environment. There will be more; those in existence will grow in strength and importance.

This book was written in the hope that the experience of St. Louis will be of help to others. The authors are saying that there is an awesome diversity of problems and that there are no ready-made solutions. Answers differ from community to community, just as the questions do. Nonetheless, the history of St. Louis’ Council can shed light and can point the way to what can be accomplished, although St. Louis would seem to have a distinct advantage over some communities of like size. It has a rather large number of civic-minded businessmen and industrialists who have come to recognize the value of the arts as an integral part of community life. They have also spent an inordinate amount of their own time in convincing others.

We cannot, however, solve the problems confronting the arts by making the community alone responsible for their encouragement, preservation, and availability. The St. Louis Symphony Orchestra is, after all, a major artistic resource not only for the City and its immediate environs but for the entire State of Missouri, for the Midwest, and for every region of the country in which it gives
concerts. Other resources—the Museum of Science and Natural History, the Repertory Theatre of Loretto-Hilton Center, the Missouri Botanical Garden, and educational television station KETC—all are important beyond the confines of their immediate geographical location. As such they need the support of a wider constituency.

We have come a long way toward accepting this pluralistic concept of funding the arts in recent times. The creation of the National Endowment for the Arts in 1965 was a major step. Since its initial funding year, the Endowment has successfully generated about three dollars in private, local, and state government support for each one dollar it has granted in federal funds. The Associated Councils of the Arts has worked successfully as a private organization to encourage significant cooperative efforts on behalf of the arts. The Business Committee for the Arts has become increasingly active in its effort to dramatize the needs of the arts and the effects of business support in answering those needs. The major foundations have taken some creative and productive steps in support of the arts. And a growing number of smaller philanthropic organizations are helping.

Among the most important results of the law creating the National Endowment for the Arts, of course, has been the growth of the state arts council movement. Prior to 1965 less than a dozen active state councils existed. Today, there are working councils in all fifty states and four of the five special jurisdictions. Nationwide, we have seen a surprising increase in quality arts programming and an astonishing rise in the level of accessibility. Thousands of people are now regularly enjoying, participating in, and learning from the arts in areas
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previously untouched by artistic productions.

The job, then, of enriching our lives is not an impossible one by any means. It can be done. It will be, if we set our minds to it.

But the job cannot be done by "organizations" or by "governments" alone. In the first and last analysis, the money the arts need will be raised by people—and that means volunteers. Is there anyone more important in American society? I doubt it.

That is one of the strong points Mr. Newton and Mr. Hatley make in this volume. No matter how brilliant the concept for a fund drive may be, no matter how great the support for it may be at the top social and economic levels of the community, the success of the drive depends ultimately upon the volunteers who handle the personal contacts.

The true story of what has happened in St. Louis is a combination of many stories—of business and corporate executives with broad vision and dedication to their community, of teachers and other professional men and women who are determined that the real needs of children shall be met, of housewives and parents—all giving their time and energies to a cause they feel is of prime importance to their lives and the life of their City.

The St. Louis Arts and Education Council office estimates that 1200 people gave 35,000 hours to the fund drive last year. That is an impressive total. It cannot be converted into dollars and cents, for it is creative and generative in its effect on the drive itself. It should inspire in all who read this book a confidence and a conviction that the problems of the arts in our local communities can be solved.

One final word of appreciation is in order.
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In 1968 the Associated Councils of the Arts published a brilliant and invaluable book on audience development. *In Search of an Audience* was the work of Bradley Morison and Kay Fliehr, who had been primarily responsible for developing audiences for the Minnesota Theatre Company (Tyrone Guthrie Theatre) in Minneapolis.

This present book is an equally common sense treatment of a situation of universal interest wherever the future of arts organizations is at stake. I hope the Associated Councils of the Arts will consider this only the second in a series of volumes addressing themselves to specific and commonly felt problems in the arts. As such it is a necessary and highly enjoyable addition to the small, select, but growing library shelf of practical and useful books on the arts and their community.

Nancy Hanks
January 1970
CHAPTER 1

STARTING IN THE MIDDLE

"St. Louis has been in the middle of almost everything that has made the United States what it is today." —SALT LAKE TRIBUNE

"Are the people who live in St. Louis different, somehow more cultivated, from those who live in Chicago and those who live in Kansas City? It is not likely, though wisdom and foresight went into the establishment of that Arts and Education Fund, which would be a mighty useful thing to have around here just now."

—KANSAS CITY STAR

ANY CITY IS DIFFICULT to distill to its essence through words. Just as every city has some measure of poverty and plenty, of beauty and ugliness, every city is distinct. Just as all cities contain to some extent an element of indefinable magic, each has an air, an ambience that is its own. Berlin’s citizens proudly refer to their “Berliner-luft” that supposedly makes the sober, giddy, and the timid, ebullient. Paris has long had adoring songwriters to evoke its mood. And in America, it is not just tall buildings that make the difference between Dallas and Fort Worth, or a smaller population and a Midwestern location that make Chicago the “Second City.”
St. Louis' essence is undeniably American, containing all the confusions and contradictions that the mid-twentieth century has taught us the word American encompasses. Some cities in our country retain marked traces of a portion of America's early heritage—the English in Boston, the French in New Orleans, the Spanish in Albuquerque. St. Louis does not. It is here that the "melting pot" has worked to blend, to blur distinctions and create a new synthesis with elements of diversity. St. Louis has seen and endured and made a part of itself the events that created the American character—colonialism, the Civil War, westward expansion, waves of immigration, the rise and decline of various modes of transportation, the unionizing movements. And now, the proliferation of urban problems and America's outstanding failure, the socially disenfranchised American Negro, are St. Louis issues too.

Established in 1764 by a French entrepreneur named Laclede, St. Louis retains little of the sophisticated influences that traveled the ocean from France and up the river from New Orleans to the proposed capital of Upper Louisiana. Little remains, that is, except several melifluous, but regularly mispronounced names: De Baliviere Cote Brilliante, and Chouteau, for example. Almost nothing lingers to indicate that the City was once part of Spanish-held territory.

What has remained are the effects of Thomas Jefferson's outlay in 1804 of $15 million for the purchase of the Louisiana Territory. In Europe those effects were slight: Napoleon squandered the money on a short-lived and unsuccessful campaign against the English. On our own continent, the purchase precluded the fulfillment of European dreams of a second American empire and
nearly doubled the size of a burgeoning United States of America. Jefferson’s actions, in a brief time, changed St. Louis’ position from the backend of a struggling young nation and the potential first city of an even younger country to the middle of a democracy on the threshold of development which was to dazzle the world. St. Louis became the borderline between East and West. For many years, it was the most sophisticated of a brash new breed of Western cities. Easterners might consider it part of the rough-and-tumble West, but anyone who traveled from the Mississippi River on one of the trails to the plains, the Rockies, or California saw things differently. St. Louis was cultured, metropolitan, and refined, all the things the West was not.

Years later, St. Louis was to find itself a borderline once again; this time between North and South. Even today, Northerners often think of St. Louis as part of the South, while Southerners know all too well that the City is Yankee territory. The city on Missouri’s eastern border had never truly seemed part of the state; indeed, St. Louis was founded more than fifty years before Missouri was a state. When the Civil War was declared, there ensued a power struggle that left St. Louis and Missouri with an even greater rift. Jefferson City politicians, including the governor, were avid secessionists. St. Louis’ populace, by then greatly increased with numbers of German and Irish immigrants, would have none of that. Missouri remained in the Union. Nonetheless, the pattern of rural over-representation that had begun even before the war between the states was strengthened. The State continues to assume many municipal functions, such as control over the police forces and far-reaching taxing powers.
St. Louisans still find themselves mildly surprised when required to buy automobile license plates that say: Missouri. Whatever portion of the loose conglomeration that is called St. Louis one comes from—with the possible exception of the Illinois portion of the metropolitan area—the identification is with an area, a city in its broadest meaning, not a state or region. St. Louis has always been a city in the middle, and because of that, a city on its own, independent and proud.

Legally, St. Louis is a confusing jumble of sometimes overlapping, sometimes separate jurisdictions. In 1875, in what was hailed as a farsighted and innovative action, the City seceded from the County, in effect forming its own co-terminus city-county. The idea was to give the City greater freedom from the rural-dominated legislature. It now seems the concept was terribly shortsighted, or at a minimum, badly handled. Now the City of St. Louis is a strait-jacketed area with a dwindling population as more and more people cross the artificial boundary into St. Louis County which surrounds St. Louis on three sides. Within the County are jammed helter-skelter over a hundred independent municipalities, the largest of which has almost 60,000 people; the smallest, to date, less than 350.

Some of these communities are just nice little towns that got caught up in St. Louis' version of the American Everyman's search for "a place to call his own." Others are fabricated, or prefabricated, appendages that see a 90 per cent exodus each workday morning. And where do the people go? Many spend their days in downtown office buildings. Many simply go to other municipalities, wise little villages that give tax breaks to large companies and lure them from locations in the City.
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Within these municipalities are found the highest and just about the lowest tax rates for school support in the State. Thus boundaries which many deplore and no one changes may determine whether two equally bright children receive an astonishingly up-to-date education or do not bother to finish at a high school constantly under threat of being unaccredited. The discrepancies in school taxes and consequently in the quality of education are only examples of the life-influencing nature of government in a muddle. A few people benefit—not many cities have the luxury of a hundred or so mayors and their attendant bureaucrats—but many people suffer. A Metropolitan Sewer District, an energetic Regional Industrial Development Council, and a largely impotent East-West Gateway Coordinating Council do not signal immediate change. Too few still believe the illness is worse than the cure.

There is in the area one boundary that is not artificial, the Mississippi River. It is still a magnificent sight; just standing by it, one can feel its quiet power, its gliding speed, and understand why Missouri’s Mark Twain and others waxed romantic over a river. But few St. Louisans spend much time enjoying its presence. More likely they are crossing back and forth to Illinois’ equivalent of “the County” (in this case, two counties), that contains the same overgrown rural villages, bedroom communities, and industrial sites. Perhaps most disheartening is the city of East St. Louis, which seems nothing more than an extension of St. Louis’ worst examples of urban decay.

Such a discouraging description of St. Louis would have been adequate fifteen, or even ten years ago. Today
it does not suffice. St. Louis is not, as some of its devotees would say, experiencing a renaissance. But it is a city awake and aware, a city in the middle of the quest for solutions both to problems that are its own and to those it has in common with the rest of urban America. It is impossible to say what actually sparked the willingness to search, but a small comparison should indicate the City’s mood.

In 1904 St. Louis staged a spectacular World’s Fair to celebrate the centennial of the Louisiana Purchase. Remnants of that exposition still grace the City. Forest Park, the scene of the Fair, despite encroachments by superhighways, remains a green expanse, partly manicured, partly forested, on the City’s western edge. Within the park are the City Art Museum, regal and bastion-like; the Jefferson Memorial, built with the unexpected profits of the Exposition; and miles of streams, ponds, and reflecting pools. Washington University’s administration building was once the headquarters for the Fair’s management; its sports field was the site of the 1904 Olympics.

In contrast, 1954, the 150th anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase, slid by without official recognition—not so much as a proclamation from the mayor.

And then, just nine years later, in 1963 and 1964, the City mounted quite a respectable two-year long celebration of its founding. Although memory of the Bicentennial is fading, the spirit, energy, and imagination which put it together are now a part of St. Louis life. Surely the greatest symbol of the City’s ability to rally its forces and accomplish a goal is the Gateway Arch, sixty stories of grace fully soaring steel. Ostensibly, it commemorates St. Louis’ position as the gateway to the
STARTING IN THE MIDDLE

West; more accurately, it signifies St. Louis' participation in the present and the future. The Arch is part of a small park, the Jefferson Expansion National Memorial, which it is hoped will once again make the River a major focus of the City's life. The whole Memorial—which includes the "old courthouse" of the Dred Scott trial—is in turn only a part of a newly developing downtown. In the shadow of the Arch are a new sports stadium (a suitably in-the-center-of-things location for sports-loving St. Louisans), the Spanish International Pavilion (transplanted from the 1964 World's Fair through the intervention of Mayor Alfonso Juan Cervantes), and the striking new international headquarters of Pet, Inc.

In, under, around, and through all this change, this tearing down and building up once again, are new highways and wide boulevards, as old as the City itself. The highways are not vast interchanges as in Los Angeles, nor are the streets quaint and narrow like some of those in Boston. St. Louis is neither the new American city, nor the old, but rather a blend. In its early years, it was the outpost of things Eastern and the beginning of things Western. Even today, both boulevards and highways go generally east-to-west, spreading out like the ribs of a fan, once more reminding us that St. Louis is in the middle of America, at the start of trails-become-highways that lead to Oregon and Texas and all the vast land between.

Simply by geographic position, St. Louis was destined to be a major transportation center. Each time a change in transport methods took place, St. Louis was quick to change also. It is still America's biggest river port, still a major railway center, still sends thousands of trucks along interstate highways, but now something new
is added. One commercial airline has a flight it calls the “Space Route” that goes from Seattle to St. Louis to Huntsville to Cape Kennedy. It is a necessary flight for St. Louis—much of the hardware that goes hurtling to the moon or around the earth was designed and built close to a river still alive with loaded barges. More than likely, the plane that takes designers and engineers to and from launch sites was also conceived and built in St. Louis.

This example taken from the transportation industry illustrates a major change in emphasis. St. Louis is now more a center of manufacture and business than merely a location for the distribution of other cities’ products. Indeed, with the sixties and St. Louis’ renewed vitality came the recognition that the City was quite remarkable industrially. At the mention of Detroit, one thinks of cars; of Pittsburgh, steel, of Akron, rubber, and so on through the list of most American cities. St. Louis was once the same, largely dependent on manufacturing beer and shoes for its livelihood. But that is the way of the past. Certainly, there is a lot of beer brewed in St. Louis and its plants produce shoes enough for a fair-sized country or two. Yet, as the seventies begin, the City is the nation’s second largest producer of automobiles and houses, the national headquarters of major chemical, electric, steel, aircraft, and food industries. The list of locally owned American business is long and impressive. Simply put, diversified and locally owned industries are vital to a city’s economy and, in turn, to its general liveliness. St. Louis has both ingredients.

While words like “industry” and “economy” may sum up one aspect of a city’s life, “culture” or “educa-
tion” are not quite broad enough to use for another aspect. A city’s essence is not just whether it has money and a proud heritage, but what it does with them. “What it does with them” is much or meager in St. Louis, depending on expectations and perspective. Higher education provides many examples. St. Louis has two major private universities, Washington University and St. Louis University, in addition to a three-campus junior college system, sixteen other colleges, and recently, two State-supported university campuses, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville and the University of Missouri at St. Louis. Both Washington and St. Louis Universities have undergraduate programs and medical schools of nationally recognized excellence. Yet for many years St. Louisans turned their backs on both institutions as “streetcar schools.” The streetcars are gone from St. Louis now and so are the schools’ parochial clientele. St. Louis University has multiplied its facilities several times over. Students no longer dash from class to class across city streets, but wander through an up-to-the-minute campus on the site of a slum-cleared urban renewal area. Washington University’s “70 by 70” program reached its $70 million goal a year early, by 1969. The Tudor Gothic buildings and Graham Chapel, fashioned after Trinity College at Cambridge, still give each new freshman class, now from all parts of the country, a sense of a university’s traditional significance, but those same students are housed in modern dormitories—three, four, even eleven stories tall—in an area genially called “the South Forty.”

The progressive side of college-level education is not vested only in the large privately supported institutions. Construction workers park side-by-side with 7000 students as building on the University of Missouri’s three-
year old campus tries to keep pace with increasing numbers. Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville has a new campus, too. But the noise of the jackhammer has been out of the air long enough for the University to act as host of the Mississippi River Festival, which presented alternate evenings of music from the St. Louis Symphony and rock groups from around the country. Music-lovers who thought themselves adventurous got a surprise: S.I.U. is not “some little school they’re building over there.” With new highways, it is close; it is whopping big; it has a finished, settled look.

In 1967 a college president decided to request that her Roman Catholic women’s college be made a secular institution, the first such change in the country. The result was instant publicity for her Webster College. The brouhaha settled, her efforts and vision remain. Webster College is coeducational and has a strong emphasis on the arts. For theatre-minded St. Louisans, Miss Grennan’s contribution to the City is easy to single out. It is Loretto-Hilton (an unusual name signifying the spirit of the Sisters of Loretto combined with the money of Conrad Hilton), which provides St. Louis with its only repertory theatre. Its striking facilities and varied productions of high professional competence are a welcome change of fare from stale Broadway musicals. The Repertory Theatre of Loretto-Hilton is an example of the much-orneager principle applied to the arts in St. Louis. There is not a lot of theatre in St. Louis, but there is more than there has been in the past several decades—with the exception of the brief flourishing of the Crystal Palace, where Phyllis Diller, Nichols and May, among others, performed as unknowns, and which actually sent a show to Broadway, the Beatnik musical, The Nervous Set.
Powell Symphony Hall: The predicament the St. Louis Symphony faces in common with other major American orchestras is ironical since it comes at a time of impressive growth in earned income and audience (400,000 a year), a tribute to the acute and purposeful administration of Symphony manager Peter Pastreich.
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There is much music now in St. Louis, but it has never been meager. From the early French "fiddle players," the German immigrants who organized brass bands and classical ensembles, the 1860 founding of the Philharmonic, and the 1881 founding of the St. Louis Symphony, St. Louisans have loved music most of all the arts. Few cities can boast such musical resources. The Symphony is the nation's second oldest professional orchestra and the Philharmonic, operating with unpaid musicians of high calibre and in its 110th year, is certainly one of the oldest "community" orchestras in the country. The Philharmonic's concerts, given free each year in cavernlike Kiel Auditorium, are filled. The Symphony, no longer able to endure Kiel's shortcomings, is housed in a glorious symbol of St. Louis' renewed energy, devotion to music, and reawakened appreciation of a proud past, Powell Symphony Hall. Once a super-overembellished movie house, today it is splendor—red carpeting, glistening chandeliers, gold leaf, all done with a sense of style that adds up to elegance instead of mawkish, too-ornate gloom. The high quality of the Symphony itself, comfortable seats, and acoustics fit for genius, mean that St. Louisans go, listen, and enjoy.

In no other artistic medium does St. Louis do quite so well. For good or ill the City Art Museum is still one of the few major art museums in the country dependent on a mill tax for its existence. This amount (from the City of St. Louis, not shared by the suburbs) does little more than help the Museum wage a frantic battle against the deterioration of an aging building. The collection is nonetheless of superior quality, far-ranging, and well displayed. The citizens of St. Louis are much in the debt of many donors who provide time, money, and items from
their own collections. St. Louis has traditionally been a center of skilled art collecting rather than art production. The habit of importing art continues: for example the poster announcing the Powell Hall opening was commissioned from a nationally known artist who happened to live in New York, not a nationally known artist who happened to live in St. Louis.

Of all the examples of philanthropy and the cultural resources they have stimulated in the City—of money earned in St. Louis and returned and multiplied—one is outstanding. Though it is an instance from St. Louis’ not-so-recent past, it is a tribute also to mid-twentieth century energy and productiveness.

One hundred fifty years ago a nineteen-year-old Englishman named Henry Shaw came to St. Louis, setting up a hardware business to outfit expeditions opening up the American West. By the age of forty, he had amassed fortune enough to establish the Missouri Botanical Garden. What was once a prairie is, through Shaw’s efforts and generosity, now one of the world’s seven major botanical gardens, a fine park, and the site of some of the City’s most distinguished architecture. Adding to Shaw’s original buildings, the Garden built, in 1958, the striking geodesic-domed Climatron filled with a half acre of exotic flora, a bog, a rice paddy, and a stream complete with waterfall.

The Garden’s contributions to society are many: research leading to the discovery of aureomycin, cortisone, and rauwolfia; development of the first system of measuring a virus; hybridization of corn, waterlilies, and orchids; the development of the preservative powers of creosote; and the introduction of the philodendron to the households of America. Research now centers on ecology,
particularly appropriate in an era when man influences nature more than ever before. Shaw farsightedly insisted that the Garden should maintain a balance between the cultivation and display of flowers, research activities, and educational efforts (he also endowed the Washington University Department of Botany), recognizing the need to both serve, and appeal to, the public. His ideas have endured. In 1969 the Garden carried out a capital fund drive to provide for the addition of a new library-herbarium and educational buildings.

Only a few aspects of this city in the heart of America have been discussed. But one more aspect of St. Louis life remains of enormous significance to St. Louis. The population of the City is just under 50 per cent Negro. Many are post-depression immigrants from the South, many others the offspring of generations of St. Louis residents. The St. Louis public school system is over 60 per cent Negro in its student population. Many blacks in St. Louis also live in suburbs, those with good school districts and those with inferior. Yet overwhelmingly, Negroes, for economic or other reasons, are living in deteriorated mansions of another era or public housing, either of which would make any man who was proud of his city sick with shame.

Black St. Louisans have contributed to the growth and vitality of St. Louis for many years, particularly in the arts. More are doing so now than ever. The unhappy truth remains that vast human resources are wasted with every opportunity that is denied to any citizen. A city cannot long endure, can certainly never achieve greatness, if it squanders its resources in a time when urban America needs so much. To use its human resources in
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a humane way may be the greatest challenge St. Louis faces. Though many St. Louis citizens would be hard put to articulate their deepest, underlying concerns, their actions indicate true care for the part of man that the twentieth century wastes, the self each person has and hopes to find.
CHAPTER 2

IN THE BEGINNING

"This is not tea-party culture. It is a real stand-up-and-be-counted activity—a practical, fully convinced, warmly devoted, economically operated organization willing to make an unspectacular beginning so it can work towards big ends. The ends are big, indeed, and the Spirit of St. Louis Fund holds out the possibility—just about the only possibility—that St. Louis will take its place among the country's noted cultural centers, and not fall back into the ranks of the second-rate provincial towns."

—GEORGE McCUE
The St. Louis Post-Dispatch
April 29, 1962

By the close of the fifties, St Louis was well along in efforts to arouse itself from the doldrums that set in as the Fair closed and the twentieth century began. Plans for constructing the daringly conceived Saarinen arch were in the probable stage. The downtown area was looking forward to a new sports stadium; close-by Mill Creek area blight was scheduled for complete destruction and rebuilding that would include the first direct-route highways to downtown. And the United Fund for health and welfare was the closest ever to reaching its
multimillion dollar goal. Some people were even discussing ways of putting St. Louis on the cultural map, or at least buoying up existing but flagging cultural institutions.

Because the United Fund announced achievement of its goal in 1959, and because most St. Louisans felt reasonably assured that they were part of a city awakening to its problems and possibilities, few people were prepared for the United Fund’s ouster of seven agencies.

The Community Music School had provided vocal and instrumental lessons to low-income students since its inception in 1924; the International Institute provided orientation services to an ever-dwindling number of immigrants; the Volunteer Film Association, which showed movies to shut-ins, found itself questioning its relevance with the advent of television. The National Conference of Christians and Jews provided a broad range of education programs, promoting interreligious and intercultural understanding. The Adult Education Council supported such efforts as teaching illiterates to read and the development of educational television. The American Health Association was the local chapter of a national group concerned with physical and mental health. The People’s Art Center, originally begun as a WPA project, taught classes in various media on a no-fee basis, emphasizing the possibility of racial integration to a degree some considered excessive.

Though the ouster may have caused surprise, the community’s reaction hardly constituted a civic crisis. The agencies were small, each of them engaged in a limited scope of activities; all however were open to the objection that they were “not health and welfare.” In some quarters the decision was received with approval.
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Although its goal had been narrowly reached, the United Fund was not yet on solid ground. In efforts to find why the drive was not getting the full support it needed, especially at the industrial employee level, the United Fund leadership came across many responses—one can always find a reason not to give. A recurring theme was the United Fund’s support of too many “nonessential services,” those peripheral to basic health and welfare needs. Thus, a decision was made emphasizing the charitable nature of the United Fund—charity defined as public provision for the relief of the physical needs of the poor. The change was at the expense of the one-and-only-one-gift concept implied in the name United Fund, for no longer could one gift cover all areas of need.

Equal in importance to the word “physical” in this definition was the word “poor”—the United Fund would undertake to provide services only for those who could not afford them themselves. As a specific case, the People’s Art Center, maintaining the principle that its classes should be free to all, did not charge any participants for its services. This meant that in some instances plant workers were paying for benefits received by executives’ families. Even though the director of the Center insisted these apparent inequities were necessary to maintain the diversity of the Center’s users, the Allocations Committee knew the furor this might cause among the labor unions supporting the United Fund.

Various exigencies, as well as pragmatic and philosophical considerations, led to the dismissal of the seven agencies. For whatever reasons, however, early in 1960 the agencies were finally and officially out of the United Fund. Though not creating a tempest within the community as a whole, the withdrawal of support threatened
the continued existence of the unfortunate "outer seven." Each had come to depend on the United Fund's major contribution to its operating budget. When the notice of ouster came, most of the groups found themselves in the same position. Their boards of directors were generous in giving time and concern to the agency's efforts, but weak in fundraising ability. Formal protest sent to the United Fund by several of the agencies did not reverse the situation. Informal, livingroom discussions of alternatives began among board members of the affected groups. Of all the suggestions made and possibilities discussed, the eventual outcome was the creation of a new united campaign. This emerged under the leadership of two people, a board member of the Adult Education Council and the president of the People's Art Center.

Mrs. Morton D. May had long been interested in problems of education and, as wife of the chairman of the board of May Department Stores, she was in a position to help a cause of importance. Furthermore, Mrs. May was known for unflagging determination and a judicious use of her position in the community. From her meetings with Mr. MacLean Johnson, president of Webster Publishing (now a division of McGraw-Hill), the seed of an idea began to germinate. St. Louis needed a focus of support for all the arts and for nonpublicly supported educational efforts. The recently expelled agencies needed support immediately: let them, or some of them, form the nucleus of a new united fund, one to provide resources for the intellect and the creative potential of men swiftly being dehumanized by the crush and rapid pace of urban life.

Beginning with the relatively well-formed idea of a joint campaign designed specifically to deal with the
intangibles of learning and stimulation of creativity, criteria for inclusion were developed. To be eligible a group must be concerned primarily with art or education. Its services must be available to any interested metropolitan area resident; and the emphasis had to be local, using St. Louis-raised money to directly benefit St. Louisans. This venture might be a rescue mission, but it had to be more than that alone.

Thus, by late May of 1960 when a public relations firm agreed to help form a campaign, four agencies were committed to a joint appeal. The local chapter of the National Conference of Christians and Jews was denied admission because of a heavy financial commitment to its national organization. Community Music School, though eligible, initially declined an invitation to join. The American Social Health Association did not request admission. The International Institute, Adult Education Council, People's Art Center, and Volunteer Film Association would go it alone together.

Within forty-five days a not-for-profit corporation was formed and the campaign was under way. Its constitution stated that the new federation's purpose was to raise funds for existing organizations, encourage more such organizations to join and "promote a cultural renaissance in the St. Louis community."

It was to be a group without membership for individuals. Its board of directors would be composed of two representatives of each member agency balanced by an equal number of members "at large." A euphonious and symbolic name was found: the Spirit of St. Louis Fund. This was complemented by a well-designed emblem showing an abstract version of a familiar landmark, the statue of Louis IX of France on a prancing steed. Pe-
gasus-like wings were added to the mount, giving an impression of soaring movement. (Later both the name and emblem were to become subjects of dispute. Some people regarded as presumptuous the use of these hallowed symbols of the City by what they considered an upstart group.) As early as July, barely six months after the United Fund’s dismissal action, the first campaign meeting of the Spirit Fund was held. Approximately fifty volunteers attended. They were to be the captains charged with recruiting additional workers to approach businesses and the community at large. Cards and brochures were prepared. News releases optimistically foresaw 500 workers for the new campaign. Not surprisingly much of the work in fact devolved on Mrs. May, some of the more active members of the boards of the Spirit Fund and of the individual agencies.

In its early stages, the board of the Spirit Fund was composed primarily of people with interest in one particular agency. Even MacLean Johnson, by then elected president of the Spirit Fund and Mrs. May, vice-president and campaign chairman, had initially become involved because of loyalty to a group in need.

The volunteers, too, were willing to solicit funds either because they were friends of a board member or because they felt deep involvement with a single agency. A few were simply interested individuals such as Gilbert Harris, then director of the Jewish Community Centers Association, and Mrs. Eric Newman, well-known in the city for an ability to put in motion her strikingly imaginative ideas.

A goal of $125,000 was set. This represented the basic, pared-down amount the agencies needed and included $12,500 as payment for the public relations firm’s
The Museum of Science and Natural History: The benefits derived by the young from museums are an important and pervasive adjunct to the educational system and this one is visited by some 100,000 St. Louisans a year.
expenses and fee. How to achieve this modest figure, whether through individual support or corporate contributions, was the subject of frequent insistences and persuasions. However, after two months of campaign effort, the dollar from the man-in-the-street was proving elusive. Even so this type of gift composed the major part of all contributions. The problem was clearer but not solved. It would take many times more small gifts of concern to reach the goal. These gifts were important as indicators of public support. Yet the number received by September 1960 (about 2000) hardly represented a groundswell. Corporations and executives were unimpressed and continued marginally responsive.

As one early board member bluntly summed up the situation: “We had limited access to intercorporate extortion.” Less harshly expressed, volunteers were in such short supply that the Spirit Fund was in no position to evaluate a volunteer’s particular strengths and apply them where they would be most effective. Thus, housewives were asked to approach business leaders on what was essentially a business transaction: giving money as an investment in a better St. Louis. From its inception the Spirit Fund’s founders recognized the need of the Fund to grow, not merely in terms of money collected but in the number of people and agencies served. Knowing this, requests for contributions were made not only on the basis of the Adult Education Council’s, the People’s Art Center’s, the Volunteer Film Association’s, and the International Institute’s need for operating support, but on the promise that the Spirit Fund would grow into a major united cultural appeal. Not many people would have had a chance of success in selling to the business community this combination of an emergency and
what might be just another good idea. Mrs. May had, from the beginning, insisted on appealing to business leaders as opposed to simply going to the community at large. Her awareness of how business supports civic endeavors and her contacts with the seats of power gave this first campaign a sense of direction it might otherwise have lacked. Using her resources and supported by the conviction that this idea was the one in many that was better than just good, Mrs. May provided the essential leadership. Major corporations were contacted with letters forthrightly stating: emergency now, commendable future potential.

In the span of time from September to December of 1960, Mrs. May, with the support of her husband, managed to buttress the campaign from the disappointing September figure of about $50,000 to pledges of $125,000. Whether or not it was recognized at the time, it is now obvious that no amount of energetic rallying of volunteers could replace the corporate support necessary for tangible financial results. For the agencies, the results were indeed tangible, as the figures below indicate. The amounts recorded as coming from the Spirit Fund are approximate and were adjusted several times:
The amounts listed above proved to be somewhat more than the agencies actually received. The first year's allocations for the individual members of the Spirit Fund cannot be compared from agency to agency because at that time all the agencies were operating on different fiscal years. All told about $95,000 was expended the first year. This included agency allocations, some for only part of a year, and campaign expenses, about $3500 above the $12,500 paid the public relations firm for expenses and fees. In their rather idealized division of the projected income, the Spirit Fund board had not taken into account the cost of operating the Spirit Fund itself. Thus money was used in a way that was not originally planned: the Spirit Fund began to establish itself as a separate entity. Funds were used to hire an acting executive director, to outfit an office, to add secretaries, and in March 1961 to retain a full-time executive director and a campaign manager. The alliance was already becoming an expensive proposition.
The Climatron: Buckminster Fuller's geodesic greenhouse.
The eventual relative success of the first campaign resulted from three main assets. First, the emergency nature of the project and "the idea," apart from the agencies themselves, had some appeal. Many people responded because they recognized an idea they, too, thought reasonable and sound. In mid-September of 1960 when contributions were in a slump, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch published a feature article which cogently and clearly stated the case for a united cultural appeal that would compare favorably with similar projects in other cities. The article strongly implied that the Spirit Fund was opportunity knocking for St. Louis to become the largest city in the country with an arts fund. Indeed throughout the campaign, media support for the fledgling organization was favorable. Both St. Louis daily newspapers published short editorials of approbation; and weekly papers often printed large advertisements of the campaign as a public service.

Second, although the campaign had deficiencies in organization, an impression of soundness and responsibility was created. The materials were professionally prepared, understandable and clear, taking the campaign out of the neighborhood bake sale league. Perhaps a blessing in disguise, the lack of large numbers of volunteers precluded getting involved in activities that were time-consuming beyond their money-raising effectiveness such as art fairs, fashion shows, bazaars, and benefits. Even if some community leaders might think the group an upstart, the image projected was not amateurish, but one of dedicated people pursuing a cause they believed worthwhile.

This dedication was the third, but most significant ingredient for success, success both for the immediate
campaign and the eventual direction of support for arts and education in St. Louis. Through its short, troubled history, the Spirit Fund was fortunate in having board members who sacrificed short-term satisfactions for a bigger goal. Many people shared in this early devotion to what was largely an idea; but Mrs. May and MacLean Johnson stand out in applying their abundant energies to the task at hand, pursuing the sources of support they knew existed in St. Louis business.

Events related and parallel to the development of the Spirit Fund had been taking place. These were to affect the future direction of the organization.

While campaign efforts went on, the board of the Spirit Fund undertook the task of developing an organization with a strong internal structure that remained with the Spirit Fund and, later, the Arts and Education Council. A Budget Committee was established to decide each year, in consultation with the member agencies, the amount of their allocations from the Fund’s receipts, providing a check against the preservation of the status quo. Membership dues, in many cases a thinly disguised way of soliciting contributions, were not to interfere with the joint enterprise. It was absolutely necessary that the desirability of a single, united effort over multiple campaigns be demonstrated conclusively. An Evaluation Committee, chaired by Evelyn Newman, sought to devise criteria by which groups seeking admission to the Spirit Fund could be judged and to institute a sound mechanism for evaluating member agencies each year, not just with regard to finances and efficiency, but as to how much service was really provided to the community. This internal strength was necessary not just to fulfill philosophical commitments, but also to insure the
respect and consequent involvement of the business community.

There is in St. Louis an organization named Civic Progress. Begun in the late fifties, it is composed of the chief executive officers of the forty or so largest locally owned corporations in the City. Civic Progress sees as a primary concern making St. Louis attractive to new business and to prospective employees for existing businesses. The members of this association are not fundraisers, yet their support is essential to achieving large-scale corporate support. Once Civic Progress backs an endeavor—and it seldom does without near-unanimous group approval—each member is expected to do his share. The results of this high-level cooperation are obvious: the rebuilding of downtown St. Louis and the year-in, year-out success of the United Fund provide ready examples.

In the mid-sixties Morton D. May, who has been a leader and generous supporter of every major improvement in downtown St. Louis, asked his fellow members of Civic Progress for their endorsement of the Spirit Fund. Later that year, he proposed that Civic Progress accept the obligation of aiding the establishment of a comprehensive, united cultural fundraising effort. Oddly, and perhaps because of May's identification as an arts supporter, neither suggestion was received with more than perfunctory approval. At that moment the obstacles to such an effort seemed great. Civic Progress had lent its full support to the United Fund, then only beginning to come into its own. Members were reluctant to appear in any way to undermine the United Fund's full and complete success. Also, the benefiting agencies of the Spirit Fund had recently been looked on with disfavor by the United Fund.
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In June of 1960 as local newspapers announced the formation of the Spirit of St. Louis Fund, the American Symphony Orchestra League was holding its annual convention in St. Louis. Attending that meeting were representatives of the few arts councils then in existence in America. Among the more significant events of the convention was the founding of Community Arts Councils, Inc., later to be Associated Councils of the Arts. Chairman of the committee responsible for establishing this new organization was a young man named Charles Mark, then director of the arts council in Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

Mark was again to come to St. Louis, this time in December 1960, at the request of the Junior League, to meet with leaders of various cultural and educational organizations. From these meetings, he was to make recommendations about an overall plan for increasing the efficiency of arts management in St. Louis. As a result of his well-received remarks and analysis of St. Louis’ situation, Mark was asked to be the executive director of the Spirit Fund.

By his own admission, Mark’s report was basically a synthesis of existing opinions and conditions in St. Louis. Yet because Mark was professionally familiar with arts councils and the philosophy behind their organization, and because the Spirit Fund gave every indication of being a nascent council, it was a sound and natural conclusion that the Spirit Fund should begin positive steps toward its own metamorphosis into the arts council for St. Louis. Certainly many of the suggested actions for the Spirit Fund were immediately necessary. The Fund needed a staff and a director, needed to clearly define its purposes, needed to handle more efficiently its
budgeting and fundraising.

In May, almost at about the same time that Mark was hired, the campaign officially began, the Spirit Fund made another wise financial investment. Mrs. William McElroy was employed as the staff campaign organizer. Mrs. McElroy's considerable experience with the United Fund has stood her, and united cultural fundraising in St. Louis, in good stead from these early beginnings to the present. When she arrived at the small Spirit Fund office, she found disorganization resulting from volunteer management of the detailed and complex recordkeeping necessary in contacting thousands of people. Mrs. McElroy's knowledge of the community provided answers to the basic questions of fundraising: who was a good prospect for a substantial contribution and who would be the best person to ask for that gift. She quickly became an indispensable asset to the campaign as a tactician.

There were other needs though, seemingly outside the control of the Spirit Fund. For the six member agencies to survive, much less grow and expand, they must become part of something larger than the Spirit Fund. This called for a concerted, encompassing approach to paying for services to provide for the nonphysical needs of people in the St. Louis area. Other, similar groups in St. Louis seemed to be endlessly, almost frantically, involved in searches for operating support. Thus, the community had to be awakened to its responsibility to make a comprehensive effort to put the finances of these agencies on a secure footing. It was Mark's job to capitalize on the willing aid of those who wanted to see the arts grow and flourish but knew they could not on a starvation diet. Equally important was to convince the dubious
that the arts were not icing on the cake, but of real com-

Unity was the highest priority. A way must be found
to bring together the supporters of arts and education
and those indifferent; to make administrators aware of
their organization's obligation to the community. In turn
the community must become aware of its obligation to
support those things which benefited its growth. In other
words, to create common ground for the common good.

However, the existing Spirit of St. Louis Fund was
not satisfactory to many different people in the com-

unity. Some regarded it as an upstart, and worse, a
weak organization. In the view of one person actively
involved, much time was lost by community leaders
whose position could have added strength to the Spirit
Fund, in waiting for it to die. Spirit Fund leaders feared
a disenchanted public would believe this demise indi-
cated the impracticality of any joint fundraising for the
arts. Many who liked the idea of a united appeal, but
who felt the Spirit Fund too weak a vehicle, cried out
for the inclusion of larger agencies such as the Sym-
phony. Those same larger agencies feared loss of auto-
nomy. It seemed only natural that if required to split
gifts ten ways, even on a proportional-need basis, large
agencies would be supporting the smaller. It was difficult
to be sure that one campaign for several agencies could
actually get considerably larger gifts. The Symphony
with its record as the largest fundraiser among the cul-
tural organizations saw itself as having most to lose.

Although much of the Spirit Fund leadership strong-
ly supported the idea of an arts council, many still felt
their primary aim was operating support for the member
groups. This was a natural and reasonable attitude, es-
PECially for those board members who represented particular agencies. In order for the Spirit Fund to carry on, to provide any base of support for the proposed arts council, it was necessary that the Spirit Fund succeed in its existing fundraising. Otherwise it would have been only a lobbying group for an idea, for a lot of possibilities. The strain was between immediate and long-term solutions.

These were strong arguments against the as yet unborn Arts and Education Council. For the idea to have prevailed, there must obviously have been points in its favor. All could agree that it would be wise to consolidate some of the myriad worthy appeals, and stop the syndrome whereby the same people constantly asked each other for money. There was an increasingly dominant mood of civic responsibility among St. Louis business leaders. This feeling that it was not only necessary, but imperative to support anything that was deemed good for the City had become a pervasive and powerful force in St. Louis. Once an effort had been so labeled, support for that effort was forthcoming. An arts council was not immediately deemed good and necessary; but because a few farsighted individuals with community-wide stature recognized the value of the concept and were consistently generous and active in their own backing, the level and breadth of support steadily grew.

Whatever may have been the reservations of the larger agencies about joining together, the truth was that they were not making ends meet on their own. This was especially true of the Symphony whose string of fundraising events was becoming a source of irritation. What was worse, the various balls and benefits failed to raise the money needed.
Missouri Botanical Garden: Known as Shaw's Garden after its founder, it is one of the world's seven major botanical institutions and has, in addition to plants and the Climatron, half a million visitors each year.
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Mark’s position and that of the other supporters of an arts council was clear. He and they, working from the small and insecure power base of the Spirit Fund, had to convince both the sources of support and the City’s cultural and educational agencies that the era of Medici-style patronage was over. The time of corporate and community responsibility for the welfare of the City’s assets was at hand.

In April of 1961, only a few days after arriving, Mark made a speech to the annual meeting of the Adult Education Council; it was only the first of many such presentations, each designed to explain an arts council. An arts council: "... is a service agency, a trade association for cultural groups; ... it looks after the welfare of the arts in the community ...; it is a management consultant service ... and a highly skilled promotional instrument ... a forum to work out problems; it is a practical idea by which the artists learn to understand the realities of doing business and the community learns to appreciate the artist ...; it is a method of dealing with the practical problems of the arts ... councils do what the community asks of them, but in every case, even in the least successful communities, an arts council has saved money, saved manpower, and brought more enjoyment of the arts to more people."

These basic themes were reiterated again and again before groups both powerful and interested and sometimes to groups that were neither. In September of 1961 after Mark’s appearance before Civic Progress at which he proposed a new arts council corporation to supersede the Spirit Fund, Civic Progress appointed a committee to study the desirability of the proposition. The names of the men on the committee were familiar in St. Louis’
cultural life. The chairman, Howard Baer, had long been prominent in garnering support for the St. Louis Zoo and other important institutions. He was joined by Morton D. May, J. W. McAfee, Kenton R. Cravens, and Edgar Monsanto Queeny. In addition, two nonvoting members of Civic Progress served on the committee, the Very Rev. Paul C. Reinert, S. J., chancellor of St. Louis University, and Ethan A. H. Shepley, then chancellor of Washington University. Their findings, reported in late November of 1961, may only have served to document the obvious. They did nonetheless reveal the plight of St. Louis' cultural groups and the skimpy support tendered by St. Louis corporations.

The committee selected five organizations for detailed analysis of their fundraising: St. Louis Symphony, KETC Educational Television, Missouri Botanical Garden, Civic Opera Association, and the Spirit Fund (which then included six agencies). (The first three listed and three of the six Spirit Fund agencies are now members of the Arts and Education Council.) The committee found that, altogether, these groups raised $219,886 from businesses and $232,139 from individual donors, for a total of $452,025.

The ninety-six largest corporations in St. Louis contributed $137,922, amounting to 63 per cent of the $219,886 raised as business contributions. The gifts of the ninety-six corporations in support of these cultural agencies were compared with the same corporations' support of the United Fund in St. Louis. The report showed:

a. The ninety-six corporations are equally important sources of income for the United Fund and the five cultural organizations. They account for
29.8 per cent of the total amount raised for each group.

b. In contributing to the five cultural agencies, the ninety-six corporations averaged 5.516 per cent of their United Fund contribution.

c. However, there was no set pattern of corporate giving to the cultural organizations. For example, seventeen of the ninety-six did not contribute to any of the five while another seventeen gave them 10 per cent or more of their United Fund gift. None of the ninety-six corporations contributed to each of the five cultural organizations. The larger number of corporations, fifty-four, gave to two of the five.

d. The Symphony received contributions from sixty-three of the ninety-six largest corporations. Next came the Spirit of St. Louis Fund (fifty-four gifts from the ninety-six); KETC (thirty-eight); Missouri Botanical Garden (seventeen); and Civic Opera Association (seven).

From these and other analyses, the committee drew three basic conclusions. They felt that too few individual donors were contributing to support the arts; according to their calculations, proportionally fewer St. Louisans were contributing to the arts than were residents of any of those cities which had united cultural funds. Second, "most smaller corporations of St. Louis and some of the ninety-six largest were not carrying a proportionate share of the cost of cultural support—if proportionate was defined as 5.516 per cent of a company's United Fund contribution, the percentage that was the average for the ninety-six largest corporations." And third, the commit-
tee found that an unwholesome sense of competition was developing among St. Louis cultural agencies seeking support. This latter problem was complicated by inefficient management or other internal problems within the agencies.

Just as the committee’s findings were simple and straightforward, so were their recommendations. They felt that Civic Progress should give its full support to the creation of a united cultural fund fashioned on the order of the United Fund and involving the highest calibre of civic leadership. A new corporation should be formed to begin its solicitation in the spring (to avoid conflict with the United Fund’s annual autumn campaign) of 1963. Because the report was given in November 1961, it was felt that a spring campaign for 1962 would allow too little time for organizing among the potential member agencies and for preparing a presentation to the public. The report specifically recognized that a year’s delay was “a serious problem to at least one of the potential member agencies, the Spirit Fund.” It was therefore recommended that Civic Progress assume the task of providing a civic leader to head the 1962 Spirit Fund campaign.

The tone of the report strongly implied that the major portion of increased support should come not from the larger St. Louis corporations, but from a greater appeal to the community at large and to smaller corporations. In discussing the quality of staff and volunteer leadership needed, the report stated that an able board, chairman, and staff were necessary to “put on the vigorous and imaginative selling effort required to broaden the base of individual and corporate giving for cultural purposes. Unless the base is substantially broadened,
this new approach will have been a waste of time and effort." In effect, the appropriateness of a company's cultural giving being equal to 5.516 per cent of its United Fund gift was never questioned. Events were later to prove this percentage was far too small but the formula itself was a significant precedent. Equally it was more difficult than imagined to increase the number of gifts beyond the estimated total of 8000 to 9000 personal and corporate contributions to the separate campaigns in 1961.

Besides the Civic Progress members who had taken part in the committee's work, three other people were involved in supplying information and assistance to the committee. Charles Mark was one and Harry Wilson, a member of a St. Louis public relations firm who acted as the secretary for Civic Progress, was another. The third person was Robert Brookings Smith.

Smith is the scion of a prominent St. Louis family. At the time the committee met, he was serving as president of the Missouri Botanical Garden. Under his leadership the remarkable Climatron, designed by Buckminster Fuller, was built and proved an immediate financial success. Smith nurtured yet another idea to benefit the Garden and the City. He wanted the Garden to be the site of a new cultural center, which among other things, would provide a permanent home for the Symphony. The plan was a way of giving St. Louis physical facilities which it lacked and the Garden a source of income, making it largely self-supporting. Thus, Smith was not presenting himself to Civic Progress as a disinterested party, but seeking to gain support for a specific plan. Indeed, at that time, he already had promises of financial support for a center.
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Most of the money was conditional on some sort of evidence that a center there was preferable to one in another location. The site could not be taken for granted as the Garden is located neither downtown nor on a main axis of a generally east-west oriented city.

The Civic Progress report included a relatively lengthy recommendation that the proposed joint fund-raising body tie its planning as closely as possible to Smith's proposal. It emphasized, nonetheless, that fund-raising efforts should be limited to operating funds, not raising money for capital expenditures. Basically the report's recommendations included support for Smith's tangible suggestions for a cultural center and recommended methods of implementation for Mark's proposals for an arts council. It seemed logical that things could move ahead as planned, neatly and with a minimum of difficulty.

Meanwhile, the second and third campaigns moved ploddingly forward. The 1960 campaign success and the salutary publicity received by the Spirit Fund had resulted in a number of applications for membership. Two agencies were accepted to join with the original four. The Community Music School made a welcome addition—well-established in the community, it had a loyal following, and presented an admirable program economically. The Mark Twain Summer Institute, established originally under foundation grants, had a soundly administered program providing courses ordinarily unavailable in area high schools, such as Chinese and advanced calculus.

Even with the additional members and the incipient development of the Spirit Fund into a seventh agency which had to be supported, the goal for 1961 was set at
only $175,000, just $50,000 more than the preceding year. In terms of what the Spirit Fund hoped to accomplish the figure was moderate; in terms of the Fund’s power of appeal, the figure was perhaps overambitious. It was difficult also to return to contributors the second year with nothing more tangible to show by way of a federation of all the arts and education than the inclusion and consequent financial burden of Mark Twain Summer Institute and the Community Music School.

For many reasons, as the end of the year came inexorably closer, things looked gloomier for the Spirit Fund. A “supplemental campaign” begun in August was of little avail. Despite the uneasy self-assurances the Spirit Fund board occasionally indulged in, the day came in early October when Mark had to announce to each of the agency directors that allocations would amount to only 80 per cent of the approved amount. Planning had assumed a base of the previous year’s $120,000. In truth, only about $95,000 of the 1960 pledges were paid. This meant that in 1961, even after raising $23,000 in new contributions, the net was lower than what had been claimed in 1960.

Various ways were devised for dealing with the disheartening fact that only $118,000 of the hoped-for $175,000 was raised. $10,500 remained from the previous year’s reserves; $4000 had been returned by the International Institute as budget surplus; the administrative account was reduced by $6000. The fiscal years of all the agencies were brought into alignment with a closing date of June 30, 1962. The varying budget schedules had always been a problem in establishing financial procedures, but the overwhelming advantage of making the switch at this time was that most agencies would have
to operate for only nine months on this decreased allotment. Because such schedule readjustments could be used only once, it was essential for survival to put faith in the 1962 campaign and work to insure that faith was merited.

During the previous September the Spirit Fund had proposed that all its member agencies undertake a critical self-evaluation program. Louis Schaefer, a dynamic St. Louis executive who had been elected president of the Spirit Fund in February of that year, captured the mood of those days in his message requesting the evaluation: “In short what we are trying to do is be prepared when a potential contributor asks: Why should I continue to support, or begin to support these agencies? What have they done that is so important that I should give them a share of my contribution budget? I realize what we are asking is extremely difficult, especially in the light of the curtailed budgets. However, the hard facts are that unless we can give evidence of a vigorous new enthusiasm in member agencies, we will be in an even worse financial position next year.” Schaefer was an ardent and eager supporter of the Spirit Fund ("the unsung hero" in one board member’s estimation), but he was also a businessman who realized that even a top quality product had to have more than general “goodness” to make it sell.

The self-evaluation was the first of four events in 1961 that gave the Spirit Fund an air of expectancy and hopefulness. The second was the admission of two new member agencies, the St. Louis String Ensemble and Young Audiences. The aim of the Ensemble was to develop interest in stringed instruments and subsequently to create a large reservoir of young players. Young Audiences also sought to stimulate the musical interests of
young people. They did so by presenting various types of ensembles to metropolitan area school children, accompanying the presentation with informal discussions, demonstrations, and audience participation. These two new members could reasonably be expected to add strength to the appeal. Also, perhaps not voiced, was the thought that if new members were eager for admission, it must be more difficult to survive outside than inside the Spirit Fund. A third source of encouragement was the awareness of the shortcomings of the 1961 campaign. Because people recognized and admitted failure they were all the more eager that the 1962 campaign succeed. By late autumn the campaign was being devised, this time in better arranged divisions. For instance, a Women’s Division was set up to be headed by Mrs. May and Miss Adelaide Cherbonnier, then Junior League president and a long-time supporter of the idea of united cultural fund-raising. Finally, a concerted effort was being made to extend the publicity potential of the Spirit Fund. A great boon to that effort was the aid of Batz-Hodgson-Neuwoehner, a St. Louis advertising agency, which agreed to take on the Spirit Fund account without charge as a public service. All of these things served to bolster the self-image of the Spirit Fund. Probably none gave so much encouragement though as the reported interest taken by Civic Progress. Most people concerned with the Spirit Fund realized that interest was essential.

The Spirit Fund had entered into a self-evaluation as had the other agencies. Their report took the form of unattributed quotations made in answer to broad questions and revealed basic underlying problems which would not easily disappear.

"I didn’t know the men I was soliciting, and the
men didn’t know the Spirit of St. Louis Fund.”
“The medium-sized corporations ignored us completely.”
“This is just a duplicate of other fundraising campaigns.”

Question: “Do you think you could go back to your accounts next year and get an increase?”
Answer: “No.” (unanimous)
Q: “The same amount as last year?”
A: “Not likely.” “Perhaps.”
Q: “Would you be willing to work next year for the same agencies?”
A: “No.” “I’d prefer not.” “I can’t sell this package.”

Q: “Of the gifts we did receive this year, why do you think the gift was made?”
A: (a unanimous statement agreed on by all present) “Firms gave because the president couldn’t refuse the solicitor because of past favors. Individuals gave for the same reason or they had faith in the future of the idea. Very few people in the large gift category gave out of belief in the agencies. It was all mutual back-scratching.”

“The majority of my prospects weren’t interested in these agencies. Some had never heard of them.”
“This is a cultural fund without cultural agencies.”
“People will not give until more agencies are in and more service comes out of the ones that are.”
“My prospects and workers kept asking why Culture can’t pay its own way.”
“It’s a tremendous job to sell the average man on Culture, even though I know that all the men I solicited were above average in income and education.”
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Obviously the Spirit Fund was on unsteady ground. It was to get little succor from outside for its internal problems. Most discouraging was the Civic Progress reaction to its own committee report: it was simply tabled. Even when accepted a month later, there was no immediate action. None seemed in the offing.

A crisis was brewing. Whether the committee report was accepted or not, acted upon or not, the statement it contained that merely existing through 1962 was a “serious problem to...the Spirit Fund” was a truth. The members of the committee especially were in an awkward position. If they gave aid to the Spirit Fund, bypassing their fellow Civic Progress members, they risked antagonizing the very people whose support would be vital to a new cultural fund. Yet it was the Spirit Fund people who had been doing all the work toward an arts council. Deserting them now would mean starting at the beginning to organize a nucleus of arts council advocates.

A compromise was reached. As with most compromises, it completely satisfied no one, but did serve to calm troubled waters. Civic Progress Committee intervention provided a 1962 Spirit Fund campaign chairman. Unfortunately, this gesture was not entirely effective, partly because the appointment was made at the last moment before the campaign started and partly because the chairman was not himself a member of Civic Progress.

By June Charles Mark and others began to despair over the possibility of Civic Progress-initiated action. By then the basic trend of an unsuccessful campaign, already established, added to the despair. The Spirit Fund was to fall far short of its $175,000 goal, an amount set only by working severe budgetary cuts for the now enlarged
group of eight member agencies. The final tally showed 2693 gifts, amounting to $135,148. Of this total, 350 corporations supplied $64,244. The largest single gift from any source was $2500. Corporate leaders had not rallied behind the Spirit Fund; thus they failed to demonstrate any conviction that the Spirit Fund was the proper device for achieving unity. This made the job of transition that much more difficult, that much more unlikely.

It was at this juncture that Mark wrote to Robert Brookings Smith, by then a member of the Spirit Fund board of directors, asking if the Spirit Fund and the city did not really need “a very broad and comprehensive study of all the cultural resources and needs for St. Louis.” Smith agreed that a thoroughgoing review was the proper tack to take. Within a short time he had tapped resources to finance the study. The management consultant firm of Booz, Allen and Hamilton was retained. At a cost of about $40,000, their study was to cover past, present, and future, the finances and development of all cultural institutions and programs, and the numerous possibilities of establishing a cultural center.

In order to oversee the work of Booz, Allen and Hamilton, a committee was put together under the aegis of Civic Progress. Smith was appointed chairman of the group, officially titled “The Greater St. Louis Arts Survey Committee of Civic Progress, Inc.” Included were not only the members of the original Civic Progress Committee and other members of Civic Progress, but also people who had been active with the Spirit Fund, a great number of people involved with one or more potential member organizations such as the Symphony and the Botanical Garden, augmented by a few of the “generally interested.” The group was large, but it effectively brought
together many people concerned with the cultural climate of the City.

The scope of the study was monumental. It involved interviews with 250 people. Dozens of Junior League volunteers trooped out to help 130 art organizations, large and small, complete forty-page long questionnaires. Another ninety questionnaires were answered by arts councils, symphonies, theatres, etc., across the country. Information gathering took hundreds of man hours in the nine-month period from July 1962 through March 1963. The results of all this effort were embodied in a 323-page tome with a set of five subdivided appendices.

For all its documentary length, the recommendations of the survey can be distilled to three simple points. St. Louis needed first, a strong arts council to give cohesion to the efforts of arts organizations in the metropolitan area; second, a united fundraising effort to provide maintenance income for major cultural institutions; and third, an arts center. This was to serve as an effective setting for performances, reduce the expense of housing individual organizations by sharing facilities, and serve as an audience attraction in itself.

The study was encompassing and, at the time, was the largest such undertaking ever completed in the country. Yet the eventual formation of the Arts and Education Council owed more to the precedents established by the Spirit Fund than to the findings of the survey. A Council was established, a Fund was instituted. But both took form more around the immediate needs and exigencies of member organizations than around the extremely detailed and inclusive structural chart and operating formulas set forth in the “Greater St. Louis Arts Survey.” Two specific examples will illustrate this
point. First, as the survey was progressing toward completion, several people vigorously expressed concern that the proposed council was entirely “art” oriented and did nothing to include “education.” Booz, Allen and Hamilton replied with the express recommendation that a separate education council should be formed, although it would be possible for the two councils to conduct jointly a fund campaign. This simply did not happen: instead an arts and education council and arts and education fund were formed. Second, Booz, Allen and Hamilton also stated “... we feel that the fundraising organization and activity should be a subordinate activity of the councils and neither in graphics nor in philosophical approach should be looked on as the parent organization or activity of the two councils.” Yet, rightly or wrongly, from the inception of the Spirit Fund through the present, the fundraising activity has been the dominant factor in the life of the Arts and Education Council.

By far the greatest usefulness of the survey was in bringing together many people and asking them to center their varied, and sometimes amorphous, concerns around a focal point: unifying the cultural and educational resources to an extent where those organizations could make a greater impact on the City. It was concern, conviction, and effort that led to the establishment of the Arts and Education Council, not the recommendations of a survey.

There had not (and still has not) been in St. Louis a commensurate demand for a cultural center. The Spirit Fund through its three-year history had devoted some time to exploring ideas and actual locations that would put some of their member agencies together in a shared facility. Nothing ever came of those efforts. The survey
recommended that several locations for a cultural center should have precedence over the proposed Missouri Botanical Garden site. This meant that the funds Smith had been promised, conditional on the Garden’s being the selected location, could not be collected. There was no other staunch cultural center advocate. Any enthusiasm for one has waned since the renovation of Powell Symphony Hall and the erection of the Loretto-Hilton Center. There is still not a “cultural center” as such in St. Louis.

In its cooperation with the survey the Spirit Fund put its faith in Robert Brookings Smith and his Civic Progress-based committee; it would accept and abide by the actions of that group. But in many St. Louisans there was a mood of hesitancy. It seemed impossible to organize anything on such a grand scale in the short time before the generally agreed upon March or April starting date for the campaign. It was the devil and the deep blue sea. Organize a campaign now and run the risk of failure, or wait and perhaps lose the commitments gained, as dissension multiplied and enthusiasm waned. The former concern dominated. Practical wisdom dictated now or never, and a council was born at last.

Members of the Greater St. Louis Arts Survey Committee were greeted in the first week of January 1963 with a three-page letter from Smith. He indicated that the Spirit Fund agencies could not exist another year either separately or together, that Civic Progress firmly supported a 1963 campaign, but only if major agencies agreed to take part, and that the Symphony would start its own maintenance drive within a week if the united effort were not immediately begun. Smith continued that the press of time required him to present a course of action for consideration without the formal machinery
of committees and voting. The formation of a campaign would be undertaken immediately with Morton D. May as 1963 chairman and volunteers recruited through various potential member agencies. A council would be set up on the general format suggested by Booz, Allen and Hamilton. The first committees instituted would screen applicant organizations to determine who was to benefit from the campaign and review budgetary requests. An overall meeting of the Survey Committee was held in late January to approve articles of incorporation and by-laws, and to elect officers and directors. Agreement was that the plan Smith had outlined was the reasonable course of action. With two exceptions—discussion of whether or not to include education and continued debate on a cultural center site—events proceeded as planned. Smith was named chairman of an organizing committee to set up the council.

By February 11 1963, the Arts and Education Council was incorporated, among other things, to operate the Arts and Education Fund. The specific signers of the charter are of interest only to St. Louisans; what is interesting is that the names were almost equally balanced between those persons who had been active in the Spirit Fund and those with ties to Civic Progress. It would be unfair to say that a reconciliation had taken place—there had been no warfare—rather, there was a meeting of minds, a consensus, on approaching a St. Louis problem. The Spirit Fund was not carried over as a body, but neither was it totally supplanted. Mrs. Newman, for instance, was named chairman of the new Council’s Admission and Evaluation Committee; Charles Mark was immediately named acting executive director; and the Spirit Fund staff became the staff of the Arts and Education Council.
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One of the organizational recommendations of the Booz, Allen and Hamilton survey incorporated into the bylaws was that the Council would both conduct the annual Arts and Education Fund campaign and be a beneficiary of the proceeds of the Fund. The Council would, in turn, be a federation of cultural and educational groups. There would be various types of memberships in the Council. These are:

**Fund Member**: an organization exempt from paying federal taxes, and receiving annual operating support from the Arts and Education Fund; qualified to receive other funds from money-making projects of the Council; eligible for any of the services of the Council.

**Regular Member**: an organization exempt from paying federal taxes; *eligible* to receive money from the Council, either from the Fund if approved by the budget committee or from any other money-making activity undertaken by the Council; is eligible for other services of the Council.

**Associate Member**: an organization *not* exempt from paying federal taxes, not eligible to receive money from the Council, but allowed certain of the Council’s services (e.g. listing in the monthly calendar of events).

These membership distinctions insured among other things that the Council would not lose its own tax-exemption by attempting to raise funds for nonexempt organizations. Secondly, since the Council would have no individual or personal memberships, as other organizations and some other arts councils do, there would be no “friends” group whose interests might conflict with the Fund. Nor would the Council have any way to raise
funds for its own operation other than receiving a portion of the Arts and Education Fund.

In February also, the dissolution of the Spirit Fund began. There was little left to do except to tidy accounts and get finances straight between the member agencies. All Spirit Fund agencies were to apply for admission to the Arts and Education Council in the same way as any other organization. For some this proved disastrous. The International Institute was denied admission on the grounds that it fit neither the definition of a cultural ("the enlightenment or refinement of taste acquired by intellectual and aesthetic training") or an educational group ("an agency offering a formal and accredited program of instruction as its sole purpose, or an agency recognized by accredited educational institutions as a purposeful and important educational endeavor . . ."). The People’s Art Center had the singularly poor fortune to be caught up at this time in complex and debilitating internal strife. Shortly thereafter it closed its doors and only ill will was left of a worthwhile institution.

The following chart will show the difference in composition between the Spirit Fund and the newly formed Council:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spirit of St. Louis Fund Members</th>
<th>Arts and Education Fund Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education Council (UF)</td>
<td>Adult Education Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(original)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Institute (UF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(original)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Film Association (UF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(original)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s Art Center (UF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(original)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Music School (UF)</td>
<td>Community Music School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1961)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Of the eight Spirit Fund members, four are today beneficiaries of the Arts and Education Fund and two are non-Fund members of the Council. The International Institute has been readmitted to the United Fund; and the Volunteer Film Association was reformed as Talking Tapes for the Blind. The St. Louis String Ensemble was deemed not to have a metropolitanwide impact and was denied Fund support by the Council on that basis. It has been a regular member since the formation of the Council, however. Totally new members were the St. Louis Symphony, Missouri Botanical Garden, KETC, the Museum of Science and Natural History, and the Little Symphony. They had two attributes in common. Each was in the market annually for operating funds. Each recognized in even the cautious blessing which Civil Progress had given to the Council a warning signal about what might happen to those who stood outside. The fact that Civic Progress, which represented the most formidable coalition of potential donors, had lent its name to the survey indicated that the business community would not be indifferent to the success of the Fund.

Not without difficulty the first campaign was organized and a sizeable goal was set: $731,253. This amount, obviously a gigantic increase over any of the
Spirit Fund goals, was determined at least partly to re-assure members that joining had been worthwhile. The need to keep the amount at a reasonably attainable level was small check on pressures of a high goal. The new Fund’s members were asked to present statements including dollar amounts of, and numbers of contributors to, their own previous fundraising ventures. It was hoped that a compilation of these would give a rough idea of the first-year potential. However, most of the statements included overestimates of what was piously hoped might have been raised rather than figures for amounts actually received. This occurred not from any intent to deceive, but because the records of the nine agencies were often in a muddle. For instance, all too often contributors’ cards were out of date, and when added together only increased the bulk of the “potential contributors,” but did not reflect active current interest, and thus gave an inflated impression of the Fund’s first-year potential. Nonetheless, the financial need of neglected agencies was great.

A look at some percentages will illustrate the effect these factors had. The nine agencies reported a cumulative total of $460,389 raised in 1962. Thus, the first Arts and Education Fund goal was a 58 per cent increase over that amount. $134,359 (18 per cent of the goal) was for the cost of establishing and operating the Council, conducting the Fund campaign, and allowing reserves for uncollectable pledges and contingencies, all expenses that were occurring for the first time.

Allocations were approved for the agencies to receive collectively 29 per cent more than they had raised in 1962. Some had past debts to meet in the 1963-64 fiscal year; some simply required increases over their 1962
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budgets. Specifically, the Fund was asked to absorb an extra half year’s budget for KETC because of timing complications with their fiscal year. Moreover, Symphony musicians’ demands for a longer season and higher salaries had already been agreed upon and had to be paid for.

From incorporation to campaign beginning was less than four months. Time was indeed dear for simultaneously organizing an agency and making prearrangements for the actual campaign. There were issues large and small yet to be resolved. Despite the shortage of time, two basic necessities, putting together a campaign team and preparing printed materials were attended to.

In April 1963, under the chairmanship of Morton D. May, the first Arts and Education Fund campaign began. It was a campaign that was to last through the remainder of 1963, and was to raise $560,000, falling $170,000 short of its goal, but providing the member agencies with $100,000 more than their previous separate campaigns. Despite the considerable efforts that had gone into the establishment of the Council and Fund, assured continuing success was a long way in the future.

A strict chronological recounting of the ups and downs, successes and failures, after these early beginnings would likely be of interest to only a limited number of people. Indeed what is outstanding about most St. Louisans who have contributed to the development of the Arts and Education Council is their lack of concern with the past and their consuming interest in the present and future.
CHAPTER 3

WHO RUNS THE COUNCIL

"The representative owes you, not his industry only but his judgment, and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion. You choose a member, but when you have chosen him, he is not a member of Bristol, but he is a member of Parliament."

—EDMUND BURKE to the electors of Bristol

"I am convinced that the secret to whatever we have achieved is our recognition that the united approach to these community needs, problems and opportunities offers the best chance of success. The united approach worked in rebuilding downtown St. Louis, it has worked in health and welfare with the United Fund, and it is working through the Arts and Education Fund. We have shown that the united way is the distinctively St. Louis way to get things done."

—C. POWELL WHITEHEAD accepting the 1968 St. Louis Globe-Democrat "Man of the Year"

THE BOOZ, ALLEN AND HAMILTON SURVEY undertaken just prior to, and during, the first weeks of the Council's formation, was an opportunity to involve many people in a common concern for the city's cultural well-being. Booz, Allen and Hamilton, charged with gathering information from all St. Louis' cultural organizations and making recommendations based on that information, quite naturally responded to the sheer numbers of small groups
throughout the City, particularly so because they saw gaining widespread support for the emerging Council as a basic need. People in the arts tend not to band together in associations to protect their interests as even competitive businesses often do. Once below a thin layer of professionally managed organizations, leaders of cultural groups are almost invariably also participants, whether as actors, singers, musicians, or craftsmen. Artists of whatever vein are often jealous of time to pursue their own medium and quite reasonably unwilling to forego some of that limited time for a Chamber of Commerce-like activity. Yet a management consultant firm might quickly recognize the benefits of a comprehensive union of all artists, while disregarding the enormous difficulties in sustaining that union.

Such a federation was prominent in the Survey’s recommendations. Indeed, it was to be this loose union around which all the Council’s activities revolved, including the Fund campaign. The blueprint was for something like a town meeting modified to include only the arts and giving nodding recognition to its urban context. The Greater St. Louis Arts Survey prescribed two focuses of power within the Council, a General Assembly (to include one delegate from each member organization) and a Board of Directors. Among the proposed functions of the General Assembly were the nomination and election of members of the Board of Directors and its officers, the establishment of objectives and functions for the Council, and the right to review reports of the officers and committee chairmen. The General Assembly was to meet semiannually, the Board, quarterly, and an Executive Committee of the Board, biweekly.

Today the Council is still organized as a federation,
John D. Rockefeller 3rd: "Few cities in the United States share your reputation for accomplishment in the visual and performing arts or enjoy the cultural leadership which characterizes St. Louis. There is unusual understanding here of the importance of the arts to the individual and to the quality of life of a city. The Arts and Education Council is unsurpassed in the country in terms of diversity and vitality."—To the General Assembly of the Arts and Education Council, 1969.
but in name only, having developed in directions other than the Survey writers planned. It was apparent from the time of the first meeting of the General Assembly that a body made up of representatives of over fifty disparate organizations ("all member organizations should be entitled to one vote, regardless of size or audience appeal") was not suited to provide leadership to an undertaking of this magnitude. The Board of Directors, in contrast, developed remarkable cohesion. This was reasonable enough. The newly formed Board of Directors was made up primarily of members of Civic Progress and people who had worked with the Spirit of St. Louis Fund. The first group was primarily interested in getting a job done, putting the Symphony securely on its feet, and developing a business channel for support of cultural institutions. The latter group had devoted years of unselfish effort to putting an arts council in operation, most of the time with little help from any other quarter. They were not about to see that effort lost through a myriad of demands to fill parochial interests.

Indeed, for a period of three years the General Assembly did not meet at all and predictably, the Board of Directors filled the vacuum. In due course amendments were made to the bylaws regularizing the de facto changes. (See Appendix B for a copy of the current bylaws.) With meetings reinstituted in the spring of 1966, the Assembly has since met annually to hear a brief report on the progress of the Council and to ratify formally nominations presented by the Nominating Committee for elections to the Board of Directors. The Nominating Committee itself has changed to become a standing committee of the Board rather than of the General Assembly. The annual meeting is now composed of such pleasan-
tries as a dinner, presentations to the year’s Fund Chair-
men, and speeches by leaders in the arts, recently Jennie
Lee, M. P., Great Britain’s minister responsible for the
arts, and John D. Rockefeller 3rd.

Now the General Assembly meeting is an enjoyable
occasion for the arts and education in St. Louis, provid-
ing a sense of community and a wider picture of the arts
in the city and the world. It is unlikely that the General
Assembly could ever have worked in the way suggested
by the Survey even had it been given further opportunity.
The Assembly would, by today’s count, include ninety-
five member organizations varying in size from a large
university with a multimillion dollar budget to a com-
unity chamber ensemble operating with no budget at
all. The type of business leader who had to be involved if
the Fund were to succeed was most unlikely to agree to
serve an organization with direction potentially so vol-
atile and uncertain. The principle that the Council should
be led by delegates of its own constituents was at any
event a mistake. If the Council is to represent an objec-
tive community interest in the arts and education, it can
scarcely be given ultimate direction by delegates of
member organizations concerned with special and di-
verse interests.

The Board of Directors has come closer to repre-
senting this community interest. Five places on the Board
are held by representatives, typically the presidents, of
the five agencies which receive the largest allocations
from the Arts and Education Fund. The only other ex
officio memberships are filled by the co-chairmen of the
Fund campaign, the chairman of CAMELOT and the
head of the CAMELOT men’s board, for the years in
which they hold their respective positions. While other
directors may occasionally also serve on the boards of one or more member organizations, it is almost always the case that their principal identification is with the Arts and Education Council.

The Board is not constituted with any eye toward balancing all representative elements of the community, as prescribed for example, in Ralph Burgard's *Arts in the City*. Representatives of organized labor and the City and County governments are not present for reasons discussed in Chapters 7 and 8. It is a Board dominated by the business sector with twenty-two of the forty-three positions held by businessmen and five of the six officers being from business or the professions. Most of the businessmen are chief executive officers of their companies or have recently retired from that position. Similarly, the members from the professions are without exception senior partners in their firms. It is true in St. Louis, as elsewhere, that prospective board members are most eager to serve with a group whom they consider to be peers.

Nonworking women make up the next largest identifiable group, with eight members. These women have an abiding interest in the arts and education, a quality which distinguishes them from some male colleagues. Most of the men who serve do so as a matter of community responsibility rather than from involvement with the arts or a specific member agency. The women are in some instances also leaders of St. Louis' society, but this is scarcely a primary characteristic. Community power and influence, rather than social connections, have always been the strongest considerations of the Nominating Committee. The Board is rounded out by, among others, a newspaper publisher, the chief executive of a
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radio station, three college or university presidents, the president of a foundation, and one State official. Virtually without conscious effort, a balance of Catholics, Jews, and Protestants has been achieved. With only minor exceptions, the Board could be translated into the governing body of a university, hospital, or chamber of commerce. A shortcoming of the Board has been the failure to involve its black members more actively in the affairs of the Council.

In 1967 changes were made in the bylaws of the Council to allow an expansion from the originally designated size of the Board. Accordingly, the Board may now have any number of directors, over a required minimum of twenty-six. Quorum considerations dictate that the Board must not become unwieldy. Expansion was undertaken in order to add strength, with the needs of the Fund drive very much in mind. As a result of the enlargement, it became impossible for all decision-making at the Council to be carried out solely in Board meetings. Consequently a sturdy committee structure has developed. Problems are now discussed and recommendations prepared largely in committee. Reports are then made to the full Board, seeking approval for courses of action which have already been given detailed consideration above the staff level. There are six committees: Executive, Nominating, Admissions, Budget, Arts Development, and Planning. The functions of the Executive, Nominating, and Admissions Committees are self-explanatory. Those of the Budget Committee are described in Chapter 4, those of the Arts Development Committee, in Chapter 5. The most recent addition, the Planning Committee, was not created until the fall of 1969. It is charged with the supervision and direction of Council activities other
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than the Fund campaign and the CAMELOT auction, and with establishing priorities among such activities. The Council had undertaken additional activities, brought about almost entirely at a staff level, in its service to the general community. And as it became clear that not only were considerable sums of money involved in this expansion, but also that the programs had potential for serious communitywide impact, the Planning Committee was formed to analyze the Council’s role in the community’s future.

The effect of this overall, lively, committee structure has been to make the quarterly Board meetings relatively cut-and-dried affairs, where open and frank discussion more commonly elicits information than affects decisions. Few substantive changes are made in committee recommendations. Opinions expressed at Board meetings nonetheless have an effect, providing guidance to committees in future discussions. Committee chairmen have been noticeably sensitive to expressions of dissent from within the Board as a whole. One danger arising from a large board is that skills and energies of individual members may go unused, with the result that busy people feel they are not really needed. Such feelings in turn lead to disenchantment or lack of interest. This danger is particularly acute when an organization is served by a strong staff. Frequent consultation with individual board members, the involvement of as many as possible in the work of the committees, offer partial safeguards. Currently two out of three Arts and Education Council Board members have at least one committee assignment.

As with any organization seeking to get a job done, there is a tendency at the Council to weigh, rather than to count, votes. The chairman of the board, the president,
Miss Jennie Lee, M.P.: "Civilization has always been borne on the backs of a minority. Our hope and endeavor is substantially to increase that minority; indeed one day to turn it into a majority." — To the General Assembly of the Arts and Education Council, 1967.
the committee chairmen, past and present Fund chairmen and certain Board members of long standing are the key power group. If anyone were to be said to run the Council, it would be these directors rather than one committee or any one or two men. Curiously, the voices of the ex officio members from the Fund agencies have been less significant, perhaps because their special interests are so readily identifiable.

From the early stages, there has been an underlying tension within the Board between those who see the Council as an organization to sustain the Fund agencies and those who believe the Council’s commitment is to a wider community. Until the campaign achieved some measure of stability, the Fund interest clearly prevailed. More than anything else, it was the successful application for Title III funds used to establish the Metropolitan Educational Center in the Arts (Chapter 5) that legitimized the broader view of the Council’s role. The watershed in this debate came after the first CAMELOT auction. As a result of the auction, considerable uncommitted money became available outside the Arts and Education Fund. One viewpoint held that the logical use of this money was in closing the gap between the stated needs of the ten Fund agencies and the amount raised by the Fund. It was argued that it would be unwise to take on new financial burdens until the Council had met its prior commitments. The opposing argument emphasized the strong possibility of criticism from non-Fund members for the Council’s providing financial support over the years to only the same ten organizations. The criticism was difficult to answer because so many art forms— theatre, opera, dance, the plastic arts, and literature—were not represented in the Fund. If the Council restrict-
WHO RUNS THE COUNCIL

ed its support to ten organizations alone, it could hardly justify its title as the Arts and Education Council of Greater St. Louis. The decision to allocate one half of the funds from the 1968 CAMELOT auction to non-Fund member organizations represented a commitment, difficult to reverse, to the broader needs of the community. In so committing the Council, the Board demonstrated a serious intention of fostering a wide range of cultural offerings. The alternative would have meant stunted growth and a development tied solely to the status quo.

In the field of health and welfare in St. Louis, the same dilemma has been answered by delegating the two functions to separate organizations. The United Fund is responsible for fundraising; the Health and Welfare Council concentrates on the provision of services, research, and evaluation. While there are links between the two, the division is clear-cut. A parallel with health and welfare is not quite exact for arts and education because of the difference in scale. The combination of the fostering and maintaining functions within one organization, the Arts and Education Council, is probably healthy. A separation would result in the Fund's interests emerging as the stronger, with a tendency for the Fund to protect its own and to resist additions of new members or the disaffiliation of existing members. The history of the Council and Fund suggest that likelihood.

Change, which must eventually come, is more likely if forces demanding it are within the Council rather than heard from a weaker organization outside. While its Board gives the impression of representing the Establishment in St. Louis, the Council has not been a force concerned only with the maintenance of the status quo.
Through its arts development grants, it has given more than token support to organizations of limited power and less than widespread appeal. The favorable outcome of its programs of educational support might, in some cases, revolutionize school procedures. Some inner city grants have helped organizations concerned with using the arts for social change. Support has not yet become a matter of public debate but the Board has clearly recognized the implications of its actions.

The general community view of the Council is most affected by the outcome of the Fund campaigns and of the CAMELOT auctions. Apart from these, the activities of the organization are hardly dramatic. Substantial programs for which the Council has secured funding, like MECA and the Artists-in-Residence program in the inner city, cease to be associated with the Council in the public mind once the original grant has been made. Credit for its various publicity programs is usually given to specific newspapers, radio and television stations rather than to the Council. In fact, the greatest visibility the Council has achieved in St. Louis is a result of reports in the national news media. With the member organizations, the story is marginally different. Respect for the Council has clearly grown as it has proved more effective in fund-raising and program support. Respect, although not affection, is the reward of power.
CHAPTER 4

ARS LONGA-PECUNIA BREVIS

"And we can't hope to attract or keep good businessmen here in St. Louis unless we buckle down and support these cultural activities. A lot of those men would not come to St. Louis if it weren't for things like the Symphony. And a lot of good men we have now would leave if their wives weren't happy with the community. So, we're out to do this to help St. Louis business and industry, too."

—GENERAL L. J. SVERDRUP
Chairman of the Board
Sverdrup and Parcel & Associates

THE TORTUOUS BEGINNINGS of the Spirit of St. Louis Fund bequeathed the Arts and Education Fund a mixed legacy: on the one hand dedicated and energetic leadership, and on the other, a frenetic tempo, the lingering result of supplementary campaigns, unmet goals, and pressing needs. Sadly, a feeling of a harried, hand-to-mouth existence was carried on into the initial years of the larger, federated appeal. Once the era of the little agencies facing the giants was over, the Fund needed more than bravery and gusto. Strict fiscal economy has scant romantic appeal and dervishlike activity only frightens away workers and donors alike. Patterns may lack daily
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excitement, but they do provide a framework for accomplishment.

Through its seven campaigns, the Council has evolved just such a pattern. It is not a new structure or a dramatic one, but logically employs the United Fund’s success in the field of health and welfare as a model. In the case of the Council, innovation for its own sake would have been doubly foolish; the Council leaders are frequently identical with those who brought the United Fund in St. Louis from early difficulties to what now seem like inevitable triumphs. Their accumulated experience is invaluable.

As these leaders know well by now, the year’s calendar is marked not so much by St. Louis’ unpredictable season changes as by the stages of the campaign process. For them and for the Arts and Education Council, the year begins in the summer, a full nine months before the campaign’s announced starting date, when Fund agencies are asked to submit budgets for the coming year. By late autumn, the Council’s Budget Committee has reviewed those budgets in formal hearings which lead to a recommended campaign goal and a breakdown of that figure into allocations for each agency. Fall is the time also for the great “head hunt,” when the campaign chairman or co-chairmen are enlisted and they in turn recruit their leadership team. The pace quickens with each day of the new year as advance solicitation gets underway in selected divisions. On March 1 the public phase of the campaign begins with all its varied approaches to everyone from corporate leaders to the man next door. In May, June, and July, appeals continue to potential donors who have not yet given. With luck, planning, and determination, these are completed just in time for the cycle to commence once again.
At least this is the ideal.

The letter to Fund agencies signaling the start of the process can hardly be considered a beguiling first robin. It merely contains a standard budget form with positions for four sets of figures: actual amounts for the last complete year, the estimated budget for the current year, actual income and expenditures to date, and the projected budget for the fiscal year to be covered by the forthcoming Fund drive. Explanations of major changes from one year to another are also required. A current listing of members of the agency’s board of directors completes the form.

With the creation of the Fund, it was established that all agencies should operate on the same fiscal year, extending from June 1 through May 31, although many found it necessary to change procedures to meet this requirement. Without such a common practice, the Budget Committee would find further difficulty in drawing fair comparisons between the needs of different agencies.

Even more significant than the procedural matter of a common fiscal year was the policy decision that money raised by the Arts and Education Fund should provide for the fiscal year following the campaign so that agencies might plan their programs in advance with a degree of certainty. The system benefits the Council too, preventing anxious waits for actual cash to be received in order to make disbursements to agencies. Advance planning can insure that funds are readily available for the regular quarterly payment of each agency’s allocation. Rational billing procedures for unpaid pledges are possible. And, no small advantage, the Council is able to collect interest—currently between $15,000 and
$22,000—on its investment of next year’s Fund revenue.

The necessity to establish the following year’s goal on the basis of the following year’s needs is the strongest argument for starting the budgetary process far in advance of the campaign. Almost as persuasive, however, is the amount of time necessary for the Budget Committee to meet with representatives of each agency. Typically, six Committee members, the Council’s executive director and the president, treasurer, and staff director of each agency meet with one another at least once. The process is slow and seemingly archaic to those who argue that formal written budgets should speak for themselves. Yet even in an age which considers efficiency the highest virtue, face-to-face contact has its merits. It is possible in the hearings to form some impressions of the vitality of an agency as the figures of a bare balance sheet are read in light of the services the organization offers. It is equally important psychologically for the agencies to know that, at least once a year, they must “sell” the justification for those services. Finally, the Budget Committee in making its recommendations must not only be impartial, but be seen to be impartial.

Of the six Budget Committee members, two, usually the chairman of the board and the president, represent the leadership of the Council. The others are most often Council directors who have worked actively on Fund campaigns. The Committee’s chairman for the past three years has been Richard K. Weil, a forceful and impartial retired businessman who seeks out members without close ties to individual Fund agencies. Although interlocking directorates are an established fact in the life of St. Louis cultural institutions, it has been possible for the Committee to enlist members whose primary identifica-
tion is with the objectives of the Fund.

After Committee hearings with all agencies, the executive director is asked to present recommendations on the campaign goal and the division of its proceeds. These suggestions are matched against the agency requests, with an eye to the Fund’s likely potential, and a Committee recommendation is prepared for the approval of the entire Council Board.

Achieving this final set of recommendations is no easy task. There simply is not enough money. The discrepancy between agency requests and total allotments is great: $1,120,428 versus a Fund goal of $875,000 in 1969 and $1,271,542 versus a Fund goal of $925,000 in 1970. Obviously, significant reductions must be made in what each agency declares is essential.

Today the goals are set with a realistic notion of what the outcome will be. Such was not always the case. In the Fund’s early stages, when the union was more fragile, the Council felt it paramount to demonstrate its willingness to fill the agencies’ needs. Thus the goal was set at a figure only slightly below the agencies’ combined requests with no reference to the amount it was reasonable to expect could be raised. The sad result was the failure of the first four campaigns to meet the established goals despite hard work and, in some cases, superb leadership. Each allocation had then to be reduced by a percentage equal to the difference between the amount raised and the goal. In 1966 the procedure was reversed with the establishment of a plausibly attainable goal, of which more than 90 per cent was raised. Finally in 1967, again with a realistic figure, the first of three consecutive successful campaigns was completed. The 1970 goal gives the overall picture:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Other Income</th>
<th>Supplied by the Arts and Education Fund</th>
<th>Total Estimated Budget for 1970-71</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis Symphony</td>
<td>$1,644,177</td>
<td>$447,000</td>
<td>$2,091,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KETC</td>
<td>508,675</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>618,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri Botanical Garden</td>
<td>436,419</td>
<td>101,000</td>
<td>537,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Education Council</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>93,500</td>
<td>116,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum of Science and Natural History</td>
<td>101,600</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>169,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Music School</td>
<td>87,299</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>121,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Twain Summer Institute</td>
<td>44,160</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>66,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education Council</td>
<td>8,700</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>26,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Symphony</td>
<td>14,630</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>31,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Audiences</td>
<td>53,900</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>59,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,922,050</strong></td>
<td><strong>$915,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,837,550</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reserved for uncollectable pledges and contingencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>9,500</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1970 CAMPAIGN GOAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$925,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A second, but related, problem for the Budget Committee is the inflexibility of the St. Louis Symphony's needs. While the Botanical Garden can hire fewer groundkeepers, or KETC can reduce its programming, the Symphony has no choice but to sign a contract with its musicians for a fixed season or close its doors. Moreover, the Symphony's bargaining position in signing a contract is affected by competitive labor conditions on a national scale. Because the Symphony's predicament is common to every city with a first-rank orchestra, the problem comes as no surprise to St. Louis. Nonetheless, the Committee's position is delicate, especially since the Symphony receives almost half the Fund total. No agency can be pleased that its financial fate is determined under the shadow of another's problem. The only answer to this annual question is a pragmatic one: endeavoring to take into account each agency's current special circumstances.
The Committee is also faced with the less formidable but equally delicate task of exercising its powers of sensitivity to the various approaches of agency advocates. Some agencies are modest in their requests, attempting to guess what might be their fair share of the proceeds. Others overcompensate with inflated budgets in the sure knowledge that their asking figure will in any event be desecrated. Experience with the Budget Committee has shown that a rough justice usually prevails. Even though its members have small margin for maneuver, the Committee’s choices of increases in allocations have tended to reflect and reward vitality and competence. It is surprising, but gratifying, that Committee members become familiar with the needs and programs, the merits and shortcomings, of Fund agencies during the intensive budget hearings.

There has been little tendency to cut back allocations from the level reached the previous year. The exception was experienced by KETC educational television, which is the recipient of the second largest share of the Fund. In the early stages of the Fund, the KETC portion was reduced in one year from $125,000 to $100,000 at a time when much community dissatisfaction was being expressed about the station’s level of performance.

Responsibilities and problems have increased for the Committee since the creation of the CAMELOT auction (Chapter 9). It must now also make recommendations on the distribution of that portion of the auction’s proceeds reserved for Fund member organizations—$85,000 in 1968, and $120,000 in 1969. Because CAMELOT as a money-raising device has a shorter life expectancy than the Arts and Education Fund itself, the Budget Committee is faced with a quandary. There is clearly a danger
in encouraging agencies to rely on CAMELOT's proceeds when each year speculation arises on the wisdom of repeating the event. The Committee must fear the anguished cry if an agency were to use CAMELOT funds to expand its program only to find difficulty later in cutting back when the money from the auction was no longer available.

In the first year of CAMELOT, funds were allocated to the Symphony and the Garden for regular maintenance support. Grants to other agencies were made for specific projects. This policy was clearly inequitable. In 1969 CAMELOT grants were made available for operating support (as a supplement to the Fund), accompanied by a clear statement that these amounts could not be guaranteed on a regular basis with the certainty of yearly Fund allotments.

Apart from ritual denunciations of the Symphony's disproportionate share of the proceeds, there have been few complaints from the community as a whole about the sharing of the Arts and Education Fund. With the disparity in the sizes of ten member agencies, this constitutes a tribute to the collective wisdom of the Committee.

One of the first questions asked each year in Budget Committee hearings is how agencies have survived with less from the Fund than was declared essential to continue operations. Too often the reply is a sad one: the reduction of services, the accumulation of a deficit, or a dip into reserves. Membership in the Fund precludes conflicting fundraising activities since this is the very thing the Fund was designed to avoid. The Council has broadly given authorization for the continuation of certain devices, such as memberships which were already
in existence at the time of the Fund’s inception. But limits are strict on new activities. While requests of this type are referred as a matter of procedure to the Executive Committee—occasionally with smiles at unwarranted dreams of great wealth—they are also commonly a matter for intense discussion at Budget Committee hearings. However much an agency director might think wistfully of $1000-a-plate dinners, in the last resort the Budget Committee and the Fund as a whole function effectively because the belief is general that the Fund provides more support through its united appeal than agencies could, each going a separate way.

At about the same time the Budget Committee meetings are underway, the Council’s leadership is faced with its toughest job of the year, the search for a chairman or co-chairmen to lead the campaign. Responsibility for finding the qualified man has come to rest with the chairman of the Board, the president and, because of his pre-eminence and record of dedication, Morton D. May.

The chairman is the key to victory in any fundraising campaign. His contributions are varied and many, from recruiting the leadership to making a number of key calls in person. Above all he commits his prestige to the success of the drive. The earlier the choice of chairman is made, the greater the likelihood of reaching the goal. Faced with an October campaign, the United Fund appoints a committee to nominate its chairman the preceding November, almost a full year in advance. By unhappy contrast, the Arts and Education Fund’s search ordinarily begins in the fall. Too often in the past, the chairman has been secured at the eleventh hour. Delay makes recruiting the various division chairmen unduly difficult. The best workers at every level are in demand
for each community drive and their commitments are made far in advance. The last minute appointment of chairmen has undoubtedly been the greatest weakness of the Arts and Education Fund since its inception. Not until 1969 was a chairman found in good time.

The profile of the ideal chairman includes the wisdom of Solomon, the patience of Job, the touch of Midas, and the determination of Washington at Valley Forge. In fact, he should be the chief executive officer of a St. Louis corporation, preferably a member of Civic Progress, have prior experience in fundraising and record of both personal and corporate generosity to a wide range of community causes. The last qualification is important because unless he has a reputation for giving a chairman is unlikely to be able to persuade others to be generous.

Of all the personal qualities needed, the most desirable are commitment, determination, and persistence. This is a rare combination of chemistry which some business leaders mysteriously have, and of which others are almost devoid. The combination was found strikingly in such men as William A. McDonnell, then chairman of the St. Louis and San Francisco Railway, Morton D. May, chairman of May Department Stores, General L. J. Sverdrup, chairman of Sverdrup and Parcel and Associates, W. L. Hadley Griffin, president of Brown Shoe Company, and C. Powell Whitehead, former chairman of General Steel Industries.

Mr. Whitehead in particular exemplifies the leader who makes the crucial difference in any united arts appeal. It is no accident that he led the Arts and Education Fund in 1967 to its first surpassed goal. When he was chief executive officer of General Steel, the company was
known as a generous supporter of many civic causes. His personal example as well was unimpeachable. He served as a trustee of the Missouri Botanical Garden, one of the Fund agencies, but was otherwise not closely associated in the public mind with the Council when he assumed the leadership of the Fund. His long list of civic credits included service as a campaign chairman of the United Fund. Equally important, he had worked effectively over the years on countless United Fund campaigns, all of whose chairmen were as a result very much in his debt. Whitehead’s great strength was bringing to the leadership of the Arts and Education Fund the same analytical skills and business sense which he had used to build General Steel into an important St. Louis company.

Another key strength carried over from business life was Whitehead’s sales ability. Fundraising is as searching a test of salesmanship as there is. Any man who can sell a potential donor on the importance of a cultural appeal where the returns are sophisticated and far from tangible should be able to sell the most unexciting product. But there are different styles of salesmanship. It is sometimes said that community drives, like the United Fund and, to a lesser extent, federated arts appeals, depend for their success on a bludgeon approach in which business leaders secure gifts from their customers and colleagues in a spirit of extortion bordering on blackmail. Experience with the Arts and Education Fund has shown that such muscular tactics work less well than the cool, reasoned, and authoritative appeal which has been the trademark of such men as Whitehead, McDonnell, May, and Griffin.

Over the past three years the Fund has evolved a
formula for leadership organization which makes the task of recruiting a campaign chairman less painful. The burden is shared by the selection not of one chairman, but of two co-chairmen who receive equal billing and jointly share the responsibility. Typically the co-chairmen have represented two generations in which an older business leader with considerable experience has been teamed with a younger man who has recently taken the reins of a St. Louis company. A successful example of this combination was the 1968 team of General L. J. Sverdrup, chairman of Sverdrup and Parcel and Associates, and Eugene F. Williams, Jr., president of St. Louis Union Trust Company. Sverdrup had been the hero of countless St. Louis causes while Williams was virtually unknown as a community leader despite his recent appointment as president of the leading trust bank in the State of Missouri.

The leadership recruitment problem is directly traceable to the Fund's early difficulties in reaching its overambitious goals. Since the breakthrough in 1967, it has been considerably easier to find leaders. Few businessmen considered it attractive to be associated with a cause which seemed doomed to certain failure. William A. McDonnell, who in 1965 led one of the Fund's most dramatically successful campaigns, taking the total from $547,000 to $753,000, was saddled with an unrealistic goal of $885,000. It was hardly likely that McDonnell would willingly persuade any of his friends or business colleagues to take on such a thankless task after he had secured the largest percentage of increase in the history of the Fund only to fall short of the goal by 12 per cent.

Once co-chairmen have been secured, they are immediately faced with the task of assembling a small
The Community Music School: St. Louis has perhaps fared better in music than in any other single art form, and the Community Music School, founded in 1926, has recently expanded its low-cost musical instruction to extension centers throughout St. Louis, Kinloch, and East St. Louis.
army. At least they must provide the top brass, the chair-
men for the eight major divisions which make up the 
campaign structure. This is decidedly not a small under-
taking, but the co-chairmen are selected for their skill in 
tapping resources and resources are at hand: the boards 
of directors of the Fund agencies, workers from previous 
Arts and Education Fund campaigns, and those commu-
nity leaders who have been personally associated with 
the co-chairmen in other civic endeavors. The Council’s 
staff is also able to provide names of prospective workers 
with some assessment of past performance.

The divisions of the Fund structure have been de-
veloped from experience and are designed to provide the 
easiest access possible to potential or past donors and 
eliminate embarrassing and time-consuming duplicate 
solicitations. (See Appendix F for campaign results by 
divisions.) They do not form a hierarchy of command, 
but simply provide a framework for accomplishing a job. 
They are not sacred and are not unchangeable, merely 
the simplest method the Council has devised thus far to 
make wise use of limited manpower.

The Initial Gifts Division, composed of the boards 
of directors and staff of the Fund agencies, is chronol-
ogically the first each year to be solicited on the theory 
that those most closely associated with the Fund (and 
its results) should readily demonstrate their concern. 
The suggestion for this division came from the firm of 
Ketchum, Inc. in 1967 at a time when some businessmen 
were becoming restive about their disproportionate share 
of the total support. Each year these contributions form 
a base and a model for subsequent contributions. In its 
first year, under the leadership of Mr. and Mrs. May, the
Initial Gifts Division secured an increase of 5 per cent over the amount the same pledge cards brought in 1966. Since then the division has accounted for 8 to 11 per cent of the total Fund proceeds. In most cases the responsibility for solicitation is accepted by the chief officer of each agency’s board. Sizeable contributions are expected from those capable, but great emphasis is placed on the importance of every member of every board and each staff employee making some contribution.

The *Advance Gifts Division* is the euphemistic title for the “big money,” the corporate and executive gifts from the seventy to eighty largest companies in the metropolitan area. Besides supplying almost half the amount of money, this division has also provided the greatest increases. At an early stage the Fund secured the endorsement by Civic Progress of a recommendation that firms should give a percentage equal initially to 10, subsequently to 20, per cent of their United Fund contribution. Today, especially since the figure is now clearly established at the 20 per cent mark, the formula is of enormous value; as more firms comply with the recommendation, their example becomes progressively more difficult to resist. At the conclusion of the 1969 campaign, more than half these major firms were giving at the recommended level. The formula has been acceptable to many of the corporate donors because, while they had no particular affection for the Arts and Education Fund agencies, they were willing to assume their proper community responsibility. There is a second advantage to the prescription: whenever the United Fund gains a corporate increase, the Arts and Education Fund can legitimately ask for a commensurate advance.

Although obviously any city’s leading corporations
with large investment in their area's vitality and national image will provide the predominant measure of a cultural fund's giving, the appeal must also have other sources of growth and significant contributions. At the heart of most United Fund successes is the effective solicitation of employees through a payroll deduction system that makes the giving as painless and invisible as possible. Such a method needs the acquiescence of both management and labor. To achieve that agreement, a compact was made between unions, employers, and the United Fund that similar forms of internal solicitation would not be countenanced for other causes, however worthy. Thus, from the beginning, a payroll deduction system was out of the question for the Arts and Education Fund in St. Louis. Because of this and also the less dramatic appeal of the Fund, it has been impossible to approach quantitatively the hundreds of thousands of givers who supply the United Fund's massive popular base. Yet the Arts and Education Fund has steadily won ground in presenting campaign material to executives at their place of business. For the first time, in 1967, the United Fund itself accepted this principle following conversations within Civic Progress between business leaders closely associated with both campaigns. Clearly, it was contradictory for corporations to complain that the Fund relied overmuch on corporate contributions as they closed effective channels for increases in personal giving.

Executive giving has now become one of the principal growth categories of the Fund, even though corporations use widely varying interpretations of just what an executive is—ranging from anyone not on an hourly pay scale to a mere handful of well-heeled vice-presidents. Letting the employer set the policy keeps rela-
tions cordial and simplifies the actual solicitation. Ordinarily, the Fund's solicitor, in calling on the chief executive officer of a corporation for that firm's gift, will also include a request that the officer insure the solicitation of his executives. Cards for both purposes are then left with the company. Although the Advance Gifts Division is the area in which the campaign chairmen approach a significant number of prospects, the division requires the help of at least fifteen other solicitors, most of whom are necessarily corporation presidents. It is vital that donors have requests made to them by men at their own business or social level.

In order to hold down the unwieldy size of the Advance Gifts Division, the Finance Division was established with three separate sections. Each of these sections—banks and their executives, brokers, and savings and loan associations—has its own chairman. Relative generosity to the Fund varies widely, with banks clearly in the lead and savings and loan associations clearly far behind.

From ten to twenty workers are required to obtain the contributions from foundations, trusts, and substantial private donors not under the purview of other divisions. This component, the Special Gifts Division, is relatively the most static portion of the Fund and also where the federated approach is least successful. Too often contributors who warrant the term "Special" are eager to exercise their right of free choice by giving directly to the agency that interests them most. The Fund, whose rationale is that individual decisions multiplied would destroy the obvious advantages of a collective approach, would happily discourage such an independent spirit—if it could. It is no easy proposition to
persuade a cactus lover that music should have half his contributions.

The chairmanship of the Business Division, however, is perhaps the most thankless of all the Fund’s top positions. This hapless leader is saddled with those companies whose corporate gifts fall below an arbitrary dividing line of $1000. Once a donor company reaches that figure, it is normally moved to the Advance Gifts Division. Within the Business Division are two groups, one Industrial and the other Commercial and Services. They are, in turn, divided into sections with such self-explanatory headings as overland carriers, food, and apparel and millinery.

The difficulties are apparent and great in convincing the president of a small company or the branch office manager of a national corporation of the Fund’s importance to him. Major corporations like Monsanto or McDonnell-Douglas, which are concerned with attracting skilled technicians or executives to a lively community, are infinitely more amenable to persuasions that a botanical garden or symphony help provide that liveliness. These arguments hold little relevance for small companies with no need to recruit sophisticated employees. What the Business Division needs more than anything else is persistence, and its past successes are attributable to that spirit of aggressive determination. The division is given a gratifying boost by the example of the Measuregraph Company, a smaller, but well-run business, whose annual demonstration of concern is worth countless brochures or sales pitches on the need to sustain a vital cultural climate.

Each year this difficult selling job is undertaken by seventy-five or more solicitors, most of whom are execu-
tives "loaned" to the Fund by major corporations through recruitment efforts by the campaign chairman in January. The device works well for the Fund, producing an additional form of manpower and, in prospect, providing a long-term educational effect on the loaned executives themselves. Typically the loaned executives are young men of promise in their companies, in many cases knowing little about the agencies or the Fund, but with a sense of responsibility toward community causes. From the point of view of the companies who lend their services, work on the Fund may offer a potential leader an opportunity to extend his contacts and his knowledge of how the community works.

The Professional Division is a close second to the Business Division in sheer effort required. There are seven chairmen, each in charge of a single section, each drawn from the profession to be covered. Annually arguments are presented for the involvement of nonprofessionals on the supposition that a lawyer or accountant will give more generously to a potential client than to a colleague. The Arts and Education Fund, like the United Fund, has found that such conclusions are promising only in theory. Assembling a team of "potential clients" is virtually impossible. The prime factor in this division's success, as with many other divisions and sections, is the quality of the chairman. So each year the doctors are asked to contribute through the hospitals where their primary affiliation lies; lawyers, accountants, architects, and engineers are solicited through their firms; and dentists and government employees are sent letters from the president of the Dental Society and a well-known government official.

Notoriously underpaid teachers and school adminis-
trators would seem to offer little hope for contributions. A school teacher's income often increases at a rate below the rise in cost of living. Thus while he may have sympathy for agencies in the same dilemma, he would seem to be in no position to provide much help. It is true that the *Education Division* provides a small percentage of the amount the Fund raises, yet the division has one of the best records of steady, continued growth. It also makes a major addition to the Fund in the numbers of contributors it provides. Ordinarily the chairman is the president of a major university or college within the area whose primary function is to recruit chairmen for the individual sections arranged for convenience to include public schools in the City, those in the County, private school teachers, each university individually, libraries, and parochial schools. The division is flexible; if a school district superintendent will not permit solicitation within his schools, often a teachers' association will grant the necessary intermediate service of getting campaign materials to the personnel.

Frequently when a layman thinks of organized appeals for money he envisions hordes of smiling housewives going from door-to-door jingling a few coins in a canister. One is left with the impression that by shell- ing out a quarter or two the world's problems will be staved off, if not solved. The *Women's Division* does indeed involve many housewives: in one of its three sections alone, the residential, more than a thousand work each year. This section is a catchall that includes all potential contributors who do not logically fall in another category. It is subsequently divided into twenty-three geographically defined (by postal zone) regions on both sides of the Mississippi River. Even though the section
is a catchall, it does not have catch-as-catch-can organization. Each area has its own section chairman who is responsible for the enlistment of block workers.

Plainly, such a relatively complicated pyramidal structure requires considerable organizing and a high level of quality in both volunteer and staff leadership. The steady increases of this section and the division as a whole are a tribute to that leadership even more in a time when the rationale for door-to-door solicitation is being brought into question. The profusion of charitable appeals nationally, the reduction of a sense of neighborhood identification with the advent of apartment and far-flung suburban living, and the consequent fear that many have of opening a door to strangers, are all strong arguments that residential solicitation makes no sense at all. The shortcomings of this money-raising method are further pointed out each time a solicitor receives one of those ubiquitous quarters that lowers her morale, or every time a staff member computes the comparatively high cost of processing large numbers of small gifts. Yet the solicitors steadily accept gifts of any size in the hope that a donor of $5 or more—after receiving the monthly calendar of cultural events for a year—may be persuaded to make a gift more consistent with his income and the needs of the agencies.

Today the average gift in the residential section is just over $10, an amount that, multiplied many times, is not insignificant despite the costs of getting the gifts. That it does bring in money, and in increasing amounts each year, is an argument in favor of this method of reaching the public. This, coupled with the constant pressure to increase the total number of contributions to demonstrate to business donors the Fund's broad com-
munity support, means that residential solicitation is not
destined for abandonment in the near future.

Increasing amounts of money raised and numbers of
contributors are strong justification for continuance de-
spite the theoretically anachronistic character of this
section. Nonetheless, increased efficiency is necessary
and is happening. One change in procedures was insti-
tuted after a study of the very effective women's division
of the United Fine Arts Fund campaign in Cincinnati.
In January 1969, a letter invited previous contributors
to renew their gifts early, easing the volunteers' work-
load and helping the campaign to save time and money.
The request brought remarkable results—more than 57
per cent of the 1968 total was received in reply. This
change in style actually only reflected developments
which were underway informally. Many solicitors long
ago ceased to ring doorbells but employed handwritten
notes or the telephone to make their calls. While the
Women's Division leadership has never formally ac-
cepted this as the approved way to complete solicitation
calls, it is decidedly the method by which much of the
job gets done.

While the residential solicitation requires by far the
largest number of workers, there are also two other sec-
tions in the Women's Division, special gifts and inde-
dependent business. The first includes gifts of $100 or more.
There is an obvious problem in deciding which donors
rightly belong in this category and which in the regular
Special Gifts Division. The determining factors are sim-
ple and broad in application: some women are likely to
be more responsive to a call from their own friends and
there are a greater number of women solicitors available.
The third section, imprecisely named independent busi-
ness, is also the province of the Women's Division because of the larger supply of women campaign workers. The section solicits neighborhood business, laundry, hairdressers, drug stores, and shopping center retail or service operations which would ordinarily escape the attention of men working in the Business Division. The section started promisingly in its first year, 1969, and will provide a growth area for the Women's Division.

Obtaining this supply of woman-power would be considerably more difficult without the ready and capable support of the Women's Association of the St. Louis Symphony. The Association is a cohesive, well-structured group with a long record of successful community activity on behalf of the orchestra. For many years it bore the brunt of the orchestra's maintenance drive before the formation of the Arts and Education Fund. Attempts have been made to recruit workers for the Fund from supportive organizations associated with other agencies. Such efforts have met with only partial success because similar groups lack the flexibility and sense of purpose that have long been the Women's Association's distinguishing hallmarks.

Men, women, doctors, lawyers, merchants, chiefs—the Fund would like to see them all giving proportionately. And the Fund works toward that end. Yet an obvious omission from the listing of divisions is labor unions. There is no such heading on campaign tally sheets. Early in the Fund's short life, the St. Louis Labor Council, a powerful force in the United Fund, saw the Arts and Education Fund as a potential interference with its full commitment to efforts in health and welfare. Furthermore, educational television station KETC, one of the Fund's beneficiaries, has been involved for three years
in a dispute with the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. This made it difficult for labor organizations to endorse or support the Fund. More sympathetic and fruitful relationships have evolved between the Arts and Education Council and individual labor organizations—notably the Teamsters and the United Auto Workers—outside the Fund. If labor is to play a larger role in the central cultural life of the City, it will probably first come through creation and encouragement of significant programs to provide for the leisure activities of union members rather than through direct support of the annual campaign.

Everyone in St. Louis knows that the United Fund campaign never takes longer than one month, for by tacit consent it is considered poor sportsmanship to count the time between January and September when the solicitation teams are recruited and the advance requests are first made. While the public may think that October is the month of the big push, the United Fund leadership knows that it is mere denouement. The process deserves no disparagement, however. The Arts and Education Fund would happily settle for a nice relaxing $13 million anticlimax. By contrast it has always suffered from the reputation of operating a year-round campaign, with consequent difficulties in recruiting for positions of leadership.

As the fortunes of the Arts and Education Fund changed for the better, enlisting top quality command became an easier proposition. Busy corporate leaders are likely to be busy community leaders also. They are anxious for accomplishment, not a year of frenetic activity that leads nowhere. Certainly their attitude now serves the Fund’s purposes well. They and the staff are
pleased to see that a regular and less harrowing course of action has developed and that each year, since the first successful campaign, the date of achieving the Fund goal has been reached sooner. Now, January and February are devoted to obtaining Initial, Advance, and Women’s Special Gifts, before the public portion of the solicitation begins in March and continues through April. During May and June a quiet, but persistent follow-up leads to victory in the early summer, or at least, evidence that commitments can be counted on to insure reaching the goal. A handful of reluctant donors lingers through the fall in making their pledges, but December, the time to estimate incomes and taxes, brings a last minute windfall.

With a more settled system, the number of normal meetings can be kept to minimum. The campaign cabinet, including the co-chairmen, division chairmen, and senior campaign staff, meet weekly throughout March, April, and sometimes May. In March reports are made on the percentages of gain or loss for the gifts that are coming in. Later, meetings develop into countdowns of pledges outstanding and estimates of probable final results. These eight to ten meetings, providing face-to-face contact among the leaders who are in the last analysis responsible for the Fund’s success or failure, probably do more to maintain and stimulate the pace of the campaign than any other factor.

Before key leaders begin these substantive sessions, many others who make up the Fund’s work force must be familiarized with both the Fund’s agencies and procedures for soliciting. Bus tours beginning at Powell Symphony Hall, progressing to the Garden and KETC, and ending at the Museum of Science are designed to accom-
plish both ends as pledge cards, brochures, and instructions on solicitation techniques are distributed along the way. Ordinarily, there are two traveling information sessions, one for the loaned executives, the other for primary leaders of the Women’s Division. Shortly after the bus tours, a formal kickoff is held for everyone involved with the campaign to provide them with fighting words from the chairmen, introductions to the leadership, and a brief tape-slide presentation. High seriousness and a sense of businesslike readiness has served the Fund better than a carnival atmosphere suggesting the venture is fun or simple. The kickoff demonstrates to the volunteers that they are not alone in their task and that they may have confidence in the quality of their leaders. There are few enough opportunities for a sense of community in the administration of the arts to fritter this one away in any case.

Any other meetings are held at the option of the leaders of individual divisions. Women’s special gifts solicitors meet in January to divide their work load. The entire Women’s Division holds a report meeting in mid-March to encourage both achievers and laggards. That division also holds a special organizational meeting for its Illinois contingent, stressing the Fund’s metropolitan-wide impact and importance. Frequently, individual section chairmen—lawyers, say, or the shoe section of the Business Division—deem a coming-together necessary.

At a stage when the Fund’s survival was far from assured, the advertising firm of Batz-Hodgson-Neuwoehner came forward with a magnanimous offer to donate the services of its professional staff in preparing promotional materials for the campaigns. Through the interven-
ing years the agency has devoted countless hours of time, as account executive Miss Patricia Mansfield, copywriters, and art and media directors prepared the tools enabling the Council to promote the Fund. Subsequently the agency also took on similar responsibilities for the CAMELOT auction. The various national awards which the agency has won for its efforts are little recompense for the donated talents of Mr. Hiram Neuwoehner and his staff.

The basic document in any campaign is the pledge card. For every card duly signed and returned, more than five are distributed. What happens to the other four, sent out with eager anticipation, is a mystery. Clearly their destiny as bookmarks or jetsam in the bottom drawer of a busy executive’s desk is ignominious. Certainly pledge cards are already too filled with copy to serve well as shopping lists for the volunteers in the Women’s Division. The card’s format includes a gift range based on the salary of the donor suggesting that a person in the $5000 to $6000 salary range might reasonably give $9—$12, while someone earning $40,000 to $50,000 has a greater responsibility, from $213 to $338. These and similar estimates covering all income brackets, are helpful in establishing in the minds of potential donors what level of giving is needed. The scale is the most dramatic way to demonstrate that the Fund serves ten purposes in one and that small change is not enough to do the job. The United Fund with its fair share concept and churches with their tithing plans find it necessary to give guidance in the same way. There are occasional complaints that what a donor gives is his own business and that a suggestion of his fair gift is an improper intrusion. Such criticism is a small price to pay
for the opportunity to tell frankly how much the Fund really requires.

In 1967 the Arts and Education Fund first transferred its records of donations to a punch card system. The time saved in preparation is immense and the subsequent speedier reporting of gifts received increase the entire campaign's efficiency. Looking back, it seems scarcely conceivable that a campaign of the Fund's magnitude, involving more than 20,000 prospects, could ever have been administered without the blessings of automation.

The brochure which presents the story of the Fund each year is also of great importance. Originally, the Fund prepared two distinct versions, an elaborate one aimed at the larger corporate contributors and an economy model for the greater number of individual donors. In 1968 the larger brochure was abandoned in the belief that one brochure could perform both functions, especially when backed up with an inexpensive, multilithed Fact Book of more detailed information. This change, which saved considerable expenditure, passed without comment from donors to the Fund.

The current, multipurpose brochure contains information about the agencies, reasons why the Fund is important to the community, a list of the campaign cabinet, and a summary of the agencies' budgets. Three similar versions are produced, each of which varies by only one interchangeable panel. One version of the panel is addressed to company heads suggesting why the Fund and its agencies are important to business; a second is for residents of Southern Illinois, describing Fund services which affect the lives of people across the Mississippi River; the third is aimed at the average Missouri resident.
of Greater St. Louis. The brochures are of standard size designed to fit a regular business envelope.

Batz-Hodgson-Neuwoehner also exercises its skills on other materials, billboard and bus posters, bill stuffers, imprinted shopping bags, report envelopes, filmed messages for showing in movie theatres, radio and television materials, flags, and a tape-slide presentation. All are then distributed and placed either by the ad agency, or by the Fund staff, on a public service basis, without charge.

Undoubtedly, the most successful of all the Fund's publicity tools is the tape-slide presentation, partly composed of a professionally recorded fifteen-minute commentary, interspersed with remarks by directors of agencies and comments by users of Fund services. This composite commentary is timed to be shown with a selection of eighty slides depicting the activities of the Council and the Fund agencies. The presentation, produced at much lower cost than a film, is important both in preparing volunteer workers for their role in the campaign and for showing before countless organizations in the community. The latter educational task is undertaken by volunteer members of the Speakers Bureau of the Council. The combination of tape with slides offers a range of advantages; it looks professional, strikes an easily palatable mixture of information, salesmanship and human warmth, is inexpensive to produce and simple to operate.

Aside from the brochure and tape-slide presentation, the Council invests most of its limited publicity budget (approximately $13,000 all told) in the preparation of radio announcements, some as teasers before the campaign begins and others for use throughout the public
phase. Frank Harris Productions in St. Louis composed and taped a special electronic score for these spot announcements which lends them an air of authority comparable to nationally distributed commercials. Finances prohibit making television materials of similar high quality. Instead of using visual material which compares unfavorably with the standard television commercial fare, the Fund’s message is carried solely by identification slides with spoken copy. In 1968 something new was added. Rather than relying solely on billboards in the unpromising locations usually made available as a public service, the Fund displayed flags in prominent locations throughout the region. The flag’s design, prepared by Mr. Gerry Dean of Batz-Hodgson-Neuwoehner, uses a combination of the Fund insignia with the merging-of-the-rivers motif of St. Louis’ own City flag.

There is clearly a compromise in preparing materials for a charitable appeal between the fatal implications of opulence and the suggestion of low professional standards. If the Fund seems to be spending too freely, objections are raised that the money being sought is used unwisely. If materials are too far below the monied standards of polished commercial sales pitches, the suggestion is that the Fund is managed by the inept. Also, in appeals for the arts and education, there is an obligation to maintain standards of taste in all public materials.

Over a period of time, the two major metropolitan newspapers in St. Louis, together with the great variety of the neighborhood press, and television stations, have accorded to the Arts and Education Fund the same enthusiastic support—in the use of materials about the campaigns—that they have given to other major civic causes. If anything, the Fund has enjoyed more than its fair
share of this media support. Curiously the agencies themselves have been considerably less cooperative than the media in using their publications, releases, and radio and television offerings to promote the Fund. Opportunities to assist in this way are numerous, but rarely taken except after continuous urging and cajoling from the Council staff. The problem is not that of any one disaffected agency but reflects a general lack of concern for the Fund’s progress. Perhaps this is a by-product of any united campaign in which the responsibility for maintenance support is abdicated. Whether merely disheartening or a more serious concern, in the past three years the Council has not received more than three or four inquiries from Fund agency directors about the progress of the campaigns. It is certainly not to be expected that the member organizations will feel warmly about a Fund which has not met their real needs and for which they must regularly reduce thoroughly reasonable budgets. However, it might seem reasonable to hope that agencies would one day accept some degree of responsibility for the Fund’s well-being without the need for constant entreaty and irritated nagging.

The Arts and Education Fund has never had a compelling slogan or one even close in forcefulness to the “Hope is in Your Hands” battle cry of the United Fund. The difficulty of finding a resounding theme only underlines a more serious challenge: how to say in simple, readily understandable words why anyone should feel impelled to give in support of cultural institutions. Communicating a sophisticated message is problem enough. It is compounded in St. Louis by the Fund’s mixture of various forms of arts, education, and science; the man who likes music may not be moved by molecules. To
counteract this difficulty, it is possible to seize on their educational contribution as a common characteristic of the agencies. This is particularly tempting since, traditionally, no American has ever been opposed to education while many have been indifferent to the arts. To concentrate on education alone, however, would be neither honest nor plausible since the largest, and therefore most visible component of the Fund is the St. Louis Symphony Orchestra. While the orchestra performs some teaching functions, it would be misleading to suggest that education is its principal raison d'être. The business of a symphony orchestra is still to play music. Pressing the Fund's educational component is not wholly convincing either, because the traditional institutions, elementary and secondary schools, colleges and universities, that a layman would expect in an education drive have no place in the Arts and Education Fund. The reverse approach which stresses the importance of the arts for their own sake or as a leaven in society can give an equally false impression since it does not take into account such agencies as the Missouri Botanical Garden, Museum of Science and Natural History, and the Adult Education Council.

The other obstacle to finding an approach which gains effect from its consistency is the need to appeal equally to corporations and individuals. A statement that the presence in St. Louis of lively cultural institutions will be helpful in attracting new business or recruiting employees for existing business is not likely to capture the imagination of the average donor in the Women's Division.

Campaign themes have accordingly been very general. The one common emphasis is that the appeal accen-
tuates the positive. For once, the volunteer is told, he can forget the gloom of poverty and disease, of mental and physical ills. The Arts and Education Fund by contrast is a campaign concerned with plus factors. Health and welfare drives save lives, the Arts and Education Fund seeks to make lives worth living. Even this approach, with its suggestion that the arts are some kind of optional extra, which can be added to give life a little style, is not satisfactory. Moreover, the Fund still lacks a fetching slogan to capture the essence of this argument. In the search for the right combination, it has tried a new slogan almost every year, ranging from the quite banal “Together for the Full Life” (1968) and the unmeaning “Give for Greatness Sake” (1969) to the present imitative (based on a St. Paul, Minnesota, idea) “Help Something Wonderful Happen.” None, understandably, has started an avalanche of checks.

While the mixed composition of the Fund has presented problems in finding the right words and spirit to capture the whole, this combination of the arts, education, and science is not necessarily undesirable. The quest for self-expression and self-development and the longing to understand the essence of things provide a common meeting ground. The arts add a particular strength because, through their concern with communication, they foster a sense of community.

The job of the campaign staff is to minimize in every way possible the work of the volunteers, short of actually asking for money. The minimum expected of any staff is up-to-date and accurate records of previous contributors. The staff can also save embarrassment by insuring that names are spelled correctly, and that potential donors are not approached more than once, especially
after they have already given. In dealing with corporate donors, they can lay the groundwork for a successful call by furnishing the name of the appropriate contact together with a record of the company's previous giving. The best type of record keeping also includes memories of the idiosyncrasies, aversions, and delights of major contributors to better prepare the solicitor for his task.

The campaign director is charged with other quite specific responsibilities. He presents the campaign chairman with an overall plan. The purpose of the plan is to pinpoint areas of growth and weakness, as well as to map out a schedule of deadlines. The director advises the chairman on who might fill which position. Logistics of the campaign are also his responsibility whether they be promotional materials, arrangements for meetings, or the preparation of progress reports. When the campaign is finally underway, the director's task above all is that of maintaining the pressure, insuring that no division lags, and that the chairmen are kept informed of weaknesses or delays.

The executive director of the Council serves as the campaign director. However, the good reputation earned by the Fund organization over the past years is primarily due to two early and fortunate windfalls. They are Mrs. William McElroy and Miss Dorothy Lee Garvin, who brought to the Arts and Education Fund an indispensable mixture of experience, knowledge, competence, adaptability, and good humor. An added bonus was the respect and affection in which they were held by countless volunteers with whom they had worked at the United Fund and other campaigns. Their combination of talents and division of responsibility has worked smoothly and effectively.
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Following the departure of Charles Mark to take a position with the federal government, the Council operated for two years without a chief executive officer. During this period the firm of G. A. Brakeley was retained to provide staff leadership for the campaigns. In 1967 a different staffing solution was sought to take account of a simultaneous capital fund drive by the St. Louis Symphony. Faced with a challenge grant from the Ford Foundation and their need for a new home, the Symphony Society had decided to mount the first capital appeal in its history, with a goal of $4 million. The coincidence of such a large drive at the same time as the annual Arts and Education Fund caused concern on both sides. To mitigate conflicts between the two appeals, the firm of Ketchum, Inc. was retained with instructions to plan both campaigns. Solicitation was carried out jointly in some Divisions, notably in Advance Gifts. The final results were, by and large, satisfactory to both sides. However, in 1968 all outside professional assistance was dispensed with and when, in 1969 a second joint campaign was carried out, this time in conjunction with the Missouri Botanical Garden's capital appeal for $3 million, complete staffing was provided by the Council and Garden together.

Using outside professional fundraisers was always seen as a temporary expedient. There was never any doubt that it would be preferable to retain a full-time locally based staff with its attendant continuity. The contracts with Brakeley and Ketchum were both satisfactory from the viewpoint of the Council given the special circumstances of the times. However, an outside fundraising firm is faced with some difficulties in staging an annual maintenance appeal. Problems arise from the
necessity of acquiring detailed local knowledge overnight and from occasional insensitivity to particular local conditions. There is always a temptation for an external fundraiser to be mesmerized by the immediate need to meet a target in a current campaign without considering that the local group remains in the community and will be looking for support each year for a long time to come. In the last analysis professionals do not cause a campaign to triumph or fail. It is the calibre of the volunteer leadership which is all-important. The successes and shortcomings of the Arts and Education Fund in St. Louis are a barometer of the calibre of this leadership.

In Appendix G, which gives the annual operating budget of the Arts and Education Council, a detailed breakdown of actual Fund expenses is shown. These campaign costs are separated and meticulously recorded quite apart from expenditures for the Council's other operations. They show that approximately seven cents out of every dollar raised in the Fund campaign is absorbed by administrative costs. The percentage figure has fallen in recent years as the actual amount raised has increased and as the cost of outside fundraising has been eliminated. It now approximates closely the administrative costs of United Funds and Community Chests. This is an important achievement, especially because health and welfare appeals are typically raising considerably larger sums of money than the arts. The larger the goal, the lower the percentage of cost can be.

An equally useful comparison is with the cost of fundraising by individual agencies before the creation of the Arts and Education Fund. Some of the agencies were then spending as much as twenty-five cents of every dollar in raising that dollar. Experience then bears
out the argument that a united approach can be not only more effective but also more economical than individual appeals.

In 1967 and the years following its first successfully reached goal, the Fund settled into a predictable growth rate of 5 to 8 per cent annually. That such a long hoped-for pattern could be established reflects the Fund's new age of stability. It is probable that such stability and its attendant growth rate can be sustained so long as the economy of St. Louis and the nation retains its own stability.

Yet problems still facing the Fund are of great magnitude. The Fund has relied on increases from the major corporations for much of its recent growth. Many of these same businesses have now reached the target figure of an amount equalling 20 per cent of their United Fund contribution. Eventually increases will have to come from other sources. It is easy to identify executive giving and the Special Gifts Division as the most likely alternatives. Yet it is common knowledge that it will take a tremendous number of additional executive gifts to produce the equivalent of a corporate increase of $5000 to $10,000.

It is also daily made clear that a rate of growth of 5 to 8 per cent will not fulfill the needs of most of the Fund's agencies. That percentage covers little more than the average annual jump in the cost-of-living index. Thus, for the Community Music School, or the Symphony, or KETC, or the Garden, other sources of income must be discovered to sustain new fields of endeavor or an expansion in the numbers of people presently served.

An equally serious problem is the static composition of the Fund. Since the creation of this united appeal, new organizations have developed within the commu-
nity. Some of these ought reasonably to be included in a federated appeal addressing itself to the community on the alleged basis that it covers operating needs of privately funded cultural institutions. While these problems and alternative possible solutions are discussed in the next chapter, they must be considered in any overview of the Fund. These difficulties should at least make the community as a whole aware that the Arts and Education Fund is not a panacea for financial needs in the arts. Indeed, if despite the Fund's impressive record there are still so many needs unmet, perhaps it is only proof that private patronage is unprepared to carry the burden of support alone.
CHAPTER 5

THE ARTS DOLLAR IN ST. LOUIS

"St. Louis is realizing that culture is a lot more than decorative frosting, that it is the only true gauge of a city's spiritual health."
—The Wall Street Journal

One of the mysteries about the arts is the same economic conundrum that baffles the typical American family: however fast income rises, demands on that money multiply even faster. When these demands are analyzed, the mystery disappears though the problem remains. It is understandable that an increase in demand for the arts inflates their price, just as it is reasonable that musicians should be paid on a scale commensurate with their long training, that actors should be paid a living wage, and that even dancers should not be allowed to starve. Yet to the businessman, the government official, and the prospective individual donor, the arts seem inherently shrouded in crisis, facing financial doom.

Much of the misunderstanding arises from failure to distinguish between the two sources of support for the arts: earned and contributed income. Of the two,
the limits on the growth of earned income are fewer. There is in theory no ceiling on the amount of money which can be generated by artistic endeavors of quality, well-managed and well-promoted. The arts dollar in this form has room for open-ended expansion. Families do not budget so many dollars, and no more, for art. They budget in accordance with how well they are persuaded that a particular performance or product is important to them. People do not attend a symphony concert rather than see a play, or go to the ballet instead of buying a print. One arts institution does not grow rich at the expense of another. Rather, it is the total expansion of opportunity to experience works of quality that in itself creates new enthusiasts for the arts. The expansion of earned income, however, does not necessarily reduce the financial difficulties of the organizations. To operate within an acceptable price range, most performances must fetch less at the box office than their true cost. This means that a larger paying audience often brings in its wake a more substantial deficit. The experience of Young Audiences in St. Louis illustrates this dilemma. There is a near insatiable demand for concert-demonstrations in elementary schools. Young Audiences has arrived at a price for these concerts that the schools can reasonably afford, while the balance of the cost is made up out of contributed income. The limitation now on the number of concerts given is not demand but the inelasticity of Young Audiences' subsidy.

Contributed income provides less room for growth than earned income. Substantial increases have been seen in St. Louis during the past decade, resulting particularly from the success of the Arts and Education Fund in its appeal to the business community. The con-
THE ARTS DOLLAR IN ST. LOUIS

tributed dollar is, however, more limited than the dollar earned at the box office. For, when the arts are classified as charity, they are consequently put in competition with hospitals, health and welfare agencies, universities, colleges, and churches. Dramatic increases are possible, as private institutions of higher education have demonstrated in the years since the end of the Second World War. But the case for the arts is more difficult to document (no one fears the Russians will launch a cultural Sputnik); still if need becomes more urgent, crisis may become the decisive advocate. One lesson is clear. Whereas in former days the private wealthy patron sustained arts institutions, today such support is beyond the wealth of any individual donor. The institutions must depend for their continued existence on a mixture of private donors, both large and small, corporations, foundations, universities, city, state, and federal government. The twentieth century Medicis wear a thousand guises, but behind none of them hides limitless wealth.

The test of success the community applies to the Arts and Education Council is whether the Arts and Education Fund goes over the top. Idealism, ingenuity, and imagination notwithstanding, arts councils are measured by their ability to raise money.

The Council in St. Louis has operated a Fund drive which has been at least partly successful. The amount of money raised has increased from $395,396 in the last year of individual agency campaigns to the 1969 total of $906,000, a leap of 129 per cent in seven years. As a result, all the Fund agencies have stayed in business. During this same period the Symphony has extended its season from twenty-seven to forty-seven weeks; the
minimum annual salary scale of its musicians has risen from $3375 to $9400. Total contributed income is now $795,000, which stands up well against that of other orchestras. Quality as well as quantity has improved. The Missouri Botanical Garden has in three years experienced one of the most vital periods in its history since the days of its founder Henry Shaw. The Community Music School has grown from a small neighborhood school to a flourishing educational institution with a network of extensions throughout the metropolitan area. Virtually all the agencies have shown vitality and have extended their services during this period. Part, at least, of the credit must go to the Fund, which has helped sustain them.

At the same time, the Council has not been able to meet the full needs of the organizations. Each year budgetary requests are cut back with dispiriting results: a reduction in the desired level of programming; the accumulation of deficit at the Symphony; a restriction on the amount of local programming at KETC; a delay in the introduction of a pension plan at the Museum of Science. The Fund’s settled rate of growth makes it impossible to reward agencies in a dramatic way for vitality or unusual achievement.

The one member organization for which the measured growth of the Fund presents particular problems is the St. Louis Symphony Orchestra. It may be, of course, that without the Fund the Symphony would already be out of business, but the Fund has far from solved all its problems. In keeping with the national pattern, the orchestra’s costs have skyrocketed since 1965. There is, moreover, no sign of their reaching a plateau until a fifty-two week season is in force. This, together
with the expiration in 1971 of the so-called “free money” from the Ford Foundation (an annual supplement of $100,000 given for a five-year period at the time of the Ford Foundation endowment challenge grant), will precipitate a new financial crisis. The deficits will be multiplied just as extravagantly over today’s figures as those of 1970 are over those of the mid-sixties. The Symphony will be faced with a choice. One answer could be increased endowment, although in St. Louis this is not likely to be found in time. Another alternative could be governmental assistance which, in view of the straitened circumstances of the City and the disinclination of the County and State, will entail federal help as part of a national solution. A regional grouping or an orchestra reduced in size must also be considered. The most unlikely answer is that the community will be prepared to double its annual giving to the Symphony directly or indirectly, through the Arts and Education Fund.

There is no fixed law determining the amount a community is willing to give year in and year out for the maintenance of an orchestra. But in St. Louis experience and the present climate of opinion suggest that such giving is not likely to grow much faster than the cost of living once a level of approximately half a million dollars a year has been reached. This problem, which places a time bomb in the future of the Arts and Education Fund, is clearly one for which the Symphony and Council have to seek a solution jointly. The Symphony will survive in one form or another. But the impending changes call for advance precautions so that they do not harm the interests of other Fund member organizations or disrupt St. Louis’ entire cultural future.

It is impossible to measure accurately the effect of
the Fund on the institutions that lie outside its circle. Even without statistical evidence it is almost certain that the Fund, by its very success in establishing itself as the united cultural appeal in St. Louis, has slowed corporate support for other cultural institutions. "I'm sorry, but we give through the Arts and Education Fund," is one of the benefits a business gains from its annual contribution.

This attitude would be to the Fund's advantage if its membership had not remained stationary, limited to the ten organizations originally included. In 1963 this composition was logical. These were the institutions in the market for more private maintenance support, although two major cultural organizations remained outside. One, the Missouri Historical Society, had developed and continues its own fairly satisfactory pattern of private support. The other was the City Art Museum, dependent on revenue from the City of St. Louis for its day-to-day operation.

The financial problems of the Museum are acute: need for capital renovation, for expanded staff, and for acquisitions. Fund membership for the Museum is nonetheless unlikely since asking for contributions to defray the operating costs of a tax-supported institution would meet strong opposition. While it would be more acceptable to provide money for acquisitions, the Fund has, by policy, considered its concern to be with operating costs as opposed to capital improvements or acquisitions of any sort.

The Museum's current tax support is not only inadequate, it is decidedly inequitable. Residents of the City of St. Louis, with its declining property tax base, are solely responsible for the support of the Museum,
while the larger and far wealthier population of St. Louis County uses the Museum freely without sharing its financial hardships. It would be the proverbial insult to injury to ask a City-based business to double its support and thereby give tacit consent to the inequity. Hope is possibly in sight for the Museum’s problem with public support. Plans are underway to create one Metropolitan District which would have title to the Museum and the Zoo (which is similarly supported) and would have taxing powers to raise the necessary operating funds in both City and County. The District could also support other institutions that might be added later.

The Museum’s chief community fundraising endeavors are individual and corporate memberships in the Friends of the City Art Museum and participation in special events staged by the Friends, commonly in connection with the opening of a major exhibition. The proceeds are used mainly for acquisitions, and thus to augment the encouraged donation of works of art from the City’s private collectors. During the past seven years, notwithstanding the Fund’s existence, there has been a steady rise in the Friends’ memberships and income, although corporate support might have played a larger part. Because the Friends’ income does not alleviate the problems of an aging building and an incomplete staff, the Museum may at some future date turn to private donors for support of a major capital appeal. Such a course is, however, open to any organization, whether or not it belongs to the Fund.

The effect of the Fund on the City Art Museum is probably not as pronounced as on other less venerable and established institutions. It often happens that the most stimulating and lively organizations in the arts are
the youngest. Because such organizations are frequently the outgrowth of the energies and talents of one or a few persons, they may find it difficult at first to establish themselves financially. No one knows how many organizations die of a lack of contributed income in their beginnings. It simply takes a long time to join the ranks of the Symphony and the Boy Scouts on the approved giving lists of major corporations. Through fear of the unknown, foundations and others give help where, in a sense, it is less desperately needed, to the tried and true. If a community arts council also goes for safe bets, what hope is there for the newcomer?

The Council's best device for avoiding this particular peril is the Arts Development Committee of its Board of Directors. Formation of the Committee was stimulated in 1966 by a grant from the Danforth Foundation. The grant, initially for $10,000, was renewed in 1967 for a further two years, each for the same amount. The Foundation wished to encourage the Council's concern with the financial needs of all member agencies, both Fund and non-Fund. The grant enabled the Council to develop philosophies and procedures for extra-Fund assistance and to test the demand for Council support from non-Fund members. In acting through the Council, Danforth found the combination of a responsible agent and judgmental competence in the arts. Since Danforth has no staff arts specialist, this arrangement made it possible for it to assist the educational programs of local cultural organizations without the need to employ outside consultants to judge the specialized needs and program quality of applicants.

The guidelines written by the Arts Development Committee under the chairmanship of Mrs. Daniel
Schlafly invited member organizations to present proposals designed to strengthen the educational services they offered. (At that time Danforth's particular emphasis on education made this condition necessary.) Specialized and mechanical requirements were also included, as well as the stipulation that single grants would not normally be made in excess of $3000. Similar guidelines were again set forth in 1968, with the addition of a clause reminding applicants of the Council's particular interest in the inner city. In 1967 twenty applications were received, requesting a total of $47,876. In 1968 there were eleven applications totalling $25,180.

Altogether, eight grants were made in the first two years. In 1967 the recipients were: Opera Theatre, in conjunction with the St. Louis School system, for a three-day high school workshop on the production and staging of an opera; the School of Continuing Education of Washington University for a series of lecture-demonstrations in homes for the aged; Missouri Botanical Garden to develop an educational program for deprived children; Repertory Theatre of Loretto-Hilton for a series of theatre demonstrations and readings in area high schools. In 1968: the Adult Education Council to establish a basic curriculum laboratory in conjunction with the Public Library and the Voluntary Improvement Program; the Performing Arts Area of Washington University to offer Saturday classes in modern dance for high school students; Metropolitan Educational Center in the Arts (MECA) to establish an adult component to one of its Saturday Centers; Missouri Botanical Garden to prepare new teaching kits for its educational program. Each year three of the programs satisfactorily achieved their stated purpose while one was a disappointment, a
high batting average for a newly initiated program.

It is a common technique of foundations to offer money on the condition that it be matched by a commensurate or greater amount from the community. With regrettable frequency the challenge goes unmet and programs flounder and fold. The Danforth Foundation grant to the Council carried no stipulation that it be matched, yet it is an example of a foundation's initial investment creating a multiplied return. In 1968 and 1969, $80,000 from the proceeds of the CAMELOT auction was made available to the Arts Development Committee, representing an eight-fold increase over the Foundation's annual contribution.

This greatly increased resource brought with it a more formidable responsibility for the Committee; and a new set of guidelines recognized the implications of the change. A first resolve was to use the $80,000 solely for non-Fund members; other CAMELOT receipts had been set aside for Fund agencies. The Committee then increased the normal-maximum-grant stipulation from $3000 to $10,000 and dropped its statement about the inner city since its interest had been clearly registered by that time.

A difficult question facing the Committee was whether it should allow grant funds to cover regular operating costs. Some members felt strongly that the Council's function in the community was helping cultural and educational organizations with day-to-day operations. Accordingly, it would be inappropriate for the Council to act as a foundation, seeking to finance special activities on a temporary basis with the expectation that the community would later pick up the cost. The Arts and Education Council is that community. On
The Mark Twain Summer Institute: Presents advanced educational opportunities to gifted high school students. Here is a printmaking class, and a student of Chinese, Sylvia Baron: "Most of the students who begin Chinese in the summer go on in the winter . . . I got into a Japanese class, too, and my interest has grown from the time I started and so I've kept going back to Mark Twain and then I started taking courses at Washington University in addition, and I plan to get a Ph.D. in Asian Studies."
the other hand, there were reservations about meeting operating costs out of CAMELOT money, by its nature an unassured source. A compromise was formulated in a statement for the guidelines: "Requests must be for specific amounts to carry out identifiable projects or activities. A mere statement of need for operating funds will not be considered sufficient justification for a grant. Projects or activities to be covered by a grant may be part of the regular operation of the applying organization. However, it is emphasized that, in making a grant for the current year, the Council is not committing itself to a continuation of the same support for future years."

In 1968, the first year of CAMELOT money and the last of the Danforth grant, announcement of Arts Development Committee funds stimulated twenty-eight requests for a total of $236,624. Out of this number, fourteen were selected for funding in the amount of $90,000. Of the fourteen, five were identifiable as being intended to relieve operating costs, the balance were for new programs or for acquisition of capital equipment. The 1969 grants were made to: Repertory Theatre of Loretto-Hilton to underwrite student tickets; University of Missouri at St. Louis for an experimental film program of instruction for freshmen; Opera Theatre for support of its August Opera Festival; Black Artists Group for materials and equipment for its new training center; the Children's Art Bazaar to inaugurate a traveling art instruction program; Metropolitan Educational Center in the Arts (MECA) for the partial funding of the new position of school relations coordinator; School of Continuing Education of Washington University to provide jazz concerts and musical instruction in the inner city; Craft Alliance to establish a neighborhood craft school
in the inner city; the Page Park YMCA to continue an extension of the Community Music School; Talking Tapes for the Blind to purchase equipment; Jefferson College to purchase tickets to cultural events for a new program; City Art Museum for printing costs; New Music Circle for commissions; Dance Concert Society for administrative costs.

A major issue not covered in the guidelines emerged from the discussions in Committee and at Board level. Should the Council, with its limited privately raised resources make grants to large, tax-supported institutions? This issue arose specifically over the proposed grant to the University of Missouri. The logic of the objection was clear. The Committee nonetheless felt that the University had presented an excellent proposal, and that it was invidious to disbar member organizations of the Council simply because they were tax-supported. The inclination of the Board was to change the guidelines to state that proposals from tax-supported institutions should indicate that public funds were not available for the purposes covered by the application.

The Arts Development Committee emerged from these discussions as one of the most vigorous and spirited within the Council. The Committee represents less of an Establishment viewpoint than most others. Under both Mrs. Schlafly and Joseph L. Tucker, who succeeded her, the meetings were lively and informed and, most important, free of vested interests.

Any consideration of money available for the arts in St. Louis must raise questions about gaps in the City's inventory of cultural attributes. For a long time, the most glaring omission was theatre. Other notable absences
were a sustained opera season and a professional dance company. However unfortunate it may be, most cities of St. Louis' size have been equally lacking in both opera and dance, yet many have maintained at least one resident professional theatre company. Since the creation of the Council, sustained serious theatre of professional quality has developed, but its emergence and growth has occurred outside the Council.

When the Council was first formed, the only serious contender to fill theatre's vacant place was the Gateway Theatre. The Gateway, like many operations of its type around the country, struggled valiantly for years to emulate the success of the Alley Theatre in Houston, Mummers Theatre in Oklahoma City, and Arena Stage in Washington. The short-term goal was to develop community roots and an audience for a low-budget, semi-professional company. The longer term plan was to emerge as a fully professional theatre of outstanding quality, able to offer a substantial season. The struggle finally ended for the Gateway as it attempted the awkward and expensive transition to Actors' Equity status. Whether the Council could have aided the Gateway's survival through an infusion of funds is difficult to judge in retrospect.

Even had the Council possessed resources to help, it would have been faced with a further decision. As the Gateway was entering its final ordeal, a new theatre was launched with secure institutional backing. The Repertory Theatre of Loretto-Hilton was created in 1966 by Webster College, under the leadership of Miss Jacqueline Grennan. The first three years witnessed a considerable repertory production schedule. However, the most striking growth in quality was not until the 1969-70
season with the introduction of Mr. Walter Perner as managing director. The Theatre now offers an extended season of its own productions interspersed with touring engagements of nationally known groups such as the Negro Ensemble Company.

The Theatre’s annual deficit has been in excess of $200,000 a year, which a small liberal arts college is unable to bear over a sustained period. To this time, private fundraising for the Theatre has been sporadic. Most of the load is still carried by the College itself. The long-term existence of the Theatre must depend on its ability to shift a significant part of this burden to the community outside. The logical source of support is the Arts and Education Council and Fund.

The Council’s response to this challenge has been to finance specific educational activities of the Theatre in 1967, and, in 1969, to provide $15,000 towards operational support. The source of these funds was in each case the Arts Development Committee of the Council. The 1969 grant was in fact the largest made out of CAMELOT funds to any organization other than the Symphony. Such grants are short-term, partial solutions. Funds from the Arts Development Committee are by their nature hardly reliable sources of continuing support. The logical home for the Repertory Theatre, if it continues to offer its high level of production, is within the Arts and Education Fund itself. A prior condition for Fund membership would be the creation of a separate organization for the Theatre with a board of directors independent of the College. It would be unacceptable for the Fund to support part of the internal budget of a larger organization whether a college, university, or school system.
The issue for the Arts and Education Fund in taking on this responsibility is the doubtful wisdom of adding an eleventh agency when the existing ten are still unsatisfied. The difficulty is further complicated since an organization cannot belong to the Fund only in part. Membership implies restrictions on other outside fundraising. If the Fund is to accept responsibility for the Repertory Theatre, it must do so in its entirety, except for any voluntary commitment that might be continued by the College.

The most hopeful source of further major funding for the arts is probably public money. It may come in any of three forms.

The proposed Metropolitan Cultural District could substantially increase direct local tax support for the Museum, Zoo, and other organizations which may be added at a later date. While such a move is logical and equitable, it will require support in a referendum from a majority of St. Louis County voters. An affirmative vote will call for a remarkable degree of imagination and enlightened self-discipline from an electorate who are being asked to vote themselves additional taxes. Cultural causes do not, alas, always command such self-imposed generosity.

A second possibility is support of specific cultural programs by state-supported universities. Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville has already pioneered this new approach by its sponsorship, in conjunction with the St. Louis Symphony, of the six-week Mississippi River Festival. The novel Symphony-Southern Illinois University relationship is a model of cooperation. Dr. Delyte Morris and Dr. John Rendleman, by their enlightened leadership, have recognized in the Festival an opportu-
nity to demonstrate that a university is rightly charged with more than the academic training of its students. The quality of the society for which those students are prepared is also an appropriate concern.

The third possibility for tax support is through direct federal or State subvention. Limited State funds have already been a factor in the budgets of the Symphony, Young Audiences, and Loretto-Hilton Repertory Theatre as a result of sponsorship by the Missouri State Council on the Arts of tours in rural areas. While Missouri was one of the leaders in securing state support, the likelihood of substantial increases in its appropriations appears bleak at the moment. Federal support has been substantially present in the MECA Title II program, although the life expectancy of the MECA grant is limited. But it may be expected that other legislation will be forthcoming in the years ahead to meet the plight of cultural organizations across the country. Of this future promise, the present vigorous leadership of the National Endowment for the Arts is a good omen.

There appears to be little opposition in St. Louis to the idea that public funds should be made available to assist the arts. This acceptance probably springs from the fact that many of those who by inclination reject the principle of government support of the arts are the very people who sit on the boards of directors of cultural organizations. Their close acquaintance with the needs of the arts makes it easier for them to accept the proposition that the pursuit of happiness is a rightful concern of government.
CHAPTER 6
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"Civilization has always been borne on the backs of a minority. Our hope and endeavor is substantially to increase that minority; indeed one day to turn it into a majority."

—MISS JENNIE LEE, M.P.
Great Britain’s Minister for the Arts

"Men are men before they are lawyers or physicians or manufacturers; and if you make them capable and sensible men they will make themselves capable and sensible lawyers and physicians."

—BEN SHAHN

"He who would do good to another must do it in Minute Particulars. General Good is the plea of the scoundrel, hypocrite, and flatterer; For Art and Science cannot exist but in minutely organized Particulars."

—WILLIAM BLAKE

Services . . . Schools teach students, Rotary Clubs hold luncheons, and community arts councils publish calendars and maintain mailing lists. The Arts and Education Council of Greater St. Louis is no exception to this general rule. A calendar of events and a mailing list of people believed to be susceptible to culture are attractive services for many reasons. Either would strain the resources of most individual organizations. When assembled centrally, they effect savings for all who use them. Both offer
opportunities for an expansion of the paying audience for the arts. Together with certain elementary printing services, they are the only Council functions still in existence that date back to the very beginnings of the Spirit of St. Louis Fund.

The Council's services to its member organizations take three forms. The first and simplest is the provision of "hard" services like the calendar. The second is a publicity program designed to make people more conscious of the arts and to ensure that the arts in St. Louis receive national attention whenever possible. The least well-defined is the provision of certain forms of managerial counseling to organizations.

The central mailing lists the Council provides contain more than 20,000 names, arranged by postal zones, on addressograph plates. The largest aggregation is of those donors who give to the Arts and Education Fund. More specialized lists include the news media in the metropolitan area, inner city agency personnel, members of various Friends organizations, and the editors of industrial internal publications. All lists are available to any member organization for the actual cost of running the addresses. The one limitation placed on their use, of course, is that no straightforward solicitation for funds may be addressed. This does not preclude the mailing of pieces designed to sell tickets or a subscription series. Since no list is worthwhile unless it is up-to-date, all are kept current by the Council staff. Equally lacking in glamor is the provision of the Council's multilith and copying equipment. This is particularly important to smaller groups which could never justify the purchase of a duplicating machine costing several thousand dollars. Again, the only charge is for actual staff time and supplies.
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The Council maintains a master calendar of St. Louis arts activities, from which is devised the Calendar that attempts to provide a listing of all concerts, plays, exhibitions, art film showings, and similar events scheduled each month. Individual copies are sent to all who give $5 or more to the Arts and Education Fund. Copies are also made available in schools, libraries, newspaper offices, hotels, and galleries. Until 1970 the Calendar was sent to Fund donors regardless of the amount of their contribution. The minimum gift requirement was an economy measure reflecting increased postage and handling charges. The Calendar initially appears in the weekend St. Louis Globe-Democrat. Copy is prepared by the Council for the newspaper. In this way the readers of the Globe-Democrat see the Calendar while the Council saves on typesetting costs. The newspaper provides the Council with reproduction proof. Copy is then prepared for the reverse side. Together, these go to the printer who prepares 15,000 copies for distribution. The Globe-Democrat and the advertising of the General Bancshares Banks enable the Council to provide the entire service virtually without cost other than staff time.

One purpose of the Calendar is to increase public awareness of the programs of the cultural organizations. Toward the same end, the Council has developed a number of regular newspaper, radio, and television series. These have mostly been the production of the inventive mind of Mrs. Millie Wolff, for two years the Council’s public relations adviser. Perhaps her most ingenious idea was the “Laura Scott” column which first appeared in the Globe-Democrat in 1968. The column is based on the “Dear Abby” approach, but instead of broken hearts and marriages and domestic discontent, Laura Scott
PERSUADE AND PROVIDE

deals with the layman's questions about the arts and education. It is Mrs. Wolff's belief that the arts have acquired an aura of snobbery which creates barriers to many people's enjoyment, and at the same time makes them embarrassed to confess ignorance. The column, written with a light touch, covers a wide range of readers' questions on issues varying from the serious to the frivolous—from how to get tickets for a group of old people to why ballerinas dance on their toes.

The idea for the most successful of the Council's radio offerings was stolen outright from the BBC. The program entitled "Critic on the Go" consists of a biweekly discussion of three matters of cultural interest in St. Louis. The conversation is carried on by a panel of three, selected for verbal agility and insight rather than professional depth of knowledge. Each of the critics prepares himself in advance of the program by attending the plays, concerts, films, or exhibitions under discussion. The show has some added refinements. It is recorded in a first-rate St. Louis restaurant after the critics have enjoyed an elaborate dinner. The plates are cleared, microphones appear with the brandy, and conversation begins. The show has taken as legitimate subjects for review such topics as street furniture, parks, church structures, advertising, urban design, the quality of individual buildings in St. Louis, and January white sales. The unspoken assumption is that the arts are inseparable from everyday life. "Critic on the Go" has attracted a loyal audience during the three-year run on KSD, the NBC affiliate in St. Louis.

The Council's concern over the quality of drama criticism in the metropolitan newspapers gave rise to its most successful television promotion to date. Mrs. Peggy
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Meyer, who hosts most of the radio and television shows for the Council, interested television station KSD-TV in using theatre reviews as part of its daily news reportage. Mr. Herbert Metz, one of the "Critic on the Go" team and a member of the English Department at Washington University, provides the pithy reviews with sparkle, good humor, and sound judgment. Since the reviews are part of the station's news programming, they reach a wide audience likely to skip over the same subject in the newspaper. The value of this service to legitimate theatre in St. Louis is incalculable, but reactions to the KSD-TV reviews are immediately felt at the box office. In some ways this is an awesome reflection on the power of television. In others it is refreshing evidence of the ability of an arts council to use its influence positively and, at no cost, to build up the earned income of its member organizations.

The Council has also produced a monthly television show entitled "Arts Alive" on KTVI-TV, in addition to series on KFUO radio and on KETC-TV, the educational television station. "Arts Alive," the most elaborate of these ventures, was an attempt to explore taste in such matters as buying pictures, furnishing a house or apartment, and choosing clothes. It was intended to reach the same audience as the Laura Scott column in the Globe-Democrat.

Perhaps one of the most spectacular achievements of the Council was in persuading a St. Louis department store, Stix, Baer and Fuller, to run a series of twelve full-page advertisements in the metropolitan newspapers calling attention to the specific programs and services of St. Louis cultural institutions. The advertisements, modeled on a format developed by Macy's in New York, were
the first of their kind seen on any scale in St. Louis. They
were in fact sufficiently impressive to earn Stix, Baer and
Fuller one of the national “Business and the Arts” awards
sponsored by Esquire Magazine. Also, among its regular
local St. Louis publicity efforts, the Council prepares a
column for COMMERCE magazine, the monthly pub-
lication of the Chamber of Commerce. This offers an
opportunity to speak directly to St. Louis business in a
magazine where stories about the arts do not commonly
appear.

Many Midwesterners find it hard to believe that
their homegrown arts organizations amount to much un-
less they have some assurance from the news media
nationally. The Council has accordingly taken trouble
to place stories about its own accomplishments and those
of its member organizations in the national press. During
the past three years, such stories have appeared in more
than one hundred major dailies across the country and in
a great many of the weekly magazines. These stories,
often reprinted in St. Louis newspapers or reproduced
for circulation, have helped develop confidence at home
and have made it easier to sell the Arts and Education
Fund and CAMELOT. With a similar objective, the
Council presented nominations in both 1968 and 1969
for the Esquire Magazine-Business Committee for the
Arts awards honoring companies making outstanding
contributions in support of the arts. All three nominees
presented by the Council—Famous-Barr, Stix, Baer and
Fuller, and Mark Twain Bancshares—received awards.
This not only stimulated a favorable national impression
of St. Louis but also gave recognition and encouragement
locally to companies which had provided strong support
to the Council.
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Awards are valuable on a local scale, as well as nationally. It has been helpful that during the past three years volunteers nominated by the Council for work on its behalf have been honored among St. Louis' "Women of Achievement" and "Outstanding Working Women." A particularly proud moment came in 1968 when C. Powell Whitehead, chairman of the Board of the Arts and Education Council and co-chairman of the 1968 Arts and Education Fund campaign, received the city's highest civic award, being named the St. Louis Globe-Democrat "Man of the Year."

The third type of service, counseling member organizations, takes many forms. It may be concerned with fundraising or budgetary planning or program development. Specific examples over the past year or two are: recommendations on sites for a music training program, guidance in the selection of board members, counseling on the preparation and content of applications to national foundations, actual writing of applications, suggestions on ways in which organizations can become involved in the inner city, help in the selection of subjects to be covered in university extension courses, and assistance in developing cooperative programs involving two organizations which had not previously worked together. Requests for help have grown in number and complexity as the Council has gained stature in the community. No formal network of consultants is retained by the Council. Most of the consulting is performed by the executive director, frequently calling on the experience of individual members of the Board of Directors, notably Homer Sayad, the Council's experienced and shrewd president.

The person calling for help or advice is often the
staff director or an individual board member of an agency who feels in need of an informed and objective outside view of a problem. The existence of the Council and its sympathetic staff is clearly a help in the lonely decision-making process. Cultural organizations often have no more than one professional staff member, making the presence of a peer in the profession especially helpful. When consulting takes place, it is normally initiated by an organization or individual requesting assistance. However, on occasion, the Council has itself taken the lead. The most obvious examples of this type of initiative are those connected with large-scale undertakings such as the creation of MECA. On a more modest scale the Council has brought about formal meetings of the administrators of college and university lecture and concert series. These meetings have been designed to explore ways in which bookings of events may be coordinated to cut costs or improve quality. Another example of this form of joint endeavor was a workshop on the arts and the inner city, devised by the Council in conjunction with the local OEO agent to introduce the leaders of St. Louis cultural institutions to people actively involved in inner city life.

Advice is also sought by outside organizations with no formal involvement in the arts that wish to make some contribution to the cultural life of the community. These have included labor unions, churches, social clubs, and neighborhood centers. Counseling in these cases has frequently been unsuccessful since the nature of the requests is often too general or too muddled for useful advice to be given. The Council does not have the staff necessary to devote a great deal of time to the follow-up and unravelling of many of these overtures. The Arts
Young Audiences: Performing in small musical groups, professionals give demonstration concerts in elementary schools throughout St. Louis. There are about 400 such performances a year to average audiences of 300 students per concert.
and Education Council has also been called upon by numerous arts councils, civic action groups, individual cultural organizations, and business leaders to give guidance in other communities. Many assignments have been accepted. This is the one case in which the Council charges fees.

There is no end to the services which an arts council can offer to its member organizations, the only limits being cost and staff time. Considerable use has been made of volunteers, especially in the radio and television programs. Because of the broad nature of the goals involved—building an audience and creating a favorable climate for fundraising—it is difficult to price services precisely in relationship to their effectiveness. Some activities must be accorded the highest priority, others, with the exception of the counseling function, are more or less a luxury. But probably the truth is that if the Council is not called upon for this kind of service, it is failing its community in a profound way.

*Housekeeping* . . . Unlike an orchestra or dance company, a council does not have a readily visible program to justify its existence or expand its income. Its sole justification is whether it can supply needed services at reasonable cost. The values of these services are easier to establish than those of any other arts organization. It is, for example, simpler to decide whether the community is receiving value for the $125,445 spent on the Arts and Education Council than to judge whether the Botanical Garden is worth the $649,934 which it costs to operate for the same period.

Any debate about the community’s return on this expenditure must take into account not just the amount
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of money which the Council raises, but also what it
would cost the member agencies to raise the equivalent
sum on their own. That it now costs seven cents to raise
a dollar where once it cost individual agencies as much
as twenty-five cents justifies the Fund portion of the
Council's activities. It is prudent for a Council always
to have this type of reckoning in mind in considering
its own housekeeping. It must also be conscious that,
since its own business is arts management, others are
going to expect of it the highest standards of sound
administration and exemplary evidence of a dollar's value
received for every dollar spent.

A detailed budget of the $125,445 a year it takes to
operate the Arts and Education Council appears in Ap-
pendix G. The figure includes the cost of administering
the Fund campaign and CAMELOT, and of providing
services to the agencies and the community at large.
Major self-liquidating items such as grants for special
purposes and General Bancshares' sponsorship of the
Calendar are not shown in the budget. The costs of the
Council are meticulously recorded under three principal
headings so that individual services can be evaluated
in the light of their cost. This enables the Council to
measure what percentage of the gross amount raised by
the Fund and CAMELOT is spent on their respective
administration and to insure that specific forms of ser-
vice offered to member agencies do not assume costs out
of proportion to their value. The totals of the divisions
within the Council's budget are: Services, $42,830; Arts
and Education Fund, $67,670; CAMELOT, $14,945.

Most of the Council's income is its own allocation
from the Fund. The amount is supplemented by income
earned on the investment of money before its disburse-
ment to the agencies. CAMELOT expenses are recovered from the proceeds of the auction. Until this year, the budget has been balanced by allowing the Council to recover a fixed amount each year from the reserve set aside for uncollectable pledges to the Fund. This is possible because the reserve of $10,000 has overcompensated for any such defections. The device is admittedly unsatisfactory, and the amount taken by the Council from this source is reduced each year. Outside its allocation from the Fund, the Council has no potential for income for its own use. By its bylaws it may not hold conflicting fundraising activities or have a Friends organization. The one exception has been the Council's receipt of fees earned by its staff's provision of consulting services in different parts of the country. The Council levies no membership fees from its constituent organizations although charges are made for the actual cost of specific services, mostly mailing and printing, carried out in the office. In all its experience of writing applications, the Council has never asked for money for itself.

When embarking on special projects, the Council has in some cases sought outside funding to offset the cost. In 1966 and 1967 grants were received from the Danforth Foundation to prepare the Title III application which established MECA. Also in 1967 a grant was received from the Missouri State Council on the Arts enabling the Council to carry out the Jelliffe study of the arts and the inner city. In 1968 CAMELOT funds were received to stage a conference on strengthening the relationship of cultural organizations with the inner city and to underwrite part of the cost of a new television series.

At the time of the first Fund campaign, the Council
was forced to adopt the undesirable tactic of borrowing ahead from its allocation for the coming year to meet current costs of fundraising. Only in 1967 did the Council finally catch up and start to operate, as do all other Fund agencies, on its current allocation. The accumulated borrowing ahead, or deficit, has been eliminated; the Council operates within its budget and in 1969 a small reserve was established. It is now the intent of the Budget Committee to accumulate a reserve equal to the full cost of one year’s operation.

**Staffing . . .** The Council staff consists of an executive director, two full-time Fund coordinators, a part-time administrator for the CAMELOT auction, an office manager who also keeps all financial records, and three full-time secretaries who handle the printing and addressing equipment, maintain the Fund and CAMELOT records and files in addition to myriad standard clerical duties. During the most intensive period of the campaign, additional part-time clerical assistance is enlisted. Other professionals are contracted for specific purposes. An administrative assistant is on loan from Southern Illinois University to staff the Arts Development and Planning Committees of the Council, and to help member groups write proposals and applications for funds.

This is a lean provision for the multitudinous activities of the Council. That all works so well is a tribute, above all else, to the capabilities, intelligent planning, and dedication of Miss Laverne Boulware, the Council’s office manager. Besides directing the work flow of the office, Miss Boulware supervises the preparation of the monthly Calendar, maintains records of disbursements to agencies and accountings of the Council’s own expenses,
records the billing and payment record of pledges to the Fund, and audits the approximately 13,000 gifts received by the Fund.

At first glance, it might seem that the work of the Council should be seasonal because the Fund campaign is scheduled to take place in the spring. In fact, while Fund business peaks between February and April, record-keeping and planning has taken on a year-round character. Even if there can be some relaxation from the campaign during the summer and fall, the intensity and volume of business is quickly replaced by the demands of the November CAMELOT auction. The introduction of a punch card system in keeping Fund records has made it possible to reduce the pressure during key periods and to spread the work load more evenly throughout the year.

The effect of the Council has been considerably greater than it might have been because volunteers readily step forward to perform functions for which additional staff would otherwise have to be retained—Mrs. George Hoblitzelle, for example, whose work in the inner city is described in Chapter 8. In addition, the Junior League has assigned its members as volunteers for a number of years. Their work has been to assist in the detailed and demanding compilation of information for the Calendar and in assembling a Fact Book, descriptive of all member organizations of the Council. Other volunteers have assisted in preparing the inner city summer calendars, in the production of the Council's radio and television shows, and in the more mundane, but equally important, business of keeping records in the office. These volunteers are quite distinct from the countless men and women who work each year to insure the
success of the Arts and Education Fund and CAMELOT.

The assignment of volunteers to tasks worthy of their skills and aptitudes presents a challenge. Few organizations have been successful in tapping effectively the enormous, often-wasted, resource offered by women with time to give and the readiness to give it. Many of these women are capable of holding down paid jobs of real challenge. Too often they are asked, as volunteers, to perform routine, boring tasks which present little challenge or interest. The Junior League, which requires volunteer work from its members, has taken the trouble to match these human resources intelligently with jobs which need to be done. The Council in turn has learned from the Junior League's experience. Successful placement of volunteers calls for sensitivity on both sides. The Council has a limitless appetite and need for volunteers ready to take initiatives. They must do so remembering that they are acting in the Council's name and still be willing to forego the time-consuming luxury of daily, detailed supervision. For an organization with as small a staff as the Council, it is vital that the employment of volunteers should not itself create an unbearable additional work load.

Home . . . In 1966 the Council moved from its cramped quarters in an unimposing, one-story structure to an efficient if unpretentious office building closer to downtown St. Louis. It has since been joined in its new location by four of its agencies, the Adult Education Council, Dance Concert Society, Opera Theatre, and Young Audiences. The resulting mini-cultural complex was not a matter of design even though there had been intermittent talk over a period of years about the benefits to be
derived from easy access. The cluster in fact grew by accident as first one, then another agency found itself in the market for an office.

The advantage to the organizations of this proximity is their sharing of certain expensive aids to efficiency which, on their own, they could hardly afford. The common use of multilithing, addressing, and copying machinery owned by the Council is an obvious example. So too is the readiness of the Council to supply telephone answering service during the temporary absences of the small staffs of its neighbors. A less obvious asset is the constant availability to all the organizations of Miss Boulware, an experienced office manager, who not only schedules the joint use of equipment but knows from experience where bargains are in office supplies, furniture, and printing. This grouping of offices demonstrates that useful savings and common action can sometimes be effected by common sense as well as by planning on a major scale.

In the appearance and furnishing of its own office, the Council seeks to give an impression of the style and expense undertaken by any small business handling between $1-2 million a year. For any charitable organization there is a delicate line between appearing too prodigal with contributed money and seeming to be so parsimonious as to suggest disorganization and inadequacy. Until the move in 1966, the Council gave the latter impression. It operated with donated typewriters on borrowed furniture. Salary scales were accordingly low. Since that time, some new furniture and equipment has been bought—at sales. Salaries have been improved. No one is ever going to grow rich working for an arts council but it is absurd to suppose that councils should
be staffed only by the self-denying. Saints are not necessarily the best typists. The Council even now in its outward appearance leans towards caution. It is guided by the principle that to be cautious in small things allows one to be radical in the things which matter.
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"After reading the evening paper and hearing the daily newscast, I must think of programs such as MECA to find courage to maintain my faith in humanity. With more than half of all the tax money going to buy more sophisticated murder machines and defense systems to protect other defense systems, I take relief in knowing that some money is left over to use in building pride, self-respect, and an awareness of man's desire to create rather than destroy."

—PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHER

"P.S. Try to excuse my writing its not very creative because I just finished with my right hand in fencing and my left in ceramics."

—SATURDAY CENTER STUDENT

It was an arduous struggle from the formation of the Spirit of St. Louis Fund to the secure place the Arts and Education Fund holds now in the life of St. Louis. Yet along the way it was never assumed that the Council should not perform services in St. Louis other than operating the Fund campaign. Under Charles Mark's leadership, many possibilities were explored. After his departure, there was little active programming outside the Fund, beyond the publication of a Calendar and maintaining mailing lists. It was during this period, when the Council was without staff leadership, that the Con-
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gress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, signaling a major breakthrough of concern for public education in America. Title III of the Act made funds available to local education agencies to improve education by: “enabling communities to provide services not now available to children who live there; to raise the quality of educational services already offered and to stimulate and assist in the development and establishment of innovative and exemplary educational programs.”

Title III caught the imagination of several members of the Council’s Board of Directors, particularly Dr. Leigh Gerdine, then chairman of the Department of Music at Washington University, now president of Webster College. The new legislation was opportunity knocking for St. Louis to tackle some of the shortcomings of public education in the arts, and at the same time, to tap a revolutionary source of federal support for arts activities.

Gerdine obtained a small grant from the Danforth Foundation to finance the Council’s formulation of a Title III application. A young St. Louis lawyer, Donald Faerber, then president of Young Audiences, was retained to explore the possible components of such an application with educators and leaders of St. Louis cultural institutions. After four months of extensive survey in the schools and countless meetings, a complicated document was prepared on behalf of local school districts and a request for funds was addressed to the Office of Education. A formal notification of the application’s rejection arrived eight weeks later.

This notice was received the same week that Michael Newton was appointed executive director of the
Council, and one of his first duties was to participate in the post-mortem on the application. It became clear that Title III did indeed make provision for the type of exemplary activities in elementary and secondary education that the Council had in mind. The Office of Education also welcomed cooperation between school districts, even when those districts lay in two states as was the case with metropolitan St. Louis. It was equally obvious that the application was faulty in the eyes of Washington on three major points: the City of St. Louis School District was not one of those participating; the content of the proposal was not devised by professional educators; the programs were not innovative enough. The failure of the St. Louis Board of Education to endorse the proposal combined with an apparent intent to sell the services of cultural organizations were the principal objections.

The Danforth Foundation was willing once again to provide a grant to the Council, covering the cost of resubmitting an application. Building on Faerber's considerable groundwork, a group of interested Board members, including Gerdine, Dr. Richard Gordon, and Miss Adelaide Cherbonnier, went to work with the new executive director. Committees of school arts and music supervisors, curriculum directors, and managers of cultural organizations were formed. Countless interviews were conducted. Ideas were developed, explored, discarded, and in some cases incorporated into a plan. Meetings were held with superintendents singly, and in groups, large and small. An Advisory Board was formed of superintendents, representatives of universities, the senior staff of the Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory (CEMREL), and Council Board members. Finally, a comprehensive plan was formulated.
Writers at the Department of Education of the University of Missouri at St. Louis translated the plan into the language of an application. The resulting document was then presented to the Committees and the Advisory Board for modification and approval. That draft was next sent to eighty-two superintendents for their endorsement. At the last moment, the superintendent of the St. Louis School District was persuaded to add his approval.

The document submitted to the Office of Education ran to 113 pages. When the Office called for revisions, a further seventy-four pages of changes and clarifications were added. In May 1967, eighteen months after Faerber had started work and almost a year from the time Newton began his revisions, a grant was made.

The first-year grant was $377,000. Subsequent renewals and other income earned from the operation of the program will have generated a total of more than $1 million for education in the arts in the first three years of operation. This represents not just great amounts of money from a hitherto untapped source, but the first time federal revenue has made a large-scale contribution to the cultural life of St. Louis.

Because the Council has a policy of not operating programs itself, and because the legislation requires that school districts control the funds received, management of the Title III program became the responsibility of an organization created specifically for the purpose and named the Metropolitan Educational Center in the Arts. Scarcely a catchy title, it resolved itself into a more memorable acronym, MECA. A Board of Directors was formed of twelve superintendents with Dr. Elmer Kane of Clayton School District (Missouri) and Ralph Cox of Belle Valley 119 School District (Illinois) as chairman.
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and vice-chairman, respectively. Since Kane and Cox had given imaginative leadership in preparation and since their Districts formally presented the application from their respective states, they were logical choices for leaders of the new organization. The Board reflected the metropolitan nature of MECA, including four superintendents from Illinois and eight from Missouri. The bistate, cooperative character has always been one of the most attractive features of MECA (sad thought that only in the arts and education and in the provision of sewers by the Metropolitan Sewer District has bistate cooperation worked smoothly in Greater St. Louis). The Board's election of the executive director of the Arts and Education Council as an ex officio member gave recognition to the role which the Council had played in providing new resources to the area. Soon after MECA's creation, it recruited a director, Dr. Arthur Custer, a composer and music school administrator, and a program coordinator, Dr. Judith Aronson, a specialist in educational administration.

In a sense, the role of the Council in the program ceased with the creation of MECA apart from representation on the Board. However, the Council's interest in the organization has continued as a practical matter. MECA became a non-Fund member of the Council, and subsequently, received funds from the Arts Development Committee. On more than one occasion the Council has designated MECA as administering agent of programs for which the Council secured funding. In general principle, it is undesirable to create new organizations whose primary purpose is to administer a specific federal grant as was done with MECA. Hindsight indicates that this is only building problems for the time when the grant is
terminated. Odds are against developing a power base from which to continue worthwhile activities during the limited lifespan allowed most federal programs. However, in the first flush of success, three years seemed a long time.

A common concern throughout MECA’s programs is introducing young people in elementary and secondary schools to artists and performers as professionals. One reason why so many children enter adult life seeing the arts as a hazy, pretentious frivolity of marginal importance compared with English, mathematics, home economics, football and other “relevant” studies is because this is the very way they are presented in the great majority of schools. If a child needs medical help, he is taken to a doctor; if he needs to be taught English, he is taught by someone prepared in the subject; if he is to learn to play football, he is taught by the coach. Only in the arts is instruction commonly left to the amateur; and only in the arts is a child’s first experience likely to be with those who treat them as a hobby. Such is not the case in all school districts. The City of St. Louis, for example, is served by a remarkable group of art teachers, recruited and lovingly trained by a distinguished educator, Dr. Marie Larkin. But she has neither financial resources to implement even a small portion of her store of ideas, nor are school principals sufficiently aware of their good fortune. With rare exceptions, the professional artist is at several removes from the public school student. The MECA application called for the operation of a range of different programs. Variations and refinements of these have been the substance of MECA for the three years of its existence. The operation as a whole has been
similar in size, scope, and budget to that of a small school district.

The creative ingenuity of Dr. Larkin provided the idea for the most attractive MECA innovation, the Saturday Centers. There are five Centers in all. They are strategically placed throughout the metropolitan area: in a lower middle class district, in a smart residential area, in a distant suburb, in a semi-rural community, and in an area with an unusual social and economic mix. The Centers offer Saturday instruction during the school year in all manner of art forms ranging from the various media of plastic arts to dance, photography, and theatre. Often, the students determine the subjects and content, so fencing, light shows, and electronic music have appeared on the list. Centers are open to students of elementary and secondary school ages who come of their own volition and receive no formal credit for attendance. The teachers are for the most part professional artists. Some may have teachers' certification; others do not. Each Center has its own director who hires the staff and whose personality sets the mood. The emphasis is on allowing children to work in their own time out of a school context on projects in which they are interested. PropONENTS of MECA felt that too often when the creative or potentially creative child emerges, he is treated as a problem in the regular classroom because he is out of step with other children. It is hoped that the more open atmosphere of a Saturday Center, where the arts are recognized and treated as central to life and experience, will provide a special opportunity for such children.

The Centers have been unequal in their achievements. The most important factors in how well they function have been the quality of their personnel and the
nature of the communities in which they have been located. The most exciting and effective Center is in the City of St. Louis, situated so as to be accessible to inner city students as well as to those from middle class homes. The well-balanced social and racial mixture (characteristic of the MECA program as a whole) has stimulated a vitality of its own. But, the key to success has been its director and staff. The director for the first two years was Mrs. Patricia Degener, an effervescent, engaging, and articulate woman, who was more a participant in the Center than a figure of authority. She was formerly a teacher with Dr. Larkin’s art department and is a gifted potter. One of Mrs. Degener’s recruits, Russell Durgin, headed the Center in its third year. He was a natural choice since he had previously taught drama there. Durgin, the energetic, scholarly, but not pedantic English department chairman of an expensive boys’ school, made a perfect complement, in drama instruction, to the young director of theatre for the Black Artists Group, with whom he shared his responsibilities. Indeed, Mrs. Degener recruited a whole staff as fascinating as herself: a businessman with a passion and talent for writing; a black dancer who formerly worked with Alvin Ailey and the New York City Ballet; a hip photographer; a professor from the Art Department at Washington University; a jazz musician; and a skilled puppeteer who also works magic with papier maché. This unlikely assembly of teachers, together with 150 young people, spent a year of Saturdays presenting traditional or student-written plays, developing puppet shows based on classical mythology, making films, writing poems and plays, creating a jazz band and two memorable television shows, staging happenings, and parades, and evenings
of entertainment for parents and friends, for the Urban League, and for the Arts and Education Council's General Assembly. Their first home was a parochial school, then the community center of Christ Church Episcopal Cathedral, and finally, best of all, a vacant shoe factory imaginatively donated by George Rosborough, Jr., and the Measuregraph Company. The annual budget for the Center has varied from $18,000 to a too-restrictive $10,000. It is a triumphant demonstration that the arts can generate their own excitement given the combination of exuberant teachers and involved children. Location is less important. With the right staff, a Center could probably succeed even in a school building.

The elusive combination of the fine artist and the superb teacher was the hallmark of the first program MECA launched. These dual assets were provided by Murray Louis who brought seven members of his dance company for a three-week residency in area schools. The brief stay made available concentrated instruction in a number of school districts which already offered dance classes, and a master class for forty advanced students and their teachers. The program was interspersed with performances for students and the general public. Louis' residency, followed by a similar program in the second year with Lucas Hoving, are among the few exposures to modern dance that St. Louis has experienced. The city has no locally based company, only some dedicated and effective people in the Performing Arts Area, an inter-disciplinary program of Washington University, under the leadership of Miss Anneliese Mertz who introduced Murray Louis to MECA. Louis' impression on students, teachers, and administrators with whom he came into contact was electric; few were awed by his reputation.
because few had heard of him. A consortium initiated by MECA, including the new Dance Concert Society, Southern Illinois University, and Washington University, was formed in 1968-69 and 1969-70 to bring modern dance companies to St. Louis. One-quarter of the cost was met by a grant from the National Endowment for the Arts.

After the departure of the companies, the weakness of the dance program became apparent. No one of such quality remained to follow up the initial missionary activity. This gap was filled the second year by retaining Bill Frank, a former member of Murray Louis’ company, as a dancer-in-residence for MECA. Since no individual school district retains a dancer of Frank’s calibre on its faculty, this represents a valuable MECA service. The dancer-in-residence is available for master class instruction and to supplement public school offerings. A variant on the dancer-in-residence concept has been the position of composer-in-residence, introduced in the second year of MECA. For the first time, high school students could attend classes in composition. The cost of this program has been shared on an equal basis with the Department of Music at Southern Illinois University.

The costliest aspects of the MECA program have been its music components. It became clear in the initial survey in 1965 that the most frequently voiced demand for improved educational services in the arts came from music supervisors. As much as anything, this probably reflected the fact that musical interests are more deeply entrenched in the schools than those of any art form. The visual arts ran a distant second, while hardly anyone spoke up for drama, creative writing, or dance. Most of the demand was for increased availability of Young Audiences’ lecture-demonstrations and St. Louis Symphony
school concerts. Both Young Audiences and the Symphony appeared to be popular with music supervisors and superintendents. Unfortunately, the survey, in those simple days when student opinion was regularly ignored, was not addressed to students. There was little criticism of Young Audiences, but some bitterness was felt toward the Symphony for allegedly giving the schools warmed-over versions of its Saturday night fare.

Acknowledging the survey's results, MECA set out to increase the number of concert-demonstrations and Symphony performances, and also to create a more logical, sustained educational approach to the use of professional musicians. A system of sequence concerts was developed in which children heard a series of Young Audiences ensembles introducing them to the string, brass, and other components of the orchestra, and culminated in exposure to the full Symphony. Special emphasis was placed on intelligent programming of the full concerts so that the content would follow logically from what had gone before, avoiding the common occurrence of children being taken without preparation to a concert designed for an experienced, adult audience. With only this latter experience as background, it is no wonder that so many young people are put off orchestral music for life. Significant amounts of MECA funds were used to subsidize the cost of these sequences. MECA even paid for rehearsal time (unusual in the purchase of school concerts) to insure that the orchestra had adequate opportunity to prepare programs especially for a school-aged audience.

It is difficult to form an objective judgment of the relative success of this program. The approach was logical but perhaps too lavish, since, without subsidy, it is
unlikely that many schools will be prepared to pay for this necessarily expensive progression. The quality of the educational offerings of the Symphony and Young Audiences have markedly improved since MECA came into existence. How much this is due to the involvement of MECA and how much to the infusion of new leadership both within the Symphony and Young Audiences is not clear. Both were probably factors.

Friction between MECA and each of the two organizations developed in the operation of the program. The Symphony management was unhappy, for example, about some aspects of MECA’s choice of musical compositions and the manner in which they were presented. MECA felt that, as commissioning agent with direct responsibility to the schools, it had the right to conduct a program of its own design. The seed of the difficulty dated back to imprecision in the application, when funds were sought to hire an educational director as a new position for the Symphony. Originally, it was intended that this new director should be a member of the Symphony staff, answerable to the orchestra manager. In an Office of Education review, Washington insisted this be a MECA staff position so that the funded project would have ultimate control. The educational director was also given responsibilities for the content of the Young Audiences component. MECA control implied an unprecedented surrender by each of the other agencies of responsibility for a major part of their educational efforts. The best solution in retrospect would be for the commissioning agent, MECA, to establish as precise a set of guidelines as possible for what was expected from a program, but to leave the implementation in the hands of the cultural organization. Most important of all, it is neces-
sary to establish a clear understanding from the start where responsibility rests.

One of the least expensive and most popular of MECA's early undertakings was the institution of joint rehearsals with the St. Louis Symphony for school orchestras and, in a second phase, for school choirs. Young people enjoy the experience of sharing music stands with, and working alongside, professional musicians, while witnessing firsthand the dynamics of a major orchestra at work. These activities now continue with funding coming from the participating schools.

A music program that was scarcely innovative in the language of Title III, but which filled a clearly expressed need, was the establishment of two branches of the Community Music School. They are located in East St. Louis and Kinloch, two of the poorest sections of Greater St. Louis, both completely inaccessible to the Community Music School by public transportation. These branches, in their three years of operation, gave children in areas devoid even of adequate schools an opportunity to study a musical instrument under a first-rate instructor.

The only MECA program in the visual arts other than through Saturday Centers is conducted in cooperation with the City Art Museum and Washington University. It is a singularly successful effort—initiated by Mrs. Aronson and Museum curator Miss Emily Rauh—to prepare students and teachers for their visits to the Museum. Special teaching kits consisting of slides and printed materials are prepared for use in advance of visits; training sessions are held for teachers; and, the Museum is opened to participating classes of students on a day when closed to the public. The intention is to give the teachers confidence in interpreting the collection or a special ex-
hibition, and to dispel their fear of being embarrassed in front of their classes by lack of knowledge. Additional emphasis is placed on students developing a proprietary feeling about their tax-supported Museum, to bridge the gap between them and this possibly alien world. Though of modest size, the program fulfills the intention of Title III, developing an exemplary use of a major community resource for educational ends.

The provision of a small professional theatre company involved the greatest initial skepticism of all MECA programs because of a necessary gamble in finding the right artists to meet the spirit of the undertaking. The Second Story Players, an Off-Broadway company with an Obie award to its credit and a fine record of presenting new plays, was brought to St. Louis. In a short period of time, the company (inconsequentially renamed the Harlequin Players) developed a set of improvisational sketches and techniques of high calibre. It soon became apparent that their sophisticated talents were best suited to high school students and also that their performances had little intellectual usefulness if presented without follow-up. Accordingly in the second year, the performances were offered to high schools, and workshops were always available in conjunction with the performances. The company developed a series of sequential workshops not only for teachers of English, speech, and drama, but for any interested teacher from any subject field or age level. In the workshops, improvisational theatre techniques were explored in order to demonstrate their potential for developing communication.

The acting and directing quality of the company won them a following and stimulated respect for theatre in general in many of the places where they appeared.
However, the program was plagued throughout its two years by deficiencies of management, accentuated by occasional lapses of discretion in fitting a performance to a particular audience. Had it been possible to have recruited a company of equal calibre locally or had it been possible to graft the Harlequin Players onto the professional company at the Loretto-Hilton Center, there might have been a more lasting return on a fascinating experiment. As it was, individual members of an eager, young company performed on their own in several revues, opened a small free theatre, taught drama and improvisation, conducted workshops, and as a company, staged well a number of contemporary plays. The experience showed that improvisational theatre technique can be an exciting device to stimulate young people and to give them a first taste of theatre. At the same time, the program and that at the Saturday Centers underlined the need for follow-through to take students beyond theatre games to dramatic literature.

In its third year, MECA’s efforts in theatre continued with workshops demonstrating improvisational techniques for teachers and also took a first step toward a young people’s theatre in St. Louis. This enterprise is being developed by Alan and Joanna Nichols, a husband and wife team who chose to stay in St. Louis after their former colleagues from the Harlequin Company had dispersed. The Nichols have offered free instruction in theatre to thirty-five interested adults. No charge is levied for the instruction other than a requirement that selected and qualified participants perform in an agreed number of productions in schools. MECA charges fees for these performances, recovering part of the cost of the program. This is an ingenious device to achieve two
goals at once, training interested adults in theatre and providing schools with performances of quality. One or two of the participants are college students, some are former professional actors, others are just plain stage-struck. One extremely attractive aspect of the program is that the Junior League, which retired from the business of trooping shows in favor of this semi-professional group, underwrites the cost of performances in those inner city schools which cannot afford to pay the fee.

A balance sheet listing the weaknesses and strengths of MECA will indicate a considerable record of achievement. Launching a program of this scope virtually overnight and from a limited base was a major undertaking. The scale of MECA's operations has been almost intimidatingly large. The best programs have been those which showed the exciting possibilities of enlisting the energies of talented artists and then giving them free rein. Educational services of many cultural organizations have become more responsive to school needs since the creation of MECA. Ideas emanating from MECA have been picked up by teachers and supervisors within individual school districts. Patterns of cooperation with St. Louis colleges and universities have been established. For all of this, particular credit must go to Arthur Custer who has proved adept at bringing organizations together to pool their resources. Perhaps most significant was a movement, as MECA became established, toward greater emphasis on teacher training, if only because of the very magnitude of the task and the needs of students numbering into the hundreds of thousands.

Some specific programs naturally fell short of what was expected or did not work as planned. But the major
MECA Saturday Center: The Metropolitan Educational Center in the Arts, a program funded by the Office of Education on a proposal by the Arts and Education Council presented a variety of programs to St. Louis schoolchildren. At top (right) is Mrs. Patricia Degener, director of the Saturday Centers which brought arts instruction into the inner city.
overall weakness has been a failure to involve the school districts themselves more deeply. That the schools have never come to feel MECA theirs is understandable. MECA’s rationale and very existence was intended to pinpoint shortcomings of the schools and ways of meeting them. Many teachers, supervisors, and superintendents clearly felt threatened by this kind of example. Students in Saturday Centers sometimes reported they were careful not to talk in school about their Center because of the hostility and derision their remarks aroused among some teachers. This fear may have been exacerbated because so many of the staff, teachers, and artists were not visibly part of the elementary and secondary school tradition. In dealing with a profession sensitive to intrusion from well-meaning laymen and indeed, all outsiders, this clearly was a handicap. Superintendents weighed down by failing bond issues, teacher salary pressures, pleas for decentralization, integration, segregation, more bussing, less bussing, and thousands of other conflicting demands were hardly anxious to be told in addition of their schools’ shortcomings in aesthetic education.

Although the losses in scale and variety would have been immense, MECA might well have stood a better chance in this regard if it had been confined to one school district and could have operated from within the system. This approach is now being tried in University City, a St. Louis suburb, in the Arts in General Education program sponsored by the JDR 3rd Fund, CEM-REL, and the District itself. The starting point in University City is that the arts should be treated as part of general education rather than an optional frill. The program is less flamboyant than MECA’s. Initial effort is
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centrated on the preparation of teachers from all subject fields. The firm financial backing, the experience of Miss Kathryn Bloom of the JDR 3rd Fund, and the presence of a sympathetic environment should stand the experiment in good stead.

Plans are underway to secure continuing support for MECA from within the St. Louis community when the federal grant runs out. It is possible that many of the more successful programs will be taken over by existing organizations or will secure independent funding. MECA itself may well be merged with an existing program to insure that its work of experiment and stimulating change may continue. One by-product of the Title III experience is that some of the federal funds introduced to St. Louis as a result of the original application by the Council were used to purchase services from its member organizations. All this portion of the money was used to pay for services, not as subsidy direct or indirect, but at least the budgets of Young Audiences, the Community Music School, the Symphony, and others had their first experience of federal funds.

To anyone connected with MECA, Title III, and the workings of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the foresight, imagination, and flexibility displayed by the Office of Education, and originally by the 1965 Congress, were impressive testimony to "creative federalism." Title III lost this quality when control over the program passed to the often less imaginative Departments of Education of individual states as the result of a short-sighted amendment promoted by Congresswoman Edith Green (D. Ore.). Nonetheless, the legislation, in its brief history, has set a welcome precedent for the investment of federal funds in building tomorrow's advocates for the arts.
CHAPTER 8

SUMMER AND TALK

"It is said that when the Japanese build a garden, they plan no paths, but wait to see where the people walk. That is what we must do."

—Jesse Horstman
Deputy Director, St. Louis Model City Agency

“A good art teacher with newsprint and imagination is worth more than a poor art teacher with the best of supplies and equipment.”

—Dr. Marie Larkin
Supervisor of Art
St. Louis Public Schools

“The concept [in St. Louis] involves nothing less than enlisting the arts in today’s efforts to preserve the city from social disintegration.”

—The Wall Street Journal

Although many people will admit to knowing little about the arts, everyone knows something about childhood, just because he, too, has had one. And, as every distraught den mother and Sunday school teacher, from suburb to slum, knows, “arts and crafts” are good for children. Variations on a theme in papier maché or modeling clay have many uses: to keep idle hands busy, to thinly veil a moral point, or to hammer home an object lesson. Even those whose own childhood has left a sour taste for mixing poster paints and preaching have
probably been charmed by some child's efforts and even amazed at his insight, if not his skill. Indeed, it is this, childhood's unique capacity to take even the fraudulent and false and create the ingenuous and disarming, that makes people receptive to the notion that children and art have a special relationship, that one can do much for the other.

From its inception, the Council has received scattered requests for help from people working with children in churches, schools, or community centers, often in the inner city. For many years the Council was concerned mainly with its own uncertain existence. However in 1967, its actions toward making art a more important part of elementary and secondary education brought additional resources to the area when MECA was established. Yet it was obvious that the inner city deserved special attention to special needs.

Determining those special needs was the next logical step. With the support of a small grant from the Missouri State Council on the Arts, a study was commissioned from Russell and Rowena Jelliffe. The Jelliffes had pioneered with Karamu House in Cleveland, a community center devoted to the arts. (Long before the poor were called "the underprivileged," Negroes were subjected to all the euphemisms guilt can devise, and the arts raised a flutter of hope where other panaceas had failed.) With numerous consultations and a ten-day stay in St. Louis, the Jelliffes prepared recommendations for what they hoped would develop in the way of arts resources within a geographical area comprising about 10 per cent of the City of St. Louis. The area was approximately commensurate with that recently designated the Model City target area.
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Basically the Jelliffe report contained sound general principles: good teachers and good equipment are both essentials, but in that order—the arts are not some universal toy everyone is qualified to play with, rather they demand professional attitudes; not every child will take to the arts any more than every child will take to baseball.

What became clear about the report, however, was that it erred into the realm of “wouldn’t it be wonderful if.” Still too close to its own beginnings, the Council quickly recognized it was not omniscient. No matter how tidy it might seem, there was no chance of simply swooping in and providing a lot of art. It was later to be made clear that it was not even desirable that it should do so. The Jelliffes’ success with Karamu House was in part due to their own exciting, dynamic, and visionary natures. But, success was not instantaneous. It grew as Karamu House became a part of its community. Any similar St. Louis instance of the arts being an important aspect of the lives of the poor must also grow and develop.

Once the conscious decision to commit the Council to a concern with the inner city had been made, and reaffirmed by the stimulating contact with the Jelliffes, it was apparent that nothing could supplant some experience or at least firsthand knowledge of the area of concern. The Council staff is small and any decision on commitments must take that into account. Work with the inner city is nothing if not time-consuming. As with any small agency, the Council turns to volunteers to supplement its staff. So, the Council found an unsuspecting volunteer.

It was important to find a person who would do more than say “frightful, simply frightful,” when asked how
things were in the places she visited. She had to be someone whose opinions could be trusted and who would be welcomed by social service agency staffs who are often quite suspicious of anyone poking around on their turf. Furthermore she had to be a willing and industrious worker—St. Louis’ inner city is no small, neatly defined area.

By a stroke of luck, or of genius, or of fortune smiling, the Council found Mrs. George Hoblitzelle, who has been continuously cheerful and gracious the whole while she became less of a volunteer and more of an unpaid staff member.

She agreed to reinterview some of the St. Louisans with whom the Jelliffes had spoken. In the interviews, she sought answers to many questions: what is involved in working with the inner city; what residents have in mind in the way of arts and education; which social welfare agencies are doing what about the urban poor; which local and national government and private agencies the Council can aid or obtain support from; what “supplemental education” programs exist in the inner city; and how the Council can best expend its collective energies and any material support it can obtain. Mrs. Hoblitzelle assumed that one day the assignment would be completed. Two years later, she, and in turn, the Council staff are still seeking answers and rethinking problems and issues.

Before Mrs. Hoblitzelle had time to talk with even a small portion of a rapidly expanding list of people with valuable knowledge and experience of the inner city, the Model City agency asked the Council’s executive director to serve as chairman of the Arts and Recreation Task Committee for Model City planning. Scott Hatley was
MECA Saturday Center: A chance to read poems to friends...

take part in the rehearsal of a play...

and learn some of the body's capacities for modern dance.
added to the Council staff to aid in this endeavor.

Federal legislation setting up a form of assistance to problem-plagued urban America required that a single section of no more than 10 per cent of a city’s total land area be designated a “Model City Area.” That portion was to be eligible for all available federal government assistance in a coordinated effort to handle its interrelated complex of problems. The Model City area in the City of St. Louis is almost exactly that 10 per cent maximum. Statistically it also has the worst “anything-rate” in the City. It comprises five different “subcities” in Model City’s terminology that have little in common except geographic proximity and general poverty. One of these is a vast public housing project with nothing but thirteen eleven-story monoliths that are a nightmare of inhuman planning. Another contains a population half poor white and half poor black, coexisting in an atmosphere of tension. Here, the streets are lined with tenements made from what was once St. Louis’ most fashionable residential section. Silent testimonies to the past are scattered throughout the five areas: a church named St. Bridget of Erin, a forlorn and scarred statue of the poet Schiller. The population of each of the subcities ranges from 60 to 100 per cent black.

In every subcity is an agency called a Gateway Center. These are the most immediate, neighborhood level, representative agencies of the Office of Economic Opportunity’s agent in St. Louis, the Human Development Corporation. HDC has staff in each Center to provide specific services, and especially to insure compliance with the Department of Housing and Urban Development’s ruling that all poverty programs must have “ maxi-
mum feasible resident participation.” The Model City program must also comply with this guideline, and it is consequently reasonable that neighborhood planning takes place through the Gateway Centers.

The Model City program in St. Louis has suffered from many shortcomings, though perhaps its case is not singular. The agency has always been understaffed, and the quality of its personnel has not always been equal to the task set before them, that of supplying an all-sided approach to all the problems of urban poverty. The results are such anachronisms as an “arts and recreation committee” that eventually became “arts, recreation, and juvenile delinquency.”

Out of necessity, the agency has found itself in the position of many poverty programs before it, having to promise far more than it could produce simply to sustain its own existence until funding came. And when money did arrive, it was in disappointing amounts that seemed always earmarked for “planning.” The Model City agency has served as the hapless buffer between those who cried: “Just give the residents the money and let them spend it like they want to,” and those who said: “You know you’ll never get anywhere unless you involve City Hall and HDC” (or whatever agency the speaker happened to favor). Too often Model City meetings, whether held at City Hall or at a local Gateway Center, devolved into harangues or competitions over who was the more liberal, or the recitation of cliches, or simply complaining sessions.

The problem of achieving genuine “resident participation” has not been solved in St. Louis, nor has the issue of who is really to control Model City agency spending, be it the residents by some procedure of voting, the
leaders of governmental or private agencies, or those who purport to speak on behalf of the residents’ best interests, be they Gateway Center staff, contracted “advocate planners,” vocal residents, or settlement house personnel. The problems of the Model City program in St. Louis only serve to illustrate the intricacies of working in the inner city. The Council, simply because it works with arts and education, is not freed from working in the context of what can only be termed a power struggle with, as yet, no winners and many losers.

The brief life of the Arts and Recreation Task Committee is an example of the debilitating effects of dissonance between “resident” and “power structure.” In theory the Committee was to include one representative of each of the subcities, and professionals in arts and recreation persuaded to give their time. The latter included a YMCA executive, a professional football player, the supervisor of art for the St. Louis Public Schools, a couple of aldermen, a young actress, and more. This plan gave way almost immediately. Subcity residents, long planned for by others and promised that this time they were to do their own planning, had a thorough-going disgust for “professionals,” whatever their ilk. Instead of conducting Committee meetings at the Mayor’s office, the Council staff, including Mrs. Hoblitzelle, went to the Model City area, attended meetings there, and learned from what took place. More enlightening than the meetings themselves were the frequent visits to an area which, in truth, none of the staff called home. Sometime during the long, hot, and occasionally heated, meetings during the summer of 1968, came a greater understanding of the part the Council could play in dealing with the inner city’s complex problems. Of the ideas, from any source,
that arose during the Council’s connection with the Model City agency—superb, indifferent, ridiculous, or somewhere in between—none have been put into effect with Model City money.

No irrefutable rules can apply in human contact, especially those involving different races, religions, philosophies, and backgrounds. A common concern is not the great equalizer one might hope. No one of the Council’s staff was, or is now, free of prejudices and misconceptions. Despite these impediments, repeated contact with the inner city has provided an increased understanding and some basic thoughts derived from that understanding have proved useful, if not absolute truths.

The inner city presents a special situation. Its way of life is not common knowledge to most of the people who serve on the boards of cultural organizations or to those who staff these same institutions. From the very outset, even the terminology is confusing and intimidating. Few laymen can sort out the variety of governmental and private programs and agencies involved and the phrases and concepts each employs. The term “maximum feasible resident participation” is widespread. Although no one can define the phrase to the satisfaction of everyone, it is viewed as an almost sacred goal. Consensus breaks down, however, over the “maximum feasible” portion. There simply is no rigid formula that can apply. It remains, nonetheless, a worthy aim and must be considered by any person or agency with a commitment to the inner city.

The varied connotations of “maximum feasible resident participation” perpetuate many misconceptions, difficult to destroy. As an example, “black” does not automatically equal “grass roots.” Nor is “grass roots” an
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automatic good. In fact, the Council has not encountered a truly "grass roots" arts project the entire time it has maintained a concern with the inner city. Most projects and efforts succeed or fail because of the teaching and administrative personnel involved, whether they are black or white, indigenous poor or well-to-do suburbanite. By the same token, black people are likely to operate a more satisfactory program designed to provide services to blacks, in terms of accomplishment and attractiveness, than are whites. But, black and white are far from being the only differences between people. A good teacher with the right combination of commitment, knowledge, and capability to communicate is a rare find.

The nearest one can come to truth here is that certain groups are almost irrepresensible, whether officially sanctioned (e.g., by a Model City) or not. If they want help, asking for it or pursuing it when offered, they should be given whatever help the Council can offer. The question of quality is rightly a council's concern. Yet most arts projects tend to be either low-grade paste-and-cut busy work or professionally quite acceptable. There is less middle ground (professional, but marginal or bad) than one would expect. Thus the problem boils down to finding personnel who are competent in their media and competent administrators, and who either are, or can make themselves, acceptable to the people within a neighborhood. Because it can be stated simply, the problem is not necessarily itself a simple proposition. A person with that combination of talents is most likely to be a cross between a demigod and saint.

In making the search for a miracle-worker a little easier and his position more tenable once he is found, a council can try to provide a bridge between the inner
city resident and worker and the resources they need—money and knowledge. To do this a council may supply help in writing proposals, especially for those people who have something started and only need the wherewithal to make it grow. Often a simple introduction will suffice, pairing up people who are working in the inner city with professionals who can give help, ideas, and advice and then will let the inner city worker do what he wishes with his increased information.

Being this bridge, this go-between, means that a council must have knowledge of both the inner city and the resources, the government agencies and foundations, to know where to go with an idea worth pursuing. Indeed, a major share of a council’s responsibility to the inner city lies in stimulating the arts and education establishment to an urbanwide commitment. Its combined knowledge and experience in the inner city is invaluable even in such simple acts as explaining the confusing terminology and machinations current in an inner city neighborhood. A council can also steer arts organizations away from well-intentioned but fatuous or superficial undertakings.

Surely the most difficult lesson to learn is what a council cannot do. It must not create and sell a program that has no genuine base. There is an easy tendency to do this simply because the council’s staff is adept at planning and promotion. This sort of business skill is better used to obtain resources and funds, not to promote programs to those who will have to form the program’s own constituency. Many a seemingly good idea has failed because its originator had not the time to stick with it from conception to fruition. Just as a council’s staff must resist the temptation to create a program with
no base, it must become sensitive in recognizing those programs which exist only in the mind of the creator. Moreover, a council cannot do things that are rightly the province of other agencies no matter how strong the pressure to do so. A current emphasis in St. Louis is on providing jobs for unemployed inner city residents, especially teenagers. There is continual pressure to create positions with titles such as “recreation specialist” that can give some person in need an income. The arts are simply not in the employment business; money is scarce enough and bureaucrats plentiful enough without a council’s watering down a program with short-term palliatives.

All of these matters, and many more, are clearer with hindsight.

As a result of the Model City information and experiences, the Council decided that the most significant use of its time would be developing a proposal for foundation funding to fill some of the needs that had been discovered. As originally developed, the proposal was to have three main parts, the first of which was titled Artists-in-Residence in the inner city. Based on the finding that there were essentially no professional artists in the Model City area, it was proposed to provide funds for several positions ranging from painters, filmmakers, and writers to architects and landscapists. These people would be available to Gateway Centers or other neighborhood-based agencies, to talented individuals, to anyone interested. It was hoped that the artists’ own work would be affected by their experiences, thus providing a new voice for the voiceless poor.

The extension of the Performing Arts Training Cen-
The Adult Education Council: More than 150,000 St. Louisans enroll in adult education courses each year, and the Council helps coordinate the more than 3,000 courses offered by the 106 institutions affiliated with it as well as helping to recruit qualified teachers and sponsoring workshops and conferences.
ter of Southern Illinois University at East St. Louis, under Miss Katherine Dunham, was the second part of the proposal. Funds were to be a subsidy for an existing program which emphasized the rescue of talented high school dropouts for positions as teachers in community centers. PATC also provided the only cultural focus in a city lacking even a single bookstore or cinema.

The provision of transportation services to some facilities such as the Art Museum, Botanical Garden, and Museum of Science was repeatedly mentioned in Model City area meetings. One of the inner city’s greatest problems in St. Louis is its isolation because of a woeful lack of satisfactory public transportation—busses are infrequent and expensive. This third component of the proposal was dispensed with at the foundations’ behest.

The first two portions were founded cooperatively by the Rockefeller and Danforth Foundations. Norman Lloyd at Rockefeller and Lawrence Howard at Danforth gave sympathetic hearings to the proposal. The funding represented for each foundation a departure from the types of programs to which they had previously committed themselves. Rockefeller, through its Arts Division, had not put money directly into attempts at social change, and in turn, Danforth, though recently emphasizing efforts at racial reconciliation, had not directly invested in the arts. One year later is too short a time to make final judgments on the programs. Neither portion developed in the expected way; and neither has developed a real or lasting connection with either the East St. Louis or St. Louis Model City program. Nor has a lasting connection evolved between the two components themselves, and they are now generally regarded as separate entities.
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What ensued is far more fascinating than the Council’s carefully laid out judgments of what might be. Artists-in-Residence (AIR) has formed an alliance with the Black Artists Group. The resultant acronym, AIR-BAG, may be unfortunate, but the union is exciting. AIR-BAG now operates a center which provides instruction for children and teenagers and serves as a rehearsal location for performances presented throughout the St. Louis area. The combined group has given performances at such places as the City Art Museum, Washington University, and the Christ Church (Episcopal) Cathedral’s 150th anniversary celebration, providing white, middle class audiences views of black concerns that are always amazing, sometimes frightening, but consistently professional in calibre. Varied productions—including poetry readings, jazz flute, a play with a medieval setting by a contemporary Belgian writer, light shows, dances, and painting demonstrations—have been provided to elementary schools and community centers, in gymnasiums and on the street during St. Louis’ more than warm summers. One particular development of the AIR-BAG association stands out as a singular success in an area where many other organizations have failed. AIR-BAG has developed a Citizens Committee composed of members of the black middle class. This part of the community has previously remained regrettably uninvolved in many St. Louis endeavors whether the leadership was predominantly black or predominantly white. They offer an important alternative to white control over the finances of black projects with the attendant inherent pitfalls of paternalism or censure.

Even more isolated, even more devoid of humanizing influences than the St. Louis inner city is East St.
Louis, Illinois. St. Louisans hurrying to Chicago for the weekend breathe a sigh of relief and relax tense muscles as they go beyond East St. Louis into the flat and fertile Illinois farm country. Now on a newly constructed interstate highway they can virtually rise above the squalor and poverty, the air of lurking danger, the boarded-up and half-demolished anomaly of East St. Louis. The City, although having a considerable population and only a wide river’s distance from America’s ninth largest metropolis, has the feeling of a small town long since resigned to its own decline.

This seems an unlikely setting for a Parisian fencing instructor, a United Nations simultaneous translator, a wood sculptor from Nigeria, a teacher of classical ballet also from Paris, and a Jamaican anthropologist. The setting is even more unlikely for the sophisticated and internationally known dancer who drew these others to East St. Louis. But Katherine Dunham is an extraordinary woman. She is just short of a sorceress who can create fascination out of thin air, or as is the case in East St. Louis, quite thick air.

Miss Dunham was originally persuaded to come to the Alton, Illinois, campus of Southern Illinois University in October of 1967. Her only obligations were to teach a course and complete a book she had in progress. However, she was scarcely capable of adjusting to a quiet life after a very full one which included obtaining a degree in social anthropology from the University of Chicago, work as a choreographer and dancer in the theatre, opera, films, television, and concert halls in more than fifty countries, writing for publications as diverse as Ellery Queen Mystery Magazine and anthropological journals, completing six books of her own, operating her
own touring company, and establishing four performing arts schools in such far-flung spots as Stockholm and Dakar. With this background, it seems even more unlikely that Katherine Dunham would pass by so great a challenge as East St. Louis poses.

The project she began, the Performing Arts Training Center, has developed in uneven paces since its inception. It is no easy matter for the University, the City, and the Council to keep up with Miss Dunham's creative energy. Until June 1968 the Center had a maximum staff of seven, most of whom were engaged in basic dance instruction for the teacher-trainees drawn from East St. Louis' high school dropout population. With the Danforth and Rockefeller funding, the staff was increased and a wider range of subjects were provided, from Dunham Dance Technique I and II and Socialization through the Arts, to African Traditional Music and Ballet I and II, from Design for Theatre and Pattern-Making to conversational courses in French, Spanish, Japanese, and Yoruba. This exotic blend has always characterized the PATC program, reflecting the belief that a rich combination of the unusual and dramatic, provided it is presented by qualified instructors with style and assurance, is necessary to attract and stimulate those alienated by the regular educational process. Such a flair is helpful in overcoming the City's provincial rejection of the alien. The underlying emphasis on things African is stressed to help many of the students learn the sources of their culture, but with an eye toward separating the significant from the superficial.

Problems are many. All these goings-on are sometimes viewed with amazement and alarm by the predominantly white administration of this predominantly black
city. It is difficult for even the sophisticated to maintain the confidence and respect of factions as diverse as a university administration quartered some 20 miles away, a city hall that has not changed mayors since 1953, several street gangs, and a mixed and cosmopolitan faculty working under trying conditions. Yet the program has flourished and worked cooperatively with neighborhood centers, the local Head Start and the Concentrated Employment Program. A museum has been established that enjoys the approval and support of all these groups. Its collection of Dunham Company memorabilia and dozens of fine examples of ethnic art have been enjoyed by thousands of East St. Louisans who had never before seen a museum. Now with an additional small foundation grant the museum can achieve more professional display and preservation of the objects it houses in what was once a nurses’ residence.

If the capacity to garner financial support is testimony to the quality of a program—and it is not always so—then the PATC has been doing well. During the year of the Danforth and Rockefeller grants, the program also received support from two other foundations. In addition, the Illinois Arts Council gave funds for specific programs (in Cairo, Illinois) and the University has increased its own support of the PATC each year. For the 1969-70 academic year, the University is requesting another substantial increase from the State legislature.

The performing company, and Miss Dunham herself in numerous appearances throughout the metropolitan area and nationally, make known the names PATC, Southern Illinois University, and East St. Louis; Head Start children learn rhythm and movement; two PATC students now have fellowships; East St. Louis has a
nascent museum; white students learn through music, poetry, and dance about problems they never knew existed. Probably the greatest long-term effect of PATC is on the development of higher education in East St. Louis. When the Center opened, the City was served only by a small and diminishing branch of Southern Illinois University. The quality of PATC encouraged the University to authorize and seek funds for a newly devised two-year associate degree program. The proposed new approach has gained the required approval of the University's Higher Board and of the State legislature. State funds have opened a new junior college in East St. Louis, the first in the State of Illinois for which no local matching funds have been required. Without Miss Dunham's leadership, the foundation funds secured by the Council which enabled her to demonstrate the potential of her ideas, and the initial foresight and support of the University's president, Dr. Delyte Morris, this growth most likely would not have taken place.

Through the Council's work with the Model City agency, AIR-BAG and an expanded PATC program had evolved. And through its involvement with these efforts, the Council had gained a reputation for effective action in a new direction. As a result of this reputation, in the summer of 1968 the Mayor's Council on Youth Opportunity asked the Council's executive director to serve as their arts coordinator.

Largely in response to the disastrous riots which blazed through the nation's cities in the mid-sixties, President Johnson formed the President's Council on Youth Opportunity to be headed by the vice-president. Cities around the country followed suit, establishing
agencies to mobilize their resources and receive and encourage federal contributions to handle the obvious problem of the many students freed from school but without the money for even the cheapest amusements. St. Louis’ aggressive and energetic administration was among the first to set up a Mayor’s Council. It was to emphasize employment, recreation, and education.

That summer the National Endowment for the Arts, with prompting from Vice-President Hubert Humphrey, made grants of $25,000 each to sixteen large American cities. Although plans were begun early in the year on the summer programs, it is unlikely that all of them would have been possible without this federal money.

Although the specific activities apply in detail only to St. Louis, the experiences with them have formed part of the Council’s thinking on inner city programs in general. For example, the Model City experience has taught the Council that short-term activities which have no relation to a continuing life-pattern are of little value. Thus, all ideas for “love-em-and-leave-em” projects like helicopter rides around the Arch were dispensed with immediately. Instead, programs were sought that offered the possibility of year-round implementation through established agencies such as the Community Music School. If the specific program itself were not to be available year-round, then at least something similar would be accessible once the summer and its attendant panic had passed.

A comprehensive workshop in the arts was established with MECA on the lines of a Saturday Center, but operating throughout the week. The program was designed to be a part of several community centers’ regular schedule of summer activities. This apparently sound and
reasonable thinking temporarily produced near disaster. It was the first time most of the professional artists who acted as staff had ever worked with any social service agency and the clash in philosophies was evident daily. The staffs of the settlement houses were appalled at "lack of discipline;" the instructors were disgusted with the "repression;" and the children were delighted with all their freedom while the adults quibbled.

More encouraging, the children enjoyed equally the eight weeks of high quality teaching that followed the first two weeks spent ironing out approaches. And, too, adults in evening classes were fortunate to have the entire ten weeks of instruction in similar media ranging from pottery to photography, batik-making to drama. The Council learned, not for the first or last time, that it was absolutely essential to have an overall administrator for an entire program and that nothing replaced sound beforehand training for all concerned.

There are two other major points that SUMMER-ARTS '68 made evident. First, arts agencies have a responsibility to educate the public not just about art, but also about themselves—about the community need for the services they provide, and about their strengths and limitations. The social service agencies staffs were grievously disappointed that a program had not been designed to suit every child and handle his every problem. This disappointment occurred primarily as a result of a failure to clarify what an art program was intended to do and that there was indeed a difference between "keep 'em quiet" activities and teaching of art.

The relation of arts organization to social service agency leads to a second point. The Council by its own policy may not operate a program, nor is it equipped to
do so. This means that it must stimulate member agencies to operate programs, for which they are prepared, in the inner city. Yet most of these agencies are not capable of going into the streets and soliciting participants, especially since the usual white, middle class methods of communication—radio announcements, posters in prominent places, newspaper stories—are not of much use in the inner city. The Council has therefore acted on the premise that an intermediate group, like a Gateway Center or settlement house, is necessary to attract participants. In theory these intermediate agencies know the lay of the land and have access to the inner city word-of-mouth communications network. In fact, this has infrequently been the case.

When the Community Music School conducted a summer program in 1968, it sent staff members to various churches and community centers in the inner city. In each location there was to be a neighborhood-based coordinator supplied by a social service agency simply to make sure the teaching space was available and the students showed up for their individual or group instruction. The effectiveness of this mode of operation ranged from near perfect to nil. There was no predicting which location or coordinator would be which. In another program of high quality instruction, this time in improvisation and theatre games (for which the Council secured OEO funding), the same was true. At one particular location recruitment of students was successful. The next year, a similar program at the same place folded midway for lack of participants.

The Council has found no suitable alternative to the awkward marriages-of-convenience between arts agency and overburdened social service organization. A far hap-
The Repertory Theatre of Loretto-Hilton: A bright new cultural addition, the theatre is situated on the campus of Webster College and offers professional level productions to a community which has never had a long-term residential company.
pier arrangement might be for the arts institution itself to have a person solely to work with inner city agencies. He would gain firsthand knowledge of whether a program was wanted and needed by the community and if it had the genuine support of the social agency personnel. The Council's role in this arrangement would be doing what it does best, seeking funding. Such a situation presumes, however, the strong prior commitment of an established arts agency.

Two other small efforts begun in the summer of 1968 show great promise for inexpensive but positive accomplishment. The Council organized and edited a special calendar for the summer which emphasized inexpensive or free activities for children or adults with groups of children on their hands. The calendar was quite separate from the Council's monthly Calendar of cultural events. Information included bus routes to places such as the Zoo and the Botanical Garden, the name and telephone number of a specific person to call for information or appointments for group tours, any classes that were offered, in addition to the usual information on time, place, and date. The information was as detailed and inclusive as space would permit. Most important, the emphasis was placed on wide distribution. The calendar was mailed to every social service agency, to the Metropolitan Church Federation's mailing list, to all HDC-affiliated centers, to hospitals, and any group which might be interested. A resident of the inner city was hired and provided with a car to go to laundromats, grocery stores, bars, public housing projects, in short, any place people might see the posters he distributed. In the second summer of publication, in addition, the calendar was printed in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.
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Secondly, the Volunteer Artists Workshop was devised. For approximately a week volunteers with some art training or background and social agency personnel participated in informal classes demonstrating techniques in rock-bottom low-cost media suitable for children. Anyone conducting a summer program was invited to participate in one of three ways. The Workshop's group of professional artists offered to train a staff member, or provide a volunteer to teach children, or send a volunteer to "consult" with and instruct staff members. In this way agencies jealous of their own areas or sensitive to the limitations of their staff had their sensibilities protected. As it turned out most agencies were eager to send staff to renew their depleted stores of ideas, and cumulatively, they wanted more volunteers than the Workshop could possibly supply.

Volunteers have played an important part in all the Council's inner city activities. They have devoted long hours to compiling the summer calendar, have organized as well as provided the manpower for the Volunteer Artists Workshop, have taught, and have cajoled money. Mrs. Hoblitzelle has given endless and conscientiously applied energy to many undertakings. It is she who is most adept at putting together inner city resident or settlement house staff with Establishment figures. Yet all the while she served as the Council's "dollar-a-year-lady," she maintained that professional artists were indeed professionals and should be paid as such. The Council's commitment to the artists must not end because of its commitment to the inner city. Distinctions between volunteer and professional were valuable. Volunteers, like the Council itself, can only do certain things, and although asking artists to give their time is a tempting
way to get value for money, it defeats other important goals.

In summary, the Council now knows better its limitations and its strengths. One of the greatest services any arts council can perform is in introducing people to people, providing the settlement house worker with a friend at an established arts agency and vice versa. This requires the council’s staff to know well both the inner city and the resources. As frustrating as at times it may be, a council cannot operate a program or force an inner city group or arts group to do so without willing concensus. Help, encouragement, and with luck, financial aid are what a council can best offer. These must not be proffered passively, but an arts agency that is lured along with money makes a poor prospect. Similarly it is important to resist the temptation to play on the need of the inner city group to “get more things going” to justify its existence.

Surely the worst trap for a council concerned with “programs” in the arts, whether for children or the inner city, is overemphasizing value received for money expended. Because funds earmarked for the arts are not overabundant, there is a natural concern to keep costs low. Exigency and sound business judgment demand frugality. But the success or failure of an effort can never be determined by the devices to which government agencies are prone: numbers of participants, cost per child, instructors’ median salary. A program’s degree of success is its effect on human lives and that cannot be judged by such tangibles as an increase of wage-earning power. Rather it is how one small segment of mankind views mankind as a whole.
CHAPTER 9

ONE BRIEF SHINING MOMENT . . . HA!

"The Arts and Education Council of Greater St. Louis may lack an acronym (AECOGLS being plainly impossible), but the Council, representing nine different cultural and educational organizations, put on the most imaginative auction to date."

—TIME

"What mattered was that everyone really did seem to be having fun while the money was pouring into the arts council's coffers . . . [the amount raised] is about par for New York's better benefits."

—THE NEW YORK TIMES

Despite the Arts and Education Council's efforts over the years, the majority of people in Greater St. Louis are still unaware of its existence. Yet many of the same people find it harder to elude knowledge of the CAMELOT auction. CAMELOT offers as much excitement as a circus and as many episodes as a soap opera. If someone has no personal experience of the auction, it is still likely that he has read one of the frequent stories in the metropolitan press, or seen a television report, or heard a radio bulletin, or read a story in Time or Newsweek or some other national publication. Which is not bad for an undertaking only two years old.

It was not until 1967 that the Council's Board of Directors gave approval to exploring the possibility of a
benefit auction. There had been speculation for a number of years as mouthwatering stories about the success of auctions on the West Coast sifted back to St. Louis. No matter how enticing the idea, critics pointed out that neither Seattle nor San Diego, the leaders in cultural auctions, conducted an annual fund drive. Thus there was no way of measuring the effect an auction might have on the Arts and Education Fund, finally in 1967 achieving its first tenuous grasp on success. And despite the tales of Far Western Eldorados, some Board members felt that supplemental activities at any time impaired the principle on which united fundraising is based: one and only one request each year to support many needs.

Such serious objections were likely to be overcome only by equally weighty considerations in favor of the auction. That the Fund did indeed reach its 1967 goal promised future successes in the minds of all but the gloomiest pessimists. Furthermore, even Fund supporters with Pollyanna tendencies were recognizing that the Fund was not likely to sustain much more than a 5 percent growth rate each year. While gratifying, that increase was inadequate to meet the needs of existing Fund members let alone the needs of groups receiving no financial aid from the Fund.

These considerations emphasized the obvious need: more money from somewhere. Tipping the balance in favor of an auction, Mrs. Eric Newman was the idea's foremost advocate. Mrs. Newman, who has been a member of the Council's Board from the founding of the Spirit of St. Louis Fund, is a woman of considerable charm, imagination, and persuasiveness. Moreover, while it was possible to argue that West Coast successes had
no relation to the St. Louis situation, it was not possible to argue with Evelyn Newman's record as a prime mover of fundraising events in St. Louis. Added to Mrs. Newman's advocacy were the voices of Homer Sayad, the Council's president, and Morton D. May, vice-president, both of whom had the unusual reputation of supporting farsighted innovations. Their combined conviction that the auction held a plausible promise of success moved CAMELOT from speculation to reality.

PONCHO in Seattle and COMBO in San Diego provided St. Louis with a well-formed idea and remarkable testimony of its money-making potential. The formula had an attractive simplicity: 1) persuade a number of people or corporations to donate goods and services; 2) list the contributions in a catalog; 3) auction them to the highest bidders.

Ground rules were established from the start in St. Louis. It was made clear that requests for gifts were in no way to conflict with the Arts and Education Fund campaign. The idea was to stimulate new money, not to devise an amusing way to keep jaded Fund solicitors on their toes. Thus the emphasis was placed on getting contributions from smaller businesses, not ordinarily strong supporters of the Fund; the auction was scheduled for the fall to avoid the Fund's spring campaign; there was to be no outright solicitation for cash; and, if major Fund donors balked at the idea of a second appeal, solicitors were not to persist. This protective attitude toward the Fund was necessary, and led to a corollary ground rule. If the Council were to expose itself to the risks inherent in initiating a second fundraising activity, the stakes were to be set high enough to raise a significant amount of money. It would have been foolhardy to endanger the
Fund for the sake of a rummage sale and take on bric-a-brac like Aunt Maude’s stuffed owl or that hideous old clock which never worked. To avoid such pitfalls, emphasis was placed on the glamorous nature of the items to be offered. Publicity stressed the “dream” quality of the auction: it was to be the place where every Walter Mitty might find fulfillment, realizing fantasies that money could not normally buy. To capture this spirit, the name CAMELOT was devised. To those who cared, it was an acronym for Cultural Auction of Many Extraordinary Lots Of Treasure. To all, it conjured images of King Arthur’s mythical kingdom, the “congenial spot” of the Lerner and Loewe musical. And the name was a “place,” giving a tangible quality to an otherwise ethereal notion.

CAMELOT did indeed have a tangible quality. For St. Louis an auction was new terrain although Seattle’s encouraging and helpful Paul Friedlander made it seem less frightening. It was an enterprise of considerable scope, requiring imagination, organizational experience, and copious energy; the main reward was the challenge of giving substance to the unknown. A team of three women with an admirable record of combining their talents on a host of civic endeavors was enlisted. The general chairman was Mrs. C. Alvin Tolin, aided by Mrs. Newman, and Mrs. Frank Pelton. The three were subsequently joined by Mrs. Milton Tucker, Jr. Within eighteen months CAMELOT was a reality, a $210,000 reality. In the second year, a new team of Mrs. Oliver Farrell, Mrs. Milton Greenfield, and Mrs. Harry Loeb was assembled under the leadership of Mrs. William Ely, and presented an equally impressive event with gross receipts of $276,000. The income of both years was
a delight to underfinanced Council member agencies.

The auctions definitely did not fall into the rummage sale category. There never has been a quarter of a million dollar rummage sale. But between idea and hour of triumph, there were many moments that were neither brief nor shining. Those involved came to realize that "such stuff as dreams are made of" had a familiar look: it was simply hard work.

One of the earliest decisions made by Mrs. Tolin was to hold the auction on two consecutive evenings. It is not possible to auction items at a faster rate than one every two minutes and at that pace, CAMELOT would have been a twenty-four hour marathon, not a gala event. The division allowed the efficient plan of auctioning on a Friday night—mainly by sealed bid—the greater number of items, while reserving the hundred most dramatic and intriguing for Saturday night sale by an auctioneer. Entry to the Friday night auction was open to all, on payment of a $3 admission fee at the door. The charge entitled the bidder to a $3 discount on any purchases made. On Saturday night, advance reservations were required for a lavish dinner preceding the auction. The $50-a-person charge for that evening also provided $25 worth of scrip to be applied against any winning bid. In the first year, approximately one-fifth of the total gross receipts of the auction came from the Friday night sale. In the second year, with a greater total number of items for auction (the Saturday night limit of one hundred remained constant), the Friday night portion rose to one-quarter of the gross.

A first step was to find a business sponsor for the auction, a company which would meet part of the over-
head and provide technical advice and guidance. Famous-Barr, the St. Louis outlet of May Department Stores, agreed to accept responsibility for transforming a room into an atmosphere befitting the name CAMELOT. This was no small task, first requiring the display of 400 such unromantic and diverse items as refrigerators, wigs, and a “wardrobe” of eyeglasses, and then arranging the same space for 800 people to sit down to dinner within a mere eighteen hours. The preparation and dismantling required the labor, for three days, of the entire display departments of all five Famous-Barr stores, in addition to countless hours of preparation in the company’s own workshop. Famous-Barr also made available the valuable advice and assistance of executives and buyers to aid in securing items for auction.

Those concerned with the image that CAMELOT would present were startled to learn that the location for this spectacular event was to be the employees’ cafeteria at the world headquarters of the Monsanto Company. However unprepossessing the title “employees’ cafeteria,” this dining room is special. Located in a building at the center of the Monsanto “campus”—which sprawls over dozens of acres in St. Louis County—the room is huge and stark, with vast poured-concrete walls, massive pillars, a large balcony, an imposing entryway, all lushly carpeted; it suggests the sparse grandeur of a feudal baron’s hall. Monsanto generously added to this donation the services of numerous employees who, good-natured and amused, received, stored, and accounted for statues and paintings, air conditioners and diamond brooches.

An idea, a name, a sponsor, and a location—these gave a base for an army of volunteers who handled
the thousands of details of a production as involved as staging *Aida*. Experience over the past two years has shown that between 200-300 volunteers are needed. For the most part CAMELOT calls on the energies and goodwill of women. However, a men’s board (which predictably became known as the Knights of the Round Table) was formed to give assistance in the solicitation of gifts. Individual members of the Knights helped open doors to business offices and made contacts so that the women solicitors could more effectively move in for the beguiling kill. This assistance was invaluable, particularly when given with the light and spirited touch of George Conant, president of Sligo, Inc. and chairman of the Knights of the Round Table in 1969. A total organizational plan has been developed for the auction which calls for three separate divisions: one to acquire items for auction, another to arrange each night’s activities, and a third to administer the auction, including warehouse provision, printing, and recordkeeping. Certainly the most intriguing of the jobs is the acquisition of gifts. To simplify procedures, to insure that potential donors were asked for contributions by only one solicitor, the division was split into sections with titles from the exotic to the mundane: dreams, vacation homes, travel, automobiles, furs and jewelry, art, and several others. Each section had its own chairman who in turn recruited workers.

The highlights of the auction and those which captured local and national headlines were the “dream” items. A walk-on part in CBS’ “Mission: Impossible,” a place on the Field Enterprises team searching for the Loch Ness Monster, a dinner for four prepared in his own home by Danny Kaye, the use for a week of a
super yacht with food and drink and crew of five, conducting the St. Louis Symphony orchestra at ones own party, selecting and arranging an exhibition from the collection of the City Art Museum—all these proved irresistible. Devising enticing yet possible dreams calls for flair and imagination; actual solicitation, however, depends on the oldest technique in fundraising: tapping the right person to persuade the potential donor. In contrast to the Fund drive, the primary targets were celebrities or those fortunate enough to have a vacation home, a yacht, or an airplane at their disposal rather than corporations with a developed sense of community obligation. Nonetheless, the success of the “dream” aspect owed a great deal to American Airlines who made a substantial cash contribution to the Council to defray a major share of necessary air transportation costs.

CAMELOT did not live by dreams alone, however. In the first year more than 300 gifts were acquired. In the second year the total was almost doubled. At the level below private barge cruises down the Mississippi River and the right to name a flower newly developed by the Botanical Garden, there were leases on automobiles, suits, dresses, dinners at restaurants, gift certificates, refrigerators, washing machines and other so-called “hard” items. Indeed, the auction neatly divided itself into two. On Friday the room was filled with eager bargain hunters hoping to manage a 15 per cent discount on a dishwasher that ordinarily seemed a little out-of-reach, while on Saturday a bidder in an expansive mood would decide that life was not complete without an $1800 evening with Eddie Albert and Eva Gabor.

Solicitors were instructed not to request gifts less than $100 in value. Too many small items would have
CAMELOT: In a setting of feudal grandeur, the St. Louis cultural auction sells everything from mink coats to a date with Joe Namath—no rummage sale ever brought in a quarter of a million dollars for the arts.
cluttered the display and cost more to promote than they were worth. This limit helped maintain the generally high standard and avoid ambitious attic cleaning. There seemed to be particular pleasure in creating salable items out of services not otherwise available, something like having a license to print ones own money. For example, it became popular for well-known couples or groups of friends to offer to cater dinners or cocktail parties, for the Mayor to allow a successful bidder to be mayor for the day, for athletic stars to play the bidder a game of tennis or golf, or for the St. Louis Cardinals to entertain successful bidders at their training camp.

The most expensive single gift was the CAMELOT house, an idea originating once again at West Coast auctions. The house was acquired through the cooperation of the developer of a new subdivision, who asked his subcontractors and suppliers to donate labor, services, and materials to provide their respective parts of the dwelling. Other donors were approached and asked to contribute the cost of the lot for the house. Finally the developer himself agreed to forego his own profit and his management costs. In 1968 the CAMELOT house sold for $55,000; in 1969 a second house was auctioned for $64,000. Each time, a portion of the cost was in fact picked up by CAMELOT to cover those expenses for which no donors could be found. This reduced the net profit a bit, but means the house could be auctioned complete. For the developer and subcontractors, CAMELOT generated a remarkable amount of publicity in all news media. The results could be measured by sensational increases in the number of visitors at display houses in the weeks preceding the auction.

Other divisions of volunteers involved less salesman-
ship but intense devotion to detail. Gifts had to be cataloged and records kept of potential donors and solicitors. Volunteers and more volunteers were needed to process the thousands of written bids Friday night, telephone the winning bidders on Saturday morning, collect the payments, send invitations to the Saturday dinner, arrange food, wine, and music, sell tickets for the dinner, act as bankers and hostesses at the Saturday auction, persuade printers to donate their services, write copy and see that catalogs and other printed material were prepared, man the warehouse, arrange shipments, buy insurance, thank donors and notify them of the names of successful bidders, solicit pre-bids on important items, ask for donations of full-page advertising so that all items could be listed in the newspapers, and secure publicity in all media both locally and nationally on a year-round basis. The amount of work was overwhelming, the logistics intimidatingly complex. Monsanto prepared each year a battle plan running to more than forty pages. Famous-Barr assigned as many as seventy-five people to the production. The volunteers, particularly the chairmen, devoted almost a year of their lives to the cause.

In the second year of the auction, the Arts and Education Council made its first formal staff provision for CAMELOT. Mrs. Tucker, whose verve and resourcefulness had been outstanding even among the gifted leadership of the 1968 CAMELOT, was retained on a part-time basis almost immediately after the first auction. She fell heir to many responsibilities as it became evident that CAMELOT was to be a year-round project. With her previous experience, she gave a sense of continuity and filled various roles: preparing materials for volunteers, handling publicity, coordinating plans for the
house, and acting as liaison between the Council and CAMELOT leadership. Of her many strengths, her talent for publicity was pre-eminent. No St. Louis fundraising effort—including the United Fund and the Arts and Education Fund—ever received so much coverage as has CAMELOT. It was hard to resist the combination of Mrs. Tucker’s persuasion and the copy potential of a successful bidder trekking off through the jungles of Panama on a Botanical Garden expedition or taking a role on the CBS “Here’s Lucy” show.

CAMELOT had a generous share of problems which no amount of energy or good nature could dispense with entirely. Many arose from the sheer magnitude and bewildering intricacy of the production. Because of the apparent carnival nature of the project, many donors and solicitors were slow in completing various steps of the transactions. In 1969 fully one-quarter of the gift contracts arrived after the ostensible deadline date for accepting donations. Then, too, it is difficult to vary the gifts and avoid the strong temptation to repeat an offering because it had been amusing and a good seller the first time. Such repetition is death to an event which relies for promotion on novelty and the bizarre. For the first CAMELOT, the St. Louis Zoo donated fifty pounds of llama manure with the assurance that it was the caviar of lawn food. Selling at over three dollars a pound, this was a hilarious headline-maker in 1968. In 1969, when the gift was repeated, the laughter was noticeably strained. It proved difficult to sustain an exciting pace for the Saturday night auction. For those not taking part in the bidding, even an elegant room, a good dinner, flowing bar, and the exchange of thousands of dollars can grow tiring unless ways are
devised to capitalize on all the evening's potential excitement. CAMELOT was fortunate in securing the services both years of Ed Jenkins, a nationally known auctioneer, backed up most ably in the second year by Bruce Selkirk. Both men have a talent for creating drama and did well in focusing interest on the larger-than-life screens with projections of the item up for bidding. Nonetheless, attention wandered before the auction was at the two-thirds mark.

Serious problems of tact arose from the donation of art. Numerous artists of varying degrees of skill gave work to CAMELOT, some because they were asked, many on their own initiative. Frequently solicitors received the complaint that artists should not be asked to support the arts by giving their works; it was they who needed the support. More serious was the uneven quality of the art itself. Since no jury was employed, there was no way to separate good from bad, to say no when the Sunday painter overestimated his development or the professional thought he had discovered a way to bury a mistake. Tempers were further ruffled when CAMELOT refused to set a minimum price below which a work would not be sold. This means that many works were sold for less than their creator's view of their worth. To compound the problem, CAMELOT properly refused to relax for artists its rule of not disclosing the amount for which any item had been sold. Since all art works, except a screen by an unknown seventeenth century Japanese master, were sold by sealed bid, some artists were most unfortunately convinced that CAMELOT had something to hide. It was true that in some cases, works sold for modest amounts, but in few instances was the selling price outrageously out of line
with the probable market value of the work. Future plans call for the institution of a jury to review works of art before they are accepted. It is interesting to note that considerably more works of art were received the second year, even though the solicitation of art was soft-pedalled to counteract the complaints of both artists and patrons.

For the Council, CAMELOT presented one clear-cut public relations problem. The auctions were staged at a time when a sense of seriousness in the nation made large-scale social events seem frivolous and unworthy. Lingering war in Vietnam and self-multiplying urban problems could have made CAMELOT seem a superficial irrelevance. More than anything else the Council's own reputation for matters of civic concern probably served to counteract this danger.

Despite difficulties, the auctions were successful and were so not just because they raised a lot of money without interfering with the regular channels of giving through the Arts and Education Fund. The auctions actually tapped new sources of support for the arts which had never been reached before. Among the donors of goods and services, CAMELOT secured gifts from building subcontractors, hairdressers, laundries, jewelers, small retail shops, and others who had never responded to the appeal of the Fund. Among the bidders were many whose imagination was touched by the excitement of the concept but who might have been indifferent to the quieter anonymity of the Arts and Education Fund. All new donors were duly sent information on the Fund. CAMELOT was also successful in bringing together for a common cause an unusual cross-section of the community as a whole. It involved as volunteers
many people who had never before worked together and many who had not previously been active in support of the Arts and Education Council. That the number of beneficiary institutions was broad and inclusive undoubtedly helped in assembling this strong but diverse team.

Serious questions were raised after the first auction about whether success could be repeated the second year. Many felt that the novelty and hence, the fascination, could hardly be sustained. The Council’s decision to go ahead on an annual basis was proved wise by the experience of the second year. There remains, however, a question about how many years the event can be effectively repeated. At a certain point, when the tide starts to turn and the gross receipts begin to show a decline, it may be necessary to discontinue CAMELOT in favor of some new approach. In the celebrations marking the happy outcome in both 1968 and 1969 one question, still unresolved, was forgotten. Why is reputedly staid St. Louis so receptive to such a wild and theatrical exhibition as CAMELOT?
CHAPTER 10

HERE AND FROM HERE ON

“Few cities in the United States share your reputation for accomplishment in the visual and performing arts or enjoy the cultural leadership which characterizes St. Louis. There is unusual understanding here of the importance of the arts to the individual and to the quality of life of a city. The Arts and Education Council is unsurpassed in the country in terms of diversity and vitality.”

—JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER 3RD
1969 General Assembly of
The Arts and Education Council

“As life is action and passion, it is required of a man that he should share the passion and action of his time at peril of being judged not to have lived.” Oliver Wendell Holmes’ dictum holds true for institutions as for men. In our times the fundamental cause for concern in the arts is not the health of the organizations which arts councils commonly support. It is rather the bleak and uncomfortable fact that an awareness of the transforming power of the arts and the experience of the arts as more than a minor adornment of our lives are as remote as at any time in history.

Indeed, although many ages have been concerned with preserving the art of the past, our own is singular
PERSUADE AND PROVIDE

in trying consciously to create an environment in which the arts may flourish. It is as if we feel we have devised a way of life that is so contradictory to the humanness of man that we must pay guilt money to sustain the arts artificially because they encompass this very humanity. But since the arts flourish on creative energy and life, not on money or seclusion, they grow today sickly and spindly. We must face the possibility that if the arts do not become an integral part of society, they may cease to exist. This separation of the arts from daily experience lies behind the difficulty which all arts organizations face in formulating reasons why business, government, and people should give their support. The popular discovery in the late sixties of the damage that “progress” has cumulatively wrought in man’s environment is potentially an ally of the arts. Awareness that the air we breathe is being poisoned, that our water is becoming impure and our green earth paved and polluted has stirred discontent with the “quality of life” even if it has not altered the values that guide our judgments. Solutions predictably are sought in money, and arts organizations may well grow richer through the resulting provision. If the power of money is not infinite, it may yet provide the tabernacle in which the art of the past may be safeguarded, it may create conditions in which people can use their eyes to see and their ears to hear, it may ease the lot of an artist in need. But paradoxically, money, the medium in which arts councils work, cannot create art.

To date, arts councils have capitalized on our growing sense of disquiet coupled with inchoate feelings of goodwill toward the arts as a pleasing cosmetic for society. But the temptation is always to pass on the help
to museums of the arts, those places where works which have the approval of the ages and of a high price tag are preserved. The museums may be art galleries, or symphony orchestras, or ballet or theatre companies. Often they merit support. However, in the long run, arts organizations may suffer financially when the worried masses discover that these museum institutions—as we know them—are ill-suited to transforming society and that the arts are not a poultice for social ills. Arts organizations, anxious to insure their own survival, may pave the road to failed expectations by insinuating they can indeed cure society’s malaise.

For the Arts and Education Council, this complex of challenges appears in quite practical terms. As it comes of age, the Council will have to extricate itself from the trap of subsidizing the status quo. It will require skill and foresight if this maneuver is not to be divisive and cause the Council to lose the original constituency that gave it life and health. Currently in St. Louis and across the country, loud criticism is voiced of United Funds’ tendency to perpetuate their own member organizations without considering their continuing worth. Even more frequently, as member agencies strike out into sensitive areas, United Funds are finding that the more conservative elements among their contributors threaten to withdraw support. Such instances may herald parallel developments for arts councils. Also, because its fundraising successes were so hard-won, the Council is easily mesmerized by them and in turn the community responds by looking at and judging the Council in light of this one function. Success in fundraising can never be assured and the necessary annual increase will be difficult to sustain, but at least a winning formula has
been divided. Now the Council must confront the problem of determining how the money may best be used to allow the arts and education to excite and transform society.

To the present time the Council has sought and allocated funds on the basis of immediate opportunities and needs. Budget Committee meetings have been concerned with current pressing matters and Fund allocations have reflected this concern. The infusions of funds from national sources that the Council has engineered for aesthetic education and for the arts in the inner city have commonly been stimulated by knowledge that money is available as much as by a considered awareness of need or priority. Arts development grants, too, have reflected selection from a set of random choices. This is not to say that the funds have been poorly used or the causes have been unworthy. It is true however that the Council has not developed a philosophy for the short term to govern the best use of the limited resources that are and may become available. The recent formation of a Planning Committee of the Council’s Board is the first essential move towards preparing the organization to make these policy decisions.

It is unrealistic to suppose that the Council can formulate an all-inclusive ten-year plan for the arts in St. Louis. This is neither practical nor desirable. However, it is possible for the Council to establish priorities among its own activities, which deal less with the arts than with the conditions which affect the arts. Such priorities might arguably prescribe that, instead of concentrating on audience development, or the schools, or the inner city, or organizational support, the Council should devote its money, energy, and talents to one area alone, perhaps the
enlistment of governmental support. It is possible too, for example, that the Council should arrive at conclusions about the functions of a symphony orchestra over the next ten years. Until the Council has reached such conclusions, obviously in consultation with the leaders of the symphony orchestra among others, it has no choice but to react unquestioningly to each Symphony crisis with only the present in mind. Similarly, until the Council has a view of ways in which the potential of public television can be deployed, its own policies are likely to be decided by emotional responses, influenced by peering into the seemingly bottomless chasm of KETC’s financial appetite.

Commonly arts councils piously state that they will not interfere in the internal affairs of their member organizations. Up to a point this is as it should be. An arts council must avoid the temptation to be a universal busybody. However a council, like the Arts and Education Council in St. Louis, is not just a spokesman for its member organizations in addressing the community at large. It is also, in reverse, an advocate for the community from which it raises funds and must present an accounting to the community over and above meeting whatever financial needs may seem expedient to a limited number of organizations at any one time.

In 1967 the Council sought from its Fund member organizations projections of their budgetary needs over a five-year period. The answers to this request indicated that in most cases the organizations themselves had given little thought to the future. Typically they were so beset by current problems that they had no opportunity to see where today’s solution might or should be leading them tomorrow. The Council’s own planning for the future
should then be a useful stimulus to the organizations themselves. Furthermore, an evaluation is needed if the Council is to face the jangling skeleton in its own closet, its failure since its inception to introduce new members into the Arts and Education Fund. Inertia will continue to dictate the present static composition of the Fund until procedures are developed to evaluate the potential of the claimants for inclusion and also of those already served.

Another current need is for fuller information about the plans and prospects of many of the City's organizations that are concerned with the arts. For example, no attempt has been made to compare building or programming plans in the performing arts of the sixteen institutions of higher education in the metropolitan area. Equally, there is little contact between the Council and the library system which includes what are, in a sense, the oldest cultural centers in the City.

All too often organizations use the accumulation of information as an excuse for inaction. For the Council, it is vital that knowledge about its member organizations be used to formulate policies which may guide it during the second decade of its life. This formulation should also enable the Council to take stands on public issues affecting the arts and to take initiatives in matters where leadership is otherwise lacking. Evidence of the Council's limited view of its potential is apparent in its failure to take a position either on the creation of a Metropolitan Cultural District or on the desirable composition of such a district; the voice of the Council has not been heard in protest against the imposition of a City tax on admission to cultural events; the Council has been silent on all matters of urban design.
Meanwhile the Council’s fundraising must continue and more money must be found. Consideration has been given to a tie with the United Fund, whereby the two campaigns might be amalgamated, and to a reversion to the Atlanta, Los Angeles, and Seattle plans in which the united approach covers only the solicitation of corporations while member agencies are free to make their own appeals directly to individual donors. Neither change is likely in St. Louis in the near future. The United Fund is faced with severe problems of its own in keeping pace with the cost of living and in adjusting to changing patterns of need. It would be a leap in the dark to give up the Arts and Education Fund’s contributions from individuals which account for almost half the total annual giving.

A more likely source to meet the new scale of increased funding is government at the local, state, and national levels. This will not come about without conscious effort. The Council needs to exert the same energy in enlisting the interest and support of the political leadership as it exerted earlier in winning the support of the business community. The Council’s work with the Mayor’s Council on Youth Opportunity, with the Department of Parks and Recreation, the “Challenge of the Seventies” program, and the Model City Agency represents only a start. Cultivation of political support is almost unknown among the agencies of the Council. Their dealing with government at any level has all too often arisen only in asking for some kind of subvention. Immediate funds are needed to sustain higher levels of operating support to certain organizations and to continue existing school and inner city commitments. In addition it is going to be as important for the Council to explore the potential
Eligible for Associate Membership is an organization which does not qualify for Regular Membership, but which has an active cultural program as part of its recognized purpose or activity.

Section 2: Application for Membership
Any organization which deems itself eligible for any type of membership may submit a written application to the Admission and Evaluation Committee of the Council which may request a meeting. Application for Regular and Associate Memberships deemed qualified by such Committee shall be submitted to the Board of Directors for final approval. Applicants for Fund Membership, having qualified for Regular Membership, shall then apply directly to the Budget Committee which shall after an appropriate meeting recommend to the Board of Directors for final action whether, to what extent, and on what conditions Fund Membership may be granted.

Section 3: Obligations of Membership
a. Every organization by applying for membership agrees to be governed by the Articles of Incorporation, By-laws, and applicable regulations and practices of the Council.

b. Every member agrees to maintain a responsible management with an administrative committee or Board of Directors and which shall file with the Council currently the names of its governing personnel, its major announcements, and its programs as well as changes relating to its eligibility as a member.

c. Every member shall endeavor to elevate the quality of its performances, exhibitions, instruction, or programs, to improve the efficiency of operations and to cooperate with other member organizations in meeting the cultural needs of the community.

d. Every member shall cooperate with the Council in each of the Council's fundraising campaigns.

e. (1) A Fund Member shall keep regular books of account open to the Council or its appointees and shall have an audit made by a Certified Public Accountant if requested by the Budget Committee.

(2) A Fund Member shall also furnish minutes, documents,
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budgets, financial schedules, and other such data as the Budget Committee may require.

(3) A Fund Member shall undertake no public or private campaign or solicitation for gifts without the approval of Council, except the continuation of established nonconflicting money earning activities, and except membership dues not in excess of such limit as the Budget Committee may have approved.

(4) A Fund Member shall conform its operations and expenditures to its approved budget, all in accordance with the conditions of its Fund Membership. Any contemplated major expenditure not included in its approved budget shall be submitted to and approved by the Budget Committee before the obligation therefore is created.

Section 4: Rights of Membership

a. Every member shall have the right to participate in all of the general projects, activities, programs, and services, except that any Associate Member which does not have a tax-exempt status shall be required to reimburse the Council for any service rendered specially for it.

b. Every member of the Council shall have the right to be heard before the General Assembly, Board of Directors, or any committee of the Council, provided that reasonable notice of such intention has been given.

c. Every Regular and Fund Member shall have the right to vote for such Directors of the Council as are elected by the General Assembly.

d. Only Regular and Fund Members shall have the right to vote upon any issues relating directly to the acquisition or disposition of property or funds.

Section 5: Withdrawal

Any member may formally resign from the Council at any time provided written notice of such intention is given to the Board of Directors at least sixty days prior thereto. No withdrawing Fund Member shall be entitled to any funds allotted for any period after its withdrawal.

Section 6: Reclassification and Expulsion

a. Any member which at any time shall fail to meet the eligibility
requirements set forth in the By-laws for the type of membership held shall be reclassified or dropped by the Board of Directors after consideration by the Admission and Evaluation Committee, but may subsequently reapply for any type of membership.

b. The Board of Directors by a two-thirds vote may suspend or expel any member upon evidence of material violation of the By-laws, public laws, or any regulations or practices of the Council. The member in question shall be entitled to be heard by the Board of Directors before such action is taken.

ARTICLE IV: THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Section 1: Members, Rights and Privileges
Every member accepted by the Board of Directors shall appoint one delegate who shall cast one vote for his organization. All committee chairmen, panel chairmen, officers, and members of the Board of Directors of the Council who are not member delegates shall also be members and hold voting rights.

Section 2: Duties of General Assembly
The General Assembly shall hold annual elections. At each election it shall elect one-third of the Board of Directors for terms of three years.

Section 3: Regular and Special Meetings
The General Assembly shall meet at least once a year. The annual meeting shall be devoted primarily to carrying out elections and other legal business. A special meeting of the General Assembly shall be called within three weeks after the president is notified that such is the desire of 25 per cent of the membership.

Section 4: Standing and Special Committees
A Nominating Committee shall be the only standing Committee of the General Assembly. This Committee and its chairman shall be appointed by the president for terms of three years. Any vacancies occurring on the Committee will be filled by the president for the unexpired term.

The Nominating Committee is responsible for recommending a full slate of officers and members of the Board of Directors. The Committee shall notify the members of the General Assembly the names of those nominated for election by the General As-
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semble three weeks before the election meeting, and make adequate provision for additional nominations from the membership-at-large. Such additional nominations shall be submitted in writing to the chairman of the Nominating Committee at least two weeks in advance of the General Assembly meeting. As deemed necessary, the president and/or the General Assembly may establish ad hoc committees.

ARTICLE V: BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Section 1: Elections and Appointments
The Board of Directors shall consist of no less than twenty-six (26) persons elected or appointed as follows:
a. A minimum number of twenty-one persons elected by the General Assembly at its annual meeting as stated in Article IV, Section 2.
b. Five persons appointed by the five agencies receiving the largest allocations from the annual campaign. The determination of which agencies shall be included in this group shall be based upon the total allocations of the two preceding years. These appointments shall be made before the beginning of the fiscal year in which such persons are to serve.

Section 2: Terms of Office
Directors elected by the General Assembly shall agree to serve for three years, after the initial election. Any vacancies shall be filled by election at the next General Assembly. The five agency appointed Directors shall serve one year terms. Agencies will fill vacancies as they occur.

No person shall serve on the Board of Directors for longer than nine consecutive years.

Section 3: Ex Officio Members
The officers of the Corporation, the immediate past chairman of the Board of Directors, chairman or co-chairmen of the Arts and Education Fund, the general chairman of the CAMELOT auction, and the chairman of the CAMELOT Knights of the Round Table shall be ex officio members of the Board if these persons do not hold Board positions.

Section 4: Duties
The Board of Directors shall carry out the policies established by
the General Assembly and see to the execution of such policies.
Specifically, the Board of Directors shall enjoy the following authorities:
a. Elect a chairman, president, vice-presidents, secretary, and treasurer of the Corporation to serve one year each.
b. Authorize officers and employees to transact business.
c. Authorize appropriations and/or expenditures.
d. Designate the method(s) of disposal of funds and properties.
e. Designate the place or places in which the monies, properties, and equipment shall be kept.
f. Exercise such other authority as may be deemed advisable for the control of the monies, property, and equipment on hand, or to the credit of the Corporation.
g. Approve or disapprove all methods of raising money by or in the name of the Council by any group or individual.
h. Frame rules and regulations from time to time for the government of the Corporation providing such rules and regulations are not inconsistent with the existing Constitution and By-laws.

Section 5: Appointment of Executive Committee and Ad Hoc Committees
An Executive Committee of five or more members shall be appointed by the president from the officers and Directors of the Council. The president shall serve as chairman of the Executive Committee.
As he deems necessary, the president shall appoint ad hoc committees for indefinite terms subject to the approval of the Board of Directors.

ARTICLE VI: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Section 1: Elections and Appointments
The Executive Committee shall be appointed as prescribed in Article V, Section 5 of the By-laws.

Section 2: Purpose and Duties
The Executive Committee shall hold its purpose and duty to be assisting the Board of Directors in carrying out its responsibilities, and providing a close liaison between the Board of Directors and the various committees and panels of the Council. Specifically, the Executive Committee is responsible for:
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Coordinating the development of policies, plans, programs, budgets, and fundraising goals of the Council, and recommending their approval to the Board of Directors.

Section 3: Meetings
The Executive Committee shall meet at the discretion of its chairman, or on special call of three of its members. All notice of meetings, and their time and place, shall be the responsibility of the chairman of the Executive Committee.

ARTICLE VII: STANDING COMMITTEES

Section 1: Definition and Purposes
The activities of the Council are the responsibility of the four standing committees. The major responsibilities of the four committees are:

a. The Administrative Committee shall be responsible to the Executive Committee for recommending the appointment of the professional staff, the approval of administrative programs and budgets, and all matters pertaining to paid personnel and administrative services of the Council.

b. The Admission and Evaluation Committee shall be responsible to the Executive Committee for receiving applications for memberships in the Council. The Committee shall establish basic standards for program services as criteria for approval. The chairman of this Committee shall be a member of the Executive Committee and the Board of Directors, and shall appoint at least three persons to serve on the Committee for terms not to exceed six years.

c. The Cultural Planning Committee shall be responsible for encouraging wide participation in planning for the development of cultural enterprises in Greater St. Louis. The chairman of this Committee shall be a member of the Executive Committee and the Board of Directors, and shall appoint at least five persons to serve on the Committee for terms not to exceed six years. Among the duties assigned by the Executive Committee shall be: recommendation of persons to serve as panel chairmen, coordinating plans involving or affecting two or more panels, and generally assisting the several panels in execution of particular projects, recommendations, and studies.
The Budget Committee shall be responsible to the Executive Committee for reviewing the proposed budgets of agencies seeking participation in the annual financial campaign, and recommending approval or changes in such budgets. This Committee shall also give attention to any other budgetary matters the Executive Committee or Board of Directors may direct.

The chairman of this Committee shall also be a member of the Executive Committee and the Board of Directors, and shall appoint at least five persons to serve on the Committee for terms not to exceed six years.

ARTICLE VIII: PANELS

Section 1: Definition and Purposes
When recommended by the Executive Committee, the Board of Directors shall establish cultural activity panels to plan, promote, and coordinate arts and educational enterprises under the guidance of the Cultural Planning Committee. Such panels shall have the responsibility for continually assessing the local needs within their defined area of concern, and to develop and promote means of improving community service.

Section 2: Areas to Be Covered by Panels and Their Chairmen
Every member of the Council shall be invited to nominate one representative each to serve on panels under one of the following headings:

a) Dance, Music and Opera
b) Theatre
c) Museums and Gardens
d) Visual Arts
e) Literature

These representatives shall elect panel chairmen who will coordinate the activities of their respective panels. The chairman will normally be elected for a period of one year.

ARTICLE IX: MEETING NOTICES AND QUORUMS
Unless specified, five days shall be considered reasonable notice of all meetings of panels, committees, and other official bodies organized within the Council.

One-third of the members of the Board of Directors in office shall
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constitute a quorum. A majority of members of all other bodies organized within the Arts and Education Council shall constitute a quorum.

ARTICLE X: FISCAL YEAR
The fiscal year of the Council shall terminate on the last day of May each year; this date may be altered at the discretion of the Board of Directors.

ARTICLE XI: AMENDMENTS
These By-laws and the Articles of Incorporation may be added to, altered, amended or repealed by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Directors, a quorum being present.

APPENDIX C

THE ARTS AND EDUCATION COUNCIL OF GREATER ST. LOUIS–MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS

FUND MEMBERS
Adult Education Council of Greater St. Louis
Arts and Education Council of Greater St. Louis
Community Music School
KETC
Little Symphony Concerts Association
Mark Twain Summer Institute
Missouri Botanical Garden
Museum of Science and Natural History
St. Louis Symphony Society
Young Audiences

MEMBERS
Academy of Professional Artists
Actors’ Workshop
American Guild of Organists
Artist Presentation Society
Artists Equity Association
Bach Society of St. Louis
Black Artists’ Group
Block Gallery 288
Carrollton Players
Chamber Music at Sheldon
Children’s Art Bazaar
City Art Museum
City Players of St. Louis
Civic Opera Association
Collegians
Concordia Seminary

241
Cosmopolitan Singers
Craft Alliance
Dance Concert Society
Early Music Society
Florissant Valley Community College
Fontbonne College
   Fine Arts Committee
Forest Park Community College
Friends of Artistic & Musical Endeavors
Gateway Festival Orchestra of St. Louis
Greater St. Louis Folk & Square Dance
International Folk Dance Association
Jefferson College
Jewish Community Centers Association
Junior League
Junior Theatre
Kirkwood Arts Council
Kirkwood Symphony Society
Kirkwood Theatre Guild
Landmarks Association of St. Louis
Loretto-Hilton Center
Maplewood-Richmond Heights Symphony Orchestra
Maryville College of the Sacred Heart
Meramec Community College
Metropolitan Educational Center in the Arts
Midwest Chamber Ensemble
Missouri Historical Society
Monticello College
National Association of Teachers of Singing
National Museum of Transport
New Music Circle
Northside Art Association
Opera Theatre of St. Louis
Page Park YMCA Cultural Center
Philharmonic Society
Principia
St. Louis Artists’ Guild
St. Louis Chamber Orchestra and Chorus
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St. Louis Civic Ballet
St. Louis Dance Theatre
St. Louis Dancing Teachers Association
St. Louis Institute of Music
St. Louis Mineral and Gem Society
St. Louis Poetry Center
St. Louis String Ensemble
St. Louis University
  Committee on Fine Arts
  Metropolitan College
  St. Louis University Theatre
St. Mary’s College of O’Fallon
Society of Independent Artists
Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville
  Fine Arts Division
Springboard to Learning
Talking Tapes for the Blind
Theatre Guild of Webster Groves
University City Symphony Orchestra
University of Missouri at St. Louis
Washington University
  Department of Chinese and Japanese
  Department of Music
  Performing Arts Area
  School of Architecture
  School of Continuing Education
  School of Fine Arts
  Steinberg Hall
Webster College
  Fine Arts Division
White House Conference on Education

Interested organizations in the five-county area should write
to Mrs. Elmer E. Hilpert, chairman, Admissions and Evaluation
Committee, Arts and Education Council, 607 North Grand, St.
Louis, Missouri 63103. The letter should spell out the purpose
and history of the applying organization. In order to approve an
application the Council will subsequently need copies of the
organization’s By-laws, and—if appropriate—letter of exemption
from payment of federal tax.
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### ARTS AND EDUCATION FUND CAMPAIGN CHART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIAL GIFTS</th>
<th>ADVANCE GIFTS</th>
<th>FINANCE</th>
<th>SPECIAL GIFTS</th>
<th>BUSINESS</th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL</th>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>WOMEN'S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academy of Science</td>
<td>Corporations</td>
<td>Banks</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education Council</td>
<td>Executives</td>
<td>Brokers</td>
<td>Dental</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Archdiocese</td>
<td>Independent Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Education Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Savings &amp; Loan</td>
<td>Accountants</td>
<td>St. Louis U</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>So. Illinois U</td>
<td>Special Gifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Music School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Architects</td>
<td>Washington U</td>
<td></td>
<td>Webster College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KETC - Channel 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attorneys</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>Fontbonne College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Symphony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engineers</td>
<td>U of Missouri</td>
<td></td>
<td>Junior College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri Botanical Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Webster College</td>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis Symphony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fontbonne College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Audiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Junior College Dist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**HISTORY OF ARTS AND EDUCATION FUND ALLOCATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education Council</td>
<td>$12,707</td>
<td>$12,600</td>
<td>$12,750</td>
<td>$12,220</td>
<td>$12,779</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$16,500*</td>
<td>$17,500**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Music School</td>
<td>20,921</td>
<td>22,680</td>
<td>21,250</td>
<td>23,500</td>
<td>24,575</td>
<td>29,500</td>
<td>31,000*</td>
<td>34,000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KETC</td>
<td>124,995</td>
<td>84,000</td>
<td>110,500</td>
<td>94,000</td>
<td>98,300</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>110,000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Symphony</td>
<td>8,693</td>
<td>7,728</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>9,830</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>16,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Twain Summer Institute</td>
<td>15,675</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>12,750</td>
<td>16,920</td>
<td>17,694</td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>22,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri Botanical Garden</td>
<td>19,975</td>
<td>20,160</td>
<td>63,750</td>
<td>75,200</td>
<td>78,640</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>96,000*</td>
<td>101,000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum of Science and Natural History</td>
<td>46,018</td>
<td>46,368</td>
<td>47,600</td>
<td>51,700</td>
<td>54,065</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>68,000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis Symphony</td>
<td>248,400</td>
<td>268,800</td>
<td>375,700</td>
<td>360,960</td>
<td>377,472</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>424,000*</td>
<td>447,000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Audiences</td>
<td>2,274</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>2,949</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>4,500*</td>
<td>5,500**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Education Council</td>
<td>57,797</td>
<td>54,917</td>
<td>71,400</td>
<td>72,380</td>
<td>75,691</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>89,000*</td>
<td>93,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for Uncollectables</td>
<td>3,289</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>9,830</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>9,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$560,744</td>
<td>$532,121</td>
<td>$735,250</td>
<td>$728,500</td>
<td>$761,825</td>
<td>$825,000</td>
<td>$875,000</td>
<td>$925,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Additional funds from the 1968 CAMELOT auction were allocated as follows: Adult Education Council, $1,000; Community Music School, $3,500; Missouri Botanical Garden, $4,000; St. Louis Symphony, $65,000; Young Audiences, $4,000; Arts and Education Council, $1,400.

**Additional funds from the 1969 CAMELOT auction were allocated as follows: Adult Education Council, $1,000; Community Music School, $5,000; KETC, $15,000; Missouri Botanical Garden, $11,000; Museum of Science and Natural History, $4,000; St. Louis Symphony, $70,000; Young Audiences, $4,000.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIVISION</th>
<th>INITIAL GIFTS</th>
<th>ADVANCE GIFTS</th>
<th>SPECIAL GIFTS</th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL</th>
<th>BUSINESS</th>
<th>M. D. S.</th>
<th>D. D. S.</th>
<th>C. P. A.</th>
<th>LAWYERS</th>
<th>ARCHITECTS</th>
<th>ENGINEERS</th>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>RESIDENTIAL SPECIAL GIFTS</th>
<th>INDEPENDENT BUS.</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>361,920</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1,936</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>106,699</td>
<td>36,467</td>
<td>57,748</td>
<td>106,699</td>
<td>1,936</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>106,699</td>
<td>71,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>52,073</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1,765</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>52,073</td>
<td>1,765</td>
<td>52,073</td>
<td>1,765</td>
<td>1,765</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1,765</td>
<td>79,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>50,432</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1,608</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1,608</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1,608</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1,608</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1,608</td>
<td>80,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$777,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$905,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$944,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| AMT. RAISED              |               |               |               |              |          |         |         |         |         |            |          |           |                          |                  |         |
APPENDIX F
ARTS AND EDUCATION FUND
SEVEN YEAR SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIVISION</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>1966</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO. GIFTS</td>
<td>AMT. RAISED</td>
<td>NO. GIFTS</td>
<td>AMT. RAISED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVANCE GIFTS</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>$269,945</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>$283,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVES</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>52,626</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>45,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL GIFTS</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>54,251</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>58,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>33,665</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>28,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>30,991</td>
<td>1,293</td>
<td>31,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN'S</td>
<td>5,765</td>
<td>118,480</td>
<td>3,727</td>
<td>99,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>8,574</td>
<td>$560,744</td>
<td>6,622</td>
<td>$547,311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G
1969 ARTS AND EDUCATION COUNCIL BUDGET

**Receipts**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Education Fund</td>
<td>$ 89,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carried Forward from Previous Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>$ 110,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Disbursements**

**Administrative Expense**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary—Professional</td>
<td>$ 11,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries—Other</td>
<td>16,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues and Publications</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance and Bonding</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of Equipment</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of Equipment</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental of Equipment</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and Conference</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Tax</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendar (Not Covered by General Bancshares)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Administrative</strong></td>
<td>$ 42,830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Campaign Expense**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries—Professional</td>
<td>$ 24,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries—Temporary and Clerical</td>
<td>14,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Tax</td>
<td>1,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed Materials</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publicity</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of Equipment</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Campaign** $67,670

**Total Disbursements** $110,500

## 1969 CAMELOT BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>$12,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Tax</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent and Parking</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings and Travel</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $14,945

**Grand Total—Expenses** $125,445
first time in St. Louis — all these questions are answered here. Nor do the authors of this book shy away from the unanswered questions raised by the Council's very success: how to offset a council's tendency to maintain the artistic status quo; what programs, if any, can succeed in the inner city. Throughout the book, the authors stress that practical wisdom by which far-fetched ideas can be made real.

This is a story that could be paraphrased, "Once upon a time there was a Spirit of St. Louis Fund which grew into an Arts and Education Council, achieved success, and went on to CAMELOT."
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"I'm not an artist; I'm a business man ... Whether we like it or not the liveliness of a city's approach to the arts is today accepted by the most hard-headed of our citizens as one indicator of a city's attractiveness. By attractiveness, I mean the appeal of a city as a site for new business and as a home for potential employees."

— Homer Sayad, Senior Partner, Haskins and Sells

"There wouldn't be a new spirit in St. Louis if it weren't for Buster May."

— Richard Amberg, late publisher of St. Louis Globe Democrat

"The difference in the arts today is that artists are learning that they must by necessity turn into promoters. That is, they must learn where and how to find sponsors for their work. They must become entrepreneurs."

Adam Aronson, Chairman of the Board of Mark Twain Bancshares

"The choice, which is perfectly plain once we face it, is whether to think of the place where we live as a metropolitan community or just as a lot of people clustered together to make it more convenient to sell things to one another."

George McCue, St. Louis Post-Dispatch