

## ARTS &amp; LETTERS

and filled with tension than even Picasso's forms," Kisselgoff observes. Inspired by the dances of American Indians and other primitive peoples, Graham stressed constant motion in her performances and avoided the fixed positions and poses of classical ballet. Standardizing her repertoire of movements in a training regimen (the "Graham technique") allowed her to pass on her style to disciples, establishing a permanent alternative to ballet.

"I don't want to be understandable, I want to be felt," Graham declares. Her chief principle is that dancing expresses emotions that people will not or cannot express in words. The quintessential Graham movement begins in what she calls "the house of the pelvic truth." The dances are often direct and erotic, enough so that in 1962 two congressmen protested in vain against State Department subsidies for her troupe's cultural exchange tour in Europe. Since Graham herself stopped dancing, however, her company's performances have been without a "mesmerizing focus" and have become cooler and more studied.

Cooler or not, Graham is far from retirement. Last winter saw the premier of two new Graham works. And while some of her younger colleagues now believe that dance should be cerebral and more formal [see *WQ*, Summer 1983, p. 33], Graham continues to insist that dance be a direct form of communication between performer and audience.

### *Subsidizing The Arts*

"Arts Funding: Growth and Change between 1963 and 1983" by Kenneth Goody, in *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* (Jan. 1984), Sage Publications, 275 South Beverly Dr., Beverly Hills, Calif. 90212.

It is no accident that Americans no longer associate artists with bleak garrets but with chic Soho lofts. Growing audiences have made painters, musicians, and others in the arts more prosperous. Moreover, reports Goody, a Rockefeller Foundation consultant, arts contributions by government, corporations, and foundations have soared.

In 1963, these three types of institutions gave a total of \$40 million to the arts. By 1982, that figure had risen to over \$940 million, an 800 percent jump even after inflation. One reason for the surge was the creation in 1965 of the federal government's National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), which last year distributed \$131 million to individuals and organizations—painters, film makers, symphony orchestras, dance troupes. And state governments appropriated \$129 million for the arts in 1982, up from only \$2.7 million in 1966. Also between 1966 and 1982, foundation support grew from \$38 million to \$349 million, corporate contributions from \$24 million to \$336 million.

Today, foundations and corporations each supply about 36 percent of the nation's organized arts funding, while the state and federal governments together provide 28 percent (versus seven percent in 1966).

---

**ARTS & LETTERS**


---

Their inexperience in the arts and lack of knowledgeable specialists do not encourage boldness by foundations and corporations, Goody says. They prefer to help mainstream organizations, such as ballet companies, pay salaries or to support projects that will have broad public appeal. The NEA and the states tend to fund more experimental work. Government programs always risk politicizing the arts, Goody notes. Politicians are often divided over whether to support excellence or encourage "democracy" in the arts. Constituents pressure them for patronage.

Nevertheless, there is strong support for government subsidies in Washington and the statehouses. Despite two recent Reagan administration attempts to cut the NEA budget, federal arts outlays continue to grow. So do state contributions. And while foundations will not increase their donations much in the near future, corporations will as their profits grow. In short, art and poverty are not soon likely to become synonymous again in the United States.

---

**OTHER NATIONS**


---

*In Afghanistan*

"Report from Afghanistan" by Claude Malhuret, in *Foreign Affairs* (Winter 1983/84), Reader Services, 58 East 68th St., New York, N.Y. 10021.

Four years after invading Afghanistan, the Soviet Army is still bogged down in an inconclusive war. Yet Malhuret, head of the Paris-based volunteer group, *Médecins sans Frontières* (Doctors without Borders), which operates six hospitals in Afghanistan, writes that the conflict is not, as it has been called, "Moscow's Vietnam."

American commanders in South Vietnam (like other Westerners in recent antiguerrilla wars) tried to enlist the villagers against the insurgents. But Soviet generals take a different approach. According to Malhuret, their goal is not winning over the population, but terrorizing it. Mao Zedong once observed that successful guerrillas submerge themselves in the rural population like "fish taking to the water." The Soviet response, Malhuret writes, is to "empty the fish bowl." The huge number of Afghan refugees—some four million of the nation's 15–17 million people have fled to Pakistan and Iran—is not an unintended consequence of war but a result of deliberate Soviet strategy.

There are now about 115,000 Soviet troops in Afghanistan. Since late 1980, heavy casualties inflicted by the Afghan Mujahedeen guerrillas in rugged terrain have forced the Soviets to rely less on ground attacks, more on air raids. Helicopter gunship strikes and the dropping of mines and of booby-trapped toys designed not to kill but to maim—"an injured person is much more trouble [to the rebels] than a dead person," Malhuret explains—have emptied the Mujahedeen's rural strongholds of up to half their population. And large Afghan cities, such as Herāt