BOB DOLE
KANSAS

United States Senate
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER
WASHINGTON, DC 20510

September 20, 1985

TO: SENATOR DOLE

FROM: GEORGE PIELER

SUBJECT: TALK TO AMERICAN COUNCIL ON THE ARTS, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1985 at the Capitol Hilton

The American Council on the Arts would like to hear primarily about tax reform and how tax changes might affect cultural activities. Their main concern would be how tax changes might affect charitable giving; secondly, the impact of proposed changes in the deductibility of business entertainment expenses (i.e. ability of a business to deduct cost of concert tickets distributed for 'goodwill' purposes, just like tickets to sports events).

Attached are talking points on charitable giving and tax reform; on tax reform generally; and on the deficit.

Attachment

Charitable giving and tax reform

● The main changes in the President's tax plan that might be of concern to charitable organizations are the overall reduction in tax rates; and the elimination of the above-the-line charitable deduction (for nonitemizers).

● Whenever tax rates are reduced, charities and voluntary organizations that use the charitable deduction extensively in their fundraising are concerned. That's because reducing rates also reduces the dollar value to the taxpayer of any particular deduction: a charitable gift of $1,000 by a taxpayer in the 50% bracket is worth $500 in tax savings, but only $350 if the bracket drops to 35%.

● Nevertheless, we have reduced tax rates a number of times with no disastrous effect on charitable giving (although statistics can be employed to show an impact, it is not clear how great the effect is). This time we are talking about a more drastic reduction in rates, so you might expect some impact on charitable giving. But even then, preserving the charitable deduction when most other tax breaks are repealed outright may more than offset the effect.

● The same rationale applies to disallowing the deduction for nonitemizers. The above-the-line deduction for charitable giving has only been available since 1981, and there is much dispute as to how much people in the lower brackets concern themselves with tax savings as an incentive for giving.

● Americans have always supported voluntary organizations, and they always will, with or without a tax break for doing so. The charitable deduction will be kept, and the revised administration tax plan is much more generous than the original Treasury proposal, which imposed a 1% of adjusted gross income floor on deductions for charitable giving.

THE DEFICIT AND THE AVERAGE AMERICAN

- Unless we enact a massive deficit reduction measure, American families will face either higher interest rates or higher inflation: not to mention the risk of a disastrous new recession throwing millions of breadwinners out of work.

- Most economists believe that enactment of the deficit reduction package as large as the Senate offer will produce a drop of at least 1 percent in interest rates over the short run and 2 to 3 pecentage points over the long term: relative to what they otherwise would be.

- With a 2% drop in interest rates, the monthly payment on a median priced home ($80,000) will go down by about $100 a month.

- Conversely, if we don't reduce the deficit to keep rates as low as they are now, homeowners could face that large an increase-or-more in monthly payments.

- A 2% drop in interest rates would mean an additional $4,000 in income for the average wheat farmer with a 1,000 acre operation.

- This year alone, the Federal government will overspend close to $1,000 for every man, woman and child in America.

- This $1,000 per head of additional Federal debt will be one more burden for our children to repay in higher taxes or higher inflation in the future.

- I don't believe we can let this budget negotiation fail. If we don't act now on major deficit reduction, the American people will pay the price. By 1989, interest on the debt alone would take up half of all individual income tax payments. The interest cost would be $250 billion or $1,100 for each American.

- If we can get something like this package I am very, very optimistic about the course of the economy. I think we take too much for granted what we have achieved so far: strong growth without inflation. We can keep that going if we reduce the deficit substantially. The way is open to economic performance unprecedented in the postwar period if we have the will to find it.

Taxes

- The President and the American people have sworn off tax increases as a deficit solution, and no one in Congress seems to want to suggest otherwise. So as far as taxes are concerned, the focus will be on tax reform and ways to improve the distribution of the tax burden.

- There have been a lot of reports and analyses of inequities in the tax code, including one by Joe Pechman on who pays taxes, and one by Ralph Nader's Public Citizen group on corporate loopholes. Despite all the headlines, the bottom line conclusion is one we have known for a long time--payroll taxes and bracket creep raised the tax burden on working people, while the proliferation of tax loopholes cut taxes for the upper incomes and corporations. There, in nutshell, is the source of most of the momentum for tax reform.

- Working people have legitimate concerns in the tax debate: protection of the tax free status of fringe benefits that workers have bargained for, including health insurance--greater equity for the average taxpayer through lower rates and larger personal exemptions. Businesses and workers who don't benefit from rich fringe benefits have legitimate concerns, too, which is why we expect a long and lively debate.

- Clearly tax reform is important, because we must have a tax system that our people believe in and will support without coercion. But unless we deal with the deficit, initiatives such as tax reform will fall by the wayside--because our fiscal crisis will demand all our energy if it gets worse.

- Republicans led the effort to reduce and index tax rates, close corporate loopholes, shut off some upper-income benefits, and improve tax compliance over the past four years. Taken together these changes are the best improvements in tax policy for working people in many years. And without them, scheduled increases in the payroll tax would be pinching workers much more severely than they are.

- The latest report by the Joint Committee on Taxation shows that tax loopholes and preferences will amount to about $424 billion in 1986. Tax loopholes are on a rapid growth path--which is why people are troubled by the unfairness of a "swiss cheese" tax base.

Reagan's Tax Reform

- The President has proposed a striking and historic revision of the income tax laws. His plan would make the system both simpler and fairer.

- The present 14 brackets would be replaced by just three: 15%, 25%, and 35%. The maximum corporate rate would drop to 33% (with graduated rates for small business).

- The plan as a whole would shift the tax burden away from working people and toward businesses that have a lot of income but haven't paid their share of tax. Total taxes paid by individuals would drop 7 percent, while corporate tax payments would rise about 9 percent.

- Distributional Offset. Under the Reagan plan, families with incomes of $10,000 or less would get a 35.5% tax cut; $10,000 to $15,000, a 22.8% tax cut; $15,000 to $20,000, a 13.5% tax cut; $20,000 to $30,000, an 8.7% tax cut; $30,000 to $50,000, a 6.6% tax cut; $50,000 to $100,000, a 4.2% tax cut; $100,000 to $200,000, a 4.1% tax cut; and $200,000 or more, a 10.7% tax cut (the larger-than-average break for the top income group results from the lower top rate of 35% and the lower top capital gain tax rate of 17.5%).

- Return Free System. Under the Reagan plan, only 33% of taxpayers are expected to itemize. In addition, more than half of all taxpayers would be able to get their tax bill or refund without filing a return (if they so choose).

- Protection for Low Income. The plan would remove from the tax rolls virtually all families, married couples, single heads of households, and older Americans at or below the poverty line. This would result from the combination of increasing the personal exemption, zero bracket, earned income credit, and the new consolidated credit for the blind, elderly, and disabled.

- Indexing Protection. The plan retains the indexing protection for rate brackets, the personal exemption, and the zero bracket which we pioneered in 1981. Most plans that claim to do more for middle incomes (like Bradley-Gephardt) do not protect taxpayers against inflation and would do less for them in the long run. President Reagan also expands the indexing concept to the earned income credit, protecting the working poor, to depreciation and to capital gains (in 1991).

- Business and Growth. President Reagan proposes a system of business taxation that is more neutral and will reduce tax-motivated distortions that skew economic decisions. Repealing the ITC and revising depreciation schedules mean greater neutrality among different investment categories. Other changes that will limit economic distortions include limiting real estate tax breaks to the amount at risk, and tightening the minimum tax with regard to oil and gas tax breaks (intangible drilling costs).

- Issues to Watch. Congress is giving the President's plan a very close look, and no doubt many Members have particular changes they want to propose. In particular, there will be focus on:

  - Distribution of Tax Burden. Some are concerned about the break for the top income class--but to address that would require changing the rate structure on the capital gains exclusion, both very sensitive issues. Secretary Baker's proposals to drop inventory indexing, eliminate 401(k)s, and restore the child care credit will help make the case this is a revenue-neutral plan.

  - Neutrality/Investment. Any perceived deviation from "neutral" tax treatment for different industries will bring demands for change from other industries. In addition, those industries most heavily subsidized by the current code--like those which benefit from the ITC because they are capital-intensive--will want to minimize the effect of the plan.

  - State and Local Taxes. Secretary Baker has said that eliminating the deduction for State and local taxes is a sort of "acid test" for serious tax reform. This is a $40 billion item over the projected phase-in period, and that amount would be difficult to make up. If high-tax States can fight off this change--even in the context of much lower tax rates and other benefits that ease the tax take on their citizens--progress may be difficult. A compromise that doesn't lose much revenue may be necessary.

ESCALATING DEFICIT

The main threat to continued economic expansion is run-away Federal spending.

- Since 1940, the Federal Government has run deficits in 37 out of the last 45 years. Since 1960, we've run deficits in 24 out of 25 years.

- In 1985, the gross Federal debt will total $1,841 trillion, an increase of 533% over 1960, 238% over 1975, and 101% over 1980. The total debt in 1985 now stands at 48% of our GNP.

- With no changes in Federal spending policy, CBO projects that Federal outlays will rise from $950 billion in 1985 to $1,378 trillion in 1990--an increase of $428 billion in five years.

- If no changes are made, the budget deficit will increase from $214 billion in FY 85 to $300 billion in 1990 and the National debt will increase to $2,786.

INTEREST ON THE DEBT

This massive increase in debt has itself created one of the largest and fastest growing components of Federal spending--interest on the debt. Constant deficits have put fiscal policy on an endless treadmill of paying for the irresponsibility of previous decades:

- In 1965, interest on the National debt cost $9 billion and consumed 1.4% of GNP. By 1980, annual interest costs rose to $52 billion--2% of GNP. But the worst was yet to come.

- In 1985, interest on the National debt will cost taxpayers $130 billion--almost three times the level of five years agc. This represents 3.8% of GNP, 13.5% of the entire 1985 budget, and a 1,450% increase in costs over 1965.

- $130 billion is equal to the sum total of all Federal spending from 1789--the founding of the Republic--to 1936. It also equals total Federal outlays in 1966, the entire defense budget in 1980, and twice the level of medicare funding today.

- To put it in even simpler terms, about 40% of all revenue collected by the Federal Government from personal income taxes ($330 billion in 1985) will go to pay interest costs and no Federal services at all.

TRADE

o Historically, free trade has spurred U.S. economic growth, and fair competition from abroad has encouraged our industries to be more efficient. As a Senator from an agricultural state, I appreciate the importance of world markets for U.S. farmers. But, the United States cannot be the world's only free trader any more than we can unilaterally disarm.

$150 BILLION TRADE DEFICIT

o Last year, as you know we faced a record shattering $123 billion merchandise trade deficit and this year it could reach $150 billion. Our deficit with just four of the places I recently visited--Japan, Korea, Taiwan and Hong Kong--will amount to $70 billion this year.

o This gross imbalance has devastated important sectors of our economy, particularly manufacturing which is costing us millions of jobs, offsetting employment gains in the service sector. In the last ten years, it is estimated that the United States has lost over 600,000 jobs in just three industries alone: textiles and apparel, steel and footwear. And this trend has now spread to such high technology areas as telecommunications and semiconductors.

IMPACT ON AGRICULTURE

o The deterioration in the U.S. trade position has been equally pronounced in the agricultural sector. From a record high of $43.5 billion in 1980, farm exports have plummeted $10 billion in the past five years.

o To a large extent, our trade woes are self-inflicted. American business can be faulted for not being more aggressive in pursuing export markets. The U.S. economy also has recovered from the worldwide recession more quickly and vigorously than the economies of our major trading partners. The biggest culprit however is the overvalued dollar, which has made U.S. goods 40% more expensive over the past four years -- and at the root of this problem is our inability to control budget deficits.

o The best known of the trade bills include the Thurmond/Jenkins bill, which estabishes annual limits on the growth of all imports of textiles and apparel, except for goods from the EC and Canada. With 53 cosponsors in the Senate and over 290 in the House, passage must be considered a strong possibility. Another major contender is the Danforth/Finance Committee bill responding to Japanese Unfair Trade Practices, which mandates U.S. retaliation unless Tokyo acts to remove trade barriers. A similar nonbinding resolution passed the Senate by a vote of 92-0 in the spring. There is also the Bentsen/Rostenkowski bill, which provides for a 25% surcharge on all imports from Japan, Taiwan, Korea, and Brazil.

OPTIONS

- Section 301 authority permits the Administration to respond by imposing tariffs, import quotas, or other restrictions, when an unfair foreign trade practice is burdening U.S. commerce. But Section 301 has only been used in two cases since its enactment in 1974. There are indications the Administration has recognized this need.

  Some of the options available to Congress would include:

  - More active and coordinated exchange rate policy.
  - A temporary and generalized increase in U.S. tariffs to offset the effects of the overvalued U.S. dollar and reduce the U.S. budget deficit.
  - A review of the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) to eliminate some of the better-off beneficiary countries.
  - Reform of U.S. trade remedy laws to make them more responsive to complaints by U.S. industry and encourage more expeditious adjusment to foreign competitors.

September 23
Monday
luncheon
Cap. Hilton

Joyce

AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR THE ARTS

570 Seventh Avenue
New York, New York 10018
212 354-6655
WORKING FOR ALL THE ARTS
NATIONALLY SINCE 1960

OK

1213 29th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20007
July 22, 1985

The Honorable Robert J. Dole
141 Senate Hart Office Building
Washington, D.C 20510

1:45 or 2:00 SPEAK

perhaps could do after "Salute to HOP Sen Leaders 1:45 or 2:00

Dear Senator Dole:

The American Council for the Arts (ACA) will conduct a National "Issues in the Arts" Conference in Washington, D.C. at the **Capital Hilton on September 22-24, 1985.** The title of the Conference will be:

CONNECTIONS: THE ARTS IN A CHANGING SOCIETY

At the suggestion of Mrs. Pete (Gayle) Wilson, we would very much like for you to address the Conference on Monday, September 23 at the luncheon which will take place from 12:30 to 2:30 p.m. ~~Because of your~~ significant leadership in this nation's general economic development, as well as your specific impact upon tax policies that affect this country's cultural community, we would be interested in hearing from you on the topic of how tax reform and tax policies impact upon the cultural life of our nation. As Senate Majority Leader and a member of the Senate Finance Committee, your perspective will be important to this discussion.

7/18 Gayle Wilson called to urge that you do

The Conference, which is made possible by grants from CBS Inc. and the AT&T Foundation, will focus overall on how artists and those concerned with the arts will meet the challenges of a rapidly changing society. Attending the Conference will be artists, representatives from business, foundations, government leaders at all levels, national arts organizations, local arts advocates, arts administrators and trustees, the education community, and many others beyond the traditional arts community. (A statement on the Conference is attached.)

- Dean Anhouse, Asst
202/333-5841 - ofc.
9/10 advised Sen. would speak at 1:45 or 2:00

In preparation for the Conference, ACA conducted seven regional hearings to gather input from artists, arts professionals and arts advocates as to the pressing concerns facing the arts. A National Steering Committee, consisting of national arts leaders and advocates, was established (a list of members is enclosed) who have had the responsibility of assisting ACA in planning the direction of the Conference. Serving as Honorary Co-Chairs of the Steering Committee are Rep. Tom Downey (D-NY) and Rep. Jim Jeffords (R-VT), who are Chair and Vice Chair, respectively, of the Congressional Arts Caucus.

As we approach the 1990's, many questions about the future of the arts nationally and locally have yet to be discussed. It is our hope that you can join us as we begin to scratch the surface and lay some foundations. In the meantime, if you have any questions or need further information, please call me at 333-5841.

Sincerely,

Jack

Jack G. Duncan
Special Counsel for
National Policy

ACA

July 1985

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR THE ARTS
ON A NATIONAL ARTS CONFERENCE

Since the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities was established in 1965, this country has witnessed a phenomenal growth in the number of arts institutions, performing arts ensembles, community and state arts agencies, and the like. Both public and private support for the arts has grown, and more opportunities exist in more communities across our country to enjoy and participate in quality arts programs. This growth has been made possible, in part, by federal leadership through the National Endowment for the Arts; by the bipartisan commitment of government leaders at all levels to the encouragement of excellence in the arts, and to broader access in communities across our country to such cultural opportunities; and by the willingness of the private sector to provide support for cultural activities.

As a result, we do not find ourselves in the same position today as in 1965. Fiscal problems, the phenomenal growth of new technology, and other developments have also had a significant impact upon the complex world of the arts. We therefore feel it is timely to pause and take stock of the situation, to identify our successes, as well as unresolved issues, and to try to determine where and how we might address current and future problems within the arts community. The American Council for the Arts is undertaking this through a National "Issues in the Arts" Conference entitled Connections: The Arts in a Changing Society in Washington, D.C. in September 22-24, 1985 at the Capital Hilton.

In preparation for the Conference, the American Council for the Arts has sponsored a series of seven regional hearings around the country to hear from a broad cross section of the arts community about issues facing the arts now and over the next decade, and how these might be addressed. Hearings have been held in San Francisco on February 4 (Pacific Region), in Washington, D.C. on May 17 (Mid-Atlantic Region), in Chicago on September 7 (Great Lakes Region), in New Orleans on October 12 (Southeast Region), in Denver on October 16 (Great Plains Region), in Dallas (Southwest Region) on November 9, and in Boston (Northeast Region) on November 16.

These hearings sought input from artists, arts managers, business, the education community, foundations, government leaders at all levels, national arts organizations, local arts advocates, and many others beyond the traditional arts community as to the current condition of the arts, their advice as to the principal issues facing the arts, and recommendations on practical steps which can subsequently be taken to strengthen the arts in this country. It is also our hope that these hearings will stimulate additional state and local activities which will provide further input into this yearlong listening process.

An additional key component is the development of a National Steering Committee, consisting of national leaders working in and concerned about the future of the arts, who will have the responsibility of assisting ACA in developing the format of the Conference, identifying issues to be addressed during the Conference, and analyzing the purpose and outcome of the Conference. Serving as Honorary Co-Chairs of the Steering Committee and the National Conference are Rep. Tom Downey (D-NY) and Rep. Jim Jeffords (R-VT), who are Chair and Vice Chair, respectively, of the Congressional Arts Caucus. Attached is a list of National Steering Committee members.

We approach this Conference with an open mind, aiming to hear from as broad a cross section of our society as possible in order that we may expand the perspective on cultural policy issues. Through the process of public hearings, analysis of the information and recommendations we receive, and the eventual conference, we hope to identify issues of major consequence to the arts, and to forge coalitions around these issues--be they matters for local, state or federal government, or for the private sector--in order to actually implement the recommendations which come out of this process. It is this effort to translate conference ideas into actual policy which we see as the major focus of this undertaking.

MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE STEERING COMMITTEE

CONFIRMED STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Honorary Co-Chairs

The Honorable Thomas J. Downey (D-N.Y.), U.S. House of Representatives, Chairman, Congressional Arts Caucus
The Honorable James M. Jeffords (R-Vt.), U.S. House of Representatives, Vice Chairman, Congressional Arts Caucus

Working Co-Chairs

Barbaralee Diamonstein-Spielvogel, Writer; television interviewer/producer; Commissioner, New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission; New York Cultural Affairs Commission, New York, NY
Michael Newton, President, Performing Arts Council of the Music Center of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA

Steering Committee Members

Caroline Ahmanson, Trustees Committee and Honorary Board Member, American Association of Museums; Executive Committee and Board of Trustees, Los Angeles County Museum of Art, Beverly Hills, CA
Susan Arnold, Legislative Assistant, Senator Ted Stevens (R-Alaska), Washington, D.C.
The Honorable Stanley Aronoff, Ohio State Senator, Past President, Arts, Tourism and Cultural Resources Committee, National Conference of State Legislatures, Cincinnati, OH
Anna Arrington, Program Officer, Atlantic Richfield Foundation, Los Angeles, CA
William Baumol, Economist, Princeton University and New York University, Princeton, NJ
Livingston Biddle, Writer; Former Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, DC
Theo Bikel, Actor, Past President, Actors' Equity Association, Georgetown, CT
Gene Boucher, Baritone, New York Metropolitan Opera; National Executive Secretary, American Guild of Musical Artists, New York, NY
John Brademas, President, New York University, New York, NY
Ralph Burgard, Cultural Planning Consultant, New York, NY
Ellen Burstyn, Actress, President, Actors' Equity Association, New York, NY
Alan Cameros, Chief Executive Officer, Flanigan Furniture, Rochester, NY
Ellie Caulkins, Trustee, Denver Symphony Orchestra; Executive Committee, Opera Colorado, Denver, CO
Alexander Crary, Professional Staff Member, U.S. Senate Labor and Human Resources Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and the Humanities, Washington, DC
Lanham Deal, Director, Center for Arts Administration, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, TX

Gene Dorsey, President, Gannet Foundation, Rochester, NY
John Everitt, Executive Director, Arts and Humanities Council, Tulsa, OK
Jean Firstenberg, Director, The American Film Institute, Los Angeles, CA
Jack Golodner, Director, Department of Professional Employees, AFL-CIO, Washington, DC
Toni Goodale, TKG Associates (Fundraising Consultant), New York, NY
Lou Harris, Louis Harris Associates, New York, NY
Anne Hawley, Executive Director, Massachusetts Council on the Arts & Humanities, Boston, MA
Daniel Herrick, Vice President for Finance, Metropolitan Museum of Art; Chair, The Foundation Center, New York, NY
Richard Hunt, Sculptor, Former Member, National Council on the Arts, Chicago, IL
Lee Kimche-McGrath, President, Lee Kimche Associates (International Cultural Relations); Former Director, Institute of Museum Services, Washington, DC
The Honorable Harry Kinney, Mayor of Albuquerque, New Mexico, Top Honors in the 1984 City Livability Award Winner, Albuquerque, NM
Jack Koten, Vice President, Corporate Communications, Illinois Bell, Chicago, IL
Joseph Krakora, External Affairs Officer, National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC
Margaret Ladd, Actress; Artistic Director, Imagination Workshop, Neuro-Psychiatric Institute, University of California-Los Angeles, CA
Fred Lazarus IV, President, Maryland Institute, College of Art, Baltimore, MD
Ruby Lerner, Executive Director, Alternate Roots, Atlanta, GA
Reynold Levy, President, AT&T Foundation, New York, NY
Nanette Fabray MacDougall, Actress, Member of the National Council on the Handicapped, Los Angeles, CA
Roger Mandle, Director, Toledo Museum of Art, Toledo, OH
Richard Moore, President and General Manager, KTCA-TV, Minneapolis, MN
Sondra Myers, Chairwoman, Steering Committee for State Arts Advocacy Organizations; Chairman, The Pennsylvania Humanities Council; and Member, U.S. Commission on Fine Arts, Scranton, PA
John Hallmark Neff, Art Advisor, First National Bank of Chicago, Chicago, IL
Louise Nevelson, Artist, New York, NY
Rogelio Novey, Acting Director, Museum of Modern Art of Latin America, Washington, DC
Carl Petrick, Executive Secretary, Seattle Arts Commission, Seattle, WA
Tina Ramirez, Artistic Director and Founder, Ballet Hispanico of New York, New York, NY
Peter Raven, Director, Missouri Botanical Garden, St. Louis, MO
Pamela Coe Reynolds, Chairman, The Governor's Award for the Arts, Richmond, VA
The Honorable Charles Royer, Mayor of Seattle, Washington, 1984 City Livability Award Winner, Seattle, WA

Frank Saunders, Staff Vice President for Cultural Affairs, Philip Morris, Inc.; Board Member, Foundation Center; Advisor, Business Committee for the Arts, New York, NY

George Seybolt, Chairman, Trustees Committee, American Association of Museums; Former Chairman, Institute of Museum Services; Boston, MA

Mary Shands, President, Kentucky Arts and Craft Foundation Inc., Louisville, KY

Harold Snedcof, Project Director, CITY BUILDING, A Place for the Arts in Mixed-Use Developments, San Francisco, CA

Peter Solomssen, President, Philadelphia College of Art, Philadelphia, PA

Jack Stefany, FAIA, Architect and President, McElvy Jennewein Stefany Howard, Inc., Architects, Planners and Interior Designers, Tampa, FL; National Chairman, Artists-In-Education Program of the National Endowment for the Arts

Cissy Swig, President, San Francisco Arts Commission, San Francisco, CA

Billy Taylor, Pianist/Composer, New York, NY

Jim Volz, Managing Director, Alabama Shakespeare Festival, Montgomery, AL

Pamela Walker, Executive Director, Arts International, Washington, DC

Elizabeth Weil, Vice President-Cultural Affairs, Rogers & Cowan/Washington; Former Director, National Endowment for the Arts Challenge/Advancement Program, Washington, DC

Phylis Wyeth, Vice-Chairman, National Committee Arts for the Handicapped; Businesswoman; Washington, DC

Ex officio member: **Hugh Southern**, Deputy Chairman for Programs, National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, DC

TOTAL STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS - 61 JULY 1985