

## Bill Ivey Transcript

Do I need a mic? Great. Well welcome everyone, thanks for taking part of your day and spending it here with us here on campus. We deeply appreciate your coming here and sharing in this afternoon event with us. We are especially pleased that we have broken our record of cosponsors for this event. Just a few weeks ago we had, then, a record of twenty for Alan Leshner. So my thirteen year old granddaughter keeps telling me that men drool and women rule, so today arts and humanities rules with a new record of cosponsors. This includes four colleagues, four departments, eleven centers or academic programs on campus, and six community partners. Because the office of University Outreach and Engagement invests most of its resources connecting university knowledge with community knowledge for mutual benefits, I think it's appropriate to especially recognize our community cosponsors. Creative Futures, The Greater Lansing Convention of Visitors Bureau, Arts Council of Greater Lansing, Lansing Economic Area Partnerships, The Michigan Council for Arts and Culture, and the Michigan Humanities Council, so thank you.

University Outreach and Engagement will continue to provide resources to assist academic departments, centers and institutes, and extension on priority issues of concern to society by encouraging, supporting, and collaborating with faculty and academic staff to generate, supply, transmit, and preserve knowledge. In all of its work University Outreach and Engagement emphasizes partnerships that are collaborative, participatory, empowering, systemic, transformative, and anchored in scholarship. The National Collaborative for the Study of University Engagement plays a national leadership role with respect to conversations about the scholarship of engagement. The Collaborative seeks to understand, to advance greater understanding of the role of community engagement and faculty scholarship by studying the processes, relationships, and impacts of engagement on faculty, the academy, and its partner communities. It does this through original research, creative activities, publications, institutional studies, reflection, and professional development programs, advocacy, and national collaborations. Its directors, Laurie Van Egeren and Burt Bargerstock, join me in welcoming today's speaker Bill Ivey.

Bill Ivey has had a remarkable life. Since leaving the Upper Peninsula to craft this life and adventure, in the years to come we know that there is every indication that he will weave even more enriching patterns into the tapestry that preserves and tells his story. Part of that story is chairman of The National Endowment for the Arts, director of the Country Music Foundation, Chairman of the National Academy of Recording Arts and Sciences, President of the American Folklore Society, and Team Leader for Arts and Humanities in the Obama/Biden Presidential Transition. Bill Ivey's Challenge America Initiative, launched in 1999, has garnered more than fifteen million dollars in the new congressional appropriations for The Arts Endowment. He is a four time Grammy Award Nominee, author of numerous articles on United States Cultural Policy, as well as on folk and popular music. And author of two recent books, one of which you

can get here, especially at our reception following this talk. Bill Ivey holds degrees in history, folklore, and ethnomusicology as well as honorary doctorates from the University of Michigan, Michigan Technological University, Wayne State University, and Indiana University. He is founding director of the Curbs Center for Art, Enterprise, and Public Policy at Vanderbilt University, director of the Center's Washington based program for Senior Government Career Staff, and the Arts Industries Policy Forum, and is Senior Consultant to Leadership Music, a professional development program serving Nashville's music community. Please welcome Bill Ivey as he shares his thoughts on arts and community in the age of Obama.

I think I am going to use this one. Thank you, Hi. We were struggling to get a level ear mic up and working, but this will be just fine, I think. Hmm, that's more difficult. Are you sure it won't fit? Yea, you're right. Ok, I'll work, I'll demonstrate that I actually have two hands; although actually let's see. Let's see, two hands, click here, we'll make it work. Thank you, Hi. It's great to be here with you and terrific to see what exciting engagement around culture and the economy is happening right here at Michigan State. I want to thank everyone involved for the hospitality I've enjoyed over the last; I guess now almost two days and especially Kurt Dewhurst and Marsha MacDowell who have been so generous with their time. Kurt of course is an old colleague, both are folklorists. Kurt's now the President of the American Folklore Society and MSU has been kind enough to lend him part time to head that organization. So I am very pleased to be with them and thank them for their generosity.

The Curb Center is an arts policy center with a difference, interested in creative enterprise, not only the nonprofit sector. And so it's great to be with you here in East Lansing. Back when I was Chairman of the NEA; Hi mentioned that I grew up in the Upper Peninsula. I still pay, not a lot of taxes, I pay some taxes here in Michigan because I own a home up on the shore of Lake Superior, just outside of Calumet, Michigan where I graduated from High School in 1962. The last time I was actually on this campus was when I was brought down here as a National Merit Scholar Semi-Finalist in the summer of '62. And Michigan State was trying to get me to come to school here, but instead because of family pressure—you know both of my parents had attended the University of Michigan—and so that's where I went to school. But I have fond memories of that visit. And I often think that I would've chosen better had I chosen to come to school right here at Michigan State. And when I was with the NEA I would drive—you know the government can take these fairly long holidays—and I would drive from Washington, D.C. up to Calumet. And of course when you are heading up north thought the Lower Peninsula you pass nearby Lansing, East Lansing. And I always was startled by the truth that when I passed Michigan State I was almost exactly half way between Washington and Calumet. I still had that far to go. This is a very big state, so it's great to be here even though the state is so large I don't feel all that close to home.

Here's my talk, you notice I got the date wrong; I've got me talking tomorrow. But this is what the address is going to be about. And really talking about a couple of themes that I think are going to be very important. You saw the slide—Hi held up my book—you saw the slide of Arts Inc. And many of the ideas that I'm going to be talking about today are incubated or expressed in

more elaborate form in *Arts Inc: How Greed and Neglect Have Destroyed our Cultural Rights*. It was published a little more than a year ago. I mentioned the Upper Peninsula of Michigan in that book a number of times; it shows up a lot of different ways. Calumet of course is today a poor failed copper mining town. The mines began to decline really in the mid 1950s and the last copper mine closed in 1966. But it's a culturally rich area. And I found as I reflected on the importance of culture to community and culture to individual lives, I kept coming back to my experiences in the UP and remembering that when I was young, before my teenage years, there was a daily newscast, WHDF, the local station at noon in the Finnish language. And the existence of that broadcast in Finnish on, at that time our only AM radio station, simply indicates how culturally diverse that community is. Because there were many other languages that could have argued that they also deserved a newscast on that station. So I want to accomplish these two things today, talk about some of the key markers in the evolving relationship between Obama administration and its cultural agenda. And I also want to talk about a couple of new ideas that to me seem essential for those of us who care about the vibrancy of the cultural environment in America's towns and cities.

Now here's a beginning look at the Obama Vision as it emerged beginning fairly early in the campaign. The campaign issued promises to the arts community in January of 2008, a forty member Arts Policy Committee was established. It was co-chaired by a TV producer and writer named George Stevens; he's based in Washington, D.C. And Margo Lion who's also a producer, a producer of Broadway shows in New York. The committee was greatly expanded in July; that's when I became a member. And the group conducted bi-weekly conference calls and while policy was actually discussed, as you would expect the committee predictably zeroed in on ways in which art and artists could help advance Barack Obama's then primary campaign, Presidential campaign goals. A lot of it had to do with trying to raise money.

Now in the late summer of 2008 Bill Clinton's former Chief of Staff, a guy named John Podesta—he was my old boss when I was Chairman of the NEA, he was my point of contact with the West Wing of the White House—he was asked to organize a secret government review process, this was called the Obama Transition Project. And the Obama Transition Project goal was straightforward but hardly simple. This was about examining public documents to produce a thirty page report that highlighted the key policy and personnel issues in every agency of government. So that thirty pager was then going to be reduced to two pages, a two page summary. And the President Elect would have on his desk a fat notebook with two pages summarizing the key issues affecting every agency of government the morning after the election. That was the goal of the Obama Transition Project. Now I was asked to review the NEA. My boss was a guy named Tom Wheeler, he's a venture capitalist based in New York, based in Washington. And of course we worked in absolute secrecy because the Obama Project you know smacked of measuring the drapes; assuming you were going to win the election long before any votes had been counted. Now the Obama Transition Project was conducted entirely by phone and email. And each participant pretty much worked alone. No assurance we'd be part of the real transition should the candidate prevail. And of course we know now that the candidate did in fact

prevail. And I was brought forward to head the group that was addressing technology, science, and the arts.

These are the campaign promises that we began with. These are the campaign promises that were extracted by Americans for the Arts from the Obama Campaign, actually during the primary. And if you look at them closely you will see that these are pretty much the old chestnuts of Arts Advocacy. Those of you who have been around the arts for a while these are the things that have been desired by those who want additional engagement on the part of the federal government. The new item here is really this Artists' Core, the idea of a group of artists who would be in communities paid by the federal government. And this idea has some legs today. But these were the Obama Campaign promises and here's the timeline in which the Obama engagement with the arts developed.

So right now we are between the Obama Transition Project and the Obama Transition. I was asked by, as I say, Tom Wheeler to move from the Project into the actual Transition. And this is what we were working on. The top, above the line we're doing agency review. We're looking at the various agencies of government in exactly the same way we did in the Obama Transition Project. That is we're looking at issues of personnel, issues of policy, to see where the bodies are buried to make sure that new political appointees could come in and hit the ground running. We were also tasked with figuring out who might be the new politically appointed leadership of the key cultural agencies. So our little team worked on NEA, National Endowment for the Arts; National Endowment for the Humanities; and the Institute of Museum and Library Services which is less known but a very important grant making agency of government that supports libraries and museums.

Now I don't expect you to memorize this, but this is one of many pages in the description of how the Transition would do its work. And I place it here just to give you a feeling for how things were structured. And you can see there were a series of Group Leaders. I was in the group right below the center of the chart, the one that was science, technology, and the arts. So we were kind of an odd combination, we were an odd cohort. There were three hundred of us working in the Transition. It was part a kind of government agency in waiting, it was part euphoric, successful political campaign, and it was something of a employment office because I would say two thirds of the people I worked with in the Transition were very interested in moving from the Transition into government. In fact I think I was one of the few who from the outside said no, I'll be here for nine weeks and then I'm going to go back to Nashville.

We were set up in the top three floors of a Department of Justice office building on Sixth Street, Northwest. So we were almost exactly ten blocks east of the White House. And this is the very building and we had the seventh, eighth and ninth floors. Agency review was on seven, I would say the "big dogs" were on eight—that was John Podesta, Rohm Emanuel, various characters who were certain to move into the administration—and on the ninth floor you had a suite of offices for the President and another suite for the Vice President and a press office and a space for press conferences.

In our first meeting we were photographed for Secret Service ID badges, we were issued Blackberries, assigned phone numbers, email addresses, and so on and escorted to the seventh floor. And because Tom's group included science and technology I was in a cluster with a bunch of Clinton era political appointees who worked with agencies like the FCC, The National Science Foundation, The Department of Commerce, and so on. In fact my officemate, Jim Nollenberger, was reviewing, was heading agency review for NASA. And that's the space agency not the organization that works with state arts agencies; what I call the "real NASA". But from the beginning there was really more in play than creating documents for the incoming agency leadership and selecting qualified candidates for top political jobs. And I go back to this slide to look at what's below the line.

You'll remember our economy was in a five turn spin—that's George Bush's phrase—in mid November. And it was obvious to me from day one that the contents of the looming, inevitable stimulus bill, that was going to be assembled not by Nancy Pelosi—you know it's always been called Nancy Pelosi's bill which always intrigues me because<sup>3</sup> it was almost entirely put together within the Transition Office. And from the outset everyone was trying to get the agencies they worked with designated as a recipient for some of the federal money that was going to be certainly coming down the pipe. Now it's a story that could fill its own speech. And I'll answer questions later and I will be happy to take questions about it.

But to cut to the chase after a fascinating and slightly contentious process of internal advocacy and negotiation, I learned in January—and this was just after the eleventh hour as we were closing the offices—that fifty million dollars would go through the NEA to arts organizations around the nation as part of the stimulus, the economic stimulus effort to create and protect jobs. Now the fifty million itself, those of you who track this, it became very controversial in Congress; a big fight between the Senate and the House. The Senate didn't put the money in the bill. And in fact Tom Coburn authored an amendment to the bill that said no money would go for the arts or for dry heat saunas, light shows—he had a list of things he was willing to treat dismissally and money for the arts was one of them. And the amendment passed. But in conference, David Obey, the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee; Nancy Pelosi, who got a phone call from Robert Redford; stood firm. And they said the House voted for the fifty million and it's gonna stay in. I saw the New York Times had the story already written, you know "NEA Loses Again". They just assumed, there was just an assumption that that money was going to be taken out of the bill. But it wasn't, it stayed in. So that was part of it. Keep getting money for your agency as part of the Transition job in that stimulus bill that was being crafted in that Sixth Street office building.

Now I had my own agenda and I called it "The Journey West". And I argue about this at some length in Art Inc. During my tenure as NEA Chairman I had become convinced that arts and culture need to find a new way of connecting with the policy apparatus of the White House. Now from 1965 on when the agency was first created through every Presidency into the Clinton Administration, into the Bush Administration our cultural agencies have been linked to the Executive Branch through the White House Social Office and The Offices of the First Lady. It

was actually Hillary Clinton's Office that recruited me to be NEA Chairman. That's as it's always been. There are after all two wings in our White House. The west wing—and that's the one that has been made famous, on your right. It's the one that's been made famous by the long running TV series. It's home to the Domestic Policy Council, the National Security Council, The Council of Economic Advisors and so on. And then there's the east wing on the left where those of you who've attended White House events were screened through security. If you wanted to sneak into a White House dinner you had to do it through the east wing. It's also where the White House Social Office is located and where most of the Offices of the First Lady are Headquartered. So if the west wing is about public policy, the east wing is more about, well parties and the social life of the White House. And although I hold all of America's First Ladies in the highest regard, the truth is that agencies that are linked to administration leadership though the Social Office simply don't acquire standing with real west wing policy makers. And burdened by a thin connection to policy actors, the arts and the NEA have pretty much remained an amenity, albeit one that can quickly turn politically toxic. And that was of course the case when arts controversies dogged the elder President Bush during his second primary campaign which ended up in the fights over Mapplethorpe and Serrano and John Fortmeyer—then the chairman of the NEA—losing his job. I hope to change things.

So while I supervised Transition agency review and we worked to assemble our list of NEA chairman candidates, and lobbied to make arts workers part of the economic recovery package, I also peppered my Transition colleagues with memos arguing that something I labeled an "Arts and Culture Portfolio" should be positioned somewhere in the west wing, and probably in the Domestic Policy Council. That was then being put together by an Obama advisor named Melody Barnes. And these are the things that I thought should be in there, in that cultural portfolio. And I kept trying to talk to my colleagues on the seventh floor about the obvious fact that authority in cultural matters is scattered all over government and it would be good public policy to find a way for the Obama Administration to consolidate its work with many agencies in one west wing office.

So what has happened? What's happened since the Transition ended and the threads of these campaign promises—stimulus money, the new appointments, the organization of the Obama White House—how have these all been knitted together? What has happened? Well I think the news is mixed, basically good, but mixed. The NEA stimulus package, it did a first rate job of distributing its money. This is how that money went out. I've heard that the Office of Management and Budget singled out the NEA as being—it was certainly one of the very first, perhaps the first agency to actually move money. Makes sense, they're grant makers—but singled them out for the excellence of their program.

You know second, in Rocco Landesman, the President picked I will say the least mainstream candidate on our Transition list. And I'm revealing for the first time that he was on our list because I know Margo Lion, one of my colleagues, has spoken to the New York Times about this. So it's no longer a secret that he was one of the five names that we sent along to the White House. But he was the one that no one in the arts community would have automatically

recognized. Now I'm convinced that Rocco's bold stance on the value of art and of the Endowment and his focus on art in communities will ultimately, significantly advance the NEA. And the idea of an Artists Core, the idea of an Art Works Program with artists in communities, does seem to have some traction. Not so much with the White House, but with Congressional leaders like David Obey and Louis Slaughter and others who have supported the arts over the years.

But I would say it's not all sweetness and light. I mean the agency is currently operating with a budget of about a hundred and sixty seven million dollars, a little more than that. The President requested only a hundred and sixty one million in his budget request for fiscal 2011, that'll be for next year, given the attention that's now focused on our overall federal budget deficit; it will be very tough for congressional supporters like Louis Slaughter and Jim Moran to add funding during the appropriations process. That's the way the NEA has gotten its advances in recent years.

And I would say; I talked about campaign promises. When I started with the campaign these were 'campaign promises', by the time we started the Transition and the economy was sinking they became "campaign objectives", and by the time we were splitting up the offices they became "campaign goals". So that list, that impressive list I think has somewhat been put aside. And as to my dream of a coordinated west wing link for the NEA and other government cultural activities, well at first it didn't look that promising. I was told that Mel Barnes had placed an Arts and Culture Portfolio in the Domestic Policy Council in something called the Office of Social Innovation and Civic Participation. The west wing; nothing happened for months. But it seems now that this west wing connection is coming to life. Barnes has hosted a meeting with arts leaders; she did that back in January. And in February Chairman Landesman began to regularly meet with the Domestic Policy Council, he meets with them once a month. That has never happened in the history of the NEA. So that part is very encouraging.

So what can we learn from the Campaign Transition in the first months of the new Administration? I think first, in a process burdened by federal deficits the most we'll see is incremental growth in the NEA budget added by Congress. And we'll be lucky to get that. However Rocco Landesman is willing to take some very strong positions on the arts. And it does feel that the timing may be right for a bolder message around the federal government and culture. You know when I was chairman we were all in a defensive crouch. You know the republican congress had just been on the NEA for nearly a decade. And Rocco is temperamentally and intellectually not suited to a defensive posture and I think he's delivering a bold message that I think may end up proving that the right wing rhetoric that we've heard over the years is really mostly luster. And if that message gets through it will be a lot easier for the White House to be supportive.

But I do think that in the big picture long standing assumptions about how art and government interacts with culture have proven to be remarkably sticky. We've kind of worked our way into an existential crisis. But we'll have to work to continually reconfigure the arts and the way we think about arts and community. And I think we're caught somewhere between the

First Lady's Office, probably between the First Lady's Office and the Office of Public Liaison and the Domestic Policy Council. I think we've moved the issue at least to the middle, maybe a little bit all the way to the right toward the west wing. So we're caught between one and two and we're engaging three. So art to date has pretty much remained in its traditional role. The First Lady has attended some important art openings, but where's the President? The White House has hosted evenings featuring Jazz, Country and Classical music but the events have been organized without any consultation with eh NEA, the NEH, the Smithsonian, the Library of Congress or any other sources of expertise within the government. So we've been pretty much in that traditional role. So that's where we are right, today.

What I'd like to do and I'll refer to the federal situation a couple of more times but I really want to talk, as I begin to conclude, about a second point: What arts leaders must do if we are to create and sustain a deeper and more meaningful connection between art and our American democracy, our American communities. Now first there's the arts, an amenity that can suddenly turn radioactive. I think we need a bigger policy frame. You know we constructed a frame for the arts about fifty years ago in the early days of foundation government spending. I think these are the four components, five components, four components, that are in it. You know we care about artists who work with the nonprofit community. We care about nonprofit arts organizations, mostly those focused on the fine arts. We certainly care about state community grant making agencies and then K through 12 arts education, mostly music, mostly band. Policy questions and advocacy about the arts have pretty much been posed within this frame. So we strategize about ways for nonprofits to connect with minority neighborhoods, study the impact of arts facilities on real estate values, advance claims that music instruction improves in school test performance, or the presence of a creative class will increase a city's appeal as a site for industrial relocation.

Now I think we've pushed the arguments within this frame about as far as they will go. In fact there's a tone of desperation when we argue that art improves test scores, or that artist studios will advance economic development, or the presence of some creative class will make a city an irresistible destination for industrial relocation; probably one of the more crucial things I'll say today. The art forms within our frame constitute what an economist named Richard, back in the fifties, called merit goods. They are products and services the government believes should be more widely available, what would be the case if you could only go out and buy them. The government intervenes to make merit goods more available. There's nothing wrong with viewing the arts as merit goods. It's just that the merit good frame, our merit good frame is pretty weak when it's compared to things like subsidized health care and housing for the poor, protected wetlands, subsidized anti-viral drugs for AIDS victims in Sahara Africa, etcetera, etcetera. Merit goods, after all, get ranked in order of importance. And those rankings are especially important in tough economic times. And if you look at that list you know you really see the things that, you what I think of as the "big dog" foundations like the Clinton Foundation, The Gates Foundation. These are their priorities and culture is at best a twig on a branch on a limb far below these

priorities. So I'm convinced we need to think about a larger frame, a different kind of policy frame.

I've always argued that while arts policy must address issues affecting the nonprofit arts, on a national level I think we have to expand to take on the public interest impact of things like copy right law, trade policy in cultural goods, mergers and acquisitions in the media industries, access to cultural heritage, to the tools of online creativity and learning. And that means thinking about how for-profit galleries interact with young painters, what Clear Channel Communications and its ownership of local radio means to local broadcasting, the rights of citizens to engage cultural heritage even if that cultural heritage—say old movies, old sound recording—are owned by some multinational as corporate assets. In short we must think about a broad system in which art is created, distributed, preserved. Analyzing and improving the ways that system intersects quality of life in our American democracy. And I've argued in Arts Inc and in other places that we need to think about cultural rights.

And I'm gonna run, I'll give you just time to read it and then I'll quickly move on. But a right is a assertion, a fundamental assertion not based on evidence, based merely on argument. And I put these six rights forward in a speech to the National Press Club in December of 2000, about ten days after the Supreme Court had decided Bush versus Gore. Believe me; very few people were interested in cultural rights ten days after the Supreme Court decided the results of that election. So it didn't get a lot of attention. But it kind of stayed with me. I had other opportunities to speak about it and it became the basis of Arts Inc. And there's a chapter in the book organized around each of those rights. Beyond the rights I talk about something called expressive life. And this is a slide that I'll come back to a little bit later in a different context. But to me it's the broad term that denotes an area of knowing and doing that links artistic practice and access to the tools of creativity connection with the past, engagement with novelty and innovation, in a broad frame that really possess some really powerful implications for quality of life. I use expressive life instead of art and instead of culture because I think those terms are kind of burdened, they're kind of lost their clear meaning.

As a nation, an individual, or community if each of those three possesses strong links to heritage and ready access to the tools of individual voice, I believe you can claim a high quality of life. And from this connection to quality of life, expressive life can acquire the kind of gravitas that defines other policy sectors like healthcare, education, and the environment. So my selfish wish is that on a national level you advocate on behalf of a more coherent connection between expressive life and government. Maybe arguing that we need, you saw that slide go by quickly earlier, a Department of Cultural Affairs. We desperately need to consolidate and coordinate the way we work with culture and government. This is just a few of the agencies that own little pieces of what I would call the cultural policy pie. They each have some authority over our cultural system, in some cases pretty dramatic authority. And they're the ones that determine how our art system interacts with artists and citizens here and throughout the world. Now this kind of vision is a necessity long term and national in scope. But because most of the laws and

regulations define the playing field on which art gets created, moved around, transformed, consumed, is federal this transformation will only occur after a patient advocacy effort.

But I'd like to shift my focus away from Washington as I really do wrap up today and take your questions and talk about art and community policy objectives that I think offer a real opportunity for front line leaders who want to talk about how arts connect here in the Lansing, the Greater Lansing area and other communities in Michigan. I met yesterday with Lesley Donaldson, Kent Love connected with your arts council here and we talked about some of these issues. Here's our, just as we had an old frame nationally I think we have kind of an existing frame for art at the community level.

We also need to change this frame and think broadly about the quality of the expressive lives of individuals and communities. And that means moving beyond nonprofit K through 12 frame to gather up an array of indicators that together determine the cultural vibrancy of the city. When I put creative class up there, that stands for all work and economic impact. So I'm talking about community studies that count movie screens—and I'm going to leave this up for a while so you can look at it—but count movie screens, independent book stores, library branches, art galleries. I'm talking about measuring the penetration of high speed internet services, cable television in poor neighborhoods, calculating the number of night clubs that feature live, local music, the number of locally owned radio and television stations. Taking about counting the number of community schools of the arts, and of course attendance at symphony concerts and museum exhibitions.

But when it comes to arts education, here's a controversial idea. Let's not just count nonprofits and public school activities, but also think about private music teachers, for profit music instrument retailers who are giving lessons in their stores as part of this new broad assessment of the music education scene. We've learned from the studies by Wolf Brown, an arts consultant, and others that attendance at activities of traditional fine arts nonprofits—that is the institutions in big gray limestone buildings in the heart of cities—that attendance has steadily been declining over the last decade. Communities however, community arts are on the growth side of the curve because you and your counterparts are at the very center of the explosion of real arts participation. And I'm suggesting here is a new kind of community study or survey carried out within a broad conceptual frame designed to measure every marker of a vibrant community expressive life. A survey that looks at these elements and how weak or strong they are in any particular city. The notion would be to engage citizens and leaders of government in celebrating real arts engagement, finding areas of strength and weakness, and adopting policy to strengthen where things are weak and celebrate where things are strong. So we're talking about a Community Culture Plan. A compilation, an analysis of the results of such a study would enable a logical next step. The creation of a Community Cultural Plan designed to protect arenas of accomplishment, repairing or improving areas of deficiency. Now there are targets of opportunity out there. You know there's a bill coming down the pipe that the President should soon sign that will expand low power FM radio opportunities for nonprofits. There is an opportunity to begin to revitalize localized broadcasting if nonprofits get in line, get these

licenses. Most of them have gone out; I will be honest, to religious organizations. But cultural nonprofits are perfect candidates to own and manage low power FM stations that have a reach of three to five miles. And so you plant one in the middle of a midsize town and it can have real impact. Watch for targets of opportunity.

Now what do we get if we study our communities and culture in our communities in a new way and look at expressive life and find ways to enhance expressive life? Now this is just an assertion, but this is what I think we get. We get an affordable pathway to a high quality of life even in tough economic times. That's really one of the great questions facing our society that doesn't get talked about much. How then shall we live if we're not as rich as we thought we were, when we could borrow too much on a home we couldn't afford and spend the equity on a vacation we probably didn't really need? How then do we live? I think expressive life is one root to that objective. Here's expressive life again. Heritage, connection with the past, community, belonging, voice. Your individual expression, your political speech, your artistry, what separates you from community and distinguishes you as an individual. Things that are not especially expensive, things that are available and satisfying even if we're not quite as rich as we were two, three, four, or five years ago. So I think we have a real opportunity to lead at the national level and at the community level. To use a fresh look at defining art and art engagement to craft a high quality of life in the society that is likely to come. And I think arts leaders at the community level are well positioned to move us to the next level.

Here's a Barack Obama quote, and I think we have in our President a leader who is uniquely connected with culture and artistry through his biography and his connection with multiple cultures around the world. I fear that around him he's surrounded by people who don't care as much or know as much about the power of culture and community. But I think he gets it. So the challenge will be to provide every policy opportunity for this leader in his age to take us where we know arts and community, arts and society need to go. So I'll stop there and ask you for any questions.