

ORAL HISTORY IN THE MID-ATLANTIC REGION

AN INTERVIEW WITH JEFFERY FRIEDMAN

FOR THE

FORREST C. POGUE AWARD RECIPIENTS

INTERVIEW SERIES

INTERVIEW CONDUCTED BY

SHAUN ILLINGWORTH

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY
NEW BRUNSWICK, NEW JERSEY
JULY 8, 2008

TRANSCRIPT BY

SHAUN ILLINGWORTH

Shaun Illingworth: This begins an interview with Dr. Jeffrey Friedman in New Brunswick, New Jersey, with Shaun Illingworth. The date is July 8, 2008. The purpose of this interview is to interview Dr. Friedman as a follow-up to his earning the Forrest C. Pogue Award, conferred upon him by the Oral History in the Mid-Atlantic Region Association. Dr. Friedman, thank you very much for being here.

Jeffery Friedman: My pleasure.

SI: Congratulations again on receiving the Pogue Award.

JF: Thanks, Shaun.

SI: To begin, before you went into oral history more or less full-time, you were a very accomplished dancer. Would you mind telling me briefly about your career in dance before you became involved in oral history?

JF: Sure. When I was attending the School of Architecture at Cornell University, I was taking the opportunity to recover my interest in dance. I had trained in classical ballet early, early on as a child and was, I think, socially ostracized for that, because it appears, at least in the '60s, anyway, we're talking about, and in a particular location like rural Pennsylvania where I grew up, that that was not an activity for boys to do. So I quit that, but always retained an interest in the arts and the performing arts. When I went to college at Cornell, I began taking [dance] classes again, training, and I had sufficient facility, at that time, that I was able to progress quickly. Also, as you probably are aware, there's very few men in dance, relative to women. The proportion is probably eighty to twenty or even greater and so, if there is a male dancer with some facility, they usually get some opportunities, more quickly than women, which is sometimes demoralizing for women in the field. I want to acknowledge that but, in my case, that created opportunities to perform in other people's choreography, to create my own choreography. Eventually, after the third year in architecture school, I was able to take a leave of absence and perform professionally in New York, basically, between New York and Boston. I was performing with several companies in Boston, where I was living, for the Rhode Island State Council for the Arts in Providence, as well as a dance company at Brown University, and then, with a company in New York City. So, I was basically commuting back and forth between New York and Boston.

SI: I remember a story you told where you said it was very hectic.

JF: It was very hectic. You know, I was twenty-one, so, I had the kind of stamina, I suppose, physically and mentally, to fulfill all of those obligations. I can remember, very specifically, there was one week in the winter of 197-, I guess that was '78, where everybody I had performed with in Boston was applying for a particular grant opportunity, where they had to audition live, and so, I had several live auditions. Those were pressured situations where we really wanted to be at our best. I was probably doing three separate auditions in five days. I was also performing in Providence at the same time, had a major season at the theater there. I remember being driven by my Aunt Lael in Boston, who was a wonderful support for me, and she had made dinner and

she was spoon-feeding me while I was driving to Providence. That was a memory that sort of encapsulates that kind of hecticness you mentioned.

SI: You mentioned that there was a gap between your childhood education in dance and your time at Cornell. Did you find that Cornell was a more open place or that you were just in a different place personally, that you did not care what other people thought?

JF: Oh, I think you've identified the two main factors. One is, I think that college environments, especially a large campus like Cornell, which, at that time, it was 15,000, I'm sure it's larger now; well, you know, I never thought about it this way quite, but that's always the wonderful thing about interviews and asking good questions. Cornell is a major research university, world-class university, but it's located in a fairly rural location. So, as a kid who grew up in rural Bucks County, Pennsylvania, not in an urban location, for me to choose Cornell was both an opportunity to expand my horizons significantly by being thrown into a large population of diverse students and great educational opportunities, really, international opportunities, and, at the same time, the location itself was not nearly as intimidating as, say, for example, Columbia, which was deeply embedded in an urban environment, which may have been rather intimidating for a kid coming from a rural location. So, Cornell was both safe in one way and eye-opening in others, and I would guess that, yes, of course, I had changed. I had certainly continued to pursue the performing arts, especially in high school, but mostly in the theater realm. I'll just briefly mention that, theoretically speaking, I think we'll find that print text-based forms are a lot more acceptable in modern Western society than, say, body-based forms. So, dance is scary. Dance is feminizing. People perceive it as a feminine occupation and, of course, in a patriarchy, that looks dangerous, feels dangerous, appears dangerous, and text is not nearly so challenging, I think. So, performing in theater was my way of continuing that interest.

SI: Early on, your career was primarily based on the East Coast, but you eventually made the move to the West Coast. When did that happen and how did that take place?

JF: Yes, that's an interesting story. I spent my year in Boston, between, I guess it would be called an academic year, from August, well, really, July, because I attended Harvard in a summer school program for dance in July, and then, from then on, all the way through July of the next year, so that was '78-'79 in Boston, and in the spring of '79; no, sorry, '77-'78, I apologize, 1977, August, or July, to July '78. In the spring of '78, there was a marvelous opportunity. A major choreographer named Twyla Tharp was performing in Boston and also holding a workshop, for the first time, where she was providing access to outside students.

Now, that's a great opportunity in and of itself for any up-and-coming performer/choreographer, but I also had an especial interest in Tharp's work because my first and most primary and important modern dance teacher at Cornell was a former member of Tharp's company and I was embedded within that very witty, intellectual and visceral style of movement from the beginning of my training at Cornell. So, I was compelled by this opportunity and it turns out that, while there is a lot of interest in going to the workshop from many students from all over the country, very few men had applied. So, the Humanities Council of Massachusetts offered scholarships to men and there was an audition and I applied and three people were accepted, three men were accepted. One chose not to attend, but the other guy, John Carrafa, and I received scholarships

and we attended this workshop, which was held in Andover, in Western Massachusetts. Basically, I saw this as my ticket to becoming a professional performer with Twyla Tharp. It turns out that she was auditioning for someone, for a male, in the company and I certainly felt scrutinized while I was doing that workshop. I had a lot riding on it. I think I was rather too young for that pressure. I will admit that John Carrafa was certainly a skilled dancer, but, also, was, I think, a more mature person and was able to handle that pressure better. I think Twyla made the better choice to select John Carrafa. I think, if I had joined that company, she would've eaten me up and spit me out. [laughter] That's how I perceive it and it's just as well, I would say. But, with some, I think, amazing kind of foresight, I did make a "Plan B."

I decided that, if I did not get the job with Tharp, that I would go back to architecture school and finish my degree. Now, Cornell has a five-year degree program; those were relatively rare, mostly on the East Coast. I walked into an architectural bookstore at Harvard Square one spring day and was very interested to see a set of books called *The Pattern Language* and several others by the same author, Christopher Alexander. Christopher Alexander is a West Coast [architect]. He's actually a mathematician, I believe a Cambridge or Oxford mathematician, but he became very interested in architecture and he developed kind of a regional architectural style in Northern California, which was codified in a book called *The Pattern Language*. I looked at *The Pattern Language* and I saw what it was that I had been missing in my architectural education at Cornell. It was deeply embedded in the context of the, shall I say, Pacific Northwest/Northern California watershed. It had ecological approaches, it was humanistic, all of the things that were missing at what I would call a Beaux Arts school model in Cornell, which was focused on formalism. I said to myself, "Cornell wasn't working for me but, if there was a school that was interested in *The Pattern Language* and Christopher Alexander's work, this was right for me." It turned out, right next to *The Pattern Language* on the shelf was a book called *The Oregon Experiment*, in which the University of Oregon School of Architecture had attached itself to the aesthetic of Christopher Alexander and was developing new buildings on the campus of the University of Oregon using *The Pattern Language* as a model. I thought, "This is great. This is people working with an aesthetic and also implementing it in practical terms and committing themselves." So, I applied to the School of Architecture at the University of Oregon, which was one of the very few five-year programs on the West Coast, and was accepted. So, when Tharp chose the other guy, John (and, to his great credit, he had a wonderful career with her) I drove out, sight unseen, to Eugene, Oregon, across [the] country, and went back to architecture school on the West Coast. So, then, to answer your question, what happened is, I completed my degree in one year, '78-'79, continuing to dance pretty actively at the university.

When it came time to graduate, I knew that I was going to go for a professional career in dancing and I had some debacles. I went to Minnesota to audition for a company that, when I arrived, said I was too short, because I'm only 5'7" and, in ballet, that's relatively short for men. So, that was odd and awkward, that they hadn't gotten that from the resume, but, in any case, I came back to Eugene. I decided that, "I guess I'll go visit San Francisco and I'll figure out what to do once I'm there," and I slept on my friend Nancy's couch, who was a dancer friend from Cornell. She took me to a class at the Oberlin Dance Collective and I loved it and I stuck around.

SI: You were there for quite awhile, about nine years.

JF: I was with the ODC for ten years, actually, yes. The first six months I spent [there], they had just purchased a building, which was very rare for a dance company, for a modern dance company, to own real estate. I spent the first six months renovating that building, with a group of very committed, collective-based artists, in which I built a dance floor and renovated bathrooms and, basically, did architectural things, [laughter] which is pretty ironic. At the end of that six-month period of probation, in January of 1980 they asked me to join the Collective and I spent the '80s with the Collective.

SI: For people who will read this who may be unfamiliar with collective dance groups, can you describe the Collective?

JF: Yes. It was a group of faculty and students from Oberlin College, in Ohio, who had begun an inter-arts program, led by Dr. Brenda Way, who received her Ph.D. in aesthetics but was also a practicing dancer and choreographer. She led this inter-arts program to great success at Oberlin and, eventually, Oberlin College said to the inter-arts collective, "Are you a performing group or are you faculty and students?" They said, "We're a performing group," and they bought a big, yellow school bus and they drove to San Francisco and established themselves, in 1976, in San Francisco. These were the days, in the '70s, of feminist consciousness-raising and the idea of collective management of an arts group was not, I think, so unique. I think there were many collectives. There were work collectives [of all kinds]; I had friends who were in bakery collectives. There are still collectives in the Bay Area, San Francisco Bay Area, that are ongoing. In this case, it was, I think, about a group of twelve people who decided that there would be a collective management, which is to say, business decisions were made by consensus in very long business meetings. For awhile, there were some stabs at doing collective artistic process, which is to say creating choreography as a group, but I think, eventually, what happened is that they agreed that individual artists would create work using other members of the Collective and that they would commit themselves to supporting multiple individual choreographers' work on repertory programs. But what in fact evolved, Shaun, is a deep commitment to the contributions of what would be called dancers or interpreters to the creative process. So, in fact, much of the work, I would say, in the Oberlin Dance Collective, in the years I was participating, was created in a co-authorial style, with one person having, I would say, the ultimate authority to make editorial decisions, but they relied deeply on the contributions, the creative contributions, of the participants in the work.

So, that was my experience through those years. Now, what's interesting, over time is that, as we purchased a building and became the inheritors of a mortgage (which was a significant shift financially for us) there were some decisions made, by consensus, to work towards a more corporate model, but the values of collectivity were always sustained. Even today, thirty-seven years later (since ODC was founded at Oberlin College in 1971), in 2008, there is still a collective artistic directorship of that group. Now, they own more than one building and they're a major force, internationally, as a collective of dancers and artists.

SI: Do you still maintain any affiliation or contact with them?

JF: I'm great friends with everybody and, when I go back to San Francisco twice a year, I'm quite interested in seeing what new developments have happened. In fact, while I've been here at

Rutgers University, I've reconstructed two, well, I would say three, works specifically of Brenda Way's choreography. Her dissertation on aesthetics was both written and performed. There was a group of works called *The Formats* which include several formalist [choreographies] of great wit and humor and deep intellectual investigation. I felt very strongly that the Dance Department here would benefit from having access to seeing those works performed and, also, the students participating in reconstructing them. So, I've reconstructed three of those *Formats* works over the past five years. So, I've received perfect cooperation from Brenda and the rest of the company members to do that work, yes.

SI: This collective approach, where you have to work with all of these different members and get their input, did that lead to your interest in oral history or have an impact on it?

JF: Well, you know, I think not directly, but I think you're bringing up an interesting point. A very deep value that I feel that I developed while in the Collective was, as one of, at first, two men in a feminist collective, that I learned how to listen *deeply* and to take into account what I would consider a multiple dialogic conversation about values. I would see people argue for their positions, but it was always in the context of a shared value and a consensus-building process. So, I would say that, [yes, I did], at that most deep level, in which [I learned] the value of dialogue, and not to put too fine a point on it, the dialogic, that is to say, anything that is emergent. Rather than having a structure imposed from the outside, the Collective was always committed to an emergent process, that is to say we didn't know what the final product was going to be, but we were committed to the process. By committing to the process, we believed that something new, something interesting, something investigative would emerge, of interest. This was true of the business process, certainly, but I would say, even more so, the core was our commitment to artistic investigation at that experimental level where, guess what, a science experiment means you don't know what's going to happen. This is what I say to my kids in choreography class, "We don't know what you're going to make. That's the great challenge and joy of experimental work, to commit yourself to the process, not knowing what it's going to be at the end." That commitment to the emergent, I think, was definitely supported [at the Collective] and my values for it grew as I saw that really great works of art emerged out of that process.

So, I would say, yes, indirectly, that commitment to that value was supported and refined over those times. But I would say that the incident that helped create my interest in oral history emerged out of [a] particular confluence of my personal life having a kind of crisis, in terms of having a major back injury, having to go through physical therapy, having to recover and step out of being a full-time dancer. You know, for a dancer [who is] constantly in their body, working with their body, working with other people's bodies, to step out of that is really an identity crisis of some sort. At the same time as that was happening, the emergence of the AIDS epidemic in San Francisco. So, there was, as any good oral historian will hope, the confluence of an individual set of circumstances and a historic set of circumstances, [which] intersected in a way that I felt strongly that something needed to be done for the dance community in San Francisco. The moment that I think catalyzed that intersection and created something new was that my physical therapist for my back injury went home and died of pneumocystis in Texas, without even knowing he was seropositive. These were the early days, when people weren't testing, because we didn't even have tests for these sorts of things, and that was a great shock and a great loss. Even though we were all shocked, our community got together and produced a

memorial service for him. His name was Joah Lowe, L-O-W-E, and I remember, very vividly, sitting in a studio in the Mission District of San Francisco with a large group of grieving people. In the middle of the stage, well, this was a loft, so, it was just a big wooden floor, there was a video monitor and on the monitor were these very small flickering images of Joah dancing, and I said to myself, "We can do better than that to honor the kinds of lives that dancers commit to, and what would be better?" Certainly, video is a great documentary method. I have nothing against it. With some thought over the last twenty years, I feel that, if one can triangulate as many possible documentary methods as possible, that you're going to get something valuable from each one. But, for me, I felt that interviewing somebody gave them the chance to speak in their own words about how that life developed, just as we're doing here, of course. You know, it's a great honor and opportunity to do that and I felt strongly that giving dancers the chance to speak in their own voices was not common, that dancers are often seen as nonverbal entities. I would say that's certainly not true from my experience, having sat through many, many consensus-building business meetings with very articulate people. I think people are often surprised how articulate dancers can be.

For me, there was also the opportunity to look to the New York Public Library Dance Division, which had an oral history program there already. I was very lucky that Leslie Farlow, at that time the director of the oral history program, was interested and compelled, as I was, with the questions of the AIDS epidemic and its effect on the dance community. So, together I think, on the East Coast and West Coast, we decided to, for her, add another mission commitment for their program, which is to not only look at, say, elders in the community [who] are, of course, very important, but also people in early and mid-career who are dying and disappearing, and I was basically focused on people with AIDS. So, over a year's time, from, say, 1987 to 1988, that perspective was developed with Leslie's help, and, also, some training with staff from the Regional Oral History Project [Office] at Berkeley.

SI: Were you interviewing at that time?

JF: I was taking a nine-week course from Elaine Dorfman, a staff member from ROHO who taught at Vista Community College, which is [in] Berkeley, [part of] the Alameda County Community College System. At Vista, she taught a nine-week course on oral history methods in which you did an interview as a completed project for the end of the course. I took the course twice, because I felt it was important enough for me to do that, and I did my first interview as part of that course, yes.

SI: When you first began the LEGACY Project, did you find that people were hesitant to talk about it?

JF: Yes, I think you're right about that. I think there was a stigma attached to being HIV-positive or having AIDS. You know, there were two diagnoses, one with ARC, which is AIDS-Related Conditions [Complex], and AIDS, which is Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome, ARC being the precursor to AIDS, and being seropositive being the precursor to ARC. Any of those carried stigma with them. I'll say that, probably, New York and San Francisco, to use this term (and I don't like using military terms often) but it was, people look at it as "ground zero," because people felt like they were in a war, [laughter] maybe, in some ways, at war with social

stigma and, also a very unresponsive Federal Government, led by President Ronald Reagan, who, of course, never said the word, "AIDS," during his entire administration, that there was stigma, there was shame.

I can remember distinctly that, when I would contact certain individuals, they would react quite angrily that I even knew that they were challenging these situations medically. I'll mitigate that by saying, in general, I was contacting people that I knew pretty well, because it's a small community, in one case, somebody with whom I was dancing at the Collective. So, after his initial response, which was something like, "How did you know and why are you calling me?" for me to be able to respond by saying, "I care about you. I want to offer you this opportunity to speak in your own words about your experience," you know, those were often the only words that people needed to hear. I wasn't there to expose them, I was there to give them a chance to be listened to and talk about their lives in dance. So, if there were negative responses, in most cases, I believe that they were easily overcome by framing what I was doing as something that could benefit them. I think people perceived [that] quite quickly, without maybe knowing much about oral history; just the chance to be listened to and to speak in their own words about their lives, I think, is a great opportunity that people recognize. I will mention, though, that there were people, that I regret now, who literally dropped out and died without anybody knowing, and then, we would only find out later. So, these were years (maybe people now, in 2008, don't remember so well) but I think these were years of great conflict, individually and societally, around the issues around medicine, the questions of homosexuality and legitimacy in terms of access to care, whether or not gay men were worth saving, I'll just put it bluntly. I think that, in a small way, LEGACY Oral History Project was able to at least make our case that lives were worth saving, at least documenting. I mean, we couldn't save them medically, but we could at least create an archive of their own words, yes.

SI: Can you briefly tell me how the LEGACY Oral History Program became involved with the San Francisco Performing Arts Library & Museum?

JF: Yes. Well, I think that, out of just this earlier set of statements, about society and shame and stigma, there was also, I think, a counterbalance, especially within the performing arts communities, of people desperately wanting to do something, to honor people, to acknowledge them, to help them in whatever ways they could. When I would approach different individuals within the San Francisco Bay Area performing arts communities, I think people were eager to recognize the value of what we were doing and to try to help us. I think one of those people was Margaret Norton, who was the current executive director of the San Francisco Performing Arts Library & Museum, which was dedicated to archiving the records of the performing arts communities of the Bay Area. Now, Margaret herself, I think, was very sympathetic. I think she herself probably knew several people who were coping with AIDS and was one of many people who were interested in being sympathetic. I think, at the same time, she was very aware that the SFPALM, the acronym at the time, was an organization that needed to stay fiscally responsible and her perspective was, first of all, the archives of LEGACY should be held at the Performing Arts Library. There was no doubt, in either of our minds, that whatever materials we produced belonged at PALM, where they would be, first of all, cataloged and made accessible, a great boon because I'm not a cataloger or a librarian, and they were going to provide those services. They were also going to provide the crucial gate-keeping services of an archive, which is to say,

protecting the rights of anybody who contributes materials and making sure that copyright law and fair use and all of those things are handled well. So, I saw that there were institutional benefits to having SFPALM hold the archives and that was immediately agreed upon.

Then, we developed a subsequent set of contracts about fiscal agency. From my perspective, the last thing I wanted to do was create a stand-alone business, a nonprofit business, which, as probably you know, has a great deal of paperwork, quarterly tax statements, these kinds of things. I was still having a full-time career as a performer and, also, as a self-producing choreographer. I wasn't interested in creating a new business. So, fiscal agency provided me with access to SFPALM's 501(c)(3) nonprofit status, through which I was able to raise funds that could be then tax-deductible (which, of course, is the great lever that the Federal Government provides us with as nonprofits to raise support). So, I developed an initial 501(c)(3) fiscal agency relationship with SFPALM, which meant that every proposal that I sent out into the world requesting support needed to go through the development office at SFPALM, essentially, a series of individual fundraisers, and then, they also provided some bookkeeping services, which was terrific for me. So, there was some really great nonprofit services provided and this archival location and those were great boons at the beginning. I would say, looking back on it, it may have also provided a certain element of legitimacy for me, that, perhaps (I don't know, because I don't ever remember someone saying this) maybe some people, some narrators for oral histories, agreed because they knew their work would be held at PALM, which is great. So, maybe that was a benefit in those ways, too, yes.

SI: What do you remember about those early interviews, when you were just getting started? For any oral history project to get started, there is some heavy lifting, and you were relatively new to the genre. What do you remember about that?

JF: Well, you're so right, Shaun, really, "heavy lifting," what a word. [laughter] It has great sort of physical heft to it and, of course, for a dancer, that's always a great metaphor. Well, my first response is that I did a lot of interviews and I felt like I was carrying the lives of these individuals forward for them. It was an emotional, and I don't want to say burden because I don't think it was, but it was an emotional . . . it was some heavy lifting, to use your words, thanks for that. So, you know, I carried a lot of pain with me [from] those interviews.

I can remember walking into not a very nice apartment, because, you know, people who are on disability don't afford good apartments in San Francisco, and sitting down with someone for a half an hour, before we even started the interviewing, listening to their deeply painful medical concerns and, you know, weeping with them about it, and then, saying, "Let's start the interview." [laughter] Now, based on that context, you can imagine the kind of interviews that emerged, but I felt that I could not walk in and just switch on this [recorder], click the switch, you know. It just didn't make sense to me and, you know, these people often were isolated and maybe I was one of the few people that was listening deeply to them and gaining their trust. As you probably know yourself, when you do a series of interviews with someone, the relationship doesn't stop when you finish recording. There's a human relationship that continues, and [it's important] to sustain those, and then, a couple years later, doing a lot of bedside sitting next to dying people, for me, was the result, and that's some heavy lifting, I guess.

You know, I did an interview with a man who was one of my most wonderful teachers, Aaron Osborne, who was an incredibly visceral performer with the Lar Lubovitch Company in New York, but was also a marvelous teacher, greatly beloved by the community of dancers who studied with him, including me. I interviewed Aaron when he had been paralyzed from the waist down, due to an AIDS-related infection, and here was a man who could not any more locomote himself, but whose identity as a dancer was intact. I can remember, specifically, watching Aaron in bed, sitting up from the waist, you know, from the waist up demonstrating the subtleties of Limón breath techniques, saying, "You arc over your sternum," and he would perform that for me in bed, paralyzed from the waist down. You know, those are the kinds of things that stay with me, because they were deep emotional experiences. Then, of course, Aaron taught himself how to walk again, and then, he lost the sight in one of his eyes, and so, it was just seeing people struggle and succeed, and then have setbacks and you sort of lived that experience with them and their families and their caregivers as you commit yourself to that human relationship.

One, I think, really good example of this is that, in 1989, a choreographer named Anna Halprin created a, well, she had already been doing large-scale performances, which [included] dozens, if not hundreds of people performing improvisational performance scores that she created, and I won't go into the deep background on that. In 1989, she decided to specifically focus that practice on people with life-threatening illnesses. She invited 125 people with life-threatening illness to perform in a work that she created over a week's time. Well, very smart Anna said, "I need at least four or five [professional] dancers who are able to hold the structure of that improvisation, to help people remember," and so, she invited myself and, I think, three or four other folks to perform in that work. So, I participated in, I guess it was eight days, all day, choreography workshop/emotional therapy session [laughter] /life changing, transformative experience, and then, we performed for a thousand people about that experience that emerged out of dealing with life-threatening illness. You know, I committed my body and my soul to that performance, and then, two years later, we were asked to do it again. I brought my friend, Penny Peak, who was trained in one of my workshops, and we actually interviewed four people in that process, before the event and then after the event, to trace their experience. So, those oral histories come out of a deeply committed experience of working with over a hundred people. I mean, if I'm talking about the human relationship of an oral history interview, we each did two interviews, but we experienced 125 people's life experiences while doing that. So, I guess the scale just is multiple in that situation, but we were committed to it, because it was a rare opportunity to work directly with people and to participate, and tell our own stories, in fact. One of the things we did, Penny and I, was, for the interview history where we record the process of doing the interview, we interviewed each other about the process of doing this experience, because we felt that that was compelling enough for people to understand the context of it.

SI: Had you been involved with any other works that integrated oral history with choreography and dance prior to this point?

JF: Well, let's see, that was 1989 and 1991, the second one, when we did the interviews. So, maybe, as a result or as a consequence of doing this process, I decided to choreograph a work titled *Muscle Memory*. *Muscle Memory* was created, let me think, 1993 maybe, was the year of process, and I think it was produced in 1994, first. Yes, so, I had always felt . . . eventually, it was inevitable that, as a choreographer and performer, that, somehow, I would bring that to bear

on LEGACY's collection. By 1993, we had a collection, you know. Since 1988, we had done, I don't know how many interviews. There's about eighty now, but maybe there were twenty by then, and I didn't know how to do [make a performance from the oral histories]. I didn't have any models at that point, but I decided that I would work with some interviews from the collection and create some oral history-based performances out of that, yes. Because, you know, everything that we've talked about up to now, all that heavy lifting, it had to go somewhere. I think maybe where it went for me was into the creative process, that I needed to process that reality for myself, the holding all those lives, and channel it in some way, and so, *Muscle Memory*, perhaps, was the choice that I made to achieve that.

I worked with two separate interviews, one interview that I did with Frank Everett, whom, I mentioned earlier, was the dancer that I knew so well, who said, "Why are you calling me and how do you know?" but Frank, in fact, loved doing this oral history. Frank was a big drama queen anyway, [laughter] so, for him, the chance to be front and center was exciting and he gave a great interview. He understood what he was doing when he did the interview. It wasn't just about an ego trip for him. He understood, but he did it with great verve, I must say. Then, there was an interview created by my friend, Mercy Sidbury, who's a performer, was a performer also in the modern dance world in San Francisco, who interviewed a wonderful mentor of hers named Eve Gentry. Eve Gentry was eighty-four, I think, at the time of her interviews and Frank was twenty-eight.

I guess what I would say, in general, Shaun, is that because I've been either the interviewer or the editor or the supervising editor for almost every oral history in the collection, I know the collection well and, in some ways, the collection in my head starts to develop certain kinds of conversations among themselves. I know that, for example, out of the collection, the name Anna Halprin whom I talked about earlier, shows up in every decade of her life through different people's perspectives in the interview. I mean, it's a wonderful, emergent, I'd say critical observation that the collection provides us [with that form of self-analysis], that it seems that the community in the Bay Area values her work so highly that she shows up in lots of people's lives. One example of "conversations" among narrators in the collection was Frank Everett and Eve Gentry. Though very different in gender and in age and in location, in many ways, in life experience, [Frank and Eve] shared several crucial turning points in their lives as artists that, to me, seemed like a very interesting opportunity, that such different narrators would actually have shared experiences, though they'd never met.

I thought, "Okay, this is a dramatic opportunity. This is interesting. How can I provide insight to that, through choreography?" So, I developed a series of strategies that had to do with creating fictional dialogues between the narrators, whom never met, doing that both through text and choreography. Or creating what I would call "intrapersonal dialogues," that is to say, several aspects of one person's interview being linked together, edited together, so that they spoke to themselves at different times in their life. [These] different kinds of strategies enabled me to show both the personal conflicts and developments of each individual, and then, also, the shared experiences of both individuals. Then, I also framed it with my own experience as a listener; what was it like for me to listen. So, for example, the very first thing that you hear in *Muscle Memory* is me saying, "Listen. What is it like to listen, deep inside my body?" and so, [I introduced] the idea that listening actually goes into the body in some ways and that, in a way,

Muscle Memory is what then emerged out of that. So, I framed the work at the beginning and at the end, but, in the middle, I trace these lives through those various strategies.

SI: Were you at UC-Riverside then, or did that come later?

JF: Riverside was later. This was 1993-'94. I was, by that time, no longer working for the Collective, because that was 1980 through 1989. I was now performing my own work and commissioning works from other folks. I was touring a solo performance, a concert of my own, titled LOCUS Solo Dance, L-O-C-U-S, a locus being the intersection of several sets in mathematical terms, that I was the intersection of all those sets. My solo body was doing my work and the works of several other choreographers, and included on that program was *Muscle Memory*.

So, what's so interesting, actually, Shaun, is that I found that, as I booked myself around the country, that *Muscle Memory* was the engine that was driving my touring. There were sociologists and anthropologists and theater department professors, all of whom were interested in that particular work, because they could see it relating both curricularly to, say, experiences in fieldwork [or] qualitative interviewing methods, and then, relating that, in very visceral terms, to performance. So, there was quite a marvelous strategy emerging for me, where I would be able to elicit a small amount of funds from several different departments, do some sort of lecture or lecture demonstration for each community, but, then, when it came time for me to do my performance, I could sell that performance to a large number of people, all of whom came from a different perspective into the work. That was a marketable concept for a solo artist traveling around the country. So, I could go to Dickinson College, Susan Rose was there, and she could bring me in to speak about sociology, but, yes, I could also work with the dance department and the theater department as well. I could go to the University of Idaho and teach a workshop for the Latah County Historical Society, and then, also, teach parts of *Muscle Memory* to students in the dance department, and I could sell five hundred seats in a theater because different populations were interested, for different reasons, in coming to see the work. So, gradually, I saw *Muscle Memory* rising to the top, as kind of the driving force of my touring career. That [touring] was over the next, say, well, from 1991 to 1997, so, *Muscle Memory* emerged in '94, that really took off for those last three or four years of my touring career.

During that time, then, I started being asked to speak at various conferences, like Dance/USA, which is the service organization for the dance community nationally. Many people [were] saying, "What can we do to support people with AIDS in the dance community?" and I was doing something. So, they would invite me and I would go and I would say, "First, I'm not a historian, but this is what I do." I did that enough times and I started to ask myself, "Why couldn't I be a historian? Maybe that was interesting. Maybe I was already doing something historical. Maybe I could explore that further," and that was when the opportunity to do graduate school seemed to make sense. That was 1997, that I was able to identify the right program at UC-Riverside, which is the first dance history and theory program developed in the world for Ph.D. work.

SI: Were you the first recipient of that Ph.D.?

JF: No, no, no. They had started, like, I'm thinking, 1992. So, I think I was, like, maybe the fifth or sixth class, but, remember, the first class was one guy. [laughter] He was, bless his heart, committing himself to an emerging program, and then, maybe [over] the next couple years, there were two or three or four, and, you know, it wasn't that many folks when I arrived in 1997. I mean, it was a going concern, it was an established department, but, yes, we came in as a group of eight [in 1997] and we graduated probably four of those eight, eventually. So, yes, it was a small and emergent academic discipline, and I'll say, even now, in 2008, still emergent, but this was an opportunity for me to commit myself intellectually to exploring oral history theory, oral history method, and use the practice of oral history that I had already experienced and to further that practice in a degree-granting situation. So, I committed myself to that. That would be six years.

SI: What was the focus of your doctoral work there?

JF: Well, you know, I walked in with one idea, something to do with oral history and LEGACY, of course, that made sense, but, as one of my professors, Linda Tomko, said, and I think very smartly, "If you walk in with one idea and it doesn't change, you really haven't done graduate school." All the coursework that you do, in the first two or three years, should be transformative for you. I mean, you're committing yourself to reading and discussing and analyzing great works of writing, of theory and of method, coming from all different perspectives, from semiotics to cultural anthropology to history to political theory, and, you know, that should change your first idea.

Eventually, I think, to some degree, it did change, for me. It transformed into a focus on, "What is the role of nonverbal communication in the interview process?" This was something that most people were not looking at in oral history, as far as I know. What I discovered is that there's a great deal of literature on nonverbal communication, especially from the '70s, where it was very popular actually, but most people were doing what I would call microanalysis, you know, looking at very short bits of film in microtime [units], the shifts in what people were doing, and I was interested in looking at it at the macro-level of narrative. So, that was my challenge, was expanding an existing literature in nonverbal communication to look at the macro-level of narrative structure, particularly in an interview situation, which is a dialogue, not looking at the subject as a singular object. So, that was the challenge, and, also, bringing to it a much deeper set of skills and perspectives from dance studies, looking at movement. I mean, just looking at the words "nonverbal communication," already what you've done is you've set up a negatory relationship, because the presumption is that verbal communication is the major set of data and that nonverbal is the negatory, everything else that wasn't verbal. So, the primacy of verbal communication, to me, was something that was, again, as we mentioned earlier, kind of a focus on print text culture and how our consciousness has been formed by print text. The case I was trying to make is that, before that, all the work of [Maurice] Merleau-Ponty and the phenomenologists suggests that we are pre-verbally sensorimotor beings that build a world through perception. In many cases, especially, I think, Merleau-Ponty, what you see is a focus on visual perception, which is problematic, because it's a very powerful mode of perception, but it's not the only [sense], of course. My focus was bringing dance studies to bear on these ideas and bringing in the kinesthetic mode of perception as just as powerful, and perhaps even foundational, that our bodies' experiences of the world actually prefigure almost all of our

subsequent ways in which we interpret the world. I received my certification in Laban Movement Analysis during my doctoral education so that I would have the tools to deeply observe and analyze movement, and notate it, actually, so that I was able to, in print mode, notate my observations of complex movement. Those were perspectives that hadn't been brought to nonverbal communication studies, the idea of the macroanalysis and the idea of deeply focusing on the kinesthetic mode of observation and analysis [from a dance studies perspective]. So, that's the theoretical focus, or, shall I say, the descriptive focus of my work.

I would say that what emerged out of that shift was, you know, some bigger ideas about philosophy, based on my readings of [Martin] Heidegger, many of whom in the philosophy field feel very strongly that his philosophy is ontological and not phenomenological, in the sense that it's disembodied. I feel quite differently, and I think my dissertation [also] then tries to extend the work of Paul Ricoeur, who's a narrative theorist, who links Heidegger to narrative, to acknowledge embodiment as an important foundation for his theories about narrative. So, those things emerged. So, you know, the good news is that transformation does happen in graduate school and that I was able to move, in several different directions, towards some new ideas. The case studies that I did were interviews with Twyla Tharp dancers, whom I'd met at that workshop in Andover, Massachusetts in 1978. So, I came full circle around, back to Twyla Tharp, bless her heart, and went to the archives at Ohio State and contacted [several] of the people that I'd met from that time and was able to interview them in a studio, where I encouraged them to move as much as possible during the interview and even dance. Of course, one interview turned into a choreography of six hours in length, [laughter] in which we ended up dancing together. You know, those were experiments based on what I felt was possible for dancers' interviews, to highlight the kinesthetic mode of understanding and of representation. Those interviews were deeply analyzed for the kinesthetic aspects of the interview and some conclusions were reached, or maybe some observations were reached. Now, I don't know how conclusionary they are.

I will say that, in one interview, my last interview, I was in Manhattan during 9/11. I had done one interview and I was scheduled for another. So, you know, speaking of the personal and the historical, that was one place in which the intersection of the deeply historical came into contact directly with my personal life, in that, you know, we had to slog our way to Brooklyn, through, I guess I'd call it a blockade. It was a blockade, because President [George W.] Bush was coming to Manhattan [on that Friday, September 14th] on some form of transportation yet to be identified. So, there were multiple ways in which the Island of Manhattan was blockaded, by land, [by sea], and by air, and in order for me to get from Manhattan to Brooklyn, where my last interview with my last narrator [was], along with my videographer, who was downtown, even closer [to Ground Zero], was a compelling [journey]. I was deeply compelled to finish my interview, [laughter] in spite of all of that, and we did. I ended up staying, living with the narrator and her husband for three days, because I couldn't get out, because of the [suspended] airlines. In fact, the day that I did leave from LaGuardia, I had written my will and they were the two signatories on my will. (In fact, her husband was also a narrator. They were a married couple that had danced together in Tharp's company, Tom Rawe and Jennifer Way.) You know, talk about the human relationship that's established in an interview, this was a deeply human relationship, where Jenny said to me, "You can't go home. Bring all your stuff with you and come stay with us until you can get out," and, you know, the day that I knew I could fly, I didn't know what would happen.

You know, of course, I think we all were unresolved [laughter] about what it meant to fly after 9/11, but, yes, so, I wrote my will and they signed it.

SI: You said that was your last interview.

JF: My last interview for my dissertation research, yes, that's right. I did eight interviews. That was the last one, yes. Yes, so, that was accepted by my committee in 2003 and I graduated in August 2003.

SI: Then, you came to Mason Gross [School of the Arts, Rutgers University].

JF: Yes. I made the decision that, at age forty-seven, I didn't have a year to wait, so, while I was finishing my dissertation and, making the deeply conflicted assumption that I would pass my oral defense, (you don't know, you're not wanting to presume that), that I would also apply for a job. [laughter] So, that was challenging. You know, applying for college professor positions is a full-time job in itself and I was also finishing the dissertation at the same time. Yes, I applied to the job at Rutgers and went out here to New Brunswick for an interview in the spring of 2003 and was offered the job in May. Yes, so, I knew that I had a job waiting for me in September when I finished late in June and graduated.

SI: Have you found Rutgers to be an accepting place for your research, your blend of oral history and performance, particularly your theoretical approach?

JF: That's a good question, Shaun. There's a lot of answers to that. The first thing that I'll say is that when I looked on the website and saw that there was an oral history center, [the Rutgers Oral History Archives], that made me very happy. So, because I happen to sit in it right now with you, I'll acknowledge that first off. The University is, I think, struggling to hold open a fairly large container that acknowledges, I think, the traditional approaches to scholarship which are certainly rewarding in many ways, and, also, be open to new modes of research, and I think that's a challenge that the University struggles with and that I personally struggle with. So, we're struggling together, you know, the large institution and myself, as an individual. I think both of us, if I can speak for the institution at all, are on the right path in that way.

I would say that the implementation of that path is challenging, because of the existing structures that any large institution has. That has to do with, for example, in the School of the Arts, we teach very high course loads and perhaps that makes it more difficult for me to commit as much as I can to research. The reason why we have high course loads is because we are a conservatory model training program in the arts within a liberal arts university, which has, in itself, its own set of conflicts, in that our students graduate with a huge number of credits under their belts and terrific training, but that's a very intense undergraduate education that they do. We, as a faculty, in the dance program and in all of the arts departments, are challenged as University faculty to guide them and sustain them through that. Not to say that other departments don't do the same, but I think there are the special problems of teaching arts within the University, where the students not only do their homework, but they also commit themselves to, say, multiple annual productions of art, in which, guess what, the art process is emergent and isn't predictable and doesn't often lend itself to course structures or seminar structures or just a limited number of

hours, period. So, there are challenges, structural challenges, to this goal, but I would say, looking back on the last five years, I've had the opportunity to find structures that also are supportive, you know.

Douglass Honors College allowed me to teach a new course in oral history and performance, where I combined the practice of oral history and the practice of performance with theoretical texts and analysis. We created a marvelous, full-length performance work based on the conflict around merging Douglass College into the new School of Arts & Sciences. These were primarily first-year students who went out into the field and did about seventy-five interviews, with everybody from the janitor to Dean Carman Ambar, and created, with my guidance, a set of choreography and text and video events that coalesced into a full-length, hour-long performance. So, that would be an example where [I had] the opportunity to work across disciplinary lines and across discursive boundaries, that was, I think, quite successful. I'm slated to teach another Honors College course for SAS in the fall, similarly focused. I've had the chance to work with the new Byrne Family Seminars for first-year student research, in which I co-taught a course with Matt Matsuda from the History Department called "Performing Histories." We worked with archival materials to generate performances, where people used multiple intelligences, the kinesthetic, the audi[tory], the intrapersonal, the interpersonal, as well as the verbal, logical, analytic, to generate performances that allowed them to dig deeper into who these people were and why they were important. [We used] University Archives-based documents, all of whom were individuals or organizations that were part of Rutgers history. So, these students learned about their own institution, using the performance mode, but moving through some theoretical concepts, in their first year, and I thought that was quite successful. So, there have been these kinds of opportunities for me to create new, or to work with new structures that have supported my interests.

I would say that the Department of Dance supports me as a doctoral scholar, their first and only such faculty member. I think they're unconditionally supportive of my work and I think that the challenge there is to make it relevant to their lives as creative artists, and that has been my challenge. No one else is going to do that for me, and so I have to strategize around that. You know, for me to be able to go to New Zealand and teach for the summer and into the fall semester another course on oral history and performance shows that the faculty is committed to supporting me. They enabled me to be late for three weeks into the first semester, and that's tough, you know. The beginning of the semester, as new students come in, is a really crucial time and they gave me that time to be able to finish that work in New Zealand and come back late. So, that would be an example where, I think, they get it, that there are certain conditions needed, and they support me in that way, yes. I would hope that, as I mentioned to you as I walked in, I'm going up for tenure in the fall, that I have more opportunities in the future to continue those trajectories. You know, I have a lot of ideas about how that can happen, but it's a matter of putting myself up for evaluation at the tenure level, to see if this university would like to support that. I hope so.

SI: Good luck.

JF: Thank you. [laughter]

SI: You have stayed involved with the LEGACY Project throughout the years.

JF: Oh, yes, that's a good question, Shaun, yes. I have a workshop that I teach, this is the fourteenth year, every summer. That started off, let's see, that would be 1994 or '5, when I started it in San Francisco, because I wanted to train volunteer interviewers, because I just couldn't do all the interviews myself. Certainly, I had some wonderful volunteers helping me before that, but I started training teams of interviewers with the workshop. The workshop has evolved to being of interest to academics from all over North America. We've had people from Canada and Mexico and all over the United States come. [This past June] we had someone who's doing transgender activist work in Philadelphia and someone from the local historical society in Lake Tahoe and someone who does interviews with Ayurvedic medicine in India. So, the method is, as you well know, transferable across many disciplines, and my particular focus is to teach the method in a way that is accessible to everyone, but, also, be able to ground it in my perspective of the embodied nature of the interviews, trying to make the case that embodied practices deserve to be recuperated in the historical record. So, for example, someone doing interviews about Ayurvedic medicine will want to know, "How is the practice of Ayurvedic medicine deeply immersed in embodied knowledge?" So, that's the sort of thing that I'm interested in having people elicit, and I can help them from my theoretical and practical perspective.

So, that workshop has been ongoing and I return every summer to do that, and, also, work on some projects and help my part-time manager move forward with existing projects. Then, I also go back in the winter to sort of pull up the bootstraps with her as well. So, I go back to San Francisco about twice a year to do that work. We just recently implemented a huge oral history project for the San Francisco Ballet, where they celebrated their seventy-fifth anniversary and had an alumnae weekend, in which people came back from decades before to celebrate the Ballet. LEGACY managed to create both a video and an audio oral history station, in which multiple interviews, I think over a hundred interviews, were recorded over a two-day period. So, that was a major project that we implemented this past April, I think, yes.

So, LEGACY is ongoing. It is now affiliated with the same institution which changed its name last year to the Museum of Performance & Design. The library function is still there; LEGACY still continues to function within the library collection department. I think what's interesting about LEGACY is that, within a museum, it is a proactive collecting function. Whereas a museum might acquire, it has an acquisition function where it acquires materials, objects, records of every sort, but LEGACY, in fact, proactively initiates collection from the inside out. I think that's not so common. I think it's rare, but I think it's really important that museums see themselves as being present-day institutions that are engaged with the living communities surrounding them and that oral history really has a role in seeking to articulate that kind of relationship with living communities, yes. So, the museum, even though the name has changed, still is committed to retaining that function, through LEGACY, in the library program, yes.

SI: Do you find that the project is as much creating a community as it is documenting the community?

JF: That's a good question; does it work both ways, in that sense? Well, what I would say is that ...

SI: Or, perhaps, creating a larger community.

JF: I would say that LEGACY has had the ability to, I'm using political rhetoric here, transform the hearts and minds [laughter] of at least the Bay Area anyway. I'm speaking very generally here, but there is a segment of the population that understands what we do, values it, proactively seeks it out in terms of research. For example, there have been at least two other choreographies that have been created using LEGACY's materials. That creative engagement is proactive, on their part. People use it for research. I know that, because we have records on that. People from all over the world use it for research, but I would say that there is a community of people who realize how important it is to document an ephemeral art form that lives in time. Every performance lives in time, but because music and theater have musical notation and print text (dance has its own notation, but it's not very accessible to general populations) in a way, [we must do] whatever we can do to reduce the disintegrating effects of that temporal quality, that something is retained, that people value it.

I think what might be true, Shaun, is that, what? it's been twenty years since LEGACY started. So, in a way, that used to be, I don't think it is anymore, but it used to be [that] a traditional generation is the next twenty years. You know, that was when people got married and had kids at twenty. [laughter] Maybe it's a little longer now, but I would say that those people who were aware of LEGACY at its onset are now a generation and that there's a new generation, and that those people who have committed themselves to knowing what LEGACY is and valuing it see now that there's a new generation that needs to have their culture transmitted to them, the prior generation to the current. So, the value of LEGACY, I think, is seen within their own mature perspective on what it is that they would like for themselves. I guess what I'm saying is that oral history provides that unique access to generation transmission. I think Paul Ricoeur says this in one of his books, that an oral history gives the present generation access to not only the narrator's experience, but his or her memory of however long they can remember into the past generation, so that the narrator is a link to multiple generations prior and that that is a unique historical situation. I guess what I'm saying is that LEGACY has achieved at least one generation passing and that that perspective may be enabled now in a way that maybe it hadn't been before. So, in a way, there's a community that starts to understand that generational transmission, especially under the effects of losing people unexpectedly and early in their careers. That generational perspective is foreshortened in a way and made more urgent under those circumstances. So, perhaps, we can even say there's maybe more than one generation, because of that foreshortening effect. So, I think there is a community out there that, maybe, in their own way, has become aware of the benefits of documentation, the benefits of archiving, the benefits of passing or transmitting from one generation to the next, or, as they say in the Judaic tradition, "*l'dor v'dor*," "from generation to generation," yes.

SI: Is there anything else that you would like to say? I think we covered a lot of ground. I am very thankful that you explained a little bit about your career, particularly your theoretical work and your work here at Rutgers.

JF: I hope so, I hope so. I guess what I would just like to say is that it's very important for me that research be understood, at least from my perspective, [from] both a traditional perspective, that we're going to work with theoretical texts and we're going to analyze cases and we're going to make arguments, [and] at the same time, I would like to say that, in addition to theoretical texts, there are also performative experiences; I don't like to use the word text, because it's a different mode of experience. It's a sensorimotor, kinesthetic, audio, visual kind of experience, but those experiences have different value and contribute their own kinds of theoretical possibilities. Those modes, both the print text research mode and the performative research mode, have equal value to me and that, for me, what's the most interesting is to see how they can cross-reference one another and create integrated research products, which can have print text aspects to them, but, also, have performative aspects. So, what I'm saying is, the inquiry can be both performative and text-oriented, but that the product can also be print text and performative, and that, depending on how the work emerges, you know, there can be concentrations or a focus on one or the other. That's my struggle, is to carve a niche in the University where that is possible and it's acknowledged as valuable and can be supported, yes.

SI: To conclude the interview, you received the Forrest C. Pogue Award at the most recent OHMAR conference, held at Columbia University in March of 2008, in which the topic was oral history and performance. The conference brought together a variety of people, such as those from more performance-based backgrounds and those from more traditional, academic, text-based backgrounds. Just as an observer, how do you think it went? What do you think of this collision, which you have dealt with for much of your career?

JF: Well, yes, you're asking the right question, Shaun, because that conference was programmed with myself and several other folks who really wanted that collision to happen, though we couldn't predict exactly what the results were [going to be], because that's the glories of conferences, is that they are unpredictable. What I felt is that niche was carved a little wider and a little deeper as a result of the conference. I think that there are those rare few who actually live in both worlds, someone like Della Pollock, who brings a deep, theoretical, text-based world together with the performative, because she's certainly worked with people generating performances, similarly to myself. I mean, I'll admit it, that Della is a mentor for me in that way, that there are those few like Della, who already bring those integrated realities. But, then, I think people in the performative mode, professional cultural workers, and people who are truly text-based theoreticians were able to see both Della and, in my case, I hope, with the Pogue Award speech that I tried to also present that [integration], and other folks like us, and that they could see that integration modeled for them. This was a great opportunity to bring a critical mass of people who were doing that integrative kind of work into the kind of limelight, to highlight them, and then, also, to bring those other people who live in one of the other worlds but have an interest in the other world, a chance to talk across their disciplines a little bit, to see work that's stimulating. You know, Rich Bencivenga, as you well know, created this wonderful work [the play *Flight of the Iron Butterfly*] based on materials from World War II. To see a young, recently-graduated [from Rutgers] person out in the world, really committing himself to this mode, I think, was very inspiring for me, I'll say, because I've worked with Rich, and certainly [it impacted] much more experienced performers, playwrights, and so on, to have the chance to see where the possibilities are for themselves.

You know, Amy Starecheski and I have created a website proceedings that will give people a chance to review some of those works, both text works and, also performative works, at a URL to be defined, yet. If you're interested, it would be linked through the Columbia Oral History Research Office there. It should be available later this summer, in 2008. So, that's kind of a trace form of the actual conference, where we tried to give people ongoing access to that niche that was carved. So, I think that, as I said, the niche was a little wider and a little deeper and I know, because people e-mail me all the time, there's continued interest in interaction. I hope that we can continue to sculpt that niche even more, yes.

SI: Thank you very much for your time. Congratulations again on your well deserved award.

JF: Thank you, Shaun. This was a pleasure.

-----END OF INTERVIEW-----

Reviewed by Shaun Illingworth 4/10/08

Reviewed by Jeffery Friedman 4/10/08