Ann Reynolds Interviewed by Barbara Clausen, May 27, 2020

http://artistarchives.hosting.nyu.edu/JJKB/ann-reynolds-interview-may-2020/

Barbara Clausen: Hello, this is Barbara Clausen. I'm here for Joan Jonas Knowledge Base and we're interviewing Ann Reynolds today. She's a professor of Art History and Women's and Gender studies at the University of Texas at Austin. It's May 27th, 2020.

Barbara Clausen: I want to thank you for taking the time to speak with us at the Joan Jonas Knowledge Base. And why don't we just start out with a question, how did you first encounter Joan's work?

Ann Reynolds: Well, of course I was aware of her work since graduate school. And then when I started teaching I taught some of her work, but never in an intensive way. It was really when I saw the very first live performance of her work, which was *The Shape, the Scent, the Feel Of Things* at Dia:Beacon in fall of 2006. I would have to say, it kind of changed my life. And it made me understand her work much more fully, which is something that I think we're going to talk about today...

Barbara Clausen: Yes.

Ann Reynolds: ...this whole issue of coming in contact with her work through black and white photographs and some video. That was when I also met her, because Lynne Cooke made it a mission to introduce us to each other. And as soon as I saw that performance, I immediately got the notion that this piece should be performed in the Southwest, because it is, ostensibly, in part about the Southwest. So I just said to her, without any evidence that it would happen, "I'm going to make this happen."

Ann Reynolds: So we went from being mere acquaintances to kind of seeing a lot of each other, because that led to my dean giving me a lot of money for reasons I still don't quite understand. And then she [Jonas] came to Austin and we team taught a class on her work together, and she gave a series of lectures and did a workshop with the grad studio students. It took five years for it to happen. So there were a couple of visits to Austin, and that led to many other things.

Barbara Clausen: Yeah. And I guess it also really led to your engagement with Joan's work, also with a friendship, but also really your engagement with her work has, ever since, been very fruitful and very intense.

Ann Reynolds: Yeah, because the learning curve was quite steep. I was not somebody who focused tremendously on performance and video in my own work or my own teaching. So, there was a lot to learn. When I taught this class with her, having read all the literature on her, it also raised a lot of issues for me about the history of art and these categories that are set up that make it very difficult to address an artist like her. And, sort of came to help me understand why I didn't really have a deep sense of the work. Because, the disciplinary ways in which this kind of work has been addressed have not been terribly good.

Ann Reynolds: And so, a lot of our early conversations were about that, in part. Because, it's something that Joan...I don't know that she thinks about it so much anymore, but certainly when I first knew her, it was something she thought about a lot. Like, "Why am I not really fully engaged with by art historians?"

Ann Reynolds: And so the course then developed into this, really, the course from the beginning was called “Performing Art History.” It's basically using Joan to think about the critical period of the late 60s to the present, the rise of video and performance and intermedial work. I mean, not that it didn't exist before. But the incredible concentration of that. New York City and all the variables that go along with the history of that period, with a city like New York. But it was also teaching them to think about this kind of work historically. I mean, how can we develop models for really thinking about it historically? And also, along with that—

Barbara Clausen: Okay, we continue, sorry.

Ann Reynolds: That's all right. So, this balance which is inherent to the problem of performance and it's like, how do you re-stage, re-install, re-present work, that was made in a very specific context initially, in a very specific moment. This seemed like a really important skill to use her work to think through with students who are interested in writing about contemporary art in a historical way.

Barbara Clausen: And, I think that's really something that's so crucial to the work itself: this change of medium and the interdisciplinary approach that Jonas's work has.

Ann Reynolds: Yeah, and I think it's also... One of the things that we do, which I have images which I can share with you, is that our Visual Arts Center has a space, one of the rooms in the Center is called Fieldwork Space. When I teach this class, I have it for two weeks, and we basically use it as a classroom laboratory, but they also are given the task of figuring out how to create an exhibition around a particular work or a particular type of work. The first

time we did it, it was *Songdelay* and *Delay Delay*, and then the last time we did this past spring was all the *Mirror Pieces*. So, the walls are all covered with paper and they make all kinds of drawings and they bring objects, and they're really trying to think about how documents and objects, and then live performance... How you can sort of begin to weave the historical documents together with something that's operating in the present. Because, a lot of them I encourage to actually re-stage her work in their own work.

Barbara Clausen: Oh, fantastic.

Ann Reynolds: Some of them, they create an archive around it, they each choose a work by Joan and they create an archive around it. Because some of them are Studio grads and some of them are Studio undergrads, some of them have actually re-staged the works that they've chosen in ways that are incredible. I don't think in some cases you would even know if you didn't know anything about Joan's work, that this was the source.

Ann Reynolds: Because they're so completely internalized and re-imagined. I know this is a question that you wanted to get to perhaps later but, one of the reasons I think her work is so wonderful to teach, as a kind of lesson in balancing the past and the present, is also its incredible capaciousness. All the students end up engaging with it in ways that change their work fundamentally.

Barbara Clausen: Yes.

Ann Reynolds: Regardless of their interests, they all seem to find these ways to enter it, and it's generated Masters theses, studio shows. It's generated Honor theses, it's generated new work. I've recently had a student writing a dissertation who wrote about it. For me too, it's really the engagement with this work, [it] has changed certain things for me as well. It's both brought this consideration of time-based media into my larger concern about archives and history and trying to write history as a contemporary art and my interest in cinema. It's been incredibly rich. I think also that this journey with Joan, one of the things that we both find deeply, at first deeply surprising, and now we take it for granted, is that our working methods are very similar.

Ann Reynolds: It's helped me to think more deeply about that. Because often times when you have someone who's adjacent to you, and has these overlaps with you, it helps you to really specify, more carefully what you're doing. Especially if they're not working in the same genre, like Joan is not a historian.

Barbara Clausen: Right.

Ann Reynolds: She's an artist. And so, one of the most fruitful things in our relationship is Joan, and I, and Susan Howe had this public conversation about how we all use analogy in our work. It was really kind of, all three of us, I don't know what the audience thought about it, but all three of us got kind of giddy with this realization of this kind of 'fellow traveling' way of being. Even though the three of us are quite different in terms of what it is we produce.

Barbara Clausen: Right. I think maybe what comes to play is that too, is that Joan herself has taught for many years and was an incredibly influential teacher for many artists and obviously as well art historians. I think that really comes into play, this sense of, transmitting knowledge and sharing knowledge about work, and work procedures.

Ann Reynolds: It was also in that initial time, when we actually team-taught this class together, I look back at it and I think, what were we thinking? Because we didn't know each other that well. We would get into these arguments about things, which I think was really great for the students even though it scared them a little bit. Because, to sort of think about how do art historians and critics and artists talk to each other, and how do we find common ground around really important topics like feminism, and the state of the art world at certain points, and the balance between people's personal lives and what they want people to write about. I hope that in looking back on it, it was quite a good lesson for the students to see.

Ann Reynolds: Because for me and I know, I'm sure, it's true for you, I really believe in training art historians to talk to artists, and to have relationships with artists, and deal with that.

Barbara Clausen: Absolutely.

Ann Reynolds: Because it's not always easy. That's been another really important thing and she's still… Every time I teach it, she still Skypes with us at the end. I think she really enjoys it, because the students know quite a lot, so they don't ask her questions that she's been asked a thousand times, because they know the answers to those questions.

Barbara Clausen: Maybe we can talk about the exhibitions, because I know you've seen many of Joan's exhibitions, and one of the key case studies of the Joan Jonas Knowledge Base is the very important

retrospective that Andrea Lissoni curated in Milan in 2014 at the Pirelli HangarBicocca. I know you saw that exhibition, and I was wondering if you could tell us a bit about your overall impressions. Just describing in your memory when you saw that exhibition and the circumstances, and what was important, and striking.

Ann Reynolds: I feel very fortunate to have seen that show. If I were a rich person I would have purchased everyone a ticket to that exhibition, because I think it was deeply groundbreaking. Although, I didn't see any of the earlier retrospectives, the one at the Queens Museum, so I can't juxtapose it with earlier shows of her work. I saw the space first, because Joan and I went to Milan on the way to Venice to start working on the piece for the Biennale, so we spent, I don't know, 10 days maybe there. There was a Cildo Meireles show in the space, and you could see right away that this space was very challenging, because it has no defining parameters. It's just black and large without any light. This show just basically plopped. Scale was the thing that the curator took advantage of, because the pieces are large, they could spread out, and so you just moved from piece to piece in the space.

Ann Reynolds: So that clearly was something that wasn't what Andrea and Joan wanted to do. They wanted to encompass the whole space, but I'm very glad that I saw this other thing. So when I came back again, in the fall of 2014, for the opening, the description that best captures my own experience was something I read in an Italian newspaper by a critic. And I can't remember exactly, so I can only paraphrase.

Barbara Clausen: Yes.

Ann Reynolds: She said something like, "it feels like entering into a dark forest of tall trees, with shimmering mushrooms at their base."

Barbara Clausen: Oh my God.

Ann Reynolds: I wouldn't have used those exact analogies but it really was pulling back the curtain and coming into this space... It was transportative because you would look into the deep space and just see... It was breathtakingly beautiful and luminous. You could just see all the way to the end of the space and amidst the space, at various distances where these flickering colorful screens of various sizes and shapes that seemed almost anti-gravitational, floating there. It was really this initial image of her work, not as a sequence of individual installations, or performances, or videos, but literally a world that was

interconnected. Then that just becomes deeper as you move into the space because you begin to see the interconnections obviously among objects, and themes, and images, throughout the space.

Ann Reynolds: I think, really, something I've thought quite a bit about in terms of her work, is that, there are these discrete pieces over time and they need to be studied in depth, but there also is this vocabulary, and there is this set of themes, and set of actions, and gestures that sustain across all of her work, that actually create this deep dialogue. It's not so much the more you know about her work, the more you know about what each of these things mean, it more that the more you know her work, you begin to understand how these different images and tools, and props, et cetera, become these containers for different kinds of meanings. That's what I mean by capacious... It doesn't narrow down to 'the dog means X.' It opens up to the opposite, which is 'the dog can mean this, and this, and this, and this, and this.'

Ann Reynolds: Which I think the exhibition just on a kind of, almost subliminal level in the beginning, did an incredible job of laying the groundwork. Then when you start to really think about it more deeply, and of course the very first piece in the show is, *Waltz*. This video that Andrea thinks is kind of a very crucial work, and it's certainly not a large work, a complicated work. But, I think there's something quite smart about using a piece that is not complicated to set out the certain kind of tone and theme of her work so that then it becomes additive as you move though the space. Then in the center of the space of course there was this giant snake drawing from *The Shape, the Scent, the Feel of Things* suspended perpendicular to the sightline. You couldn't see it when you would look down the space, you would only come upon it because it was parallel to the walls.

Ann Reynolds: It was kind of functioning like this map, of this black labyrinth that you're in. It was adjacent to the installation for *The Shape, the Scent, the Feel of Things*, but also kind of speaking to the rest of this space. I think, the other thing, I don't know if you want me to keep going or you wanted to ask another question.

Barbara Clausen: I think it's great to actually, what's very interesting, I think for our listeners too is, it's actually quite rare to have somebody eloquently describe the experience of seeing an exhibition. And especially an exhibition of Joan's that has so many different layers to it. And that is, on one hand, it welcomes its viewers but on the other hand is also challenging to see, to grasp in its fullness, to remember. It's a very specific experience because of its various different moments of translation. And I find your

description extremely, to me, interesting and I think very helpful. It would be wonderful if you could continue describing the exhibitions as you remember if you would like to.

Ann Reynolds: Sure, I think once you get into the space and you're immersed in this world that I am describing, where the continuity of all the work is manifested, but then that continuity, continues in detail once you get to be looking at the end of individual works. It sets this tone or mode of experiencing the work that I think is quite special. In thinking about it a lot, and of course I have some insight because of being there, on the first site visit and also going to this installation a few days before the opening, is that there was also this incredibly, carefully calibrated relationship among the works in terms of sound and scale.

Barbara Clausen: Yes. Yes.

Ann Reynolds: ...that I found really, quite, impressive. So, some videos were silenced, some had headphones. Some, the sound was fully bleeding throughout the whole space. Some videos were projected large, some were on monitors. Some of it was about trying to maintain a relationship with the original context or medium. So for example, both *Songdelay* and *Wind* were projected on a large scale, on a cinema-sized scale, even though you're still seeing digitized versions of what were originally films. Which I thought was really intelligent because it allows you to think about these differences in media, but in a subtle way. It's not like those would be shown in a separate room, as films, with a projector, which I think would be, perhaps, too heavy handed. It would also begin to separate everything out.

Barbara Clausen: I mean, it's an interesting question because of that sense...this particular situation in Milan of, the scale. I saw the show only in Malmö, which also is a kind of hall. It got an inkling of that sense of vastness of space. But if I listen to you, what I hear is that it was a really, a kind of limitless space around these works. There was no roof that kind of pressured.

Ann Reynolds: They were very interpenetrating, because it wouldn't be that completely clear that you're outside of one and into the space of another. Because there were no internal walls, the only walls that were functioning were the screens, and some of the screens were double-sided so you would see the same image of either side from inside or outside. Then there would be the sound bleeds that were delicately, I mean, I know how much work they put into that. They were delicately calibrated so they wouldn’t overwhelm one another but you would still be having this aroma of something else that's adjacent to you.

Ann Reynolds: The main thing I would say is because the individual works were liberated, I would say liberated, from a conception of them being completely discrete, as many exhibitions of video performance and installation work tend to do. They tend to separate things out in discrete spaces, many times they have to, just because of the space they are dealing with. But [they] treat them as if they were paintings, or sculpture, meant to be experienced one by one, even if in a sequence. But this exhibition really, especially because of that initial view, the idea of sequence, or one by one, or discreteness is really set aside for this overall image of an environment.

Ann Reynolds: Something really important to think of, because an exhibition space certainly nowadays, many of them are not a theater, they're not picture galleries, or movie theaters. In the case of HangarBicocca the space is a repurposed industrial space. So thinking about that kind of flexibility, rather than trying to turn the industrial space into an art exhibition space, allowing it to kind of be doing different things, for different artists. Dia:Beacon is another example of how Lynne [Cooke] really thought about each of the spaces in that building as having a character and how which artist's work would be best in dialogue with that character. So you have this sense of the past in the space and its potential to be flexible. I feel like that was something that Andrea really brought to the exhibition but also Joan was very involved in making happen.

Ann Reynolds: I think it's also really important in terms of the ways Joan's original, early work...the spaces that generated this work were not exhibition spaces, they work at the outdoor landscapes in Cape Breton, on Long Island, in Lower Manhattan. All these coastlines with these incredibly long views of space, then the combination of her loft which is both a domestic space and workspace, that kind of, flexible space that so many artists were operating in of her generation. Then Anthology Film Archives, which is a film space but also one that has a very particular kind of viewing rhetoric around it...the isolated seats where the walls would be either side of the spectator and they could only look front. Then Joan using the shape-shifting of the screen to kind of turn the screen into a sculpture.

Ann Reynolds: I think there's this relationship to space that's so central to her work...but also, I would argue, to other artists of her generation, that this exhibition allows to come back into the work. Not didactically or explicitly but in the spirit of that.

Barbara Clausen: Yes.

Ann Reynolds: And I think that's another reason why the show is a really excellent model for thinking about and showing this kind of work. After all, Joan's work really wasn't defined by the white cube till much later. It's not necessarily in dialogue with that early on and those aren't the terms.

Barbara Clausen: It's also something, where I sometimes think it's interesting how close, and how interconnected her work for her performances is with that of her installations, and her treatment of moving image and objects. How there is not really an order necessarily, where one could say, "this is the first step, and then that is the second step, then there's a third step, there's the installation." It's actually a much more fluid process and correct me, but I think that with Milan to stay with that exhibition, especially in that exhibition, that fluidity was really put on stage, or performed or somehow presented, it became palpable.

Ann Reynolds: Yeah. It became the subject of the show in many ways. Both their decisions to put *Reanimation* in a room by itself at the end. I thought about that a lot, because it's completely cut off from the rest.

Barbara Clausen: Yes.

Ann Reynolds: I think it's because in many ways it's a much more 'installation-y,' I know that's not a word, work than any of the others in Milan. I think it really was, is defined in relation to an architectural space.

Barbara Clausen: Yes

Ann Reynolds: ...quite differently than the others, so it does work inside a box. At first, this is not something that was clear to me initially, but thinking back on it now, and then having seen *Reanimation* reinstalled a number of places. It's quite different. All the other installations in that space are much more theatrical.

Barbara Clausen: Yes.

Ann Reynolds: They are much more about a background, and objects, and platforms, oriented outward rather than in all directions. So it makes sense.

Barbara Clausen: I think it's also really interesting how we started this interview with you speaking about teaching and sharing your thoughts about Joan's work with your students...together with Joan, on your own, and how that then translates into exhibitions. When

we think about Milan and the question of restaging or exhibiting Joan's work. Because the Joan Jonas knowledge base is there for conservators, and for curators, and for writers, and art historians and hopefully also artists...if you would need to share something like advice or comments on restaging or exhibiting Joan's work in relation to what you've said, is there anything that comes to mind for you? Like what you would pass on as somebody who so continuously follows her work, with such care, observes how Joan works with image and space.

Ann Reynolds: I think it's a really important question and it's actually kind of hard to answer in the abstract because the spaces themselves are what one has to really start with in thinking about how to restage her work. They're immediately brought into the dynamic. I guess the thing that I have thought about the most in working with the students, and seeing the most successful shows that I've seen—unfortunately, I didn't get to see your show in Montreal, which I'm really sorry about—is this dynamic between the work as something made at a particular point in time, in the past

Barbara Clausen: Yes.

Ann Reynolds: And its existence in the present.

Barbara Clausen: Yes.

Ann Reynolds: That both those things have to be honored.

Barbara Clausen: Absolutely.

Ann Reynolds: For the work to really be what it is. That's something that I felt Andrea really accomplished in Milan. I think the show that Joan had in Kyoto in Japan, also accomplished that in an astonishing way, because the means at the curator's disposal were so limited, but in her dialogue with Joan they weren't afraid to rethink the work and do things with it that they reanimated, to use a word that is already embedded in Joan's own work. For example, the exhibition in Kyoto was called *Five Rooms: Joan Jonas*. Each room had a specific work in it. But then, the work that I have often seen not installed well is the *Organic Honey* work and I think it's partly because of restrictions on how and where it can be exhibited, but oftentimes you just see this line or row of videos, in these uniform monitors, which really is deadly.

Ann Reynolds: In the space that was devoted to that piece, or to those two pieces *Organic Honey's Visual Telepathy* and *Organic Honey's*

Vertical Roll, they used different sizes. Some of the videos were projected on the wall, and bled onto the floor, and some of them were shown on monitors. These things were not hierarchical so that there was a decision that, 'this is the main video, and this the ancillary video.' You would walk into the space, and you were surrounded —again, kind of like in Milan— by the work.

Barbara Clausen: Like an environment.

Ann Reynolds: Yes, exactly. You would still be tempted, of course, to look at individual videos and watch them, but you really weren't able to watch them in isolation. I guess the thing that I think about a lot, partly from the first time I saw one of Joan's installations, because as I said, I've come to her work a little late. The second one I ever saw was for *The Shape, the Scent, the Feel of Things*. One of the first questions I asked myself which, I assumed you probably do too, is 'what would somebody who hasn't seen the performance get from this?'

Barbara Clausen: Yes.

Ann Reynolds: Because I'm filling in all the time. But it dawned on me, and then I kind of did this experiment where I took friends, who I know haven't seen it, and wanted to hear what they would say. But I realized that if you accept that the work is all about fragments, and it's never total, and the installation can convey that, then you kind of escape this problem of trying to manifest something, completely, and totally, and perfectly.

Barbara Clausen: Yes.

Ann Reynolds: But everything—and this may be my history as a [Robert] Smithson scholar seeping in here—it's always something that is missing something else. And there's this space for the imagination that is allowed in because of that, rather than feeling like an inadequacy or a limitation. So I think that the shows that really try to create these new worlds, but try not to be completely reconstructing some authentic thing that happened in the past or happened in a different format... Those tend to be the best because I do think that that's another continuity across Joan's work. Not only does she have a language, a vocabulary, it's always in pieces.

Barbara Clausen: Yes.

Ann Reynolds: And so you see a bit of video from a work twenty years old, older, in a recent performance, or you hear the audio from a performance forty years ago in an installation now matched up with a set of images that are completely different. So all of that kind of constant piecing together, it could seem like you have to track it all back and know the source. But I mean, one of the cool things that happens when I teach this class is that the students want to do that in the beginning. And then they start to realize they don't get anything from that. Not only do they realize that, they realize it's kind of impossible. And they start to realize that there's a way in which starting to float all of these things together creates an analogous kind of feeling of the work, and a kind of capaciousness for them to enter into the work and make their own work.

Barbara Clausen: Yes.

Ann Reynolds: Which is why I think she's an excellent artist to share with young artists, because I think it's just very generous work. I've seen it over and over again. It gives people courage to make more open work themselves. So, I have this video of when we were, one of the groups had to do *Lines in the Sand*, they had to run the whole seminar on this. So they cleared the whole room and they taped paper all over the floor and made sticks with chalk attached to the end, like Joan does. And then they picked out music and everybody had to make drawings with these sticks.

Barbara Clausen: That's great.

Ann Reynolds: And what came out of it is that this is harder than it looks, but it's also that they got to understand how it's a drawing, and a performance, and all of that all at once. And it's fine to say that and to see her doing it, but to actually feel their own way into it. So like these pieces, they add up, but they're new every time, I guess.

Barbara Clausen: Maybe to slowly come to an end, I wonder, because we're speaking about teaching and sharing and this generosity and how important Joan's work has been for many artists over many generations... Are there artists that you would advise us to interview? Not just from a historical perspective, but really from that idea of influence or of inspiration?

Ann Reynolds: I have to think about that. Because a lot of artists that I meet say that she's a tremendous influence on them. And certainly artists that I've trained, even now twenty years on, you can still see the connections. But I'd have to think about that because...

Barbara Clausen: Well, I think it's—

Ann Reynolds: It's kind of one of those questions where I have this very broad sense of it, but then I'm having a hard time thinking of an actually specific name.

Barbara Clausen: Well, I think it's a question we can also pose to future listeners, curators who will listen to this, and other artists. And to kind of think about that. What are the networks? And I think this is also one of your really specific interests, the sense of the networks artists are part of, and the networks of the people they influence, and that they communicate with. And I don't know if you have a final statement in regard to that. What's special how... What I always find so specific about Joan's work, but also her ways of working, is this closeness and this proximity she has to what is going on. She's somebody who's incredibly well informed. And I think she's always, I mean, you might know that better, but I think she's always been that way. She's always had this closeness to... She sees many shows.

Ann Reynolds: Yes, yes.

Barbara Clausen: This energy....

Ann Reynolds: I think that was also something that goes back to this issue of, 'how do you historicize and bring things into the present?'

Barbara Clausen: Yes.

Ann Reynolds: Because the ways in which that context—and that's not quite the right word—but how her work operates very much in the present of whenever it was made, is often quite indirect because she has a lot of faith, I think, in her viewer and always what happens. So there's a lot of reference points that, say, when one is talking about *Songdelay* or *Delay Delay*, and what lower Manhattan was like in the seventies. These are things that one has to explain to present viewers because of course, lower Manhattan doesn't look anything like that anymore, and it was a different time. But always when we get to *Lines in the Sand*, there's this way in which the students can feel, they know what this is about, because they've shared 9/11, they were alive. And even though the piece never mentions 9/11, and the same is true of course of *Reanimation* because of its complete connection to climate change.

Barbara Clausen: Yes.

Ann Reynolds: Even though again, it's not hitting you over the head with that. So I think there's a way—I once wrote, actually, an essay on Joan and the editor made me strike this word, but I still someday I'm going to put it in print—I think Joan really is and wants to be relevant. She's not interested in being an icon.

Barbara Clausen: Yeah.

Ann Reynolds: She is absolutely living in the present, wanting to be part of it and be relevant to it, which I don't... This editor thought that was patronizing, but I don't think it is. Again, I think it's an example of someone who's not resting on their laurels, who wants to be speaking to audiences right now, in the present, and not just showing them that she is a great artist and an important icon of the past. So I guess the reason I can't quite answer the question about specific artists is...I feel like that's something that should be an influence on everyone.

Barbara Clausen: Right. Well I think—

Ann Reynolds: Because I think...

Barbara Clausen: Yeah, I think that's the perfect answer to that question. And with that, I think we have to stop the conversation now, but I know there will be many more. I want to thank you on behalf of everybody on the team. This was an incredible interview and I really, really want to thank you. This will be—

Ann Reynolds: Well, thank you too.

Barbara Clausen: ...a very rich source.

Ann Reynolds: Thank you for letting me think out loud about one of our favorite people.

Barbara Clausen: Yes, absolutely. This was really...okay. I'm going to stop the recording now.

Ann Reynolds: Okay.

Barbara Clausen: Let me just be sure to save it the right way.

This transcript is intended to provide an accessible form of interview audio content. It has been edited for factual accuracy and clarity. Any alterations are noted with brackets.