

Brian Graney: Thank you, John [Lucaites]. And before we begin I would also like to acknowledge the hard work of the staff and graduate students at the Black Film Center/Archive: Ardea Smith, Stacey Doyle, Nzingha Kendall, Katrina Overby, Chinedu Amaefula, and Natasha Vaubel and our director Michael T. Martin and to thank also for their assistance and support Jon Vickers, Manny Knowles, Brittany Friesner, Carla Cowden, and Laura Holly-Ivens here at the cinema, Greg Waller and Barb Klinger in the Department of Communication and Culture, Rachael Stoeltje and Will Cowan in IU Libraries, Cara Caddoo in American Studies, John Walsh in the Department of Information and Library Science, and all of our visiting presenters.

Among them I have to single out Jacqueline Stewart at the University of Chicago as a principal inspiration for the events of today. In her 2011 article: "Discovering Black Film History: Tracing the Tyler, Texas Black Film Collection," a cache of mostly nitrate black cast films from the 30's to the 50's recovered from an East Texas warehouse in the early 80's. She writes,

"What I take to be valuable about the collection is not just that some of the prints may be the only ones existent or the possibility that it contains footage that can fill gaps caused by missing or damaged reels of film that were already available. In addition we can learn from the singularity of each print in this collection and what any existing print might teach us about the circulation, exhibition, and content of movies in this under documented film culture. Indeed, when we think of each print as a unique artifact we are encouraged to reconsider what we think of as a film's content."

Some examples she gives are how multiple prints can help us to trace a film's multiple routes of travel. Cuts can indicate local censorship. Scratches can signal heavy use and additional footage might signal theatrical re-release. Production prints might suggest circulation to nontheatrical markets. To paraphrase Paolo Cherchi Usai there are no films there are only prints.

So if we reconsider how we define the content of a film print going beyond the audio visual information recorded on the carrier to encompass the evidentiary information conveyed through its physical characteristics, markings, and structures as a material artifact we should consider at the same time how we place this unmined evidence within the context of the related documents, censorship reports, distribution records, promotional materials that form the basis of so much of what we know about the under documented culture of early black film.

With this event today our participants, among them interdisciplinary scholars, archivists, and museum curators, have been invited to reflect on historical and current approaches to research on early black audience film and the modes of access to film and related documentation available to scholars, to consider the multiplicity of documentary forms but of film artifacts in particular and how they constitute meaning apart from their essential content as moving images and taking the arena of the race movie circuit as an unifying context for films, performers, producers, distributors, investors, venues,

and audiences, to explore the web of relationships between documents and films dispersed across private collections and archival institutions.

A pioneer and leader among these is the Schomburg Center for Research and Black Culture located in Harlem, New York, a research unit of the New York Public Library System, begun with the collections of Arturo Alfonso Schomburg more than 85 years ago. The Schomburg has collected, preserved and provided access to materials documenting black life in America and worldwide supporting and promoting the study and interpretation of the history and culture of peoples of African descent.

I'm extremely pleased to have joining us this morning from the Schomburg Center, Shola Lynch. In her work as a curator, journalist, and filmmaker Shola Lynch carries through the thread of her earlier background in American history and public history. She learned her craft as a documentary filmmaker on the job through early efforts with Ken Burns and Florentine Films on the ten part Jazz series, among other productions. In 2004 she made her directorial debut with the Peabody Award winning "Chisholm '72: Unbought & Unbossed" about Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm's run for President. She was nominated in 2012 for the British Film Institute's Grierson Award for her most recent documentary feature "Free Angela and All Political Prisoners," about Angela Davis' 1971 trial. In 2013 she was appointed the curator of the Moving Image and Recorded Sound Division at the Schomburg Center for research and black culture.

Please welcome Shola Lynch.

Shola Lynch: Thank you very much, Brian [Graney], for inviting me and all of your colleagues. I'm incredibly excited to be here and for organizing this conference on regeneration and digital context. So, yes, I am Shola Lynch and I am a filmmaker as well as the new Moving Image and Recorded Sound curator at the Schomburg Center in New York City.

I think my journey, although my bio was incredibly well done this morning, I think that my journey to this position exemplifies the fluidity around history, archives, and film as artifacts. So if you'll indulge me for a minute I'll tell you the short version of my story so you can understand my perspective and how I get to this place. But before I get started I do want to say that what Brian [Graney] said to me before this is this is informal. So I'm going to talk for a little while and I hope we have some time for questions because this format is new to me. I am a maker, I am a collector, I am an archivist, and a curator. So I do hope we have some time afterwards.

So a little bit about me. I grew up in New York City in the 70's. The top selling children's album at the time was "Free to be You and Me." The title pretty much said it all. Plus in New York City as a kid we were inculcated with the idea of individuality. In our mind it was post-Civil Rights and women's lib. Malcolm and Martin had kind of taken care of the race issues and Gloria and the gals the gender problem. I was truly free to be me.

Fast-forwarding to college, I was a nationally ranked track athlete, a middle distance runner, and recruited by any school you can imagine. I chose to be a Lady Longhorn and

attended the University of Texas in Austin. Now, this is where things become interesting when it relates to history, race, and archives. I was actually bombarded with the idea, ideas about race that kind of interrupted my sacred sense of individuality. At the time I used to like to blame Texas when in fact it wasn't Texas. It was just the world outside of my New York City enclave. My dad was a history professor and my mom a Canadian and very international world.

So to understand and combat and contradict and counter these stultifying ideas I looked to black history for facts. Then I looked to black literature for stories, some sense of narrative, who were we, what did we do, what were we like, how did we respond, how did we talk. But in the end it really wasn't enough. What I wanted was the visual. I yearned for a realistic and nuanced visual sense, evidence of black people, of me.

Bill Cosby, the comedian, who was a huge track fan, said to me once, and I'm paraphrasing. You young people are so arrogant. You act as though you never existed, that there was no one in a previous era that was like you, that was as energetic, as smart, as vibrant as you are.

So I wanted to use my historical imagination to think about who I would have been in previous eras. So I became obsessed with visual culture. I earned a master's in American History and Public History Resource Management from the University of California Riverside. My plan was to actually tell historical stories through visual, multimedia installations, to bring the history alive through physical artifacts through the stuff, through the evidence. So I was going to be a curator and a public historian.

Due to a lousy job market in the mid 90's I was redirected to curate for film by landing a job as a visual researcher for the documentary filmmaker Ken Burns. I worked on Frank Lloyd Wright about the American architect but also Jazz, all 20 hours and ten parts of that series on the history of jazz. So for many people they think of it as a film about music. For me it was the story of black and immigrant life in the United States from 1890's through the 1960's. My job was to find the visual evidence to tell the story.

So this has been my life's work essentially for the last 17 years. I've been digging in the crates looking for visual evidence to tell stories primarily related to black history. So there are a few things that I've learned along the way. One, there is no category for us whether you are at the Library of Congress or at some collector's house or a research university. We're often filed in many different places. So I learned to look under Negro, colored, Afro American, black, African American. Sometimes I was cynical enough to look under coon when I was doing photographic work because we would often end up there. I would look under miscellaneous, treasure trove actually, miscellaneous and unidentified categories as well through general categories like cotton field, theater, segregation, street life. I would try and narrow down by thinking about a particular address or thinking about a particular date depending on the story.

So what I discovered, and I discovered some treasures in these various categories is why I mentioned them. Our material is often not lost. It has just not yet been found. It is really up to us. Our work is to be vigilant in the finding of it. The unearthing work is

critical, for film in particular, because the films provide evidence in the Greek sense of seeing is believing. This is evidence of blackness and of black life.

And I quote, you know so this was back when I was in graduate school in the 90's. I'm quoting one of my favorite texts so hopefully it's not terribly out of date. But I'm quoting Ray A. Brown in "Hollywood as Historian," here.

"If a picture, as we generally agree, is worth a thousand words then a motion picture is worth millions of words because its words in action. Picture as history are exceptionally effective because although words lie flat and dormant to some readers it is difficult to miss the messages carried in motion pictures. Indeed, the esthetic power of motion pictures, historically correct or incorrect, is difficult to resist."

It made me think of a prime example in early film, which was not a film made by us but it impacted blackness and that was "Birth of a Nation," which was released in 1915. The movie was described by then US President Woodrow Wilson as writing history as lightning and is considered, was considered; let me say, to be an accurate portrayal of black folks in relation to the genesis of the Ku Klux Klan. It seems to me that there is, and I say was considered accurate because we know that it wasn't accurate and that it isn't accurate. But it seems to me no accident that the birth of race films comes in this period and flourishes shortly thereafter. Our media is often made to combat, contradict, and counter broader trends but it's not only that it is a document of our existence.

We can find meaning, as Jaqueline Stewart states in "Early Black Film: Artifacts of Material Evidence," that when we do think of each print as a unique artifact to reconsider what we think of as films content. I would only add that for outside of academia, for students, for the public, because I am at a public institution, that we consider context not only as a backdrop but critical to deciphering the meaning and messages of films for academia but also the broader public because it provides a narrative that helps bridge the present with the past and to make it relatable and relevant.

So I think of my college self and when I was learning history and being connected to ideas and black history and culture to see the motion pictures, to see the evidence in motion would have been astonishing and for that material to work together.

So, again, there is the "Birth of a Nation" in relation to the birth of race films but there's also in the context of World War I. Imagine the documentary footage, the newsreels that were also available. I think particularly of the Harlem Hell Fighters. A few years later there was newsreel of the Harlem Hell Fighters in World War I, an all-black unit coming back to Harlem and marching proudly down Lenox Avenue having returned victorious from battle. But these things are in conversation for the makers in a particular period but they are also in conversation for us and help bring it alive for a broader audience. That motion pictures, both movies and archival footage, work on these parallel tracks and are in conversation and key to our understanding of the past.

So this kind of brings me to where I am at the Schomburg because both of these parallel tracks inform my vision for the Schomburg's collection. Primarily it is not early film. It is film that was; it is an archive that started in 60's and 70's. So it is a treasure trove of material related to the kind of pre-Civil Rights Civil Rights and it includes some documentary but primarily films that were made by us. What I want to do is build on that idea and create a reference collection that tells the story of black people in film to document our historical presence. I mean this from Edison's first clip of us eating watermelon, so I say documentary, to flappers in Harlem to Madam C. J. Walker, our first millionaire, to Jackie Robinson, the extraordinary baseball player who broke the color line, from Civil Rights protesters to the Black Panthers. On a parallel timeline I think it's important to have the films that were made by us and how they impacted us because they are in conversation.

So you're asking me how is this possible to create this reference library when we all know that the resources are slim. We don't necessarily have to own the copyright or the original material and primarily it will be digital kind and low resolution. So we work with places like, for instance, when I make a documentary film on Angela Davis, ABC, NBC, CBS all collect these materials and they give us screener tapes. So it's kind of like creating a YouTube version of black history where in low-resolution form connected to the proper copyright owners, etc. If we do on this parallel tracks with the images that were created from Oscar Micheaux if it's possible to Ava DuVernay's film, from "Birth of a Nation" to the "Imitation of Life" to "Do the Right Thing," if we can kind of create a database that connects us to this material either to see it in clips or to connect to purchase it or to see it if the copyright is available. Then we create a space that is not just in one place but tells the whole history of African Americans through visual images. I think it would be a great draw, so a nexus, a place of community and a place of discussion and a great draw.

So the mission is to be the nexus point, the connector for seeing black people in moving images and I must say recorded sound. My boss sometimes gets annoyed that I don't include recorded sounds. We have an amazing collection of recorded sound as well.

So my final thought is this. Black films still exist in the margins, outtakes and discarded scraps, whether it's race movies or archival footage from newsreels or home movies. It's critical to treat each bit, each scrap as documentary evidence to be preserved but to remain uncropped and significantly altered. I do agree that each piece can offer some information about it, about the maker, about its production and about the context. But even more significantly is to have students and the public know they exist and to see them and to engage with them and to interact with them so that the regeneration work then is to unearth, preserve and learn from black films. It is critical work. The images provide evidence of black life or, as I would have said when I was 18, of me. Thank you.

Barbara Ann O'Leary: Thank you. I have a question. In your vision what are ways that individuals and the public can be on the lookout for materials and alert you so that it can build?

Shola Lynch: That's part of how I see the Schomburg as a place for conversations. But if you find something that you don't know what it is and it seems important and its evidence of black film or black filmmaking to share it with your public institution, whatever public institution, and connect to conferences like this and collections like this. There are small collections all over the country. What I'd love us to be is to be in conversation with one another. The whole point of the public library in New York City is to make things publically accessible so that our education doesn't end after college and university so that we can continue in that conversation.

Grafton Trout: Can you say something about the Schomburg's collection outreach efforts and relationship with other centers like our Black Film Center? What kind of relations do you have in terms of collections and also in terms of dissemination?

Shola Lynch: So I just started at the Schomburg this summer. When I was on my interview I didn't, they weren't showing us and in fact they weren't showing us the archive in the space. So actually my first order of business is to find out what we have in that collection. I'm piecing it together. I'm doing my own research in my own collection, not mine but the Schomburg's. I'm piecing together from the material artifacts, from the letters, from the files that are not in any particular order. I'm going through all of the stuff that has been kind of stacked up. We don't have a proper inventory yet and then catalog. Only a fraction of the material that was collected has been cataloged. For instance, I have found accidentally, incidentally, as I'm going through this material we have audio recordings of A. Philip Randolph from the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters meetings. I popped a tape in because we they were transferred to cassette. I popped one in and it was magical to hear the sound of his voice. Has anybody heard the sound of his voice before? I've never seen a bit of film or heard the sound of his voice. You pop it in and he's taking his brothers to task for being afraid to confront and organize. He's doing it in a way that is a combination of Paul Robeson, pre Sidney Poitier. You can see where he fits in the context of history through just the sound.

We have a collection. Somebody went around during Selma, organizing of the Selma March, days leading up and then the Selma March, a man named Ken Dewey and recorded sound like he was Alan Lomax. He was just around with sound. So he's got people who are talking about the march and organizing. Harry Belafonte introducing Odetta to sing before Dick Gregory gets up to tell some jokes to get the crowd excited about marching to Selma. So we have all of this amazing stuff but we're not quite sure. So I'm looking forward first into making the material we have accessible and then growing from that point. What we don't have is enough money. Each institution and organization has the same problem. We shouldn't be redoing our own efforts in terms of digitization, in terms of sharing. We should be somehow working together to create a collective catalog that shares the whole history digitally. This is my, it may take ten or twenty years but I'm really excited about this conference and I'm really excited to be at the beginning of this journey.

Grafton Trout: What is your funding source?

Shola Lynch: Right now the New York Public Library. So Khalil Muhammad, Dr. Khalil Muhammad and I have been talking about endowing the collecting and figuring out how to do that. The first order of business in that is to find out what we have. We have 5,000, but to give you a sense of the size, we have close to 5,000 cubic square feet of material. That is astonishing. If it's anything like what I've just been able to pick off the top, people, it's very exciting and I look forward to sharing it.

Michael T. Martin: Shola [Lynch], you wear several hats. You've been talking now as an archivist and a curator. Let's talk about you as a filmmaker, how you use film artifacts in the recovery and reconstitution of the past. Could you talk a little bit about that?

Shola Lynch: I do wear different hats but in a way this dynamic is the same. So I feel like over the last 17 years what I've been doing is building archives on particular topics. Researching is one of those funny things that you've got to put your investigative hat on. I feel a little bit like an archeologist also. You find things you're not quite sure what it is, which is why, by the way, I feel adamant about not cropping altering.

I ran into a photographer working on Jazz who had taken all of these photographs of a seminal moment and he only kept the prints that he thought were the most important at that time and he threw out the rest and the negatives.

Another example would be maybe for the younger folks in the audience who remember Clinton and Monica Lewinsky. So if the photographer that had been at that event where the first photograph of them standing near each other had thrown out all the photographs at the time that he thought were irrelevant that photograph would have been thrown out as irrelevant because nobody knew about that relationship.

So keeping this stuff is very important and caring for it. So when I'm working on a film it's a very directed, it's directed towards a particular subject. So with the Angela Davis film, for instance, or even the Shirley Chisholm film, I had heard rumors of a documentary that had been made about her in the 70's with her run for President called "Pursuing the Dream." I couldn't find it anywhere; nobody had any more copies. But in talking to people who were in this world and collecting, you know what, one day after months and months of conversation on other topics the collector came to me and said you know what I found this thing in my attic. I'm not quite sure what it is. It might be useful to you. It turned out to be "Pursuing the Dream." It was this great 40-minute film on Shirley Chisholm's run for President that we mined for the larger film.

So I'm constantly amazed at how even though something is old we can see it with fresh eyes and that it's important to collect and preserve. Another example on the Angela Davis film, there is a moment of a shootout between the Black Panthers and LAPD in the film. Some of the footage had been seen before but CBS, I believe, was the archive, had all this footage related to that day. They had in a kind of miscellaneous category of bystanders, etc.; they had footage of Angela Davis talking to a reporter and her immediate response to the shootout. It's priceless. Even if you read the transcript and the reporter said so you're here, how did you find out about it and she says somebody from inside the office called us and said there was a shootout going on. The reporter says

what are you going to do about it and she looks at him. What do you mean what am I going to do? That's her expression. She said I'll do anything I can to help out and walks away.

So there's something in seeing the interactions that brings alive the history of motion pictures. This is a documentary moment but I do believe that film, early film also does that in a similar way that seeing somebody's response is really important even if it's set up. We can call it reality TV, fake reality.

I think that answers your question.

Jacqueline Stewart: Thank you, Shola [Lynch], so much for these insights. As related to Michael's [T. Martin] question, thinking about how it is that you as a documentary filmmaker you find so much material but then there is only so much that you can put into the finished product. Sort of related to your great idea about this broad repository of images, are there ways that maybe filmmakers can share the additional material as a part of this effort?

Shola Lynch: Absolutely. In fact, for the Shirley Chisholm documentary I became the foremost expert on Shirley Chisholm's run for President in the United States in 1972 and collected the most amount of material related to it. Brooklyn College called me up, her alma mater, and now all of the material is deposited there for scholars to see. So that's where I started to get the idea that when we're working on our scholarship we cannot forget about visual and audio. We cannot. You become then a firsthand reporter in describing an event that happened that you couldn't have possibly been there for. It's invaluable. Even at the Schomburg we have outtakes of Bill Miles' James Baldwin film. We have "Jazz on a Summer Day," we have all of the original 16 mm film, outtakes from that film. It is an incredible resource. I've already told all of my filmmaking friends, colleagues that I'm gunning for them. I do feel like it is important and I cannot underestimate the impact and value for making history and this material and our work important in the minds of students and regular people. I think that as we do that, as we bring more people into our fold in terms of the understanding of how critical this work is the more funding there will be and the more we will be able to do. That helps us find more material because people's eyes are searching.

Brian Graney: I'd just like to follow up to that with a comment about the idea that documentary productions are essentially archives in themselves. We recently at Orphans Midwest had a presenter from Washington University in St. Louis who works with Blackside collection. "Eyes on the Prize," because the producers were so diligent about sourcing unique archival material from private collectors, from broadcast news stations, from historical societies, they have essentially an archive of footage that hasn't been preserved and maintained by those original sources. So even what was B roll or outtakes for the finished production is itself a valuable archival collection at this point.

Shola Lynch: Actually that's a really key point that I'm glad you brought up. So part of the problem is that many archives are commercial archives. There is a big difference between a commercial archive, let's say the news, ABC, NBC and CBS, where Blackside



would have collected much of that material and an academic institution or a private archive. What happens is these archives are bought by bigger and bigger corporations. Things get lost or they're thrown out. So whoever owns a copy it becomes an original because all of the other copies don't exist. Also, it gives academics and researchers and filmmaker's access to see material that isn't as costly because the commercial archives, by their nature, are all about making money, all about making money. So we have to deal with them in terms of rights as a documentary filmmaker but the whole state of affairs has gotten out of hand. The Angela Davis film, the cost of the archival was a third of the budget. Over the eight years that it took to make the film the state of affairs had dramatically changed. So my line item was woefully just not enough and had to raise an enormous amount of money just to finish the film. That means that these kinds of works are going to become more and more rare because they're just not feasible financially, which means that this work is even more important. We can't let all of it become lost because it is a treasure trove. It is really something when you see, when you read about a particular period and then you see it in action. You see real people responding to, reacting to, in documentary film footage but also the art, the film art that comes out of being in that period.

Brian Graney: I think we have time for two more questions.

Barbara Ann O'Leary: Could you give some advice about a good approach to organizing yourself as a documentarian to get rights in a timely manner and as inexpensively as possible?

Shola Lynch: Yes. So my strategy is one that I learned, I essentially learned the craft of filmmaking on the job. I worked for Ken Burns for, I don't know, five or six years on these projects. That conversation starts at the beginning. If I don't have a good relationship with an archive before I start, as I'm starting production, I will not use that material. I will not hand it to my editors. The cost has to be and then I can choose if there's something promo that I really spend a lot of money for and I have it towards the end then I can choose. You have to think as a producer at the beginning because there is no shortcut to that negotiation. The Angela Davis film we started that process at the beginning and we negotiated our hearts out. We had a team of people. We had the director of research working on this. We were still, the costs were outrageous and we were discounted.

So there is absolutely no shortcut. I will tell you this as a filmmaker that if you don't deal with it you won't be able to sell your film. That means television, it means digitally and so it's very important to deal with the business of filmmaking and the business of archives early on.

Brian Graney: Last question.

Terri Francis: Hi. I raised my hand before the question actually fully formed. My body wants to talk to you before and so my mind is catching up as I'm talking. Thank you so much for your thoughts and for setting a great tone for the day beginning with chatting and conversation first of all. There were some words that kind of stood out to me in your

comments that I want to maybe hear you reflect more on. I was really struck by like when you said something about the fluidity around artifacts. So on the one hand there's this fluidity around artifacts but also this desire for the artifact to act as evidence, evidence of us. What that made me start thinking about is on the one hand it is us but then and it is for us now but then it's also them then. So how do we account for what's different about these images and how they functioned or what they were at that particular time, what came before and what came after that's the slice that we're using for our own experience now. Do you know what I'm saying?

Shola Lynch: I think that's a good point and I don't mean it as a flatness as there is no difference between us and them. I mean it more and it really was what Bill Cosby said to me is the sense of historical imagination. So here you and I exist. We have brains, we have hearts, we think, we are smart. We will talk and parse. What would we be like with these attributes in a completely different context? What would we be like in the 20's where access we would not, perhaps we wouldn't be standing here having this conversation but what would we be like? I think that part of what motion pictures do; part of what moving images do is they help us with our historical imagination, to put ourselves in their place. Not to say that we are the same exactly but to talk about what would be different. It's classic. We all like to think we would be the hero in the story. Fact is we wouldn't.

Terri Francis: But do you know what that reminds me of? Do you remember that moment in "Daughters in the Dust," where the unborn child looks into the stereoscope and she looks into the post card and sees this, I guess this footage of, the streetlight footage.

Shola Lynch: Yes.

Terri Francis: And it kind of looks like she's looking for herself or looking for her family and they're not quite there. Do you know what I mean? It's like that kind of moment that's like searching.

Shola Lynch: Yes and how would we fit and how would we fit? The beginning of that for me actually came out of some work I did at the California Museum of Photography. They have one of the largest collections of stereographs, those two photographs that you put on the card and you put in the viewfinder and they become 3D. It was essentially cable in another generation because the way the companies were they were like, yes, tour the world without leaving your fireside. Be in the Amazon, be in the cotton fields. I was like tour the world without leaving your fireside. I wonder how black people fit? Yes, I know. So it's 1901. The top song in America is "All Coons Look Alike to Me." We actually fit not in the humor section where there were jokes about college women, women being silly and jokes about Irish rubes and all of that. We were in the coon series. We were in the coon series in the child life section. So there were all of these photographs of babies and then adults, kids, etc., images of black folks in the child life section under the coon series. The only other place we came is in something, a series on the cotton fields and incidentally we would be in the field.

So I became fascinated with the idea of the evidence of us but also where do we go to find it because it's not obvious. Me, Shola Lynch, in the, that was the 90's was not thinking of herself as a coon, let me tell you that. I would not have gone to the child life section looking for evidence of me. But I had to learn to put myself in a particular time and place. What was 1901? What were the things that were going on? What were the songs? What were the plays? No movies really yet. What was going on? It was through putting myself in that position I became, I was able to find the evidence. I think that that dynamic is something that is played out over the last 17 years of researching. It's why I've been able to unearth some really amazing stuff. It's more an attitude towards the material and a willingness to be flexible and to have some fluidity. Not to say that the evidence only works in one way. That it can have multiple meanings in different contexts for multiple people and keeping that in mind.

We can be precious about an early film artifact or early film as art. We can and I think that's important and we need to do that but it's also, it could also be a great tool to help bring more people into the conversation as an artifact, as evidence, as in conversation with a particular moment.

Brian Graney: Thank you very much, Shola [Lynch].

Shola Lynch: Thank you.

Brian Graney: I'd like to invite to the stage our first panel and our moderator from the Department of Communication and Culture.