

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF DANCE

Annual Meeting 2015

Keynote Address

**An Ode: To Those Who Dream in Turnout
A Dance Alphabet ©**

By Ben Cameron

Alone aloft I arch an arabesque, just a
B Boy Ballet Beating a Bugaloo down Broadway
Cause Yes I Can Can Cavort a Cakewalk or Cha Cha Charleston as I
Dance a Disco dubstep with an
East Coast Swing. I ease my ego through an electric slide of ethnic dance
Fanning my fanny through a fandango and foxtrot of fabulousness. Fear me for I am a
Gangam style Grizzly Bear, as I gallop and gavotte through a
Hitch hike, hip-hop hokey pokey and heave my
Irridescent improve-ed Indian Italian Irish
Jig, juking the jerk as I jitterbug a jive through a
Kaleidoscopic kalinka kathak.
Ladies will laugh as I lindy and leap to a lap dance of love
Morphing from marenge to mambo to Macarena and more.
Now I know you Tina Turner knew the new and nifty Nutbush, a
One stop one step
Pulsing Pony, a pop Prince pirouette—oh please please please plie and perform a
Queer quadrille and quickstep
Reel that really rocks the rumba, as oh my
Sweet sisters sweat a samba, shake and shuffle a shimmy shag
Turn and twist and tap a time warp tango
Under a Ukrainian Upa and I
Vamp and vogue a valedictory
Watusi with a wilting waltz in an
Extatic, exhilarated, exhausting excess. And
Yes, you must yip and yell as I YMCA and
Zealously eggzecute a zesty zumba of egtazy.
For from the moment we dance into a world
Where planets dance to the music of the spheres,
And the elements dance up a storm
Where light dances on the water, and
Ideas dance in flights of fancy,
We are the lords of the dance say we.
Even as we move in time ever closer to the dance of death
Our bodies soar where our minds cannot go
Our spirits leap beyond the ties of words
For to dance is to reveal our most essential selves
In a flight of bodies that is unadulterated, unequivocal, inexhaustible and pure.

I am delighted and honored to be here.

My mission today, as I see it, is to be both advocate and provocateur—to both report on what we see afoot in the professional dance field, and to pose questions about what this may imply for the work you do in colleges and universities. While I hope to hearten you at times, I feel certain that I am likely to say things that will disturb or even enflame some of you. Nevertheless, I hope that in our time together we can pursue and embody the pathway of creativity as described by Angeles Arrien: “Showing up—really showing up—listening deeply, speaking the truth, and letting go of predetermined results.”

To begin. At the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation, where I am coming to the end of my work, our late benefactress charged us in her will with the care of actors, singers, dancers and musicians in the presentation and performance of their work—a directive that, in intersection with her life-long passions and friendships—including her friendships with and pioneering support of Katherine Dunham and Martha Graham, from whom she often took private class—has led us to dedicate our resources to professional artists working in jazz, contemporary dance, and theatre (thanks to those actors), and the organizations who nurture, present and produce them.

In order to define our grants strategy, we periodically convene artists, managers, administrators and board members from those fields to ask, in essence, “What keeps you up at night?”

We have heard three kinds of issues in these conversations. We have heard idiosyncratic issues—issues particular to one field but not to others—issues of career transition for dancers, who in many cases forego college and even high school in order to train and at the age of 35 find themselves with knees failing, backs going out, at the end of the careers, facing the rest of their adult lives unable to do the one thing they have been trained to do—an enormously challenging issue in dance, but one that does not resonate for jazz artists who play into their 70’s and beyond, or theatre, where artists perform similarly for decades until they become too old to learn the lines—at which point they migrate to television, film and *Downton Abbey*.

Second, we hear chronic issues—first, issues of under-capitalization as shockingly few American performing arts organizations have significant reserves, much less endowments, with the fields now operating with aggregate negative working capital, and the majority living on the proverbial razor’s edge, struggling to meet current obligations—and second, of under-compensation, not only of artists but of managers, technicians, and administrators as well. In fact, when we discuss foundation giving, government giving, individual and corporate giving, we should acknowledge that the biggest charitable giving sector of all is the artists, managers and technicians on whose lives the work is made by virtue of inadequate compensation, paucity of benefits, lack of pensions or retirement assets and more. We called these issues chronic, not to suggest they were unimportant or not worth addressing, but in large part because our industry is predicated on discounted labor and because those of us in our 60’s, like I am, heard these same issues 10 years ago, 20 years ago, 30 years ago, and more.

But we hear three issues that we would not have heard 10 years ago—or at least not with the same urgency as today—issues I’ll call issues of the new millennium.

First, we heard concerns about the increasing dysfunctionality of the 501(c)3 model—the breakdown of old fundraising strategies, the difficulties of managing boards, and the hunger for new

models, as arts leaders, increasingly overwhelmed, said, “I went into this business, not from desire to manage a large organization, but because of a love for the arts. Now my life is about fundraising, board cultivation, school board policy, advocacy and the like. Weeks go by without my setting foot in a rehearsal hall, artists come and go in our building whose names I don’t even know. Something is wrong with this picture: isn’t there another way for us to finance and support the work we are called to do?”

Second, we heard about an impending generational transfer of leadership, as a founding and/or presiding generation of leaders retires or moves on. A Meyers Foundation report in 2006 predicted that 75% of all not-for-profit chief executives—including but not limited to those in the arts—would have to leave their jobs by 2012, citing burnout from fundraising and exhaustion from working with their boards as their top two reasons. While this has not happened—due in no small part to an economic downturn, the lack of viable alternative employment and the diminished retirement portfolios to the now too proverbial 201(k)—the transfer is coming. For decades, we in the arts have wondered, “Where in the arts will we find the young people who want the long hours, the bad pay, the lives of social and financial masochism with which we contented ourselves?” But in these conversations, we heard a very different response from the youngest participants. “There are more than enough of us willing and ready to lead,” they said, “but we don’t want to be the mere custodians of that thing you made. Unless we are given the power and autonomy to shape and change your organizations, we won’t be interested”—a perspective that means the issue is not the identity of an heir apparent, the real issue is organizational capacity for flexibility and change.

Third, we heard about mystifying shifts in audience composition and behavior. We in the US are moving rapidly to a non-majority country—as California and Texas, two of our largest states, for example have already done—a shift to diversity that our fields have yet to fully embrace and that challenge organizations at every level—staff, board, artists and audience. And while this shift offers us fantastic new opportunities—not only in revealing enormous richness in heritage and dance forms from all over the world, but also in new aesthetic, new collaborations, new forms of cultural and physical expressions—it challenges a presumed allegiance and understanding of traditional Eurocentric forms of expression and social customs on which our nonprofit arts industry has been built. And retaining the more traditional audience is increasingly perplexing: single ticket sales are down, subscriptions are down, aggregate attendance is down. Even a decade ago, 42% of men and 58% of women said, “I am too tired to do the things I want to do,” and the number one answer to a poll asking what people most eagerly anticipated on a free evening was no longer going to a dance concert, attending a movie, or even dinner with friends, but was instead, “I want a good night’s sleep.” After decades of growth, our audiences are shrinking and our own financial needs, driven in many cases by escalating fixed costs of facilities, insurance, health care and more, in tandem with flat or negative shifts in funding mean escalating ticket prices that threaten to place attendance beyond so many in our communities we wish to reach and serve.

Finally, we heard about the mystifying impact of technology on the performing arts—impact felt on at least three levels:

1. As competition. While we initially saw the Internet as a great ally in marketing, it has now emerged as our biggest competitor for time and attention. Now, depending on whom you read, in order to gain attention, dance companies must compete with between four and six thousand different marketing messages a typical American sees every single day. Leisure time Internet consumption has increased more than 50% in the last three years alone, and

according to *The New York Times*, by the time she graduates from college, a young woman will have spent 20,000 hours on line and an additional 10,000 hours playing computer games—a reminder we now operate in a cultural context where computer games outsell music and movie recordings combined and are reviewed in the Arts and Culture section of *The New York Times*.

2. As shaper of consumer expectation. Thanks to the Internet, we believe we can get anything we want any time we want it, shopping at 4:00 in the afternoon or 3:00 in the morning, ordering jeans tailor made to our own bodies, delivered to our front doorsteps—expectations of personalization, customization and convenience, that the live concert dance, which has set curtains, set venues, attendance inconveniences of travel, parking and the like, simply cannot meet.
3. And as determinant of cultural economics. What will it mean when we ask a young person to pay \$50, \$75, \$100 for a modern dance or ballet ticket, when that young person is used to downloading culture on demand 24/7 for \$1.29 a song or for free?

These are huge, seismic issues. But however particular these issues feel to us in the arts, we are not alone: we are essentially in the midst of a realignment of cultural expression and communication—a realignment that is shaking the newspaper and television network industries, the publishing and book industries, that is redefining and challenging higher education with the rise of online universities, MOOC's and certificate programs; and (in an indication of what may be yet to come) has led to the collapse of Borders Books and Tower Records in the shadow of the ever growing Amazon.com.

Surely we see ourselves in the words of poet Adrienne Rich in *The Dream of a Common Language XIII*: “We’re out in a country that has no language, no laws...Whatever we do together is pure invention. The maps they gave us were out of date by years...”

And aren't you glad you invited me here to brighten your day?

As an occasional student of history, I was struck by a question at the International Society for the Performing Arts (ISPA) conference in 2009, when, in considering this stress, an audience member asked, “What if we are in the equivalent of the Religious Reformation of the 15th Century? Could it be we are in the early days of an Arts Reformation?”

This question resonated deeply on several levels.

Both reformations have been spurred by technological breakthrough—the invention of the printing press meant anyone could own a Bible, tracts nailed on a door in one town could be reproduced en masse and appear across a country in a matter of days—and God knows we are in the midst of a technological revolution and a mass redistribution of knowledge.

The Reformation obliterated old business models. As Russell Willis Taylor, former CEO of National Arts Strategies has observed, “The Reformation was a great time to be a land buyer and a rotten time to be a monastery”—a reminder that we need to at least examine the question of whether the classical ballet company, for example, might be the monastery of today.

But at its heart, the Reformation challenged the notion of intermediation—why do I need a priest to intercede for me with God?—a question that is finding a direct parallel today as more and more people question the necessity of a professional artist to have a creative, artistic experience.

Just as the religious Reformation reconceived and broadened the universe of how religion would operate, when and where it would operate, who would be empowered to act, giving rise to new denominations, new religious rituals, new opportunities both for clergy to practice in radically new ways and for the common lay person to assume responsibility for her own spiritual experience, we are witnessing an explosion of new practices and challenges to old assumptions.

Alan Brown, on behalf of the Irvine Foundation, has actually redefined audience interaction as a five band spectrum of possibility—first the performance, that product to which many of us have dedicated our lives, and which represents the focus of many of your programs, culminating in performances, whatever the genre or period; next, the elaborated performance, i.e., the addition of program notes, talk backs with dancers, meet the artists session with the choreographer, and more—essentially ancillary materials and experiences designed to enhance the performance, but in which the “artists create, audiences consume” is maintained.

But then a bright line of sorts is crossed—one in which the audience exercises increasing degrees of curatorial and interpreted control. First we have co-curated arts events, where the audience has an active say in the choice of the artist to be engaged or the work to be presented. Perhaps in the dance field, the audience-participatory dance contest—whether *So You Think You Can Dance* or *Dancing with the Stars*—fits here, while I recall a dance presenter offering clips of several different *Nutcrackers*, asking audiences to vote for which they would like to see engaged and presented.

One further step to the right, we find co-created arts events, where the audience has an active role in the creation of the work itself. Liz Lerman as you know has been an exemplar of co-creation, going into communities to work with firemen, electricians, fishermen, scientists, not to teach them to dance, but to unlock the physical impulses and vocabulary these citizens already carry within them and then create dances together.

And finally, we have surrender of space and resources—the flash mob, the surrender of public plaza to dozens of theatre and dance performance pieces at the Yerba Buena Center attended by more than 3,000 people while 250 watched the sold out performances of Young Jean Lee’s Feminist show inside, or the dedication of subway platforms and street corners to young hip hop dance troupes, or even Midsummer Night’s Swing at Lincoln Center in New York, where the Fountain plaza is filled with strains of big bands and couples swing dance the night away.

For in this new age, while traditional live arts attendance is eroding, arts participation—avocational citizens accessing professional work through technology, but now writing their own poems, making their own movies, dancing their own dances—is exploding at an enormous rate. We are seeing the emergence of the hybrid artist: avocational artists doing work at a professional level—a group dubbed elsewhere as the Pro-Ams—a group whose work populates YouTube, film festivals, dance competitions and more, a group who are expanding our aesthetic vocabulary at one end of the spectrum, and professional artists who choose to work outside of the traditionally hermetic arts environment, not from financial necessity but because the work they feel called to do cannot be accomplished in the narrow confines of the gallery, the concert hall or the theatre at the other. These hybrid artists are expanding our sense of aesthetic possibilities—even as they assault our

traditional notions of cultural authority and undermine the assumed ability of traditional arts organizations to set the cultural agenda.

This expanded spectrum is in short a new set of opportunities—one that, while may not be for everyone, at least invites us to ask, “Where in this spectrum can we find value? Where can we offer value? And how can we move more fluidly back and forth through this spectrum as opportunity and occasion warrant?”

No one has been more adept at rethinking the way dance can behave than Trey McIntyre, founder of the Trey McIntyre Dance Project. In 2008—just in time for the world economic collapse—Trey McIntyre, a choreographer who has choreographed for San Francisco Ballet, Houston Ballet and others, announced his intention to begin his own company. Major donors in California, Massachusetts, Texas and other places beckoned to him, promising funding and facilities if he would set up shop in their home cities. Instead, Trey deliberately settled in Boise, Idaho—a town of 200,000, more than 550 miles from a truly major urban center, and one with no particular dance community or local funding community vested in the arts. The company initially attracted local attention by launching “spurbans”—spontaneous urban events—seizing the logic of the flash mob to create short dance interactions on public streets for startled pedestrians—a rejection of old assumptions around curtain times, venues and concert formats. They performed at football games, basketball games, little league games around town, launching one of their first full concerts at a drive-in movie theatre where patrons were encouraged to tailgate. They began that performance with a documentary film—not about dance or Trey or the dancers but with every dancer giving a personal testimony about what she or he loved about Boise—a core connection to community that formed an intense bond before the first dancer had danced a single step. They offered public dance classes as well as concerts, and reached out to local groups, creating work for and with the local Basque community, a vibrant but previously overlooked immigrant community. They launched a new sense of cooperation with the surrounding arts community, hosting an arts auction where local visual artists are invited to create work that reflects local or dance themes, and where the company and the artist split the gate—a huge event binding the arts community together. In perhaps my favorite strategy, they have made a link to the local high-end bar where the mixologist, not bartender, has created a different signature drink for each member of the company, bearing her or his name—a strategy that gives people a personal connection to the often all-too-anonymous ranks of dancers, that becomes an event to drink your way through the company, and which supports the company through an arrangement giving them a portion of the proceeds of every named drink sold. Perhaps most tellingly, they have positioned themselves in harmony, not with an arts agenda but with a civic agenda for Boise, one emphasizing innovation—embracing the software industry, the government, the dot com start ups, that has included a monthly working group bringing together the dot com CEO, the sheriff, the football coach at Boise State University and John Michael Shert, Trey’s managing director—a collaboration documented in their book *Wise Beyond Your Field*. Recognizing their value, the city funded them with economic development funds and created an official cultural ambassador designation, as Trey took businessmen as they went on tour to Shanghai and Hong Kong and New York to meet their counterparts and say, “You think you know Boise? THIS is Boise!”—a perspective that led to finding at the airport, just two years after their arrival, a banner erected by the city to greet them as they boarded their plane, saying “Good Luck Trey McIntyre Project. Boise’s Economic Cultural Ambassadors to the World.”

Make no mistake: Trey is a serious artist of the highest order, deeply dedicated to the concert dance format. But he is equally irreverent and entrepreneurial and fearless and generous—and at every

point, has reexamined with whom, for whom, with what resources, where and why the work is made.

Comparably expansive thinking is proceeding in exciting ways at many colleges and universities, which are hungry for us to expand our purview and move into new roles within our institutions. Indeed, while we have engaged in the STEM vs. STEAM debate—one that recognizes the arts as a discrete discipline worthy of its own study—there is increasing appreciation for what I would call STEM raised to the A power—learning transformed through the animating power of the arts—efforts that are transforming pedagogy, transforming interest in the arts, transforming public conviction that the arts are increasingly essential in these difficult times.

Our Doris Duke-funded Creative Campus program has supported a number of these projects: Liz Lerman worked with scientists at the Clarice Smith Center at the University of Maryland to create a work embodying the DNA strand; subsequently Cassie Meador of the Dance Exchange co-taught global warming and climate change at Wesleyan University; under the auspices of the Lied Center at the University of Nebraska, Troika Ranch has worked with patients at the Madonna Rehabilitation Center to explore patterns of violence and healing; the Mark Morris and Merce Cunningham companies have worked with medical students at the University of Michigan medical school to help deepen first hand appreciation of physical sensation and to understand physical movement differently, while the leaders of Diavlo dance have worked at Penn State on a project designed to uncover the unseen emotional life of public spaces as part of training for urban designers and landscapers. In all of these cases—and others—we hear repeatedly that student learning skyrockets, classroom dynamics change, that the non-arts professors engaged become passionate advocates for the arts and rethink their own basic instructional pedagogy. John Bohannon’s “Dance vs. Powerpoint” TED talk is a case in point, arguing that student comprehension of scientific theory is enhanced by student performance of nuclear fission.

Many of you may have heard in all of this a death knell for traditional concert dance companies, so let me be clear: the religious Reformation did not obliterate the Catholic Church. Just as 500 years later, many people around the world still find deep meaning in high mass and formal religious institutions, I for one believe that the historic institutions that we have funded to date at their best will continue to be worthy of our investment. They currently and will represent the best opportunities for lives of economic dignity for many artists, and the logical place where artists who need and deserve to work at a certain scale can find an appropriate home. Whatever we do as a community, we must continue to nurture and sustain these groups, and especially support their efforts to adapt and change to the larger world.

We need and will continue to need the conservatory mission, dedicated to honing and refining expertise, craft and dance skill to its highest level.

But these groups are likely to be fewer in number and less and less likely to command the lion’s share of philanthropic resources. So forward thinking groups are asking hard questions—questions based not primarily to examine the quality of dance, but of its very value.

And indeed, it is in this environment of expanded opportunity, shifting formats, recalibrating value and redefined roles that you are being asked to train your students and the professionals of the future. Regardless of mission or aesthetic, forward thinking departments must at least consider the following questions: what if the true mission of dance is not producing dances, but social

orchestration in which the production is a piece, but only a piece, of what we are called to do? What if the future will be less interested in products to be consumed than in experiences that serve as springboards to their own creativity? What would we do differently if we thought of ourselves less as dance departments and more as platforms designed to aggregate live physical energy?

The artists and administrators that choose to pursue those new pathways will need a very different set of skills. Emphasis on voter registration methods and moveon.org may be more relevant to their future than *Subscribe Now* (with all due respect and affection to the late and great Danny Newman). The pop-up or ephemeral organization—a pattern exemplified by the aforementioned Trey McIntyre, who closed his company amid great artistic and financial success because his interests had shifted to film and visual arts experiences—may be more relevant than the permanent institution; miscapitalization, viability and adaptability may be more appropriate lenses than under-capitalization, sustainability and stability. At the very least, inter-cultural fluency, technological facility, policy articulation, grasp of political process, donor psychology, and community organizing will be baseline skills only in the management of organizations, but potentially in artistic practice, especially for the civically inclined artist.

Teaching these new skills, embracing them in the curriculum will be enormously challenging. It will beg the question, not of what we will add, but of what we will let go of, what we will STOP requiring to give space, time and energy to the study and development of these new essential skills.

But how do we prioritize and decide? In this journey, we must begin by asking: why must we exist today? Because we have a building is no longer good enough. Because we have a staff and board is no longer good enough. Because we have a history of critical reviews and awards is no longer good enough. What is it in the world that mandates that we continue forward and flourish today?

Every department must begin by asking itself questions:

1. What is the value of dance (not of my dance department) for our communities—communities of students, faculty, town and nation?
2. What is the value dance alone has or that dance offers better than anything else?
3. How would our communities be damaged if we closed our doors and went away tomorrow?
4. And how might my department be optimally structured, poised and focused to be my communities' best conduit to dance? A question that invites us not to jettison all we do, but to keep what is most central and viable, to expand to embrace the new possibilities we may not have seen, and to discard past behaviors that do not and will not serve us in the future.

I know this is a lot to ask, and that the very real bureaucratic barriers of many institutions can be daunting. But two years ago, I heard then outgoing Tulane President Scott Cohen share his experience on returning to a devastated New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina—a city decimated physically, socially, spiritually. His university—long a leader in higher education—longed to reunite, to reconnect to its past, to re-form, reunite and move forward in its long standing mission of being a center for learning and reflection. At the same time, he realized, nothing in that mission required Tulane to go beyond its own walls, to reach out to its surrounding community, to roll up its sleeves, get its arms dirty, “to strain in the mud and the muck to move things forward, who do what has to

be done, again and again,” as Marge Piercy would say in her famous poem “To Be of Use.” And so Cohen chose to ignore the mission—to require without debate every student, every course, every department and facet of the university to add a public service component to rebuild the city. In the face of significant resistance from a highly tenured faculty and uncertainty from the students themselves, Cohen called on the community to respond at its most creative and spiritually committed levels. Business students counseled start-ups and entrepreneurs, engineers tackled construction, philosophy majors worked to rebuild education, recognizing their ability to debate complex ideas to start debate clubs in every surrounding high school. Some resistant faculty moved on, others frankly were marginalized, but in the wake of this new purpose, applications grew, retention rates grew, graduation rates grew, contributions grew, the sense of community grew.

Like Scott Cohen’s New Orleans, we face a moment of physical, social, and spiritual upheaval and distress—and the world is begging us to roll up our sleeves.

If we can answer understand and truly live our values, if we can think about the needs of our multiple communities and be intentional in our place, not only within our colleges or universities but in an aggregated landscape of training, we will move from this Arts Reformation into an Arts Renaissance, a renegotiation of old ideas to flower and flourish in new ways in these new and often mystifying times in which we live.

I am deeply optimistic about the future of dance in the academy and in this country, no matter how much I may not have sounded so until this moment.

I am cheered by the eloquence of the Harvard Task Force on the Arts in its cry that the arts enable students to become citizens of the world, prepared to apprehend what at first may seem only strange and participate in a human creativity that is not hemmed in by fear and suspicion or tightly bound by time and space—a cry that has led Harvard to announce its first arts major sequences for undergraduates, beginning next year.

I am cheered by our recent Public Will Building research into the values that Americans place on the arts—research that, even as it reminds us that the way we talk about arts is deeply alienating to the public, they value the arts for connecting them to themselves and to others, and that the most passionate supporters are people under 40 and people of color, surely a great opportunity for us in moving forward.

I am cheered that despite the elimination of arts education classes in schools, a horizontal student to student teaching dynamic has emerged—a shift especially evident in the emergence of hip hop for example and now evident, not only in the academy’s embrace of that art form but in the explosion of interest that is seen in the ever growing arts graduates—almost 120,000 last year alone and growing 30% every decade—a number too large for our industries to absorb but that will live on even as the lessons they learned of discipline, rigor, patience and teamwork will stay with them for a lifetime, and their role as arts advocates can be tapped to move our cause forward.

I have been pondering Peter Coleman's *The Five Percent*, a book about how we find ourselves stuck in tough problems, whether the impasse in the Middle East between Israel and Palestine, or here closer to home the abortion rights debate, or perhaps even redefining tax codes and economic structures. Coleman suggests that these seemingly intractable problems share three common qualities: the emphasis placed on a win/lose/winner take all dynamic, the oversimplification of

issues especially in a sound bite age, and the tendency of participants to surround themselves with self-reinforcing feedback loops, reinforcing their perspectives—as apt a description of the Congress of the United States as any I have heard.

The arts in general offer us an alternative to intractability. Instead of competition, we promote cooperation; in the face of over simplification, we promote nuance, shades of meaning and substance. And especially now when we are encouraged by ways both overt and subtle to view one another with hostility and fear and suspicion and in the face of reinforcing feedback loops, at our best we assemble audiences of people not like one another to consider their fellow human being with generosity and curiosity. God knows if we have ever needed that capacity in human history, we need it now.

Whether you choose to shape the future through cultivation of delight and imagination through traditional dance practice or move into this emerging social practice realm even as it struggles to define itself, I salute you, as social activists, pledged as you are to a world of tolerance, compassion, empathy and hope.

As Tony Kushner says in *Angels in America*, “You are fabulous creatures, each and every one. And I bless you: More Life. The Great Work Begins.”

I promise you the hand of the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation remains outstretched to dance both now and for years to come.

And I thank you for your kindness and generosity in listening to me this morning. Thank you and God speed.