

Richard Cándida Smith
Department of History
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

PUBLISHING ORAL HISTORY:
ORAL EXCHANGE AND PRINT CULTURE

From *Oral History Handbook*, eds. Thomas Charlton, Lois Myers, and Rebecca Sharpless. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, forthcoming 2003.

Since the earliest days of “oral history,” long before the term had achieved any currency, writers and scholars kept records of conversations with historical informants and used quotes from these sources in the work they published. Books based largely though seldom exclusively on interviews have also long had a niche in the publishing business. Back in the sixteenth century, Giorgio Vasari based his now classic text *The Lives of the Artists* on conversations with the friends and colleagues of the leading Italian Renaissance painters, architects, and sculptors.¹ Their insights were credible to readers, though perhaps less so to subsequent art historians. The use of conversations helped Vasari convey the human side of men whom he nonetheless wanted to readers to see as geniuses. In a very different vein, Henry Mayhew’s *London Labour and the London Poor: A Cyclopaedia of the Condition and Earnings of Those That Will Work, Those That Cannot* gripped English readers in 1851 by allowing them entry into the lives of the most desperate members of their society as recounted by themselves.² Many early twentieth-century classics of sociological and anthropological literature relied heavily on the

presentation of firsthand testimony in works such as Harvey Zorbaugh's *The Gold Coast and the Slum*, Nels Anderson's *The Hobo*, Sidney Mintz's *Worker in the Cane*, or Oscar Lewis's *Children of Sanchez*.³

The success of Studs Terkel's books braiding together the voices of Americans sharing their experiences of economic hard times, war, social protest, and most recently aging and mortality have been national best-sellers.⁴ Individual narratives by Chicano labor activist Bert Corona, Communist Party leader Dorothy Healey, gay rights pioneer Harry Hay, or Alabama sharecropper Ned Cobb have also found significant readership, as have books based on oral histories with both jazz and classical musicians.⁵ Interviews with painters and writers remain a staple of the publishing trade, perhaps for the same reason that Vasari's volumes proved so successful. Books based largely on oral history interviews provide a tantalizing glimpse into the human side of historical change.

When authors begin working with oral sources for print publication, they must answer several key questions. The first and most important is whose voice or voices will provide the narrative spine. In books based on an interview with a single individual, it has been most common to tell the life history in the subject's own voice, but authors must then decide whether to organize the narrator's voice around a question-and-answer framework or as an autobiographical narrative. Authors of books using multiple interviews have taken quite different strategies in how to combine their sources into a unified story. Studs Terkel weaves the multiple voices he has collected into a collage of typically contrasting perspectives. Stories wrap around each other as Terkel builds an emotional arc that helps

define how larger historical processes have limited each and every one of his informants, the powerful and wealthy no less than the average working man and woman. In *Amoskeag*, a now classic historical study of a New England mill town, the authors Tamara K. Hareven and Randolph Langenbach arrange the voices into a sequence of stories grouped by thematic topics such as work, family life, and unionization.⁶ In *Like a Family: The Making of a Southern Cotton Mill World*, Jacquelyn Dowd Hall and her coauthors tell the historical narrative with a professional academic voice interpreting the industrialization of North Carolina and its effects on a variety of social issues.⁷ Copious selections from the many oral histories they collected are found throughout the text in quotations to support the authors' arguments while grounding their analysis in the lived experiences of their informants.

All of these approaches have been equally effective in gaining both critical and popular acclaim. The choice of how to organize and present interview material must follow the author's sense of what is the most effective way to communicate story and argument. Authors will need to decide whether their goal is primarily story-telling or scholarly analysis, for that will affect which segments of the interviews are most important and how to arrange them in building towards the conclusion. Authors need to decide if the goal of the book is to provide readers with information, an argumentative point of view, or human-interest stories. These are not mutually exclusive goals, but writers need nonetheless to have a sense of the hierarchy of their goals if they are to develop effective print texts. Authors must also consider is how much editing will be required to translate the oral texts into effective, readable print documents as well as how much context they

need to provide readers as background to narrators' accounts. Context can come in the shape of end- or footnotes, prologues and postscripts, framing sections for each chapter, or as narrative that weaves in and out of the quotations from oral history throughout the book. A decision on how much contextual information needs to be included will determine the balance of voices within the work and whether readers perceive the narrators or the researcher as the book's author. Issues of confidentiality, defamation, and invasion of privacy must also be taken into account. With the exception of historical figures with public reputations, Theodore Rosengarten in preparing Ned Cobb's life-story for publication changed the names of everybody discussed. Even Cobb's name was changed, and he became "Nate Shaw."⁸

The decisions that authors of oral history books make to arrange the interview texts they have collected into effective narratives usually remain hidden. Studs Terkel has said little of his working method, other than the commonplace that he listens for emotional truth.⁹ Elena Poniatowska has provided a colorful image of herself typing away transcribing the notes she had made from hours of conversation with Josefina Bórquez, the working-class veteran of the Mexican Revolution whose life story formed the basis of Poniatowska's first novel *Hasta no verte, Jesús mío*.¹⁰ Poniatowska in this case was not after an exact verbatim rendition. Through constant return to the flow of words she had recorded over many sessions, she strove to connect themes and to strengthen stories by combining material from different days into a single retelling on paper. Poniatowska stressed her role as a listener, seeking to find the truth in the words and finding a way to convey that truth in language readers would understand. In this case, the text was presented as a

“novel” rather than journalistic reporting in part because both narrative and phrasing had been reworked so heavily. The first-person narrative of the novel was based on interviews but transformed into poetry by a process of imaginative encounter that remade Poniatowska from interviewer into author.

Poniatowska may have had an unusually free approach in her handling of oral narratives as raw source material, but her account can help clarify one of the most important dynamics involved in turning interview material into books. On the simplest level, publishers when presented with a proposal for a book based on oral history materials will inevitably ask the question, “Who is the author?” They want to know whose vision will guide the creation of a print product. The temptation for oral historians might be to defer to the primacy of their subjects’ voices, but this is to mistake the different roles the parties involved in oral history and publication play. The author of a book is the person who pulls together the material and provides an organizing structure. The author develops a rhythm of context, anecdote, and argument within which narrators find the setting for their thoughts. Even in a book almost entirely based on oral interviews, the narrator is the creation of the author of the book, in this case the editor who transformed hours of raw conversation into a meaning-laden account, a meaning that is imaginatively produced by the editor. This may be a difficult point for many to accept, because the narrator is not simply words on paper for them, but a vibrant human being oral historians have come to know, respect, and often admire. It is that emotional response that an author must convey to readers, almost none of whom will ever personally meet the interviewee. The reader enters into a relationship with the author, who by sharing his or

her response to interviewees and their stories, allows a much broader public to get a glimmer of the effect the narrator can have on others.

Theodore Rosengarten in his preface to *All God's Dangers: The Life of Nate Shaw* described a multilayered, multiyeared process behind the book. He first met Ned Cobb in 1969 when Rosengarten was researching the history of the Alabama Sharecroppers Union. Cobb, a veteran of that organization, had just turned 84 years old. Over a period of two years, Rosengarten continued to visit Cobb and his wife to discuss the Sharecroppers Union. During these discussions, many aspects of Cobb's tumultuous life came out though not in any coherent narrative. At this time, Rosengarten was not taping Cobb, but recording their conversations with handwritten notes. In 1971, Rosengarten proposed tape-recording Cobb's account with the idea of preparing a book based on the recordings. The history of the organization had given way to an oral memoir that Rosengarten understood could reveal in more depth the social forces that African American sharecroppers contended with during the Jim Crow period.

Rosengarten showed up for the first taping session with a hundred pages of questions, most of which were never asked much less answered. Cobb's life story took on its own momentum, developing in an on-going, and somewhat free-ranging conversation between the historian and the subject. Rosengarten recorded sixty hours of tape over sixteen sessions. "I hadn't asked the questions I'd come with," he noted, "and I had to choose between that and going over the same ground with a finer-toothed comb." Rosengarten decided for the later course and working from extensive notes made while playing back

the first set of tapes, Rosengarten asked more pointed questions in a second of fifteen session recording another sixty hours of tape.¹¹

Rosengarten only briefly describes the editing process that condensed 120 hours of tape and hundreds of pages of notes into a 561-page book. He typically had multiple versions of stories to choose between for many of the most important accounts. He combined parts of one version with others in order to arrive at the most complete story. Despite the best of intentions on Rosengarten's part, his on-tape discussion between Cobb did not follow any strict chronological order. Memory and association often led to asides that leaped across the years and back. The sequence of Cobb's stories in the book had to be determined by Rosengarten, who wanted to do "justice both to their occurrence in time and [Cobb's] sequence of recollection. I tried, within the limits of a general chronology, to preserve the affinities between stories. For memory recalls kindred events and people and is not constrained by the calendar."¹² The historical goals guiding Rosengarten were quite distinct from Poniatowska's search for a new type of novel based in popular experience, but both authors felt their way to a publishable book by a slow process of continually refiltering the words of their narrators through their own emotional responses. With each pass-through the accounts became crisper and more pointed, ironically, coming to express the power of the speaker the further they moved from the original words. It was this single-minded focus on the emotional resonance of the narrator within the author that gave structure to two books that succeeded in having a powerful emotional impact on readers.

Behind this general process of responding to the emotional truth that interviews awaken with the author of a published oral history work lies a labyrinth of detailed decisions that usually remain hidden. In his essay “Preparing Interview Transcripts for Documentary Publication: A Line-by-Line Illustration of the Editing Process,”¹³ Michael Frisch sought to remove some of the mystery behind editing by presenting the editorial decisions he made in arranging an interview with a steel worker for publication. After discussing the principles for his decisions, he presents two line-by-line versions of the interview transcript, the first as edited for publication, the second a relatively verbatim transcript of the original recording. He numbered the lines so readers can trace the decisions Frisch made, which as with Terkel, Rosengarten, and Poniatowska involved isolating the emotional truth that he as listener had heard in the conversation but which could be lost when reduced to mere text.

The first step was to isolate and concentrate the sections of the interview that expressed the core of a narrator’s ideas in the most concise fashion, while preserving much of his patterns of speech. The most obvious change as a result of Frisch’s converting conversation into edited text was the deletion of large chunks of the interview, particularly sections where the speaker spoke with less clarity. The sections Frisch preserved give the speaker a crisper, more concise feel. Frisch also pared down his own questions.

Frisch maintains that accessibility has to be the primary goal in presenting oral history materials to the public. *Accessibility* means more than opportunity to read collected

interviews. The reader should come away with an understanding of the narrator's communicative intent. The immediate listening process involves ignoring irrelevancies that often enter into a discussion, as well as sidetracking or delaying speech that occurs while the speaker figures out what he or she really wants to say. Face-to-face communication includes a range of vocal and gestural cues that help listeners know when one thing said is more important than another. Words on paper stripped of these physical cues have a false equality that did not exist in the conversation. One task of the editor of oral transcripts is to restore hierarchy of thought within a person's expressions.

Frisch's second strategy for extracting the core communicative exchange is to combine discussions of the same topic otherwise scattered through the original conversation. Rearrangement on the simplest level is to restore the narrator's authority by allowing the printed text to convey as crisply as possible the intent of his or her words. This intent would be clearer in immediate communication, and if it were not, listeners could query the elements of the account that were confusing. That sort of negotiation is impossible in the printed text, and the editor must anticipate the confusions of the original text and answer the queries that readers might address the speaker if they were actually in the same room. Rearrangement also heightens drama and emotion, making for a better read, but from a more purely intellectual perspective, its primary functions are to help the reader see as clearly as possible choices that narrators recall having faced in the past along with emotional and practical consequences.

Frisch's detailed presentation of his working method is a practical, valuable account of

how one author made his research accessible to others, a process that remains invisible if an author succeeds in focusing attention on the narrators' stories. Readers are impressed by the emotional power of the accounts Studs Terkel presents but they do not see, and in most cases are not interested in seeing, the lengthy editorial process that led to a well-shaped book with the power to engage them even after they have put it down.

The desire for coherence is powerful. It is typically shared by interviewer, interviewee, and subsequent readers alike. It is also a danger in that it gives priority to the conventional and the already known. Combined with a commitment to a narrow definition of "accessibility," the conflicts and contradictions of the spoken situation can become technical problems for erasure. The goal of making a transcript as easy to understand as possible assumes that everything in the original communication was open and transparent. Difficulties become interference that can be screened out much as a filter reduces the static of old sound recordings. In this case, "accessibility" may tacitly become little more than not having to think. Interviews will then contain information for that readers can extract but only if authors have previously erased the narrators' confusions, memory slips, or emotional struggles that lie outside the arc of the story the author wants to tell.

Interviewees can often be inconsistent in different accounts of the same event, and differences in their moods may reveal depth to how they themselves responded to life's challenges. To create the text for *Everybody's Grandmother and Nobody's Fool:*

Frances Freeborn Pauley and the Struggle for Social Justice, Kathryn L. Nasstrom

edited together a stock of existing interviews that had been recorded over a twenty-year period with interviews that Nasstrom taped specifically for the book project. She was impressed by the consistency over time of Pauley's stories, but as she worked more deeply with the material attempting to construct a single, unified personal account, Nasstrom began to see more clearly differences in emotional register in the sources she was combining. Pauley's tone typically was upbeat and energetic, but there were more than a few instances where she said things like, "I am tired, tired, tired of giving up, giving up, cutting back, cutting back. I guess that's what life is. So, it is correct to say that I am tired of life." Nasstrom decided to include some of the downbeat material to underscore the complexity of Pauley's thought. Nonetheless, as a progressive white southerner who had fought for civil rights over many years, Pauley had succeeded in having a impact because of a largely positive approach. Nasstrom decided to preserve "some of this contradictory material, but the text as a whole favors the Frances who always found a way to persevere and, I think, favors the way that Frances wants to be remembered."¹⁴ The challenge that Nasstrom faced was not simply how to combine apparently contradictory material, but how to make sense for herself of how important these contradictions were for understanding a life. The resolution she arrived at gave depth to the narrator she presented to readers but without sacrificing the key characteristics that had made her subject so compelling to Nasstrom.

"The ideal transcript is an accurate verbatim reflection of the interview's content, preserves as much of the quality of the interview and the individualities of the speakers as possible, and is easy to read and understand," is the advice by Cullom Davis, Kathryn

Back, and Kay MacLean in *Oral History: From Tape to Type*, one of the most widely used manuals for oral history practice.¹⁵ “If the meaning of a sentence is ambiguous to you as a reader,” they continue, “it must be clarified. This is tricky business because you must *be sure* you understand the speaker’s meaning.”¹⁶ The test for clarity is whether one stumbles on reading a sentence or section and returns to reread it.

The goal as articulated is basically impossible because the chief interference to the coherence, or closure, of a printed text derived from oral history materials comes from the open-ended communicative *exchange* of the original interview situation. The problem for print versions of oral history is that the relation of reader and narrator lacks the interactive negotiation found between speaker and listener, that is between Rosengarten and Cobb, or between Nasstrom and Pauley. This is not a question that can be resolved by finding the best written translations for oral language. Nor is it even a question of how to interpret what was said, much less of style of presentation. The problem rests in the social relations constituting oral exchange, something a book cannot reproduce.¹⁷ Alienation from the source is inevitable whenever an interview is prepared for public presentation. This alienation is augmented by the myth that the interview captures the narrator’s “story” because the dialogic process is not one of exchanging discrete, reproducible narratives. There is a mental process that occurs when two people encounter each other that cannot be reproduced but might be indexed.

The complexity of the relationship between oral sources and their print referents may be clarified by considering the distinction that Roger Chartier had made between “text” and

“print.” Chartier works on the history of the book and print culture. Different productive processes are involved in the process of creating a text, or the content an author has created, and manufacturing print objects such as books or periodicals. In “print” editorial decision process mediates the relation of readers and authors. Editorial motivations have little to do with the intentions of authors.¹⁸

In oral history that has been published, there are two distinct, though related texts: the original spoken words, which I’ll designate text₁, which when transcribed are read in a first-level print version (print₁). The author of a book version works with the transcript, not with the original words, to create text₂, the narrative manuscript from which a book will be produced (print₂). Within this theoretical perspective, it is helpful to think of author, editor, and reader not as actual persons but as activities and expectations.

“Readers” is a term referring to structuring conventions providing a set of expectations against which “authors” (originators of texts) and “editors” (designer and disseminator of print objects) can measure their activities. A further distinction needs to be made between the “author” and the “narrator” in that the voice articulated in a text exists only for that communicative act and is addressed to the readers whose expectations have been imagined.

In oral history publication, there is a doubling effect that complicates the process, and may help explain why converting oral history interviews into satisfactory books can often be difficult. In text₁, the author is the speaker who projects an interpretation of him- or herself to the listener, who is analogous to the reader, but possesses the inherent

capability of reminding the author of her expectations at any time during the creation of the oral text. Narrator₁ is a product of the interaction between author₁ and the listener or reader₁. When the listener begins to prepare the interview for publication by transcribing the conversation, he becomes an editor preparing a print object with a relatively fixed and quotable version of the content the author has provided in an improvised, spoken text.

Conversation (text₁) between author₁ and listener (reader₁) becomes transcript preparation (print₁), which transforms reader₁ from a listener into editor₁ controlling presentation of the text to reader₂.

As the interview is prepared for publication, the transcript (print₁) becomes the basis for text₂, the manuscript developed as a book project. The conversation, to the degree that it is maintained, is an effect of the text, that is a creation of author₂, who is no longer the original interviewee, but the interviewer, scholar, or journalist who has decided to present the interview to a broader public than the transcript alone will allow. In order to reach that public, author₂ submits the text to editor₂, who is motivated by the expectations of reader₂ for an accessible narrative that conforms to genre expectations. The narrator (narrator₂) within the imaginary conversation presented in text₂ is no longer a situationally specific narrative voice deployed by the interviewee to represent him- or herself while creating text₁ for the listener or reader₁, but a character created by author₂ specifically for text₂ in order to satisfy the expectations of reader₂. Narrator₁, while not identical to author₁, emerges in an immediate relationship in which expectations and texts are generated simultaneously through a process of dialogic negotiation. Narrator₂ is the product of genre conventions predetermined by the impersonal relations of editor₂ and

reader₂. Narrator₂ is an effect appropriate for the commodity relation that structures the interaction of author₂, editor₂, and reader₂. The immediate and personal relationship of an oral history interview in which two people explore the meanings of the past becomes increasingly impersonal transactions surrounding the creation of a commodity. The value of the resulting print product is not the creation of a relationship between narrator₁ and reader₂ but a satisfaction of expectations that the reader has formed for a class of print objects that appear regularly on the market. In the case of oral history publications, the expectations may involve a sense of participating more directly in the past through reading the perspectives of eye-witnesses and thereby gaining a deeper and livelier sense of what occurred and of the effects past events had on “real people.” These expectations can be satisfied only if the author shapes the narrator of her book around her own interpretative and emotional responses, which are the only the connection within the book linking the reader back to the original narrator.

If alienation from the source is inevitable whenever interview material is re-presented to the public, the question for facing authors of books or articles based on oral history work is not one of techniques but of principles. They need first to decide what it is that they must present for the project to have intellectual validity and what they are willing to settle for as a reasonable facsimile of what began as an immediate human relationship. Any hope for direct communication between interviewees and book readers should give way to a goal of conveying to subsequent readers the spark of insight that occurred during the oral history exchange. That might mean retaining the confusions and contradictions in oral testimony as indicators of areas where further thought is needed.

Some of the most successful and emotionally powerful presentations of oral sources have occurred in projects that questioned the need for a coherent story and consequently making the process of interpretation/narrative construction invisible. An extreme but effective example was Claude Lanzmann's film *Shoah*. Lanzmann sought witnesses to and participants in the Nazi genocide of European Jewry. Interviewees were forced to provide explanations for their actions and to assume responsibility for a past which they had tried to evade for decades. The film audience, while unable to interact directly with interviewees, observes a narrative process in which the author has sought to highlight expressions that belie the more benign words interviewees developed to conceal their personal responsibility. The meaning and intent an interviewee wishes to convey are no longer important. Indeed, they are shown as superficial to a larger process of relationality. Understanding is not the point of transforming the past into history, but positioning oneself in relation to others today.¹⁹

The testimonio literature that emerged in Latin America during the 1960s similarly eschewed the illusion that the narrators whose spoken recollection provided the bases for a series of powerful books on the lives of the poor necessarily were going to tell the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Why would one seek to conceal important aspects of one's life rather than invite potentially sympathetic readers into an intimate relationship?²⁰

Donna Haraway has observed that facts are opposed to opinion and prejudice, but not to

fiction. Fact derives from the past participle in Latin of the verb for “to act.” A fact is done, it is action that has occurred and is no longer changeable. Fiction on the other hand is inventive and open to possibilities.²¹ This distinction is pertinent to oral history in general for while narrators struggle to explain what has happened to them, they may not want to be defined by the mere facts of their lives, that is the accumulation of past actions. This has been particularly true for the genre of oral testimony that emerged in Latin America in the 1960s. The facts of the narrators’ lives were often so brutal that to accept them as inescapable was to accept tragedy as final and unchangeable. Testimonial literature was closely linked to the boom in the Latin American novel of the 1960s, in that the speaking out by the oppressed prefigured the transformation of society. Truth was less important than an act of speaking out. Rigoberta Menchú in the beginning of the book based on her story does not promise to tell the truth, but instead to provide listeners with what they need to hear. She also states she will conceal what is necessary for her and her community to maintain their autonomy, even from sympathetic readers.²²

Menchú’s assertion of a right to concealment in a document whose appeal might be a sharing of personal experience might seem contradictory, but it underscores the degree to which the relation of narrator and reader is mediated by an extensive interpretive process that must conceal aspects of the narrator that interfere with the effect the book is intended to convey. The words an interviewee speaks remain alive only to the degree that they have moved someone enough to want to pass on a rendition to another person. Authors of the print publication based on oral texts are more than conveyor belts. They actively engage the words of another person and make them their own by conveying their own

responses to the person to a broader public. To keep interpretation alive, to keep interest alive, are not simple tasks or word of mouth would suffice.

When work derived from oral sources is published, it crosses over to another universe. This is inevitable and salutary if oral history work is to effect public understanding of the past, but the price is loss of direct contact with the speakers whose accounts make oral history such a vital contribution to understanding the complexity of the past. My goal in identifying assumptions that accompany strategies for presentation is to refocus attention onto the circuits of meaning that constitute public communication. Exchange of perspectives characterizes oral speech. Publication of oral history work may involve an inevitable alienation from the source but if such work perpetuates dialogue, if it opens up new ways of looking at social relations and the roots of the present in the past retains, it remains faithful to the inner logic of oral history.

¹ For a recent English-language translation, see Giorgio Vasari, *The Lives of the Artists* (New York : Oxford University Press, 1998).

² Henry Mayhew, *London Labour and the London Poor: A Cyclopaedia of the Condition and Earnings of Those That Will Work, Those That Cannot* (London: G. Woodfall, 1851).

³ Harvey Zorbaugh, *The Gold Coast and the Slum: A Sociological Study of Chicago's Near North Side* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929); Nels Anderson, *The Hobo: The Sociology of the Homeless Man* (Chicago: University. of Chicago Press, 1923); Sidney Mintz, *Worker in the Cane: A Puerto Rican Life History* (New Haven:

Yale University Press, 1960); Oscar Lewis, *The Children of Sánchez: Autobiography of a Mexican Family* (New York: Random House, 1961).

⁴ See Studs Terkel, *Division Street: America* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1967); *Hard Times: An Oral History of the Great Depression* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1970); *American Dreams: Lost and Found* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980); “*The Good War*”: *An Oral History of World War Two* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1984); *Working: People Talk about What They Do All Day and How They Feel about What They Do* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1985); *Race: How Blacks and Whites Think and Feel about the American Obsession* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1992); *Will the Circle Be Unbroken?: Reflections on Death, Rebirth, and Hunger for a Faith* (New York: Pantheon Books, 2001).

⁵ Mario T. Garcia, *Memories of Chicano History: The Life and Narrative of Bert Corona* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994); Dorothy Healey, *Dorothy Healey Remembers: A Life in the American Communist Party*, edited by Maurice Isserman (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990); Harry Hay, *Radically Gay: Gay Liberation in the Words of its Founder*, edited by Will Roscoe (Boston : Beacon Press, 1996); *Central Avenue Sounds: Jazz in Los Angeles*, edited by Steven L. Isoardi (University of California Press, 1998); Alan Lomax, *Mister Jelly Roll: The Fortunes of Jelly Roll Morton, New Orleans Creole and “Inventor of Jazz”* (Berkeley : University of California Press, 2001).

⁶ Tamara K. Hareven and Randolph Langenbach, *Amoskeag: Life and Work in an American Factory-City* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978).

⁷ Jacquelyn Dowd Hall et al., *Like a Family: The Making of a Southern Cotton Mill World* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987).

⁸ Theodore Rosengarten, *All God's Dangers: The Life of Nate Shaw* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1974). The *Oral History Evaluation Guidelines* prepared by the Oral History Association (USA) in 1989 and revised in 2000 stress the importance of interviewees having the right to maintain their anonymity. See section (d), Ethical and Legal Guidelines, *Oral History Evaluation Guidelines*, Pamphlet No. 3, available at the Oral History Association website <http://www.dickinson.edu/organizations/oha/index.html>

⁹ Terkel quoted in *Interviews with Interviewers—About Interviewing* (videorecording). New York: In Motion Productions, 1985.

¹⁰ Elena Poniatowska, *Hasta No Verte, Jesús Mío* (México: ERA, 1970); composition discussed in Beth Ellen. Jorgensen, *The Writing of Elena Poniatowska: Engaging Dialogues* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1994), 60-61.

¹¹ Rosengarten, *All God's Dangers*, xiii-xxiii.

¹² *Ibid.*, xxiv.

¹³ Michael Frisch, *A Shared Authority: Essays on the Craft and Meaning of Oral and Public History* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990), 81-146.

¹⁴ Kathryn L. Nasstrom, *Everybody's Grandmother and Nobody's Fool: Frances Freeborn Pauley and the Struggle for Social Justice* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000), 195-197; quotes on 197.

¹⁵ Cullom David, Kathryn Back, and Kay MacLean, *Oral History: From Tape to Type* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1977), 35.

¹⁶ Davis et al, 53.

¹⁷ Nor can film or video for while a visual image conveys much more of the performance dynamics of an interview, the viewer's relation to the oral history film remains passive. There is still no dialogue possible between the recipient of the oral history and the narrator.

¹⁸ Roger Chartier, "Texts, Printing, Readings," in *The New Cultural History*, ed. Lynn Hunt (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 161.

¹⁹ Claude Lanzmann, *Shoah, an Oral History of the Holocaust: The Complete Text of the Film* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1985).

²⁰ For an introduction to testimonio literature see *The Real thing: Testimonial Discourse and Latin America*, edited by George M. Gugelberger (Durham: Duke University Press, 1996).

²¹ Donna Haraway, *Primate Visions* (London: Routledge, 1989), 4.

²² Rigoberta. Menchú, *I, Rigoberta Menchú: An Indian Woman in Guatemala*, edited and introduced by Elisabeth Burgos-Debray (London: Verso, 1984).