

## Robin Dunbar/Brooke Allen Interview

**BA:** We're on the line with Robin Dunbar, a British anthropologist and evolutionary psychologist at Oxford. Thanks for taking our call. You've written a book entitled, *How Many Friends Does One Person Need? – Dunbar's Number and...*

**RD:** Evolutionary Quirks.

**BA:** So, how many friends does one person need?

**RD:** Well, it depends on what you want your friends for, but the burden of the story in the book if you'd like, and the research that I've been doing for the last decade or so is the limit of the number of people you can have let's call a sensible relationship with; let's say one that's reciprocated - where you know where they stand and they know where you stand, and that number is about 150, give or take a little bit around that. And that's what Dunbar's number has come to be. But to be fair, those are the people you have a history with but you may not see most of them all that often. There's the family funerals, weddings, bar mitzvahs and christenings kind of people.

What that layer of 150 really consists of is kind of a series of layers coming in towards you. You might think of yourself as a stone being thrown into a pond and the ripple is going out; kind of layers of intensity of relationships. There's a very small layer that's very close to you of about five intimate friends, then the layer outside that, then the layer outside that, and eventually you get to 150 friends – you go from you in the center outwards. The people included increase but the quality of relationship declines, and therefore how important they are to you kind of declines as well.

**BA:** So for psychological well-being, you're certainly not implying that we need 150 friends. What you're saying is, we can get by with a few, right?

**RD:** The number for psychological well-being – well, this is an interesting question as to what exactly these layers amount to. It's clear that the inner two layers, which set the 5 and the 15 (and keep in mind the 15 includes the 5 and the insiders) those are the critical social support networks. The inner most five we think of as your support clique. They are your most intimate friends and relations because they include family, the people you depend on when things fall about your ears and things get difficult for you. If you need some advice, you need to borrow some money, or you just need some help thinking through a problem, they are the people you'd go to.

The next layer that adds to 15 is called the sympathy group. It's all the people that if they died tomorrow you'd feel pretty upset about. And those people are the ones you would think of as your best friends, as opposed to your intimate friends. They're the people you go barbequing with every weekend or you do a lot of socializing with. They're the people you exchange child care with and these kind of things.

**BA:** That's interesting. In which direction does causality work? I'll give you an example. My college roommate and I sort of lost touch with each other for about 5, 6 years. Then his father died and I got

word from his wife that that happened, so I went to the funeral. After that we became best friends. I asked him years later, how did that happen? And he said, 'well, none of my friends came to my father's funeral.' So, I came to that funeral out of respect, but we became friends; whereas he and I both notice that when we're under stress, our friends sort of backtrack. Partially because I think they're too sympathetic and they feel what we feel and they don't like feeling that.

Whereas some of the more distant, the people in the 150 group, all of a sudden one or two of those 150 step forward, and all of a sudden we have a friendship. Is that possible?

**RD:** Yes, pretty much. I mean, the gloss on your story probably is that with the roommates from your college days, you were the one that when push came to shove, dredged up that old relationship and thought, unconsciously, this is an important one, we had good times together, so I have to go. And that's probably why you struck up that relationship again and have from that point on.

But there are some critical differences in terms of the structure of relationships within these networks. I might just add that the sort of outer layers that lead to the 150, which is the bulk of the people you know, are the people who really provide you with access to information about the world. They're what you call weak links in the social network literature. And they're the people who help you out when things are down by finding you jobs, or letting you know there's a job going where they work, or they heard on the grapevine that there's something coming up. So that's a source of information for you. Therefore it's particularly important in the context of finding jobs

But that said, if you look at the whole 150 all together it really consists of two networks, which are sort of unrelated to each other in our modern societies. One is the network of family or kinship and the other is the network of friends. These two networks behave very differently. Pretty much on average it's split 50-50. So you have somewhere from say the last 50 to a 100+ extended family on the average. And those people, almost no matter what you do to them, will stand by you. You really have to abuse them very badly, at which point they will say "OK, that's it, I'm never talking to you again." But as long as you don't quite go that far they will always come to help you.

Now friends are very different. Friends will only do that, so long as you are maintaining and servicing the relationship with them. If you don't, our data show very clearly that your friendship relationships start to die away. If you don't keep ringing people up or going out to have a beer with them or whatever it may be, those relationship will quietly wither. And it's difficult to resuscitate, it's only in exceptional cases like the one you described yourself, where you can pick them up again where you left off years and years later. Of course that's when you need them suddenly and they don't turn up, as you noticed.

**BA:** {Laughs} That's interesting. So here's a question. I think there's a third layer outside that I'm noticing; the one I'd call community. And of course in a way I am member of many communities. But I also have 3,000 contacts in my contact list and 1700 contacts on Linked In, and to some extent, it's impossible, and you would say biologically possible, to be in this circle of 150. But there is something that I think technology is allowing me to do that we couldn't have done back when we

were evolving: I can broadcast a need without the implicit expectation that any particular person respond.

And an example would be, when my son graduated from college, I just broadcast a message to everyone in my Linked In group that he graduated. And within a week 12 people came forward with 'I have a job,' or "I know of a job.' And I think this is what you're talking about; the strength in seek ties.

**RD:** It's absolutely the case that the 150 isn't the end of your social world as you rightly point out. What it is is the limit of the number of people you can have realistically reciprocated relationships with; relationships that have a history of some sort. Beyond that there are several more layers that go out to at least 1500 and very likely beyond. If you put all those people on Facebook, I tend to think of them as the voyeurs of your social life; they are vaguely interested in what you had for breakfast, maybe. These people extend out past the layers of the 150. It probably is extended, we don't really know to be honest.

It seems to be fairly reasonable and a safe bet to say those people are extending out to your weak links as the social network people would describe them. They're kind of less likely to come forward voluntarily to you. I think the people within your 150 would be the ones who, if they heard you were out of a job, would take the time to ring you up. Whereas the people outside the 150 would only ring you up if they were prompted to do so if they know for sure who you are. Things like Linked In and the other social networks work very well in that context, but there are other people in those outer layers that for sure wouldn't care too much.

So whoever it is, the anchor person that reads the news every night. You know who they are, you know a little bit about them, but believe me, if you rang them up and said, 'fancy going out for a pizza tonight?' the response would be, 'and who are you?'

**BA:** So I will describe this in lay terms, and you can give me a scientific response. I say my family are people who will help me even if they don't like me, and my friends are people that will help me because they like me. And so one thing that happens is that often when somebody is under stress they become less likeable. And that's why their family comes through but not their friends. Friends will say, 'write when you get a job' even though you've been talking every week. And then there's this community, the slightly less than strangers...however, those are acquaintances that are reciprocated.

Like you said with the guy who reads the news, I am acquainted with him but he is not acquainted with me. Clay Shirky, who's the author of *Here Comes Everybody* and *Cognitive Surplus*, he describes fame as the point in which the people acquainted with you vastly outnumber the amount of people it's possible for you to be acquainted with.

So when I broadcast a need to my acquaintances that I am out of work, out of the woodwork come people who I don't believe are motivated because they care about me, but because they care about

making a match. You know, if I help you get a job with my friend who needs you, then the world is better off. You know, why not? Am I making any sense?

**RD:** Yes, it's an optimistic view of life I would say, although I don't entirely disagree with it. I think what might prompt the people in that outer community to respond in that way can be many and various things, but it's nearly always due to some connection with you. So if you look at the quality of friendships that we have across these layers, starting with the inner most one and going out beyond, then what you find is that as you come in you find more and more things in common with the members of each layer.

What's interesting is when you go out beyond the 150, where you share a reasonable number of things in common like interests, hobbies, backgrounds, languages, you get these people who essentially are one-dimensional relationships. You share one thing in common, but that one thing is important enough to make that relationship work, to help you out when the time is needed. And these tend to be things like being a supporter of the same football team, belonging to the same church, sharing a particular hobby or interest with them. There's something specific that sits you into this club of like-minded people. It works quite well in real life that sometimes those single points of contact can strike something up.

So almost by virtue, just by being on Linked-In for example, the people you have in that contact circle and you've both made a decision to link up, so there is that common element there.

**BA:** So that's interesting. So you're saying in a way, that it's the fact that we're members of this network that is our common interest?

**RD:** Yeah, well in a way you're absolutely right to use the word community at that level because it is belonging to a community. It doesn't define all the relationships in those outer layers, but it does define a lot. These are people you wouldn't invite to your son's wedding or you wouldn't probably go on a BBQ with, but you meet them on some context and you know them so you have some sort of relationship with them. Be it church or a baseball game on a Saturday evening, you bump into them and you gradually get to know them. You have that thing that binds you together as members of that community. And it seems to kick in this willingness to help out.

Of course in the end family is sort of analogous. We've come to the view that families are the archetypal communities and it's off the back of the family relationship. In other words, it's a simple things like 'so and so is your second cousin twice removed' that completely changes how you view your relationship with that person. And it's the same way with being able to say 'I support the Red Sox' or whatever.

**BA:** A friend suggested I join a network that's English based, it's called ecademy. And I signed up and at the end of the first day I'm allowed 10 emails at random to members. My son was looking for a job in Stockholm for the summer. So I wrote an email to the top 10 connected people in Stockholm and told them my son is looking for a place to stay, a job and classes. By the next morning, seven had responded, and they all said, 'well, get me his resume and I'll help him find

work.' Two people offered to have him housesit for them during the summer. One person said if he wants to learn Swedish join Lingo Friends. Another person gave a link to a government site where he can get a stipend to be a student; you know they pay you to be a student in Sweden. And I was bowled over.

I think you just described what happened. The people who were collecting all these contacts, as I do, we're a member of a club where we will help strangers, because, why not?

**RD:** Except that you're being by virtue you're a part of the group so you're not a complete stranger. It's like someone is ticking your box for you and saying now this bloke's all right, you can trust him. It's like the diamond merchants in New York. Pounds of diamonds handed over with nothing more than a shake of the hand. They know you'll bring them back. And it's just an extended version of that. Someone's going to vouch for you as an upright, upstanding member suitable for membership of the club.

**BA:** So it's an issue of a network of trust. And in some ways it seems that if a stranger and I have you in common and you are vouching for both of us, in other words, you're staking your reputation on our behavior, it's almost as if we will treat each other better than if it was just the two of us, because then we don't have a responsibility to a third party.

**RD:** That's right. And in fact if you look at networks as we've done, which are more densely interconnected (networks of friends as opposed to family), people are more likely to act altruistically towards each other than in star shaped networks, where you sit at the center and your friends don't interact much with each other. When they do interact, it becomes a self-policing network where everybody is vouching for everybody else.

**BA:** Now it sounds like you would argue that it's of value to people to push the number of people they care about, and who care about them, out toward this Dunbar number; out to 150 rather than leave it at 15 or 20, because 150 squared is much bigger than 15 squared...

**RD:** Well it's a trade off here. You have to be careful. What we found in our work on networks is people vary a lot. The 150 is kind of an average. People vary from having 80-100 in their circle to 200, maybe even a little bit more. But those who have bigger social network have, on average, less intimacy with each of the members. So you have so much emotional capital, and you can spread it thinly, or you can spread it thickly. But whichever you do you'll have more or fewer people in your social circle. And if your inner core relationships are going to be important to you, for whatever your current circumstances may make important, then you do best to focus your attention on those closest to you.

But on the other hand, in the information flow sense, if finding jobs is what is most important, then maybe you should sacrifice your good friends in the interest of just friends.

**BA:** Well I agree with that. I can see that it's possible to spread yourself too thinly, and it's hard to care about too many people. But I also feel that a place like ecademy, Xing, Linked-In, and my

favorite networking site Couch Surfing – I’ll be traveling around Germany next month and staying with strangers who are friends of friends. And they are not people I have a relationship with, but it’s my experience that they are people I will end up having a relationship with, and some of those people will end up in my 150.

So Facebook seems to have this – everyone seems to be broadcasting these messages like, this is what I just had for lunch – and it sounds like, ‘hey look at me, look at me! Now look at me again.’

**RD:** It’s the lighthouse model of facial behavior, as I describe it. Blinking away like a lighthouse and you don’t know who is getting the message.

**BA:** I’ve seen some broadcasts that are more effective than others. One is, "Are you okay?" Or, "Can I help you?" If you broadcast that message, “Can I help you?” to a thousand strangers, it seems a very intimate thing for someone to admit they could use some help.

**RD:** Yes. That's absolutely right.

**BA:** And often that become a way you can get pleasure out of helping people, because there is somebody you can help. And maybe one in five you can help, and one in five of those end up making it into that 150.

**RD:** That’s in the end. That move into the inner circle is dependent really on you then being able to invest a lot of time. It can be done on the Internet but it’s much more effective if it’s done face to face. You’ve got to invest time in building that relationship. You can’t treat it in a casual way and expect the quality of the relationship to move in. On the other end of the scale, and I guess the risk you always run by generously offering help to anyone who’s out there is you become prey to the classic Nigerian scammer.

**BA:** The sociopath?

**RD:** Not a sociopath so much as someone sending out multiple messages who needs help, which people constantly fall prey to. So it obviously works and it fits this model. They are blindly sending out thousands of emails in lighthouse signals, and as long as one person picks them up and sends hundreds of dollars they’ve done pretty well that day.

And our problem is going back to the issue of trust, that we’re always at this risk of being exploited by the folks over the hill. So we’re naturally cautious of that and that’s why we look for these signals of trust and honesty in the people we deal with.

**BA:** That’s interesting. And it seems to play a big part in the design of these explicit social networks. I think Facebook is terrible at this. Whereas Xing, this German networking site, everybody who signs up goes through their homepage which has a scrolling list of new members, and some members engage with them, and I’m one of those people, and we try to flush out those frauds pretty rapidly. And Couch Surfing is even better because there you can put a negative reference on someone’s

profile. So if you do something wrong, even if it's something inappropriate like treating it like a dating site, you have 150 connections, you protect that...

I was in London and I met a young man, age 19, who said that network completely changed his life. Because his parents were telling him he was a dick. He was unkind, he was inconsiderate, he was sloppy; he was all these things, and he fought his parents tooth and nail. So when he turned 18 he told his parents he wasn't going to college because that's what they wanted him to do, and he joined this network that will give him free housing all over the world. And immediately people starting saying he was rude and unkind and sloppy, saying all the things publically that his parents had been telling him, and all of a sudden he had to go back to these people and ask, 'how can I get you to change your opinion of me?' And they told him in a way that was kind, and he said it completely turned him around. He went back to his parents and apologized and explained that he now saw what they were talking about.

**RD:** Yes. And that's probably a peculiar environment, the online environment, where that might happen because in real life people, on the whole, won't tell you those things; they will just avoid you.

**BA:** It was phenomenal. And in that network, you're obligated when you sign up to call people out on that because someone else may invite them into their home. And it's phenomenal that there are now 2.4 million members and I believe there has only been one theft. And he was tracked down and he's in jail.

Now let me ask you, are there differences between males and females? What are they?

**RD:** Yes. Two-fold, really. One is that women's networks at any of these levels are slightly bigger than men's, and that's because they are more socially skilled, and the cognitive mechanisms that underpin the ability to service relationships, they are better at, which allows them to keep more relationships going. The second is that the way men and women maintain relationships, as one would service a car, are quite different.

Our data suggests that what prevents a relationship between friends, and again this is different from families, is that friendships are more fragile and susceptible to erosion if you don't keep up the relationship actively, as it were. What prevents relationships from declining over time for men is doing stuff together, whereas what prevents relationships from declining over time for women is talking together. And you can see why, and it's obvious to me, why the telephone, which women are notorious for having hour long conversations on, and I maintain that the average phone call length for teenage boys is 7.3 seconds long. Because they need to say is see you at the club at 7.

Things like Facebook, the phone, and all these kinds of digital media are designed for women's networking. But by and large much less for men. Men really have to get out there and bang their heads together. And I think that's kind of true, in the end, with women too. Digital media like Facebook and the phone are just sticking plasters; they allow you to keep the thing ticking over

under circumstances where you can't meet face-to-face, but sooner or later you really have to meet up and just have a little time together.

**BA:** Well, that resonates for me. I have a friend in London who was telling me that she was in Mongolia and spent three hours with a clerk trying to book a train ticket and getting nowhere. And finally she burst into tears and immediately everybody started trying to help her. And she said, 'you know I forgot the first rule: try flirting, and if that doesn't work, try crying.'

I asked, what about us guys? If I try flirting, particularly if it's with a guy, and then I start crying, I'm in deep trouble. What do we do?

She said, 'Oh, guys collaborate on the problem. If you and the other guy, who's even causing the problem, if you can get on the same side of the problem and make the problem the target, all of a sudden you have a collaborator. Women have a hard time doing that.' And I see that among job seekers. Women will get together and spends hours commiserating and men will get together and solve the problem.

One friend of mine – I was unemployed – he's a friend now but just a distant colleague at the time. I got laid off and he pulls me in his office and cancels all his appointments for the afternoon, then pulls out his address book and just starts calling people and saying, 'you need to talk to Brooke, take my word. Tuesday? lunch? okay: done.' And instantly I was no longer depressed. In fact I couldn't be; I was too busy to be.

**RD:** Yes, indeed.

**BA:** So it sounds we could learn from each other. Men could be more like women and women could be more like men, or is that just an impossibility?

**RD:** That's an interesting question. I actually don't know what the safe answer is. In principle one would say yes, that would be a very good idea. The fly in the ointment is going to be just how different the psyches between the two sexes actually are. There are limits and I think you've just identified one. Crying won't do.

**BA:** That's interesting, because I'll tell you, among my male friends when that happens we instantly bond in a way that I don't with my female friends because it's too common.

**RD:** Yes. Well, that's an interesting point.

**BA:** The Department of Labor says that when people become unemployed, they replace their work time with TV, they sleep an hour later, they talk to their friends (but not friends of friends) and they only spend 5 minutes a day working for free and only 30 minutes a day looking for work, and of that, the data is skewed. One in six spends three hours a day and five or six spend no time whatsoever.

People who watch television report that watching TV makes them feel less lonely. But in fact people who watch a lot of television are much lonelier than people who don't.

**RD:** I'm sure that's the case on both counts. And the danger is that in one sense you can put anyone you like into your circle of 150 or into a circle beyond that. They don't have to be real people. They can be your favorite pet or potted plant as long as you see that as a relationship. I guess as long as you talk to them (laughs). And people do. It doesn't have to be a real person, it can be a fictitious person. And therefore, I think this is one of the reasons why people get so attached to the soaps on TV because you have this little social world that's played out on the day's program. And these people come to be part of your social world too because you know so much about them. So you're peering in but it feels like you are part of the furniture there and part of the community.

And so in a sense that's good because if you can't go out and do stuff because doing stuff costs money, well that's a way of having a social world. The danger is it actually replaces your real social world. And here I come back to the fragility of friendships. So you have to keep them ticking over by seeing people and doing stuff with them, whatever the appropriate doing stuff might be. If you're spending too much time sitting on the couch watching TV all day, those relationships will wither away. You may well lose out on opportunities to find out about jobs, going somewhere, what have you.

**BA:** I guess the advantage of the soaps is that you can feel like you are participating without the fear of making any mistakes.

**RD:** That is true. But it does require you to invest a lot of time. And it's time you could be spending doing something else.

**BA:** I'm 58 years old and about 8 years ago it dawned on me that I saw among my friends that their circle of friends began declining. The things that happen at my age is that people start dying, but they become married, they become absorbed in other things, they have children, they move away. And I've noticed that the majority of people do nothing to replace those friends. And as they get older they end up having fewer and fewer relationships, and sometimes those relationships become a burden on others, like requiring their family to everyday invest time with them. Is it a good idea, is it possible to explicitly work at having new friends?

**RD:** Well it is the case that there is a natural life-cycle here. We think you start with a toddler and a very small inner core, your parents, and as you go through childhood and teenage-hood you gradually add these layers on the outside. If you look at late teenagers their equivalent Dunbar number is about 50, and they only acquire the full 150 perhaps when they get to their mid-20s. Then it's fairly stable after that and remains on a plateau until you get to, dare I say it, our age, and after that it starts to decline.

What seems to happen is you gradually contract back in through the layers until you end up with one or two very, very intimate relationships like you started out with at the age of six months or a year, when you get to your 80s. We know the early part of that is a consequence of the development

of social cognitive skills through that period. You don't finish acquiring these skills until quite late on. The bit of the brain that seems to limit the size of your social networks doesn't finally stabilize and stop growing until you reach your mid- 20s. The stuff up above the eyes is basically the frontal lobe which is why we have these big foreheads.

As you will know, after a certain point you start to lose brain cells whether you like it or not. So once you get up to the 60s and beyond you quite possibly are losing some of the connections that were critical in allowing you to maintain these relationships. And it may be part of the reason why you shed these outer layers progressively.

But there is a second reason and that is motivation and time. Because in the end when friends and relatives die off, and you've got some spare spaces in your social world, you can only fill them by going out and meeting new people, devoting time to build appropriate relationships. Once you get to the 70s and 80s people will say 'I'd rather sit on the bench and watch the birds in the garden.' It's just too much of an effort to go out and make new friends.

**BA:** Well that seems to be the norm, but there seem to be counterexamples.

**RD:** It's a generalization. It's like saying the typical number of friends you have is 150. Yes it is, on the average, but there is variation around that. Some people are less social and some people more social, and therefore have bigger circles.

**BA:** Now I've started an informal survey among friends, acquaintances and even people I just meet. And I ask them, how many people do you know who are a different sexual orientation? They're gay, they're a different race, a different religion, a different ethnic background, they're foreign, whatever. And I find people have a very diverse set of friends and acquaintances.

And then I ask, how many people do you have a strong, reciprocal relationship of mutual respect with someone who is more than 20 years different from you in age, that doesn't have a power relationship. Not a teacher, not a relative... And almost nobody has those relationships. It seems to be stratified by age.

**RD:** Yes.

**BA:** And you're saying yes, so you agree?

**RD:** This is very typical of traditional societies. If you look at tribal societies that's exactly what they look like. They are stratified; you have age grades within the community, and particularly for the men. The men all go through as an age cohort together; they're rather like a platoon in the military. They start out together and they finish together. And they gradually move up through the age layers. They start off as the boys doing the herding of the cattle and they become the warriors, then they become the family men and eventually they get to be the elders if they live long enough. But that cohort is very much bound together and it really is a kind of brotherhood.

**BA:** But it doesn't have to be that way, does it?

**RD:** It doesn't have to be. It's an interesting question as to why it's like that so commonly in traditional societies and whether there is a good functional reason in terms of how societies work, or whether it's a byproduct of something else. I'm kind of struck to some extent on how much cross-generational friendships you can have in the modern world, but I agree entirely with you that they're the exception rather than the rule.

**BA:** Because I've found at this point it's easier to do. Partially because the people my age are pretty much absorbed in planning retirement, their children are just heading off to college. Whereas I find people significantly younger, half my age, are sort of hungry for someone my age who can talk about what's down the road ahead, what they should be planning for. And conversely, people 20 years older than me, I can help make them feel younger. Now that's a question. I feel younger when I'm with younger people. It makes sense, right? I feel sadder when I'm with sad people and happier when I'm with happy people. Do people who live with younger people live longer?

**RD:** That I don't know the answer to. It would be interesting to find out actually. It kind of wouldn't surprise me if that were so, if only because younger people tend to be more optimistic and positive than older people. And my good friend Chris Darkis at Harvard has done some nice work on social networks showing that how happy or depressed or ill you become, whether getting divorced, or becoming obese, is largely influenced by whether or not the people in your close social network, going out from friends of friends of friends, are in that state. So if you're surrounded by lots of obese people, your chances of becoming obese, let's say within the next 2 years, will hugely increase.

Or if you know lots of people getting divorced in your network, your chances of getting divorced are magnified enormously. And likewise of being happy or depressed.

**BA:** I've noticed that in Sweden everyone is trim and in the American Midwest everybody's obese. And it's almost as if you're given permission to be obese when you're around it.

**RD:** Yes; absolutely.

**BA:** Okay, thank you so much for your time, and I wonder, have we missed anything? Particularly for the people who are unemployed and trying to figure out what to do, and sort of shrinking from the world, rather than engaging.

**RD:** I think we've covered most of the relevant points. I feel like the advice that one might give has come out of the conversation really. Keep your friendships up, basically.

**BA:** I should mention one last thing. I won a prize with British Airways, and it's called the Face of Opportunity. And their whole advertising campaign is it's not good enough, even if you have video on your Skype, to establish business relationships and trust without meeting face-to-face. It sounds like you would agree with that.

**RD:** I think so. I've long been of the view that in the digital age, you can imagine this is my business nightmare – I can imagine an accountant somewhere going, 'hmmm, we can get rid of all these expensive middle-management/senior-management trips around the world, just give them a video conferencing suite and they can sit at home for cheaper. My guess is that any business that really does that is busted in a year. Because at the end of the day, what these guys are doing on their business trips is actually getting to trust each other. When the chips are really down somewhere the guys at the end of the phone will say, 'okay we'll help you out but it's going to be tough for us, but I remember that good golfing game we had.' I think there's nothing to replace face-to-face.

**BA:** And it seems like there's a movement along the lines of, even if you're my friend, if someone undercuts you by 3 cents a unit I should go with them. That the trust we might have had in the old boy's network is fact anti-capitalistic. It hurts the market.

**RD:** Yea...

**BA:** Thank you so much.

**RD:** Thanks.