Episode 3.22 Interfering with the Legitimacy of the Settler State with Chelsea Vowel

March 22, 2019

Hannah (Host): 00:07

[Music: "Mesh Shirt" by Mom Jeans] Hi, I'm Hannah McGregor and this is Secret Feminist Agenda and I'm having a pretty rough, y'all. If you follow me on any social media platform, you will have already seen me talk about this, but the neck injury that I've been dealing with for a couple of months now flared up really badly this week and I've been dealing with some pretty significant pain and thinking, as a result, about pain a lot, and how hard it is to, to think through pain and how scary pain is when you're in the midst of it, and how hard it felt to get any of the doctors I saw to, to respond with what felt like the gravity that the pain I was experiencing deserved. And, and how hard it was, at the same, time to recognize that that pain is a real thing and that I was allowed to take a day off [rueful laugh]. I asked on Twitter today for people to recommend readings about pain because I've been thinking about it so much and I, I think I'll probably end up talking about it for the minisode next week. So if you hear this and you have things that you have read about pain that have stuck with you, I'd love to hear about them. I am feeling better for now. Apparently with this injury there's, there's really no way of knowing when it will flare up. It's one of those non-linear recovery things that we know are true but that are so hard to actually live through. So I'm extra grateful that this episode required next to zero editing because it is live. I love a live episode. I have a really good excuse not to go in and take out all of the "ums" and "ahs" and "likes" because I'm trying to, you know, maintain the authenticity of the live experience. So what you're about to hear is a conversation that I had at the University of Alberta in Edmonton, as part of the U of A's, Canadian Literature Centre's Brown Bag Lunch series where they bring in writers to give short readings and talks over lunch. They've been doing this series for years. This year they also featured Amber Dawn and Joshua Whitehead, so I feel like I'm in pretty good company. They invited me to come and talk about my book, the book that I co-edited, Refuse: CanLit in Ruins. And I asked if instead of just me talking to him reading, I could have a conversation with Chelsea Vowel who is Edmonton-based, and a Refuse contributor, and who I admire hugely and I was delighted when Chelsea said yes that she would participate in the event. So you're about to hear that conversation that I had with Chelsea about her contribution to Refuse, about the state of CanLit, about Indigenous literature

and, and tons of other things. Before I take you into this episode, there's one more thing I wanna mention. Chelsea brings up the lawsuit that is currently being directed against a number of students and writers in Canada. I have linked to the ongoing GoFundMe for people being named in that suit. It's called the Galloway Suit Defense Fund. You can read more about it there and you'll hear Chelsea talking about it in this episode. A lot of the original funding for that suit happened with that first surge of publicity, but as is the way with the internet, we lose interest when things aren't new, but the people being sued are still going to need a lot of financial support. A lot of these cases are going to drag on for a long time. So if you haven't already given, go click on that link and consider donating something. [Music: "Mesh Shirt" by Mom Jeans] All right. This is normally the part where I would introduce my guest, but I'm actually going to let Marie Carriere introduced Chelsea. So take it away, Marie [Music: "Back in Black" by AC/DC

Marie: 04:38

My name is Marie Carriere. I'm the director of the Canadian Literature Centre. I would like to start by acknowledging or location today on the lands of Treaty Six. We acknowledge the past, present, and future generations of the Treaty Six nations, the Papaschase and the Métis nation, with whom we are stewards of this land, as Treaty people. And then to honor and celebrate this place, I extend sincere gratitude to the Indigenous people of all ages and generations who join us here at the CLC today. So, as you can see, we have a lot going on today and thank you for your patience. Also as we said in our newsletter about this event, why kick off the 2019 CLC Brown Bag Lunch Reading series with one brilliant thinker when we can kick it off with two? As you can see, we are deviating from our regular format today, an exciting live podcast recording featuring Hannah McGregor and Chelsea Vowel. Hannah McGregor is an Assistant Professor of Publishing at Simon Fraser University where her research focuses on podcasting as scholarly communication, systemic barriers to access in the Canadian publishing industry, and magazines as middlebrow media. She is the co-creator of Witch, Please, a feminist podcast on the Harry Potter world, and the creator of the weekly podcast Secret Feminist Agenda, which is currently undergoing an experimental peer review process with Wilfrid Laurier University Press. She's also the co-editor of the book Refuse: CanLit in Ruins, which if you don't know already, is having its Edmonton launch this afternoon at 5:00 PM at the old arts building. So please join us if you can. Chelsea Vowel is Métis from manitow-sâkahikan, Lac Ste. Anne, Alberta, currently residing in Edmonton. Mother to six girls, she has a Bachelor in Education and a Bachelor in Law

and Legislation, and is currently a graduate student and online Cree curriculum developer at the Faculty of Native Studies here at the U of A. Chelsea is a public intellectual, writer, and educator whose work intersects language, gender, Métis self-determination and resurgence. She is co-host of the Indigenous feminist sci-fi podcast, Métis in Space, author of Indigenous Writes: A Guide to First Nations, Métis & Inuit Issues in Canada, which is also a for sale here by Glass Books at the back. And she makes, I hear, legendary bannock. So please give a warm welcome to Hannah McGregor and Chelsea Vowel.

Audience:	<u>07:30</u>	[Claps]
Hannah (Host):	07:31	Are we on? Yeah, that sounds amplified. Great. I love to have a bottle of water, a book, and a phone and nowhere to put any of them. So
Chelsea:	07:47	Yeah. I, I need a little step stool.
Hannah (Host):	07:49	We're just gonna, it's going to be really exciting. And you get to watch us try to get on these high chairs. It's just a lot of dignity happening.
Chelsea:	<u>07:55</u>	Yeah, yeah. Just look away. Look away.
Hannah (Host):	<u>07:57</u>	And we got it.
Chelsea:	07:58	Little ding.
Hannah (Host):	07:58	Really got it. This here so I can keep track of time, because we are going to try to have some time for questions at the end if people would like to do that. I'll never touch that phone again.
Chelsea:	08:07	Perhaps some interpretive dances.
Hannah (Host):	08:11	So welcome everyone. I'm Hannah McGregor. This is being recorded. Hey Claire, is that true? Great. Love it. It's being recorded and will be released at some point as an episode of Secret Feminist Agenda. Secret Feminist Agenda is normally recorded and will be edited and produced where I live and work, which is the traditional and unceded territory of the Musqueam, Squamish, and Tsleil-Waututh first nations. I'm super grateful to be here on Treaty Six territory. I lived in Edmonton for a while; it always feels like a bit of a homecoming. And I'm also really excited to be here meeting Chelsea, who I'm a huge fan of!

Chelsea:	08:47	Oh, my god.
Hannah (Host):	08:49	Hi, Chelsea.
Chelsea:	08:49	Hi
Audience:	08:52	[Laughs].
Chelsea:	08:52	everyone. Can we get some like bright lights so I just like don't see anybody?
Hannah (Host):	08:56	You just have to look in the faces of all these beautiful people.
Chelsea:	09:00	I know, I know.
Hannah (Host):	<u>09:00</u>	So we are here to talk. We're going to start at least by talking about, this book <i>Refuse: CanLit in Ruins</i> . For sale, copies in the back, which Chelsea has a poem in. And so I'm gonna ask, maybe if you can start us off by reading the poem and we can use that as an entry point into having a conversation about CanLit. How does that, how does that make you feel?
Chelsea:	09:22	That just sounds so great.
Hannah (Host):	09:23	Just [laughs]
Audience:	09:23	[Laughs]
Chelsea:	09:23	I'm very excited. [Laughs] Okay, so this actually was like a Twitter rant. This is
Hannah (Host):	09:33	All great poetry is.
Chelsea:	<u>09:34</u>	Yeah, right? So, okay. Oh my god, I've never read it out loud. [Coughs] [Lip buzz] Just kidding. Actually, this is, is this a little bit feedbacky? I gotta, I got to be quiet.
AV Technician:	09:47	We're working on it.
Chelsea:	09:47	All right.
Hannah (Host):	09:49	[Laughs].
Chelsea:	09:49	Okay. So this is called "No Appeal." Pardon any profanity, or enjoy it? I'm sorry. This is really weird to me. Okay. All right. As you can tell. Okay: Reconciliation is a weirdass thing pretty sure CanLit can tell us how to do it /feathers to swear in cops to beat

Audience:

land defenders treaty flags on malls to keep /us addicted to capitalism/ Crown and Indigenous Relations to continue administering poverty and /corruption/ white guys playing red guys working with white guys doing projects on residential schools celebrated/round dance cynicism tokenistic territorial acknowledgements as de facto/ cede release surrender here's an oil patch bursary/ we believe women we believe you but not you he's our buddy witch hunt/ twitter mob/ hope you weren't planning on making a home here our literature is about /you not for you/ I love your culture I hate your face here's a drink splashed in it better than /a trailor hitch/Canada 150 teach us teach us make us feel guilty it's settler-domming seed/release sweet surrender 50 shades of Grey Owl /tell me all the terrible things so I can be appalled titillated now me and /Beyak have suffered with you maybe now we have PTSD for you/ get over it get over it property rights stay off my lawn we don't shake canes /we shoot kids free speech fist in your gut crowing joy in your twitter feed got what they deserved I don't see colour /studying you studying your issues can you do it no we must and that's how we/indigenize the academy that's how we write you in you're on the menu agenda/ in a year from now we can all relax and pat ourselves on the back for how /much work we did this decolonization gig is sweet hope you liked it.

Audience.	10.44	[Appliause]
Hannah (Host):	<u>11:33</u>	That was great.
Chelsea:	<u>11:33</u>	[Laughs].
Hannah (Host):	<u>11:33</u>	That didn't sound like your first time. I also really just wanted you to [grunts angrily] "take that, book!"
Chelsea:	<u>11:39</u>	Yeah. But I would never be able to pick it up. I'm so high up here.
Hannah (Host):	<u>11:41</u>	I know, right? Anything that goes down, I'm kind of regretting putting it here already. It's just a short, a short arm problem. Alright, so
Chelsea:	11:47	The air is thin.
Everyone:	<u>11:52</u>	[Laughs]
Hannah (Host):	<u>11:52</u>	[Laughs] We've never been on high chairs before, apparently. We, we're really overwhelmed by the experience. All right, so let's talk a little bit about CanLit and about [laughs] what's going

[Applause]

10:44

on in that poem, in terms of the way that you're thinking through like CanLit's complicity in this larger project of, sort of, reconciliation as a settler colonial agenda and the way that it glosses over ongoing anti-Indigenous violence. Like, what, what role do you think CanLit plays in that?

Chelsea: 12:22

Well, it's like any, sort of, cultural industry, you know, that, that is based on a multicultural, sort of, paradigm where, you know, we're just, we're just one more minority to be, to be, you know, put into this wider, you know, real literature, right? We're just like, we're, we're the sesame seeds, you know, on the bun.

Audience:

12:42

[Laughs]

Chelsea: 12:42

And you know, there's, there's ways that we're allowed to express ourselves. You know, we're allowed to have music, we're allowed to have art, and we're allowed to, within like pretty narrow frames, have literature. But it's not really literature, right? It's, it's more like we're exposing our trauma and our dysfunction, cuz that's what Indigenous lit is supposed to be. We're supposed to be like, you know, ripping ourselves open and being like, "look at my wounds." And if you stray from that, like if you want to do something else, then, then they don't really know where to put you. And so it's kind of like, "well, that's not a great fit for us." So, CanLit, like everything else in Canada, just like consumes us, and capitalizes on our trauma in order to, you know, check off diversity boxes. It'd be like, look at how many Indigenous authors we gave awards to this year. Like, I think we should be good for the next couple of decades.

Hannah (Host):

<u>13:36</u>

[Laughs] Yeah. Yeah, yeah.

Chelsea:

<u>13:36</u>

Fulfilled that quota.

Hannah (Host):

13:37

Yeah. And the counting and seems to be a really strong urge, which, which makes sense within, sort of, this, this apparatus. Like, settler colonialism loves counting and it loves that that checking off boxes is just another form of that of itemizing inclusivity or diversity.

Chelsea:

13:52

Yeah.

Hannah (Host):

13:52

And being able to say like, "look, we did it!"

Chelsea:

<u>13:53</u>

It's a point system. Yeah, because that's easy. If you don't actually, you know, it's like I've been talking lately about how

privileged discourse, as it's becoming more mainstream, becomes sort of a mathematical calculation. It's like if I'm white, there's, there's a point against me, but if I'm slightly disabled and I have this other point that it works in my favor, and like, then you, you know, you have a score that floats above your head and you can compare yourself to others to determine who is more right. You know, it's, it's like, it's bizarre, but that's like, that is what capitalism does is it, it, it turns everything into a commodity and a score. Yeah.

Hannah (Host): 14:24

Yeah. It reminds me, I had Ryan McMahon, who hopefully you all know, a brilliant Indigenous podcaster's making an absolutely incredible podcast right now called Thunder Bay. He was visiting my campus last year. Time's really confusing, but I think it was last year, at this event where somebody asked him you know, "all of this diversity initiative is great. How will we know when it's enough?" Like, "what's the, is it like that, that the publishing industry matches the, the demographics of the Canadian population?" And he was like, "if that's where you're starting, you are starting from the wrong premise." It's like, the counting is always going to be the wrong instinct.

Chelsea: 15:07

Yeah. That's really interesting because I think that that question does come from a place of like wanting to, like for a lot of people, you know, some people say it very cynically and, "when is it enough? You guys always want more," right? But whatever. But like, I do think that a lot of people do actually wonder, like, "okay, so what is it you want? What is, what is the quality going to look like and what is inclusion gonna look like?" But you're right to, to immediately sort of, say like, as long as we have like this percentage of Indigenous authors, and within that are a percentage of like, visibly Indigenous and queer Indigenous and this and that. Like, that doesn't, that's not, I, you know, for me. So I mean, CanLit, is not something that I feel like I'm a part of. Although it was hilarious. We hilariously were referred to as like, by somebody I won't name as like, sort of, like insiders in CanLit. And I was like, "what?"

Hannah (Host): 15:58 [Laughs].

Chelsea: 15:58 And I'm like, "shit, I don't even know what CanLit is." I haven't

> read most of these, I read Margaret Atwood in high school. Like, like when I go to these like a writer's festivals and stuff, I'm like,

I don't know who anybody is.

Hannah (Host): 16:08 [Laughs] You're not a CanLit insider?

Chelsea:	<u>16:08</u>	Like I am like. No! I'm not a CanLit, I don't even like know. It's ridiculous. But yeah, just that, that, you know, so I don't feel like we're a part of that. And, I don't feel like a real author and I don't feel like I'm really, you know, anything. And so I, for me, what it would look like is CanLit would not exist, and neither would Canada, and instead every, you know, people would be free to like write the stories that the way that they want it. So it's not all just this. You know, it's like, it's like queer Indigenous brown kids on the rez, you know, like urban natives writing about like, I don't know, they're weird slash fic and having that, like, that's, that's what I love. Like maybe it has nothing to do with "Indian stuff," you know? It's just like, it is what it is.
Hannah (Host):	16:52	Yeah. And that was, we were chatting a bit, prior to this event about CanLit's sort of unbelievable as a, as a system and an apparatus and an industry, it's unbelievable ability to sort of consume, particularly in this case Indigenous literatures, and to say like, "cool, you're doing something that's, that's fundamentally resistant to the project of CanLit. Oop! You're CanLit now and now we can claim like, 'oh look how radical CanLit is."
Chelsea:	<u>17:15</u>	Yeah.
Hannah (Host):	<u>17:15</u>	It includes all of this stuff that's critical of it, which mirrors obviously the way that Canada as a nation state functions, that it is also incredibly good at absorbing critique and using that absorption of critique to make claims about being a, sort of, inclusive and tolerant place without actually transforming any systems.
Chelsea:	<u>17:34</u>	Mmhmm, mmhmm.
Hannah (Host):	<u>17:34</u>	And there's, there's a mirroring between these, how these things work.
Chelsea:	<u>17:38</u>	Well, they can't be separate because they're all part of the same colonial project, right?
Hannah (Host):	17:42	Yeah, yeah. Like they're friends. It's like literature and the nation state work together or something.
Chelsea:	<u>17:45</u>	Yeah. The literature is where the nation state, as a thing that exists in our mind, is created. Like that's the thing. It's like, you know, people, people talk about literature as though it's sort of this esoteric thing over there that you can just enjoy that doesn't really have much impact, but no, this is like we're nation

building happens. This is where the imaginary is created, and it's done very deliberately and it's done by very small group of people. And so of course, like any expansion of that is, is a threat to it because you're, you're not just messing with, you know, like WP can sell his ability to, you know, live around natives and never interact with them and then think that he can write about them. You're interfering with the legitimacy of the settler state, which is what I always want to be doing. And that's the thing is if CanLit is like, if CanLit finds a space for us where we actually feel comfortable, then I think, then something's gone wrong. Right? Something's wrong there because it cannot exist with us within it, because our whole purpose, my purpose, is to explode that. Just like, just get rid of it.

Hannah (Host):	<u>18:48</u>	Yeah. Yeah. Which is a sort o

Yeah. Yeah. Which is a sort of, in some ways an exercise of constant resistance because the strength of that, that inclusion and interpolation instinct, it's, you know, it's powerful because it's got money behind it too. Right?

Chelsea: Yeah. And that's the thing. Okay. So this is another issue that

again, it's, it's, it's true of writing. It's true of any sort of like cultural work that you do. It's true of, you know, being an activist or just a human being, and it, it's, it's that, you know, to be legit, for us, for like Black and Indigenous and People of color, we basically have to live in poverty and, and, and be like, you know, to be grassroots, you can't be too educated. You have to be poor. You can't accept money from the state. And your work has to be like, often very like trauma-based.

Hannah (Host): 19:38 Mmhmm.

Chelsea: 19:38 But like that, that expectation that, that, sort of standard

doesn't exist for most people in CanLit. Right?

Hannah (Host): 19:43 Yep.

Chelsea: 19:43 Like you can, you can just be like a frivolous, middle-class, white

woman who writes something about their, their dog and that's fine. Like, I'm not saying that that's like a bad thing. I might like that book, but you know, but they're not expected to suffer for their art. I mean that in some, some guys pretend they suffer for their art but like, but we are expected to suffer for our art.

Hannah (Host): 20:07 Mmhmm.

Chelsea: 20:07 And it's like, you know, so it means like when we get

opportunities, like even some of these award, like Governor

General Award and things like that, we were always like hearing in the back are people are saying like "sell out, don't do it." You know? And, and why is we going even be celebrated within the system, because somehow it's and maybe that's legitimate, it's somehow like an acceptance or validation of that system and that's really hard. Like you just want to frigging write--

Hannah (Host):	20:32	[Laughs].
Chelsea:	20:32	you're smutty poems. Why should you have to think, you know, balance all of these things all at once?
Hannah (Host):	20:38	Yeah.
Chelsea:	20:38	It's not fair.
Hannah (Host):	20:39	Yeah. [laughs]
Chelsea:	20:41	Just let me write my smut.
Hannah (Host):	20:41	[Laughs] So let's talk about the genres that CanLit doesn't have space for, cuz that's really like, it seems that in, in terms of what Indigenous literature gets, sort of, brought into these apparatuses, it's realism, right?
Chelsea:	20:55	Mmhmm.
Hannah (Host):	20:55	Like that is that its trauma-based realism in particular, but a lot of your own writing is speculative fiction.
Chelsea:	21:02	Yeah.
Hannah (Host):	21:02	And is oriented towards Métis and Indigenous futurism, which that work, insofar as it falls into the world of genre writing, doesn't seem to have a home in CanLit.
Chelsea:	21:12	Yeah, yeah. So, I've definitely, I never intended to be a nonfiction writer that, you know, like I always want it to be, I'm a huge sci-fi nerd and so I always wanted to write like, you know, high fantasy when I was a kid. Now I don't like it so much. Now it's like sci-fi cause that's more grown up. And the line between fantasy and sci-fi is very delineated, ah whatever. Anyway.
Hannah (Host):	<u>21:33</u>	[Laughs] It's clear and everyone knows what it is.

Chelsea: 21:34

Yes, exactly. But no, I now the work that I do, I really want to imagine like I want to Molly, my co-host on Métis in Space, calls it star, "star trekking it." You know, where you don't have to explain how you got to this, this place, you just, you're there and you get to like have fun with your, you know, all the technology. Right? And, and, and that's it for me, that's like, that's a really important thing for Indigenous peoples to do, because we're always expected to give the blueprint, right? Reconciliation, how do we get there? What is enough in CanLit, right? We're supposed to give you like the 12 point plan and every detail has to be checked over and confirmed and, and you know, agreed with or not. We don't get to just like cast our minds into the future and imagine like if we could fly or if like, you know, we can have augmented vision that would allow us to see like when somebody, you know, a racist asshole so we just avoid them, like stuff like that. We don't get to do that. And so I'm saying yes we do and maybe it's not really going to fit into CanLit, but whatever. And so when I write that stuff, feeling like I'm not going to fit into CanLit, my audience isn't, isn't CanLit's audience, my audience is other, other niches out there. I just want to be like, you know, do cool things like, and I don't explain. I don't want to explain cultural references because we need, as Indigenous people, we need to be able to build up the literature that has cultural references and in jokes and things like that that outsiders can then study. Because I had to, I had to sit through Shakespeare. I had to sit through all this Western lit that has all these Biblical allusions, I didn't know what any of that shit means. Like I read that little book in the doctor's office, the Illustrated Bible or whatever, but I don't know what's going on in there. So like all of these high literature references to like Biblical things, just over my head. Right? And yet I'm expected to do the work to understand that, that background to get this work. Well you can do the work then to understand the background when I'm talking about elder brother or like making these references and maybe you don't get them and we get to laugh and be like, "heh heh heh! You missed that."

Hannah (Host): 23:35 [Laughs] I liked that laugh.

Chelsea: 23:35 Yeah.

Hannah (Host): Just a great attitude to have towards your readers. I'm on

board. I, so, so, and that seems like a really interesting shift of audience orientation from Indigenous rights, which is so clearly

speaking to settlers.

Chelsea: 23:53 Yes.

Hannah (Host):	23:53	And saying like, "okay, time to get some shit sorted out."
Chelsea:	23:57	Yes.
Hannah (Host):	23:57	So is that a project that you feel like you are done talking to settlers and do not want to do that work? Like is that work you are burned out on doing?
Chelsea:	<u>24:06</u>	Yeah. Well I mean I keep saying that, but every time I try to get out, they drag back in.
Hannah (Host):	24:10	[Laughs]
Chelsea:	24:10	Like, I wrote that book so I would never have to talk about that stuff again. And what do I do? I go around the country talking about that stuff all the frigging time. [Sighs]
Hannah (Host):	24:18	Shouldn't have written such a good book.
Chelsea:	24:19	Right?
Hannah (Host):	24:20	Shoulda made the book bad.
Chelsea:	24:20	Man. Man, oh man. Oh Man. But you know, yeah. I that, that kind of work needs to exist so that people can get past a 101 level so we can have conversations that are more generative. Cuz that work isn't generative, that work is trying to combat stereotypes. And it's, it's, it's intensely exhausting to deal with that kind of thing, and so it's a labor saving device for myself and others but it certainly isn't generative. So it's, it's just allowing people to catch up. And so the work that I want to do, oh my god, Marie Kondo's coming into the conversation, where did you come from?
Everyone:	24:54	[Laughs]
Chelsea:	24:54	I want to do work that brings me joy. Just a phenomenon.
Hannah (Host):	24:59	[Laughs]
Chelsea:	24:59	Yeah. But for me, like <i>Métis in Space</i> . So, you know, I started this podcast with Molly because, my kids were gone for the summer and my husband and I were moping around the house and all depressed. And so she would come over, we'd drink wine, we watch sci-fi, we'd like just talk and talk and talk about it, and dissect it, and laugh and be like, "we're the funniest people on Earth. We should record ourselves." And so

Hannah (Host):	<u>25:19</u>	That's how all good podcasts.
Chelsea:	25:19	Yeah, and we are the funniest people. I like, seriously, you have to listen to it and maybe you're not going to get on that level, but I think that we are very funny.
Hannah (Host):	<u>25:28</u>	[Laughs]
Chelsea:	<u>25:28</u>	And so that to me that wasn't work. And that's, and that's like, it's hilarious, and it's fun, and it's generative. And the second we've always agreed, the second it stops being fun, then we're not going to do it anymore.
Hannah (Host):	<u>25:39</u>	Yeah.
Chelsea:	25:39	And I mean, we've had like interludes, like I've had two babies in the meantime, and we did our, we started our master's thesis together and she finished. Now she's on her PhD. So, you know, there's lots of breaks and stuff.
Hannah (Host):	<u>25:50</u>	Yeah, you've been busy.
Chelsea:	<u>25:50</u>	Yeah, but it does stuff. And what it really did is it linked us up, you know, we were feeling like very alone is like these little indiginerds, or it's like, you know, maybe we're the only niches who like, you know, <i>Star Trek</i> and stuff. No man, like so many geeks out there and we like, they got in touch with us and all of a sudden there's like this huge community of, of indiginerds. And that was like, I mean, that's something because now we're building things, right? Versus like having those conversations, those one-on-one conversations over and over again that doesn't build anything. That just like sucks you dry and then you're just like, it's like, no, not moisturizing in the prairie winter dry, like that level of dry.
Hannah (Host):	26:26	[Laughs] It's so dry here. I feel like I've been mummified.
Audience:	26:29	[Laughs]
Chelsea:	26:32	We're all well preserved.
Hannah (Host):	<u>26:34</u>	Yeah, you'll all last for thousands of years. Yeah. So that, I mean the, the what you're speaking to that, that to find community
Chelsea:	26:43	Yes.

Hannah (Host):	26:43	via doing this work that sparks joy, that does seem to be, in my experience, something that podcasts are really good at in particular.
Chelsea:	26:52	Yeah.
Hannah (Host):	26:52	And I, my theory is that, it's because people, like you can hate read somebody's Twitter feed, and many of us do and many of us have our own Twitter feeds hate read, and you can hate read a blog post and you can set up Google Alerts for words that you want to yell at people about. But podcasts are really hard to track. And also if you want to hate listen to somebody's podcast, you have to spend an hour listening to them talk.
Chelsea:	27:18	Yeah, it's an investment.
Hannah (Host):	27:18	And the people who hate us don't want to spend an hour listening to a woman talk. And so for the most part, the people who are going to engage with it, other, the people who who care and self selects out.
Chelsea:	27:29	Oh yes. And it's super niche. Like, like that's the thing about podcasting. It can be super, super niche. You know, what's more niche than like, I dunno, the genre of drinking wine and, and critiquing like old sci-fi stuff from an Indigenous feminist lens. And then so people, yeah, people are gonna, are gonna listen to because they care. We were expecting to get way more hate than we do.
Hannah (Host):	<u>27:53</u>	Yeah.
Chelsea:	27:53	Like I get so much hate on my social media and stuff. Like it's just, I'm sort of inured to it at this point. It's just, it's ridiculous. But like, nary a bad word about <i>Métis in Space</i> . And it is, it's definitely like, we always go a bit over an hour, and nobody's listening to that, you know, our fart jokes and stuff. Like, I mean they are listening but then they think fart jokes are funny.
Hannah (Host):	28:13	[Laughs] Yeah.
Chelsea:	28:13	Can you fart in space? I mean, these are the important questions.
Audience:	28:18	[Laughs]
Hannah (Host):	28:18	Can you? Have you resolved this?

Chelsea:	28:19	Oh, there's a whole technical, it depends on whether you're in a suit or you're dying out there. But yeah, no, it just recycles. Yeah. You're breathing your own farts. Anyway
Audience:	28:29	[Laughs]
Chelsea:	28:29	This is high intellectual conversation here.
Hannah (Host):	28:31	Very high intellectual conversation. Is that clock correct?
AV Technician:	28:35	It's so wrong.
Hannah (Host):	28:35	No. What time?
Chelsea:	28:35	No Man. That's like
AV Technician:	28:37	Twenty to 1:00 PM.
Hannah (Host):	28:37	We're at twenty to 1:00 PM.
AV Technician:	28:39	Yeah.
Hannah (Host):	28:39	Oh great. We've got so much time. That's great. Delightful. Okay. Can we talk about Twitter a little bit?
Chelsea:	28:44	[Sighs] Alright.
Hannah (Host):	28:44	I know it's really bad. It's very bad. It's very bad, but we're both there.
Chelsea:	<u>28:48</u>	Yes.
Hannah (Host):	28:48	And one of the central premises of <i>Refuse</i> , as a project, is that we need to take seriously the intellectual work that happens on Twitter. And that's particularly the case because, as conversations about literature and cultural production in general in Canada have been unfolding over the past three years around, a set of, particularly trying events. None of which I'm going to describe. If you want to talk about them, you can come to the launch tonight. But as those conversations have been unfolding, one of the really distinguishing features has been who has access to getting an op-ed in a major, major national paper?
Chelsea:	<u>29:26</u>	Yeah.

Hannah (Host):

29:26

Who doesn't? So where are the conversations happening? And the degree to which a lot of the resistant conversations have been happening on social media has been a way those voices have been delegitimized.

Chelsea: 29:37 Mmhmm.

Hannah (Host): 29:37 So we, we wanted to be, you know, we have like a, a, a Twitter

essay by Zoe Todd in there, sort of, roughly in its original form because that's how he does a lot of her intellectual work. It's

how you do a lot of your intellectual work.

Chelsea: <u>29:53</u> Yeah.

Hannah (Host): 29:53 So can you talk a little bit about, you know, despite Twitter

being horrible while you're still on there doing that work?

Chelsea: 29:59 Yeah. Actually *Refuse* is really interesting because the in, in the

intro talks about, sort of that, about the ephemeral nature of the conversations that are happening and the importance of like having some sort of archive of that. And it's really difficult to do when, you know, when, yeah, like time, you know, you look at my feed, what I, that, that Twitter rant poem, good luck finding it. Like it's so buried in the, in, in, in time. And you have to also be like, you have to be there when it's happening. That's, that's a weird thing. So like, when there was the whole appropriation prize, where people were actually raising money, I just happened to be online at midnight watching that happen. So like, it's, it's interesting to hear other people's, sort of, perceptions of what was happening when I was there live seeing it happen, right? Like there's difference there. And so people's reactions who are actually, you know, you're, you're present but you're not in the room with these people, right? You're present at the time that it's happening. So those, getting that perspective is super important, not just like people reading your perspective and digesting it later. And so that's, that's what I see is like, mainstream media is very far behind. The cultural work, the intellectual work, the theoretical work is happening in live time, quite often on social media and, and, and it gets, it does get discounted because, people fail to realize, I think a lot like with the arc of Wikipedia, right? It was like anybody can contribute, therefore it's value is lessened. But then when you realize that anybody can contribute, it means that also anybody can, can fix errors and you're getting experts in the field, like experts in the field in their, in these very niche areas who know everything about the thing who are, who are giving this information. Then you sort of realize, "okay, it has a bit of a value." And social media is a lot like that, is, you know, the

theorizing that's happening is in reaction to real time events, and, and it's, and it's very, it can be very generative and amazing and it makes it really, like somebody will say something and you're like, "oh my gosh, like that's like world changing for me." And all of a sudden you're like, "how am I feeling about that?" And it's all happening. And then later somebody gets paid to, to do sort of a boring synopsis of that very exciting thing that just happened and write it up and be like, "wah, wah, wah, milennials."

like Tupac's lyrics in their poetry and being celebrated and nobody noticed. Right? Like you can't pull that shit now. Like when I find out that somebody like, you know, claims that I'm their cousin and they're like, you know, using me this way, I hear about it immediately and I can find their Facebook and call

[Laughs] Everyone: 32:15 Chelsea: 32:15 You know? And so it's, it's very divorced from what we're actually doing. And, and often the people that end up writing about it because they have that sort of, that access, don't understand what the hell they're writing about. Yeah, yeah, yeah. I mean, the rise of journalism that is just a Hannah (Host): 32:27 summary of a conversation that happened on Twitter is, is a real thing. Chelsea: Where it's like literally just screenshots and a bit of like, like 32:35 funny, like, "oh, look at that." You know? "Haha. Emoji" You know? Like that's not journalism. Damn. You're literally taking other people's words and just like, you're not even trying at that point. Yeah. Yeah. And to get back to that question of how, you know, Hannah (Host): 32:48 the, the expectation that in particular, like BIPOC writers and thinkers have to do work without getting recompense because you're selling out, and that the appropriation of work that has happened in particularly Black and Indigenous intellectuals on Twitter having their work just taken up, scooped up and placed in articles and to treated as though that is original, right? Chelsea: 33:13 Yeah, yeah. But the nice thing about social media and the voices that are able to access it, is that now we can call those things out in much shorter time. Like, you know, I'm thinking about some of the scandals in CanLit where you know, you have, you have like some French writers who are like, like literally using

them out for it. Like--

Hannah (Host):	<u>33:45</u>	Do people do that?
Chelsea:	33:45	Oh, people do that. I know. It's wild. It's wild. Yeah. People, people do all sorts of, make all sorts of wild claims. But the thing is, is that now all it takes is one person being like, "you know, I heard this person say that," and then boom! It's like fact checking from everywhere, right?
Hannah (Host):	<u>34:01</u>	Yeah.
Chelsea:	34:01	And so yeah, they can go ahead and do that and they're going to continue to, to steal our work and get credit for it. But I think with much less, it's, it's a, it's, it's much less easy for them now because we're there. We can be like a check out my Twitter feed here. It's funny how your, your article is like verbatim.
Hannah (Host):	34:20	[Laughs].
Chelsea:	34:20	And time stamped and everything. You know?
Hannah (Host):	34:22	Yeah, yeah. And it is that, well, it is simultaneously ephemeral work that, that sometimes needs to be archived in other way, it's still there.
Chelsea:	<u>34:30</u>	It's there.
Hannah (Host):	<u>34:30</u>	There still a record. Unless you are one of those people who deletes your Twitter feed every month. Which
Chelsea:	<u>34:34</u>	Yeah. No.
Hannah (Host):	<u>34:36</u>	It's brave. That's a brave thing to do.
Chelsea:	34:39	Sometimes I think about it. A lot. I think about it a lot.
Hannah (Host):	34:42	Yeah?
Chelsea:	34:42	Yeah.
Hannah (Host):	<u>34:42</u>	I also think about it a lot.
Chelsea:	<u>34:45</u>	God.
Hannah (Host):	<u>34:45</u>	There's probably some really bad takes in there, honestly.
Chelsea:	<u>34:47</u>	I know. Well, I'm just like, I often think about how I'm so glad that I didn't grow up with social media.

Hannah (Host): 34:52 Mmhmm. Chelsea: Like I, I sort of like I came to university, where the Internet was 34:52 just starting to be a thing, and thank god because if I had to listen to 15 year old me talk about anything, I think I would just vomit. Audience: 35:04 [Laughs] Hannah (Host): 35:06 It's unkind. It's unkind to have recordings of ourselves as youths. Chelsea: 35:09 But what a, what a strange new world we live in where that's like the norm now. So like everybody's sort of post, you know, they say that millennials should be the ones who are, you know, it should be the generation that's sort of like, like grew up with the internet. Like they didn't know anything else. Right? And I think that's fair because like, these people have their whole lives documented, you know, in ways that, that a lot of us can't understand. And, and here we are digging up tweets from people, you know, from seven years ago and being like, [angry scolding noise], you know, no room for growth. But I don't think that that's going to be sustainable when everybody has their whole life out like that. There's going to be, it's like when you grow up in a house, like a one room shack, I don't know who I'm talking about here, a one room shack with lots and lots of people and you don't actually have any privacy or bedrooms. And so you create privacy through these sort of like, social conventions where you just don't notice things, you don't talk about things. That's, I think that's going to be the landscape that we have to adopt because nobody's going to be safe. Hannah (Host): Yeah. Yeah. And that also, I mean the, the other big piece of 36:05 social media culture that you alluded to there, which is room for growth, what does it mean? You know, especially when you are somebody who is a public intellectual, who's doing a lot of work publicly, what does it mean to fuck up? What does it mean to make a mistake when so many people are looking at you and to figure out how to say like, "I want to be accountable for what I'm doing." Chelsea: 36:27 Yeah. Hannah (Host): And also we're all changing and working and learning. And 36:27 that's gotta be something that in under the public eye, we're still allowed to do. Chelsea: Yeah. And we've got great examples of how not to do that. 36:37

Hannah (Host):	36:40	There's many, many excellent examples of failures of accountability happening every day.
Chelsea:	<u>36:45</u>	But again, this is another commodification of everything, right? Where they're sort of like that, those, those ideas of being accountable and, and sort of making up for the, the fuck ups that you've had, has become an industry. Like people hire people to tell them how to do it in, in ways that seem like it's, it's all about the image. Right? And, and I think that's a bit of a problem because it sort of, it does create this expectation of, you know, when you do screw up, here's how you have to deal with it, and if you don't deal with it in that way, then you're not really sorry, and you're not really fixing it. But maybe that way isn't actually doing anything. Like you're just going through the motions. Right? Yeah. Yeah. I'm always, I'm always very wary of stuff like that. Also, I've really, sorry, that just reminded me of a huge pet peeve. "Weary" is tired, "wary" is suspicious. They're not the same thing. Stop mixing them up.
Hannah (Host):	<u>37:36</u>	[Laughs] Welcome to the new segment of this podcast where we talk about words that people commonly mix up.
Chelsea:	<u>37:38</u>	Yeah, I'm sorry. I see it all the time. And I usually, I'm like, I usually when people do that, I'm like, get over it. But that one really bothers me for some reason. I don't know.
Hannah (Host):	<u>37:47</u>	Weary and wary.
Chelsea:	<u>37:47</u>	Yeah.
Hannah (Host):	37:48	I have my big grammar bugaboo is "fewer" and "less," and it's not, it's a stupid thing to be annoyed by. Trying to stop using the word "stupid" pejoratively. It is
Chelsea:	<u>37:58</u>	Ableism is hard.
Hannah (Host):	<u>37:59</u>	Ableism is hard. Getting rid of ableist language is an ongoing project for me. It is a waste of my energy to be annoyed by "fewer" and "less," and I'm trying really hard to stop but like, like "15 items or less," I'm always like, "give me a sharpie."
Chelsea:	38:17	[Laughs] I don't even like English. Fuck you, English!
Hannah (Host):	38:20	[Laughs]
Chelsea:	38:20	But it's just like, I want to keep my, I want to keep my exhaustion and my suspicion as two different things.

Hannah (Host):	38:27	[Laughs]
Chelsea:	38:27	I don't want to be exhaustedly suspicious.
Hannah (Host):	<u>38:30</u>	That's great. That's beautiful. There's plenty to go around, you don't need them to overlap.
Chelsea:	38:34	Yeah, exactly.
Hannah (Host):	<u>38:34</u>	Do we have, how much? How are we, how are we time?
AV Technician:	38:39	You got nine minutes.
Hannah (Host):	38:40	Nine minutes?
Chelsea:	<u>38:42</u>	Yeah. Let's do some questions.
Hannah (Host):	<u>38:43</u>	Okay, so anybody have any, any questions, or thoughts, or short rants, or grammar pet peeves?
Audience:	38:48	[Laughs]
Hannah (Host):	38:50	Don't share your grammar pet peeves.
Chelsea:	<u>38:52</u>	No, that's fine. Awesome. Nice talking to you.
Hannah (Host):	<u>39:00</u>	Like, we can go or we can just keep talking.
Chelsea:	<u>39:03</u>	No, come on man. I know somebody, ah! ah! I saw you move. No, I'm just [laughs] This meeting.
Hannah (Host):	39:09	This is like in class when you're like, "I can wait longer than you."
Chelsea:	<u>39:12</u>	Yeah, it's true.
Hannah (Host):	<u>39:13</u>	But I don't want to do that to this lovely audience. I don't want to stare them down like I do with my students.
Chelsea:	<u>39:18</u>	I don't know. I'm kind of enjoying it.
Questioner #1:	39:21	I will say something. I'm enjoying actually reading your book. And I think what I enjoy the most is the humor that you've injected into the book. I didn't, I kind of expected it to be a little, I mean, it's very academic, as far as research.
Chelsea:	<u>39:34</u>	Yeah.

Questioner #1: 39:34 But I appreciate the humor that you inject into it. It makes me want to keep reading it. Thank you. Chelsea: Yeah. Well, that's the thing is when you're talking about tough 39:40 subjects, it's hard on the audience, but it's also hard on the person doing that work. And so if I, if I couldn't approach some of these things with a little bit of humor, then I don't think I could do that work at all because some of it's real grim. And I mean, if you've, you know, like, , I, I couldn't do a residential school chapter. I mean, it's in there, but it's not, it's not like anything else that I wrote in that book. I, I, it's just, that's a topic I can't handle, you know? And there's certain things I just cannot, I can't do. You know, there's no amount of humor that will allow me to approach that topic, and so I have to like, value or honored that in myself too. So, yeah. Hannah (Host): 40:21 Other, other question, questions, thoughts? Thought questions? CanLit? Rob? Questioner #2: 40:37 I have a question that's about like, who, as an editor of Refuse did you approach, who was like "No, fuck CanLit. I'm not refusing it, I'm just not having this conversation"? And how, like if, if you were surprised by people's responses. And Chelsea, kind of that similar conversation where you're up here, your particular work on social media, your particular work on [unclear] when I hear you say something different, it's sort of like, your work in graphic novels... Chelsea: 40:51 Mmhmm. Questioner #2: 40:51 And so as educators and humans, and however you identify, where you come up against people who you care about and respect their work, but do you have any tactics about how you negotiate... Chelsea: Yeah. 41:19 Hannah (Host): 41:19 That's what I'm going to repeat the question just for the podcast. So the question was about, where you sort of have reached out to collaborate with people and they say no, and that may or may not surprise you and sort of how you negotiate, sharing projects with people but having really different tactics in terms of how you go about it. That was certainly something that came up when we were approaching people for Refuse. Interestingly I would say some people said, you know, "I don't care about CanLit, I'm indifferent to CanLit as a project. I don't want to talk about it." The more common

response in particular, because we approached people who had been speaking out already around the sort of events that the book is engaging with. And so what we got a lot more of was people saying, "I am so burned out on this work."

Mmhmm.

Chelsea: 42:07

Hannah (Host): 42:07

Chelsea: <u>43:06</u>

Like, "I am so tired of talking about this. I'm tired of," because talking resistantly about CanLit for the last three years has been an incredibly punitive activity, culminating obviously in the lawsuit that had launched at the end of last year against 23, 24 people, many of whom are students, precarious authors. So like it has been like literally punishing work. And so when we reached out to people and they were like, "yeah, no, I am so, so, so, so done talking about CanLit," that was something that we were like, "yeah, cool." Like, "Great, great. Absolutely." And a lot of the time we reached out to people like Alicia Elliott, we reached out and said, "you've already done this work. You wrote an essay that was really fundamental to these

conversations. May we just republish this and give you some

conversation, right? Like, you're already doing the work and we

money for it?" And that like, sometimes that was the

just want to archive it and also pay you.

Yeah. And, and that, that, so yeah, let's talk about getting sued. So I'm luckily not one of the people, but on the day that that suit dropped in the fucking media, of all the places to put it, , I was, I was sitting there being like, "okay, is my name going to be on there?" Right? And that's the thing. It's like, it's not, I mean, it's not just this situation. I, it's a lot of situations, but when you speak out publicly, about particularly male violence seems to be a real flash point for this sort of litigious approach, but, but not

only, you are threatened. I mean, it's not just the, it's not just

the crappy things people say to you. It's not the complaints that they may launch with your University of Alberta Police Protective Services and say that you hate white people and you're racist and blah, blah, blah. You know, things like that that happened being sued or being threat with a threatened with legal action, particularly in places that don't have anti-slap legislation is horrifying. Like, I have a legal background, but I've been through a litigation before and it, it, it is life ruining. Like literally, I'm not, that's not hyperbole at all. It is life ruining and it does exactly what it's intended to do, and it's shuts you up. Because you, you're your best approach to that litigation is to absolutely shut down all of your social media, to stop speaking

publicly, to hunker down until it's over, and we're talking sometimes years before it blows over. So it does what it's intended to do. And the fact that that can be wielded with such

Hannah (Host):

46:39

ease, you know, against anyone, you know, basically just have to file a \$250 fee to sue someone, right? Like, that's pretty easy to do and you just fuck their life over. That is a violence that we can't even do anything about while it's happening, because it might harm the people, the defendants at the time. Right? So what did you know, what do we do about that? Like this ongoing violence is, and just forget about the money, just, just the, the personal stress, the years of your, of your life lost to this sort of thing. That burnout that you talked about can become permanent where people are and, people have dropped out of, of CanLit or other areas that they've been working on where they're just like, "I can't do that work anymore." And what are we losing when we lose those cultural workers? Right? We're losing the people that were supposed to be losing. It's, it's the people who are the most marginalized and lack the resources that end up dropping out. And so whenever we talk about CanLit, whenever we talk about resistance or refusal, we also have to talk about how we're going to support people who are facing, those, those tactics to silence. How are we going to make sure that they can continue to do whatever work that they choose to and then they're not ground down by it? And we don't have those conversations enough. CanLit is not just some place where we go and we get to share our words and be perhaps fetted and, and rewarded. No, it's a place that can literally like ruin your life.

The guestion was about the relation between authorship and

social media and how some authors are really present on social

Hannah (Host):	46:10	Yeah. Yeah. And it seems to be doing so quite deliberately.
Chelsea:	<u>46:14</u>	Yep. Yep.
Questioner #3:	46:27	Can you speak to the relationship between social media and authorship. I read your book, and because I knew you from social media it made the reading of the book more a performature for me. But not all, every author is engaged in social media. Is that a good thing, or are they mutually exclusive?
Chelsea:	46:37	Yeah.
Questioner #3:	<u>46:37</u>	Can you speak to that idea?
Hannah (Host):	<u>46:37</u>	Some people shouldn't be on social media.
Chelsea:	<u>46:39</u>	[Laughs]

media and some aren't there at all, and sort of how that shapes authorship.

Chelsea: 46:49

Yeah. It's a tough one. I am, that's a, for me it wasn't a strategic choice. I sort of like became a writer on social media by accident. Like, literally like I wrote a piece anonymously and then I got outed by the *National Post* and it was at that point that I kind of had to just like shit or get off the pot. So, but I mean, then I've seen other people, other authors that I liked their work and then they just on social media you realize that you don't like them as people and then it ruins their work. And so, you know, they're, they're definitely like people out there that are on social media that I just refuse to look at it because I'm like, "I want to keep liking you." And a, and I have definitely, I get so many comments on my blog about how like, you know, "I read your piece and it was really like good and everything, but you, you just lost me with your rude comments to people. Like your, just, your tone is so hostile and you're just, you know, I wasn't racist before, but now."

Audience: 47:44 [Scandalized murmur]

Hannah (Host): 47:45 [Laughs]

Chelsea: <u>47:45</u>

Hannah (Host): 48:06

Yeah. Yeah. So it's, it's, it's sort of two edged, you know? Like, you have to be careful about what you present out there. And it can mean that people, it can mean that your message is diluted because people decide that they don't like you personally. And to a certain extent that's legit. Like if people think I'm an asshole, then they're going to read my work differently. Right. So.

Yeah. Yeah, it's a, it's from I teach in a publishing program and the received wisdom in publishing is that you want your authors on social media because most presses have very, very minimal marketing budgets and it means that your authors market themselves. And so that, that has become increasingly an expectation for writers, that you be public, that you have a marketable self image, that you're actively promoting your work on an ongoing basis using social media to drive that platform. And I often talk to my students about how that is a different expectation you're directing towards authors depending on what social media is going to be like for those authors. Because social media is worse for women of color, social media is worse for trans people, it's worse for disabled. Like it's, it is, so if, as that becomes a sort of universalize the expectation, it's like, "cool. What level of emotional labor and potential trauma are you demanding of your writers?"

Chelsea:	49:03	Yeah. And where's that support?
Hannah (Host):	<u>49:06</u>	And where's the support? Yeah. Yeah. When that experience is terrible, because it's terrible sometimes.
Chelsea:	49:11	Yeah. Oh, it is. It is so bad. Sometimes I, I always swear I'm going to go off. And, and every time I do for a while it's like, it's really good, but, but it's where I can marshal resources for other people, you know? Like it's where I can fundraise for \$50,000 for scholarships for students going into Native Studies, or like fundraise for my friend's legal funds.
Hannah (Host):	49:32	Yep.
Chelsea:	49:32	Like, you know, being able to do that, I feel like an obligation that I have to, because I've, sort of, like built up this platform. I need to use it, I need to operationalize it, to help make community. But man, it comes at a cost.
Hannah (Host):	49:46	[Laughs]
Chelsea:	49:46	Yeah.
Hannah (Host):	<u>49:46</u>	Yeah. Any, do we have time for one, if there's a final urgent question. Nothing. No urgency felt in this room.
Audience:	49:57	[Laughs]
Hannah (Host):	49:57	That's good. That's good. We just kept it real low key. We talked about how terrible Twitter is, but in a very calm voice.
Chelsea:	50:03	Yeah. Yeah.
Hannah (Host):	50:04	So that nobody got stressed.
Chelsea:	<u>50:05</u>	No, no. Everybody's good.
Hannah (Host):	50:07	[Laughs].
Chelsea:	50:07	Pulse rates down.
Hannah (Host):	50:10	[Laughs].
Chelsea:	50:10	Yes.
Hannah (Host):	50:10	It's great. Beautiful.

Marie: 50:11 Thank you so much. Hannah (Host): 50:12 Thank you! Audience: 50:12 [Applause] Chelsea: 50:12 Thanks. Thanks so much. Hannah (Host): 50:12 Now to get down. Chelsea: Oh god. Okay. 50:12 Marie: 50:12 Can I give you a hand? Chelsea: 50:12 [Laughs] [Music: "Back in Black" by AC/DC. If you'd like to learn more Hannah (Host): 50:13 about Chelsea, you can follow her on Twitter

@apihtawikosisanor follow her work at apihtawikosisan.com. For spelling reference? That's APIHTAWIKOS.ISAN. I'll link to it in the show notes as well, and you can find those show notes and all the episodes of Secret Feminist Agenda on secretfeministagenda.com. You can follow me on Twitter @hkpmcgregor and you can tweet about the podcast using the hashtag #secretfeministagenda. And of course, you can review the show and now that I know how to do it, I'll see your review no matter what country you review it in. So there's a new review this week from G. Audens, no idea if I said that right, who reviewed it from Iceland, which is delightful. The podcast's theme song is "Mesh Shirt" by Mom Jeans off their album Chub Rub. You can download the entire album on freemusicarchive.org or follow them on Facebook. Chelsea's theme was "Back in Black "by AC/DC. Secret Feminist Agenda is recorded on the traditional and unceded territory of the Musgueam, Squamish, and Tsleil-Waututh first nations where I'm grateful to live and work. This has been Secret Feminist Agenda. Pass it on. [Music: "Mesh Shirt" by Mom Jeans]