Secret Feminist Agenda Transcript

Episode 3.26 Masters of Text with Ames Hawkins

April 18, 2019

Hannah (Host):	00:00	[Music: "Mesh Shirt" by Mom Jeans] Hi, I'm Hannah McGregor and this is *Secret Feminist Agenda* and I'm doing something I've almost never done before, which is actually recording the introduction to *Secret Feminist Agenda* on a Friday. That's right. This episode is going to be late. Not a whole day late, half a day late, because I didn't have time to finish editing it this week. Fun fact! This is stretching the definition of the word "fun." The week after classes are finished at the university is always one of the busiest weeks of the year for me because it is the week when I schedule literally every single meeting I don't have time for during the semester. So I have had like three to five meetings a day throughout this week. It's been extremely silly. I've also been working on a brand new podcasting project that I am starting with a friend of mine. I am going to tell you literally nothing about it, except that it is very fun, and I'm having a great time, and I think that you're gonna like it. So I look forward to more news about that at some mysterious point in the future. Okay, enough preamble. We're on a tight deadline here. The episode is already four and a half hours late and counting, so let's meet Ames. [Music: "Mesh Shirt" by Mom Jeans] Ames Hawkins is a creative critical scholar, educator, and art activist. A multimodal composer who uses writing and art to explore the intersections of alphabetic text, image, and sound, Ames theorizes the power and pleasure of querying form. Her recent work makes contributions to the larger conversations regarding multimodal composing, socially engaged practice, collaboration, queer literary nonfiction, and creative process as research methodology. Ames' is creative critical scholarship appears across a range of academic and literary publications, both print and online, such as *Pre/Text, Constellations, Palaver Journal, enculturation, Slag Glass City, The Feminist Wire, The Rumpus,* and *Water Stone Review*. Her book *These are Love(d) Letters* will be released this September in the Made in Michigan series at Wayne State University Press. Ames is co-host and co-producer of the scholarly podcast, *Masters of Text*, and is the Associate Provost for Faculty Research and Development and an Associate Professor of English and Creative Writing at Columbia College Chicago. [Music: "We Used to Wait" by Arcade Fire]
Ames:	03:13	It's funny, right? Like I don't know you at all, but when you hear each other's voice you're strangely more familiar, or comfortable, or something.

Hannah (Host):	03:22	Uh huh.
Ames:	03:22	But we're, well we don't know each other at all. Let's just be clear. [Laughs].
Hannah (Host):	03:25	Nope. [Laughs] I mean that is one of the really, like it's a, it's an oft cited thing about podcasting, but it is probably my favorite thing, is its generation of weird one-sided intimacies.
Ames:	03:39	Right. I mean it's one of the reasons I like it so much, I think, too.
Hannah (Host):	03:42	Yeah.
Ames:	03:42	Because you can feel like you have relationships with the people or you're inside that intimate conversation. You're a fly on the wall, but somebody let you in. So you get to be the, the approved voyager, if you will.
Hannah (Host):	03:54	Yeah, yeah. It's not invasive because somebody has, you know, consented.
Ames:	03:59	Right. Exactly. Voyeurism by consent, right?
Hannah (Host):	04:02	[Laughs].
Ames:	04:02	So it's, it's, it's exactly a queer politics. So we all consent to allow someone to watch, so to speak.
Hannah (Host):	04:12	Mmhmm.
Ames:	04:12	Yeah.
Hannah (Host):	04:12	Which is actually, I think, an interesting conversation that's happening right now in true crime podcasting. How, like it kind of tips the pleasure of voyeurism, that podcasting is often playing on into a space of more dubious consent. And it's like, you know, that podcast, the one that was about trying to find where Richard Simmons had gone?
Ames:	04:33	Oh, I don't know that.
Hannah (Host):	04:34	It's called something like, *Searching for Richard Simmons*. It was basically he disappeared. Not like the police were concerned, just he had been a very public figure and then suddenly he sort of disappeared out of the public eye. And so this podcaster was like, "I want to find out what happened and track him down."

		And it was a very, very popular, but a lot of people were like, "hmm, that seems like a really inappropriate way to use a public platform."
Ames:	04:59	Right. It's kinda not fair to Richard.
Hannah (Host):	05:01	Yeah.
Ames:	05:01	Maybe he didn't want to be found.
Hannah (Host):	05:03	Well, he made it pretty clear that he didn't want to be found by leaving the public eye, so.
Ames:	05:07	[Laughs] Right, right.
Hannah (Host):	05:08	Yeah.
Ames:	05:08	So there's your consent.
Hannah (Host):	05:09	Yeah.
Ames:	05:09	I mean, I think about that a lot too with the, that Shit Town podcast. A little different, but just--
Ames:	05:13	Yeah.
Ames:	05:14	--how I don't remember who made that, but how he sort of rationalized his decisions to out that main character.
Hannah (Host):	05:24	Yeah.
Ames:	05:24	I'm kind of like, "Hmmm, I dunno. That's still pretty problematic in my opinion, but..."
Hannah (Host):	05:29	Yup.
Ames:	05:30	But it was awesome. Podcasting, so....
Hannah (Host):	05:36	It was well-produced podcasting.
Ames:	05:37	Well there you go. There you go.
Hannah (Host):	05:38	Yeah.
Ames:	05:39	Absolutely.

Ames:	05:39	Yeah. Which, which I think, with this medium, can often feel like it means the same thing as good podcasting.
Ames:	05:46	Right.
Hannah (Host):	05:46	Because it's so well produced podcast is very seductive.
Ames:	05:49	Right. Yes. And there's a lot of it that is kind of not very well done or, or I guess it's rough around the production edges. Right?
Hannah (Host):	05:58	Mmhmm.
Ames:	05:58	So, so then things stand out like they stand out way above.
Hannah (Host):	06:02	Yeah. It also depends on the aesthetics that you're going for. I had a really interesting conversation with a scholar of jazz and radical improvisation at a panel that I was doing about podcasting and he was like, you know, the pleasure for him of listening to a podcast is the potential of radical amateurism.
Ames:	06:22	Oh.
Hannah (Host):	06:22	And that includes the sort of roughness of the audio recording. Like, where do you get to listen to nonprofessional audio production and what does that open up in terms of conversations you can have and voices you get to encounter. If podcasting moves in the direction of like everything needs to be professional and polished and sound exactly the same, then you kind of lose that messy edge of it.
Ames:	06:47	Yeah, I agree with that. I think that one of the things that excites me about it is that when you move to podcasting, the audio, well, the forms can open up so much, right. What you can do with any given, like podcast overall, the word itself to mean "one show" or each individual episode, or whatever you're talking about. And that's something I've been interested in in any way. So...Are we started?
Hannah (Host):	07:12	Yeah, we're like five minutes in. Okay. So this is where we're starting. [Laughs]
Ames:	07:18	So no prep. Alright.
Hannah (Host):	07:19	No, no, there's never any prep.
Ames:	07:21	There's never any prep?

Hannah (Host):	07:21	You're seeing behind the method now; there's never any prep.
Ames:	07:25	Wow.
Hannah (Host):	07:25	Yeah.
Ames:	07:26	Wow. I had no idea.
Hannah (Host):	07:26	Just start talking at some point.
Ames:	07:27	Okay. All right, so, so what do you want to know? What's the question?
Hannah (Host):	07:36	[Laughs] You got, you became aware of being interviewed? Oh, no!
Ames:	07:38	All of a sudden, yeah.
Hannah (Host):	07:40	Yeah. So this is, your episode is part of a sort of arc that I'm doing specifically about podcasting. I'm just going to end this season with a little bit of a meta arc about other feminist podcasters, specifically who are interested in podcasting as a way of, let's say, making forms of expertise that are usually locked within institutional structures, more public and more accessible.
Ames:	08:06	Right.
Hannah (Host):	08:07	And I'm really interested, you are one of a, I think still quite a small handful of academics who are playing with the possibilities of podcasting as a way of doing scholarship publicly. And so I'd really like to know sort of how you came to the medium.
Ames:	08:22	Yes, that's a great question. In the podcast, my, I, I'm going to say first because it's the first one, and I'm on now planning a second project. I'll get to that in a minute. But the first podcast, I never intended to be a podcast, or it was not my plan. My podcast is called *Masters of Text* with my friend Ryan Truman. And we had a--
Hannah (Host):	08:48	It's a good name.
Ames:	08:48	Yeah, it's good name, real good name. Actually we are, we are quite proud. And essentially, you know, he was a friend of mine and we were talking one day. He got me hooked on podcasting. I was going off to write and be on my sabbatical alone for like

this six week period, and he's like, "I think you might want to listen to these things." I was like, "all right, cool." So I started listening when I came back, we read this book together, S by J.J. Abrams and Doug Dorst and we just recorded ourselves. We thought it would be this other project, right? Like we read this together, talked about it, and by the end of the summer he kind of just said, "it's my goal. It's my life's goal to have a podcast. It's just like a bucket list goal." "So, well, I, I, I'll do it with you if you do it about what I want."

Hannah (Host):	09:35	[Laughs] Great.

Ames: 09:35   So, so, and he said, "I don't care what it's about." So I identify as a creative critical scholar, and I think that that's where this work kind of intersects as well. So when and how do artistic forms and scholarly forms come together? So creative nonfiction, is a clear area for me. That's one of my genres I write in. But rather than saying, "oh, that only works over here," or "scholarly writing's only over there," I think about how the artistic process can be understood as a research methodology. Right? So how is my making also about my thinking? I don't really think you can pull them apart. That's why I identify that way. And podcasting is like, I realized when we started making it, I've always been interested in recording. And what happened was, I think when we moved from like tape recording, like a literal tape. So when I was in sixth grade, I think, we were given these tape recorders and told to go home and record a bunch of regular things in our house and come back. And then they played them in the classroom and the instructor, well, "instructure," listen to me, teacher--

Hannah (Host):   10:43   [Laughs]

Ames: 10:43   --slowed come down and sped them up. And then we, I started thinking about how sound worked, and then I became really, really, really into the mix tape but not just to use a bunch of songs but to splice the songs up, because you could do that on a tape to tape old school machine. You know what I'm talking about?

Hannah (Host):   11:03   Yep.

Ames: 11:03   And CDs, well CDs fucked all that up for a decade, right? I didn't have the software that I could like keep that creative practice going.

Hannah (Host):   11:12   Yeah.

Ames:	11:13	And so I got disinterested in it. But now it feels like the way the podcast works in that kind of, a lot of the work that I've done has been vox pop. So you know, *The Cut Up*, those kind of forms are interesting to me. That's a really, really long winded answer.
Hannah (Host):	11:27	[Laughs].
Ames:	11:27	That I don't even know how I got to it.
Hannah (Host):	11:30	It's, it's really, it reminds me, we have been corresponding a bit over email and I at some point you were talking about really one of the central pleasures of doing podcasts as a scholar, being that sort of a DIY maker approach to it. And it's interesting because I have thought about podcasting as part of maker pedagogy and a, sort of, maker based approach to doing scholarship. But when I got that email from you, I was right in the midst of proposing, I'm working with a large SSHRC here in Canada. SSHRC is like our NEH.
Ames:	12:05	Mmhmm.
Hannah (Host):	12:05	Is that your big humanities funding?
Ames:	12:07	Yeah. The thing that doesn't have any money in it anymore?
Hannah (Host):	12:09	Yeah, yeah. We still, we still do.
Ames:	12:11	Good for you.
Hannah (Host):	12:12	So yeah. Oh, yeah. So I'm, I'm part of this big SSHRC grant, called Spoken Web, which is digitizing the literary audio archives at institutions across the country, and creating a, sort of, collective online resource for all of these literary audio archives.
Ames:	12:32	That's huge.
Hannah (Host):	12:32	It's amazing. It's a great project. Tons of librarians and archivists on board so that there'll be really consistent searchable metadata and really high quality, well preserved digital recordings. Lots of really interesting, like there's a ton of poets involved in the project. Like it's a really, it's a really cool project and they brought me on to help make a podcast that helps to disseminate some of the work that's happening.
Ames:	12:55	That's awesome. How cool is that?

Hannah (Host):	12:57	It's really great. It is really delightful to be a person people think of as like, "oh they make podcasts." I'm like, "I suppose I do."
Ames:	13:06	[Laughs].
Hannah (Host):	13:06	But I had to figure out sort of how to pitch the structure of a single podcast, as in series, that is being collaboratively created across a huge network of people, and how to balance multiplicity of form and multiplicity of voice with the kinds of consistency that are expected of a serial medium, that it has to be identifiably the same podcast while having space for people to make them the way they want to make them.
Ames:	13:34	Yes.
Hannah (Host):	13:35	And I think my original pitch leaned too far in the direction of like, cool, you just provide content and we'll make sure there's a production team who will put things together and then when you responded in this email and said like, "I think the pleasure of podcasting is really gained to get your hands on the on the software and really fuck around with the audio and see what you can do. Like it's got this DIY appeal to it." I was like, "Oh yeah, I need to let people actually make up. Like I need to let people get in there and play around with what you can do."
Ames:	14:06	Yes, to the degree that they want to, right?
Hannah (Host):	14:08	I'm trying to release control a little bit of the idea of what it looks like to, to collaborate with such a large group of people on a project like this.
Ames:	14:17	Right. That's exactly, that's exactly right. So that has me thinking really, really quickly about the next project that...I thought, I thought I was going to do a project just by myself called "Letters From Ames." And I had this big idea that I would have it be somewhere between queer rhetorics and queer literature, and that I would, oh, I dunno, do all kinds of things about messing around with and extending the ideas of epistolary forms. So I might write letters to people, like do reviews of current books as letters, since I know a lot of the authors. So instead of being a critique, it's really, it invites this conversation and maybe then they would come on and blah, blah blah. But that really feels like, it just didn't feel correct for some reason.
Hannah (Host):	15:01	Okay.

Ames:	15:01	And maybe the letter really still needs to be on the page. So I kind of put that over here. I'm just like, "that's still an idea for the future, but then my partner is getting a PhD in design and she's interested in feminist methods and diversity, equity, inclusion in design. And one of her colleagues was like, "oh, I want up to do a, I want to have a podcast on that." And I was like, "oh, I want to edit." So you could do, you can do so many things. So with this you could have two or three people who, each one of them gets their own interview, and then I would edit it, but I would edit from the perspective of like a development editor, or not just a tech editor to get it to be clean, but then then talk to them about these pieces. And then they could have three interviews. And then after they have the three interviews, the three of those interviewers get back together to talk about what really sparked their interest about the other ones. So this is the thing that Truman and I talk about in our last episode of *Masters of Text*, is what did we learn about scholarly podcasting? And he, he came up with his notion of categories. So he likes to order ideas, but the theme, the idea is that, that how and when and where we create new knowledge, that's what we call scholarship generally, right?
Hannah (Host):	16:17	Mmhmm. Yep.
Ames:	16:17	Not just, "Oh, I'm going to interview you and you're going to tell me all this stuff that's already in a book somewhere."
Hannah (Host):	16:22	Yeah.
Ames:	16:22	And I think that what I've been really impressed with the *Secret Feminist Agenda* is when those moments open. So you and I are more doing that right now, as opposed to when you interview someone who's just telling you about what they do.
Hannah (Host):	16:36	Yeah.
Ames:	16:37	And I think you can do all of it, right? This isn't a "that or that kind" of thing, but so when you're describing, what's the name of this new project for you, again?
Hannah (Host):	16:44	Spoken Web.
Ames:	16:45	Spoken Web. So when you're describing that project, I just get super jazzed because now I can see, it's kind of like this more recent design justice podcast or whatever we're going to do, is thinking of it not exactly like a journal, but you're opening the space where you offer someone a way to play around in an idea

that also has a scholarly review process. This open post review process, by which people choose to listen to it.

Hannah (Host):	17:20	Mmhmm.
Ames:	17:20	Or to me it goes into classrooms and it becomes a text.
Hannah (Host):	17:25	Yeah.
Ames:	17:25	I've been thinking a lot about how, cuz I, I try to use podcasts when I can in classrooms, but a lot of them are so informational based. It doesn't feel like there's enough there to give students something to sink their teeth into so to speak.
Hannah (Host):	17:39	Mmhmm.
Ames:	17:39	But *Secret Feminist Agenda* absolutely does. I'm like, I could give a whole season just say, "this is their class." And now, and I wonder when people could do that. You know what I mean? It's a lot.
Hannah (Host):	17:48	Yeah.
Ames:	17:48	That's a lot.
Hannah (Host):	17:49	[Laughs] I'm thinking, I mean the questions I think that podcasting inevitably raises about categories of scholarly work, I think are really valuable because they push us to rethink the easy ways that we categorize the work that we do. And even though it's supposed to be a, sort of, even spread between research and service and teaching, and the way that there's always the implicit or explicit hierarchy of those things: research, first teaching, second service way, way, way down in the bottom.
Ames:	18:21	Right.
Hannah (Host):	18:22	And I'm thinking, you know, about you taking on a project where you are positioning yourself as producer, first and foremost. And that that's really interesting as a, sort of, push in like what it means to do public scholarship, which is, "I'm not even going to center my own voice in this." It's going to be really, sort of, pushing how a scholarly contribution can consist in editorial intervention, in facilitating collaborative conversations in, in work that I think is fundamentally feminist work, because you know, the work of bringing together communities and making connection I think really is feminist

community building work, and as such as just so phenomenally undervalued in the university. And it seems, it seems very daring to me to be like, "yeah, my next project: producing."

Ames: 19:15 Well, it's not so daring because I've been doing this awhile.

Hannah (Host): 19:18 [Laughs].

Ames: 19:18 But I think it's just that I, I've realized how important that is. And one of the reasons I can see this as so valuable, I suppose is a, I have this position right now, I'm the Associate Provost for Faculty Research and Development, and one of my jobs is to be thinking about this, to help faculty prepare for tenure and promotion. Right? And so Columbia College Chicago, I think is distinctive for a number of reasons. Our education, etc., etc. But really it is in thinking about who the faculty are. And if we, we have to start with the idea that everyone's an academic, but we are equal parts scholar, practitioner, artist.

Hannah (Host): 20:01 Mmhmm.

Ames: 20:01 And in an R1 kind of a place scholar, just like 90 plus percent of the people, maybe there's an art school, maybe there's a design school, they're way on the fringes, and everything they've ever had to do has been matched up against the quote unquote "gold standards" of scholarly production.

Hannah (Host): 20:18 Yeah.

Ames: 20:18 And it's been interesting to me. So the artists like, "oh, well you have a monograph, you have a single person show. So your publishing house..." versus where it is. Like we're just gonna make these equal, equal, equal, equal things. And the thing about people who are practitioners, even as academics, they are practitioners. They've been hired, they're part of the academy, and their stuff has to count. They have a really hard time because the mechanisms for front and peer review are very different. So I write for a newspaper and my editor was my peer editing. That was my peer.

Hannah (Host): 20:52 Mmhmm.

Ames: 20:52 But really it's about what's the traction after that? What happens after that article, or I do a podcast, or I do a blog? Those are legit forms, but we don't have front end and we shouldn't maybe. And I, that's why I got so excited about

		learning about your project because I was, I was putting together my, my application for full professor--
Hannah (Host):	21:12	[Laughs].
Ames:	21:12	--and I have a lot of things that are online, and I have video essays, and I have audio, and I have this podcast and I don't know to what degree that will or will not be counted, but I wanted to start to create the mechanism and the arguments for it to at least be seen. So that's one of the reasons I'm super interested in this. And now that I've kind of articulated all that for myself, I can say, well, "this is super legit scholarly work," because it's also going to move me to assist this group of women in doing this DEI design podcast in a, it's a different totally field, right?
Hannah (Host):	21:52	Yeah.
Ames:	21:52	Yes.
Hannah (Host):	21:53	[Laughs].
Ames:	21:53	So that's, that's how, that's how I got there.
Hannah (Host):	21:57	So this conversation about peer review and how you evaluate impact is actually, I was having a conversation on Twitter this very morning about how you evaluate impact in scholarship. And it's such an interesting question for me because I do think, you know, the enduring value of peer review is that it is a way of establishing, you know, the, the value of merit of scholarship, regardless of whether anyone else ever reads it. And I think that there's, I think that there's space for that still. To say that, you know, within a small scholarly community, there may not be numerically a huge number of people interested in this work, that doesn't automatically mean it's not valuable, and the peer review is a way much like the sort of caliber of the press that you publish with or the, the, you know, the status of the gallery that you exhibit in. Like it's a way of saying like, "even if this isn't gonna make a ton of money or garner a ton of clicks, within a community of practice, people have looked at this and said, 'yes, this work matters.'" And that that is helpful and it's also deeply limiting. And so when we start thinking about work that we want to find a larger audience and start thinking like, "okay, so it's less the sort of gatekeeping function of peer review and more, let's put this work out there, and see how it circulates, and how it gets picked up and what kinds of impact it has." The actual question of how to evaluate impact for me is such an

interestingly slippery one, because I do think that there is in things like the alt-metrics community, there's this tendency to say like, "well, we measure impact by how many people have looked at a thing or clicked on a thing." And that has been a really useful tool for like, the open access community to argue for open access.

Ames:	23:46	Mmhmm.
Hannah (Host):	23:46	They're like, see you paywall this journal article. Nobody ever sees it. You make an make it open access, a thousand people read it. That's fantastic. Great. Love it. Love more people having access to research popularity cannot be the measure of impact.
Ames:	24:00	Absolutely not. Agreed.
Hannah (Host):	24:01	It's, it's so scary.
Ames:	24:03	Right, right. So, rather than it being popular, I suppose it's, it's thinking about how we talk about it in the communities where we value the peer review in the first place.
Hannah (Host):	24:16	Mmhmm.
Ames:	24:16	So for example, you know, I think *Masters of Text* has a very wee number of people who have downloaded it, we still had a goal of getting above a hundred subscribers and we hit that. But if you think about how small our field is overall, and we, if you take sound writing as an even smaller part of the field, that's pretty decent, right?
Hannah (Host):	24:37	Yeah.
Ames:	24:38	And how I know about the impact is that I get these, without putting out my shingle or anything, I might get invited to go do a talk, or I go to a conference and I'll have somebody come up behind me, this has happened a number of times now "[Gasp] You're Ames." "Yeah. I, who are you?"
Hannah (Host):	24:56	[Laughs].
Ames:	24:56	"I listen to you, I have listened to you." Right? And the, and the other thing that's really interesting about this work is more time out there, you can get more traction. So as this area of interest builds for people, we're going to want to go and say, "oh wait, what have you listening to?" And so three, four years later, even after the podcast's all over, somebody may be listening to it.

Hannah (Host):	25:18	Mmhmm.
Ames:	25:18	So then the impact is, it's the accretion idea, right? Over time and not like the one off, only on the front end where "well, you've got that publisher, boom, we're done."
Hannah (Host):	25:31	Yup.
Ames:	25:31	The book was published.
Hannah (Host):	25:32	Yeah.
Ames:	25:32	And that counts as impact somehow.
Hannah (Host):	25:36	[Laughs].
Ames:	25:36	Fully, completely.
Hannah (Host):	25:37	Yeah.
Ames:	25:38	Not, not, not that it isn't.
Hannah (Host):	25:39	The fact of the thing.
Ames:	25:40	Yeah, the fact of the thing. And on this end, the fact of the thing doesn't matter. So I do think it's, I think it's really looking at both/and. Both, how do we, how do we start to talk in a really smart way about what it means to be a public intellectual? And so the clicks do matter. But also at the same time, how are we, that's why the project you're doing with Wilfred--
Hannah (Host):	26:04	Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
Ames:	26:05	Right, where you have two people reviewing it each season. That, that the two is kind of, it's enough.
Hannah (Host):	26:11	Yeah.
Ames:	26:11	Because that gives you so much for you to reflect on, and to move forward with, and to make changes, and it's in process. You know, the other thing that's so awesome about podcasts because of the way they work this way is that we are all getting this back end understanding of how your thinking has changed or how you're doing this. You don't get the, if I get an essay, I don't often know where that thing started, how many people read it, how many people gave you helpful feedback, how long it took, what the idea development was there. And I think the

way that the podcasting pulls the lens back on that, or pulls the shroud away, or whatever, that's so helpful, not only to emerging academics but to the public to not think that, you know, these just come spouting out of our head somehow.

Hannah (Host):	27:04	[Laughs] Yep.

Ames:	27:04	Like we have these ideas. You know there's a human component that's really huge to that.

Hannah (Host):	27:10	[Laughs] Yeah, absolutely. I mean it in a lot of this kind of scholarship, it reveals the thinking process. It reveals the, the sometimes, sort of, productive lack of clarity around ideas, and I also think really helpfully embodies them. Right? That the podcast, despite being, you know, a sort of a single sense medium, so to speak, comes with the sense of the embodied ness of your host. You hear the way that a voice resonates through a body, you can hear tone, you can hear vulnerability, you can hear affect, all of these things come through in a way that that absolutely can also communicate in writing, but that the norms of scholarly writing have have often rigorously trained out of us. I'm, I'm trying right now to write a book based on *Secret Feminist Agenda*--

Ames:	28:04	Oh!

Hannah (Host):	28:04	--That sort of draws out some of the main themes in the podcast and some of the thinking that the podcast has prompted in me and trying to figure out. It was easier for me to move from traditional scholarly writing into doing something totally different with podcasting because podcasting feels totally different. Going back to writing and trying to figure out how to do that differently, I'm finding harder. But I think you came into podcasting via already doing that kind of writing, correct?

Ames:	28:33	Correct. Right. So I think that that's why I wanted to, that's why I got really excited about it because it allows me to push scholarly form farther. So that's why I call it a part of my research method to do this, and then by doing this work I can think about, "well what does it mean when I go back to the page? How do I go back and forth between these different mediums and the page?" And I definitely, personally, I like audio better than video to work in.

Hannah (Host):	28:58	Mmhmm.

Ames:	28:58	That's a lot for me to sort of negotiate. I don't know how to else to say that, but I, but I've done some, some video work. Actually. I didn't really do it; my son did the editing cause I was like, "I can't do this here you do this."
Hannah (Host):	29:10	You're the YouTube generation, you figure it out.
Ames:	29:14	That's exactly right and, and you have to collaborate a lot when you do that kind of work. I never liked writing the scholarly paper; I always resisted it from the get go. I knew how to do it, it just didn't, it didn't offer me enough space to actually play around in and with the sentence. And I think the sentence became such a tool to the quote unquote "writing up research" instead of an artistic or the way that words become a medium. And I don't know what else to say about that other than I just didn't, I just didn't like it. It just seemed so limiting to me. But so I can appreciate that. I can appreciate that it's a, that it would be you, it's sorta like, "oh crap, I can't go back now. I can't go back to this thing that was kind of formulaic and easy." Is that fair?
Hannah (Host):	30:01	Yeah, yeah.
Ames:	30:02	Okay. that's, that's what I'm saying. Yeah.
Hannah (Host):	30:04	Yeah. And that's what I actually always really liked about the scholarly essay is that I, I'm, I'm a, a good replicator of form. Like I can look at the way that something else has done and be like, "cool, I can reproduce that. Absolutely, absolutely know how to reproduce that." And I have always found it quite comforting how scholarship really is just a series of very concrete and specific genres, that once you learn how to write and work with in them, they just keep proliferating, right? Like I know how to write a grant application, I know how to write a conference application, I know how to write an article, I know...Like I know how to do these things and they do just have these, these really, sort of, familiar and reproducible structures to them. And now that I have gotten a sense of how much further my own thinking gets pushed by experimenting with form and by moving into different, different genres and different mediums, I'm finding it very, very boring to go back to a scholarly article. And really realized the way in which like I kind of already know, like I come up with the idea in my head and I'm like, well I already know. I know what this is going to say. Like do I want to spend two weeks writing down a thing when I already know what it's going to say? No, I want to, I want to go into something, not sure what it's going to say and figure it out as I go.

Ames:	31:25	Yes! That's a creative critical scholar!
Hannah (Host):	31:29	[Laughs].
Ames:	31:29	And I don't know that that isn't a lot more people or something. I just don't know that we, we knew that something would be available to us in a different way. And it doesn't mean that other folks can't keep using those, those very clear, tried and true, everyone-knows-what-they-are forms. But I think, you know, so I've been at this kind of a while now, and I do know that there are more spaces for creative critical scholarship and, and for me, in my field, they kind of come out of the computers and writing area because we talk all about multimodal composition. And what's been really interesting is that that's all fine for our students to do, but a lot of professors weren't doing that until recently. So now I am challenging people like, "why are you having your students do all that? But you've never done one, you know? Yeah. Whereas before it was easy to say, "well, I've written scholarly essays. I'm going to do..." I still think that the, you know, the traditional student essay's not even a scholarly paper; it's some other weird form that they, I don't even...And, and Columbia's not a place that we, that we, that we've ever really done that.
Hannah (Host):	32:36	Mmhmm.
Ames:	32:36	But you know, you want your students to, I mean, it's required a multimodal composing is a part of a most K-12 curriculum now, curricula. And then you come to college and, you know, your professors may or may not have ever even seen this stuff really. Not really. And so how do they grapple with what it means to assess it? It's all that kind of stuff. I just think about how they're all intertwined. And so how do we address that when we're thinking about all of these forms and all this kind of knowledge and what we privilege in these spaces and when, when do we privilege this form? And you know, you, you sound like a rhetorician to me. "Well, I know how to use this when I'll use it, what it's for," and that, that's what I hope we can help students with.
Hannah (Host):	33:26	Yeah. And I do think that there are other, that there are people who use those forms and really, in ways that are really different from how I use them. Right? Like I don't want to be like, "ha ha, the traditional essay can get into a garbage.
Hannah (Host):	33:39	Like, I read other people's scholarly articles and I'm like, "Oh yeah, you're doing something really interesting with this." And you know, I think it, it depends, in part, on how people think

and how people process ideas. And I know colleagues of mine say it takes them a year to write an essay and I'm like, "what do you, what are you doing in that year?" But like, they're thinking deeply about, like by the time they arrive at the essay, it's the result of this long process of writing, right? So it's just where does that thinking happen for you? And for me, the dialogue has proven to be a really productive way for my thinking to happen. That sort of drives these things forward, whether that's the literal conversation that happens on an interview episode or if it's the kind of imagined dialogue I'm having with listeners in the mini episodes. Like, I'm still, I'm thinking alongside an interlocutor and more aware of the presence of an audience that has often a resistant audience, or a curious audience, or you know, an audience that's gonna push me on my ideas in a way that I have not myself been aware of an audience when I've written scholarly articles. I've been more aware of an expectation.

Ames:	34:50	And I, right, and so I think right there, you know, the Secret, *Secret Feminist Agenda*, as a project, can really start to claim this ground of pushing you toward feminist scholarly forms. So what you just articulated, right, is this idea that you're thinking and the form of writing has been impacted by a dialogic collaboration with a number of human beings over the course of time, whereas built into, and we'll just make it the, the, the most stereotypical, staid, traditional form of the scholarly essay that is absolutely not in there. They, you're not, you're not having a convo with somebody.
Hannah (Host):	35:31	[Laughs].
Ames:	35:31	Even though that person may have talked to somebody a bunch to get to this idea, it doesn't reveal it.
Hannah (Host):	35:37	Mmhmm.
Ames:	35:37	It's not honest that way. And maybe they didn't.
Hannah (Host):	35:39	Yeah.
Ames:	35:39	Maybe they just wrote it up in two weeks or something. But I do think that it's, it's how our practice, so how this feminist practice and this making practice actually impacts all of scholarship, like that's what's interesting to me. And so that's why and how I would feel comfortable. And I had a question, do you have your students make podcasts? Have you done that yet? Did I miss that somewhere?

Hannah (Host):	36:08	[Laughs] I have my students make whatever kind of thing they want to make.
Ames:	36:14	Okay.
Hannah (Host):	36:14	Which includes podcasts, if that's what they decide they want to make. And so generally, increasingly, the form that sort of final projects take in my courses is a, sort of a multimedia project in which part of the assignment is choosing the medium the student believes to be the most appropriate to the work that they want to do. And they have to justify the choice of medium. And so, so we're in a publishing program and I really want to push them to think beyond notions of publishing as being constrained around print.
Ames:	36:45	Right.
Hannah (Host):	36:46	And so you know, what do you want to do? Do you want to do a zine, do you want to do a poster campaign? Do you want to make a podcast? You want to do a video series? Do you want to do like a 3D art installation is a thing a student did. The main assignment in the grad seminar that I teach every year about the history of publishing is that students have to adopt an item out of our rare books and special collections. They do a research paper on it based on, you know, sort of old fashioned history research paper, and then their final assignment is to remediate the object in whatever way they want. And last year two students were working on these old maps of Vancouver that they found. And what they did is they took the maps and they superimposed them over contemporary maps and traced the differences in the water lines, because the transformation of Vancouver as an urban space has had a lot to do with the building out and the paving over of different waterways. And so they traced the difference, and then they retraced the shapes that they had produced onto music, like--
Ames:	38:01	Oh yeah.
Hannah (Host):	38:02	--onto actual sort of music staff, and wrote a composition based on trying to reproduce these shapes, and then recorded it and their final product was this, this piece of music.
Ames:	38:19	Yeah. That's amazing.
Hannah (Host):	38:20	Like, I would never in a million years have been like, "here's what I want you to do."

Ames:	38:25	[Laughs]
Hannah (Host):	38:25	Like, and so like students and students come to me and are like, "well, can you give us some examples of things other people have done?" And I'm like, "no, absolutely not." No, no. If I tell you some things, you will immediately be like, "oh, okay. I have to do that."
Ames:	38:41	Right.
Hannah (Host):	38:41	Be like, "you're going to come up with something that's a way better idea than I ever could have. So..."
Ames:	38:45	And so in saying that, that goes back to creative practice as research methods. So they then, that's an, that's an artistic project. That's an arts project.
Hannah (Host):	38:54	Yeah.
Ames:	38:54	And, and so, interesting. So these are grad students in this program, right? Publishing?
Hannah (Host):	38:59	Yep.
Ames:	38:59	So to what degree--
Hannah (Host):	39:00	Yep. It's a fairly professional program.
Ames:	39:00	--to what degree are you collaborating with designers and artists and at the faculty level? If you're pushing people in that direction, like that's, yeah, really interesting and amazing work. And so how do they, well, if it's a professional program, I think that's a little different than if they see themselves as going off to be scholars. So how do we not let that just drop? "And that was a one off. I did that in that class at one time. That was really cool." But to get them to take that forward into their own work, even if their work is quote unquote "professional" and they go to work for press or library or whatever.
Hannah (Host):	39:30	Yeah. And I do think that it's almost easier in a program like this. So, you know, one of my colleagues, our design instructor, like she's a book designer. She has an MFA, she is an artist. That is the work that she does. She teaches the design classes. You know, my colleague who teaches the management courses is a feminist artist with a history of running feminist magazine.

Ames:	39:54	Okay, yeah. This is like the perfect program. This is awesome. That's perfect! Yeah.
Hannah (Host):	39:57	It's great. Absolutely amazing. And so I think collectively we have a sense that we want students to move out into the industry really having embraced the possibilities of creativity in of, of lateral thinking. Right? And there is that way that that kind of creative, critical thought plays better into an arts industry like publishing than it does into the kinds of ruthless professionalization that still structure how we train academics. So this the point that you made earlier about how many scholars are super comfortable assigning really non-traditional work to their students, but themselves would never do it. It's such an interesting, what's the word that I'm looking for? Like a...
Ames:	40:45	Conundrum? [Laughs]
Hannah (Host):	40:46	Rupture. Conundrum. A paradox.
Ames:	40:49	Oxymoron? Nearly, but not.
Hannah (Host):	40:49	[Laughs] A mismatch.
Ames:	40:51	Yeah.
Hannah (Host):	40:52	So many words. But it's, so, it does so much seem to be the case that we're, we're creative everywhere except what we accept as our own scholarly production.
Ames:	41:03	Yes. And I do think there are people push at the edge of that, but, but even then the, the larger system has a hard time seeing it or recognizing it. And, and that's, that's the thing that I'm now trying to figure out how to speak to or do something about or whatever. I don't know.
Hannah (Host):	41:20	Yeah. Well, in the position that you're in now, is that something that you can, I don't remember exactly what it was. It had the word "provost" in it--
Ames:	41:27	Yeah. Associate Provost for Faculty Research.
Hannah (Host):	41:28	--something something. [Laughs].
Ames:	41:29	Sort of, it gives me a space to legitimately about how to articulate these ideas and I think I help certain people at our institution frame who they are and then frame their work in

these scholarly ways. Right? So I'm trained as a scholar and I can look over at the practitioner and the artists in there maybe struggling a little differently with that big assignment. I suppose, it kind of feels like a giant assignment to me. What, you know, quote unquote, "what does the teacher want?" If I can help translate that for them a little bit, I feel like I've done my job. That's not the same as impacting scholarly work.

Hannah (Host):	42:04	Yeah.
Ames:	42:04	It is. It has a lot of impacted our, at our school's level in our college for those faculty and I'm--
Hannah (Host):	42:09	Yeah.
Ames:	42:09	--I want to help assistant professors do that and then help educate the people who are the tenured faculty when they're reviewing the cases. Like help them so that they can see the argument. Some people will never buy it. Other people will be like, "Whoa, I never thought about that." So I'm not worried about the people who will never buy it.
Hannah (Host):	42:26	Yeah.
Ames:	42:27	You have to let those people go. But I think that, I think your word "rupture" was maybe really, really good choice, or you know, this, this rip, this tear, this place, this opening, this aperture, orifice that you can like stick your finger inside, explore a little bit.
Hannah (Host):	42:42	[Laughs]
Ames:	42:42	That's, that's how I think about that stuff. And you're like, "oh, what? These don't line up real well. This shows us something that we might want to consider. I don't do that, but I'm going to sign it." Why?
Hannah (Host):	42:55	Like what value do you think it has that lets you bring it into the classroom and why do those values not translate into how you actually practice your work?
Ames:	43:02	Yeah.
Hannah (Host):	43:02	And I conversation that I've been having with many people, in many different positions, is like where's the pressure point within our institutions and our disciplines where you can get

		some movement on these things? We had Kathleen Fitzpatrick visiting here last week.
Ames:	43:23	Oh, that's super cool.
Hannah (Host):	43:24	Yeah, it was wonderful.
Ames:	43:25	Oh yeah, she's somebody I cite her stuff when I'm talking about this.
Hannah (Host):	43:28	Yeah, absolutely right. In her new book, *Generous Thinking* is all about public scholarship and the role of a public scholar, and I think you would like it. It's, it's a really about sort of, feminist and community conscious research as the saving grace of the university. How we're going to, sort of, reimagine our public mission as central to the work the university does. And after her talk, somebody in the audience said like, "well how is this actually gonna be become possible?" And she said, "it's going to take some really brave university presidents." And I was like, "well that's never happening." So where, cause you don't get to that point in university bureaucracy if you're somebody who likes to shake things up, at least I've seen very little evidence that you do. But another real pressure point, it seems to me, is tenure and promotion committees, right? That we're doing this to ourselves, that, that often people at higher levels are less attached to the specificities of work and more interested in things like impact. And it's within departments that we are often more entirely policing the kinds of behavior that are and are not acceptable.
Ames:	44:42	Yeah. And I do think that we'll know when there's, there's traction. I think there's a little traction because then you'll get a harder push back initially. That's how it goes with a lot of things. Right?
Hannah (Host):	44:50	Yeah.
Ames:	44:50	So, yeah, initially, you know, if I, if I got through and a book was good for me, then a book is good for everyone.
Hannah (Host):	44:58	Yeah.
Ames:	44:58	Well, okay, but you know, that was literally probably maybe 50 years ago or whatever and maybe 40 and yes, I don't discount that work even a tiny bit. It's really important. And I mean, when you talk about pressure points, I keep thinking about just the idea that the academy overall is under a tremendous

amount of pressure. Like our school, I'm just like a lot of American universities, they were really hit hard by the collapse of 2008 and we lost students.

Hannah (Host): 45:32 Mmhmm.

Ames: 45:32 And then the double whammy that this generation, there's just fewer of them, physically as humans. There just aren't as many. And so--

Hannah (Host): 45:41 Well that's an aspect of falling enrollment we don't talk about a lot, huh?

Ames: 45:45 No! And not, you know, I guess globally there are, but then there's the big pressure; "well, go, go to other places," and then you know, we have a, we have a president who doesn't want to let a lot of people in. So that makes everything really complicated. That kind of pressure seems to me that, I don't know how yet, but it's gotta be a piece of this picture. What is a 21st century education?

Hannah (Host): 46:10 Yeah.

Ames: 46:10 So if you're thinking about your program, what's publishing in 21st century, what's a 21st century education overall? It's not the one I had in 1986 or whatever. That's not that one. That was pretty good then. But there's something else it needs to be. So how are we challenging ourselves? Like I think it probably was pretty similar for almost a hundred years. And then now's the moment where it's, there's a lot of change, a lot of pressure. The digital world, this McPuter thing we're like looking into right now.

Hannah (Host): 46:40 Yeah [laughs].

Ames: 46:40 And doing this work it makes this work possible, which is all awesome. But then we have to accommodate it and we have to be able to talk about it. And when you do that and you put it out there, then you have to do the work of legitimating it. That becomes a hard part.

Hannah (Host): 46:55 Yeah. I, a colleague of mine Dene Grigar, who's an electronic literature scholar, said to me once that "half the work of doing new forms of scholarship is credentialing it." So you have to do the radical thing and then you have to write the book on the radical thing and you do that in the hopes that the next people

who come along and do the radical thing won't have to read the book anymore.

Ames:	47:19	Yep. That's where I feel like I am, I guess, is that I feel like I made a thing. So now I'm trying to figure out what projects do I do. What, what's enough so that I don't have to write whole book on it, but I can do this essay here or this essay there, cuz I don't know that I want to spend a whole that much time writing a book on it, exactly. It also feels more akin to what this is. If it comes out in different kinds of articles.
Hannah (Host):	47:44	Yeah.
Ames:	47:45	Then, here, let me write a book about why we don't necessarily always need to write books. Yeah.
Hannah (Host):	47:51	[Laughing] It's the currently, the first sentence of the draft of my book is like, "okay, wait, what the hell are you doing writing a book? Wasn't the whole point of this that you don't need books?"
Ames:	48:01	Well, we love books though. All of us who do that. I love books.
Hannah (Host):	48:05	Big, big fan. Big fan. Surrounded by them. [Laughs].
Ames:	48:07	Yeah, exactly. I love them! And I liked them in my hands and I don't really like them to be electronic. That's not what they are to me. I like the feel of them. I like the weight of them. And then other things are fine to be electronics, but I had a book for me. [Sighs] yeah.
Hannah (Host):	48:23	I just have trouble paying attention when they're on screens. So the other aspect of this whole conversation that again, this, this Twitter thread that was happening this morning has really prompted a lot of new thinking about these things for me. But somebody pointed out, Meg Godwin, I think their name is, pointed out that, you know, a lot of our conversations when we're talking about new forms of public scholarship are focusing on things like tenure and promotion, credit within the structure of the university. But the vast majority of academics working today will never have tenure track jobs, will never have tenure. As a system, it seems to be on the way out, let's say. It seems like like it's a, it's pretty unlikely that we will somehow pull the university back into the moment of the 1960s when getting a PhD led you into a tenure track or tenure position. And so is there also a way that we can be marrying conversations about

scholarship, about non-traditional scholarship with conversations about, let's say, non-traditional scholars?

| Ames: | 49:35 | Yes. So so obviously we have to do that. That's a huge, huge issue. I can barely wrap my mind around it. |

| Hannah (Host): | 49:41 | I know, right? |

| Ames: | 49:41 | My, my first, my first response is like, "yeah, well that happens when the same time those presidents who come into power that don't exist yet are going to make these changes." |

| Hannah (Host): | 49:54 | [Laughs] |

| Ames: | 49:54 | "Sooo, I think we're a ways off from this actually." But it doesn't mean that that's not very real. I think a lot of it has to do with that person that we're talking about who, who doesn't have the tenure check job that's still teaching in the university. Why and how and in what ways do we, or do we not, illustrate that we care that those people are doing that stuff. Yeah. My short answer is "I have no idea." That's-- |

| Ames: | 50:17 | [Laughs] Yeah, yeah. Nor do I. But they seem to me to go hand in hand. |

| Hannah (Host): | 50:22 | There seems to me to be a like, why remain precious about notions of producing the right kind of stuff in the right kind of way to get the right kind of job when almost nobody's going to get those jobs anyway? So fuck it. Do the work that you want to do in the ways that you want to do it for the people you want to do it for. |

| Ames: | 50:41 | Right. But you're going to have people hold on to that old way, like with a death grip because somehow they think, they think that there's something actually distinctive. So here's what it comes down to, something actually truly different about them, the one who has the tenure track job and those who don't, right? |

| Hannah (Host): | 51:00 | Hmmm. Yeah. |

| Ames: | 51:00 | So somehow I did something right or my stuff was better or whatever, that it wasn't just privilege or luck or whatever it might've been. In addition, when I tried to challenge folks about, "well, you know, we got these jobs, here's how this all evolved and maybe we're in the right place at the right time." I, |

		I, the pushback I sometimes get from people: "Oh, I, I earned this job."
Hannah (Host):	51:24	[Laughs].
Ames:	51:24	"Well, okay..."
Hannah (Host):	51:25	It's a meritocracy!
Ames:	51:28	"Well, hmm, but there were like, 40 of you and you're the white guy who got it. I don't know. I wonder." I, it wasn't meant to demean the person. It was meant to be like, "Hey, aren't you really grateful for your tenure track job? I know I am." I know that it's awesome in so many ways and really, really getting that, that's an amazing privilege. And I suppose that's it too, right? So I want to figure out how do I use this position of privilege now I do have tenure. You know, we'll see about the full professor. My fingers are crossed, of course.
Hannah (Host):	52:03	Yep.
Ames:	52:03	But even then, that's another level of privilege where you really need to do more, you know?
Hannah (Host):	52:08	Yeah.
Ames:	52:08	Not just sit back and do the same thing. I don't think, I think that, well I, I'll speak for myself. I feel like challenging myself to really figure out how to do things that might challenge the whole academy, not just not just challenge an idea deep inside of a narrow discipline.
Hannah (Host):	52:25	I met a prof at the Modernist Studies Association conference a few years ago, who was telling me that he does a comic book podcast. It's with a friend of his, I've been doing it for years that has quite a popular following. And I was like, "oh awesome. You know, do you count that as your scholarly output?" And he said, "oh, I don't need to, I have tenure." And I was like, "well, but couldn't you use tenure as a way to to break space open for other people who don't, but who want to be doing that kind of work?" Like, isn't there another way to think about what it means to have security as a position from which you can radicalize? But that so often doesn't prove to be the case.
Ames:	53:07	Well, and now we're back to the, it's feminist thinking, what you just said there and what that person is illustrating is not feminist thinking because it's like, "oh, I have tenure, I do not need to do

anything else. I am good." And that, that, that position of privilege, it doesn't recognize that other people are struggling. And again, this is not to say anything negative, it's just a thinking pattern. Like I don't, I don't need to do anything now. I'm good." Instead of making the argument, and I think that that's what I wanted to do too. You know, I could say, "well I, I've, I have this book or I have these publications." I would be quote unquote "good" without putting it in there.

Hannah (Host):	53:43	Mmhmm.
Ames:	53:43	But I didn't want to not put it in there, and I wanted people to have to grapple with it, and I wanted, oh my gosh, this is going to come out before they are finished with all this, but, not, it'll be fine.
Hannah (Host):	53:53	We're recording really far in advance. So...
Ames:	53:55	Right. It's going to be good. It's going to be all good.
Hannah (Host):	53:57	Yeah.
Ames:	53:57	And it's, it's fine. Whatever, whatever comes, what may, it's fine.
Hannah (Host):	54:02	Great.
Ames:	54:02	I did want a sort of, yeah, I wanted to offer it as something that, that other people have to grapple with, you know, I don't know. It'll open a conversation. All we can do is keep open these time conversations, I think.
Hannah (Host):	54:14	Yeah. I think you're exactly right. Okay. Last question.
Ames:	54:17	Okay.
Hannah (Host):	54:18	Will you tell us some of your favorite podcasts?
Ames:	54:23	Well, it's right now, my two are *Secret Feminist Agenda* and--
Hannah (Host):	54:28	[Laughs] That's great.
Ames:	54:30	It's fact. And *How to Survive the End of the World*. Is that it, with the Brown sisters?
Hannah (Host):	54:36	Yeah. Yeah, yeah. Yeah.

Ames:	54:37	Those are my two favorite right now.
Hannah (Host):	54:39	Oh.
Ames:	54:39	And I have been an avid listener of *Strangers with Leah Tau*. I listened to all the Esther Perel things. I like the relational stuff. Spottily, I listened to *Invisibilia* for a while. I dunno. Do you know the one, *How to Be a Girl* with the mom and her trans daughter?
Hannah (Host):	54:57	No!
Ames:	54:58	It's, that's also delightful.
Hannah (Host):	55:00	Oh, that sounds great.
Ames:	55:00	I love this and I think, I think the daughter's like six or seven when it starts.
Hannah (Host):	55:05	Oh my goodness.
Ames:	55:05	And so the mom really is setting up to say, you know, "here's what my daughter struggles with and here's how this, here's how this works in her life." And, and the daughter knows she's being recorded. So for whatever that's worth at the time, it's not as though there's not consent, which is yeah, the politics of consent I think are giant in this world. Yeah, that's what I'm listening to right now and I'm looking forward to when it's nice out against cause that's when I usually listen.
Hannah (Host):	55:29	Yeah.
Ames:	55:29	I take a walk and listen cause otherwise getting it crushed into other parts of the day is hard.
Hannah (Host):	55:34	Yeah. You just need to start doing my favorite activity, which is lying on my back on the floor listening to podcasts while my cats walk back and forth over me.
Ames:	55:46	[Laughs]
Hannah (Host):	55:46	Strong recommended [Music: "We Used to Wait" by Arcade Fire]
Hannah (Host):	56:07	If you'd like to learn more about Ames, you can follow her on Instagram and Twitter @amesthehawk, A M E S the hawk, like the bird, or check out her website and online portfolio at

ameshawkins.com. And if you want to listen to *Masters of Text*, which if you like *Secret Feminist Agenda*, you will also like, it is available at mastersoftext.com. And of course you can find show notes, links to all of the websites that I just listed, and all of the previous episodes of *Secret Feminist Agend*a 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. There are two new reviews this week. One is from Rosie Lefebvre from Canada, and the other is from Doctor CMR from the U.K. Thank you both so much. 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. Ames's themes song was "We Used to Wait" by Arcade Fire. *Secret Feminist Agenda* is recorded on the traditional and unceded territory of the Musqueam, 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]