

COMMONPLACE PODCAST

EPISODE # 4

Guest(s): Claudia Rankine

Host(s): Rachel Zucker

Transcript by: Leigh Sugar

Transcripts formatted after those from [Disability Visibility Project](#)

Please note: transcripts are transcribed directly from recordings of live conversations; as a result, quotes and statements may be approximate and there may be unintended memory errors.

For more information, visit <https://www.commonpodcast.com/>

Contact us [HERE](#)

[Music]

RACHEL ZUCKER: [Intro]: Hello. Today is July 14, 2016. This is Commonplace: Conversations with Poets (and Other People), and I'm Rachel Zucker. Today is Episode 4, a conversation between poet, playwright, editor, professor Claudia Rankine and myself, which I recorded about three weeks ago, on a rooftop in New York City. I've recorded several introductions to this episode, none of which sound right to me right now. In one introduction, I speak at some length about trying to find a word in the English language or a way of expressing the particular absence I feel over being separated from my son for longer than I ever have before. I talk about the desire to find a way to express that feeling as related to the conversation that Claudia and I have, in which Claudia says, "Poetry is the place where feeling gets investigated." She goes on to say, "I'm not sure we have another genre quite as committed to the investigation of feeling."

When I listened to that introduction a few weeks after recording it, it struck me that it sounded tone-deaf, insensitive, inappropriate, or would sound that way to some people listening to the podcast. Thinking about how to introduce Claudia has raised interesting questions about audience, the form of the podcast, and the particular ways in which I have no way of knowing who is listening or when they are listening or what context is most important to particular listeners, most relevant, most caring, most interesting. I started to think more about something else that Claudia said during our conversation. She said: “I certainly am surprised by peoples’ capacity to hurt other people, so one is always negotiating with that.”

I’ve also been thinking about several lines from a long poem by Adrienne Rich, a poet that both Claudia and myself have found very important to use over the years. The poem by Adrienne Rich is called “North American Time”, and in this poem, Rich writes:

Everything we write
will be used against us,
or against those we love.
These are the terms.
Take them or leave them.
Poetry never stood a chance
of standing outside history.

Later in the poem, she wrote:

It doesn’t matter what you think.
Words are found responsible.
All you can do is choose them
or choose
to remain silent.
Or you never had a choice,
which is why the words that do stand
are responsible,

and this is verbal privilege.

I hope there is a time in a future episode to think through either by myself or with another writer or artist these questions of audience, these questions of hurting others with writing or whether writing can stand outside of history and what is verbal privilege and the ways in which words are responsible.

For now, what I'd like to say is that it was a great honor to speak with Claudia. Claudia Rankine's work has been deeply important to me and to many, many other people for a long time. Her book *Don't Let Me Be Lonely* is probably the single volume of poetry that I teach more often than any other, and it is also the book of poetry that I've seen change the writing and the lives of more graduate students than any other book that I've assigned. Her book *Citizen*, which is her most recent book, published by Graywolf Press, has won numerous awards, including the PEN/Open Book award, the NAACP Award, the National Book Critics Circle Award for Poetry. In fact, *Citizen* is the first book ever to be a finalist for the National Book Critics Circle Award for both poetry and criticism. *Citizen* is also the only book of poetry to be on the best-seller list for the New York Times in the category of non-fiction. It's being read all over the country at universities, in high schools, on the beach, by readers. There was a person reading the book as a form of protest on camera at a Trump rally. The book has reached an audience that almost no other book of poetry has reached, and that, more than anything else, gives me some hope because *Citizen* and Claudia's other works *Don't Let Me Be Lonely*, *Plot*, the anthology of essays that she co-edited called *The Racial Imaginary* has changed not only my writing but my thinking and living and my daily perceptions more than any other poet that I can think of, so I encourage you to read and reread all of Claudia's work--her poems, her essays, to engage with her work--and hopefully you will enjoy this conversation despite the sirens and helicopters and various interruptions in the background. It was a great honor to speak with Claudia. Thank you.

[5:43]

[music]

RACHEL ZUCKER: The fact that *Citizen* has become something that almost no other books of poetry has become: how has that changed your life?

CLAUDIA RANKINE: Probably, I would say that the most important things that have happened since *Citizen*'s publication is that I have been able to collaborate with a lot of people that I admire: some of them referenced in *Citizen*, some of them also working in the same arena.

RACHEL ZUCKER: And how would you describe what that arena is? Is it the world of poetry? Is it the world of advocacy? Is it larger than either one of those? Arts in general?

CLAUDIA RANKINE: I think it's "the world where whatever it is you're engaged in understands how the engagement is tied to one's political, social situation, that there isn't the illusion that art is separate from that, or whatever discipline. If it's psychiatrists who have reached out, it's because they're interested in how gender and race impact what goes on for them. If it's artists, they're interested in the way that our political and social situation actually always is part of what gets made. It influences it. Even in its absence, it's a kind of influence. I mean--the arena of the conscious, let's put it that way.

RACHEL ZUCKER: Mm-hmm. You just wrote the introduction to the newly released collected poems by Adrienne Rich, and you start your wonderful introduction--I loved the introduction, and I'm so happy that this book exists now--but you started it by giving Adrienne Rich's answer to the question, "Does poetry play a role in social change?" I would love to hear your answer to that question.

CLAUDIA RANKINE: I think everything that's written plays a role in social change. I think that engagement intellectually plays a role in social change, and poetry is one form of that kind of engagement, one form of the written engagement

in the lives around us. Adrienne Rich is somebody who directly, consciously, aggressively, systematically took on the questions that impacted how we live. When people try to make a distinction, to me, between poetry and what they call identity politic, and claim that poetry that deals with politics or identity is sub-par poetry, for me that's some kind of power move to maintain the illusion of a kind of transcendent art that belongs to those in power, and then the power--the mechanism of that power--becomes invisible when the word "transcendent" gets thrown out. It's like referring to white people as people.

RACHEL ZUCKER: Right. The idea of universality and transcendence as the thing that either as human beings we should aspire to or that poetry should transport us--

CLAUDIA RANKINE: Exactly. That to dirty it up is to make a mess. It's an argument that one shouldn't even have to make, but I'm glad Adrienne Rich made it.

RACHEL ZUCKER: You talk also in the introduction about coming to Adrienne Rich and James Baldwin at the same time in your life as an undergraduate and the influence that they both had on you. I loved this quote, also from your introduction. You talk about both of them as "involved in the twinned dissatisfaction with systems invested in a single, dominant, oppressive narrative," and I was hoping you would talk a little more about the importance of Rich, and, particularly, James Baldwin because since I just read your introduction in Rich I have a little or more sense of Rich, but how Baldwin has been important to you. Or maybe, is he still as important to you in what you're working on now?

[10:46]

CLAUDIA RANKINE: Yeah, it's funny, when you asked me if he's important to me. He's not important to me as much as he's important to us. I think he's important to narratives around what it means to be American, what are the struggles Americans have to investigate, work against, engage, untie, unravel, all

of that. He managed in very clear diction, very simple language, to elucidate some of the most complex dynamics we have lived through and continue to live through. And I think even as an undergraduate, one understood how important the things he was saying, not only about oppressive regimes but also personal entanglements around identity, sexuality, race, gender--all of it. For one person to be able to circle so many dynamics within single essays is pretty astounding. He really is our guide of the century and the last century.

RACHEL ZUCKER: It seems to me that you, like Baldwin, are writing about what it means to be American. I've got *Don't Let Me Be Lonely* and *Citizen* right in front of me, and both of them say "An American Lyric" on the cover. When you talk about Baldwin, you just said, "He uses simple language to describe or untangle these very complex dynamics." Your language also is simple in a certain way, but your forms are difficult. I love difficulty, so to me, that's high praise. I guess the question is: can poetry be part of social justice, social activism? Yes, of course, the answer is yes. But coming back to poetry--not just, "Isn't everything part of it?"--poetry, with all of its difficulty.

CLAUDIA RANKINE: I know a lot of people think poetry is difficult. I just think that we don't have a habit of reading poetry, and that's what creates the illusion of difficulty. I'm sure for you what somebody would call difficulty, you would just call reading, reading the poem. You know, I was in a bookstore in Seattle and a guy said to me, "A lot of people have been coming in and buying *Citizen*, and when they buy *Citizen*, they buy another poetry book too" and that their poetry sales in general have gone up because people are in the section and they'll pull something out. I think that sends that, "Oh, if I can read this, I can also read this." So I think that sense of the marriage between difficult and poetry is another kind of fiction. There are craft issues that people are not used to seeing in newspapers, so again I think it's a habit of reading. The kind of illusion that goes on in poetry won't happen in your local paper, so people are not used to making leaps in time in the same kind of way. But it doesn't mean they're not capable of doing it.

I'm also interested in interdisciplinary approaches to writing and poetry, and I think that that is another reason why my recent work has a more general audience because people are given different ways in. To me, all of the things that get included in any given book are essential to the investigation of its subject. But it also allows someone who is more comfortable visually to work that way primarily. Somebody who is more comfortable in terms of text can negotiate the visual that way. Somebody who is used to lineation might reside there longer than with the essay, for example. So I think that helps.

[15:48]

But the most important thing for me, though, is that poetry is the place where feeling gets investigated. I don't think we have another genre quite as committed to the investigation of feeling as poetry. My friend Nick Flynn has a book called *My Feelings* and I think, "That's right. That is right." That was a beautiful book. My feelings slash poetry. That's it. And if there's a difficulty, the difficulty is in not having a sustained investigation of the legitimacy of our feeling.

RACHEL ZUCKER: The books that we're talking about are interdisciplinary. Some might call them hybrid or--I'm not in love with that term because I feel like all great poetry seems to me to be hybrid in some way--but you've also worked in different forms as a poet, an essayist, an editor, and you also fulfil or participate in many different roles. You're a teacher, playwright--I don't know if you would describe yourself this way, but, maybe increasingly,--a public figure, a critic, not that those are the same. I'm wondering: which of those roles or which of those genres gives you the most pleasure, which gives you the most energy, which feels (if any of them) like a responsibility that you feel is important to you but that just feels like a lot of work?

CLAUDIA RANKINE: Well, I think at any given moment, any one of those positions are generative and exciting to me. It's not the position itself, it's not the positionality itself. It's also inside every one of those positions is the moment when something turns into grunt work. There's the kind of necessary research that has to

happen, whether it's the poem or the essay or the classroom. And those things--you just have to do them in order to get to the next thing. So I think if there is a feeling of tediousness, that's when it happens. You have the idea; you know what you want to do. You know something is driving you toward something, but you cannot do it until you do x, y, and z, if you're gonna do it responsibly. That part, you know, is like, "Okay, I have to read these fifteen books" and each of those books might be interesting here and there but sometimes, you just gotta get through them.

RACHEL ZUCKER: So it's not like you're like, "Okay, I'm going to write this essay or judge this contest or do this speaking engagement, but I really need to get back to my real work." It's that within each one of those things you're doing, there is some grunt work and there is also the jewel of it, or the generative--

CLAUDIA RANKINE: Mm-hmm. You know, I don't consider myself a "public person," but I do find interactions with people incredibly invigorating and generative. You hear things you wouldn't have thought of yourself, and people are so interesting. I hate to say it, but they really are. And they're not me. So the part of, say, public appearances I find hard is to travel. It's not the being there.

RACHEL ZUCKER: So when you are there, in a reading or an interview, what are the questions that people ask you the most? What are the questions that you wish they would stop asking you? Or what are the questions that they never ask you that you think, "Why aren't they asking me this? This is what I want to talk about. Or this is the heart of the matter."

CLAUDIA RANKINE: Hmm. In the beginning of each book, every question seems like a legitimate question. After talking about the book for two years, you begin to think, "Well, I answered that thing about the second person. A number of times." And every once in a while, you answer it again, and you say something differently, which is interesting. But many times, you feel the same way you felt three months ago.

[20:22]

I'm trying to think what I would like to be asked that I have not been asked. One of the things that is interesting is that in the work itself you refer to other peoples' work, and you refer to those people because you love their work. So I wouldn't mind talking about some of those people because clearly I have folded them into my own work because I find them fascinating, essential. You started off by talking about Adrienne Rich and James Baldwin, and that makes sense to me because they are people who are important to me, like Coetzee or Vallejo's work--people who, for me, are crucial and important writers.

RACHEL ZUCKER: Is there a particular work for Coetzee and Vallejo or is it just their body of work?

CLAUDIA RANKINE: For Vallejo, it's his body of work but individual poems, obviously, are very moving to me and his technique. I think that he's one of the few poets who is able to sink into experience in a kind of scandalous way, and I admire it because I so rarely go there. He'll say something like, "I feel miserable today. I feel miserable today as César Vallejo." You read that, and you're like, "I know what that means!" It's the kind of known-unknown. For him to have made a distinction between the general position up against something in a position that one feels drowned by--and there are lovely places in his work where that happens. He talks in one poem about being in Europe and coming back to his little village in Peru, and his mother being fascinated by the stories he's told. He said, "My father's wife is in love with me." Which is again that sense of--he has just become a person to this woman who is in love with the experiences that this man has had, and he ceases at that moment to be her son, and he can encompass that in the phrase, "My father's wife is in love with me."

RACHEL ZUCKER: When you say that he sinks into experience in the scandalous way that you don't do as much, is it the revelation of scandalous material to the reader, is it that relationship to the "I" in a kind of close-autobiographical disclosure?

CLAUDIA RANKINE: Well, I think one of the things--and I think you do this in your work, a lot, which is another reason why I love your work so much--is that he is as interested in his own assessment of whatever feeling he is interested in as he is in the relationship dynamic. I tend to be much more interested in the relational dynamic, and so sometimes find spending time just in the enveloped feeling to be less necessary for myself, even though I think it's necessary. Like in theory, I think it's necessary, but when I'm working, it feels like if I'm gonna spend the time, I'm going to spend the time thinking about it relationally.

One of the things that Coetzee does say, like in the book, *Disgrace*, and why I love him so much as a novelist is that the characterisation of the people in his work are so full and the fullness means that we can take them on no predictable trajectory. They will fail us again and again because they will fail themselves. They will learn nothing over the course of the book, and I feel like those are the people I know. That's the life I've lived where people are so defended inside their positions, their investments, that they manage life without changing, and often you have these novels that insist on change of the character or insist on some kind of enlightenment or insist on traumatic failure, when in fact, you have people in Coetzee's work negotiating inside their own limits, you know?

[25: 40]

RACHEL ZUCKER: So, in some ways, these fictional characters are representing something or enacting something that feels more real than some of our fantasies about peoples' ability to change and have self-awareness and this kind of beginning, middle, and end sense that life is going to be a narrative, when it isn't often?

CLAUDIA RANKINE: Right. Or when the narrative is the same and for individuals. There's that sense of, "Oh, I can't believe that Trump got the nomination," but of course you can believe it because of course what he is campaigning to is something very present in this society. But people don't believe

it because they wanna believe in the fiction of change in the way that change has not happened. That's another way of thinking about it.

RACHEL ZUCKER: Yeah, I felt that really strongly--I was so honored to be asked to read a poem for the Adrienne Rich reading. I really wanted to get up and say, "It makes me sick that these poems are so relevant that they--if you read *Of Woman Born*, if you read, *On Lies, Secrets, and Silence*, if you read any of her prose and any of her poems, I just don't see that things are very different, at all. So much of the power of her work is her willingness to do anything within her power and even slightly beyond her power to imagine change and to participate in change, and so on the one hand, she's this amazing figure who has given permission and space for so many writers and artists to say, "Art and social justice are not separate; they never were. They never can be. They never should be." And "Poetry can affect social change" and yet, at the same time, her work in some ways is proof of how little things have changed. It's brutal.

CLAUDIA RANKINE: It is brutal.

RACHEL ZUCKER: I didn't know quite how to say that to an audience full of people who love Rich, and her son was there. I did say it--I sometimes wonder if it comes down to just people who think the world is better than it was and people who don't. I don't know.

CLAUDIA RANKINE: Or people who think they themselves are better than they are and then are surprised later.

RACHEL ZUCKER: So you mentioned these two writers. Who else--or maybe it's not even writers--what are the secret or not so secret major influences on your work?

CLAUDIA RANKINE: Being a spectator is the thing I find constantly renewing--a spectator as somebody who goes to art shows constantly, somebody who is excited by theatre, somebody who is waiting for the next film by Claire Denis. I think in

that sense I couldn't do what I do without the world, and sometimes it's being on the bus and listening to the conversations that are happening around me, wondering about who these people are.

[29:54]

I was actually in a restaurant the other day by myself, and at the next table, there was a woman, a white woman, an older white woman, probably in her sixties, and a partner, maybe, a husband, also white, and maybe they were in their 70s, early 70s, and a hispanic later came up and then he walked away and the woman said, "You know, I thought my hearing was going, but then I realized it's that they don't know how to enunciate." And it was one of those moments where even though I was reading, I was then moved to turn and look at them, to see who they were, to understand why that distinction was coming forward--this like, "I thought it was my problem, but it's actually theirs"--and waiting for what he would say. He said nothing. So I feel like even as I'm sitting there reading, the world is constantly pulling me forward, and I'm available to be pulled forward. I'm interested in being pulled forward. I think my practice as a spectator is one that is essential to me.

RACHEL ZUCKER: You're describing that practice--and I think that's probably the most essential part of my writing life also, being in the world and being interrupted and being porous to whatever is coming at me--but you just described that as being sort of pulled along and told the story as if it were generative, but one might hear that story as damaging and hurtful. How much of being in the world--and you talk about this in your books--requires or necessitates some kind of self-protection because the things that one overhears and the things that are directed or the position of being a spectator involves being a witness to so much damage: intentional, unintentional, microaggressions, macroaggressions? All of that.

I do feel with some other people, artists, poets, in particular, I wonder how they can even go outside. How do you negotiate between those two things: knowing that being open and being a spectator is vital to you as a person and artist and also knowing that it can be damaging?

CLAUDIA RANKINE: In *Citizen* I write about Judith Butler's idea of being addressable as tied to being open. I think that, for me, it's liberating to understand the dynamics of things and to know that, for example, in the case of the woman thinking she's going deaf and then understanding no, the other can't speak, that, to me, is important information to have in terms of the way racism trickles down and ripples out. To hear how defended people are against the other is to bring into context and focus things like the assassination of that woman in Britain, that sense of, "I feel that threatened. I feel that threatened that I am willing to go out and gun down people." defended positions. And I'm not saying that whiteness is the only group that has defended positions. I think that we all do, and it's interesting to me to hear them, to see them, to understand them, and to take them into another context and be able to unpack what that is. I'm not saying that there are not times where I'm irritated, but I'm also curious.

RACHEL ZUCKER: In is that important information to have because it allows you to know that you aren't crazy, allow for personal growth, to allow for you to make art from a position of reality and understanding, or to be less defended yourself? I don't know.

[35:26]

CLAUDIA RANKINE: I think it's all of those things. I think one is always interested--I shouldn't say one, I should say that I am interested in the ways that I myself am defended--I am always interested in why I said x thing and what it was that I thought I would build by doing or saying this thing. This might get back to having a discipline of analysis in my past, but one is always--I'm always--thinking, "Huh. Why do I want to say this now?"

I think another part of me is always looking for evidence, for the known-unknowns. You know certain things. What is the evidence that built the thing you felt you know? In a way, one is working backwards, in a sense. Also, people are fascinating. They're interesting; they're inconsistent. They make

exceptions. They are lovable. They're like children. They are unfair or full of justice. We are writers, and as writers, one is constantly engaged in understanding how people work because that is the most important aspect of the writing, I think.

RACHEL ZUCKER: You seem to have this enormous capacity for being interested in human fallibility as part of what it means to be human. That said, one of the lectures that I gave for the Bagley Wright was really about trying to develop a code of ethics for myself as a writer. I'm not so interested in rules, except I thought, "Wait, why not? What if I just experiment with this? What if I say, "Let's not have everything be relative." Let's say what I will and will not write about, in what context, in what way."

I think we're in really rich and difficult and painful territory--in the world of poetry and obviously in the larger world, which are not separate--in terms of writing to pay attention to the entire range of human feeling and experience but also with a greater and greater awareness, I hope, of what it means to trespass or how damaging and hurtful it is to other people, if you say something or you say it in one way or in another way, and my sense is that's certainly not why I'm a poet, to hurt other people or even to hurt myself necessarily. At the same time, I think that I am attracted to and influenced by a kind of poetry that takes risks, that makes mistakes, that has the ability to hurt. I'm trying to negotiate that space. Have those things changed for you? Do you have new feelings about where we are, particularly along the lines of race? I do feel like there are a lot of white poets acting badly.

CLAUDIA RANKINE: Well, I think they're people acting badly because they want to. And that's fine. I don't think that we can ever be in a situation where everyone will act in the way that we desire. I don't think that's possible; I don't even think it's desirable. I do find it interesting that the more that gets exposed or said means that whatever position someone takes, they need to take it consciously. That I'm interested in. I'm interested in people who say, "I consciously support Trump. I understand what he stands for, and I consciously support him." That to me is like, "Okay. Alright then."

[40:20]

It's when people pretend they don't know what it is they're doing--I think that's another kind of defense that I find curious, the kind of will to ignorance. But to embrace what it is you believe, at least then we know what we have. I think it's dangerous to go around telling people what they can and cannot do. How do you know you're right? I'm not really interested in right and wrong--maybe for me, maybe for myself. But I'm not interested in being in a position where I'm telling you that. I certainly am surprised by peoples' capacity to hurt other people sometimes. So one is always negotiating that.

One is always thinking about that, thinking about one's own limits in the world, like, I'm constantly fascinated by how far any individual can go in any subject. Like a stupid example would be: at a certain point I remember losing a very active interest in contemporary pop music. When I was younger, I knew what was coming, I would buy things... But at a certain point, I let that go. So now, I see that as a limit. This morning I was reading an article by Daphne Brooks on the music of protest in the current issue of *Artforum*, and she was talking about a musician, and I realized I'd never listened to his work. What she was saying was very interesting. She was saying what he is doing is important to the cultural moment. We all, as we get older, we sort of start to stoop in different places, and that is going to limit our view, in a way.

RACHEL ZUCKER: Well, what are you working on now? What are you not stopping?

CLAUDIA RANKINE: I'm about to teach a class on the construction of whiteness in the culture. One of the categories is white masculinity, but then I began to think about the white black men because we have a bunch of those. People like O.J. Simpson--partly because I was watching that incredible documentary--and Tiger Woods--people who are in a place in the culture where they supposedly transcended race, through wealth, through fame, etcetera, and yet came crashing

down--in the case of those two, in confrontations with white women. It's sort of interesting. Then you have the extreme of Michael Jackson and his own perversions around his own representation, and the more we find out about his dissatisfaction with his own looks, it's now being tied to his own perversion sexually around children.

I'm sort of thinking about Bill Cosby policing what blackness should be so that it was palatable to white Americans and yet drugging women. What the fuck? Sorry, but what does it mean for these men? And then you have the black men, like Muhammad Ali, who maintained identity at the cost of, in his case, not fame, but success in various areas of his life at certain points of his life. That's what I'm doing right now, thinking about that.

RACHEL ZUCKER: So you're preparing to teach this class--do you think that will also end up in your writing as well?

CLAUDIA RANKINE: Yeah.

RACHEL ZUCKER: Is that a normal process, that the teaching feeds the writing?

CLAUDIA RANKINE: Well, whatever I'm thinking about, I'm thinking about. Everything is serving that.

[45:23]

RACHEL ZUCKER: Would you be willing to read a short something? Whatever you want. Do you have a preference?

CLAUDIA RANKINE: Sure, sure. I haven't read from this in a while. I just opened randomly to page 70 in *Plot*, and I'm going to read "The View of the Landscape".

[reads "The View of the Landscape"]

RACHEL ZUCKER: That was gorgeous. Do you think if we opened to any of your books randomly, to any page, would it somehow seem like everything we had been talking about--

I asked you when you came to visit my class at NYU. What would you say to yourself as a younger, starting-out artist who cares about the world in the way that you do?

CLAUDIA RANKINE: I think I would say, “Love research.” As I’ve gotten older, I’ve gotten more and more and more enmeshed in research, and I love it. I love finding things out. I think when I was younger, I thought the work had to come out all by itself from me, and over the years I’ve realized I am a relational being. Doing research is keeping the self in relation. I’d say, yeah, “Love research. Love it.”

RACHEL ZUCKER: Thank you. Thank you so much, Claudia. This was fantastic.

CLAUDIA RANKINE: You’re welcome.

RACHEL ZUCKER: This has been Commonplace: Conversations with Poets (and Other People). If you like what you just heard, please let me know, on Twitter, or via the Commonplace website, and please write a review of the podcast on iTunes.

Our theme song is written and performed by Moses Zucker Goren, design work by Eton Darwish [sp?]. Many thanks this week to Erin Murray Mera [sp?], and Commonplace would not be possible without the work of Christine Larusso and Nicholas Fuenzalida. Future episodes will feature Darin Strauss, Matthew Rohrer, Craig Morgan Teicher, Cathy Park Hong, Wayne Koestenbaum, and many others. Thank you so much for listening.

As Claudia Rankine said, “Understanding how people work is one of the most important aspects of writing.” It’s certainly the most interesting thing for me about doing this podcast, and I wouldn’t be doing it without you. Take care.