Hend Alawadhi: Hi. My name is Hend Alawadhi, and I'm an Assistant Professor in the College of Architecture at Kuwait University in Kuwait City. Today is March 17th, 2018 and we are in Toronto, Canada at the SCMS Conference, where I have the great pleasure of interviewing Patricia Zimmermann, who is a Professor of Screen Studies in the Roy H. Park School of Communications at Ithaca College, and also Co-Director of the Finger Lakes Environmental Film Festival.

Professor Zimmermann has made significant contributions within and beyond fields of film, video and digital media, and is well known for her wide ranging scholarship addressing documentary studies, national and transnational media ecologies, critical historiography, social and political theory of media, amateur film history and theory, and feminist film theory. She's the author of several formative books including *Reel Families: A Social History of Amateur Film*, *States of Emergency: Documentaries, Wars, Democracies*, *Thinking Through Digital Media: Transnational Environments and Local Places*, which was co-authored with Dale Hudson, *Open Spaces: Openings, Closings, and Thresholds in International Public Media*, *The Flaherty: Sixty Years in the Cause of Independent Cinema*, co-authored with Scott McDonald, and most recently, *Open Space New Media Documentary: A Toolkit for Theory and Practice* with Helen De Michiel.

She has also edited and co-edited key texts in the field, such as *Mining the Home Movie: Excavations into Historical and Cultural Memories*, co-edited with Karen Ishizuka, and *Soviet and American Documentary Theories*, a special international issue in the *Journal of Film and Video*. Professor Zimmermann has authored over 200 scholarly research articles and essays published in international journals ranging from *Screen, Genders, Journal of Film and Video, Afterimage, Framework, Asian Communications Quarterly, Cinema Journal, Wide Angle, Cultural Studies, DOX, Film History, Socialist Review, Journal of Communications Inquiry, and The Moving Image*.

She has held endowed chair appointments such as the Shaw Foundation Professor of New Media in the School of Communication and Information at Nanyang Technological University in Singapore and the Ida Beam Professor of Cinema and Comparative Literature at the University of Iowa, and she is on the editorial board of *Film Quarterly, The Journal of Film and Video, The Moving Image: The Journal of the Association of Moving Image Archivists*, and *The Sixties: A Journal of History and Theory*.

Hello Professor Zimmermann.

Patricia Z.: Hello Hend.

Hend Alawadhi: Alright, so I'd like to start with some initial questions about how you decided to become a film and media scholar, and how your background in journalism has shaped your engagement with the field.
Okay. Those are big questions, but the place I would start is, I was an undergraduate at the University of Iowa. I went there to be an English major, because I was interested in poetry, which seems really far away from the field that we're in. I was at a party, and I met a young man who was a film major, and he asked me to be in his movie. I had long hair down to my hips, really curly, and because I thought he was attractive, I said, "I'll be in your movie."

I was in a set-up like this and my job was to lay on the ground and move my hair around while he and the guys filmed my hair, long hair, so this was in the 70s, and I thought, "This is film? It seems ridiculous." I really thought that. I thought, "It seems completely ridiculous." My long curly hair is flying around, laying on the ground with these two people with Bolexes filming me, and I thought, "Why am I on the ground and they're walking around with these cameras?"

I didn't have a feminist analysis. I mostly had rage, so I went and I still liked this young man, and I signed up for a film studies class because he was in it. I'm really embarrassed to admit this, right? I signed up for it because he was in it, and I thought, "Film, well that combines a lot of things I love: storytelling, visual images, and music." Because I had trained as a classical pianist until I was 18 years old, and I thought, "Well, poetry," which is what my great love was, "is something you do by yourself, but film, you get to sit and watch movies with other people."

And there was this young man with a Bolex who I was fascinated by, so I took this class and the class was an introductory film studies class, and it was taught by Dudley Andrew. My TA was Philip Rosen, and I realized that analyzing films and the kind of close textual analysis of narrative was very similar to analyzing novels and poetry, because you had to drill down into the text. I became fascinated by this, because it combined many of the arts, and also because this young man I was fascinated with was also a cinephile, and they had a theater at Iowa called the Bijou which showed films every night. So I was a studious person, I'd study in the library every night, and when I finished studying, I'd go see films.

In college, I had this amazing professor in Dudley Andrew. I felt like I walked out of every class he taught and I felt the world had been turned inside out and upside down, that I just was seeing and thinking differently, so I decided to double major in English and Film with a minor in Politics, and I felt very tense because I had this one world of lyrical poetry and this vibrant world in the Writers' Workshop at Iowa, and all the poets who were coming in and reading exquisite work, and my goal was to be the most exquisite writer ever. I'd think of myself as I wanted to be a feminist Emily Dickinson living in an attic writing deep thoughts.

And then there was this other world, and this other world actually had people in it, screenings, and back then in the 70s, I'd go with my love interest to these screenings and they blew my mind, because every screening had discussions
featuring graduate students or activists or scholars, a lot of young people
getting interested in cinema analyzing the film, and I thought, "I don't know
anything." Someone showed The Wizard of Oz, and these two graduate students
got up and did an analysis of it as a story that is about the Depression, and that
the Emerald ... that you start in black and white, which is the Depression, and
you move to the Emerald City, and that is the city of money. I never thought
about The Wizard of Oz that way, and they were hardcore Marxists using a lot of
words I didn't understand, and so I thought, "This is really exciting."

For me, it was just the excitement of ideas. The excitement of professors, grad
students and other students who were excited about ideas, and also this
dialectic between loving music and poetry and artistic complexity, and then this
very public world of cinema, and then a third world which was the world of
politically engaged politics, because my first year of college was September
11th, 1973, which was the coup against Allende. I start college and these fliers
everywhere to go to this demonstration, and so I went to this demonstration
and I didn't really know what anyone was talking about, because they were
graduate students. I clearly remember hegemony, ideology, all these concepts.

Those three things were convening, and just very, lots of excitement. I actually
don't remember what was in a class, what was in a bar, what was in a cinema,
and what was at a demonstration, and what was at a party, because it felt like a
swirl of ideas constantly. It felt like the world was big in Iowa. It felt like
professors were on fire intellectually, and so I did both, and I thought, "I'm going
to be a writer." I graduated from college and I worked as a journalist for a
newspaper that was owned by a big news organization, but I worked at a
smaller regional neighborhood paper, and I just thought, "I'm going to be a
writer."

Before I graduated, I applied to graduate school, and I saw Dudley Andrew
walking across the campus, and I said, "I need a letter of recommendation." And
he said, "For law school or journalism school?" And I said, "I want to go get a
PhD in Film." And he said, "Really?" I totally remember where we were. We
were right in front of the library, and he said, "Well, you could stay here or you
could go to Wisconsin. If you stay here, it's going to feel too much the same. You
should probably think of somewhere else." So I applied to graduate school, but I
waited a year before I went. I went back to Chicago where I'm from, and I
worked as a print journalist in ethnic and racialized communities, and that's
what I did before I went to graduate school.

And then I got a fellowship to go to graduate school, and I decided I should
probably go. I went to graduate school, and this is terrible to say on camera, but
I really debated whether I should go to graduate school, because I was a
journalist working in Chicago, a fantastic news town, working for a low end
newspaper, but at a time when a lot was happening in Chicago. Operation PUSH
with Reverend Jesse Jackson and Black communities rising up, Puerto Rican
liberation movements, a lot of community organizing around housing, and I was
covering these stories, and it is very exciting. I just want to say for people watching this that I was an upper middle class white girl from the suburbs who went to private schools, and then there I am after college working in communities that were very different from me, poor communities, immigrant communities, very militant communities, and trying to figure out, "How do I deal with this?"

"How do I deal with my difference? How do I deal with the fact I went to college, to University of Iowa, and I'm dealing with people who have been in jail?" I'm sharing this story because it was very deeply formative for me, because it made me realize the most important thing one can do is to realize what you don't know and be humble about it, and that was really really critical, because I was different from anyone I was interviewing. If they were white, they were usually poor. If they were white, they often were immigrants from Poland or Ukraine, didn't often speak great English.

And I had a really good editor, and he would always say, "Your youth, your difference, your gender are advantages." And I was very political and I would critique him, "No, that's privilege." And he'd say, "No, it's your advantage. Because of your difference, you can ask ... You just have to know you do not know things. You have to ask questions." I always had this experience of being not like anyone I was doing a story on, and I had to realize they're the story, not me. It's actually odd to be doing this for me. I'm used to being you. Always remembering I'm not really me. What I am is someone trying to figure out what that story is, and I realize there are so many stories that are absolutely invisible and never told.

I realized I don't matter, but what matters is that I can write and that I can tell this story, and I can listen to people and keep listening and see if I can dig out. The reason I'm sharing this is it's the reason I got into documentary, because it was very congruent with that, and it was really learning to listen, to be humble, and to get rid of my ego, which is the opposite of learning to be a poet, where it's all about yourself and it's very romantic, and it's the opposite of being a film director, where you have an individual vision. I learned to listen and listen really carefully, be completely humble and always know what I didn't know, and sometimes I'd be in somewhat dangerous situations. I would be scared. I'd be the only person like me in a neighborhood.

One time my car broke down in a neighborhood that had had some riots, riots, demonstrations, uprisings, and I thought, "What am I going to do? I'm here. It's the middle of the night." And some gang members from one of the Mexican gangs came up to me and they said, "What's wrong?" I said, "My car won't start." And they said, "Well we hijack cars, so we know how to fix them." They pulled out their hijacking tools and fixed my car, and I said, "I can't believe you're fixing my car. What can I do for you?" And they said, "Could you do a story on Mexican gangs that doesn't present us as drug dealers?"
Patricia Z.: Yeah, and so I had many experiences like that, because I never got to cover people in power. I was 21 years old. I graduated from college when I was 21, so I was really young. I still had my long goofy hair, and I'd be in these situations where I was not covering Jesse Jackson when he spoke, I was covering the juvenile “delinquents” as they called them who had just gotten out of jail who were delivering donuts to the back of the church. That was my beat. So I was never interviewing anyone famous. I want to be really clear about that. I was a beat reporter in the most... in the sense of doing stories on people in communities, and not one person I ever did a story on was at all ever like me.

And so I realized that I thought, "This is the greatest job. Every day I'm learning things. I'm learning about Poland, Ukraine, Puerto Rico, Mexico, and it's all in Chicago. I'm learning about Muslims, Sikhs, Hindus, Filipino Catholics, exorcisms, redlining." All these kinds of things I never had really thought about when I was growing up in my white suburb, and I learned to really listen. Also, my editor used to always say ... I went to cover a story, and I was with a photographer who was African American, and we couldn't get in to where we were supposed to go, because they didn't think we had the right press credentials, and we're both really young.

They kicked us out, so we went back to the newsroom and we said, "We got kicked out." My editor said, "Go back." We said, "No no no, they kicked us out. We don't have the right press credential." And he says, "You missed the story. The story is they kicked you out. Don't bury the lead. The story is they kicked you out. Go back." And it was in a African American church doing organizing around insurance fraud, and he said, "Go back, figure out a way." And we said, "We're so young, and all the other reporters are all gray hair and old, and there's news teams there." And he said, "Take your disadvantage and turn it in to your advantage. Figure it out."

So the African American photographer and I were like ... I have to share, we were like, "We can't believe we have to go back. We were just kicked out." So we go back, and we realized, "Okay, what is our advantage? Our advantage is we're young. Our advantage is we don't have the right press credentials, so let's not do a story that the other people are doing. Let's do the backstory." We went and we got into the back of the facility, and we interviewed the people who were preparing the food for the activists, and it turned out most of them had been in jail or were addicts, and we did this story about what does it take for community organizers to organize people, and what it takes, you know what I'm going to say, is food.

The reason I'm sharing this is that, when I went to graduate school, I actually didn't want to go, because I thought, "This is a great life." But I was living with my parents because this sounds glamorous, but it's not. You don't make any money. I had zero social life because I worked Thursday, Friday, Saturday,
Sunday. Everybody else was off going to clubs, so I had Monday and Tuesday off so that my social life was emergency room nurses who worked out at health clubs on those days. I had no life, and I was living with my parents because I didn't have enough money for an apartment, and I had a really old car.

My father said, "You should go to graduate school." And I said, "Well I don't think I want to go. It seems boring compared to sneaking in and not having press credentials, or covering Mexican gangs and Polish gangs and Puerto Rico Libre, and he said, "You know, you've got a four year fellowship to go and an education is something no one can take away from you. You can always be a reporter." And he said, "And maybe if you become, if you at least go to graduate school, you could get a job where you worked other regular hours." And he said, "I don't see the difference. You're not earning that much money."

So I very reluctantly went to grad school because ... I know it sounds crazy, but I was just thinking, "This is so interesting. I am learning things every day, and I'm learning so much from really wise people who are... I have nothing in common with except maybe a kind of solidarity that the world could be a better place." And I thought, "Why would I want to go to graduate school and read abstract theory?" This is, I thought it was so not in the world. But I went. And so I went to study Communications and Cinema, and when I went I had a lot of issues initially, because I thought it wasn't as exciting. It's very dull to be in the library when you're used to being in communities, in the streets.

Chicago's a big news town. You're always trying to do in somebody and muckrake and investigate, and you're always trying to tell stories from below, and there's a big tradition of very aggressive journalism in Chicago that goes back 100 years, and I just felt, "I'm part of this story." When I went to graduate school at Wisconsin, it felt a little calm in comparison, and I also was amazed that you could do it Monday through Friday, because I had not had that lifestyle when I got out of college, and I thought, "Wow, you can have your night free?"

But ended up going to University of Wisconsin-Madison, which ended up being a great place to be, because it was very political and there were lots of political communities there, and it was two and a half hours from Chicago, so all through graduate school, I was a stringer for a couple newspapers. I was a freelancer, and I would cover stories to just stay in the world. Kind of a crazy story. I haven't thought about a lot of this in a long time.

Hend Alawadhi: How did you ... So when you first started teaching, how did that ... I'm assuming that that experience must have trickled into your way of selecting films to screen or the kind of readings that you offered to the students. How did that, can you talk about your first teaching job and what that meant?

Patricia Z.: Yes, I'll talk about my first teaching job. I'm going to go back to graduate school. I went to graduate school, just to set the picture here. It was in the 70s, so Marxist feminism was flowering, semiotics, structuralism, psychoanalysis, and a
lot of high theory, and I had a very complicated relationship to all of this. The feminist media really synced up with a lot of solidarity with Central American politics. Our graduate students, we were one of the first unionized graduate students in the country, and there were strikes that I was involved with, but there was one issue that arose for me which was, I was reading all this abstract theory, and part of it, it was very contradictory.

Part of it for me was a solace, because it was abstract ideas that were very clean in a way, in contrast to my own experience listening to everyday people tell me stories of great struggle and often great oppression, so the abstraction was a little bit of a solace. It was like a zen retreat for my brain. On the other hand, it felt like, "Where's the substance? Where's the substance?" I took a course in film history and it was there I had this, I became a born again person, and I realized that being a historian matched my skills that I had trained as a journalist, because it was about listening. It was about finding and triangulating evidence, thinking about explanatory models, finding through lines, thinking about exploration and explanation, and that resonated with my journalism experience, and it also solved some ethical dilemmas.

I was always as a journalist thinking, "What does it mean to listen to someone tell their story?" And I get a thousand words, but I interviewed them for a couple hours or I tagged around when they were doing something, and I always had this deep nagging question about that that I don't know that I ever resolved. So in graduate school, I discovered two schools of thought that were a little different from those major currents at the time that answered those questions for me. One was Michel Foucault and post-structuralist historiography, because it was about a multiplicity, multiplicities, polyphonies. To just share, when I read Foucault, to me it read like journalism. It described my experience in the streets in Chicago, where one day I'd be with Mexican gangs, and the next day I'd be talking to someone who ran an art center for Polish immigrants, where that sense of stories on the margins, stories from below, with lots of multiplicity, thinking about ruptures, disjunctures and fractures. I really read it, I did not even read it as theory. I devoured it. It made my life make sense. It was like an awakening, and then the other theorist, group of theories I ready was German critical theory, particularly Habermas and notions of the public sphere, because I had spent time in Chicago looking at different ethnicities and immigrant groups, and different national identities and different classes work to make things public.

And it just, like that again, it almost read like, "This is theory? This just describes my life." That's how I got into being a historian, because it was combining this kind of theory with trying to figure out, "What's a story that hasn't been told?" And that's how I got interested in researching amateur film and documentary, because that to me was about stories that had not been told, ways of thinking that had not been done. I'm also at Wisconsin, which was coming up with ideas of the classical Hollywood system, and to me the classical Hollywood system just
seemed like people in power. When I was a journalist and when I was a student, I never got to be in that world, so I thought, "Well there must be these other worlds," and so I found the other worlds where people are not in power, the world of documentary, the world of experimental film, and the world of amateur film.

That's what I did, and I wrote my dissertation on amateur film using Foucault and Habermas. I was an outlier in our field in a way, and then all through graduate school, I'd worked in the independent film community outside of graduate school. I had this other life with people who were interested in non-studio produced political independent media, and I thought, "Oh I like these people. They have a lot of energy. They're really trying to tell stories that haven't been told."

And one of the films I worked on could not find images of the anti-war movement that they could afford, because you would have to buy it from NBC/ABC, and one of the other associate producers said, "Hey, I found this guy. He took Super 8 movies of the demonstrations." We started tracking down people who had made films of the anti-war movement, and it wasn't because I was writing on amateur film. It solidified for me to write on amateur film, because this was affordable. You just had to tell someone, "Oh we'll put your film in a movie," and you didn't have to buy the rights from CBS or NBC for this material, and it was local to Madison.

I end up getting this job at Ithaca College, and I go there and I think I have landed on another planet literally. I felt like Spy in the House of Love, "Where am I? Who are these people? What is this place, and why am I here?" Let me just paint the picture. I was by this time, I got my job, I was 25, 26 years old. I had been in the independent movements. I had been a journalist. I was working in a kind of film history really on the margins, amateur film history, documentary, really involved in the burgeoning independent media scene in the US, so I get to this school and in the department I'm in, I'm the only woman. I'm the only woman. I am ... I think the next person who was young was 15 years older than me, so they're all men, they're all white, they're almost all people who make things, photographers and filmmakers. There are a couple of people who don't even have degrees.

And the first faculty meeting I go to, I am told, "You are the secretary for the department, and you need to take minutes." Yes, this is 1981. So I had come out of these more militant scenarios of Marxist feminism, post-structural historiography. I'm really young. By this time I had cut my hair off, I was more of a punker then, and so I say in the faculty meeting, "Excuse me. I am not willing to do this. I have some political issues with taking minutes for the entire year for all of you." That was my first faculty meeting, and one guy said, "Do you think we're asking you to do this because you have two breasts?" And I said, "No, I think you're asking me to do this because I'm the youngest person here and I'm
a woman, and I think ..." I gave him a lecture on sexual politics. I'm embarrassed saying this, but I really fought it.

And they said, "No, you have to do this." And I said, "I refuse." And they said, "Well we need the minutes." And I said, "Well, I refuse to do it." I sat there with you with my pen, and I said, "I'll hold the pen, but I won't take minutes." You have to remember, those were days when you were militant. I was never a career driven person the way I hear people say, "What's your career?" I was just part of feminist movements and anti-racist movements and solidarity movements, and I thought, "Who are you guys telling me to do this?" Also, I was young, they felt really old. I thought it was sexist. I thought it was absolutely unbelievable, and I was young, so what did I have to lose?

So I said no. Well then, let me tell you what happened. It was the best thing I ever did, because word got out around campus, "There's someone here from University of Wisconsin who said, 'No, she won't take minutes,' to all the white guys in the department." Suddenly I had a network of incredible older sister feminists from Cornell and Ithaca College and Binghamton and all these schools. People were calling me, "Can I take you out to lunch? You said no." And so I'm in this place that was really focused on getting students jobs in Hollywood, and I thought, "Why did they hire me? I do documentary. I do feminism. I work on experimental film. I am totally the other in every way." And I met all these women from all these different disciplines of every race, ethnicity, nation, but there was this enormous feminist community in central New York, and I became known as ... They're like, "She's so young and she said no," and they were just completely supportive. And they would say, "The faculty meeting's coming up. Keep saying no."

Hend Alawadhi: Did they ask you again?

Patricia Z.: No. They didn't ever ask me again, and in fact, they never asked me again, so my beginning teaching was very contentious. Very contentious. And partly I went there thinking, "I'll stay a year." I went there because I was ABD, which no one is anymore when they start a job. I was ABD, I went there because I needed archives, and I thought, "Well Ithaca, this is good. George Eastman House is an hour and a half away. There's archives down in Washington DC. This is really good, because I can be in the archive, in film archives, and I can finish my dissertation and do this kind of work."

When I started teaching, because I had worked in independent film and been a journalist, I have to tell you most of my load was I was teaching film production. Because I was a writer, they thought, "Well teach screenwriting." I didn't know anything about screenwriting. That is so removed from journalism, and then they told me, "You need to teach documentary. We need to have documentary. We don't have it." I developed their first documentary course my first year there, which 37 years later, I'm still teaching that course, but they had no courses for me really, but I had a great dean who said ... He brought me in and I
said, "There's nothing for me to teach. They want me to teach filmmaking and screenwriting, and there's one course in documentary." And he said, "Well here's my thoughts about hiring. We hire assistant professors and you have one job."

I said, "What's that?" And he said, "Your job is to shake up the field and shake up our institution." And he said, "And I understand you already have accomplished a little bit of that." And he said, "Bring new ideas here. That's the job of an assistant professor. Bring new ideas. We don't have any of the things that you do, so make it happen." That was a lot of my early career was figuring out how to get courses that were somewhat related to what I do, and publishing and doing research and all that sort of thing.

Hend Alawadhi: Okay. What about Ithaca as a city? Your work has impacted the field globally, but Ithaca has ... You've had a very regional impact in Upstate New York. Can you talk more about the city and the institutions?

Patricia Z.: Yeah, absolutely. So ...

Hend Alawadhi: You co-programmed the Woman Direct Film and Video. Can you tell more about that?

Patricia Z.: Yes, yes. My first year there, one of these big sister feminists I met was a woman named Barbara Adams, who's a writer, and I think I might've told her the story that I said no to taking minutes, and I said, "I just cannot believe how male this school of communications is." Because in Madison, I had this huge community of militant Marxist feminists like Chris Holmlund, Diane Wallman, Maureen Turim, people who are major figures in our field. They were people who really gave me support and solidarity, and so these women I met, I kept saying, "It's so male."

I was just alienated. I'd never been around people so commercial industry oriented in media, because all my schooling had been in the Midwest. I'd never been around so many men who did this, and I came out of these political movements, and then the back of my mind was the theoretical models I was dedicated to of Foucauldian post-structural history looking at a multiplicity of voices and discourses and public spheres, and so these women said, "It's all men? Make a new world. Make a new world." I'm serious. None of these people were film people. They said, "Feminism and politics is not about simply saying, 'This is terrible. I'm the only woman. They're so industry oriented, you get student job oriented.'"

These women in that community said, "You have to make a new world." Let's talk about that. So we said, "Well let's bring feminist independent filmmakers here, documentary and experimental, because that's creating space that's beyond this hegemony of Hollywood industrialist education." And I then, with these women, I realized, "Wow, there's so many militant feminists here, and so
many lesbians in Ithaca, and so many activists. We can turn every screening into a public sphere." And that's what we did. We did it for 20 years, but it came out of, what I'm trying to represent here is contradictions are a really good thing.

I often wonder if I would be who I was if I wasn't in Upstate New York, so why did I go to Upstate New York? The other reason besides the archives was Upstate New York and lower Canada, even back in the early 80s, was a vibrant center and is a vibrant center for independent media practice and for experiments in technology. Canada, because of funding, New York State, because of the New York State Council on the Arts, and so there's a community of people working in independent media, independent video at the time, working with technology across the state and across lower Canada.

When I got there, I also realized from many people, one of whom was Maureen Turim, who at the time was at Binghamton and had gone to my graduate school, that you can't be institutionally identified and ever feel totally happy. That the way to feel part of things is actually to live in many worlds and many communities, and create alliances and to have a lot of multiplicity and heterogeneity in your life, so that you're teaching and you're writing and you're going to conferences, but you're also part of the independent media community. You're making independent media happen by programming it.

And it turns out this area of the country is really vibrant, which I knew when I was in graduate school. I thought, "If I go there, I'll still be hooked in with the independent media movement." That turned out to be true, so it turns out across the state of New York and Canada, there are all these people working on documentary, experimental film, doing experiments with technology, expanded cinema, and I know this sounds crazy to say, but I thought, "I have found my people. This is so exciting." And in fact in the 80s, when Ruby Rich was head of the media division of New York State Council on the Arts, she invited me to be a panelist, because I was Upstate and they always have this issue in New York State. They need Upstate people.

I knew her a little bit in Chicago. I went and I thought, "I'm in awe of this person." And I'll tell you why I was in awe of her. I thought, "She is a visionary because she has incredible clarity." I thought, "I want to be you when I grow up. I want to be clear." And the second thing I loved about her was she was a bureaucrat taking money and changing media in the state of New York. Getting works by people of color and women into museums, getting programmers to expand beyond European art film, and I was just amazed by her. The third thing I loved about her was her sense of building community. We were on those panels and we'd all go out to dinner together, young and old, all different kinds of people, and I thought, "Wow, she's like the people I met in Ithaca."

To me, there was always this sense of a dialectic, like you're in the academy, but you're also out of it, and that there are many worlds to live in because you're not just an academic. What you are is a person who believes that media has a
possibility to show us a different way to see and think and be and change the world. And you need different kinds of people to do that, so one group was of course The Flaherty Seminar, which was always happening in Upstate New York 30 minutes from where I live, so I ended up going there. The other was this community in Upstate New York. We had a programmers group for about 20 years of everyone who programmed at a university in Upstate New York, and we would get together, which is how I got to know Scott McDonald who I also just published a book with.

My sense was always, "You build communities, and you build communities so that you can live in different kinds of film communities, because if you're in one place, it's impossible to think clearly." I know this sounds, maybe that's too simple, but that's really how I've found Upstate New York. It's a place ... What I would say is there's Upstate New York, but for me I call it this region that's lower Canada, Upstate New York, Massachusetts. You draw a circle where there are these vibrant media scenes happening of people who love to debate and argue, and there's all these different institutions that you could intersect with, and I think without that Upstate and lower Canada community, and without being in programming worlds, Flaherty worlds, historical worlds, feminist worlds, all these different worlds, I don't know that I could've survived if I was just a professor if that makes any sense.

My generation of people, we always felt like you just don't study. You have a responsibility to make publics happen, to create those counter publics that you hope could exist as a counterweight to places of dominance and power, and those needs for counter publics shift and change and adapt as politics changes and adapts. So I feel like the Upstate/lower Canada area is such a vibrant important area that has led me down many paths, and one is ... People often ask me, "Why don't you write on film anymore, and why do you write on new media?" And the reason is because there's so much new media happening in this region I described, that I feel in a way I'm a journalist again. I'm looking at things that are unresolved, where people are figuring out new ways of doing things. I'm in awe of how I don't understand it all, and so it's always those things that are marginal, but that are pushing new ways of thinking and being and doing that I'm attracted to.

It wasn't like I thought, "Oh, what a good career move. I'll write on new media." For me it was more, "This is happening where I'm living, and I'm programming people who work in this realm, and there's enormous development in lower Canada in this area and in Upstate New York because of the New York State Council on the Arts, and because of all the science and technology driven institutions in our region. Why wouldn't I go there?" It's there. It's where I live. It's located in the landscape and the environment that I live in, and I don't fully understand it all, and of course it also hit on my intellectual themes of voices from below, voices from the margins, counter publics, technologies, amateurism, user generated work, ways of thinking about history and
hi
gistography. What is evidence, what is explanation, how do we think about politics?

Hend Alawadhi: Your latest book was released a few months ago in November. Congratulations to you and Helen. It's called Open Space New Media Documentary. I'm interested in learning a bit more about when you had that shift in your scholarship from analog to digital, and how much were you pushing against the canon?

Patricia Z.: Yes, that's a really interesting question.

It's connected to The Flaherty Seminar, and connected to being in Upstate New York, and connected to being a programmer, and it's connected to amateurism. I've always been very interested in a sort of nexus of technological development, democratization and access to technologies, political discourses, political movements, political struggles and debates, and marginalized voices and questions of history, and questions of historiography. How do we consider evidence? How do we consider explanation? How do we consider explanatory models that are not linear and deductive, because those don't explain the phenomena and the politics and the people I'm interested in?

I've always been interested in documentary without a noun after it, so for me, everything revolved around documentary, not documentary film, not documentary video, not documentary installation, but this nexus of documentary, which all of this sphere of ideas I just described fit into. So I lived through the transitions from 16mm to video at The Flaherty Seminar. Huge debates, "Can we show video?" It seems crazy now, right? "Can we show video, or should it just be film?" Some people saying, "No, we can only show 35mm film. How do we exhibit video?" It was very hard to exhibit video in the 70s and 80s. "What do we do with video parsing out between the avant-garde and politically engaged?"

I started seeing people starting to work in installation, so I eventually ended up on the board of The Flaherty, and I saw all these debates around technologies, and I also was living through AIDS activism, feminism, anti-racist movements, adopting new consumer grade technologies to tell stories, create new kinds of archives, create new kinds of evidence and new kinds of explanatory models, so this is all happening, and then I'm living in Upstate New York where a lot of artists and people start working with new media. I'm tracking technological change, and every book I've ever written deals with the same set of issues, so it looks like they're really different, but they're all the same. They're all, I would say the same kind of questions, same kind of inquiry.

When you take this sphere of these different topics, technology, marginalized stories, power, politics, struggle, histories, archives. How can we start thinking about it? So in 1997... 1996... 1995, I was on the board of The Flaherty Seminar and it almost went under, and the reason it almost went under is funders didn't
like it. Funders felt, "What is this thing? It has no outcome, no impact." It's a small little isolated entity. It's not a festival where it gets press. It feels like an insular East Coast institution and it seems dedicated to a kind of old fashioned view about what documentary is, and lots of struggles over race, over nation, over internationalism, over identities, and I lived through many of those both at the Seminar on the board and at my own institution.

Explosive debates about race, these are not new to the era we're in. These are embedded in American society. So the board had an idea that the way to survive was, instead of running a big seminar which needed enormous funding, and the funders had blackballed The Flaherty Seminar. By the way, I would say legitimately. I felt their critiques were correct, just to be fair here. I don't want to be a total partisan about this. I said, "Okay my ..." They said, "We're going to do seven regional seminars that will last for four days." And I said, "Oh I can talk my school into doing it. My school has a lot of money." I went to my dean who was just a wonderful guy, Dr. Thomas Bone. I said, "Would you like to do The Flaherty Seminar?"

And he was also a documentary scholar, and he said, "There's no way we're going to say no to that." He says, "But you have to do all the work." So I programmed it with Michelle Materre, and I started thinking it was sort of like a math problem. "Okay, what can we do?" And I realized what we needed to do was to be located in place, and the place we were in was a place that had massive experimentation in video, in experimental film and in new media, and that was the moment in 1997, so I decided, "Let's program a mix of analog and new media." And Tim Murray, my friend at Cornell, and I were both really moving into new media because we were living in the middle of it.

This was not, I want to be really clear, it wasn't like a career move. It wasn't like, "Oh this is new, I'm going to push the field." This is where we live. New media artists, people in Canada, people coming from Europe, people in Upstate New York exploring how to push technologies that were computational. And I just found it connected with a lot of these theoretical issues I had and also I liked that I couldn't fully understand it. That always attracts me, because then there's questions to be asked, and so Tim, I said, "Tim, why don't you curate part of this and bring in some new media people, and let's put our stamp on this as the legacy of experimental video in Upstate New York," because of course there's some famous funders, Experimental TV, which was a unit that had really propelled a lot of experimental video is 30 minutes from Ithaca.

That's what I programmed, and I programmed a CD-ROM salon and brought in new media artists who worked at Rensselaer Polytechnic and at SUNY-Buffalo, so the idea was to showcase the region as this really vital place, and I really have to give a shout-out to my dean at the time Tom Bone, who marshaled enormous resources to pull this off. It required a lot of engineering to do it, and it turned out that one of our alumni is a very famous video artist Daniel Reeves, and he was someone who was originally working on morphing and working on making
very political anti-war films back in the day in the 70s, so we brought him back with his film *Obsessive Becoming*, and we brought in all kinds of new media artists, and we ran that as a digital Flaherty.

I think back, and in fact Tim and I were just talking last night, we can't believe that was 20 years ago. For me, the move was not really a move. It was more this was what was in my world and I wanted to understand it more, and I started to see that new media practices were taking technologies, democratizing them, hacking technologies, reverse engineering technologies to make them operate in different ways, thinking of different ways to imagine and make archives, different ways to imagine and deal with evidence, and different ways to imagine and mobilize people and communities, and I just thought it was so exciting.

And then I also thought, "Wow, the great thing about new media is it combines documentary, journalism, and the avant-garde, so all these worlds are convening there, and all kinds of interesting people are doing amazing work both politically and with technologies." It just, it's so much a part of where we live that it's almost impossible to think not doing it. Does that make sense?

Hend Alawadhi: It does, it does, but a lot of the scholars out ... Yes, it also takes a lot of energy and ... I don't know, I don't know, a keenness to acknowledge it I think and to adopt it into your programming, so it goes both ways.

Patricia Z.: Yeah, I guess so. I never really think about it, because in my life, I've been a scholar. I'm a historian who works in archives, and if you're dealing with archives, with history, it's almost impossible to not think about digitality and the virtual. They seem opposite but they're actually not, and the other thing I would just say is I've been a programmer my entire life as well. As I wrote in a piece, "I've always lived a double life." And now that I talk to you, I feel like the best way to be an academic is to live in many worlds, because when one world disappoints you, you have these other worlds that will nurture you and support you and show you a way.

I never thought of that as needing to take energy, because I always felt that that's how you get energized, so because I've always been a programmer and I've always programmed public events, because I've been very committed to the idea that counter publics just don't happen, you have to produce them and create them and shape them and sculpt them, and then let them roar and let them rip even when they become controversial, that it felt really important ... In the film festival I run, we've always programmed across platforms.

Hend Alawadhi: The Finger Lakes-

Patricia Z.: Yes, because we're an environmental film festival, and the person I program with is a politics person, a politics professor, and he says, "We wouldn't be an environmental film festival if we didn't really showcase what's happening in our region," and he says, "There is not cinema or video or new media." He says, Tom
Shevory, he says, "It's a big meaty ecology, and for that ecology to be healthy you need diversity, and diversity needs to be by race, by nation, by platform, by age, by experience, by technology."

We make big grids, and our model of programming is an ecological model of, "If it's all the same, then it's going to wither and die." We've always had that, and yeah, it's a lot of issues about, "How do you program it? How do you think about it?" But I think if you're programming and you know exactly what you're doing, then you're not a programmer, because the job of a programmer is to almost be like an exorcist. You have to figure out what is unresolved and put it in public for people to gnaw at and argue about. Your job is to detonate discussion and dialogue about that which you do not know. That is your job, and if you're programming to prove a point, then what you're doing is propaganda or fake truths, or maybe you're a politician you don't want to be. Your job is to create dialogues, and also to put things out there that disturb people or that maybe they don't understand or that maybe are hard to get an audience for, and that I think is very exciting to start thinking that way.

Hend Alawadhi: You mentioned reverse engineering a few minutes ago. That's a part of the title of your current book project, which is *Documentary Across Platforms: Reverse Engineering Media, Place, Politics*?

Patricia Z.: Yes.

Hend Alawadhi: Can you talk a little more about that?

Patricia Z.: I can talk about that, and I have to on camera give a little shout-out to Hend, because she's also my research assistant on the project, which would be impossible to do without her. That project is a collection of my essays. Interestingly, over the last 20 years that date from that Flaherty mini-seminar I programmed at Ithaca College. And they're all essays dealing with this idea of documentary not being format based, but documentary being an epistemological and political stance on the world. A stance where there is evidence, explanation, artistry and publics, and to think about documentary as a political project that locates itself in many different places. The book looks as you know at photography, at new media, at experimental film, long film, short film, community-based media.

The idea of reverse engineering actually comes from engineering, and I've always had an interest in technology and technological development as well as stories from below and storytelling that is not in dominant models, and that is not linear and is not on an arc, and that is really aggregated storytelling. So I started to think, "I'm getting really tired of hearing about, 'Give voice to the voiceless, image to the imageless.'" There was something that was really bothering me, and that's a language I've heard in independent media since the 70s, since I was in college. And I started thinking, “Why am I bothered by this?”
And there was something colonialist about it, and there was something thinking, "Is it enough to just have an image or a voice?" And then... discomforts a little bit about this. And then I went to Singapore as a professor, and I was hired by Nanyang Technological University, which is like the MIT of Asia, and it's a big engineering school. I thought, "I love these engineers," and here's what I loved about the way engineers think. I was in the communications school, but there were people who did information technology, and I found it so refreshing.

Why? Because engineers look at the world, "Here's a problem. How do we create a solution, and how do we create some technology or design something for the solution?" I loved that way of thinking. Every problem has a solution. It's very Wittgensteinian. I love the idea of, "You can actually make something." I saw all these crazy engineers in Singapore building things like, "Oh, there's a problem with this. We'll build this." I would go to all these talks, and I started hearing them use this term reverse engineering.

They'd say, "Well, we're looking at this light, and we want to know how that light works, so the way we understand that light works but doesn't work perfectly. It doesn't solve the problem, so how do we understand it? We take it apart. We take the light apart and we look at all the components, and we take apart the technology and we look at the components and we say, 'What is our problem and how can we put those components together in a different way to build something new?'" And I thought, "This makes a lot more sense to me than deconstruction or making images or giving voice to the voiceless."

There was something very action oriented about it, and I thought, I always have seen independent media and documentary as a place of hope and a place where worlds can be imagined and lived in that are outside of dominant political powers. They are ephemeral. They are provisional and they're often imaginary, but we need them. And so this idea of taking things apart and putting something together to make something new felt more hopeful to me than saying, "Look at these Hollywood films. There are no images of me." Or "We need more documentaries about X, Y, and Z."

I was just very very interested in this idea that technologies were not just givens. Even technologies can be taken apart, and of course in Upstate New York, we've got all these people up there, Experimental TV Center, who back in the 60s, who were taking screwdrivers and sticking them into TV monitors to manipulate the image. People dealing with, "What if we worked with glitches?" This seemed radical to me, but it also seemed a way to be hopeful, to think about how to reverse engineer everything to create something new, so that's where I got the idea.

Hend Alawadhi: I still want to ask you about the artists that you're working with on this book that I've been communicating with for the photos. Can you talk a little bit more about your relationship with them? They have been, it's been really amazing to witness their enthusiasm and how quickly they responded to every single email,
basically saying in one way or another, "Patty can have whatever she wants. Just let us know what she needs." How have you cultivated such a strong and amazing relationship with all of them, it seems?

Patricia Z.: First of all, I'm really glad to hear they're very happy to give all the images.

Hend Alawadhi: No, they really have been, yeah.

Patricia Z.: One thing I would point out, and I'm glad you asked me this, is I don't think I've ever written anything on a feature length documentary that's been in a movie theater. So everything I've ever written about is amateur, activist, community based, NGO based, avant-garde, what I would call smaller scale. I'm really trying to think... Maybe a couple more international films, but I've always been interested in, "What is that larger documentary ecology?" Partly is, that's where my two worlds come together, so I've been a programmer for a really long time, and almost all these people you're dealing with, I know from The Flaherty Seminar, I know from the independent media scenes in this region, and most of them I've programmed.

They've been at my festival, the Finger Lakes Environmental Film Festival, and I have hosted them and sat with them and talked with them and learned from them, and I've worked to get them audiences, and I've come full circle. I go back to my role when I was 21 years old and I was a journalist. I am in awe. Just in awe that people can think that way and make images this way, so everyone I've programmed always presents a problem, "What do I do with Tony Cokes and his short, very radical videos that are highly designed? What do I do with them?"

So I worked with Tony and I said, "What if we get all those shorts and infiltrate all the propaganda monitors at Ithaca College, and put your shorts that are anti-war on those monitors? What if instead of treating it as a short we treat it as a trailer before the long films we show at the art cinema?" So it's really working at programming as a collaboration, and again I want to go back to Singapore. Learning from engineers, every problem has a solution and every solution can never be devised by one person. You have to collaborate with those artists and with those activists and with those makers to figure out how to do it. How do you take what they do, adapt it for your community, and get them what they want, and move the world to create some kind of counter public where people can come together and do something new?

Someone like Tony was figuring out, "How do we do that?" And by the way, I've had a lot of faculty say, "They're going to shut you down. The college is going to shut you down." And I just want to share, it was just the opposite. We had different offices calling us and saying, "We heard that there's this very influential artist that we can put on the monitors. The students are tired of seeing, 'Here's the day you take your GREs. Here's the day you take your GMATs.'" It was just actually the opposite because all of it is related to community building, building collaborations.
What I would say very strongly is my relationships with those artists that are in
the book is decades, and it's decades of programming and going to events and
being angry together at The Flaherty Seminar and having community. And
knowing that having community in the independent film world is just absolutely
critical, and then learning from the Singaporean engineers, "Every problem has
a solution. You take it apart and your rebuild it." And also learning ... I have a
motto and my motto is DIWO. D-I-W-O. And I learned it from a new media
collective in the UK.

They say, "Don't do it alone. Do it DIWO." And that is my mantra for everything.
When we write, we write alone, but when we think, we have to think with
others. When we’re at our jobs, we have to be with others, and when we’re a
programmer, it's not about us as a curator. It's about us programming with
others, so we have to always think in a DIWO way, and we have to think about
the communities that we build around these works, and we don't have all the
answers. You need DIWO, you need lots of people.

I would say there's a reason I asked you to interview me, and the reason is that I
feel it's really important, even as we’re trying to chart this history of the field, to
have a DIWO politics and to have people like you entering the field in all your
brilliance having a shared conversation about what are our joint strategies
moving forward, and because you remind me, because you're from Kuwait and
you work on post-colonial cinemas from the Middle East, you keep me honest to
keep reminding myself Upstate New York and America is not the center of the
world, and that we need DIWO transnational alliances across the world with all
kinds of different people.

And as scholars, because I know this is going to go online I want to say this, I
think it’s really important that we realize that we have a responsibility to
reverse engineer our field, to take it apart, to dismantle these ideas of
professionalism and careerism and hierarchies and elitism, and we need to have
DIWO endless feminist political solidarity with the Hend Alawadhys of the world,
because otherwise we don't have a field.

We don't have a field if we’re not in conversation, because I think it's really
important that we think about collaborating and honoring new ideas that are
coming up. I think that that is what keeps everything alive to really build those
communities, so those artists, when they say, "Oh, I would do this," there's one
advantage of independent artists working on the margins is they're not, they
don't have a lot of representation, and many of them are not at festivals, so
they're excited to be in a book, but they're also excited to talk to someone like
you in Kuwait.

They probably can’t even believe someone in Kuwait is talking to them about
their work, and someone who's coming up in the field with all your brilliance, so
I think it's ... I'm going to start crying.
Hend Alawadhi: Oh, Patty.

Patricia Z.: I think it's very critical to build community, and right now ... I have to stop crying. To build community across ages, differences, religions, ethnicities, and countries. We need to build strong intellectual political communities, because otherwise I don't think our field or the world has a future. I really believe that very very strongly. I also think someone like me, we owe it, we owe our field to have conversations with people who are so much more brilliant and smarter than us, like you, who are pushing and pushing and ripping those fields apart and pushing it in new ways.

One thing I learned from my great mentor Eric Barnouw ... I never went to Columbia. He was my great mentor, and I met him when I was a grad student, and I said, "I don't know how I can do this dissertation on amateur film." I said, "It's too vast." And he said, "Do you have a shovel?" And I said-

Hend Alawadhi: A shovel?

Patricia Z.: A shovel, yes. And he said, "Well, you need to go and buy a shovel, and you need to start digging," and he said, "Whenever you get lonely and feel the work is too hard, you need to call me up." And he would sign every letter to me, every book he wrote, with one word: "Onward. Eric." And I feel like what I learned from him was how to take out that shovel and how to call people up, and how to be with others trying to figure things out that are very hard, very difficult, and filled with struggle.

I think from him I learned how to go onward, and when he was dying and blind, I called him up, and I said, "Oh Eric, I don't know what to say." And I said, "What are you doing?" And he says, "I'm watching incredible radical independent film." And my thought was, "You're blind." And he said, "I'm listening to it and my wife is describing it to me." I was just stunned. He was listening to works that were anti-Iraq War works, and I said, "Eric, I really don't know what to say." And he said, "I'm going to tell you what to say." And he says, "You know, I'm not going to be here that long," so Eric said to me, "Take the baton and pass it on."

I felt like, "How could this man whose book I read in graduate school and who I knew through The Flaherty Seminar and I did projects with and I programmed with, how could this titan in the field tell little me to pass it on?" I was so intimidated, and I knew he was dying. I said something so stupid and embarrassing I'm going to share. I said, "I'm not sure how to do that." I'm embarrassed to say it.

And he said, "It's really easy. All you need are people." And I was just so amazed how simple that was, so when I think about the field of documentary studies and I think about programming and I think about screen studies, what I think about is it's this living organism that needs people who are passing it on and creating community and creating dialogues and making space for ideas and
practices and people that wouldn't happen without getting those people together. I just feel it's even more urgent now given what the world is.

I think that, in some ways, it's a little awkward to be interviewed about, "What was my career in film studies," or "What did I live through in film studies," because to me screen studies is all of us, and being at this conference and hearing all of these early career people and grad students with these daring dynamic papers, I feel Eric can rest in peace because the field, the baton has not been passed on, it's been detonated. That's what I really feel, and that the times are so urgent now. They're so urgent.

Hend Alawadhi: This is a great segue into a final question that I have for you. What kind of advice would you give to scholars, filmmakers, programmers across the world who are working in institutions where the field is still relatively young, and at times it seems that the only thing we do have is people?

Patricia Z.: What to do if the field is young and all that you have is people?

Okay, so I'm hesitant to give advice, because it makes me feel like I know something that you don't know. Here's what I would say is instead of giving advice, what I would say is I'm envious. Totally envious because, to be in a place where there's almost a blank slate, where there aren't these long legacies... I teach at a communications school, which I love and I've been there a long time, but it's 50-60 years old. We're like a Carnival cruise ship. We can't change course that easily.

I think to be, for a scholar, you or somebody else, to be at a place where they don't have the field so developed and maybe they don't have programming in place is a miraculous gift, because what does that allow one to do? If you are like I was, where you're the only person doing what you do at your institution, there's some gifts to that dialectical conflict, and the gifts are you don't have people who have a preconceived idea about what that field is. You don't have to... You can think in new ways about what's legacy and what's new and what's the dialectic between those.

You have to go and do DIWO and be with people out there in the world. You need to create those transnational alliances talking to people. It's impossible to default to what's old, what's new, what's been done for 10, 15, 20, 30 years. You're able to invent a new world to live in. It's a lot of work to figure out what it would be, but I'm struck by... an example I would give is that I think many communications and media programs in the US are struggling, struggling, "How do we internationalize? How do we internationalize?" Yet when I went to first teach in Singapore 15 years ago, their assumption is everything you teach will be multicultural and international, because it's a country where there's four legal languages, multiple ethnicities, Buddhists, Muslim, Hindu, Christian all mixed together, and it would be culturally inappropriate to just teach American cinema or just Chinese cinema.
They asked me, "Can you manage this? Can you teach in this way?" That was 15 years ago. How could they do that? Because they were not a communications school that started in the 50s. They could respond to the current moment, so I actually strangely felt I was in this incredibly dynamic zone there of putting all these different kinds of works and countries together. There was no debate like, "What do we do?" The older the program is in the States, the more American-centric it usually is.

Maybe that's a big statement, but ... I think for people starting out, when they're going to places where there is nothing, what I would say is what's fantastic about that is imagining what are all the vectors one can put in? There are a couple schools in Upstate New York that have, in the last 5-10 years, invented media programs, and when I go there, I look at it and I think, "This is a new universe." There aren't debates about, "Are we international?" There aren't debates about transnational. There aren't debates about film or new media or video or installation. It's a multi-platformed universe with those early career scholars, and there's no debate.

Those people are not fighting in a way, and the other thing I would say is that the other great advantage of it is ... and it was an advantage I had at Ithaca College, because there was no one else like me in the Park School of Communications, and there still is no one else like me. I'm the only documentary scholar there. I'm the only historian now out of 75-80 faculty, and instead of thinking that as lonely, I think of it as a gift, because I absolutely have to find people elsewhere at the university.

I have to find people in the region. I have to find brilliant former grad students like you. I have to find people elsewhere, and I've had to do that my whole career, because I was isolated, but I never thought of it as isolated. It's a gift, because if you're the only person doing what you do, you cannot become an institutional, totally institutionally identified. You have to be in these disciplines, be in the world, and you have to live in many worlds, the world of artists, the world of activists, the world of programmers, the world of the Flaherty, the world of funders, the world of new media artists.

Because all of those multiple worlds, I'm going to go back to Foucault, I truly believe in the notion of polyphonic heterotopias, and I think that's what makes our field thrive. I think I've seen it here at panels, but I think it's way to live, to really know that that polyphony of many practices and discourse can create a heterotopia that will nurture us and let us invent things, so you're lucky. That's what I would say. You're very lucky.

Hend Alawadhi: I will take that home with me. Thank you so much Patty for your time today, and for your scholarship, and for your meaningful interventions. Thank you so much.

Patricia Z.: And thank you Hend for interviewing me.
Hend Alawadhi: It's been my pleasure.

Patricia Z.: It's really an honor to have you interview me and for the camera. I look forward to your brilliant interventions and your brilliant books and the way you will reinvent the field.

Hend Alawadhi: Thank you, Patty. That's very very generous of you.