

AHL Foundation

Archive of Korean Artists in America (AKAA) Interview

- Interviewee: Jennifer Moon
- Interviewer: Kavior Moon
- August 11, 2020 / via Zoom Meeting
- Recorded and Transcribed by Soojung Hyun (AKAA Research Fellow 2019-2020)
- 1 Video file
- This interview has been edited and condensed for clarity
- Open for research use

Use of Interview Transcript of Archive of Korean Artists in America (AKAA)

The Archive of Korean Artists in America (AKAA) provides our interview transcripts for non-commercial purposes. The following interviews were conducted by various curators, artists, and scholars and were recorded and transcribed by AHL Foundation's Research Fellow. We ask readers to know that the written record is a transcription of the spoken word, which has been edited for continuity and clarity and reviewed by the interviewee and the interviewer.

Quotes must be cited as follows: Interview with _____, date of interview. Archive of Korean Artists in America (AKAA), AHL Foundation. (e.g., Interview with Jennifer Moon, August 11, 2020. Archive of Korean Artists in America (AKAA)). The recordings associated with this interview may be made available upon request.

For commercial or reproduction use, including reproduction, quotation, publication and broadcast in any medium, distribution, derivative works, public performance, and public display, prior written permission must be obtained from AHL Foundation.

Permission will comply with any agreements between the interviewee and the interviewer and may be withheld in the AHL Foundation's sole determination. Please direct any questions or inquiries for the AKAA to archive@ahlfoundation.org.

© 2022 AHL Foundation, Inc.



Kavior Moon (KM): I'll begin by asking you to talk about when you first seriously started to think about making artwork or wanted to become an artist.

Jennifer Moon (JM): Seriously thinking about it? I went to art school only because that was where I got accepted. I always admired the art students and artists at my high school. I went to Los Alamitos High School in Orange County, and at the time it was temporarily hosting the Orange County High School of the Arts. It was an afterschool program. My interest in art was more like, I thought artists were cool. Actually, that's something that I've been thinking about—desire. Be an artist and be cool. But I don't know if that would be considered a serious thing. I feel it often starts off desirous and then it becomes what one would consider serious. And that happened, I think after I got into UCLA. This was in the early nineties.

KM: And you specifically applied for the art program at UCLA?

JM: Yes, because at that time they weren't asking for a portfolio, just an essay. I wrote about a Vincent van Gogh painting. I'm not even a painter. And so I got in, but my idea of art was very traditional and very conservative in terms of painting, and marble sculptures—stuff that you would see at...what's that museum in Pasadena?

KM: Norton Simon?

JM: Yeah, the Norton Simon museum. And so I think there was the *Helter Skelter* show at the Geffen Contemporary at MOCA in 1992. I was in Jill Giegerich's drawing class, and she took us to that show, and I was totally blown away, because Mike Kelley was there and Nancy Rubins, and a lot of the people who were teaching at UCLA at the time were in that show: Liz Larner, Paul McCarthy, and Chris Burden. That was my introduction to contemporary art, "Whoa, you can do this, and it's art. Basically, you can do anything." That was a really formative show that shifted my idea of what's possible for art. And so I guess it comes from that.

KM: So that's one reason for switching from thinking about artwork in terms of a van Gogh painting to your Deedra Swan incorporated project, which you did at UCLA?

JM: Yeah. Maybe I can describe it more like something that I'm reaching for. Desiring to be that because it somehow signifies something—signifies me to be what I considered to be an artist. And then, I guess the shifting would be something that feels close to me, something that feels mine, in that sense.

KM: Would you mind briefly describing the Deedra Swan (the artist's alter ego: CEO of Deedra Inc.) project and then also what that meant in terms of being an artist to you? You said that that project represented a desire to be an artist.

JM: Yes. That project was when I was like, “Oh, I am an artist.” Before it was like, “I want to be an artist because it seems cool and all the people I admired in high school were artists and it seems free and stuff.” But the deep Deedra Swan project was when I was like, “Oh, I think I actually can be an artist.” It was a three-month performance in which I changed my name at UCLA to Deedra Swan. [She] wore a platinum blonde wig, a Desert Storm jacket, and eighties business clothes with tennis shoes. A kind of corporate casual and also military style.

I started this fake corporation called Deedra Inc., and Deedra Swan is the CEO. At UCLA, Bruin Walk is where they have all the clubs sit at tables and try to recruit people. So I set up a table and I tried to get people to invest in Deedra Inc. For \$20 you got a certificate of investment, a Deedra Inc. T shirt and a subscription to a newsletter written by another character, Catharine Bay.

Deedra Inc. specializes in covert agents and covert operations and Deedra Swan believes in world salvation through corporate ventures, so she’s a capitalist. Electra is the ultimate covert agent, and she was raised by Deedra. She believes in very binary ideas of right and wrong, good and evil. So she’s this tragic superhero figure. The money that the people invested is supposed to go to her training. And then there was Jennifer, who was Deedra’s roommate. Jennifer smoked a lot of weed and she believed in leaving her body and existing on an astral plane, and she and Deedra didn’t get along. So I would be at school as Deedra Swan, and then the investors would get these newsletters that told the narrative of all these three characters written by Catharine Bay, who is very suspicious of Deedra Swan and is trying to investigate Deedra and expose her for her evils.

At the end of the three-month period, the investors are invited to the *Deedra Inc. Cocktail Party*, and Electra comes out and does a martial arts exhibition to show the investors where their money went. Deedra has a band called Deedra and the Galaxies [who] Malik Gaines wrote the theme song for. Actually, Malik Gaines is someone I worked with a lot through undergrad and also in graduate school. So Deedra and the Galaxies would play songs, and then sometimes she would give a speech about how she’s taking over small countries and stuff.

KM: Do you think that growing up in Southern California or living in L.A. had anything to do with this kind of pop cultural fantasy world that you were spinning? Or was it more as this subcultural world of comics and not necessarily television and movies and the industry proper?

JM: Yeah. I think it’s both. Alex Segade introduced me to Marvel comics, specifically the X-Men and the New Mutants from the early eighties. I was reading them a lot, so I was heavily influenced by the Marvel universe. But also, probably not consciously, by living and growing up adjacent to L.A. I was in Orange County, and then

coming to L.A. TV and movies were a big part, and fantasy was always a big part growing up. I had a very developed fantasy world.

I should also say another huge influence is Jason Rhoades. He was my TA in Paul McCarthy's class in which I did this project. He was the one who suggested, when I was telling him about these characters, he was like, "Oh, you should form a corporation. You should get people to buy stock." And then I was like, "Oh my God. It's like, so genius." And so that idea came from him.

KM: So that seems to be an early major project where you're working out these elaborate frameworks for a durational performance project that is largely based on these alter egos or fictional characters that represent some aspect of yourself then. But that gets blown up and formed into this other persona. Over time, it seems that you've started to really dig into your own personal life—not so much alter egos, but into your real life identity. It's an awkward term: you could deconstruct that in so many different ways. But let's say a pivotal project might be *The Facility* (2000), which is the major project that you did at the Art Center for your MFA. That was about training to be a superhero. Was that superhero you?

JM: It was me. Because after Deedra Inc. started, Deedra expanded to include The Startouchers, which is a league of super powered superheroes, again, based on Marvel. As you said, there are these personas, there are these characters, so I was thinking I didn't want to play dress-up anymore. I want to be an actual superhero. I'm going to train to be an actual superhero and I'm going to patrol the streets. I'm going to be like Rogue or Storm or something. So that was the shift, from having these fictional characters and then to me. And I think a lot of this process is now realizing the fiction of everything, the story making of everything, the world that we live in. But that shift was to focus more on layers, characters, me as a person. Which again, you mentioned the idea of who we are, who I am, in relation to construction of identities from state identities to fictional ones. They're all entangled a little bit and it's hard to separate sometimes.

KM: One thing that you've talked about and you've also started to write about is this concept of The Revolution with a capital R.

JM: And a capital T. There are so many revolutions.

KM: When did that idea first come about?

JM: Graduate school. I think also through self-reflection. I think with the Deedra stuff, all those characters were parts of me that then became . . . Because there's definitely a capitalist side to me that believes in world salvation through

corporate ventures. So that's a part of me, and then it became a caricature, blown up. And then I was like, "Okay, no more characters. I'm going to focus on me, trying to train." At that time I was making a musical documentary movie called *50 Weeks*, because that was how long I put myself on this regimen of training to be a superhero, but then drugs and love and sex and romance got in the way. I think something about removing the characters and then focusing on me somehow led me to think about systems, how I'm now performing systems. Although I didn't have that language at the time, this is how I think about it now.

I think also my ideas of making art were very tied into art stardom, because it was the nineties and there were a lot of art stars. And so I think I was in the process of trying to disentangle from this individualistic idea of art into thinking about systems analysis. And so that's where *The Revolution* came. And it was towards the end of graduate school and I was like, "Oh, okay. Maybe what I really want is revolution." And then I was like, "Oh, if I want a revolution, I got to write a manifesto." And then I was like, "Oh, I hate writing. I'm going to do drugs instead." And then the ten year hiatus.

KM: *The Revolution* was, in part, something that by definition had to be collective.

JM: Yes. I feel like it has to be collective. I am constantly thinking about my role in *The Revolution*. Because close friends or people who encounter my work and *The Revolution*—I've heard this many times—say things like I'm a cult leader, or this is a cult. And so I'm like, "No, I don't want it to be the Jennifer Moon revolution." But I also know that I have a part—it's confusing because part of my other work is about me, it's so focused on me and my life. And then there's a revolution that's supposed to be a collective. It's not supposed to be about a single person.

KM: What is *The Revolution*?

JM: *The Revolution* is a way of being that is focused on—it's formless. Right now, there's four factions, but they're missions that are applicable only to address a certain issue. And then they're meant to dissolve or be disposable. There's only two principles: first, always operate from a place of abundance. When I say always, that pertains to any manner of actions that could be deemed revolutionary. There's a text that I wrote called "Definition of Abundance," which is kind of a manifesto, and it's basically, operating from a place of knowing that I'm enough for the mere fact that I exist.

The second principle is, always choose the most expansive route. *The Revolution* defines the most expansive route as one that reaches beyond binaries, hierarchies, and capital or the route that offers the greatest [number] of options, the greatest number of people or the greatest amount of freedom. I know freedom is a complicated term. The

argument is that people can only decipher the most expansive route if they're operating from a place of abundance.

KM: This is a life philosophy, as well as something that structures your art practice, would you say?

JM: Yes. I think it does. These are things I think of when I think of art projects or decisions I'm making within a specific project: "Am I operating from a place of abundance?" Or if I'm not, then how do I address that? I think a lot of my work also tends towards talking about trauma and shame and fears as a way to acknowledge them and befriend them to then be in a place of abundance.

KM: For the last several years, your artworks have become intensely personal, exploring different aspects, starting from the *Phoenix Rising* series to one of your most recent exhibitions, *Familial Technologies* (2018). What caused that shift?

JM: From the Deedra stuff to *The Facility*—

KM: —From going to superhero to really burrowing in, to the point of, let's say in *Familial Technologies*, really getting into interpersonal family dynamics and trauma, which is inherently so personal.

JM: Yeah, I think I always was pretty personal. Because it was revealing in terms of having the Jennifer character, for example, which is supposed to be me at the time. And then with *The Facility*(2000), and *50 Weeks*(2000), I have a lot of footage. I never actually cut the actual film, but the music that Malik Gaines wrote was all about love. It specifically had dialogue with this person I was dating who, even though we had an open relationship, [cheated] on me. And then there was a scene where his ex-girlfriend came and it was when I found out about this other person. So I had him reenact that scene. And the song was about love and me thinking about expansive love and what that means and redefining it for myself. So I still consider that to be pretty personal.

I think the personal runs throughout. And for me, what shifted is more tying the personal into larger social political systems, like notions of family as an institution and how the family structure is replicated in other institutions, where there's the head of the household, and then the children and all the relatives, and then connecting it to my heritage. I was born here in the U.S., in Indiana; my parents immigrated here. In *Familial Technologies*, I wanted to get into our family dynamics, which I think [have] a lot of trauma. I think in that process, it starts talking about the diasporic Korean experience, or the experience my parents had growing up during the Korean War and those

traumas. So I think that is more of a shift. It starts expanding more and connecting more to larger political and social systems.

KM: When did you start thinking about race in a very focused way?

JM: I think probably at the KAFA(Korean Arts Foundation of America) show. I won the KAFA award in 2016, and with the award, you'd have a show. And so in 2017, I did a show called *The Longest Journey is From Our Heads to Our Hearts*. That show was very focused on identities, identity politics, and identity constructions and state identities, and how one self-identifies, and then relating it to quantum physics and astrophysics, like dark matter and dark energy.

I always joke about this with the Deedra project. When I did it in New York, I was interning as Deedra at American Fine Art Company, and as Jennifer at Pat Hearn. And then I was introduced to Simon Leung, who is an artist and also teaches at UCI, through Paul McCarthy. He came and did a two hour lecture on glory holes, which I couldn't entirely appreciate at the time, but now I do. Anyways, he was in New York so I had a studio visit with him and he asked me, "What do you think about this Deedra work in relation to you being an Asian woman?" And I was like, "What are you talking about?" I wasn't even thinking about that. So from there to now, I think, you're referencing *Familial Technologies*. That was a journey that I went on to address more directly my identity markers and my histories.

KM: Were you thinking of that as someone growing up in, first Indiana and then Orange County?

JM: Yeah. I was born in Indiana, and then moved to Orange County or California when I was one or even maybe less than one [year old]. And then grew up in Orange County and in Los Alamitos, which is primarily white, so I grew up with a lot of self-hatred for being Asian.

KM: Were you very conscious of it, at the time or do you see that in retrospect?

JM: Oh, yeah, I was totally conscious. I wished to have blonde hair and blue eyes. I crushed on all the blonde surfer boys. And then experiencing racism—people saying, "Oh, did your face get run over by a car?" And rejection after rejection. Something that I think about a lot now is the violence of white love that I still have to this day. This desiring of a certain acceptance or a love from whiteness or something. So I think that had a large part in why I was not actively thinking about it in my work or considering that, but there's a reason why I wore a platinum blonde wig. There's a reason why I wore a Desert Storm jacket. But it's stuff that I was not actively conscious

of. But I was also hanging out with Alex and Malik, who were actively thinking about this at that time. So it's just something that I didn't have the tools to talk about, but I was making these decisions intuitively.

KM: So now you're an assistant professor at Otis College of Art and Design. Do you see your teaching activities as part of your art practice?

JM: Oh, totally. It's part of faction one of *The Revolution*, which is education. I even have it in my files under The Revolution, faction one. So I think it's totally part of my practice as an artist.

KM: Is the purpose of *The Revolution* to get everybody on board and to enact revolution from the ground up?

JM: Yeah. The other thing is, the stuff that I talked about in *The Revolution* is not stuff I made up. This is stuff that I'm drawing from self-help, from political theory. I think a lot of people talk about similar things. I think this is why I struggle a little bit, in terms of how to move with *The Revolution* or what it is. What's its purpose? I think more than anything, it's serving as a backdrop for my work, as opposed to getting people on board for *The Revolution*. Although I just started this class through the Commonwealth and Council Summer School that is focusing on Operation Scrooge and the League of Superheroes, which is part of *The Revolution*. And I think ultimately, what I would want is, as long as the two principles are the guiding principles for decision making, whatever happens—

KM: —Abundance and expansive.

JM: Yeah, then I think whatever happens within that is great. I think it's also in tandem with so many other amazing people who have been doing this kind of work, these revolutionary works, these movements of liberation. I reference a lot of black liberation movements, and especially now during the pandemic and the black liberation revolutions that are happening. I feel like, "Oh, wow, this is the time I've been waiting for all my life." So it's like I'm following the lead of these revolutionaries who've come before. And so I think, what is my role in *The Revolution*?

KM: In terms of a future vision, there isn't necessarily one. In terms of something that is a more defined vision that you're working towards, that's not the goal.

JM: In some ways, I would—like when I did the *Made in LA* show in 2014 and I had a meeting with Michael Ned Holte and I told him, "This is the last art show I'm going to do. After this, it's The Revolution." Of course, that didn't happen, but I always go through periods. Before I got this job at Otis, I was ready to give up art and be like,

“Maybe I need to go to a school and be a therapist,” because I wasn’t making a living. So I think one of my goals is a kind of dismantling or destroying the art world as it exists today—and institutions, now that I’m in an institution. Like divesting. I’m thinking about the abolition movements right now with Defund the Police. So I’m like, “Yeah, that applies to the art world too.” The art world is still part of that system. So divesting in the abolition of the art world and reimagining institutions, if it’s possible, or the dismantling and the divesting and the abolition of that. But I work within that too.

KM: Do you think it’s even possible to escape institutions, or how would you define the relationship that you would have to institutions?

JM: I don’t think—because everything is an institution. Even I am an institution in terms of the collection of state identities that are performing through me. So I’ve been just using the term “reimagining institutions” because I think love is an institution, our feelings are institutional. So I think more of ways to reimagine them or to enlist them on the side of the revolution or something, ways to do that. But the Art World, with a capital A-W, I think is something which people can consider an institution as well, but I think that could crumble. I don’t know. What do you think? Do you think that’s an institution? I think it’s a multifaceted system and there are institutions within it. But this is also largely talking about the art market and capitalism and the role of the artist. Do artists have agency? If artists are dependent on the market system and collectors . . . I think a lot of—at least the artists that I know and admire are actively working against it.

KM: Is this in part the reason why you’re drawn towards things like quantum physics and notions of the theories around the dark matter and dark energy in terms of science pointing to the fact that we can’t even quite imagine what we don’t know yet or what the future might reveal?

JM: Yeah, because there’s no outside to these realities that we live in, that are bound by binaries, higher case, and capital, so things that are unobservable or unknown from our position in our realities—to me, they point to possibilities of something outside of that, that we can’t imagine. I got very excited when I taught at Bard MFA in the Film/Video department and the seminar speaker was Denise Ferreira da Silva. I was introduced to one of her texts a little while ago, the one that’s the equation of value. But through Bard, I got really into her texts and she’s amazing in terms of really going through continental philosophy and philosophers to show how this total violence of blackness has been determined and is our whole entirety, through these thinkers and philosophers that are theorizing this world that leads to the inevitability of the total violence of blackness. And how our entire reality and everything that we have is built on the enslavement and the expropriation and the continued appropriation of black and indigenous people.

So through her writings I felt this affective embodiment of how there's no outside, but then in her writings and her talk, she also looks to what she calls the virtual or the quantum realms, or black Sci-Fi writers like Octavia Butler, or in her talk she gave, she did a tarot reading. So that stuff excites me, because then I'm like, "Oh, this is someone who has been working, who has been deep in this work." And she's also looking to the virtual and the quantum. She's also looking to things outside of academia and . . . the canon or something, for possibilities. So that's exciting to me.

KM: Yeah. But it's not like a white supremacist version of science, but something that—well, it's a class that you taught, like queer science, or using scientific concepts, principles, methodologies, but in a way that goes outside of or beyond the typical social realities that you see the scientific discourse being enmeshed in.

JM: Totally. This is another thing that I'm interested in. How can art be in collaboration or with other disciplines like science? Because the way that art and artists are perceived, I think, by the general public and other disciplines like the sciences, is that they are in service of all these other things. Art is—

KM: —The hard sciences or applications of whatever.

JM: Yeah. And I've had discussions with many scientists, really amazing scientists, and I went to an artist-scientist meetup at the Hammer once and they're looking for artists to make their ideas cool or accessible to the public. So it's in *service* of science, not in collaboration. What I think art is good at is making visible these systems and structures so that we can look at them and examine how they're working in how we observe things or practice science, and how they adhere to what da Silva talks about as the three pillars of modern thought, which she identifies as separability, determinism and sequentially, that lead to this total violence.

So, that kind of thinking, I think that's what art is amazing at, but it's not recognized by scientists, for example, and so that is a goal for sure. And this is something that I talked about at Commonwealth and Council with Kibum and Young. We would have weekly Zoom meetings and I'm like, I would love for artists to become—this is a very bad example—but I was like, we can be CIA agents, which—no, that's a really bad example—but in terms of infiltrating. Maybe galleries are no longer about selling work to collectors to maintain this kind of market system we're all players in, but it doesn't do anything to change the system. But galleries as dispatchers, [dispatching] artists to infiltrate the sciences or different institutions to change them from the inside structurally or something. That's how I imagine the future of art and artists.

KM: It seems you have a real attraction to covert operations.

JM: Yes. Totally. And that's my thing, my fantasy. I want it to be a movie, but it could also just be I'm a Leo, Leo rising. Chani Nicholas, who is an astrologer and a friend, sent me information, and she said that a performance, to Leos, is a spiritual act, and the service of a Leo is to show and to perform for the public. All the failures, the achievements—she didn't use those words, but the grandeur and also the follies and the despair of life, as a spiritual act and as an act of giving. So when I read that, I was like, "Oh my God, that's me."

KM: You mentioned earlier in the interview the conversation around the time of *Made in LA* in 2014 with Michael Ned Holte, that after that show you were going to give up on art. But if anything, you've become even more deeply burrowed into the art world, in terms of your success as an exhibiting artist and becoming even more of a pedagogue or, for example, having now this permanent teaching position and teaching at multiple schools. So why? What hope do you hold out for art, then?

JM: This is a good question. I think it's maybe a sign that these institutions and art worlds are softening a bit in what or who they can accept, because I think, I have had lots of successes, but I don't think it's in the way in which artists are expected to. I don't make money from my work. It is the ideas behind it and I feel the reason why now. I'm forty-seven, so I got this job when I was forty-six and started teaching at Bard. This is my first summer of actually being faculty: before I was just a visiting artist, visiting faculty. And I see it as yeah, institutions in the art world are at a place where they can accept someone like me. Not to say that I wasn't successful before, but it was more a cult following, rather than—I don't know if that's true. How does one know if they are accepted by institutions? I guess if they're invited to them, right?

KM: Yeah. If they're invited and get hired to work as part of the institution.

JM: Yeah, but does that make sense? I feel like things are also shifting in institutions in the world and that plays a big part in it, as opposed to me having to shift for the institution. And so I'm hoping, and I've been getting a lot of support from the institutions that I am in. So I think I'm on this site, I guess, of artists and activists—although I don't consider myself an activist—who believe that change can happen within, while at the same time it's necessary for all the artists who are refusing as well. That is important too. But I think for me, and my special talents, my superpowers, I think they work better within.

KM: You don't see yourself as an activist, in your artwork or outside of your artwork? Or is it just totally blurred where that distinction doesn't make sense?

JM: I think I have trouble with the term “artist.” I am always like, “I guess I make art or something.” I’m always weird when I introduce myself. Sometimes, of course, it depends on the context, but it’s even harder for me because I guess I have a specific idea of what activist actions are, what activists do. I’m not someone who goes to protest, for example. I’m not someone who does organizing and I don’t like to participate in what I guess I call popular politics, like policymaking or changing policies. My activism or the way I hope to enact change is through fantasy. It’s through bringing fantastical things into the real and that being a political act.

KM: And so making artwork or making art is itself a political act.

JM: Yeah. And I think talking about it now is also helpful for me because, you know how earlier, you were asking about that shift? I think one of my struggles was in this kind of desirous way in which I work, the libidinal way I work. Sometimes I wasn’t aware of my privileges. So sometimes the idea of bringing fantasy in and being so fantasy focused ignores actual, real violence that people are experiencing. And I think that was something that came out when I was younger and an undergrad. It was Fred Dewey who said that I was fascistic, my ideas were fascistic and that I was a fascist, and that stuck with me.

And this is the stuff that Alex and Malik would sometimes comment on, too. So I think a process of mine was trying to reconcile the fantasy, like how can I bring in fantasy while at the same time not ignore or make light of actual real-life violence. So I’m grateful for Denise Ferreira da Silva and Natalie Loveless, who’s also been a big influence, and Robin Wall Kimmerer, who talks about the importance of stories and storytelling. And also Karen Barad, in terms of talking about discursive theories as they’re material, living, breathing things, because they do materially change our realities. Just like Silva goes into the cons of Martin Heidegger’s work. Those are theories that significantly, materially changed the lives of people, largely in violent ways. So, because I have this army of amazing theorists and writers and thinkers, I feel a little bit more secure, I think, in advocating for fantasy.

KM: This reminds me of something that you said earlier, which is that these theorists are also world-makers of their own, but it’s a kind of world in which one is invited to create—at least when you’re reading the books or the texts—a temporary reality and see yourself as sharing what it is that they’re sketching out in their frameworks.

JM: Yeah. Are you talking about just in general, or are you talking about the...?

KM: I'm just talking about how theorists are also world-makers and it's not necessarily fascistic, but it's kind of an invitation to seeing the reality that they're structuring and one that you can see yourself sharing with them if you are either convinced or you believe in their theories.

JM: Yes. And I think that's the thing; it is not inherently fascistic world-building, but it also depends on who's doing it: if you're a white male, world-building means something different. And if you're someone occupying a certain subject position in which your world-building becomes the truth, then there's the potential for enacting actual violence. So thinking about that is part of how I got more invested in thinking about my identity, or about identities and subject positions.

KM: Do you see it in terms of a sense of responsibility?

JM: Yeah. I've been thinking about responsibility a lot. And I feel the pandemic and the black liberation movements—that's what they're asking, I think, of us. In terms of being accountable or responsible for how we can maneuver in the world and the effects that we have on people with our bodies and also the things that we say, the decisions that we make. This is something that I've been talking a lot about in this process group, which is like group therapy. It's this thing that I and some friends started three years ago. Because we're in this moment where we're thinking a lot about our privileges and power and our identities, and a lot of conflicts [have] been coming up within the process group and I'm finding that it's really hard. It's really hard to process through.

KM: To end the interview, could you talk about how your thinking has been affected by what's been going on since the beginning of the year with the COVID pandemic, as well as the Black Lives Matter movement and how it's become a kind of global uprising?

JM: Yeah. Of course, I'm talking about subject positions and stuff and I am definitely in a privileged position. I have a full-time job that's not necessarily at risk, I have a place to live. I live in a house that my parents own—I don't even pay rent. I can shelter at home and work from home, and of course, I occupy a lot of privilege. So I'm able to also experience the benefits of something like this, which to me is making visible to more of us these systems that have long been failing many people. And because of that, at least in my experience, there are people who are more resistant. But especially within the institutions I am in, I think people have become more receptive or willing, like Veronique d'Entremont and Christine Wang started an offshoot process group that focuses on processing through anti-black racism. And a lot of my colleagues started going to it.

So, now we have this shared language in which to talk about things. So, I'm personally very excited about it. Of course, it's a roller coaster but in a large part I'm very excited that this is the moment things could change. We can change things together.