

Appendix: Fan Studies Revisited

SPEAKERS

Coach, Hannah McGregor, Emily, Jan, Marcelle Kosman, Jack

[Witch, Please Theme Music plays) (Dance of the Priestesses by Victor Herbert Orchestra]

Hannah McGregor 00:10

Hello and welcome to Witch, Please a fortnightly podcast about the Harry Potter world. I'm Hannah McGregor.

Marcelle Kosman 00:17

And I'm Marcelle Kosman. And Hannah, I want to do something profoundly out of the ordinary because this episode isn't ordinary. It's extraordinary. Let me explain what I mean in the sorting chat.

Hannah McGregor 00:31

Oh, my God, Marcelle, what is unusual about what we're doing right now?

Marcelle Kosman 00:34

This is our final, regular episode, of Witch, Please. It's the end of an era. So we've invited our beloved Faculty to come and hang out with us, and talk with us about fandoms.

Hannah McGregor 00:56

For those who don't know, the Faculty Club is one of our Patreon tiers. And we know our Faculty Club members pretty well, because they have a special Slack channel on our actual production Slack. So we hang out with them regularly. So this is just some good friends of ours. I think, one of whom Marcelle has met in real life, none of whom I have met in real life, but that doesn't matter.

Marcelle Kosman 01:27

An internet friend is just a friend you haven't met in real life.

Hannah McGregor 01:31

An internet friend is just a friend you haven't hugged yet.

Marcelle Kosman 01:33

Yeah, that's right.

Hannah McGregor 01:35

So because we have the Faculty here, we thought we'd use this sorting chat to hear from some of the attending Faculty Club members about your first fandoms. Marcelle, I know we've talked about our first fandoms, I mean, I can't remember what yours is.

Marcelle Kosman 01:54

I can't remember what yours is. But I do remember what mine is. Quick reminder, mine was Star Wars.

Hannah McGregor 01:59

Oh, fantastic. Mine was Reboot. **[Marcelle laughs]** Animated Canadian series set inside a computer. Very cool. I've always been this cool.

Marcelle Kosman 02:09

You're very cyberpunk, Hannah.

Hannah McGregor 02:11

Okay, so Faculty, tell us; what was your first fandom?

Marcelle Kosman 02:15

And Faculty are going to either unmute and tell us with their voices or they'll pop it into the chat and I will do my best to read it before it disappears being replaced by another chat. **[Marcelle laughs]**

Emily 02:28

Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles.

Marcelle Kosman 02:30

[Marcelle gasps] Oh my god, Emily. Me too!

Hannah McGregor 02:34

Yeah, Emily, you know what? That was... Let's say like the first LARPing I ever did was my friend Brooke and I would roleplay Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles, except we both wanted to be April O'Neil. **[Marcelle laughs]** So we were just two April O'Neil's and four imagined turtles.

Marcelle Kosman 03:00

Incredible. Did anybody else watch Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles? And if you did, who is your favorite turtle? There's only one right answer. That's not true. There's four. There's literally four.

Hannah McGregor 03:11

I mean, Marcelle, I feel like you're a Michelangelo guy.

Marcelle Kosman 03:14

Do you know what?

Hannah McGregor 03:15

What?

Marcelle Kosman 03:16

My cousin- so no, no, no, I'm not. I'm not offended. You are correct that I said Michelangelo was my favorite because my cousin, Michelangelo was his favorite. And I admired my cousin so much and wanted to be cool. But my real favorite is Raphael because he's a tortured soul and a lone wolf.

Hannah McGregor 03:35

My favorite is Raphael too. **[Marcelle says "aw"]** That's why we're friends.

Marcelle Kosman 03:40

That is, yeah. Brenda! Oh, Brenda. Brenda was not allowed to watch Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles. Too reptilian.

Hannah McGregor 03:50

Too sexy. **[Hannah laughs]**

Marcelle Kosman 03:50

Those muscles.

Hannah McGregor 03:51

Synonyms. Reptilian and sexy. Means the same thing, Emily, also obviously a Raphael stan. I'm gonna say until somebody else suggests another favorite turtle. I'm just gonna say all the cool kids like Raphael the most.

Marcelle Kosman 04:11

Yeah, yeah, but I suspect maybe the most successful kids liked Donatello?

Emily 04:17

I was gonna say that I also used to love Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles. But then I stopped being able to watch it because it was on at the same time as my sister's favorite show. And it was all of a sudden too violent.

Hannah McGregor 04:28

Brenda has dropped into the chat that she was really into the *Sweet Valley* books and the *Baby Sitters Club* books. I was absolutely a *Baby Sitters Club* girly, for sure.

Marcelle Kosman 04:40

Awww, you guys.

Hannah McGregor 04:44

But also, a horse girl, so I was really fucking into *Saddle Club* and *Thoroughbred*.

Marcelle Kosman 04:53

I read some of the *Sweet Valley High* books. I think I only ever read one or two *Baby Sitters Club* books. But I did read a lot of *Baby Sitters Little Sister* books.

Hannah McGregor 05:05

That's so funny. We're the same age. Why would that have been the case?

Marcelle Kosman 05:09

I'm not sure. Maybe I was just a little bit slow to read... **[Hannah laughs]**

Hannah McGregor 05:16

I did not read *Sweet Valley High* because even as a child I did not like reading books about popular blondes. I only wanted to read books about weird outcasts. And yet here I am, you know, close personal friends with a tall hot popular blonde. So you know what? That's-

Marcelle Kosman 05:35

Coach. Don't forget, Coach.

Hannah McGregor 05:36

Great point! Two tall, hot popular blondes! **[Marcelle laughs]**

Marcelle Kosman 05:40

I'm not that tall.

Hannah McGregor 05:41

Pretty tall.

Marcelle Kosman 05:42

C'mon Coach. Okay, and Jack says that one of their earliest fandoms was the *Warriors* books. Oh my god, the cat books, the cat books. Oh, Eliot got one for her birthday. And it was the first chapter book I think she'd ever gotten. And so she was really nervous. But so she hasn't read it yet. But now she's like, deep into the dragon books, the *Wings of Fire* series.

Hannah McGregor 06:05

You know what? Cancel the actual new podcast that we're making. I need us to make a podcast about dragons. **[Marcelle laughs]** Okay, sorry, Coach!

[Witch, Please Theme Music plays]

Marcelle Kosman 06:29

Speaking of things being out of the ordinary, this is the very last time we're going to make an episode with this format, which means that for the very last time, we are actually going to take the time to review some relevant materials. **[Marcelle laughs]** We'll never do it again. But we're gonna do it one last time in revision.

Hannah McGregor 06:51

To wrap up our conversation, we are going back to the ever important topic of fandom. So last time we talked about fandom, it was with Amanda Allen, life changing, friend of the show, great scholar, who outlined for us two waves of fan studies scholarship. So she explained that in the first wave fan studies identified fan practices as an example of what Witch, Please fav Michel de Certeau calls the "tactics of the disempowered". You know, as opposed to the strategies of the powerful, we're all familiar with de Certeau's differentiation between tactics and strategies, *obviously*, so we're not going to go over that again.

So according to those early fan studies, scholars, fandom was a collective strategy or like a political intervention that highlighted how fans were trying to evade, and maybe even transform the dominant ideologies presented within mass media. So think about like, oh, mass media is heteronormative. And so fans come in and make it gay, for example. So the new wave, a fan study scholarship, recognizes the fact that like, the actual relation of fans to properties has changed really significantly, because media producers have really successfully incorporated fans into their production strategies.

So in this new wave of fan studies, scholarship, scholars tend to treat fandoms as interpretive communities that are, so not really counterpublic so much as just like, you know, one particular public that is embedded within and reflects the wider social, cultural and economic status quo. So like less of a sort of subversive, resistant, non dominant, other and more just kind of like, an audience, really.

Marcelle Kosman 08:52

Mhmm. Yeah. Irrespective of like the kind of resistant-y things they might be doing.

Hannah McGregor 08:58

Yeah. Or at least you have to consider resistance as maybe one possible interpretive strategy among many. So in other words, Amanda explained that fandom today is less studied as a site of resistance and subversion and more as an aspect of everyday life.

Marcelle Kosman 09:15

Amanda also pointed out that fan fiction really complicates our understanding of authorship, which is another cultural construct we've talked about very, very recently. In our episode on L'auteur.

Hannah McGregor 09:28

[In a French accent] L'auteur. **[Back in her normal voice]** Will we ever stop thinking French is funny? No.

Marcelle Kosman 09:33

No. We looked at Michel, another Michel. Another favorite Michel on this podcast, we looked at. Are all Frenchman named Michel? Anyway, we looked at Michel Foucault's concept of authorship as being produced discursively via the presence of the author's name on the cover of a book, which in a way makes the author function almost like a brand. You know, you can think about that when you see a new bestseller by Stephen King. The name Stephen King is always way bigger than the title of the book.

And then we added Jane Tompkins into the mix. And we talked about how an author's associations so like what circles they move in, who their mentors are, who their connections are, the relationships between their publishers and their reviewers and all of those, you know, who they went to college with, how all of these things work together to impact how an author circulates discursively.

Hannah McGregor 10:39

Some other things we've talked about circulating are books.

Marcelle Kosman 10:46
[Marcelle gasps] Books?

Hannah McGregor 10:47

Which circulate like any other commodities via the logics of the market, but whose perceived value has a lot to do with how the publishing industry has strategically differentiated books from other commodities, and instead encouraged book buyers to have an intimate, personalized, one might even say sentimental attachment to books. And one could, one might write a whole book about it, ironically. [Marcelle laughs] And if enough people become attached to the same text, and believe that its circulation speaks to them, those people become what Michael Warner, which is almost like a Michel, but not French, calls a discourse public.

Marcelle Kosman 11:41

So Hannah, are you suggesting that fandom is a discourse public?

Hannah McGregor 11:46

Yeah, I'm absolutely suggesting that a fandom is a discourse public. Do you agree?

Marcelle Kosman 11:50

Yes. Yes, I do.

Hannah McGregor 11:52

And like other discourse publics, fandoms are inextricable from the economics of the media production industries that the texts and authors they're attached to circulate in.

Marcelle Kosman 12:06

Oh wait! But Hannah, haven't we been arguing throughout this entire reboot, that you *can* engage with Harry Potter in a way that isn't feeding back into the economic value of the property?

Hannah McGregor 12:20

Yeah, we have.

Marcelle Kosman 12:21

Oh, no!

Hannah McGregor 12:22

That's a hypothesis, I think, that we're gonna need to test out today. In our next segment...

Marcelle Kosman 12:30

Okay, well, good thing, it's today, because if it turns out that we were incorrect, we have to stop making this podcast immediately. Phew. **[Hannah and Marcelle laugh]**

[Witch, Please Theme Music plays]

Hannah McGregor 12:52

Even though it's the last day of class, and we should probably only be revising for our final exams, I'm gonna break the rules and teach you a few new things in transfiguration class. So Marcelle, today, I want to talk about affect and economies and affective economies and affective economics, which, amazingly, are two different things. But I think we need to start off by defining the terms affect and economies. So Marcelle, what is affect?

Marcelle Kosman 13:29

So when I introduce my students to the term affect, I tend to say that it is a term that we use when we're thinking about our feelings, or our desires, critically, or theoretically, so not like it's hot in here, so I feel hot, but like, I am disturbed by what I've read. So why does the thing that I've read make me feel disturbed? What do you think, Hannah?

Hannah McGregor 14:01

Yeah, yeah, I think that's perfect. You're brilliant. So what about an economy?

Marcelle Kosman 14:08

[Marcelle laughs] Fun fact, Marcelle started her undergraduate degree at McGill thinking that she was going to double major in political science and economics.

[Marcelle laughs]

Hannah McGregor 14:19

That's *very* funny.

Marcelle Kosman 14:21

I know it really sounds like me, doesn't it? So economy is one of those terms that I think so we hear it a lot and we hear it referred to as a thing, right? So like, what's that? What's the term for when you? Well, nevermind. It's just a noun. **[Marcelle laughs]**

Hannah McGregor 14:41

A noun. It's a noun. The term for when there's a word for a thing is a noun.

Marcelle Kosman 14:47

So there are a lot of different ways that we hear the word economy used, but my understanding of economy is it is a system of managing available resources. So what those resources are, might be, you know, different in one context or another. But it's the process of managing available resources. What do you think, Hannah?

Hannah McGregor 15:15

I love that. I love that. You nailed it!

Marcelle Kosman 15:18

[Marcelle sighs] Thanks, Oxford languages. [Marcelle laughs]

Hannah McGregor 15:22

Oof, thank goodness for the internet. So, Marcelle, you might be asking, What does feeling as understood theoretically and critically, have to do with resources as they are managed and circulated? Were you asking that?

Marcelle Kosman 15:39

I was definitely thinking about that. And you know what, Hannah, as the expert, I would love it if you could explain to me how those things, you know, work together, just to make sure that I was thinking the right thing.

Hannah McGregor 15:53

Good. Great, great. Well, you just keep in your head what you were thinking. And then once I've explained what Sara Ahmed thinks you can confirm to me that that was basically what you had in your mind anyway.

Marcelle Kosman 16:04

Yeah. Yeah. Good. I will.

Hannah McGregor 16:06

So affect and economies. Not only have theorists thought about their relations, but they've actually thought about them in a few different ways. And I ended up getting accidentally pretty confused when I first started researching for this episode, because I came across a number of works in the fandom sphere that were talking about affective economics. And I was already familiar with the concept of effective economies. And I thought they were the same thing.

Marcelle Kosman 16:39

I mean, they sound very similar.

Hannah McGregor 16:43

Like really similar. Like one might say that there's one letter different. And one would be correct, but, but theoretically, they're actually quite different. And it turns out, when you put them in conversation with each other, something really neat happens. So we're going to do that, which is a fun brain experiment. So I'm going to start with the part I already knew, which is Sarah Ahmed's concept of affective economies. For those who don't know, Sara Ahmed is my personal favorite feminist scholar. I love her. I love all of her books. I interviewed her once on Secret Feminist Agenda, which was honestly a highlight of my whole life.

Marcelle Kosman 17:21

That's a get, is what that is.

Hannah McGregor 17:23

Yeah, yeah. It ruled. And she has written a variety of very important works in queer theory, and critical race theory and affect theory. That's kind of where she started off. Anyway, she is really interested in rethinking emotions in terms of not thinking about emotion as a thing you have, but thinking about it in terms of circulation. So affect, she argues, doesn't originate from within a particular individual and then emanate outwards. So like, I love and my love beams out of me like a Carebear beam.

Marcelle Kosman 18:04

Yes, it does. don't lie.

Hannah McGregor 18:05

And then attaches to my object beam.

Marcelle Kosman 18:08

ME!

Hannah McGregor 18:09

You, exactly. I'm beaming my love at you out of the-

Marcelle Kosman 18:14

Out of your cute little belly. I'm so sorry.

Hannah McGregor 18:18

So Ahmed wants us to think of emotions, not as something that originates within a subject and then like beams outwards, but rather as something that circulates between

subjects, objects, signs, worlds, etc. And that through the process of circulation, actually creates the effect of the boundaries through which we define our very subjectivity. So-

Marcelle Kosman 18:47

It's wild to me that this is where you're starting, because this is what you are familiar with already. Because I'm like, my brain is-

Hannah McGregor 18:55

This is my sweet spot. So Marcelle, I'm gonna ask you to read this quote from Ahmed.

Marcelle Kosman 19:01

It would be my honor, quote, "Affect does not reside in an object or sign but is an effect of the circulation between objects and signs, equals the accumulation of affective value over time, some signs, that is, increase in an affective value as an effect of the movement between signs. The more they circulate, the more affective they become. And the more they appear to contain affect." End quote. Hannah, I don't know what I just read. Coach gets it. Liar.

Hannah McGregor 19:44

[Hannah laughs] If I were to ask you to rephrase that in your own words.

Marcelle Kosman 19:47

Okay. Yeah. Let me take... let me take a... let me [Hannah laughs] Okay, okay. So the value of feeling has to do with the ways in which feeling is circulated socially between people with particular types of power, so like some kinds of feelings are acceptable and therefore valuable, or are acceptable and valuable in certain circumstances, whereas others are not. And so there are always going to be places where it's okay to like, it's okay to cry at a funeral. It's not okay to cry when you're the captain of a hockey team, and you get beaten by a really garbage team from Las Vegas, and you won't go on to finish the playoffs, even though it was your year.

Hannah McGregor 20:43

This is definitely part of it, is the sort of like the differential social and cultural value of different kinds of affects, that the more on affect circulates, the more value it accrues, so that affects that are really widespread and shared, accrue more cultural value. And this is like nationalism, right? Like, circulates freely and widely in a way that like, accrues more value as it goes.

Marcelle Kosman 21:16

It didn't occur to me to think of affect beyond like, the sort of seven basic emotions, you know, anger, happiness, sadness...

Hannah McGregor 21:27

Yeah, yeah, absolutely. So affect, you know, the actual vocabulary of feeling is quite large and nuanced, and does include things like nationalism, like xenophobia, as sort of, you know, something that goes hand in hand with nationalism a lot of the time. And when Ahmed talks about affect in this particular article, she is talking primarily about white supremacy. She was talking about the affect of circulation of hate, fear, and suspicion of the other.

And her point is that as the signifier of the other circulates within white supremacist circles, the affect attached to that figure, say the figure of the immigrant, accrues more and more value via its- and value literally just as in like, gathers more effect around it, right? Like a snowball. Like, as it bounces around, it gathers more effect to it. And that the impression that people then have is that their fear or hatred of this other is a natural outcropping of what that other is like. The affect that has gathered around this, the sign is then treated as though it is coming from that sign, whereas in fact, it has attached to that sign by virtue of how it has been circulating.

Marcelle Kosman 23:05

So, is that why if one sees a circulating affect in media, for example, that doesn't resonate with one-

Hannah McGregor 23:21

That is a normal sentence so far. **[Marcelle laughs]**

Marcelle Kosman 23:23

Become ,that it that like that disconnect is more visible than if the circulating discourse does resonate with one.

Hannah McGregor 23:33

Absolutely. So that's part of that sort of misread. And it's also, I think, part of why people argue like, if you see something really hateful, you shouldn't share it, even in the context of critiquing it, because circulation gathers more affect around the thing. So this is part of like, Ahmed, like me as a person who has argued for like, not platforming hate speech on campus, based on the premise that like even giving us space to like, quote, unquote, think critically about hateful ideologies can actually just give an opportunity for that thing to gain momentum.

All of which is to say, when Ahmed is talking about the economies of affect, she wants to use the idea of economies to talk about circulation, and the way that like via circulation, the affect, like a commodity, gathers value, because like, that's what happens when, like things become commodities and circulate through a market.

Marcelle Kosman 24:37

So going back to my very rudimentary definition of economy, if it's the management of an available resource, then the affect for example, white supremacy, the management of white supremacy, is the economy...? Oh, no, I don't know.

Hannah McGregor 24:57

Yeah, so in this case, like you define economies in terms of management. Part of that management is circulation.

Marcelle Kosman 25:02

Yes. Okay. Okay.

Hannah McGregor 25:04

Right? Like it's not, you don't have an economy through the prevention of circulation. Things have to move. And so it's that movement, and that the transformative function of that movement that Ahmed is interested in. But she's also, and this is crucial, she's interested in how the circulation of commodities through economies shapes subjectivities and the worlds that we as subjects occupy. So think about, for example, the way that capitalism frames particular understandings of subjectivity by reframing the individual as an economic unit.

Right? Like we understand this, like the economic framework, in which we understand ourselves, frames our understanding of what a person is, and how a person lives in the world. So she's making the same argument about affect. It's not like here we all are as these individual autonomous subjects, and then we like, have affects. She's like, the whole idea of like, what makes me me and you, you, and what makes us a community, but somebody else, not part of our community. Those boundaries and surfaces are actually created via how affect is circulating through us.

Marcelle Kosman 26:28

Man, this is so complex.

Hannah McGregor 26:32

Yeah, you're welcome. It's gonna get simpler as we go, which is an ideal way to teach, I'm great at this.

Marcelle Kosman 26:38

Okay, good. Good. Good. Sounds good. So I just want to check though, does Ahmed talk about fandom?

Hannah McGregor 26:44

Ahmed is absolutely not talking about fandom. She was talking about white supremacy, and the sort of concept of the self and other and the way that those are generated as identities through the circulation of racism as affect. Okay, but you know, who does talk about fandom

Marcelle Kosman 27:01

Who?

Hannah McGregor 27:02

Henry Jenkins.

Marcelle Kosman 27:03

Oh, Henry Jenkins. Yes.

Hannah McGregor 27:05

Do you know Henry Jenkins?

Marcelle Kosman 27:06

No. [Marcelle laughs]

Hannah McGregor 27:07

Okay, so Henry Jenkins is a media studies scholar who's written some very important works in fan studies, including probably most famously, his 2006 book, *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide*.

Marcelle Kosman 27:22

That sounds familiar.

Hannah McGregor 27:23

Yeah, I'm waiting for this moment where you're gonna be like, Oh, of course, convergence culture. I don't know.

Marcelle Kosman 27:27

It won't. It won't. It won't come. I remember nothing.

Hannah McGregor 27:30

Anyway, good. Okay. So in that book Jenkins is interested in to- wildly over simplify- how the Internet has changed the way people interact with cultural industries.

Marcelle Kosman 27:42

You are wildly oversimplifying, or Jenkins?

Hannah McGregor 27:45

I'm wildly oversimplifying Jenkins' book.

Marcelle Kosman 27:48

For me?

Hannah McGregor 27:49

For all of us, because I don't want to talk about most of what he says in the book.

Marcelle Kosman 27:53

That's, that's legit. I appreciate it.

Hannah McGregor 27:55

It's good. It's a very important book. It was a real turning point. It was 2006. The internet was still pretty new and people were like, what is up with this, with this wild, with all these chat rooms? What I want to focus on is the fact that he coined a phrase two years after Sara Ahmed has published *Affective Economies*, he coined the phrase affective economics, but he means something pretty fundamentally different from what Ahmed means. So, to get at what he means, Marcelle, would you please read this large block of text?

Marcelle Kosman 28:33

Yes, I will. Quote, "By affective economics, I mean, a new configuration of marketing theory still somewhat on the fringes but gaining ground within the media industry, which seeks to understand the emotional underpinnings of consumer decision making as a driving force behind viewing and purchasing decisions. In many ways, affective economics represents an attempt to catch up with work in cultural studies over the last several decades on fan communities, and viewer commitments. There is a crucial difference, however, the cultural studies work sought to understand media consumption from the fans point of view, articulating desires and fantasies that were ill served by the current media system. The new marketing discourse seeks to mold those consumer desires to shape purchasing decisions," end quote. Whoa!

Hannah McGregor 29:33

Yeah, so this maps quite well onto Amanda Allen's differentiation between the two waves of fan studies scholarship. So what do you think of this claim made in 2006, 17 years ago, that media industries might have started promoting affective economics to monetize the audience's emotional attachments to the media they love? Does that sound like it might have been a true hypothesis that Henry Jenkins was presenting?

Marcelle Kosman 30:04

I guess the thing is that it kind of doesn't feel new to me. The Internet is new. And the way that fandom takes place online would have been new for sure. But like, just to give a very silly example, like you could get Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtle sheets for your kids bed in the early 90s. So like, not to say that buying sheets with your favorite characters printed on them is the same thing as having an active and engaged fandom. But it is a way of building an emotional attachment to immediate property, right? Like, the child gets excited about the sheets, they get excited to go to bed, snuggle in with their, like, Leonardo comforter or whatever. You know? So like, what's, what's he saying that's different, I guess?

Hannah McGregor 30:53

So, brand loyalty is not new. The idea of branding and merchandising are not new, the idea of selling stuff to fans is not new. What is new, is again, the sort of economic function of it, the capacity for fan affect to circulate, such that it gets back to media producers, they see what fans are doing. They see what fans are excited about. They create new things in response to conversations happening in the fandom and then sell that back to the fandom. So what is new? And what is characterizing affective economics as Jenkins is defining them is this new capacity for fandoms to gather, communicate, and then talk back to the media industries that are creating the things that they love. So it's that capacity for responsiveness that the internet has created.

Marcelle Kosman 31:55

Do you have any examples of where this has played out because I can only think of instances where it hasn't, like all of the make it gay you cowards hashtag, hashtag Marvel, hashtag Star Wars.

Hannah McGregor 32:08

Yeah. Brenda has dropped a great example in the chat, which is the way that fandoms can successfully get shows picked back up now. Do you remember when the trailer for the Sonic the Hedgehog movie came out? And everybody online was like, absolutely not. This is profoundly cursed. And so then the studio went back and redesigned Sonic?

Marcelle Kosman 32:34

Oh, I didn't. But that's a great example.

Hannah McGregor 32:36

They put like a ton of money into doing the redesign. Because people were like, no, no, no. So that's like, not only is that an example of like, the capacity for people to respond in a way that then influences how the media industry is creating what they're creating. But then it also can be operationalized by that studio as a way to give fans a greater feeling of ownership. Like we did this for you, because this was co created by you, because Sonic belongs to you as much as it belongs to us, which is all this kind of like, discourse that circulates in a way that then increases people's likelihood of then being like, well, I have to go see the movie. They redesigned it for me.

Marcelle Kosman 33:26

As I keep saying to my students in my Canadian literature class right now, it's always in the service of the nation. Like it's always an attempt to make you reinvest in the nation, even if it's hypercritical of the nation. So it's like, Oh, you were hypercritical of this design of this important character? So if you're critical of it, that means you're probably not going to come see it. So if we then make you feel like you had a say, then not only will you come see it, but maybe you'll bring people.

Hannah McGregor 33:54

Yeah, it's always, in this case, it's always in service of the media industry.

Marcelle Kosman 33:58

Follow the money, baby.

Hannah McGregor 34:01

Yeah. So here's where we get to the tricky part because I want to experimentally put Ahmed and Jenkins in conversation. And I'm gonna do that, kind of via a really interesting article by Matt Hills, who is a professor of fandom studies in the UK. And he has this relatively recent article about the Veronica Mars movie. Do you remember when they successfully crowdfunded the making of a Veronica Mars movie? One of the ways the crowdfunding worked was via the producer positioning himself as a fan like everyone else. And being like, I'm a fan of this. I love this property. I want us to be able to make more stories together. So let's all work together and make this thing.

And it's like, Well, somebody's gonna make money off it. So he has this really interesting article about the Veronica Mars movie, and crowdfunding and effective

economics in the Jenkins center. And in it he introduces what is going to be our final concept for today. He introduces the idea of the love mark. Have you heard of a love mark? I had not before and I'm disgusted.

Marcelle Kosman 35:17

it's not a hickey.

Hannah McGregor 35:18

It's not. That would be way more fun. I wouldn't be disgusted by that. Those are cute. **[Marcelle laughs]** Love marks are a marketing concept created by Kevin Roberts, CEO of a marketing company. Gross. He wrote a whole book about it. I think he won a prize for writing a book about it. Gross. And his argument is that love marks are replacing brands. So he writes, quote, "creating loyalty beyond reason, requires emotional connections that generate the highest levels of love and respect for your brand." End quote. So a love mark is like, it's not a brand. It's not a trademark. It's a love mark. So Marcelle, last quote, I'm gonna make you read. This is from Matt Hills' article.

Marcelle Kosman 36:17

Quote, "I will consider how crowdfunding currently enables the paratextual repositioning of showrunners slash media professionals labor, as a type of fan like, "love mark", hence discursively decommoditizing the industrial exchange value of media texts. At the same time, however, crowdfunding also assigns exchange value to fans' desire for new installments of beloved texts, calling upon and normalizing the self commodification of fan sentiment and use value." End quote. What a bummer. **[Marcelle laughs]**

Hannah McGregor 36:56

Oh, hot. You wanna parse that out for us?

Marcelle Kosman 36:59

I think what he's saying is that showrunners, and media professionals are positioning themselves publicly as fans who just want to make more stuff, sort of like the Veronica Mars example you gave, they just want to, you know, make more stuff for the other fans, they just happen to be in a position where they can make more stuff if only they had the money. So if audiences wanted to contribute with money, then they would be able to make the thing. And so what this does, is it commodifies fan desire in a way that wouldn't exist if the fan didn't have the capacity to contribute in some way to a new production of something that they like?

Hannah McGregor 37:50

Yeah, absolutely. So basically, it's a sort of strategy for swapping out the exchange of money with the exchange have an affect. So that you're like, This is really just about like, circulating the way that we all love this thing. So that we can sort of like not, don't look directly at the money even while we're literally just talking about money.

Marcelle Kosman 38:14

Yeah, so like, it makes you think you're swapping out money for affect, but the money is still there. It's still money. It's just money with a smiley face on it. It's money with a love mark on it.

Hannah McGregor 38:26

It's money with a love mark on it. Gross.

Marcelle Kosman 38:14

A little kiss. **[Marcelle makes a smooch noise]**

Hannah McGregor 38:31

Yeah. And then if media producers are fans just like us, then we are working *with* them to help make more media that we all love, including by financing it ourselves, such that the exchange of capital becomes synonymous with love.

Marcelle Kosman 38:48

But I do have a little question, though. What do we do with the possibility that show runners and producers, for example, are in fact fans of the property that they want to, you know, revitalize?

Hannah McGregor 39:03

I think understanding how a discourse circulates is not the same as saying, Oh, look, this is circulating in a particular way, that means it's a lie. As anti-capitalists, I think we're really used to being like, Ah, this thing is circulating via capitalism and so it must be a trick, which is a strong instinct.

Marcelle Kosman 39:28

[Marcelle laughs] That is 100% what I was thinking in the previous paragraph.

Hannah McGregor 39:32

Yeah, it's a good strong instinct to be very suspicious, that if somebody tries to sell you something, they probably are lying to you somehow. And simultaneously, all artists are currently functioning within capitalism.

Marcelle Kosman 39:51

Yeah, Like us. **[Marcelle laughs]**

Hannah McGregor 39:52

Yeah, I mean, we all are, right? Like there's absolutely no outside to the system. There is no outside to ideology. There is no outside to capitalism. You can't be like, actually, thank you, I'm just going to opt out, I don't like this, you know, makes me feel complicit. And that's icky. So I'm going to not do capitalism, but the rest of you enjoy it. **[Marcelle laughs]**

And so this kind of critique is not about being like, look at these bad actors. Look at these jerks who love the things that they're making, **[Marcelle laughs]** and know that other people also love them, and are using that love as a way to get money to keep making the thing. Can you imagine what a nightmare- I'm being ironic because it's literally how Patreon works. And crowdfunding works, like crowdfunding has been really effectively developed as a direct result of web 2.0 and the way that it allows fan communities to not only gather and communicate with each other, but to talk back to creators. And like, this is all real.

Marcelle Kosman 41:01

And to the point that you were bringing up earlier about Henry Jenkins, that part is new. Yes.

Hannah McGregor 41:08

Absolutely. So this brings us back to Ahmed, because we can see here how effectively, affect is accumulated via its circulation between signs. So say, a beloved property, say Veronica Mars, that the effect of its circulation, so between different members of the fandom, and then between the fandom and the creator, between the show and the movie, right? As it circulates, it gathers more affective charge to it. The affect accumulates via circulation between signs and subjects, beloved property, and fans of said property in a way that generates both the meaning of those signs, and the circulation of affect between the sign and the subject, generates the meaning of the sign, and the identities of the subjects.

So the fandom is transformed by virtue of the particular ways that affect moves back and forth. Your identity as a fan is shaped by the ways that you're able to interact with the object in question, what it means to be a fan is different when you can communicate directly to the creator, when you can contribute directly to the creation of a new version of the thing that you love. So your actual identity as a fan is transformed by this new possible affective economy.

And the more possibilities of interaction and exchange, the stronger potentially that affect becomes. So we get this sort of new possibilities for the circulation of affect via the effect of economics that Jenkins is talking about. But via those new possibilities, we can also get the formation of new kinds of subjects and new kinds of signs, in terms of how Ahmed is talking about it. And Ahmed reminds us that as these affects circulate, and define new communities and new worlds, they keep gathering value via their circulation. Is this making sense?

Marcelle Kosman 43:48

Yes, I think it makes sense. I think.. I think I'm getting there, I think?

Hannah McGregor 43:52

Okay, okay, so where this leads me is to a question. And that question is; if affect accumulates value through the circulation of signs, and affective value has become one of the primary movers of the fan economy, then is there any such thing as a kind of fandom that does not add value to the circulating sign even if it isn't directly financially supporting the property?

Marcelle Kosman 44:26

I think that that is a question that we should explore by looking at a specific example.

Hannah McGregor 44:36

You know, what? Great idea, Marcelle.

[Witch, Please Theme Music plays]

Marcelle Kosman 44:47

It's time to put our new or pending theoretical knowledge to the test. So for the last time ever sharpen your quills, uncork your ink, and get ready for OWL's. **[Sound effect of an owl hooting plays]**

Hannah McGregor 45:15

Okay, so we've got, I assume a number of fannish types here in the zoom with us. And I'm hoping to hear from them as well, though, obviously no pressure, I don't believe in calling on students by name and pressuring them into answering. But while people gather their thoughts, Marcelle.

Marcelle Kosman 45:33

Yes?

Hannah McGregor 45:34

I want to hear yours, particularly from the perspective of someone who has been making a Harry Potter podcast on and off for the past eight years.

Marcelle Kosman 45:42

Well, so one of the things that we both remarked on a number of times is the sort of fond ways that we talked about Rowling in our first iteration of the podcast and how that doesn't feel good.

Hannah McGregor 46:01

We really treated her like a hashtag Girlboss. And it was hashtag bad look.

Marcelle Kosman 46:06

I think having rebooted the podcast, and we've talked about this a little bit, we talked about this when we had our various guest appearances on various radio media to talk about the new Harry Potter TV show, that HBO, which is no longer called HBO, whatever the fuck it that, you know, you know what I mean. The new show.

Hannah McGregor 46:26

I do know. The new HBO show.

Marcelle Kosman 46:28

And we talked about how we ourselves really had to grapple with whether or not it made sense for us to go forward with our plan to reboot the podcast, in light of JK Rowling's explicit transphobia. Because up until that point, there was a lot of like, well, maybe she means something different, or like, it's not explicitly transphobic. It's just narrow minded or like, but then...

Hannah McGregor 47:01

Like, we've really tried, like, she got so much more benefit of the doubt than everybody else. There was a lot of like, well, maybe she just is confused and bad at the internet.

Marcelle Kosman 47:11

So yeah, so I think we both been, we've we've both been open about the fact that like, it does feel complicated, and the way that we have moved forward with our podcast, has been thoughtful, but probably still imperfect, like we can tell our listeners not to buy anything, or download anything legally, for the purposes of like catching up on an episode. But like, at the same time, like we are actually we are making a podcast about this media property, media empire.

Hannah McGregor 47:50

And it's this contribution to the circulation of affect that I keep coming back to, right, the sort of the difference between, like, if I was just quietly reading fanfiction, or rereading the books, and sort of having feelings about it, that is a different thing than producing media about the property that continues to circulate the affect. You know, there's sort of a question at the base here of like, what is the function of critique? And does critique of a thing, ultimately, contribute to the ongoing circulation of that thing? And that is like, that's a big question that is, I think, beyond what we'll be able to tackle in the next 15 minutes.

But I think it's worth thinking about, really, in the case of this very particular property that is both unusually popular, she said in the understatement of the year, **[Marcelle laughs]** and unusually harmful because of the identity and the politics of the creator. And so, it does become this particularly intensified case study of is there any form of media production engagement, recirculation of affect, even when critical, that doesn't contribute to the ongoing circulation of this property as one that is shaping communities, defining identities? You know, are we keeping these books canonical in a way that we don't necessarily want to be doing?

Emily 49:48

I think it's a really interesting question. And I think you're right, there's some level of contribution to recirculation that's unavoidable. But for me, as I consider myself a former fan, I invested an obscene amount of time and energy and, sadly, money into this property. And this is the only Harry Potter thing I do anymore. And it's because I at least can get some good out of all of that time that I invested into the property by learning something new, theory, from my familiarity with the books and you know, being able to use that as an application.

Marcelle Kosman 50:32

What you're saying Emily makes me think about the function that Witch, Please has played as a space for fans to grieve, like, every guest that we've had on the show has given some version of, I was really in love with these books, and now I'm really sad about them.

Hannah McGregor 50:54

That's so, you're right, Marcelle, I didn't think as I've been thinking about the sort of circulation of affect, I didn't think about grief. And how much of the way that these signs are circulating through these communities right now is that we are an affect that is grieving, you're welcome, is grief and loss and like that, that also in some ways needs a

space to circulate, and to be to be processed because of how intensely attached so many of us became to these bucks.

The other piece, Emily, of what you said, that is really interesting, is this idea of like, I've sunk all of this value into this thing, is there any final value to be extracted from it before I sell all of my stocks and leave town? Is there anything there? And this is where I quite like thinking via sort of Ahmed's understanding, which is she's thinking about value attaching to the sign as it circulates. But the value is not always explicitly economic value. So we can also think about, and people have thought about, you know, the circulation, for example, of educational value, that the widespread awareness of this series has been really useful for teachers for a long time.

It's a way to get kids who are reluctant readers to pick up books, you know, it has been really successful in that way. And that we're doing a version of that, right, that like we sort of recognize this educational potential in this widespread and well known series, and learning together is another form of the circulation of different kinds of effects. And that, you know, we have, in very real ways, Marcelle, you and I, like, become different people, through the making of this project, become members of different communities.

And the thing itself, the thing that is Harry Potter has transformed for us, because of the way that it has circulated between us, and between us and listeners. So it really is for me a question like, it's not when I say, is there a way we can engage with this without sort of just adding value back into the Harry Potter industrial complex? Like, it's not a leading question like, Haha, got you guys. We're all complicit in capitalism, like, No, I know, I know, we did all already know that. **[Marcelle laughs]** Like, it's a real question. Are there ways, particularly that thinking with Ahmed can help us understand that like, we can actually attach different aspects to this thing, we can think about its movement differently, or is that so inevitably monetized, like does it feed so inevitably back into the ongoing sales of these books, for example.

Jan 54:27

For me, it's less about the fandom and Harry Potter but how Witch, Please allows me to engage with it. And through the reboot, actually finding a whole new thing that I'm now excited about which is critical theory, which I'm not an academic or like a language scholar, any of that sort. So that was all new for me and quite a ride. And now that's very exciting for me that I want to just keep learning from y'all about for the rest of what the future brings for this group.

And I'm thankful for Harry Potter to bring this together like that, that's a new value I get out of like literal value I get out of this. But at the same time, at least, until you have the

new podcast going, if I want to enthusiastically share this value with it, I always have to put in the caveat, but it's in the context of Harry Potter. And like when I share this on social media, and I'm not like, I'm very open about the things I share on social media with the things I like, but I'm very hesitant about Witch, Please because I always have to put in certain caveats about the things that you have now in your FAQ on the website. And now including that when I do that, but I still have like, lots of trans friends that in that would like, Nope, I'm, I'm an absolutist and absolutely no Harry Potter in my life, please fuck off. And that's fine. So I'm not just like a fangirl, Witch, Please, unquestionably, at this point, but can't wait for the new podcast. Sorry, I'm starting to ramble.

Hannah McGregor 55:59

[Hannah and Marcelle laugh] No, not at all! I mean, you make me immediately think, Jan, about, also, you know, the way we treat critical theory in this series, because, like, we take these ideas and are like, cool, what an interesting idea, let's play with it. But then somebody might come back and be like, you know, Jacques Derrida was a horrible person, right? And it's like, yeah, yeah, for sure. Like, a lot of these theorists that we take up, you know, that it's like, do we replace one thing with another thing in a way that I mean, he's dead. So it's maybe not a great comparison. But it is, I think, the eternal intellectual crisis of the person who is critical about the question of how ideas circulate to eventually just back yourself into a tiny, little discursive corner, where you're like, but now I'm circulating the idea of circulation. Oh, no. Oh, no! Have I fetishized the notion of critical theory? I don't. Hey, Marcelle. Here's a question. Are you allowed to love anything? And be critical? I know, that's something we used to say. But do we still believe it?

Marcelle Kosman 57:18

Yes. I love my cat. And I'm very critical of her when she poops on the floor. **[Hannah laughs]** I love her so much. But she's such a bitch.

Coach 57:30

So I'm curious about Sarah Ahmed. Hannah, if you know, like, does she discuss at all when an affective value, I don't know if that's the right terminology for it, has reached its limit? Which is to say, do we mostly agree that no one discovers Harry Potter through Witch, Please and like that, that being like a basic idea. So in terms of this idea of like snowballing, like when people if we think of that snowball, people come across Witch, Please, What are they picking up? Like, financially she's not picking up anything, she's picking up maybe more people who know about Harry Potter. But is that true? Does anybody come across Witch, Please who doesn't already know Harry Potter?

Marcelle Kosman 58:10

The odds of somebody listening to our podcast, and saying this Harry Potter book sounds interesting. I think I'll give it a go, it feels low. It does. It does feel low. And so what I'm wondering to sort of backtrack to grief again, is, and maybe a question that I have, I don't know, something that I would like to believe, you know, how like memorials, and funerals and celebrations of life are a time to come together, and mourn your time with the person who has passed? And you're still sad, you know, you still grieve them.

And so what I wonder is, if we haven't unintentionally been making, like a three year long funeral. **[Marcelle and Hannah laugh]** I wonder, I wonder, I would like to believe that folks who maybe I know this is true for me, at the beginning of the reboot, I was having a lot of trouble acknowledging that I couldn't keep engaging with the Harry Potter universe in the same way anymore, that I was going to have to let it go. And it was really hard. And I don't feel that same struggle now. And so I wonder if maybe that's something that we have helped people with?

Hannah McGregor 59:37

To get back, I mean, to Coaches excellent question and to how Ahmed thinks about, about circulation. You know, one of the really key things that she's thinking about is that the affect doesn't come out of the individual and it doesn't come out of the sign. So Harry Potter itself is not inherently linked to grief, inherently linked to joy, inherently linked, right? Like, it's not producing the way we feel about it. And we're not producing the way we feel about it, our feeling is a function of the way that it circulates back and forth.

And so we have spent three years bouncing this sign that is Harry Potter, back and forth between us, you know, you, me, Coach, our guests, our listeners, and as we have been doing that, how we feel about it has changed. Right? It's not just like, yeah, the sign continues to, the sign, you know, being Harry Potter continues to gather aspects around it. But the aspects that it has gathered have become, for us, at least as a community, much more complex, much more nuanced, much more full of grief, and critique, and all of these other kinds of effects.

And, ultimately, where it seems to have at least led us, you know, as a team, but it's, it seems like, at least, you know, the people who are here on the zoom with us, or in a similar place, is that has led us to a point of being like, Okay, I'm actually done with this thing. And that's interesting to think about a mode of circulation and recirculation, that actually hasn't led to us being more intensely identified with or attached to this sign, but to actually being ready to kind of collectively be like, Okay, maybe we want to set this down. And just be done with it. Maybe it has been three years of relationship therapy,

and we finally have gotten the closure that we need to move on with our lives. **[Marcelle laughs]**

Marcelle Kosman 1:02:05

We finally accepted that the fallacy of sunk costs is indeed a fallacy.

Hannah McGregor 1:02:10

Mm hmm. Oh, it's such a tempting fallacy, though.

Coach 1:02:14

I know. So to bring in Jenkins, though, if his idea is that with affective economics, there is a relationship between fans and producers of content and which is to say also like people getting the financial reward of it. And that, because of the internet, we are more responsive. And everybody can kind of be more responsive, like fans are always responsive, but now producers can be as responsive. Is there an element of like, okay, so under late capitalism, there's like, on the one hand the Sarah Ahmed question on the other hand, the question of like, who the Harry Potter fandom is, is now shaping what Harry Potter content gets created.

So like, Witch, Please is created not because of Harry Potter, the original JK Rowling enterprise, but because of the fans who felt alienated from that franchise, creating Witch, Please. Does that make sense? Like, like, it's not top down, and then it is responsive. And so with that in mind, even though it's very sad to think that, like, We're all under capitalism, so there's just the way it has to be. It's like some, there's some recognition that if content is to be made, it wasn't necessarily a choice, not to shirk responsibility. But like, a bit of you to Hannah and Marcelle being like, this is a needed podcast, but being responsive to a fandom that was like, Where do I put this thing now? I don't know where to invest. I don't know. Like, I don't know where to put this now. Yeah. So I'm trying to make sense of Jenkins in relation to that.

Hannah McGregor 1:03:51

Yeah. And I think, you know, Jenkins is one of these later phase in fan studies pointing out the way that fandom has gotten incorporated into the industry. But that doesn't mean that we have to throw out the whole idea of the possible subversiveness and resistance of fan practices. And what I see happening when we think about how like, via Jenkins idea that there can be sort of grassroots ground up production emerging out of fandoms, we can look at, for example, communities of Harry Potter fan fiction writers, who, at this point, have fics that are more canonical for them than the original books, and who read and engage with that work without returning to the source text, without granting the source text any kind of higher status. And that those become communities

that have sort of their own logics and their own signs and their own affects that they're circulating in a way that, not only is not necessarily putting money back into that property, but that is doing things with the property that the creator would hate, which is very fun.

And what we can see happening. And this is the sort of the part I think that is really worth keeping our eye on is that there is a component of Warner Brothers right now that is paying very close attention to how the fandom is talking. And is trying to figure out how to create new media for us to consume, that responds to how we are feeling and what we want. And are trying to frame it very deliberately by doing things like distancing themselves from Rowling, downplaying her participation in things, foregrounding people who are critical of her, who are doing things that are a very clear response to these conversations, and trying to use that feedback from fan communities to create more stuff for us to consume. We can see it happening, it's just that we then have the choice to be like, Oh, thank you. No, no, thank you. Not for me. **[Marcelle laughs]**

Jack 1:06:22

I work on a few farms. And something that comes up a lot is the importance of letting things die when the time comes and not trying to hold onto things past their time. And so with respect to thinking about Witch, Please as a context, and in which we can grieve Harry Potter seems really right and important. I'm also in academia. And so I and my colleagues, other grad students are often thinking about this question of what to do with attaching oneself and one's work to a problematic discipline to say, am I starting a new discipline? Is my work something else? Or is my work part of this larger structure that is oppressive and is inherently white supremacist? And you know, all these other things. And it doesn't seem clear what the answer is. Different people sort of choose differently, which can be interesting to see pan out.

Marcelle Kosman 1:07:25

Mhm, totally. I mean, even I don't know. Hannah and I've talked about this before, how even academia as a space, do I want to align myself with this institution that still, however it promises to welcome a plurality of voices, is always excluding people for various different reasons in various contexts.

Hannah McGregor 1:07:52

Yeah, there's a desire, I think, when we have gotten into the business of critique, critical thinking, or really into whatever work it is that we're doing, when we've gotten into that work, out of a motivation to try to make the world even the tiniest little bit better, just the tiniest bit less harmful, just like, just scooch the needle, just a little bit, that then sort of recognizing that you are in some way contributing to a harmful system.

There's so often I think, for folks like us, is this desire to be like, Oh, well, I'll just ex that system altogether. Right, like I don't want to, it's bad, it's bad. I won't have anything to do with it. You know, Brenda made this point earlier in the chat about the betrayal of the Harry Potter fandom, then making it hard to sort of fully unabashedly love anything. Because isn't that embarrassing? Aren't you making yourself vulnerable? Aren't you setting yourself up for failure by loving something wholly? Isn't that kind of a safer place to work from of just being like, Oh, me, I'm attached to nothing. Which would be amazing. I mean, it wouldn't be amazing, it would be a nightmare.

It's not the human condition. And again, this is where I find, Ahmed's not saying like, signs accumulate value by circulation and therefore stopped circulating signs. It's not like, Oh, our subjectivity and worlds are created through the circulation of affect so quick! Everybody stopped circulating affect. Like that's not the that's not the point. The point is, like, attend to how this is operating. The better we understand how these systems work, the better a chance we have of intervening in even the smallest way into them. So maybe that is understanding in the context of academia, how disciplinarity is formed, and being like, Okay, I need to actually look at my sub discipline and be like, what is the power of the discipline? What is the actual material power of the discipline? Where is it gathering value? And if I know that, can I intervene better? Are there choices that are more nuanced than full participation or complete disavowal? And I think there's got to be.

Marcelle Kosman 1:10:36

Yeah, I mean, I think if we think about relationships, we think about having relationships with people and learning that as many of us have had to do over the last 20 years, learning that sometimes we have relationships with people who turn out to be hateful or harmful or causing harm, that the answer isn't to just not have friendships or not have community, right? It's that you need to respond when you learn about these things. And...

Hannah McGregor 1:11:16

Yeah, and that context changes, right? And this is really vital. Like the Harry Potter Industrial Complex was not what it is now when we started reading it and loving it. It just wasn't. It wasn't the size it is. It wasn't the scope it is. It wasn't backing the political movements. None of that was the case. So it's not a matter of like I was wrong back then. How embarrassing. I should never have publicly liked a thing because how shameful now, because the world changes and we change with it.

Marcelle Kosman 1:11:52

What a great point ,Hannah.

Hannah McGregor 1:11:54

Oh my god, thank you. It's almost like once we realize that we create worlds through the circulation of affect it means that we can more deliberately make the worlds that we want.

Coach 1:12:04

Huge if true.

Marcelle Kosman 1:12:06

Huge if true, huge if true.

(Witch, Please Theme Music plays)

Hannah McGregor 1:12:21

Thank you, witches, for joining us for another episode of *Witch, Please*. If you have questions, comments, concerns, or praise, come hang out with us at @ohwitchplease on Instagram or Twitter. We're also on Patreon at patreon.com/ohwitchplease, where you can get lots of cool exclusive perks including the pilot episode of our new podcast.

Marcelle Kosman 1:12:50

Woo! *Witch, Please* is, shockingly, surprisingly, unbelievably, a *Witch, Please* Production, and is distributed by Acast. You can find the rest of our episodes—and soon, the rest of our *podcasts*—on Acast or at ohwitchplease.ca. Here are some other things you can do at ohwitchplease.ca: you can sign up for our amazing newsletter that comes out every month. It's the Monthly Hoot and I literally had a dream about it while I was in my gravol induced stupor. You can also access our transcripts. You can check out our merch. You can find reading lists for particular episodes. It's great and it's going to keep being great. Might even get greater.

Hannah McGregor 1:13:32

Oh Marcelle, get ready for the amount of names I'm gonna make you, I'm making you read. Special thanks to everyone on the *Witch, Please* team including our digital projects coordinator Gaby Iori. **[Sound effect of BOING plays]** Our social media manager and marketing designer and transcriber, Zoe Mix. **[Sound effect of a record reversing plays]** Our sound engineer Eric Magnus **[Sound effect of chimes plays]** and our executive producer Hannah Rehak, aka Coach! **[Sound effect of a sports whistle blowing plays]**

Marcelle Kosman 1:14:04

Because this is a very special episode, instead of shouting out the folks who left us reviews, we're going to shout out the members of the Faculty Club, some of whom have joined us here today! Thanks to Beckyboo, Brenda P, Carolyn W, Catherine M, Elizabeth S, Emily K, Emily T N, Ethan B-H, Heather S V, Jack, Jan L, Jeannette B, JoJo M, Josie L, Karoline R J, Kelsey K, Kimberley S, Linsy, Lisa T, Liz H, Lukos C, MegKat33, Noa Z R, Rachel R, and and Samantha M. Enjoy a snifter of brandy in a threadbare velvet wingback chair, on us! Metaphorically.

Hannah McGregor 1:15:12

We'll be back next episode for our very final wrap-up. But until then:

Jan, Jack, and Emily 1:15:15

Later Witches!

[Witch, Please Theme Music plays]