

EL

If Natasha were in the future to have institutional support, what would it look like? Would we revert to an older model?

ER

I guess it depends on the institutional support. I like to think about a future Natasha with more resources as an off-kilter think tank, where people can produce research without the constraints of working on someone else's time.

EL

What tenets of new writing do you value, and how do those values exist on the running margins of Natasha?

ER

I value, on one hand, personal experience taken as evidence, information that is true, if not infallible. I also like when a work establishes the position of the writer as an aggregator of different subjects. The writer acts as a prism that focuses all

these subject positions, and the product is, hopefully, both multi-voiced and clear.

I think Natasha allows space for all of those things. For hard evidence, but also treating personal experiences as significant. And allowing your subjects to speak for themselves.

ER

What do the essays have in common in this issue, and what will they have in common in future issues?

EL

In this issue, they both race toward an idea that is both always-unfounded and out-of-reach. They provide the materials to know a subject well, and in the process reveal the artifice of its construction. Is that a new kind of fallibility-poetic? They stretch research out as if it were tangled gum.

I experience them as a model more than I do as a progression toward a final act of vindication. Proposing an ecosystem