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how to anarchive
NOT QUITE AN ANARCHIVE
Andrew Murphie

There are now so many archives in the world, and ever more archiving. As a result, it is no longer a question of “the system” that presents itself, but rather many questions from so many systems, more in fact each day. The need for the anarchive has well and truly arrived. For if the archive promises order and authority, and the ability to do many things, it does so at a sometimes heavy price. The anarchive promises a way out of systems, often from within, to life’s living.

Is this book an anarchive? Only in part. Everything has anarchival tendencies, and we have tried to emphasise those here. Yet any book has strong archival tendencies. So this book—like many books, and indeed like much of working and living—plays out the tensions between archive and anarchive. This book is then an archive for the anarchive, but also an attempt to edge with care towards the anarchival within the archival. As such, the Go-To How To Book of Anarchiving is a serial attempt to go where something’s happening.
WORKING PRINCIPLES
Brian Massumi

1. The anarchive is best defined for the purposes of the Immediations project as a *repertory of traces* of collaborative research-creation events. The traces are not inert, but are carriers of potential. They are reactivatable, and their reactivation helps trigger a new event which continues the creative process from which they came, but in a new iteration.
2. Thus the anarchive is not documentation of a past activity. Rather, it is a feed-forward mechanism for lines of creative process, under continuing variation.

3. The anarchive needs documentation—the archive—from which to depart and through which to pass. It is an excess energy of the archive: a kind of supplement or surplus-value of the archive.

4. Its supplemental, excessive nature means that it is never contained in any particular archive or documentation element contained in an archive. It is never contained in an object. The anarchive is made of the formative movements going into and coming out of the archive, for which the objects contained in the archive serve as springboards. The anarchive as such is made of formative tendencies; compositional forces seeking a new taking-form; lures for further process. Archives are their waystations.

5. Since it exceeds the archive and is uncontainable in any single object or collection of objects, the anarchive is by nature a cross-platform phenomenon. It is activated in the relays: between media, between verbal and material expressions, between digital and off-line archivings, and most of all between all of the various archival forms it may take and the live, collaborative interactions that reanimate the anarchival traces, and in turn create new ones.

6. The anarchive pertains to the event. It is a kind of event derivative, or surplus-value of the event. This makes it an essential element of the Immediations project, whose stated aim has been to develop an approach to research-creation as a practice of interdisciplinary event design, or to quote the original application, as the practice of creating innovative "platforms for organizing and orienting live, collaborative encounters."

7. Approached anarchivally, the product of research-creation is process. The anarchive is a technique for making research-creation a process-making engine. Many products are produced, but they are not the product. They are the visible indexing of the process's repeated taking-effect: they embody its traces (thus bringing us full circle to point 1).
In studying a philosopher, the right attitude is neither reverence nor contempt, but first a kind of hypothetical sympathy, until it is possible to know what it feels like to believe in his theories, and only then a revival of the critical attitude, which should resemble, as far as possible, the state of mind of a person abandoning opinions which he has hitherto held.

— Bertrand Russell
“The question is not: is it true? But: does it work? What new thoughts does it make it possible to think? What new emotions does it make it possible to feel? What new sensations and perceptions does it open in the body?” (Massumi in Preface to *A Thousand Plateaus*, Deleuze and Guattari xiv)

**Personal Affects**

An opening, a risk, a vulnerability to possibility.

How we are formed in relation to others, not necessarily human others. We are neither fixed form nor fixed subject. We are constantly co-emerging through impersonal intimacies with plant, animal, mineral.

The separate self disintegrates. Who are we outside of these relations? We simply cease to be.

“The proper (*nom propre*) name does not designate an individual: it is on the contrary when the individual opens up to the multiplicities pervading him or her [...] that he or she acquires his or her true proper name” – *A Thousand Plateaus*, Deleuze and Guattari 1987

**Instructions for a micropractice**

Lodge yourself on a stratum

Experiment with the opportunities it offers

Find an advantageous place on it

Find potential movements of deterritorialisation, possible lines of flight, experience them.

Produce flow conjunctions here and there, try out continuums of intensities segment by segment

Have a small plot of new land at all times

From *A Thousand Plateaus*, Gilles Deleuze & Felix Guattari 1987

A tool, a technique, a set of practices for deterritorialising. How do we understand our own received positions and shift them? Can these micro shifts in perception create shifts within social movements?
Anarchiving Manual for Beginners

Csenge Kolozsvári and Mayra Morales
ANARCHIVING
MANUAL FOR BEGINNERS

a graphic novel

by Mayra Morales
and cence Kolozsvaki
To answer these questions, let me talk about the 3 scenarios.
WHY ANARCHIVE?

Remember the feeling of being in a room and having a specific feeling... perhaps a discomfort that is hard to describe, but that you know is happening?

Scenario #4

Ask... but what is this feeling?
You know when you enter a room and you feel that something has happened there... and you might know the narrative but you can feel it in the city?

There is something in the air.  

Scenario #2: I can tell, but I do not exactly know what.
When someone comes to you and asks:  
- What's the matter?  
- What's the problem?  
and they want a straight answer,

And you could say: It was this, this, this and this, and this and this, and this and this...

* and this and this still doesn't count for everything that is going on!

Perhaps it is this but also that, and this or this too, and this and this and this and this and this and this and this...

wait a sec... is it really what is going on?

Scenario #3

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM?

WHAT HAPPENED?

WHAT'S THE MATTER?
Often people want a straight answer

the "straight" answer many times is a narrative that could not possibly account for what is really going on.

the anarchive is a way of trying to express what the narrative leaves out.

Narratives

this matters because the narratives we tell compose the world we live in.
YOU ARE SUPPOSED TO LIVE LIKE THIS!

1. This is who you are!
   - [ ] ethnic group
   - [ ] gender
   - [ ] identity etc.
2. Be the same self every day!
3. Get a degree!
4. Get a job!
5. Get married!
6. Have kids!
7. Be a good parent, be successful, think about retirement, and buy cheese in the store!
8. Don't get old!
9. Buy buy buy stuff!
many people now feel that the world we live in is decomposing. And the structures of how we organize our lives in the everyday are making it difficult to live.
So we need to find different ways (many different ways!) for living. This is why the Anarchive came to be and why caring for it is important.

*The Anarchive would teach us to craft stories differently, so we can invent these many new ways.*
[NARRATIVE SAYS]

"Buy the cheese..."

"Buy the cheese..."

...Buy!

[CHARACTER SPEAKS]

"Wait a sec..."

"What if we learn to make our own cheese?"

[CHARACTER SPEAKS]

"Yay!"

[CHARACTER SPEAKS]

"Yeeah!"
WHAT IF WE TEACH EACH OTHER?

CAN YOU TEACH US?

HEY! IF WE DON'T STICK TO WHAT NARRATIVE Says, WE CAN ACTUALLY INVENT OTHER WAYS OF LIVING?
WHAT IS AN ANARCHIVE?

It is something that can be invented!

It can take many forms

We could also call it a process feedback.

It doesn't contain; it carries suggestions for new beginnings.

It is like when someone gives you tools to build something with.

I'm... more like collecting what makes something happen.

Like documenting what happens?

Meanwhile... an imaginary conversation started...
LET ME TELL YOU ABOUT
THE CHARACTERS THAT COME
ACCOMPANY AN ANARCHY

In-forms
finds distances, crystallises

Takes time
speeds and slownesses

Alive
always multiple

Mobile
moves with what's moving

+ Wonders
fuses into
hostile differences
Anarchives are friends with:
(some complicated folks):
- Research-Creation
- Process Philosophy
- Speculative Pragmatism
- Neurodiversity

research-creation is something that has a concern for art that thinks and philosophy that creates

for research-creation practices are ways of thinking.

and thinking is not necessarily in a person but in the world, in plants, rocks, materials, etc...
Let me tell you about the qualities that the anarchive is curious about.

How to catch things that fall in between

How to catch things that are slippery

How to catch things that stick.
The anarchive is curious about different rhythms, like rocks, thinking, feeling, knots, iguanas, dust, words, walks.

It's something that can take different forms. It collects different kinds of knowledges, practices, feelings, affective forces.

> affective forces:

A feeling of the world that comes in many varieties. They are part of knowledges, practices, and feelings, but are hard to name. But if you pay attention, you can feel them.
OK, give me some examples.

A compost!
Or a cloud! Or a
waterfitter! The elements
that make a memory.
A soug! Or a soug!
The stipples of water!
A tornado! Raindrops
on a piece of glass.
A gleet! A rainbow.
There are so many..
HOW TO ANARCHIVE?

1. You could perhaps start with wandering and wondering. Begin a process or continue a process that already started.

   What are you passionate about?

   - Experiment
   - Feel forces other than what’s visible
   - Ask: what is necessary?
   - Sketch
   - Work in collective constellations
   - Or work in solitary expressions
setting up an area

2. areas

- learn to make a place for work
- bring the things that you need
How to enter into a process that's already going on?
I.e. maybe there's something already happening that you haven't noticed.
setting up a time

- feel it out when it wants to end
- and feel it out if it already began
- decide on an approximate time
- keep it realistic

duration
1 apple
Perhaps try to **orbit** a little bit around this process; see if little by little or gradually, you can find a hole to enter. (A pause, a giggle, an inclination of bodies)

If you can't find the hole to enter, you can slip away softly, perhaps find another process or let one find you, in which case be available (or a vegetable) and no hard feelings 😢
• While you orbit a process, try to be respectful with the rhythms that the process has.

- LEARN -
• Try to hear as much about the process while orbiting, hear, see, smell, feel. Feel it out and field with it. (enter into its dance from afar)
ANARCHIVAL WALK

Here's an example?

Go anarchive a walk!

experiment different modalities of what walk can do

it could be spiralling walks diagramming walks

walks with-without displacement
THINGS THAT CAN HELP

- Conversations on what, how, why, and where
- Archiving with materials
- Playing with light and sound
- Movement games

Some ideas:
- How to enter
- How to make facts less apparent
- Think of resonances
- What makes it what it is, and what else can it become?
What else?

- Stay close with an activity over a period of time.
- How are similar things still different?
- And how are different things similar?

I'm a volcano!
One More Thing...

It's not enough to experiment!

The anarchist needs to take form(s) to be shared.

This final form is not the goal, but it is necessary.

Think of...
- New forms
- Different forms
- Weird forms
- Ordinary forms
- Off-forms
- Forms that don't fit

It is important that it takes a form!

Because it's hard to catch what is difficult to grasp, we suggest to start with a simple form.
Even though the final object is important, we cannot forget that it is only a peak of everything else.

This is why, this object is always connected with the richness of processes.

Because both process and form-taking are important and need each other, we have decided to call it a funny name:

P.O.P.P.

Product Oriented Process Philosophy

O.R.I.
P.O.P. Phy.
the anarchive in the archive/
the archive in the anarchive
WHERE ARE THE OTHER PLACES? (ARCHIVES AND ANARCHIVES)
Andrew Murphie

Archives take many forms. One is the kind of secret, hidden government or corporate archive buried in a mountain, the kind of archive that often forms the basis for conspiracy theories. Yet there are many other kinds of archive: the law, playlists on an iPhone, habits of the body, dance moves, orderings of friends and family, credit ratings. Through all these, archives organise something like “data”, and what this data can do. But what is data? Alfred North Whitehead thought data was the ‘potential for feeling’. Data can be thought as enabling feeling in networked computing as much as in a set of dance moves. If so, archives store and arrange this potential for feeling, using a series of technologies and techniques, from books to computing to the way we walk down the street (and the organisation of streets themselves for that matter). Anything that structures the potential for feeling—and thus action, remembering, thinking—could be thought of as an archive.

The archive is not just about how we store the past, then. It is also about how we organise possible actions for the future. It is also about who or what can participate in those actions, or not, and in what way. So the questions of where the potential for feeling goes and from where it returns, is crucial. These are questions of the archive. Yet there are also other questions not so much of the archive. These concern the way this potential might find new pathways and new relations in and between bodies, minds, and worlds. These questions are questions of the anarchive. The anarchival is that which breaks free of the archive, often, though not always, from within. Maybe the anarchival is moving dance moves differently. Perhaps it reads at odds with the authorised version. Or maybe it departs from established techniques in making art (whatever “art” might mean). It never just relies on the same old techniques.

An archive’s organisation increases or diminishes our power to affect and be affected by the world, and by others—by human and more than human others. As such, archives found power in two very different senses. First they exercise power over people and events. They are a powerful social authority in
that they form its very basis. More happily they enable the power to do things (that is, capability). Although, it is true, capabilities can also be a way that social authority is played out (you only have capabilities from within a particular order, to do some things well and not others).

Social change—shifts in powers, hierarchies and capabilities—can be found in the changing forms of archives and in the subsequent forms of experience and expression that they provide. Archives are also powerful in that they are part of the basis for individual or collective memory. Thus again such questions as: Where are they? Who owns them? Who can access them? How do their dead hands attempt to form what becomes living a life?

Archives are often hidden, or what is in them is hidden. Thus they are often assumed and then forgotten. Out of sight is out of mind. Our experience is more often of retrieving material from them when we want or need to. We don’t often think about the deeper, hidden, ways that structure the potential for feeling, ‘at once the commencement and the commandment’ (Derrida: 9), the literal installation of the beginning of authority and its order(ing)s. Archives determine what action, culture, person, thing or process is possible. Think of the ten commandments, the four noble truths of Buddhism, learning outcomes, the organised elements of any philosophy, key concepts, what counts as art, or who counts as an artist. The anarchive rebels against this. It looks for a different kind of potential for feeling, not immediately structured, but in passage, in a swerve, veering away from the given, even as it takes the given up and attunes it to the new.

Archives also have a lot to do with our desires. Think of your own or another’s photo album, or your iTunes files, your bookshelves, your notes, your cataloguing of what you like and don’t like, your ranking of your friends, your performance scores, your range of artistic techniques, your “expertise”, your social status, or your library. Think of the things you take seriously and don’t, or laugh at and don’t. We like to indulge these, to weave them into archives, and re-weave them. This is what Jacques Derrida called archive fever. Yet sometimes there is another desire, a daydreaming within archives that
suddenly finds itself unplaced by them, disorganised, floating away. With such daydreaming the anarchive comes into play.

Archives promise control, excitement, the fulfilment of desires, and access to the world, but the reality is that their conformation of what is already known can also be boring (the library after a long day, too much email!). So archives are paradoxical when it comes to desire—they stoke desire of a peculiar kind but they also destroy desire, as they destroy everything they archive.

What, on the other hand, do anarchives promise? Nothing. And everything. They promise a return to the world, to an everything that is also nothing because it departs from the known and the way it is known. The anarchive thus opens to that which has been obscured or excluded. It takes technologies and techniques, even of the archive, to the thresholds at which they too are transformed by the world in process, rather than simply capturing aspects of the world.

Archives not only install but also guarantee the persistence of authority into the future. This is the very point of the archival taking on a particular enduring form. The anarchival departs from this authority, its forms as well, as anarchiving takes flight from overly determined structurings. The anarchive is organised in its own way, via propositions and processes, but not as fixed structurings. It takes on a serial investigation of modes of freedom—in real, literal creativity. It also has techniques but these are primarily of process, of deviation from the ordered, of the seeking for the new within or around the old. And yet, just as there is anarchival potential within the archive, there is always the potential for an archive within the anarchive, for a return to order. However, unlike the archival, for which the departure from organisation leads back to ‘archive fever’, the anarchival feels little anxiety about its momentary returns to the archive. It doesn’t ask ‘Where am I?’, but rather ‘Where are the other places?’

1 Whitehead, 1978: 258
anarchiving research (-creation)
MATERIALIZATIONS OF THE ANARCHIVE: ANARCHIVAL PROPOSITIONS
Brian Massumi

The goal of the December 2016 event "Distributing the Insensible" was to culminate the investigations into the anarchive up to this point in a number of "anarchival propositions." These are tangible realizations—archives—through which the process of anarchiving can be made to move. They can be thought of as the waystations of the anarchival process: sites of capture stockpiling, in trace form, the potentials whose reactivation constitutes the anarchive. They operate as prototypes. They are as important for what other forms they may suggest for future realization, as for the particular form they have taken in the present, or the events in the past from which they were distilled.

In order to provide a practicable focus for the collaborative interactions of the "Distributing the Insensible" event, the genre of the book was adopted as a starting point (for descriptions and images of what emerged during the event see http://senselab.ca/wp2/immediations/upcoming-distributing-the-insensible-dec-10-20-2016/).2 Approached anarchivally, the "book" form exfoliates into a series of mutations and hybridizations. At the extreme end of this variation, the product ceases to resemble the book in any traditional sense. The anarchive operates across these variations. Most are themselves multimodal (for example combining image, material textures, and words); others monomodal (for example, a language composition or a soundscape). The anarchive emerges from the differentials between its various materializations, as attention relays between them.

The primary differentials that need to be mobilized in order to maximize the potential of the anarchive are between digital instantiations and materials-based instantiations, and between both of these and live, event-based creative interactions. The various anarchival propositions are tools for research-creation

2 More images of some of the books made during this event, as tangible ‘anarchival propositions’, can also be found toward the end of this book. A digital proposition is found at http://www.inflexions.org/distributingtheimpossible/soundcontours/index.html
event-making. They serve as a living memory of the collective explorations from which they emerged. They may be used to seed further explorations of the same collective, or for demonstration purposes as part of outreach activities to explain the concept of event-based research-creation to other groupings. The different anarchival "book" propositions are conceived to be used in various combinations, tailored to the particular occasion. Although some may be capable of standing alone as art objects, in their anarchival use they exceed that status. It cannot be restated often enough that the product of event-based research-creation is the process.

When groupings of the anarchival "books" are selectively combined into unique compositions tailored to specific contexts they compose anarchival "libraries." These libraries can be used in gallery, conference, or workshop situations as propositions for activating conceptual discussion (preferably in relation to specific readings shared by the group) and for seeding collective research-creation explorations.

The anarchival propositions that emerged from the event were produced on site during "Distributing the Insensible"
using platforms and *techniques for creative collaboration* gradually developed over the past three years of the grant through the experimentations of each of the hubs and the project as a whole. These techniques can be likened to techniques for structured improvisation in dance, adapted to research-creation. The techniques themselves become part of the (an)archive.

The concept of the anarchive dictates that the making of the anarchive be an enactment of its principles. This also applies to demonstrations of the anarchive concept to outside groups. The anarchive is by nature something to be *performed* rather than presented. It has no content independent of the events in which it is mobilized, and no form separable from the process through which it moves.
THE PROCESS SEED BANK, THE ANARCHIVE AND SUBTRACTION
(Excerpt from a conversation at the Distributing the Insensible event)
Erin Manning and Brian Massumi

Erin: Maybe the process seed bank is the way in which the anarchive detours into action.

Brian: I was thinking this also in relation to Adventure Capital [the Senselab’s initiative to rethink finance and money in more anarchival terms]. We were thinking of how the anarchive is a kind of event surplus value and a kind of event derivative. We were talking about when things move out of the anarchive into the outside world—that transition is also the creation of value.

So we have an event like this one. We get anarchival traces and put them into an anarchive that has an online existence as well. That’s a creation of value, the equivalent of mining bitcoin for example. Once you have that online platform it has all kinds of connections to offline and to a lot of material spaces focussing on anarchives. So there are other elements that it connects to. But then the traces of events get distilled into recipes or scores that form a process seed bank and that process seed bank is another minting of value. And that’s what we’re offering outside of our own network. We’re offering techniques for process.

The process seed bank has been a very old dream of the Senselab. Think of the anarchive as this reserve of excess potentials that moves out of itself in different directions and is internally differentiated: by material, by the way it moves out and relays—that could be online, it could be labelled with metadata, it could be analysed by algorithms that extract tendencies or attract points. Then there is this distillation into language—propositional language—that takes our techniques and offers it to other people to adapt for themselves in the form of a score, something very, very concrete, a how to create a certain collective research-creation event. So the pop-up propositions [specific proposition that are proposed within an
event while it is running] go towards collective event making and then there are other propositions that have another iteration that is a bit broader that might include recipes but also other kinds of traces.

Erin: Brian, you, and Anna too, have also been very clear about subtraction—the need to become really clear and precise about where the necessities are. Different materialities allow for different modes of entering.

Brian: So I was thinking about Deleuze’s idea that you have to subtract to compose well. Subtracting pressurises the material or the medium or the idea so that it takes on its own momentum and finds its own form, in ways that are anexact but rigourous. It really finds its form. If you don’t subtract it gets too messy and the form doesn’t crystallise. So we want the mess but we also want those peaks of taking form. That helps the anarchive to work differentially, to really take advantage of what happens when you put different expressions together that have gone as far as they can and really actualised themselves in a form. Then you can work the gap between them and extract something from how they can come together, differentially. If you can’t have an effect of differentials you don’t have difference.

Erin: There are material rhythms that produce one of the different ways in which the difference can be felt.

*December 17 2016*
1. Anarchiving Body

becoming
The barn owl swallows its food—mostly field mice and shrews—whole. After about six hours, the indigestible bits are regurgitated up through its beak in the form of a ‘pellet,’ which holds the contour of the owl’s stomach.

---

3 The barn owl swallows its food—mostly field mice and shrews—whole. After about six hours, the indigestible bits are regurgitated up through its beak in the form of a ‘pellet,’ which holds the contour of the owl’s stomach.
The anarchive resists the object, the it, the deliverable. Perhaps there is a sense that a form reduces, or calcifies the vibrational potential of its just not quite coming into form. In this moment of in-betweenness, or slippery ambiguity across modalities, traversing over rules and boundaries, in this gap, just before the shape it takes, the urgency to stretch the (an)archive meets the edges of those forms that it also requires. This is the crisis. From formlessness to form. From matter to meaning. Maybe the crisis is also an aesthetic one insomuch as it seems impossible to escape the spectre of representation and, if this is so, and if the intent is to make spaces for new ways of conceiving what is possible that lies just between or somewhere outside of current modes of sense, then what form can ever suffice to anarchive experiences within an aesthetic realm? What do we do when the desire is for both the collapse, and to still make something? We know that anything made will fall/fail, to some degree or another, within the familiar. Alternately we have the choice to make nothing deliverable. We can refuse. Refusal is also anarchivic, a dancing that slides away … 

I propose something between, (maybe its obvious) but I remind myself anyway, (for those moments I lose courage) … that all the intangible anarchivic materialities of the doing, thinking, feeling, touching vibrations do resonate in the folds of whatever it ends up being. This it … carves out space and time, makes cuts in the wave field/function, and momentarily articulates something out of chaos. Nothing is lost. It is all still there and nowhere at the same time.
anarchiving the curriculum
“Knowledge does not keep any better than fish.”

Alfred North Whitehead
TO HAVE DONE WITH THE JUDGEMENT OF (LEARNING) OUTCOMES
Andrew Murphie

Simple archives are sometimes the most powerful. Nowhere is this found more clearly than in education. On the one hand, education now finds itself confronted by a bewildering array of things to be known, and of different ways of knowing them, including many new technical means of learning. On the other hand educational planning and experience often seem subject to highly simplistic modes of structuring the entry to, and paths through, learning. All the exits are also covered! It’s a full collision, with opportunity and the anarchival coming from one side, and from the other side control, discipline, and the archival fear of the new.

Take learning outcomes (or LOs as even some five-year-olds now call them). Benjamin Bloom and his friends first came up with the idea of a *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*, which led to LOs, in 1948. They wrote it up and published it in 1956. This was radical and useful in the context of education at the time. That is to say in the 1940s and 1950s! However, it sometimes seems that not much has changed in mainstream thinking about education since. While in the rest of the world, everything has changed.

What was at the time a break with often regressive educational methods has become today a way of “managerialising” everything that goes on inside the classroom. This is reinforced by the constant evaluation of performance in relation to stated and standard objectives, by tests, rankings, scores, analytics and various other measures. This kind of thing has become a problem not only in education, but in psychology, media and communications, and in management more generally, everywhere these are now found. Education, work and even living seem to be more and more about fulfilling frequently tested objectives and outcomes, than exploring the new. Judgement comes before, during an after each activity, each thought, and each movement. Such judgement is becoming increasingly fine tuned. Via
this, human behaviour, thinking and feeling are led to fit in to what is in the end only a contemporary, more intense, version of an old-fashioned industrial production line. Can we not do better than this?

Readers of this book may already have realised that Bloom’s Taxonomy was a new way of archiving education. It archived learning not just in terms of the knowledge to be known, but in terms of how it should be learned. In short, it controlled process. A simple archive of LOs could determine the entire course of events involved in learning⁴. All this was based on what was in the 1950s the then new cognitivism. Cognitivism thought of minds in terms of the most radical technology of the time—computers. You can only think LOs if you think minds, collective minds, and communication, as all involving inputs, smooth symbolic processings of those inputs, and clear outputs. Just as in a computer. Yet, again, the basis for this was 1950s computing! This was of course nothing like contemporary everyday computing, and certainly nothing like, for example, quantum computing. In the 1950s, computing involved big, basic, machines, grinding out simple outputs from relatively simple outputs. Is that really how we want to view ourselves? Even if the human mind did function like a computer (which it doesn’t), why would the human mind be like a 1950s computer? Your cell phone is probably a lot more complex. What are the alternatives? Can we not think the mind without analogies to computing? Do we even need a given model for what a mind is, for what it can be?

It’s time we moved on. What would happen if we let go of some of our most prominent models of education, and of outmoded models of mind, of humans, of relations, of being-with, of collectivity, of the world? What would happen if we let ourselves think, together, anarchivally, about models but through to their other side? Which is to say, what if we only ever took them up very provisionally, or in strange combinations of perhaps initially incompatible models, and in the light of experience as it emerges? Could we simply do without models, at least some of the time? We would lose some forms of management, many forms of control, certainly most measures and rankings, but what would be gained?

⁴ To be fair, Bloom was trying to open up education at the time, and did. At the time his new archive was pitched against the older archives of, for example, rote learning. Even better was his subsequent development of ‘mastery learning’, which took much better account of individual modes and times of learning and of the specific relations between learners and teachers.
What conversations would happen? What learning could take place, and not only in schools or universities, but among friends, on the street, wherever? What new, much more open, use of networks and computing might we find as well, for learning, for living, for study? Indeed, it is ‘study’ that is at issue here.

I think we were committed to the idea that study is what you do with other people. It’s talking and walking around with other people, working, dancing, suffering, some irreducible convergence of all three, held under the name of speculative practice. The notion of a rehearsal – being in a kind of workshop, playing in a band, in a jam session, or old men sitting on a porch, or people working together in a factory – there are these various modes of activity. The point of calling it ‘study’ is to mark that the incessant and irreversible intellectuality of these activities was already there. These activities aren’t ennobled by the fact that we now say, ‘oh, if you did these things in a certain way, you could be said to be have been studying.’ To do these things is to be involved in a kind of common intellectual practice. What’s important is to recognize that that has been the case—because that recognition allows you to access a whole, varied, alternative history of thought. (Fred Moten in Moten, Harney and Shukaitis, 2012)

A simple proposition: subtract what you “know” about learning, about education, about minds, about behaviours, about how things need to happen. Even if just for a moment.
ANARCHIVAL UPSURGE BENEATH THE CURRICULUM
Christoph Brunner

One day we decided to do a seminar on debt and the aesthetics of existence in relation to artistic forms of living and techniques of survival. We started from an idea that moved from one to the other and then became several. We did this as an intervention into the structure of the curriculum, through a loophole in the system. The hole allows students to initiate a seminar of their liking if they team up with a “teacher” or someone who has taught in that particular program of study before. This might be one of the friendly glitches an art school has to offer.

So, we began with a fugitive planning of what we had always felt an urge to read, on debt. We thought of this as a preliminary structure for collective adventures in reading. We felt that there were others being excited. We felt their warmth and energy. We felt the collective desire take a hold of us. The inscriptions were plenty, but so was the clandestine taking on of the other-than-inscribed.
Over the course of the weeks leading up to the beginning of the reading, the idea took shape to plan the seminar as a flight or an exodus from the cold and hyper-controlled space of this particular art school. We asked friends at an artist-run-center if we could potentially be at their place. The conversation quickly revealed that by moving out of the framework of the curriculum of an art school the seminar would have to let go of its very nature as an “academic” format that is usually destined to work against study rather than support it. In other words, the shift of locality allowed us to leave the obligations of a school logic of learning behind to become study. Study is that very process of thinking together without any call to order naming the time and space where learning is happening. The seminar became a series of collective reading sessions. The invitation was public, the texts were available to everyone, the logo of the school never appeared.

When we met for the first time we sat on the street, in the lights of late summer, reading, drinking, cooking with many we knew and some we didn’t. We were beyond or beneath a “we.” Someone from the art school came and asked, why we didn’t put the logo there, but they abandoned that desire after two hours. The sessions didn’t have a beginning or an end. They moved between the timeframes of a seminar. The readings shifted from the initial proposition, becoming somewhat more diverse, less white, less male, less of the old dude from the West style. The readings lost their focus in terms of responsibility, not entirely, but for some parts we let go of the compass of good conduct of interpellation. The materials we read were shot through by new perspectives, coming from economics, from new friends who worked in NGOs, from below and beneath the “theories” we read. The texts themselves became more and more friends to have a conversation with, new platforms for relation. They became anarchival upsurges, written at different times, under different circumstances and in different territories; now assembling and navigating our very situation and becoming part of our insurgent urgency to think what we had felt for a long time but couldn’t grasp other than in this situation of being together.
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At the end of six such enduring sessions we were left with a strong sense of continuation. Not necessarily in the format of a reading group but rather as a collective of felt intensities infused with a sense of care for both the self and the event, without being able to disentangle the one from the other. We think and feel this shared intensity as something of an anarchival quality within our lives, within our modes of subsisting beneath the school model of learning but also beyond the individualistic logic of thinking and feeling. The anarchival upsurge takes the material as a multiplicity to generate new multiplicities, always moving from beneath and beyond while immanently being in the midst of the event.
ANARCHIVING THE CURRICULUM
Charlotte Farrell

Anarchival pedagogies operate at the limits of expression. In a university classroom, anarchival practices enable students to attend to these limits, empowering them to produce work at the generative interstices of making and thinking. In a media studies course, we drew upon anarchival practices explored with the SenseLab, particularly close readings of philosophical texts alongside practice-based research exercises, in order to make concepts felt. At the end of the semester, students were invited to collectively activate concepts from the course through practice-based presentations. One group chose the concept 'proprioception'. They instructed the rest of the class to close their eyes, and placed clay in our hands. They then guided us to reflect upon the concept of proprioception while we sculpted the clay. Many students who participated in this exercise commented upon how the relationship between their touch and the material illuminated their thinking around proprioception in ways language alone could not. In this instance, the anarchival was the transduction of a concept into a movement of thought through a collective activation. Bringing the anarchive into the classroom expands the accessibility of the course content for diverse learning abilities, while empowering students to explore concepts in creative and innovative ways.
ANARCHIVING GROUP TASKS AND ASSIGNMENTS IN THE TERTIARY CLASSROOM
Anna Munster

In any art, design or philosophy course that uses archives—for example, datasets, readings organised together to create or resist a canon, histories of performance or art practices—it can be tempting to simply say: experiment. The temptation is then to ‘design’ an assignment that experiments with these histories. That is, these archives.

Instead, a way to anarchive assignments would be to set up a set of constraints that both contain the chaos of just anarchically experimenting endlessly with the archive, and unleash the forces that are already dwelling in the archive.

These could include, for example, a group project that works with any media or materiality but is constrained by a number of conditions. For example:

— The group project presentation must be either under 5 minutes or over 25 minutes long. The length of presentation must relate to one of the forces the anarchive is trying to release from the archive.

— It must be either completely participatory with other audience members or extra-human agents. Or else it must be completely nonparticipatory

— It must be either immersive or conceptual. Or it must be immersive and conceptual.

If the archive preserves and the anarchive moves this tendency to preserve onwards, constraints in guiding group project tasks and assignments will attend to the particular relations and qualities of both archive and anarchive.
This format was developed to be used as a strategy for feedback in creative practices involving performative and ephemeral works, including university dance courses.

In the university context, it is often the case that when students are invited (or obliged by the institutional curriculum) to share a creative process in its development stage, there is a tendency to count on the freshness and impact of improvisation. This becomes visible as a lack of attention or preparation in the mid-semester crits. This lack of commitment also diminishes the effectiveness of the feedback. The students’ seeds of movement would frequently be left aside in favour of something new, arriving towards the end of the semester in a renewed gust of novelty.

This procedure was crafted from the desire to invite a commitment to the middle, and to build a concern and responsibility with regard to the seed that is carried throughout the semester.

It is a procedure for anarchiving an evaluation of a process in performance art.

1) Divide the group into 4 groups.

2) One person from each group starts at each corner of the room, as if they were on stage.

3) The other members of the group remain facing that corner and the person occupying it, forming an audience for that person's performance.
4) A sound signal is made, whereupon each person in the four corner-stages shows their sequence, their concept for a movement-performance.

5) There is no explanation of their intention, of the idea, or a concept enacted. It starts as a movement, and it finishes as a movement.

6) Once completed they repeat the movement for their audience.

7) During the second round, their audience jots down thoughts, suggestions, connections, and concerns.

8) The performance occur simultaneously in the four corners.

9) After each performer has repeated their movement twice, the sound signal is made again, and each performer moves one corner to their left.

10) This is repeated until each performer has performed for all four audience groups and have shown their movement seeds eight times.

11) Once finished the (mostly exhausted) performers sit in the audience in their original groups.

12) A new group of four performers detaches from their groups and start the corner performance round all over again, until all have finished sharing their movement seeds.

13) A compilation of comments for each performer is made from all the written comments of the audience. It is crucial that they remain anonymous. Comments from teachers and students are mixed in the same text, which is returned to the performer as a feedback.
This strategy has been tried out in dance classes and in the context of body technique, performance and composition labs. An intriguing aspect is that the written anonymous comments give the performers contradictory comments, so that they must choose themselves how to solve or develop their performance based on everyone’s comments.

This technique develops persistence and editing skills throughout the evaluation period, which helps students to figure out by themselves what matters from their seeds. Because they know they will have to repeat their movement many times for a series of audiences, it builds a commitment to their own creative process.
the anarchic share
THE ANARCHIC SHARE
Erin Manning

Process philosophy, as proposed by Alfred North Whitehead, understands the world as an event. All experience emerges from the event of experience, and all experience reflects the world. This reflection of the world is not passive: worlding is an activity. The activity of worlding is one of necessary exclusion. Not everything can actualize. Techniques for subtraction are everywhere amongst us. Consciousness is one of them: Whitehead speaks of consciousness as the “acme” of perception. Consciousness records the peak of what is lived, excluding all that does not confirm and conform to that peak. For Whitehead peaks are only one affordance amongst many: they are perhaps what is most palpably known, but not necessarily what is most effervescently felt. In Whitehead’s “philosophy of pure feeling” what is felt matters even if it doesn’t actually register. It matters because what is felt at the event’s edges reorients the very question of what counts.

SenseLab is interested in the question of how value emerges from what is not quite registered. We understand this quality of experience as the “anarchic share” of the event. The anarchic share actively contributes to making experience what it is, even though it remains unactualized. To activate the anarchic share is a paradox: to bring the anarchic share into the register of conscious actualization is to turn it into an archive. Techniques are needed to attune experience to its more-than. These techniques must be able to do the work of registering intensity without capturing it entirely. They must always begin from the process and tune toward the impersonal: the anarchic share does not “belong” to any individual. It is of and for the event. It cares for the event, giving the event its value. And here, in the event, with value edging in, is where life is lived.
SUBMERGING AS ANARCHIC SHARE
Christoph Brunner

There is no event if it is not shared. Although by this I do not mean the event one posts on facebook or sends through a messaging service. Rather it is the event that emerges as a collective in the making. Sharing considered within the logic of the self and other eclipses the eventfulness of emergence from the equation. A different logic is that of the anarchic. What does it mean to make sharing an anarchic practice?

When tied to a logic of the one and the many, sharing is a mere connection, a passing on of information, most of the time imbued with some representational value. Anarchic sharing then might begin by undermining the communicational traits of sharing based on information. What else might be worth being called sharing? Having a share in something might mean to hold a part of something that is shared by many. Again, however, we are caught in a quantitative logic that returns to a logic of property. Is there a concept of sharing that bypasses the logic of property, of the quantified divisions of shares? Another form of sharing is tied to notions of belief. One shares similar beliefs—an immediate recourse to identitarian structures. What if the share is something that cannot be given or participated in, with nothing allocated or with which to be identified? What if a share is something of a collective condition for relating? How could relation as a share come before any quantifying logic settles in—shares being allocated, clear communicative connections being established, or participating bodies being identified?

The anarchic share is a share of and a belief in the world. It is a sharing of a situation that obliges every force that is becoming part of this situation to share its very singular mode of co-becoming. Only in sharing does the universe hold together. This holding becomes the ground of the anarchic share yet it is a ground that cannot foretell how the sharing is coming about, only that there is sharing. In collective practices, such as at the SenseLab, the question is, “how to share beyond the sharing of an entity being
shared?”. While we deal with objects, feelings, words, language, gestures, and sensations, sharing them is not possible if we cling to an idea of knowing what is going to be shared. The anarchic at the root of practices of sharing, as in sharing a meal, is the desire that emerges when there is a joy of folding forces and tendencies immanent to the material, thoughts and movements involved, without having to name them. The inexplicit and the insensible are the anarchic machines of sharing beyond property—or rather they allude to properties in becoming. How to generate atmospheres where attentiveness for the emerging quality of the anarchic undermines the sharing of something, thus amplifying sharing as a ground?

Submerging might be one lure for a series of techniques for the anarchic share. In submerging, there is an overflow, a delving into apnea⁵, into a deep surround of the anarchic share. Submerging involves a strategic self-surrender that surrenders the self rather than surrendering oneself. Submerging means to enter underneath the surface, to develop a sensibility for the joyous play of forces undermining the apparatus of identitarian capture. The movement that makes an entity rather than the entity itself opens the anarchic share as submerging force in collective practice. The anarchic ensures that there is always something else or more to come once forces are submerged in a situation. The question then might be how to enter into sharing, how to dive through the anarchic power of the share, and how to resurface while keeping the ultrathin layer of the shared with us, tending to its anarchic tendencies moving with us towards the next situation to come.

⁵ In the sense not only of being out of breath but of keeping one’s breath.
analogue/digital anarchives
I am still chewing on our conversation yesterday and the discussion of processes of erasure, the notion of the trace and residue rather than artefact. I didn’t want to add more to the conversation but I am still wondering how we could build a machinic platform for anarchiving that allows for the relaying of experience by re-activating them. In my understanding this is exactly what practice/praxis means: series of re-activation and the generation of differences rather than producing finite entities.

I am not sure how we can deal creatively with this question in terms of web-media and the possible platforms we could build. However, I have a feeling there is potential to generate an interface where we can assemble things, rework them, shift them in their relations and thus reactivate them along our own ways of practicing with these materials. Instead of making giant repositories of stuff, we might very well engage in a collective process of erasure as a mode of (data) curating. However, there needs to be an inhuman constraint, so that what is erased is not necessarily what can be subsumed to “our reason” and “understanding”—meaning that relevance as a more-than-human force moving through the ecology of materials, gestures, experiences, has to become a self-affecting technique.
RE-ORIENTATIONS RATHER THAN REFRAMING: A FEW THOUGHTS ON DESIGNING WITH THE DIGITAL
Leslie Plumb

1. Close reading of the material—deploy a hypothetical sympathy that does not import judgement for what it needs or what it can do—or critique from the outside, or is based on what has come before (in relation to usability)
   experiment with its differentiating capacities for how—different qualities for entering, moving with and moving across

2. Experiment across thresholds of experience—and across works collectively—to make more palpable the differentiating 'hows' of their materialities/attentions/durations/scale within the whole ecology of, for example, an online journal
   Antagonize those qualities that may foreground emergent transversalities across those works—as an emergent collectivity

3. Build enabling constraints into/with technical restraints, rather then thinking you have to work within those limits—separating out their restrictions/potentialities from where you can invent

4. Develop and deploy techniques that make those potentialities of experience already moving with and through the work more palpable. These are those sense-making potentialities of experience that are perhaps more minor, or background or devalued. Bring an equity of attention to what they can do—as research-creation for the design work.

Whenever you think you've reached the limit point of a work or system, remember that there is always more then one way to create and execute things (in code). It is only in the name of pre-assumed value
systems of what is most usable, what is most efficient, that 'one way' become an inherited value from which to govern certain design decisions. But if you allow for emergent forms of value, value immanent to what a work or particular ecology of works is doing, then you can make decisions about which way (in the code) is best. This can help orient the design process towards an artfulness, that does not yet know what it can do.

5. Deploy Radical Pedagogy, and a kind of emergent ethics, within the process, for deciding which way(s) are best, which designs/aesthetics/coding-structures/orientations are best for entering the platform of experience. Efficiency and usability brought into equity with an artfulness born of imperfect and incomplete systems.

6. No work can do its work separate from the inflexions of online movements/gestures/ecologies of experience. No work can be separated out from the inflexions of 'offline' experiences --- the worlding crisscrossing of open windows, the kettle finished brewing.

There is no such thing as a wholly digital experience—therefore assumptions about all that a digital needs to supply, in order for a person to enter it, make short account of the multiplicity of ways and tendencies every person is already bringing to the experience (in worlding), in order to activate

7. Believe that each person has their own techniques for carrying and entering. Half the design work is actually keeping tendencies to fill, and build in continuity into the 'experience'. Leave room for the ways and techniques already in the world. Build landing sites, yes, that can spin out—but not a supply line that modulates that experience. Build with a kind of strategic incompleteness --- allow for refrains and refractions. Let the cracks keeping cracking. The difference can help motor recursive differentiations for many and multiplicities in how the work can articulate ///
allow for a system that doesn't yet know all that it can do --- rather then building enclosures, build junctures and vectors whose crisscrossing may foreground potentialities for future design techniques.

8. people can tell when a system already knows what it can do. Play happens at the edges and thresholds, not neatly within the confines. So the most interesting work/research can perhaps come from allowing for more of those edges and thresholds to persist in the initial construction of a digital platform. You'll find the play faster, and be able to re-orient the work with an artfulness—perhaps.

9. Transduce rather than seek to translate a work --- there is no equivalent for anything—no experience is duplicated, neither material nor world nor movement can find an exact representation in repetition. Try to shift the orientation for understanding what a work needs/wants in the digitally inflected experience, towards the 'how'—hows of entering, hows of the rhythmng and inflecting with ---
(DIGITAL) ANARCHIVAL PLATFORMING

Christoph Brunner

To a certain degree, it seems counter-intuitive to envision the anarchic tendencies of the anarchive as a salient element within the rather rigid logics of digital archiving and its algorithmic orders (thinking of the algorithm in the first instance as a set of instructions and rules). Is not the archive tied to generating systems of order, hierarchies, inclusions and exclusions, and closed referentiality when it comes to its formation? Starting with the process of the “triage” (a military practice of wounded soldiers being sorted at the entrance of a battle ground hospital depending on the degree of their injury) the birth of an archive begins with a process of admitting or leaving out. From here the systematization unfolds until there is a body of material (the data) supplanted by a body of ordering mechanisms (information) and the conduct of access, use, and encounter (operations). In a classic archival process one deals with an already mended body of material that has undergone severe surgery from the original “mess” with which it co-emerged. In many cases this mess might be what can be called life or life-processes. Without any romanticism, these life-processes are the anarchic share of the archive, potentially turning every archival structure into a platform for (digital) anarchiving. Why?

Life-processes are temporal in the primary instance. They are events whose expressive qualities become part of a memory or pastness inhabiting every ensuing present. This temporality of life provides the material ground for archives, created from the like of letters, notebooks, images, and many other artefacts. Such archives are often considering to be based on a set of fixed entities that have somehow captured life processes. However, in reality this capture is impossible. The real ground is one of life’s time-forms or events. The material body behind the data of an archive is therefore less a set of defined objects. Rather, the key lies in the life-relation of events, their differential character. Each event becoming is a differentiation in life that leaves its singular mark on whatever comes after its perishing, relentlessly and if ever so subtly in-forming the passing of the present—as a ‘world-memory’ (Deleuze).
This temporal pulsing of differentiation contracts into a data of a passing gesture of the present. However, when it comes to archives, they are ignorant of the temporal folding, their own material ground. Nonetheless they allow life-processes to continue their lines of activity. Put differently, once a datum enters the archive, its formal enclosure impinges on it as a structure of allocation but it cannot command how to act. There is no force in the universe that can finitely dictate how to become. There are tendencies, habits, traces and repetitions of action. Yet no material action is ever the same. It is rather, most likely, a semblance of the same while acting differently. What does that mean for the alluded rigidity of the digital in the archive?

What if we let go of the myths of the digital realm as an abstract space of repetition without difference or as an infinite archive of the cloud commanding the world via instant orders of a somewhat algorithmic kind? What we would begin to engage with then would be the anarchival impulse as the ground of any formation, structure or placement taking shape. The anarchival is not in the code per se, nor is it in the digits. It resides in the undulation of differences in electric current, of micro-temporalities shifting relations, the pulsing within calculations that yields digital semblances of some sort. It produces a binary operational fiction or a cybernetic fabulation of some sort. While the assemblage of computing does its utmost to perform reliably, the anarchival materiality of the material basis of the data, and the pulsing of the electric current which it is, resists any submission to protocol. The anarchival impulse is the slippage underneath the surface of control. This is not only a resistance but also a desire to become differently, if only as a shadowing gesture that passes unnoticed but not without effects. Thus the way to sense the anarchival in the digital archive is to seek the activating potential of the data. The key, it seems, might be time as duration rather than content or representation. Let’s take the example of a gif-Image. This assembled short animation of an image lurks between the cinematic of the film and the still of the photograph, pointing at the dynamic movement of the image as such. In briefly shifting between a handful of frames, the gif becomes a little machine for repetition while taking account of the movement immanent to the image. It is not redundant but alludes to a readiness in the perceptual fold of shifting movement between frames. What if we consider the archive as anarchivally unfolding through the
procedure of the gif-image? How could we conceive of the data sequencing in short arrays of time, making little anarchival machines that would undo the eternal impetus of the archive—its timelessness?

The relay of the digital in the case of the anarchival practice of, say, a collective working across different geographies, foregrounds the necessity of an affective and contagious operational platform capable of making intensities felt across territories. In the face of the many frustrations arising from the use of web-interfaces, networking services or collaboration tools, one might be tempted to either claim the need for something new or to give up on the digital fold in general. While many experiments move successfully beyond and between these poles, the gesture that anarchival practices are longing for might be more in the way of platforming gestures and less of a building and institutionalizing process. When practices of affectively relaying data as time-forms across distances through the digital becomes a necessity for feeling and thinking with and through others’ practices, the main concern becomes one of techniques of platforming. The anarchival plays a crucial role here. Where conventions of content and expression in web-based interfaces work through the making of digital objects, the actual temporal quality of the data as an ongoing capture of a felt and experienced intensity (like the image-frame of the gif) becomes secondary. Within the welter of collective and collaborative activity with all its captured residues—such as images, videos, writings, sound-recordings—neither a mere database nor a curated set of data in some representational interface will enable the power of the anarchival duration to come to the fore. How to invent techniques for anarchival platforming as temporal procedure open to a world memory?

A proposition

Take all the data you might consider relevant. Add more to it by subtracting. Make sure that subtraction is not a diminishing or reductive procedure but an amplification of intensity. Co-inhabit a space and time with the data. Let the data dwell with you and become part of your territory. Greet the data as an alien that brings more to life. Shift the register from understanding or ordering towards
abysmal micro-attentiveness to detail. Fall in love with the minor details, turn them into crystals of some sort, then seek infractions. The platforming has just begun. Use these emergent time-crystals as a lure for others to take the relay of this temporality and inflect new temporalities through new data. Let go entirely, do not fear perishing but keep the felt memory of the time spent in co-habitation. Don’t forget to sleep—put the machines to sleep and see how they shift gently after they awake again.
"Looking through a universe forms it into the world."

"... Fabricate a world or suffice to map one."

Arakawa & Gins
moving the anarchive
SNOWSMOSIS
Simo Kellokumpu

“17.12.2016. It is snowing in Montréal. The snow falls simultaneously to many directions. The air is filled with the traces of verticals, diagonals, curves and whirls. The touch of the falling snow is soft and it melts on my skin. The quality of the snow sets conditions for the ways of moving and my body is in incessant interplay with it. This morning I think where and how does the anarchive take place? How to touch it? How to touch the movement that does not have a beginning or ending?”

Snowsmosis is a project that took place on March 2016 in Kilpisjärvi in Lapland, just after my first visit to Senselab. The first visit was also maybe my first touch to the anarchive. Today, I think of Snowsmosis as an attempt to access the anarchive. I realize that the access is in the desire of the jump, in the air and in the bruises I got, not in the meeting point with the resisting, compact and firm snow.
COLLECTIVE SELF-INTERVIEW: THE BODY AS ANARCHIVE
Marie Topp and Emily Jeffries

Is your body an archive or an anarchive?

My body. Well it is neither. But I want to challenge myself to work within this frame.

So I am interested in our conversation, in which my body holds many choreographic works within. These works can be accessed.

How does the anarchival relate to choreography?

Could you say that anarchiving and choreography both have to do with structuring in a field where the immaterial is as important as the material?

Totally, in that the material is the physical actual body. And the immaterial is the movement.

Is the anarchive of the body complete? Can the choreographic works stored within be called upon 20 years later?

Yes, they can be recalled, be the same, and still be completely different. In 20 years all the cells of the body have been exchanged almost 3 times. None of the cells would have performed the dance before. This is maybe why the anarchive is a more precise notion than archiving, when it comes to saving choreographic works.

Genius. Would love to go into this more later.

Do you have a physical experience that relates to the notion of anarchiving?
Good question. Yes, I can recall one easily … When I started to rehearse a dance piece from my repertory, \textit{Thoughts}. The work, its intention, the memory of choreographing the work and performing it were all alive in myself. So my anarchive was functioning well (is it possible for an anarchive to function?). Although, I must admit I needed to reference the video of a previous performance for the details of movement and clarity of the sequence. Also, other performers were present and their input greatly aided my anarchival retrieval of \textit{Thoughts}.

\textbf{How do you see the relationship between improvisation and anarchive in the body?}

Anarchiving brings already existing ideas into motion. I think you could say this is the same as improvisation. I somehow like Anarchiving better. In the context of dance, improvisation has somehow been contaminated with a particular aesthetics and movement vocabulary.

\textbf{Is there a difference between anarchiving and improvisation?}

Yes, there is. There is a relation between anarchiving and improvisation that could easily become muddy. This could be because both deal with very open possibilities. Improvisation can be anarchived. Perhaps “anarchive” is the living body. And improvisation is a possibility of a frame for experience for the body.

\textbf{Do all bodies have an anarchive?}

Yes, at least every body has the potential. Then it’s a question of how you cultivate it. I guess it’s a matter of awareness and also need. Do you need your anarchive? And for what?

\textbf{Can we split the anarchive of the body into elements? One element could for example be muscle memory. What else is there?}

Mmmmmmmmm, oh boy. This could be slippery. Is it possible, for now, to have only two elements of anarchive? Then we can make sub levels later?

\textbf{What is the other, then, to muscle memory when it comes to your anarchive?}
It has to do with emotions I think. To be practical: To call back things from the anarchive, I have to connect with it emotionally and through muscle memory. Out of that comes the movement. But I think there is more to it than emotions and bio-mechanics.

**How about the conceptual elements of the work? These are also in the anarchive? Or are they of a more archival nature?**

I’d say it’s all laced together. That the anarchive is undefinable … which leaves space for everything. Conceptual, emotional, all. Its strength and weakness are both found in the fact that it is undefinable. Everything can be anarchive. All is included.

**Is there anything that does not belong in the anarchive?**

I think all kinds of documentations like images or video of the dance. Everything two-dimensional. This is archival. Let’s talk about what is outside the subject. Let’s talk about the relation between spectator and dancer and the moment of the performance.

**Could we talk about the experience of watching a performance as a process of anarchiving?**

I would be curious to distinguish the types of watching. For example: a piece seen before, a completely new piece, an older piece with new performers, a new piece but when the description has been read. Or a piece in which your friend is performing. There are countless variables that affect the person, or the body watching the performance. And in this case, I suppose it is incredibly personal as to how the experience of watching a performance affects the process of anarchiving. I’ve entered this point of view in the past through the lens of kinesthetic empathy.

The ungraspability, slipperiness, all-inclusivity of the anarchive are difficult for me to approach. The body as an anarchive seems to hold some specificity. However, I can’t seem to locate its boundaries. Actually, I get the sense there are none.

**Is there an objective of the anarchive? …**
anarchival design
ANARCHIVAL PROPOSALS IN DESIGN ANTHROPOLOGY
Jonas Fritsch and Ester Fritsch

We wish to introduce the notion of the anarchive into the discourses and experimental practices surrounding the emerging field of design anthropology. In so doing, we want to sketch out three aspects of the anarchive and what we term anarchival practices in relation to design anthropology. These aspects relate to 1) the anarchive as a living and processual archive in the digital age to be used creatively in the design process, 2) the anarchive as a way to tap into that which cannot be archived in a traditional sense (affective/relational) and 3) anarchival practices as setting an agenda for a (design) anthropology of the otherwise as an alter-politics of design. It should be noted that these aspects are very much in-the-making and all serve as propositions to engage with the joint thematics presented in the research network for design and anthropology (with which we work) so far. We view archives and, in particular, anarchives as concerns within both design and anthropology, and, consequently, something that might evolve into a shared experimentation in design anthropology.

During the past decades the nature of the archive has been up for discussion, especially following Jacques Derrida and Michel Foucault’s postmodern voices with their deconstructivist scepticism in relation to historical documentation and power (Manoff 2004:10). They—among others—have shed light on how historical documentation cannot be seen as an objective representation of the past, but consists of a range of objects that have been kept for different reasons. Put differently, there is no access to the past which is not mediated. Historian Dominick LaCapra describes a danger when looking at the archive as a substitute for ‘reality’ in a literary sense since the very process of selecting material to document something entails an interpretation (Manoff: 14). In his *The Archeology of Knowledge* Foucault describes the archive as: ‘the system of discursivity’ which establishes the possibility of what can be said. Knowledge and power, following Foucault, are an inseparable part of the archive (Manoff: 18). Derrida argues that there: ‘...is no political power without control of the archive, if not of memory.'
Effective democratization can always be measured by this essential criterion: the participation in and access to the archive, its constitution, and its interpretation’ (Derrida in Manoff: 9).

In his book from 2014 *Digital Memory and the Archive*, and more specifically in the chapter ‘Underway to the Dual System: Classical Archives and Digital Memory’, media philosopher and archaeologist Wolfgang Ernst talks about the effects of digitization on archival practices, in particular as this relates to media and art: ‘Dynamic information rasters and new search methods that go beyond the rigid indexes of traditional finding aids come into play’ (Ernst: 81). The index becomes more than a search or classification construct. It is actively shaping the experience of the archive and is ‘self-operant and self-aware’ (Ernst: 83). When talking about digital archives and algorithmic objects, Ernst states that ‘Operative mathematics (in other words, the world of computers) has less to do with concrete numbers than with relations and is thus structurally related to the essence of the vectorially linked digital archive (...) it is no longer a question of reactivating objects, but of relations’ (Ernst: 83). This new archive is an emergent archive, changing relations through the interaction with it; from read-only to user-generated, a ‘...generative, participative form of archival reading’ (Ernst: 81f). Ernst uses the Internet as an example, and argues that it ‘...is a collection not just of unforeseen texts but of sound and images as well, an anarchive of sensory data for which no genuine archival culture has been developed so far in the occident’ (Ernst: 139).

In response to these ideas, we take up the notion of the anarchive as part of an ongoing research project entitled *Immediations: Media, Art, Event*, in which we are currently working across artistic, designerly and philosophical fields under the heading of research-creation or research-through-design (Frayling). In the following, we sketch out three aspects of the anarchive and anarchival practices that we believe engage with important design anthropological considerations.

1) The anarchive as a living and processual archive in the digital age to be used actively in the design process
As part of the research center CAVI (www.cavi.au.dk), one of the authors has throughout the last decade been engaged in a variety of participatory design processes at the intersection of interaction design and digital aesthetics. From this has emerged a general interest in the active documentation of design processes, both as part of the individual process, as a way to carry out research on design processes, and as a way to foster creative resonance between different design processes. As part of this, CAVI has developed a so-called Process Reflection Tool (PRT) which aims to document the design process as a range of events and sub-events (Dalsgaard and Halskov). So far, PRT has mostly been used for the design researchers to “collect” information and documentation in the form of pictures, text and video during the design process to be reflected upon, either as part of the process, but mostly when the process has ended. However, if we take from Ernst the idea that digital archives might be more about activating relations, there is a creative potential inherent in working with design documentation as a kind of participatory and processual anarchiving. This potential would bring together designers, users and other stakeholders in the shared creation of collaborative design materials that can be used across different design processes.

2) The anarchive as a way to tap into that which cannot be archived in a traditional sense

Following on from the above, the notion of the anarchive also opens a way to engage with that which cannot be archived, as stated by Ernst. Ernst talks about sensory data that might be difficult to ‘capture’ in traditional forms of documentation. The same might be said for e.g. atmospheres or the affective tonalities of, for instance, particular design events such as workshops, field studies and so forth. From an anthropological point of view, fieldnotes might be said to be the very foundation of insights, but when aiming at documenting what lies beyond words, a range of challenges emerge in which anthropology might benefit from collaborating with design practices and possibilities. What happens in situations where we cannot describe what is happening visually? How do we develop ways of engaging with complex entanglements of sound, words, smells, sensations, spiritual forces, etc., that might end up being left out of the design documentation? Often the focus in our notes—the very foundation of our analysis—ends up being defined by what we can capture with words. This also relates to ongoing debates within archival practices in anthropology in the wake of ‘the ontological turn’ (Holbraad et. al.;
Venkatesan; Pedersen). Anthropologists can be said to face not only a range of theoretical and analytical new openings, but also methodological challenges turning towards ontology, materiality etc. This turn has, from our point of view, a range of methodological challenges that are not deeply addressed in the debate, which mostly takes a theoretical/philosophical/analytical shape.

3) The anarchival practices as setting an agenda for a (design) anthropology of the otherwise as an alter-politics of design

Anthropological engagements with for instance postcolonialism or minorities are often inspired by Foucault. They pay a thorough and enriching attention to how some voices are left out of public discourses and archives, thus questioning objectivity and especially representation (Said). In anthropological encounters with ‘the power in relation to the archive’ there is a call for a participation which is more broadly recognized in the discipline in concerns about how to put forward the voices of the people whose perspectives the state excludes—or at least to shed light on how they are excluded. Following this the anthropologist Elizabeth A. Povinelli is, for example, working with indigenous people in Australia whose voices are given little or no space in the public discourse in relation to defining what the surrounding environment consists of, especially when it comes to this environment entailing spirits and magical forces. Through a media project, Povinelli is trying to empower the worlds of indigenous people. In this vein, anthropologist Ghassan Hage introduces the concept of alter-politics as an anthropological possibility to critically exceed who we are. No matter who we are as individuals or as society we can always be in the world in another way (Hage: 289). These insights can find their way into design processes through forms of anarchival practices, opening up the contexts of intervention for critical design anthropological engagements, and an alter-politics of design.

Arguably, and intentionally, this short piece asks more questions than it answers, opening the possibility of further fruitful discussions.
speculative pragmatics for beginners
Process philosophy has a mantra: not the continuity of becoming, but the becoming of continuity. The continuity of becoming suggests pure, uncut process. This suggests no capacity for the world to register real effects. Process philosophy's pragmatic gesture is the affirmation of capture. Things happen, and they make a difference. The becoming of continuity registers this happening while acknowledging that what happens also includes an anarchic share, a more-than. The process's orientation toward the more-than can be thought of as its capacity for speculation. All experience, all events, are both pragmatic and speculative.
If you are beginning to think about engaging with techniques used in SenseLab settings (and find yourself having to explain to others how you enter into speculative pragmatics), here are some possible thresholds to consider in your ongoing practice (shared in the spirit that they might be useful for your work and how you share it with others):

1. Don't panic, worry, close down

2. Remember that there is a reason you came to the gathering and relax into that interest

3. Listen

4. Read carefully. Try to think how a philosopher is moving ideas to you, at you, trying to move with you to move you towards perhaps other directions...

5. See what attracts your interest, and what your interest is attracted to

6. Notice what you notice, think about how it grasped your attention

7. What is your interest and attention doing in the world?

8. Observe.

9. See where it might unfold later - when you're not aware of doing/thinking of anything in particular.....
THE HYPOTHESIS OF THE – INSENSIBLE – RETURN OF A HEDGEHOG (OR WHITEHEAD BY HEART)

This is the narrative [ ] of an attempt at approach [ ], from an anarchival beginner (really?), of the idea and nature of the anarchive via the implementation of an idiorythmic solitary/collective exercise over the course of the event (by definition (?) non-appropriable [ ])
A. The archive. During the opening session of the event we were (close) reading together. We read an excerpt of *Process and Reality* by A.N. Whitehead, the chapter dedicated to *non-sensuous perception*.

B. The anarchiving. An interstitial proposition.

1. Learn Whitehead's chapter by heart, segment after segment, while isolating oneself above the SenseLab studio in the University of Concordia, on the topfloor, supported by the big bay windows that frame the skyline of Montreal and the variations of the winter weather.

2. Every day after learning a subchapter, return towards the event (but maybe there was no extraction from but rather a simple spacing) and ask, at random and in an impromptu way, a participant for his/her help to rehearse the freshly learnt whiteheadian lines through a short moment of assisted memorization.

3. Rehearse, repeat, memorize better.

4. Take notes on the rehearsal conditions and happenings: who, time, location, memorization mistakes. Pay attention that the most often forgotten word is « essentially ».

5. Continue the cycle, moving forward with the learning by heart, from the skyline to the event, and from the event to the skyline, and so on, until knowing the full text, by heart.

6. (Optional) Read (again?) *Che cos'è la poesia? (What is Poetry?)* by Jacques Derrida. Choosing this excerpt (it could be another one): 

   (...) le cœur te bat, naissance du rythme, au-delà des oppositions, du dedans et du dehors, de la représentation consciente et de l'archive
abandonnée. Un cœur bas, entre les sentiers ou les autostrades, hors de ta présence, humble, près de la terre, tout bas. Réitère en murmuran: ne répète jamais... [ ]

7. Speculate upon a pluri-localization of the anarch/ive-iving-ival [ ] along this very text, once written.

8. Later on. Letting go. That is to say, forgetting. [ ]
speculative pragmatics of adventure capital
BECOMING ECONAUT
Joel Mason

What kind of value is left out of a typical financial exchange (when I buy a sandwich for $4)? Social value is always intimated at some level, but it is muted by the store-value capacity of fiat money [money that has value only because the government decrees that it does—the kind of money, e.g. paper money, most of us use every day]. This establishes and re-establishes the individual as a particular kind of limited individual with every transaction: the sandwich eater and the sandwich maker come together, exchange, and then re-individualize. There is also technical value involved [the way that all the technical systems that make money work in that they literally manufacture value]. This technical value, that machines the coming-together of the exchange, is also erased, or at least hidden from our perception and thus our ability to harness it, by the manner in which fiat money suggests clear, cogent, and consistent ownership of objects by subjects. Sandwich and dollar together take on the feel of a closed natural equivalency between themselves as distinct, owned (known) things, and not, as we suggest, intensive points in an inter-connected environment of value. In the archive of the moment, only dollar, sandwich, and single viewer exist, the narrative of their simple exchange recreating a solipsistic landscape of value devoid of relation. The anarchive, by contrast, with its here-expression of crypto-currencies and alter-economies, looks for that which overspills as the necessary condition for what has occurred and may yet occur. Fields of relation are in operation, not just exchanges between individuals. The anarchive is the awareness of the inter-touch concurring with/in an environment spreading ecologically.

To experiment with these fields and their thresholds of value “in kind,” we invited conference participants [at a conference in 2016] to use their tokens to create a texture of circulation. They should begin by not thinking too much about their techniques but rather focusing on moving one’s tokens at the greatest speed into the network of the gathering. Through the social technologies of playing pool or...
having a conversation, everyone helped everyone design exchanges of complex value: hard asset tokens [that related to actual objects or services] were stacked with anarchival trace tokens [which were more about the complexity of the relations involved], which were then bundled into smart contract tokens. Bets on the corner-pocket shot became playfully serious contracts on conversations, which emerged singularly as propositions for further coupling, contingency, laughter, and thought-reach. This was no longer the lonely universe of objects constrained to numerical valuation (“I bet 5 bucks I make this shot”). Value was no longer constrained to changing hands through predetermined, boundaried, and static objects of ownership. Instead, the anarchival tokens allowed us to speculate together about how to enunciate and activate the potential overspill of value(s) pragmatically alive in every inter-action. What emerged to be felt, in the harnessing of the anarchive, was the field of circulation of values of differential relation.

This anarchival game was inspired by an ongoing project for a proliferative, tokenized, and appreciating system of anarchival, financial, and social value called “Corridor Houses.” Like the Becoming Econaut proposition, Corridor Houses is designed to benefit precarious artist/activist collectives and the broader publics of which they are part, binding them further into interdependent collective futures.
THE NOMOS OF FINANCE: DERIVATIVE PRACTICES AT THE END OF THE ECONOMY
Erik Bordeleau

In The Power at the End of the Economy, Brian Massumi suggests that a counter-political force must engage directly with neoliberalism on its very ground, that is on the infra-individual level where pre-reflexive priming\(^6\) operates. This affective and meteorological politics of the dividual differs from “pure” political approaches relying on the protective fantasy of a political subjectivation based on clear and distinct consciousness. Massumi proposes to plunge into the perceptive intimacy of disjunctive neoliberal subjectivity in order to discern a plane of transindividual vitality that could escape its containment, capture and control by the over-individualized enterprise regime.

But how to do so? How to engage with neoliberalism on its very ground and revert its power, if not by experimenting directly with its main apparatus of (subjective) capture, namely finance? The experiment with this going on today concerns disjunctive collectives whose platformized existence has little to do with traditional forms of political organization. Politics, we could say, requires unified and voluntary subjects. In contrast, the mode of existence of disjunctive collectives could be said to be derivative: the term refers both to the breaking up of our selves into multiplicities, and the capacity to bundle up attributes into more or less plastic, volatile and distributed forms. Drawing our attention to the relation between dance and finance, Randy Martin characterizes this complex social logic of derivatives in terms of

---

\(^6\)‘Priming is a form of power that modulates events before they fully emerge. It conditions the situation and addresses the subject of interest from an angle of its relational sensitivity and constitutive openness to its outside. It induces emerging effects through implanting presuppositions, activating dividual tendencies. It inflects outcomes, and backgrounds activity. It is a kind of art of situational emphasis … that orients entry to a situation, leaves deviance to its own devices, functions by incitation and inclination, induces participation, and brings something to life. It is an inductive mode of power that allows things to come out. What this means is that priming works with the dividual. Its mode of operation presupposes a tendential undertow in the life of the individual that is best approached affirmatively, and whose complexity is such that only a certain ratio of success can be guaranteed’ (Massumi et al., n.d.).
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leverage power, that is ‘of being able to act on a certain opening or gap or opportunity that then ripples out into the world.’

This proposition could be easily dismissed as naïve wishful thinking if it were not for the disruptive power of blockchain-based technologies and the emergence of a new collaborative economy paradigm (p2p finance, creative forms of crowdfunding, etc.). Some cryptocurrencies, for example, are transforming the very concept of money. Radical political economists (see DCENT - Decentralized Citizens Engagement Technologies) have already devised a commonist money that automatically devalues under certain circumstances through the introduction of a demurrage fee, thus making it impossible to accumulate value. What if these creative cryptocurrencies become vectors for new kinds of financial war machines launched against the banking oligarchy and its weapon of predilection, the governmentality by debt? Could these Distributed Autonomous Organizations (DAO) succeed in making a claim on the enormous amount of wealth surrounding us, by operating a ‘shift from finance as a technology of capital based in debt and primitive accumulation to finance as a form of production of new kind of equity relations and commonfare production’?

We are only seeing the beginning of an intensive and multi-faceted process of decentralization and redefinition of socio-financial relations towards greater multiplicity and autonomy. Critically engage with this nomadic re-engineering of finance can also be done by envisaging it as an artistic medium. For finance is not primarily about monetary value: it is a mode of coordinating the future and its emerging possibilities through the collective design of attractors and the distribution of flows of desire.

---

7 Randy Martin, *Dance and Finance—Social Kinesthetics and Derivative Logics* https://vimeo.com/95306125

failure, impossibility, (incompossible) worlds
'TO ACT BUT FOR NOTHING', OR I WOULD PREFER NOT TO—
WHAT IS AN ANARCHIVE?
Francisco Trento, André Fogliano, Halbe Kuipers
To act but for nothing is one way to describe what the anarchive is, and does. First of all, to act but for nothing means that one no longer acts for a particular goal, no decision is made to do something, but rather one just acts. In reality, to act becomes impossible (I would prefer not to). It is only possible to act on the register of the impossible: the impossible makes possible the act and the one who acts. That's the paradox Lapoujade evokes in Deleuze. Deleuze describes it through the exhausted figures of Samuel Beckett, ‘Not that decrepitude or wreck come to interrupt study; on the contrary, they accomplish it as much as they condition and accompany it: the exhausted remains seated at the school-desk, "bowed head resting on hands," hands sitting on the table and head sitting on hands, head level with the table.’

Acting for nothing resists acting in a preordained manner. He or she that acts in this manner resists ‘realization’. It is a intensitive sufficient, relentless resistance. What is exhausted is at once the objective, that is all the possibilities currently possible, as well as the subjective, that is whoever makes the possible possible. In that there is a potential for something other.

The anarchive resists in many ways the “realization” of things, of products, thoughts, practices. It allows for study in a different way, a ‘convivial research’ as Moten would say, a renewing of habits for assembly. Anarchive as a study critical practice deploys techniques of co-composing, of listening and caring for the affects and forces around. It's a 'study without an end… And the plan is to invent the means in a common experiment launched from any kitchen, any back porch, any basement, any hall, any park bench, any improvised party, every night. This ongoing experiment with the informal, carried out by and on the means of social reproduction, as the to come of the forms of life, is what we mean by planning; planning in the undercommons is not an activity, not fishing or dancing or teaching or loving, but the ceaseless experiment with the futural presence of the forms of life that make such activities possible…’ (Moten and Harney 2013: 74-75)

So we imagine the anarchive as a study that acts, but for nothing.
We need to develop an ethics that deals with the leftovers, with the negative prehensions, with the things that are not fully actualized but that are present, making pressure, in every blink of perception. Anarchiving is dealing with leftovers, what could have been. And what can be other.

“The tendencies and capacities activated do not necessarily bear fruit. Some will be summoned to the verge of unfolding, only to be left behind, unactualized. But even these will have left their trace. It refers to an unfelt feeling entering positively into the constitution of an experience by dint of its active exclusion from it.” (Brian Massumi in Massumi and McKim)

Nota sobre o brasil:

O brasil é muito bonito. Tem muitas praias lindas! Sua história é muito interessante também.

Eu vou contar um pouquinho da ditadura militar, eu nao sei muito só o que aprendi na escola então.... Isso tudo começou em 1964. Quando vários militares resolveram tomar o poder do país. Muitas pessoas não gostaram disso, mas ao mesmo tempo outras gostaram. Essa ditadura durou 21 anos e só foi acabar em 1985. Durante esse tempo muitas pessoas foram torturadas e mortas por não concordarem com as medidas do governo. Um dos casos que eu sei foi de um casal que tinha dois filhos e foram torturados e um dia um dos filhos falou “mamãe por que você está roxa e o papai azul?” e quando a mãe foi ver seu corpo ela estava toda machucada e roxa.
IF
Andrew Goodman

IF…
The Archive is the capital A, then the anarchive is the lower case, the ugly font, the misprint, a slip of the tongue, erratum.

IF…
The Archive is polished, shiny and new, then the anarchive is covered in a child’s sticky fingerprints, unidentifiable smelly stains and it bends easily out of shape.

IF…
The Archive is the story of your life, then the anarchive is a tale of your life yet to come, your fabulous alien dream-lives lived on imaginary planes.

IF…
The Archive is a method, then the anarchive is an improvised ritual, a bloody sacrifice, shamanic rites heard in the darkest corners of the forest.

IF…
The Archive is a message in a well-stopped bottle, then the anarchive is the stormy sea blowing it off course, a leaky lid, barnacles hitching a lift, algae clouding its view, the reef that cracks it open again.

IF…
The Archive is a filing cabinet, then the anarchive is that overstuffed folder that jams the rollers sending random papers to the ground, remixing their contents.
IF…
The Archive reports, then the anarchive voices dissident and unwanted thoughts (retorts).

IF…
The Archive is a tree, then the anarchive bores holes in its trunk, digs at its roots, pupates in its leaves.

IF…
The Archive contains and bottles, then the anarchive ferments, pops its cork and oozes stickily down the shelves.

IF…
the Archive draws conclusions and makes connections, then the anarchive is indecisive, unsure of itself, equivocal, chameleonic.

IF…
The Archive is a well-balanced meal, then the anarchive is that third helping of pudding, the too rich, too oily, too spicy meal that repeats all night.

IF…
The Archive is a state of being, then the anarchive is a state of undress, un-ironed heaps in the corner, the wrong size for your figure, too many or too few layers for today’s weather.

IF…
The Archive is the collection box, the worthy cause, then the anarchive is ill-gotten gains, the robber who swaps coins for buttons, blowing the money on cigarettes or lollies.
IF…
The Archive constructs a clear and visible space, then the anarchive is the stain on the ceiling, the mold in the corner, the door that jams, the window that the wind hisses through.

IF…
The Archive is harmonic, resolution itself, compatibility, an expression of possibility, then the anarchive is still resonating from last and next week’s explosions, is difference differing over time, incompossibility, the failure folded within itself, the blankness at the heart of the problem.

IF…
The Archive is the synonym, the perfect fit, the anarchive is not the antonym (not the perfect misfit, not the upside-down), nor a well-chosen metaphor, but a jumbled box of mixed metaphors (a box of tricks: a trickster), the evil twin, the happy accident, excessive and useless potential.

IF…
anarchival care
A 2-STEP PROPOSITION FOR CARE WHEN SPEAKING IN LARGE GROUPS
Jane Gabriels

1. Who are you talking to?

You, yourself, someone particular in your mind, a person in the room, a book you read, many people in the room, a paper you wrote, the camera documenting the event, the sleep you forgot, the past, the future, now, the meal you ate/didn’t eat, the weather, the look on that last person’s face that you saw when you arrived into the room, how you arrived to this location, the history of this space, the realm of this place, your clothes, the light coming through the window, your fantastical ideas, etc., the way all of this (and more) is happening to everyone else in the room with you?

2. Who are you?

… and now who are you?

How to keep all this soft, and protected, and made vulnerable, and free, and real and in the dream, and kept private at the same time.

How not to harden into impossibilities, and know that there always is a something and never not a nothing.
The second Sydney event continued to think and experiment with anarchiving, asking how traces of past and future materials and events could energise the event and situate our activities in the active middle of ‘things already going on’ without either resorting to a pre-agreed structure or ‘call to order’. Thus we began with the proposal to resist this call (through a shared reading of sections of *The Undercommons* [Harney and Moten]), a proposal to activate (rather than archive) the forgotten rope of the [previous] Knotspace event, and a mystery box of anarchival propositions brought from Montreal by an emissary. The rope was our first challenge. We ceremoniously dragged it to the workspace from its archive and attempted to reactivate it through a series of small-group movements, weaving new forms and unraveling it to discover and listen to its tendencies. This lead into discussions on the concept of the anarchive—how could this resist the calling to order of the archive?

The package from Montreal was left unopened at first, but the tension of its presence affectively shaped the event, and on the second morning it was...
collectively unwrapped. The box contained propositions, a recording, and images—including a blue print of a hand. We had already attuned to some of the propositions in following the time of the rope on the previous day. One of the gifted propositions read: ‘practice care and generosity impersonally as event-based political virtues’. The gift from the outside enabled the collaborative work with the rope to become more generative. It lent us a hand so to speak and assisted in creating the conditions for the making of a propositional gift to the [later] Aarhus/Mols event. Apart from a spontaneous collective call to deliver the anarchical proposition and (trans)traces of the event(s) in the material of the rope, rather
than in a box, there was no discussion or consensual agreement about what to do next. There was knitting and felting with small strands of the rope, invention of propositions, image making, recording and listening. Traces of the gift became collaborators in the emergent event of occasionings. A felted/knitted rope bag was assembled. The bag became the carrier of propositions and traces of both the recomposed experiences of/with the rope and the gift from Montreal.

The question of how not to archive but to activate collectively generated movements sympathetic to traces of gifted ideas and materials; this is one we wrestle with. To begin with a gift from an emissary is to begin in the middle of something already tentatively reaching forward. How can our actions resonate with these gifts and drive adventure? How could their generosity invite care and attention? How could this flow through events impersonally? How does the gift fold into events already germinating? How is this felt in collective touch, knotting, unraveling? And, if these material traces activated this flow, how does it spread between bodies and materials, bodies-to-bodies — diagramming — so that traces are reactivated and entangled: expanded and troubled, not losing their connections but doubling them, resonating with future potentials.
At the Sydney Societies of Atoms/Anarchiving Event (May, 2016) did we enable study to actually happen? Did we listen to the emergent sociality of the event itself? Rather than trying to run things were conditions created (Manning) that enabled things to run (Moten and Harney)? I felt that a mode of
listening emerged that was not only passive: a tending to the creations of conditions occurred specific to the occasion. In this our listening fostered the emergent sociality of the ‘encounter-event’ itself (Ettinger). The ‘univocality’ of the subject was subtracted in favour of the ‘multivocality’ of the ‘ensemble’ (Moten and Harney). A listening emerged from within this ensemble—from within ‘differential co-emergence’ (Ettinger).

This kind of listening/tending does, I think, have an anarchival quality in that it is capable of immediating fugitive mobilization. As such, to borrow the words of Fred Moten, ‘[w]hat you listen to… is still moving and still living…still forming’ (in Moten and Harney). You may have to listen for a while and slow down in order feel the resonance and hear the ‘appeal’ of immanent and collaborative ‘becoming-together’ in difference.

At the Sydney event I think that most of us felt this appeal, particularly on the second day of the event. The event’s appeal emerged slowly but an appeal for a collaborative and more minor ‘becoming otherwise’ (Povinelli in Povinelli et. al) did emerge and it reverberated on the second day of the event. It wasn’t that we spent all the time listening ‘to one another’ or in agreement about what to do next. As Moten says (in the context of the abolition of credit) ‘it doesn’t work that way’. It works differently in that ‘it probably destabilizes the very social form or idea of “one another”’ (in Harney and Moten).

What is important here is that through such destabilisation a less ‘individualising’ mode of ‘socialisation’ can appear (one that is also already there). Moten is thinking of this socialisation in terms of ‘what Édouard Glissant is leading us towards when he talks about what it is “to consent not to be a single being”’ (in Harney and Moten). As I understand it, there is with Moten and Glissant a call for a socialisation of a ‘mutual becoming otherwise’ (Povinelli) that in Bracha Ettinger’s words would involve a being together in ‘not-one-ness’.

Perhaps our collaborative anarchiving event in Sydney involved a move toward this kind of socialisation. There was not consensus between sovereign subjects, and no conventional listening to a
sovereign and authoritative voice of another: no ‘call to order’ (Moten and Harney). Something quite different had been enabled to appear. There had been a tending to the event’s minor potentiality, which ended up producing this more collaborative care. This kind of care can be thought of as having an anarchival quality. In Sydney, I think, this was a felt quality that was able to feed into future events and participate in the immedation of an ‘ethics of a mutual becoming otherwise’ (Povinelli).
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More (t)here

Sitting on a cloud in Mile-End

Feeling of (t)here

A breeze touches
When sniffing of a wonder of
wonders, Deleuze sits there
When wandering on steppe and desert,
Zhuangzi simpers
here

Hong flushed red in a bottle of soju

A wonder boy, Tito breathes from India

“Come on, jump up on here”

He never talks instead sends a song of poems

I mutter

Clouds start vapouring rain on earth and trees are becoming greener
Waves untie their tide and ebb
Opacities hover
between (t)here

Horizon is everywhere

It’s a late afternoon

(Continue to unfold)
what is a book?
WHAT IS A BOOK? / WHAT IS READING? / WHAT CAN BOOKS BECOME? / PROPOSITIONS FOR INDIVIDUALISED COLLECTIVITY/COLLECTIVE INDIVIDUATION
Andrew Murphie

What is a book? What is reading? What can books become?

The question "what is a book?" arises (yet again) of course, if we are to think-feel our way through to what books can become. It's an important question because books are such a prominent aspect the archival (in many ways they are archives par excellence). Yet books also provide ways out of archives. They are paradoxically (an)archival. Within and on the way out of the book, the archive turns against itself. It turns toward the anarchival. A short history of this paradox—

It is well known that the world was changed by the distribution of writing—of books, and of related captures of thoughts, feelings and movements (revolutionary pamphlets, newspapers, scientific journals, etc). With the rise of printing, all these could be duplicated and transported at speed. Yet the book's power wasn't only in the impact of the printing press in the late 1400s. Its power lay in more than reproduction and distribution. The book's powers were found just as much in new modes of organising writing—in the always ongoing development of the codex (that is, the internal organisation of books, and their external relations, as coded archives). The codex's organisation of writing has become increasingly complex: think pages and binding, and page numbers, but think also contents pages, indexes, chapters, footnotes, dictionaries, atlases, concordances, bookmarks, libraries, catalogs. In addition, think all the coded variants and departures from the book—magazines, tv series, supermarket shelves, databases and networks, guidelines for just about everything, even "go-to how to .." manuals. The codex made all this possible.
The development of coded arrangements of the materials of writing enabled books (and their many paged and post-paged friends) to re-potentialise the (in)sensible (especially I think the insensible), in new and varied ways. Yet through this the (in)sensible could also be tamed. In summoning up the codex’s archival powers, books were able to organise variations in both sensuous and nonsensuous perception. This influences how perception blurs with action, on a grand scale and at a micro level.

Thus it is true that in books, as always, the archive institutes authority, via the very ordering of what counts as perception/action. Simply, books organise what counts as felt feeling, and how it comes to count (although what doesn’t “count” is still felt, it has less of a register—books can make us unfeel as well as feel). In this, the way that books organise data can be understood as the organisation of data as any ‘potential for feeling’ (which is how Whitehead defined data). Books not only contain such data, but also create and sustain some of the crucial vectors for the transmission of the (potential for) feeling involved. We know this, of course. We have all felt this in the acts of reading and/or writing.

Yet books have always also held the powers of the anarchive, if in paradoxical combination with the archive: think books of magic, or perhaps the I Ching but really this could be any book. The anarchive disrupts all the above from within. Simply put, it creates the possibility of other orderings of data, of other potentials for feeling, even other times, other worlds, in a kind of open taking up of “bookness”, of sensuous and nonsensuous perception, and of thinking-feeling, differentially. So a not too surprising understanding of the book, slightly detoured via Whitehead’s data as the potential for feeling, might be

---

9 Simply put nonsensuous perception is perception which is not related directly and simply to one of the senses and thus open to all of them. Reading, for example, involves sight, but has much more going on. Or think the movements between dance, music and the locality of the dance. Or think thought as nonsensuous perception. As Massumi points out, these are not really “cross-modal”, or simple “secondary” crossovers between “primary” sensory modes that we can more or less ignore. They have their own reality in themselves. They involve amodal movements and perceptions before, after and between the senses. Massumi writes that this ‘is the direct perception of what happens between the senses, in no one mode. All and only in their relation. Purely nonsensuous. Abstract. What is felt abstractly is thought. The perceptual feeling of the amodal is the fundamentally nonconscious thinking-feeling of what happens between’ (2011: 110).
this: a book is the ongoing organisation of feeling at the junction of the archive and the anarchive (and the junction of feeling-coding and feeling-freeing).

The important extra aspect of this is the obvious one, that the book allows for individualised collectivity. In books we are together, in the world, and alone (think for example of silent reading, which many argue has not always been a thing people do). Or, books allow for collectivised individuation. All this arises from the peculiar groupings of occasions or events, conjunctions of feeling, in the meeting of book and world, individualisation and collectivity.

However, there is still another, more basic, understanding of a book that underwrites all this. This is the world itself as a book to be read. The codex can organise writing only because there seems to be already a parallel, if never quite matching, legible organisation within the world itself. Books can engage with this because they are part of it themselves. The world itself seems to be able to read and to be read or interpreted because it already organises it’s own processes of feeling. It is this that can be taken up in books and writing, as part themselves of the world.

However, with too much "interpretation" and overcoding things soon rigidify. The understanding of the world as a book to be read too easily becomes the authoritative concept of an already read world without movement or change. Or of a world that the archive cannot afford to allow to move too much, in case this dilutes its standing archival powers (think of the "Royal science" which interprets and orders the world, or think of political parties, or academic disciplines). This is the basis for authoritarian archives (and all archives are authoritarian). It’s really the archive as ‘archiviolithic’, as Derrida calls it. There is an inherent violence to archives as they attempt to brake/break the world, slow it down and break it into legible pieces (that are coded to suit specific archives). These pieces can then be extracted from the world’s relational excess. Think of the reading of the world for possible extractions of oil, or minerals. In the 1800s there were even people who claimed to be able to read the world for the hidden presence of oil via spirit mediums (Jones). Look where the like of this has brought us today—stuck in the many archives that support a life based on fossil fuels.
There is perhaps a more useful, ethical, and more anarchival understanding the world as a book. It is this: the ongoing continuity and novelty of the world, as this literally moves from moment to moment, and is made available for other vectors of feeling (also world) to engage with. It's a partnership with(in) world. Any serious reader with feeling will understand this, and will have been moved by it. Or perhaps, quite differently, think climate science, in many ways a peculiarly dynamic science that has long been forced into an uncertain and shifting partnership with world. I'm thinking also of the like of cave paintings or tattoos as book here.

In all these, the movements of more open feeling and coding work together. Frequent departures from the archive are common for both feeling and coding. There is an ongoing sensitivity to different moments of the comings together of different orderings of symbolic reference. It's not the total abandoning of order but its frequent suspension and reformation (the most we can hope for, in glimpses of something else in the moment). It is in favour of potential for other orderings, which are always (dare we hope?) less authoritative/authoritarian. It's living with the world as medium, of which we are part but which exceeds us. So that climate change, for example, is not happening to us from outside. Rather it is us and we are it, although not in any easy one to one way. Climate "reads" us as much as we "read" it but never in any final reading. Or better, it feels us as we feel it, but never in any final feeling.

I think we need (at least) all of the above to begin to understand what books are, what books can become and indeed are already becoming. We also need all of the above to think-feel the archival and anarchival tensions and potentials concerning not only what a book can be, but a great deal else.

In this light I propose the following propositions, in order to feel into what a book can be. Feel free to add your own. There will be no session. You can take these up, or not, as you wish, for seconds or for

---

10 Symbolic reference, in Whitehead’s terms, is the transition/change/continuity from past to present as a kind of futuring—plus—the full field of sensory perception in the moment.
hours, making yourself an individualised collectivity or collectivised individuation. You could do it in
groups I guess, in for example reading aloud, perhaps together in a cafe.

Propositions for individualised collectivity/collectivised individuation

1. Look at a mountain, or any other prominent feature of the landscape (I tried the Montréal mountain)
for five minutes without stopping (you can blink). Where is the mountain in the looking? Where are
you in the looking? What is sensuous and what is non-sensuous perception? Can they be separated?
Where is feeling? How does feeling feel? What is immediate perception and what is coming from
somewhere else, even from a 10th of a second ago? However, do not decide any of these things.
Suspend decision …

2. Listen. What is individual, what is a collectivity, in the listening?

3. Personal orders: follow the movement of personal orders (the real movement of consistencies and
shifting continuities through time. This will, ironically, usually be "impersonal", in everyday language,
although sometimes many personal orders might add up to the personal). Or follow when nexus
become social (I'm not going to even try to explain that—if you don't know, guess! Or make it up but
keep going!), or when the organic becomes crystalline and vice versa. Do not decide anything though.
Suspend decision …

4. Watch the clouds moving. Crystalline overlap or organic order? Or both as symbol(ic reference)?
Suspend decision …

5. Anarchive or archive? Where, where not? Suspend decision …

6. Make your own propositions for individualised collectivity/collectivised individuation. Share them
with others. Rules are below.
Rules:

1. must be able to be done by individuals quietly.
2. suspend decision
3. should not need any extra materials
4. no one has to notice it's happening
5. allow for each situation/situatedness of "reading"

I wonder whether much of what a book can become concerns the variation of the usual collective/individual relation, considered in the mode of suspending decision (in favour of the decision of the world as event?).
SOME OF THE *GO-TO, HOW TO, BOOK OF ANARCHIVING*S PARTNER BOOKS, ALSO MADE AT THE DISTRIBUTING THE INSENSIBLE EVENT
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