Publishing as Relay

Anna-Sophie Springer & Caleb Waldorf

There is no Platonic reality of texts. There are only physical objects such as books and computers, foci of attention, and codes that entrain attention and organize material operations.
— N. Katherine Hayles, 2005

Triggers for joy are almost always something others might share, at least potentially, even if we experience them alone.
— Lynne Segal, 2017

Preface: Measuring the moment

A year has passed since we first got together to reflect on our respective publishing practices, to consider various aspects of contemporary media ecologies, and to analyze the emotional and theoretical landscapes that envelop our work. We examined the differences between publishing in print (more typical for K. Verlag, the publishing atelier for exhibitions in book form managed and directed by Anna-Sophie since 2011) and publishing online (mostly the case for Triple Canopy, a magazine cofounded by Caleb, who has been the creative director since 2007). We also discussed our concerns about the cultural responsibility and social conditions of independent publishing practices; already tainting our mood was a growing unease about the spread of disinformation and vitriol on social media and the general retreat of the Left in a world of fake news and *so-called* fake news.

While these concerns remain valid a year later, as this book was being prepared for print a series of world-changing events began to unfold. It is mid-2020 and we are somewhere in the middle of an unprecedented global pandemic as the United States — currently leading the world with more than two hundred thousand deaths from COVID-19, which have disproportionately harmed BIPOC communities — is in the thrall of one of the largest insurrections against systemic racism and white supremacy in its history. Meanwhile, solidarity protests for the Black Lives

Matter movement have spread across the globe, as have conspiracies about the novel coronavirus and (much smaller) protests over resultant public health measures. These events de-normalize both connections and dependencies, inequalities and privileges, leaving few aspects of life untouched. In a matter of a few months, reality itself has undergone a substantial, long-overdue reappraisal. In the shadow of this revaluation, some aspects of our work that felt more urgent last year seem to be of less consequence today, while concerns that were peripheral last summer have moved to the center of our attention.

One concern we share is that of a functional and ethical distribution system developed by and for small publishers. During a spring of lockdown and an eerily quiet summer, the world has witnessed massive disruptions to on-demand, just-in-time supply chains. These disruptions are occurring against a horizon of economic scarcity as a result of resource exploitation, habitat obliteration, and ongoing climate breakdown. In this confounding situation, the discussion of alternative production and distribution models is even more urgent. Thus, our respective views on the "distribution problem" have been sharpened while we continue grappling with a complex series of new questions related to global circulation, supply, and the attention fatigue and mental exhaustion that characterize the current moment.

Revealing the racialized dimensions of risk, this year has also amplified the tensions between the political and the personal, the public and private — thereby urgently reconfirming the inextricable ties connecting social, public, and individual health. During the core phases of 2020's lockdown, being in community suddenly meant practicing remoteness. Months of "physical distancing" have posed unique challenges to effective collective strategies of mutual aid and resistance. In Berlin, where we both live, one response to a diminished circulation of people and goods was the invention of "Gabenzaun," which saw residents tie plastic bags full of items such as juice, energy bars, cigarettes, and dog food to urban fences for unhoused people and their companion species. A season of extended quarantine, mass death, and the failure of many governments to protect their citizens against the pandemic amplified core emotional issues such as loneliness, depression, and anxiety, as well as negatively impacted general well-being.

Imagining and enacting alternative ways of being together in 2020 is also, of course, a high-tech story of the digitization of

sociality — protests, teaching, exhibitions, birthdays, funerals, and dinner and dance parties alike have moved online via Zoom, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, or any of a number of other web-based platforms. Attempting to adapt, editors at big and small publishers are trying to figure out in real time how to maintain their communities by navigating both the familiar and unfamiliar aspects of these digital platforms, which were previously treated primarily as sites for promotion rather than as places to share or experience content. Thus far, the results have been mixed; perhaps this new normal can open up spaces for different types of listening and conversation, but this is yet to be seen.

In a recent *London Review of Books* podcast, Paul Gilroy pointed out that the "viral nature" of the Black Lives Matter movement relies on new technologies to pass on, connect, and multiply content.[1] In the past, we felt skeptical about the long-term impact of social media campaigns and the temporary solidarity streams they engender. But, as a movement deeply informed by the intersectional scholarship and organizing of Angela Davis, Ruth Wilson Gilmore, and many others, combined with both an intuitive and highly strategic attention to the affordances of networked technologies, the Black Lives Matter movement is an important step toward an internationalist political discourse and a collective renewal of the world.

One fundamental quality of running a publishing atelier is being involved in the mediation between public discourse and private emotions. For us, this means being involved in claiming spaces, amplifying voices, and sustaining the relationships that make things happen and that keep ties to and with the world — a world that we understand as shaped by histories both of suffering and of collective joy, and that is manifold and pluralized by difference. It is for this more utopian spirit in a dystopian year that we now relay this conversation to you.

In conversation

CW: I'd like to start our conversation with a schema: publishing takes things from one place and transposes them into other spaces over a duration, and, in this process, it can trace as well as define new territories — some short-lived, some immutable. Publishing can also be understood as an act of making something accessible; forms and formats in publishing are vehicles to assist in movement, the making of space, and the development of

associations through common access. This blueprint applies to more than what may conventionally be considered to fall under the category of the publication, but is nonetheless a useful departure point for our discussion. We both operate in a similar area, facilitating work that traverses genres and disciplines. There are artists that have been in your publications at K. Verlag that have appeared in Triple Canopy; you did a book launch at A Public Library, a project space I operated in Berlin;[2] and, as one could naturally suspect, we've had booths next to each other at the art book fair Miss Read, also in Berlin. For all these overlaps, though, there are differences between how we've operated in, reacted to, and tried to shape the field of publishing. While reductive, the primary distinction we could make is that my practice has typically been situated on the web, yours in print and exhibition contexts. It is, of course, more nuanced than that, and this distinction creates a false binary that we should discuss, but I think it is important to acknowledge from the outset that we embark on a line of thinking about publishing from different perspectives.

I'm too old to be a "digital native," so I have memories of a less connected world, but the majority of my adulthood, and the entirety of my artistic practice, has unfolded alongside the rapidly changing technical landscape of the last twenty years. In varying ways and modes of expression, this transformation has been the point of convergence, or the backdrop, that situates most of my work. Artists have long been engaged with evolving technical and social networks as areas of analysis, use, and contestation. This is true whether we look to early digital experiments in distribution frameworks, like THE THING;[3] to older explorations of circulation and form by George Maciunas and his many interlocutors in Fluxus; or to the nexus of political journals and the avant-garde art movements of the interwar period in Europe and beyond. I point this out only to suggest that my interest in this area, far from being a radical departure from the past, feels tied to a legacy of artists working in publication (not to mention collaborative forms). But, as intuitive as this is to me, I also get the sense that my perspective is somewhat isolated within contemporary publishing in the arts.

This has led, particularly in the last few years, to a feeling of remoteness from the broad publishing landscape we are embedded in. This unease primarily arises from a gap that I perceive between the ideal(ized) potential of publishing as a means to

expand publics and communities, and the dominant forms and frameworks that are being deployed. This is probably best exemplified by the rise of the art book fair, in which a fairly consistent group of publishers gets together to trade their physical wares within a somewhat closed ecosystem, typically one supported by art institutions of varying sizes that, irrespective of their locations, tend to exist within the same cultural continuum. As someone whose publishing atelier is also navigating these spaces, and since you are likely more reliant on them to sustain your practice than I am, at least financially, could you describe how you address this in your overall practice?

AS: As a publisher, my focus on the book-as-exhibition is informed by legacies of the "dematerialization of the art object" from the 1970s, and attendant experiments with publishing that were motivated by desires for institutional independence, pluralizing narratives, and alternative modes of circulation.[4] Before cofounding K. Verlag, I apprenticed as an editor at Merve Verlag, the theory publisher from the old West Berlin well known for translating French theory into German. No doubt the spirit of freedom that characterized their publishing house was extremely exciting, but, at the same time, I was disappointed by the lack of women writers in their program. I was interested in *écriture feminine*, especially the work of Hélène Cixous, and Chris Kraus, who was both an exceptional writer and a role model for publishing. Before I left Merve, I was translating Mark von Schlegell's *Realometer* (2009), which introduced me to Ursula K. Le Guin, and Nina Power's *One Dimensional Woman* (2009), which was an opportunity to bring together my enthusiasm for theory and my desire for a more self-aware, feminist publishing project.[5]

So, there is always a certain scene that we exist in and that we are trying to change. One of the aims of my practice — especially through an ongoing creative dialogue with my partner/collaborator Etienne Turpin — has been to push the boundaries of how we do things, what we think and talk about, and with whom. Perhaps that's got something to do with also being a translator? Whatever the case, on a practical level, a factor I consider important in publishing is that of accessing and redistributing cultural and institutional resources and working creatively to open up more potential for change.

When working on something, among the team, we ask again and again: what can a book be? What is an exhibition?

An interesting fact is that the atelier's publications are not limited to English or German; bilingual combinations and even translations are also common. This helps to incline the books beyond the narrower art scene and toward a broad range of contexts regarding content, geography, and contributors — a mode of diversity I am proud of. It's just one way of trying to work otherwise — that is, of being open as well as precise, and interrogating the book as an infrastructure for different ecologies of attention, teasing out rhythms, relations, and adjacencies among variegated systems of knowing and sensing.

Making books in this way is very conceptual. At the same time, I love physical publications — they survive long periods of time and can surprise you in unexpected places. Even a closed book communicates on intimate levels, via touch, smell, volume, weight, look, wear, etc.[6] I do like that a book both archives thought and activates the mind *apart from* electronic devices and screens, without ever being a closed technology. Speaking to Aby Warburg's notion of the "good neighbor," books connect, expand, and layer the imagination across dimensions of space and time.

Thinking about all of this turns publishing into a philosophical problem.[7] But publishing is also a political act. At K., each project is a collective learning process and an unforgettable interpersonal experience. In a world increasingly dominated by corporate interests, small presses like ours can take on themes that larger institutions won't or don't have to. At the same time, ethical or responsible publishing isn't merely an "awareness" problem; it's too apparent everywhere how quickly we forget. Something I have learned from my work is that publishing facilitates social alliances and helps to build an infrastructure for an ongoing debate about what it means to inherit and coproduce the world we are living in. Philosopher and cultural theorist Peter Sloterdijk captures this sentiment so well:

> Nietzsche, who knew that writing is the power to transmit love not only to one's nearest and dearest, but also, through the next person encountered, into the unknown, distant, future life. Writing not only creates a telecommunicative bridge between known friends, who at the time of the transmission live in a geographical proximity to one another; but it sets in motion an unpredictable process. It shoots an arrow in the air, described in the words of old European alchemists as an *actio in distans*, with the

> objective of revealing an unknown friend and enticing him into the circle of friends. In fact, the reader who sits down to a thick book can approach it as an invitation to a gathering.[8]

This possibility for collective joy — to borrow a term from socialist critic Lynne Segal — is, for me, the "fantasy of the library," a space not exclusive to physical, printed publications, and which doesn't foreclose the possibility that the content may deal with difficult material or suffering.

CW: It is interesting that Sloterdijk highlights the "thick book" as the arrival point for this complex system of interconnectedness. It appears that he is actually describing the internet! Which, arguably, is a much more effective means to extend connections and cohesion beyond an overly local and "physical" context. Perhaps this is most clear on the political Right, as evidenced by the present volume of conspiracy theories and the rise of negative solidarity, "the weak bond orienting isolated and competitive individuals against those who are failing to work or bear their share of austerity."[9] This points to a long-standing conversation we've had regarding the "distribution problem," which is clearly not limited to whether something is composed of HTML or ink on paper, but rather how immaterial and material objects are operative in the world.

AS: The philosophical discourse that Sloterdijk is a part of is a few thousand years old. So, technically, that goes much further back than the printing press, the codex book, and the internet. In this sense, it's less a question of the object/medium as a solid thing than of which solidarities are relayed and thus effectively brought into existence. The early internet liberated people from the mainstream. In today's platform version, there are profound forces at play; data mining, misinformation, and public pressure make a toxic mix. As we are ever more reliant on digital connectivity, one question is: can we reclaim it (and ourselves) from the vulnerability to financialized capitalism, where the generation of profitable data has become key? A subsequent question entails the construction of that "we" in the previous sentence: how do we build alliances that are not defined by ostracization, inflexibility, and a polarized conformity? It seems that social media (as one type of internet) encourages

a particularly narrow understanding of purity and complicity, currently provoking a lot of "failed conversations." While Facebook, for instance, co-opted the term "friend" early on, today the platform is characterized by deep animosity. Also concerned with the corroding effects of fragmentation in the fight against structural oppression, artist and theorist Alex Martinis Roe has eloquently defended the notion of solidarity-in-difference, relaying the practice of *affidamento* (entrustment), which was cultivated by the members of the Milan Women's Bookstore Collective as a form of mutual commitment founded on the affirmation of difference.[10] Things are complicated and there is a lot of work to be done. To start with, "difference" must be protected to include more ambiguity than binary moral judgments such as like/dislike or friend/enemy.[11]

Through its publications, K. Verlag aims to contribute to this process. The recent book edited by Dora García, *Love with Obstacles (Amor Rojo)* (2020), on Russian revolutionary and socialist feminist Alexandra Kollontai as a predecessor of intersectional feminism, is one example. Another is *Despite Dispossession* (2021), an "activity book" developed by a diverse research group hosted by the Academy of Visual Arts in Vienna, which confronts realities of dispossession and violent appropriation, offering artistic and collective strategies for hands-on epistemic interventions into affected sites and bodies.[12] But to pick up on your point about distribution: surrounding all of these projects, there is the issue of how the work goes on its journeys — how it is made available and accessible to "unknown friends," and via which ecosystems.

Conversations with other artistic publishers show that even if you've contracted a distributor, connectivity between presses and receivers can still be limited or inefficient. Available commercial platforms listing titles for booksellers, such as (in Germany) VLB, Koch Neff & Oetinger, and Amazon, all entail costs for publishers.[13] If you are a small publisher with precarious resources and limited staff, it's difficult to keep up with all the administrative demands.

In Germany, an "interest group of independent publishers" has existed since 1979. You have to be a member of the Börsenverein, the German book trade association, to be a part of it, which requires a set of fiscal conditions that not all artistic publishers are able to fulfill. In the international art publishing scene, we might do well to form a working group and collectively

organize a tighter exchange network for our output with book-shops, libraries, collections, and inclined readers. And again, in today's increasingly anti-intellectual, anti-cultural, and anti-educational political climates, this output is worth so much! From this perspective, finding ways to stabilize the structural and economic position of artistic presses as refuges for diverse forms of thought and expression seems to be of great urgency, along with considering the social and ecological responsibilities embedded in our activities.

CW: I do wonder to what degree the "inclined readership" you mention would also need to be strengthened in order to sustainably improve circulation. Couldn't one of the underlying issues around circulation have more to do with the challenge of *engaging* readers within an overflowing, yet fractured, cultural and political landscape? This question feels like an extremely urgent issue. The rapid acceleration of the overall media sphere and network ecology, and how they drive a hunger for immediacy, has clearly impacted the field we operate in. Speaking anecdotally, I get the sense that the intellectual "trends" of the past, even those of five or ten years ago, tended to evolve over years, not weeks or months. There is also the real and urgent need to utilize communicative spaces to draw attention to oppression and to mobilize resistance and mutual aid. This makes it challenging to engender the type of attention required from the perspective of the contributor, publisher, and reader, toward a more sustained kind of engagement — one in which the publication can be an anchor for resistance, one that perhaps exists in a very different temporality.

AS: You are speaking about cultural literacy, and I believe that's an essential point. It does seem that algorithmic acceleration has reduced schools of thought (knowledge) into themes (infor-mation), and that themes have gradually deteriorated into memes (mere relics of information). We are just beginning to understand the tremendous neurological effects this rapid process has on our minds and overall well-being.[14] At the same time, particularly in the context of the climate crisis, we are faced with another type of increasing acceleration that we don't know how to cope with: the unexpected speed with which models predicting climate change are currently overhauled by the scientific measurements of actual weather patterns, leading to increasingly dire forecasts.[15]

Traditional publishing frameworks take a long time, especially if peer review processes are involved, and data can be out-of-date by the time it is published. Nevertheless, quick social media posts and news feeds, on the other end of the spectrum, cannot capture the complexity and extent of the many serious issues at stake. What seems needed in a time of such volatile, existential pull is a new collective practice of presence and attention. It is by facing this challenge that the work of alternative publishers can make an important intervention toward a sensitive and actionable conversation.[16]

However, I completely share your concern for actual readers. The notion of presence and attention also emphasizes the value of sustained space and times of uninterrupted focus, generating a mental buffer to the mind-frazzling acceleration that you brought up. There is a computer scientist and productivity scholar, Cal Newport, who publishes best-selling books about what he calls "deep work," giving advice on how to *think* enough to produce meaningful work by disconnecting from the internet and drawing a decisive boundary around digital distraction.[17] It always depends on the context, and exceptions prove the rule, but, in my own experience, I usually get a good sense of calm and reflection as soon as I switch off the Wi-Fi — even if only for an hour at a time. And while my own writerliness is conditioned through fingertips touching a keyboard, my inner dialogue with a published author tends to feel more animated if I read their words on paper, pen in hand, rather than on screen. How many others feel that way, I don't know. But, being a publisher means facilitating between public discourse and private mentalities and emotions, and nourishing these connections is a contribution to society we make with our work.

CW: In the earliest days of Triple Canopy in 2007, one of the first concepts that we developed consensus around was the desire to "slow down the internet." At the time, this idea was enacted by taking an unusual approach to the interface and layout in the web browser. Subsequently, around 2013, when discussing what the future of our platform would be, and in recognition of the shifts in technology and our relationship to the screen, I made the joke that our new mantra should be to "slow down the world."[18] This idea manifested itself through a reconfiguration of our editorial program and platform, shifting from the idea that we were an online magazine to "a magazine whose hub is online."

This meant embracing the idea that different formats — whether an event, online project, exhibition, book, or something else — all had their own characteristics and affordances, and that they needed to be probed in tandem with the concepts and themes addressed in the issues we published, developed over long durations in collaboration with our contributors. That isn't some groundbreaking idea, obviously, since an event to launch a book or magazine isn't particularly novel. Rather, I was interested in recentering those tertiary forms of production and attempting to assess them along the same lines as other forms.[19]

But, in my experience, navigating the complex logistics of collaborative publishing, irrespective of medium, feels like an intractable challenge. It also isn't a particularly sexy conversation topic, though many of us spend time lamenting these issues in private settings. More importantly, as you noted earlier, publishers across many scales (because these challenges aren't limited to small publishing houses) spend a great deal of time attempting to learn, create, and manage systems and processes that are administrative in nature. (Often to the dismay of my collaborators over the years, I can be preoccupied with trying to get these organizational arrangements as refined as possible.) From my perspective, this aspect of the work is an integral "material" substrate, and when not functioning well it creates many barriers. Distribution — the ability to get a work in front of a reader — is clearly the most conspicuous component of these more general infrastructural issues.

One dimension that can propagate this dynamic is the underlying economics of independent publishing, which can typically be characterized as non-profit, at least in Western Europe and the United States. (Even if not officially non-profit, it is effectively so, since no one is making money.) It is a model that relies upon funding and support from grants and institutions, more so than sales. Even a cursory look into that system will show a restricted economic network and perhaps, by extension, cultural and political networks that are also narrow. In short, institutions fund publishers to make products; publishers make those products; those products are made visible within the institutional contexts in which they are funded, though often not circulated widely outside of them; rinse and repeat. This is an overly simplified and crude portrayal of the situation — and pessimistic! — but the truth in it points to what is valued. Specifically, this setup tends not to support publishing

infrastructures, which impacts distribution — not to mention working conditions for collaboration and production. Ideally, infrastructural support would allow distribution to expand into communities that aren't already part of the previously mentioned institutional circuits. Maybe something like a "general" public? I also think this extends to the question of engagement, but drawing a direct line here is challenging.

AS: The steady pressure to present an effortless public image is also an effect of social media. Even if it makes us uncomfortable, we can subvert this by discussing more complicated, usually hidden structural questions. In my case, learning the "business" of running the press has taken much longer than developing creative expertise, although both are rooted in experimentation. As long as distribution and sales are in a niche, the issue of profit/ non-profit is a constant problem. Structurally, however, when there are grants for publishing they are usually for projects, not subsidies for infrastructure or maintenance, which I understand is also an issue in the field of software development. So, essentially, the atelier survives by offering services such as in-depth consultation/conceptualization, copy-editing, design, project management, etc. I think a lot of people, even avid readers, would be surprised by the time and effort it takes to fully realize a publication. And, after splitting sales revenue across distributors, retailers, and shipping companies, "making money" from the books themselves is mostly an illusion, just like you said.

The systemic precarity is obvious. Many ideas and positions materialize at the margins of the cultural economy. And yet, for the sake of an open, pluralistic society, an intensified debate about the structural position of cultural production is urgent. As part of a large support fund to ameliorate the economic impacts of the coronavirus pandemic, the German Ministry of Culture has actually issued a one-off grant specifically for publishers and booksellers. But, once again, publishers can request a production grant — that is, they can funnel the money to contractors in the framework of a new project — but they cannot use the money to invest in general maintenance. We're better off than many, but we are also currently seeing how bureaucracy and working conditions usually don't match up.

So, your comment reminds me of the ways in which art institutions have begun to discuss "hospitality."[20] How people are hosted and cared for in the context of events integrally

coproduces the affective credibility of public gestures. Appropriating the publishing context as a platform for artistic or curatorial investigations of book/exhibition modes also extends into thinking through precarity, accountability, and the structural and administrative ways in which publishing is realized. Confronting distribution, payment structures, and consignment systems is a part of that.[21] At the same time, it requires deconstructing the alleged power of independent publishers as *perceived* gatekeepers. It's a daily struggle to keep going. We'd do well to focus on improving all-round conditions rather than competing with each other by viciously recirculating our traumas and existential anxieties.

CW: I think we should return for a moment to your comment regarding the current political climate with its "increasingly anti-intellectual, anti-cultural, and anti-educational" characteristics. This political climate (both on the Right and the Left) has been facilitated a great deal by contemporary social media platforms, whose adverse physiological and psychological effects have been well documented. These platforms — Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, to name just a few — are more about fleeing in-depth encounters than engaging in ways that demand intimacy and empathy, which I think we both consider as means to effect social and cultural change. That being said, they *can* be used productively in mobilizing people for something like the Black Lives Matter movement, whether by, in this case, making visible the widespread oppression and murder of Black people in the United States, or more tactically by functioning to build mutual aid and solidarity networks in times of struggle. But those moments, unfortunately, tend to be fleeting — although this may be more of a personal outlook, since I feel like I've been in this cycle a number of times before.

Something that comes to mind is the Electronic Disturbance Theater, founded by Ricardo Dominguez, which, in the late 1990s, invented a form of electronic civil disobedience:

> Acting in the tradition of non-violent direct action and civil disobedience, proponents of Electronic Civil Disobedience are borrowing the tactics of trespass and blockade from these earlier social movements and are applying them to the Internet. A typical civil disobedience tactic has been for a group of people to physically blockade, with their bodies,

the entranceways of an opponent's office or building or to physically occupy an opponent's office — to have a sit-in. Electronic Civil Disobedience, as a form of mass decentered electronic direct action, utilizes virtual blockades and virtual sit-ins. Unlike the participant in a traditional civil disobedience action, an ECD actor can participate in virtual blockades and sit-ins from home, from work, from the university, or from other points of access to the Net. Further, the ECD actor can act against an opponent that is hundreds if not thousands of miles away. The Electronic Disturbance Theater, primarily through its Flood Net device, is promoting ways to engage in global, mass, collective and simultaneous Electronic Civil Disobedience and direct action.[22]

The Flood Net system refreshed the targeted web page over and over again so that when many people joined a virtual sit-in, it was like a semi-legal DDoS (distributed denial of service) attack. I studied with Dominguez, participating in a number of sit-ins in the mid-2000s, and what I found compelling about this conceptual and activist artwork was that it engaged in the material substrate of the network, using it as a means to create a "collective weapon of presence."[23] In short, while it was a clear method for magnifying political struggles and creating forms of mutual aid (by taking down target websites), it didn't do this by signing on to Twitter and appending a hashtag to a tweet. It worked within the fabric of the internet itself, updating and reconfiguring historical forms of resistance in response to different structures of power, and redeploying them within a performative schema.

A "provocative" claim I presented in a lecture a number of years ago may be relevant here: the Iranian Green Movement of 2009 seemed to be punctured, at least in terms of international solidarity, by the death of Michael Jackson. In short, on Twitter the trending #iranelection was replaced with #RIPMJ. This is, of course, not the reason the uprising ended — that would be the state violence of the Iranian regime led by Mahmoud Ahmadinejad — but my simple observation at the time, which I think is still applicable, is that these corporate platforms should be approached cautiously and with vigilance.

AS: Of course, and I'd like to add another example. The manuscript of the incredible, award-winning book *No Friend But*

the Mountains (2018), by Kurdish-Iranian poet and journalist Behrouz Boochani (with English translation by Omid Tofighian), was written and edited on a mobile phone using WhatsApp while Boochani was imprisoned (in contravention of international law) as an asylum seeker, for more than four years, in Manus Island Regional Processing Centre, a detention center administered by the Australian Government.[24] This mobile application made it possible to get the book out of Manus, which is important, however it was also necessary to have a publisher willing to publish and distribute the book. The risks to the publisher are incomparable to those faced by Boochani, yet it is important to consider the process as a sequence or series of events involving more than one platform.

Apart from this example, the cultural and neurological toxicity of social media increasingly worries me. I doubt that these monopoly technologies can be effectively used to produce the kinds of change we need right now. At the same time, with the Black Lives Matter movement in particular, there are ways that activists are harnessing these platforms to redirect attention to urgent struggles and to call people out to the streets. Yet there are also myriad examples of how, within the "post-truth" and "fake news" milieu, social media enables certain actors or groups (including but not limited to nation-states, of course) to undermine or eliminate democratic values, debate, opinion, and free speech. When social media facilitates digital hate campaigns, you can observe tactics of defamation and intimidation. This ultimately leads to often-invisible real-world suffering and psychological distress, as well as the silencing of those attempting to convene the difficult conversations we urgently need to cultivate. Otherwise, the outcome is further fragmentation and polarization, often to the point of violent social exclusion, scapegoating, and interminable enmity. Even when it doesn't go this far, I find it troubling to witness complex narratives reduced to a binary decision of like or dislike, not to mention the superficial yet depressing forms of attention seeking that often promote such plebiscitary reductions.

One voice I appreciate in the context of call-out culture is American author and activist adrienne maree brown, especially her writing on transformational justice.[25] Richard Seymour's analysis in *The Twittering Machine* (2019) is also excellent in this respect because he compares, in convincing detail, the social media user to the *gambling* addict (as opposed to drug addiction,

which for Seymour is caught up in a different logic). Regarding the *writing* that we practice on these platforms, he insists on the difference between interacting with people in real life and interacting via a machine or platform:

> The machine benefits from the "network effect": the more people write to it, the more benefits it can offer, until it becomes a disadvantage not to be part of it. Part of what? The world's first ever public, live, collective, open-ended writing project. A virtual laboratory. An addiction machine, which deploys crude techniques of manipulation redolent of the "Skinner Box" created by behaviourist B. F. Skinner to control the behaviour of pigeons and rats with rewards and punishments. We are "users," much as cocaine addicts are "users."[26]

> What is the incentive to engage in writing like this for hours each day? In a form of mass casualisation, writers no longer expect to be paid or given employment contracts. What do the platforms offer us, in lieu of a wage? What gets us hooked? Approval, attention, retweets, shares and likes.[27]

Writing per se might not always be wage-driven, but, given this increasingly toxic social and political climate, defending frameworks of respectful collaboration and critical, open debate is essential. Again, perhaps it is worthwhile to reflect on the qualitative difference between the meaning of the writerly "friend" in the earlier quote above, and the social media machine. Although real-life relations are usually less categorical — if we think about them conceptually — they have to do with generosity and inspired, genuine connection, while the social media network, Seymour would argue, is founded on the exploitative structure of an abusive relationship. Scandals are also, essentially, a way for companies to make money. In turbulent times like these, it seems crucial to nurture ways of writing and reading that hold open such a space — K. Verlag is committed to doing that.

Witnessing how the conditions of a democratic, equitable society are undermined by neoliberal and increasingly proto-fascist austerity systems makes it even more important to create minor spaces that can play host to a more positive future — an ideal "world of many worlds" for both humans and other-than-humans. With the *intercalations: paginated exhibition* series,

which was commissioned by the Haus der Kulturen der Welt's Anthropocene Project, we contributed to this ideal. The fifth volume, *Decapitated Economies* (2021), gathers reflections on surviving and flourishing in the ruins of traditional regimes of power and political economy. Among others, Chilean artist Elisa Balmaceda and Spanish ecofeminist Yayo Herrero López assay notions of the "sacrificial" and the "sacred" against the background of nature's cyclical rhythms, in a conversation borne of the recent political protests in Chile and the canceled COP25 Climate Summit. Steve Rowell and Priyanka Basu have a harrowing photo essay about the agricultural chemical fallout along the Mississippi River, and philosopher Nina Power contributes an essay on the psychological dimensions of contemporary politics, with a focus on the polarized emotions of love and hate as political forces.

CW: When collaborating with editors, writers, and artists on the production of "texts," I tend to come at the collaboration from the perspective of the reader. While this perspective is always present within written and visual traditions, it feels like sometimes this viewpoint gets lost. For my part, a central way to address this has been through the conceptualization, design, and development of new publishing systems. These systems attempt to work backwards from form and framework — which is where the reader encounters the "text" — to the act of writing and editing, with the aim of reconfiguring the sensibilities of both the writer and the reader. Sometimes they successfully achieve this, sometimes perhaps they do not.

 These experimental frameworks can draw attention to the characteristics of contemporaneous reading environments, and simultaneously draw a connection to older forms. The elements that a "text" is composed of, from the paragraph to other structural divisions and devices used in organizing a publication — a codex, a magazine, a tweet — are not natural.[28] These systems can be defined as "physical and cognitive architectures," as Bonnie Mak does in her transdisciplinary study *How the Page Matters* (2011).[29] The degree to which these elements condition thought, whether positively or negatively, is highly situational, which is to say that it is greatly affected by the time and place of the writing/reading of a "text."

 Clearly, the divergence between the screen and the printed object is more obvious than in the case of digital publications.

With the latter, the site of conception, production, and reading is synchronic. But unless you are self-publishing a blog, there is still a high degree of dissimilitude between where a work is typically conceived, written, and edited (document editing software, email, etc.), and the format in which that work is encountered by a reader. This is especially true with the work we've done at Triple Canopy, which has involved making four different "content presentation frameworks," all of which lay out text and media in a horizontally scrolling environment. As noted previously, this was an attempt to "slow down the internet" by providing a reading environment distinct from the endless scroll.

AS: If we assume that a text must eventually be finished, as editors we are indeed extravagant readers, collaborative interlocutors, and generous enthusiasts. What you said also reminds me of my friend Geraldine Juárez's apt remark: "I search therefore I scroll."[30] Some years ago, web designers began to use the horizontal scroll, and it is interesting to learn more about the conceptual rationale behind this decision for Triple Canopy. A similar desire for defamiliarization was behind our decision to split *Fantasies of the Library* (2015) across the middle of the book and have content run only on verso and recto pages, respectively. Breaking the habitual left—right—left—right page flow of a codex-bound text disturbs the reader-viewer's relationship with reading itself. Denaturalizing our most familiar frameworks is absolutely necessary for cultural renewal.

CW: At Triple Canopy, we continue to use the horizontal scroll, at least in desktop environments, in our latest framework called b-ber, which was released in late 2019.[31] It is both a method and an application for producing publications in a variety of formats: EPUB 3, Mobi/KF8, a static website, PDF, or an XML file that can be imported into InDesign for print layouts. All of these formats are generated from a single source of plaintext files and other assets. b-ber also functions as a browser-based EPUB reader, which explains the name. Rather than put the onus of design on the author, my goal was to enable the correspondence between media to be considered from the inception of a work by all involved in the process. b-ber pushes us to understand the publication in terms of infinite existing and potential formats and systems for translating code, rather than as the realization of an ideal and unchanging experience. To put it another way, it would

be impossible to fully account for all of the ways in which a reader might encounter a work, given the array of devices and pixel dimensions, operating systems, and software, not to mention the visual obstructions caused by dust and scratches on our screens.

The challenge for publishers is namely how to think across media and reduce the temptation to pit one format against another, recognizing that no individual channel can ever fully account for how we'd like our readers to encounter and experience what we are publishing. This feels to me like the definition of hospitality. But, given this reality, how can we envisage the many forms and formats, and the encounters they engender, in collaborative publishing in art and literature? How can we publish simultaneously across formats while maintaining the "integrity" of the work? And, importantly, how does the "work" need to change to maintain its integrity across formats?

AS: The folks at *Emergence Magazine*, a publication focusing on the role of the "story," do a fantastic job at relaying their content across multimedia formats, from online publishing of texts to audio recitals of the pieces by their authors, and from video clips to a gorgeous printed anthology encompassing three online issues.[32] Curiously, they explicitly say that the occasional print copy, which is also an experiment in translating online content to paper, is an invitation to *slow down*. All levels of *Emergence Magazine* emphasize sensual experience. While the online platform offers a multisensory, more-than-textual encounter through audio, and still and moving images, the print publication enhances a sense of touch and vision by employing a striking variety of papers and beautiful inks. During the coronavirus pandemic, when the bookshops asked K. to postpone our spring releases, we got inspired by *Emergence Magazine*'s work and modestly began to publish sound files with authors' voices. At the request of our authors, we also, for the first time, released two e-books. Both examples show how publishing as encounter, event, and experience is a matter of careful selection, refrain, and connection — whatever the sphere or medium — with agency both on the creating and the receiving ends.

CW: I recently came across a book I first read in the late 2000s, *My Mother Was a Computer: Digital Subject and Literary Texts* (2005) by N. Katherine Hayles. It was instrumental in helping me think through "publishing." I hadn't thought about this book

in a long time and it should be "out of date" given the rapid
changes in technology and digitization since it was originally
published. Yet, skimming the chapter I recalled most vividly,
"Translating Media," I came across the following passage,
part of which opened our conversation:

> The debates about encoding assume implicitly that there is
> some textual essence that can be transported from print
> to digital media. Even the anti-realist position assumes
> an essence, although now it is an essence created by an
> editor. All three positions elide from electronic texts the
> materiality of books and their physical differences. A more
> accurate perception would focus on the editorial process
> of choice, which is always contextual and driven by "certain
> interests," although these reside not exclusively in the text
> but in the conjunction of text, editorial process, and
> cultural context. In my view, the ontology card is not worth
> playing. There is no Platonic reality of texts. There are only
> physical objects such as books and computers, foci of
> attention, and codes that entrain attention and organize
> material operations. Since no print book can be completely
> encoded into digital media, we should think about
> correspondences rather than ontologies, entraining
> processes rather than isolated objects, and codes moving
> in coordinated fashion across representational media rather
> than mapping one object onto another.[33]

She continues, emphasizing what I think still resonates and
echoing many of my concerns expressed above:

> The issue goes to the heart of what we think a text is, and
> at the heart of the heart is the belief that "work" and "text"
> are immaterial contractions independent of the substrates
> in which they are instantiated. We urgently need to rethink
> this assumption, for as long as it remains intact, efforts to
> account for the specificities of print and electronic media
> will be hamstrung.[34]

This call to action feels more relevant today than when I
originally read it more than a decade ago. As we've touched
upon, our current experience with "representational media"
is characterized by noise, toxicity, and the fragmentation of

attention. One option, as suggested by Cal Newport, and which you referenced earlier, is to "quit social media" and be judicious about how we spend our "digital lives," which appears to be a completely reasonable idea! But that approach is self-driven and individualistic; it doesn't directly impact these frameworks. This point of view is often argued with regards to print publishing — that it offers a refrain from the impact of "continuous partial attention" caused by the contemporary network and its interfaces. It is true that when reading a printed book notifications aren't popping up on the page to distract a reader. But the same could be said of e-readers, which I believe can offer a similar feeling of immersion. This idea collapses different lines of argumentation, some that are extremely valid (concerns about the chaos of our networked environments), with others that have more questionable footings (that reading on a screen fundamentally means a partial level of engagement). An alternative approach would be to challenge these frameworks with new models that facilitate the kinds of absorption and encounters we are trying to achieve.

AS: I completely agree! When speaking about the "pedagogy of concepts," philosopher Isabelle Stengers emphasizes thought as a matter of relay, not representation; that is, as she says, as a matter of "both taking over and handing over."[35] This relates to much of what we've said about publishing as a practice as well, because it underscores the situatedness of experience, encounter, and reciprocity. In this, there is no need to fetishize certain objects or media — we can attend to how each thing actually works. Indeed, what is at stake — especially in this era of post-truth — is less an abstract celebration of essences or facts but rather the careful evaluation of what a particular situation demands. Learning how to pay attention, how to trust, how to doubt, how to listen, how to speculate, connect, fabricate, nurture, inhabit, and, also, how to resist. Publishing is the transmission of relays which can spur and intensify this collective learning process, making it more useful and empowering.

1   Paul Gilroy and Adam Shatz, "The Absurdities of Race," *LRB Conversations*, August 2020, lrb.co.uk/podcasts-and-videos /podcasts/lrb-conversations /the-absurdities-of-race.

2   A Public Library was not a public library; it was a space for conversations, presentations, the sharing of resources, and for collective reading, viewing, and learning, working in conjunction

with The Public School Berlin. See: apubliclibrary.org/about.

3 THE THING was founded in New York in 1991 by artist Wolfgang Staehle as a bulletin board system (BBS). "Over the last two decades, THE THING has played a seminal role not just in fostering a generation of network-oriented activists, artists, critics, and curators, but also — and equally important — searching out ways to interconnect their diverse interests and activities. It is no exaggeration to say that the list of people and projects THE THING has supported comprises a who's who of contemporary electronic culture." For more information, see: the.thing.net/about/about.html.

4 Anna-Sophie Springer, "Volumes: The Book as Exhibition," *C Magazine* 116 (December 2012): 36–44.

5 Mark von Schlegell, *Realometer* (Berlin: Merve Verlag, 2009); Nina Power, *Die eindimensionale Frau* (Berlin: Merve Verlag, 2011).

6 The fact that bookshops were counted as *systemrelevant* during pandemic lockdowns here in Germany is a nice proof that valuing the printed book isn't a question of mere "species nostalgia." On that notion, see: Joanna Zylinska in conversation with Anna-Sophie Springer and Etienne Turpin, "The Ethics of the Book (Beyond Species Nostalgia)," in *Fantasies of the Library*, ed. Anna-Sophie Springer and Etienne Turpin (Berlin: K. Verlag and Haus der Kulturen der Welt, 2015), 112–130.

7 Anna-Sophie Springer and Etienne Turpin, "The Exhibition as a Philosophical Problem," *Graz Architecture Magazine* 14: "Exhibiting Matters" (June 2018): 135–136.

8 Peter Sloterdijk, "The Elmauer Rede: Rules for the Human Zoo: A Response to the *Letter on Humanism*," *Die Zeit*, 1999; Suhrkamp, 2001; English trans. Mary Varney Rorty (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford Center for Biomedical Ethics, 2009), web.stanford.edu/~mvr2j/docs/Elmauer.pdf.

9 Jason Read, "The Principle of Our Negative Solidarity," *The New Enquiry*, January 24, 2014, thenewinquiry.com/the-principle-of-our-negative-solidarity.

10 "Forging Feminist Futures: An Interview with Alex Martinis Roe," *EuropeNow*, January 16, 2020, europenowjournal.org/2020/01/15/forging-feminist-futures-an-interview-with-alex-martinis-roe.

11 On the socially corrosive role of binary questions (guilt/innocence, good/bad, like/dislike) driving expression on social media, see: Will Davies, "Who Am I Prepared to Kill?," *London Review of Books*, vol. 42, no. 14 (July 30, 2020), lrb.co.uk/the-paper/v42n15/william-davies/who-am-i-prepared-to-kill.

12 See: https://k-verlag.org/books/despite-dispossession-an-activity-book.

13 See: vlb.de and kno-va.de/home.html.

14 Bernard Stiegler, *The Age of Disruption: Technology and Madness in Computational Capitalism* (Cambridge: Polity, 2019).

15 Daniel Boffey and Jennifer Rankin, "EU to Declare a No-Deal Brexit a Major Natural Disaster," *The Guardian*, September 3, 2019, theguardian.com/politics/2019/sep/02/eu-could-declare-no-deal-brexit-as-major-natural-disaster.

16 Bill McKibben, *Falter: Has the Human Game Begun to Play Itself Out?* (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 2019).

17 Cal Newport, *Deep Work: Rules for Focused Success in a Distracted World* (New York: Grand Central Publishing, 2016).

18   Triple Canopy, "Some Assembly Required," March 2, 2013, canopycanopycanopy.com /contents/some_assembly_required.

19   This approach has not necessarily been enacted at Triple Canopy in the ensuing years.

20   See, for example: "Rehearsing Hospitalities," frame-finland.fi /en/2019/08/22/programme -released-gathering-for-rehearsing -hospitalities.

21   On precarity, see: Isabelle Lorey, *State of Insecurity: Government of the Precarious* (London: Verso, 2015); Lynne Segal, *Radical Happiness: Moments of Collective Joy* (London: Verso, 2018).

22   Stefan Wray, "The Electronic Disturbance Theater and Electronic Civil Disobedience," June 17, 1998, thing.net/~rdom /ecd/EDTECD.html.

23   For a partial list of actions, see: thing.net/~rdom/ecd/ecd.html.

24   Behrouz Boochani, *No Friend but the Mountains: Writing from Manus Prison* (Sydney: Picador Australia, 2018).

25   See: adrienne maree brown, "Unthinkable Thoughts: Call-Out-Culture in the Age of COVID-19," adriennemareebrown. net/2020/07/17/unthinkable -thoughts-call-out-culture-in-the -age-of-covid-19. She is also the coeditor (with Walidah Imarisha) of *Octavia's Brood: Science Fiction Stories from Social Justice Movements* (Oakland: AK Press, 2015) and the author of *We Will Not Cancel Us And Other Dreams of Transformative Justice* (Oakland: AK Press, 2020).

26   Richard Seymour, *The Twittering Machine* (London: Indigo Press, 2019), 24.

27   Richard Seymour, "The Machine Always Wins: What Drives Our Addiction to Social Media," *The Guardian*, August 23, 2019, theguardian.com/technology /2019/aug/23/social-media -addiction-gambling.

28   For example, Twitter's original 140-character limit, which persisted until 2016, was based on the limits of text messages put in place by phone companies.

29   Bonnie Mak, *How the Page Matters* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011).

30   Geraldine Juárez, "Intercolonial Technogalactic," in *Reverse Hallucinations in the Archipelago*, ed. Anna-Sophie Springer and Etienne Turpin (Berlin: K. Verlag and Haus der Kulturen der Welt, 2017), 155.

31   For more on b-ber, see: Caleb Waldorf, "Working on Our Thoughts," Triple Canopy, December 17, 2019, canopycanopycanopy.com /contents/working-on-our -thoughts.

32   See: emergencemagazine.org.

33   N. Katherine Hayles, *My Mother Was a Computer: Digital Subjects and Literary Texts* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 97.

34   Ibid.

35   Isabelle Stengers, "Gilles Deleuze's Last Message," recalcitrance.com /deleuzelast.htm#.

Contributor Biographies

Taylor Renee Aldridge is a writer and curator based in Los Angeles. She has organized exhibitions with the Detroit Institute of Arts, Detroit Artist Market, Cranbrook Art Museum, and The Luminary (St. Louis). In 2015, along with art critic Jessica Lynne, she cofounded *ARTS.BLACK*, a journal of art criticism for Black perspectives. Her writing has appeared in *Artforum*, *The Art Newspaper*, *Art21*, *ARTNews*, *Canadian Art*, *Contemporary And*, *Detroit Metro Times*, *Hyperallergic*, and San Francisco Museum of Modern Art's *Open Space*.

Lizzie Boon is a writer, archivist, and designer living and working on unceded Wurundjeri Country in Australia. Her practice focuses on performative and expanded perceptual possibilities of archives. She is the registrar and curatorial assistant at Negative Press. Lizzie has a Bachelor of Art History and Curating from Monash University (2018), and is currently studying psychology at Deakin University.

Kalia Brooks Nelson is the Mellon Project Director in the African American and African Diaspora Studies Department (AAADS) at Columbia University. She is a curator, arts administrator, and educator with a focus on developing exhibitions, programming, strategic planning, and curricula for organizations working at the intersection of art and education. Her academic research covers late nineteenth-century through contemporary art with an emphasis on emergent technologies and African American, transatlantic, and diasporic cultures of the Americas. Brooks Nelson holds a PhD in Aesthetics and Art Theory from the Institute for Doctoral Studies in the Visual Arts (IDSVA). She is coeditor of *Women and Migration: Responses in Art and History* (Open Book Publishers, 2019). She has served as a consulting curator with the City of New York through the Department of Cultural Affairs, and is currently an ex-officio trustee on the Board of the Museum of the City of New York.

Maddee Clark is a Yugambeh writer, editor, and researcher living in Narrm. His work has appeared on SBS and in publications such as *Sydney Review of Books*, *Memo Review*, and *Artlink*.

Justin Clemens has published in a number of genres, including a collection of essays on art, titled *Minimal Domination* (Surpllus, 2011), and a collection of limericks, titled *Limericks, Philosophical and Literary* (Surpllus, 2019). He is an Associate Professor at the University of Melbourne, living and working on the unceded lands of the Kulin Nations.

Ben Eltham is a writer, journalist, and researcher. He writes frequently about Australian culture and politics for *The Guardian*, *Overland*, *Jacobin*, *ArtsHub* and *Sydney Review of Books*. Ben teaches in the Master of Cultural and Creative Industries at Monash University. He lives in Melbourne.

Fayen d'Evie is an artist living in the rural bushlands of unceded Jaara country, Australia, and a lecturer in the Master of Communication Design at RMIT University, Melbourne. She is the founder of independent imprint 3-ply, which approaches artist-led publishing as an experimental, critical, and poetic site. Fayen is a core member of the Society of Visually Impaired Sound Artists (SoVISA), and is on the board of the Australian Centre for Contemporary Art (ACCA).

Dan Fox is a writer, filmmaker, and musician living in New York. He is the author of two books, *Pretentiousness: Why It Matters* (Fitzcarraldo Editions and Coffee House Press, 2016) and *Limbo* (Fitzcarraldo Editions, 2018). In 2021, he was a recipient of an Andy Warhol Foundation Arts Writers Grant.

Maria Fusco is an award-winning Belfast-born writer, working across the registers of fiction, performance, and theoretical writing. She is Chair of Interdisciplinary Writing at the University of Dundee, previously Director of Art

Writing at Goldsmiths. Her texts are published internationally and translated into ten languages. Her latest books are *Give Up Art* (New Documents, 2018), collected critical writings of which Lisa Robertson has said "Fusco's scintillating mobility invites us to savour a new kind of critical empathy," and *Legend of the Necessary Dreamer* (Vanguard Editions, 2017), an ambient novella described by Chris Kraus as "a new classic of female philosophical writing."

Sarah Gory is a writer, editor, and publisher living on unceded Kulin Nation lands. She works collaboratively with individuals and organizations across the arts sector, with a particular interest in the intersection of narrative and critical writing. Sarah is a PhD candidate at the University of Melbourne and the cofounder, with Paul Mylecharane, of radical imprint Common Room.

Boris Groys is Professor in the Faculty of Arts and Science, New York University, and Professor of Philosophy and Art History, European Graduate Center, Saas-Fee, Switzerland. He is the author of the books *Art Power* (MIT Press, 2008), *An Introduction to Antiphilosophy* (Verso, 2012), *Under Suspicion: A Phenomenology of Media* (Columbia University Press, 2012), *On the New* (Verso, 2014), *In the Flow* (Verso, 2016), and *Logic of the Collection* (Sternberg Press, 2021), and editor of *Russian Cosmism* (MIT Press, 2018).

Brad Haylock is a designer, publisher, and academic who lives and works on the unceded lands of the people of the Woi wurrung and Boon wurrung language groups of the eastern Kulin Nations. He is an Associate Professor in the School of Design at RMIT University, and he is founder of Surpllus, a publishing house that focuses on critical and speculative practices across art, design, and theory. He has recently coedited *Distributed* (Open Editions, 2018) and *One and Many Mirrors: Perspectives on Graphic Design Education* (Occasional Papers, 2020). His curatorial work includes major exhibitions of the work of Experimental Jetset and Metahaven.

Hou Hanru is a curator, critic, and prolific writer based in Paris and currently in Rome, where he has been Artistic Director of MAXXI, Italy's National Museum of 21st Century Arts, since 2013. Born in Guangzhou, China, Hou graduated from the Central Academy of Fine Arts in Beijing and moved to Paris in 1990. After sixteen years working as an independent curator and critic, he moved to the US and worked in several positions at the San Francisco Art Institute, until 2012. During the course of his career, he has curated and co-curated more than one hundred exhibitions at leading institutions and events around the world. Hou consults for and advises numerous cultural institutions, serves on arts juries, lectures at international institutions, guest edits art journals, and is the author of many articles and books, most recently *Curatorial Challenges: Correspondences between Hou Hanru and Hans-Ulrich Obrist* (2013). A consulting curator for New York's Guggenheim Museum since 2015, he is also a founding member of Guggenheim's Asian Art Council, a curatorial think tank.

Paul James is Professor of Globalization and Cultural Diversity in the Institute for Culture and Society at Western Sydney University. He is author or editor of over thirty books, including *Globalization Matters: Engaging the Global in Unsettled Times* (with Manfred Steger, Cambridge University Press, 2019) and *Globalism, Nationalism, Tribalism* (Sage, 2006). He is Scientific Advisor to the Mayor of Berlin and a Metropolis Ambassador of Urban Innovation.

Flavin Judd is Artistic Director of Judd Foundation. He has designed spaces in the United States and Europe and has written for exhibition catalogues and other publications. He is codesigner and coeditor of the recent publications *Donald Judd Writings* (2016), *Donald Judd Interviews* (2019), and *Donald Judd Spaces* (2020).

Sara Kaaman, Jessica Gysel & Katja Mater are editors of *Girls Like Us*, a feminist, queer publication that has been continuously changing and morphing (originally founded in 2005 and reformed

in 2010). Since 2012, the magazine has published on the intentionally impossibly broad themes of WORK, PLAY, SECRETS, BODY, FAMILY, FUTURE, DANCE, ECONOMY, and BIOGRAPHY. The magazine has been collectively edited, the editorials collectively written.

Bella Li is the author of two hybrid books of poetry and art: *Argosy* (Vagabond Press, 2017), which won the Victorian Premier's Literary Award for Poetry and the Kenneth Slessor Prize, and *Lost Lake* (Vagabond Press, 2018), which was shortlisted for the Queensland Literary Award for Poetry. Her writing and artwork have been published in journals and anthologies including *Best Australian Poems*, *Australian Book Review*, *Archives of American Art Journal*, and *The Kenyon Review*. She holds a PhD from the University of Melbourne and lives and works on the unceded lands of the Kulin Nations.

Freek Lomme is the founding director of publisher and public gallery Onomatopee Projects but he also curates elsewhere at times, writes about art and culture, writes and performs poetry, lectures, and does more of the kinds of things fitting this profile.

Jessica Lynne is a writer and art critic. She is a founding editor of *ARTS.BLACK*, an online journal of art criticism from Black perspectives. Her writing has been featured in publications such as *Aperture*, *Art in America*, *Frieze*, *The Nation*, and elsewhere. She was the recipient of a 2020 Research and Development Grant from the Graham Foundation for Advanced Studies in the Fine Arts and a 2020 Andy Warhol Foundation Arts Writers Grant. Jessica lives and works in coastal Virginia.

Rachel Marsden is a curator and arts writer researching cultural translation, artistic and curatorial practices in China and the Asia-Pacific, and methodologies of radical care. She has a practice-led PhD in transcultural curating from the Centre for Chinese Visual Arts (CCVA), Birmingham City University. As an educator, Rachel is interested in practice-based research through writing and publishing, and

inclusive pedagogies. Currently based in the UK, she is a lecturer in practice-based research at University of the Arts London (UAL), Governing Board Member for China Residencies (USA/China), and a member of the International Association of Arts Critics (AICA).

Nikos Papastergiadis is the Director of the Research Unit for Public Cultures at the University of Melbourne. His most recent books include *On Art and Friendship* (Surpllus, 2020) and *Museums of the Commons* (Routledge, 2020).

Megan Patty is Head of Publications at the National Gallery of Victoria (NGV), Melbourne, and is founding curator of the Melbourne Art Book Fair. She lives and works on the unceded lands of the people of the Woi wurrung and Boon wurrung language groups of the eastern Kulin Nations. She has edited numerous NGV publications including *Some Posters from the NGV* (2017), *NGV Triennial* (2017), *The Centre: On Art & Urbanism in China* (2019), *She Persists: Perspectives on Women in Art & Design* (2020), and *After The Australian Ugliness* (2021). Her curatorial projects span publishing and graphic design, and include major exhibitions of the work of Experimental Jetset and Metahaven. She is a PhD candidate in the School of Architecture and Urban Design at RMIT University.

Barry Schwabsky is art critic for *The Nation* and coeditor of international reviews at *Artforum*. He has taught at Yale University, Goldsmiths College, and the Maryland Institute College of Art, among others, and is codirector of the Saas-Fee Summer Institute of Art. His books include *The Observer Effect: On Contemporary Painting* (Sternberg Press, 2019) and *Gillian Carnegie* (Lund Humphries, 2020) as well as several collections of poetry. He lives in New York.

Anna-Sophie Springer is an exhibition maker, writer, editor, and publisher. Since 2011, she has directed the boutique publishing atelier K. Verlag in Berlin, advancing new forms of the "book-as-exhibition." In her research-based

practice, Anna-Sophie works with cultural and scientific archives and collections to produce post-disciplinary ecologies of attention and care. She completed her Master of Arts in Contemporary Art Theory at the Visual Cultures Department at Goldsmiths (2007) and in Curatorial Studies at the Academy of Visual Arts Leipzig (2013). In 2014, she was the Craig-Kade Visiting Scholar at Rutgers University, New Jersey. From 2016 to 2019, she was a Visiting Lecturer at the Art Institute, Fachhochschule Nordwestschweiz (FHNW), Basel. In 2020, she received a Deutscher Verlagspreis (German Publishing Prize) for K. Verlag.

Astrid Vorstermans studied art history and worked in various jobs as a publisher, editor, and bookseller, as well as in international book distribution. In 2003 she launched Valiz, a publisher and cultural agency that traces and reacts to developments in contemporary art, architecture, and design in a broad and inventive way. Under the Valiz umbrella, she works with a large network of numerous other professionals in the arts and theory.

Caleb Waldorf is an artist currently living in Berlin. His practice operates at the intersection of publication, pedagogy, and technology, with a focus on designing, developing, and maintaining on- and offline collaborative systems. In 2007, he cofounded and is currently the creative director of the publication platform Triple Canopy. Since 2008, he has served on the committee for The Public School, an open framework for self-organized learning. Waldorf received a Master of Fine Arts in Visual Arts from the University of California, San Diego.