CHAPTER 2: GOGOGOZO: THE MAGIC OF PLAYFUL MAPPING MOMENTS

SYBILL LAMMES, CHRIS PERKINS AND CLANCY WILMOTT

In their conclusion of *Rethinking Maps*, Dodge, Perkins and Kitchin\(^1\) described three heuristic devices which could be used to better understand performative and ethnographic aspects of mapping: *modes, moments and methods*. Given the project of this book – to undertake a study of *playful* mapping – these three frames offer a useful entry-point into thinking about the relations between mapping and play. Conceptual relationships were outlined in the introduction of this book – especially in terms of playful mapping modes in the digital age – but implications of threading this theoretical framework through the design, outlay and analysis of playful mapping activities, play out through empirical exercises. How might notions of moments, as proposed in the mapping manifesto\(^2\) work in case evidence, as practice unfolds in the playfield?

In this chapter, we focus on a case study of playful pedagogic mapping exercises, designed by the authors, undertaken annually with students on a field course on the island of Gozo from 2012-2016. Much of this field course focused on interdisciplinary encounters in the field, mediated by playful mapping methodologies in which groups and individuals engaged specific playful mapping modes, as a strategy for addressing different chosen themes. It reveals the extent to which mappers can shape their assemblages and networks through play – and whether this can be a productive way of encouraging students to become critical and reflexive thinkers. The mode that we devised as a team was specifically designed for learning in a field-based environment (with the particularities of Gozo in mind), using playful encounters with space, place and culture to stimulate flow, ingenuity and creativity. Play offers interesting ways to inspire informal learning\(^3\), not only in situations with younger children, but also encouraging creative engagement for adult learners across a variety of contexts.\(^4\) Playful activities underscore the role of students as active participants in learning, by giving them greater agency to explore and improvise, whilst lecturers or teachers take on roles of guiders, facilitators or mediators. These kinds of learning activities also reframe ‘play’ from a uniquely entertainment-based activity, to becoming a valuable exercise in engaging
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more ‘serious’ social issues. This potential is increasingly recognized and witnessed by the recent surge in popularity of citizen science games, political games and games for change\(^5\). Through encouraging creativity and collaboration, games and playful activities have the potential to engage and encourage problem-solving in ways that are especially empowering and accessible, to a generation of digital natives.\(^6\)

The series of playful mapping activities designed for Gozo was grounded in this potential. During the ten day field course program students participated in various playful learning experiences. These ranged from a hybrid locative game designed to facilitate teamwork and island knowledge\(^7\), to a competitive geocache, and more experiential sensory activities, including a smell walk (curated by smell-designer and researcher Kate McLean). In addition board games with island themes were played in the evening, and a playful presentation and game jam were held at the end of the course. Each playful activity fed into broader ludic and pedagogical outcomes of the course – which were then reviewed and fed into the next year in an iterative design process.

Of course, this meant that the exercise changed from year to year, in addition to differences that emerged from the social mix of new cohorts of students becoming involved. In 2012 we started with a comparative exercise between explorative and competitive play where students from a single discipline – human geography – were asked to undertake the exercise in two parts. The first part, a dérive, was inspired by the ambulations of the Situationist International (Sadler 1998) and required students to explore the island and a chosen theme through chance, encounter and detour – points were awarded for completing tasks in new and interesting ways. The second part was structured as a kind of competitive treasure hunt, where students were asked to go and collect data pertaining to their chosen theme and rush towards a final meeting location – points were awarded for speed, the collection of the data (rather than its qualities), and for being the first group to arrive at the final destination. The next year, the course involved students from five different European universities (Manchester, Utrecht, Olomouc, Warwick, and Malta) and from diverse (inter)disciplinary and cultural backgrounds. Due to the expanded course, and interdisciplinary nature of the groups, the competitive part was dropped and the dérive was implemented alongside two other exercises: a hybrid geo-locative game (helped by the skills of our colleagues Jirka Pánek, Lukáš Marek and Vít Pászto) using WhereIGo (www.whereigo.com).\(^8\) This gave students direct instructions when they approached particular zones on the island, with a view to encouraging methodological diversity and place knowledge, In addition a smell mapping workshop was run by olfactory designer-researcher Kate McLean using her smell walking exercises.

\(^{5}\) Kate McLean, ‘Smellmap: Amsterdam—Olfactory Art & Smell Visualisation’, Leonardo, 8 (January), 2016.


\(^{7}\) Jirka Pánek, Alex Gekker, Sam Hind, Jana Wendler, Chris Perkins and Sybille Lammes. ‘Encountering Place: Location-Based Games in Interdisciplinary Education’, Cartographic Journal, in review 2016.

\(^{8}\) Jirka Pánek, Alex Gekker, Sam Hind, Jana Wendler, Chris Perkins and Sybille Lammes. ‘Encountering Place: Location-Based Games in Interdisciplinary Education.’
Although not entirely faithful to the philosophy of the Situationists (students were asked to make each other commands, for instance), the dérive aimed to mold the principles of movement, surprise and detour into interactions with the field, their themes and with digital mapping media, such as GPS-enabled action cams, mobile phones and GPS trackers. The dérive was included as an introductory exercise, aiming to help students familiarize themselves with the island at large, while also allowing them to play, to be critical and to reflect on their assumptions about islandness, the themes, maps and play. Finally, in the most recent iteration, we deviated further from the concept of the dérive, by expanding into broader Situationist literature, in particular drawing on Debord’s earlier notes on the Report on the Construction of Situations\(^9\) than from the Theory of the Dérive.\(^10\) Thus the mapping mode morphed. It was renamed The Situation Game, and was moved towards the end of the program, to help students build on their prior experience in the field. This was also designed to make the exercise more distinct from the more ‘closed’ ambulations enacted during the hybrid mapping game. Instead in the situation game the focus was on mapping and play as modes of research, emerging during the design of complex situations, rather than from dérive-based commands. Furthermore, in doing so, the emphasis of the exercise shifted away from the passive ‘doing’ of play to the role of students in constructively and creatively designing frameworks through which play and mapping could be engaged. During the last time that we ran the course, the smell mapping exercise became part of a broader sensory engagement and contrasted to a sound mapping workshop run by Costantino Oliva, and a kite-mapping workshop run by Pánek, Pászto and Jan Ciupa.

In this chapter, we focus on the thread of Situationist-based exercises as playful mapping modes, and moments – and draw on staff and student experiences of the dérives, and the Situation Game. We choose this subset of the Gozo experience because it offers a particularly rich variety of failures, rhythms, memories and creative engagements enrolled into playful mapping, but also deploy the case as a pedagogic exercise for critical thinking, and method of undertaking research. This chapter reflects on four such collections of moments – not because they are distinct in their occurrence – but because they are typical of the complexities, nuances and possibilities that can be afforded through this kind of work.

**Mapping Moments: Failures, Rhythms, Memories and Creative Engagements**

We discuss here several mapping moments, and highlight how these modes worked to interrupt and critique a variety of different factors during the learning process in the field. Moments are meaningful points in time during everyday mapping practices and this concept offers a useful way of approaching what actually happens during mapping and reflect upon what it means as a practice. Dodge, Perkins and Kitchin\(^11\) suggest possible moments to
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11 Dodge, Martin., Perkins, Chris and Rob Kitchin, ‘Mapping Modes, Methods and Moments: A
analyze in this respect and we deploy four of these to narrate particular mapping and placing stories: ‘places and times of failures’, ‘time–space rhythms of map performance’, ‘the memories of mapping’, and ‘newly creative engagement with mapping practice’ 12. The manner and mode of these moments emerged in ways that depended on spatio-temporal settings, situated experiences and the backgrounds and interpretations of the students involved. Through these moments, we will further substantiate the claim we made in the introductory chapter that playful mapping can usefully be considered as a heterogeneous and situated practice – an event-based assemblage of moments that comes together in productive and unexpected ways to augur a complex and highly interesting set of translations.13

**Moments of Failures: Cheating, Ambiguity and Improvisation**

We approach mapping as a practice that can simultaneously contain Apollonian rationality as well as Dionysian playful excess.14 The realm of Dionysian excess includes failures and messiness to the point where, in practice, failure is ever present in mapping and play.15 Maybe paradoxically, we approached moments of failure in the dérives and Situation Games as having productive didactical potential – because such moments stimulate students to critically improvise, problem-solve and find new approaches through cheating. This, in turn, provides a crucial point of reflection for students – not just about the nature of play and mapping, but also about the way in which they design and undertake research. In other words, when things fell apart, profound moments of academic reflection became possible. We purposefully inscribed the possibility of Dionysian excess into the game, by making the dérives and Situations open-ended, sandbox like, and open to interpretation – allowing room to flow around and destabilize assemblages through critical failures. We also encouraged students designing the dérive commands and the situations to work with a loose assemblage of analogue and digital technologies and to embrace ambiguity and serendipity. Encountering places and times of failures was understood as an important element of playful mapping, and as central to the process of research and design.

Digital technologies augured their own failures. Some groups of students in the 2014 iteration of the game could not get their GPS device to work, and hence had problems tracking and tracing their paths across the island, and so had to rely on other forms of mapping to record their journey. Other groups could not get the 3/4G network to function in places...
where they needed it, and so either saved files, photos and videos and uploaded them later – or, wandered around until they found somewhere with a strong enough signal or a Wi-Fi connection. Other moments of messiness or failure occurred when students did not ‘properly’ understand the commands on the card deck, or the parameters of the situation, or when they deemed the command or the situation to be unsuitable for their current location.

These minor issues often became combined with powerful influential Gozitan geography, particular the concentric model of roads leading inexorably in towards Rabat (or Victoria), and the mirrored pattern of the Gozitan public transport system. Missing the bus meant waiting for another bus, often for long periods of time, or finding alternative ways to complete the command, or construct the situation. These alternatives often involved cheating either through sheer languor or outright defiance. This led to a grouping of situations and dérive commands appearing at the bus station and the park in the center of Rabat.

Figure 2.1 Cheating with Cheating. The Hunting group (2016) receives Situation instructions to return to a place where they had cheated, record themselves cheating again in three different media, and post the data on the Facebook group in order to achieve ‘Likes’. On the third medium – drawing –, the designers of their Situations (Sacred Spaces) comment on the Hunting groups’ failure to engage according to their expectations, underscoring the tensions between design and practice.

Figure 2.2 An Ode to the Bus Station. The Sacred Space group (2016) posts a languid poem to the Facebook group without context or explanation.
So some kinds of encounter became playful moments in each of the years when we ran the game. But these playful moments also generated a kind of fondness for certain places, turning the material contexts into allies (or partners in crime), as seen in the above poem written to the bus station by the Sacred Spaces group (2016). At the time of this piece being posted on the course Facebook group, it was unclear whether this was directly related to the Situation Game, or merely a way of passing the time with a playful distraction. However, a comment on the poem from a member of the Hunting group, about the prevalence of rabbit stew throughout the game, pointed to a particular tension in the intention and interpretation of the Situations. Furthermore, this lead to intergroup conversations – what were they doing, why did they post this, comments on the abysmal quality of the poem etc. Together these moments came together in a pedagogic and collaborative form of critique.

Furthermore, many students improvised to give their instructions a productive meaning through appropriating the spirit of the command or situation to fit their theme, their fitness level, or their preparedness to follow through on the task. In 2014, as part of the first dérive-based exercise, one student in the Gender group refused to follow the command given on the card deck instructing him to get a haircut. The intention behind this was to indicate the gendered nature of personal grooming and salons in general, and to ask the group to consider how this might occur in Gozo through action research. It was also, in some ways, less to do with playful learning and more with playful teasing, since the student in question was particular about his hairdressing choices. Even though the refusal might be considered as a form of cheating, it became a heuristic moment that later became quite significant in the group’s research. Rather than following the instructions, the group decided to reinterpret this command as an instruction to compare the pricing for female and male haircuts and to ask the salon to explain the reasons for this difference. Thus, in later conversations this moment became a crucial point in which students considered gendered space on Gozo, but also reflected on their own embodied gender performativities and how they might shape their research.

Another kind of failure occurred when students lost their way, or got lost, which frequently happened during the dérive-based exercises, but also during the Situations. Again in a paradoxical way, as a playful mapping moment, this proved beneficial to the open-ended learning process engaged by these modes of playful mapping. Detouring is a very powerful principle of a dérive, as it gives participants the possibility to engage with environments in new and unexpected ways and to challenge the hierarchies of movement and flows through space. Furthermore, the dérive is a very powerful example of a situation – one which is constructed to alter or shift the hegemony of the planners’ gaze on the experience of spaces, and one which can also help to critique or contradict the hegemony of the researcher’s gaze on the collection of data or material. Students became lost in space, and in their research (and often in tandem!). Some groups have ended up in distant and unfamiliar parts of the island (from standing on the tops of mountains, to sitting in a village waiting for a bell to sound, to visiting cliffs which serve as a hard edge to Gozo), with no idea why they are there and what they are doing. This could also be considered a mode of failure – of the game structure.

and the outcomes of the exercise – but the process of finding oneself in space and in the research resulted in a greater research clarity, and also increased possibilities that are laid out for students exploring the field.

So failure became a repeating ‘moment’ during iterations of the situations, and the dérive-based games. As these iterations coiled around each other, we began to approach failure – through technological breakage, cheating and ambiguity – as an initially powerful, and then central part of these games. Hence, our rule structure encouraged playing in, and with the map and with mapping, and the productive moments of failure that sometimes emerged sometimes generated most insight into research questions.

**Time–Space Rhythms of Map Performance**

Our case study also demonstrated that failure can have a direct correlation with time-space rhythms of playful mapping. A failure to understand the reason for a command or situation, could, for example, result in stillness, in the period between reading instructions, and subsequently deciding to cheat. By the same token, losing one’s way could bring about an acceleration of movement (e.g. running to the hilltop to get an overview, and regain sense of control in an Apollonian mapping mode). This might also result in repetitive time-space rhythms, such as walking the same track over and over again. Furthermore, as students began to engage more and more with the Facebook group (as international roaming became cheaper, or in 2016, when we provided each group with a Maltese sim card) these time-space rhythms became dispersed across the island. They intersected online, gathering at certain points of waiting (such as the bus station) and shifting and teasing the rhythms of other groups.

Students had to move through diverse terrain and up and downhill. This variety of topographic experience depended greatly on the chosen themes and their interpretations of the commands or situations – and culminated in a diverse range of experiences across a range of different environments. Groups who chose religious or sacred spaces, for instance, moved from exploring the inside of churches in villages, to walking up steep hills in pursuit of Christian iconography, or statues. Groups who chose archaeological, tourism or cultural heritage themes often sped across the island on buses, but also ended up walking along cliffs, through ruins and trying to find Neolithic temples. The group who chose to research hunting on the island, however, primarily ended up in rocky fields high on cliffs at the edges of Gozo. Thus, rhythms varied as well in velocity, acceleration, stillness and the combinations of each. The GPS devices given to students not only recorded coordinates, but also time stamps and elevation. Playing with this information, students were able to create interesting narratives of their experiences and the way in which their data gathered from this space reflected their theme. Due to the nature of the triangulation between distance, elevation and time/speed, this also implied certain ideas about rhythm, the process of moving and island motility. For instance, figure 2.3 is a graph produced by the ‘religion’ group in 2014 and demonstrates the elevation of two religious spaces encountered in their walk. Yet, the relation between speed and going steeply uphill to the Citadel in Rabat, or to the Ġgantija Temples also became a key part of their explanation and their understandings of the site. Representation became an active part of performance.
A similar argument was reiterated by the Sacred Space group in 2016. They were fascinated by the rhythm of walking uphill following the Stations of the Cross, on the hill above Ta’ Pinu. Linking embodied movement with the notion of embodied sacredness, they returned to the site during the Situation Game, filmed themselves walking down the hill and ran the footage backward as a mode of cheating, but also appreciation of the rhythm of moving up the hill.

Additionally, the card decks of the dérives, and the situation cards of The Situation Game, prompted teams to stop and read the commands – resulting in missed buses, lost time and rushing to make it up. The inclusion of other performative elements into their mapping assemblages also critically engaged a diversity of rhythms. For instance, the same ‘gender’ group in 2014 who refused to get their haircut, walked slowly across the town of Rabat with an imaginary pushchair, whilst the Boundary group in 2014 were asked to walk with their legs tied together (see figure 2.4) across a border.
Deploying smartphones and GPS devices, also encouraged students to stop and look at the map rather than walking through the landscape and looking around. This was partially, we think, because their tracks could be displayed on the screens and afforded a particular kind of looking. The technology itself helped them to review the past trajectory of their paths, but also to plot this into the future. This showed how important links were between technology and playful mapping practice, comparably evident in the work of Laurier, Brown and McGregor. 

Memories of Playful Mapping, and Playfully Mapping Memories

The process of co-design also folded the time-spaces and rhythms of mobile mapping together, creating re-iterative circles of reflection, and auguring the construction of memories through material or game-based devices. Co-designing the decks of cards and the situations, was meant to stimulate dialogue between groups, bring some structure into the randomness of the dérive and to enable students to reflect on the process of making and interpreting research designs. It also gave students an opportunity to narrate their playful mapping experiences. The tasks themselves served as moments, and become objects through which dialogue and storytelling (and occasionally argumentation) occurred. As such, tasks not only became playable mapping moments, but also playful mapping memories. Tasks served as heuristics grounded with tagged GPS coordinates, photographs uploaded to the Facebook group, or time-stamped footage. Often, memories became bound with failures or rhythms, auguring the production of mementos, which were shared regardless of whether certain tasks, commands or situations had asked the students to do so. The Food Authenticity group in 2016 in figure 2.5 for example, uploaded an image of themselves eating ‘authentic’ Gozitan food for lunch – a period of lull, and for critical reflection.

Figure 2.5 ‘Local Food for Lunch in the Garden!’: The Food Authenticity group eats lunch next to the bus station in Rabat in 2016.

The notion of memory and the practice of remembering underscored for students how (playful) mapping calls possible futures into being but also fixes events in history and facilitates looking back.\(^\text{18}\) Our pedagogic structures encouraged students to reflect on the dérive or the situations, by recounting their experiences afterwards and situating them in an academic context. Memories of mapping moments were gathered through post-dérive or post-situation conversations, across Facebook pages, and then narrated during group presentations. During these presentations, students deployed many different media-forms, including video shot on GPS-enabled action cameras, photographs taken with their smartphones, GPS tracks, digital mapping and data. They also rearranged, and reconstructed the narratives of these memories by playfully mapping their journeys, showing where their dérive commands or their situations were completed. This had the dual effect of re-engaging with the spatio-temporal process of reflection, but also situating their stories in place and in time. As seen in figure 2.6, places and times are at once pulled into, but also away from their situated relationship with the rest of the research process, as the Borders 2014 group tells the story of their dérive in 2014.

Figure 2.6 Dérive Memories. A memory map of a group enacting a 2014 dérive brings together tracks and dérive stack commands.

The mapping memories that students presented were a powerful part of the learning experience. Recounting events pushed them to look back and encouraged analysis of fieldwork materials. Students sought engagement with themes by designing playful exercises and

interventions, for example in the form of poems, board-games, or performative displays, which made these experiences more accessible and meaningful. Sharing with the audience of other students and teachers, helped them to re-enact field experiences, but also laid down new moments of mapping memories.

Newly Creative Engagements With Mapping Practices

Mapping is increasingly a collaborative, creative and playful pastime, evidenced in the current profusion of map art\(^1\), and in location-based games described in chapter 3, such as *Pokémon GO* or *Zombies, Run!*. To reflect on the powerful potential of designing we also encouraged creative and playful engagement with mapping practice by inviting groups to *make* maps as well as deploying mapping in the field. Creative mapping moments emerged from this process.

One group in 2016 made a multi-mediated reflection on the links between digital and analogue worlds, and between sound and smell, making online and contrasting paper map versions of their experiences.

Figure 2.7 An English Rose. The Identity group in 2016 draws a rose using GPS and the street structure by going ‘a little off-piste’.

Another emerged in 2015 in the form of a performative game about their reflections to drinking cultures on the island, in which other students were enrolled as competing participants. This game encouraged them to move from one conceptual island, to another, across the real seminar space.
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This focus on creativity and enactment brought together mapping memories, multiple rhythms and situated failures together, and focused attention on the frequently messy pragmatics of research, mapping and playing. This pulling together demanded attending to multiple sources, and actions (see figure 2.8).

Figure 2.8 Ta’ Frenc. Students forming a tableau vivant as part of a dérive mapping game (2015).

Figure 2.9 Playing With Mess. The situated, but messy, assemblage of creative remapping during the design of a remapping of experiencing borders in 2014.
Conclusion

Two of the authors recently concluded that ‘playful mapping emerged in the case as a frequently useful ludic activity, deployed to do work but also played out, in situated island encounters, as an active part of a mutable assemblage, that was imagined, made, remade, enacted, and which was never complete’. This situated quality inevitably means that interpreting our own experiences of playful mapping – and the learning outcomes for students – is only part of the overall remit of these experiments on the island of Gozo. The course also encouraged encounters with a real place, with inter-disciplinarity and with the construction and changing and iterative co-production of knowledge. However, the moments highlighted in this chapter suggest that playful mapping in this context is a far more complex tool than initially anticipated, whilst at the same time, producing powerful results that extend beyond the design, intent and to a degree, the research assemblage itself.

Using a case that we have produced, and that is still in production, allows us to trace one process of playful mapping, from inception, through different iterations, as it has been performed, re-performed, interpreted and reinterpreted and structured and restructured in the field. The process of reading and writing about these moments might have a freezing effect, privileging the heurist interpretation of the individual moment over the subjective, fluid and processual knowledge that emerges during field experiences. However, the case of Gozo shows the importance of the relationships between play and mapping – and highlights, the potential for playful mapping to generate novelty in performative and creative ways. It highlights the intersections between theories of playful mapping in design, and the messy process of enactment, which is purposefully and productively disruptive. In practice tensions inevitably characterize this processual disruption. Pedagogic and rule-based structures frequently came up against the potential of open-ended play; different interpretations arose from the diversity of learning styles, teaching styles, field experiences and disciplinary backgrounds; students and facilitators interpreted and engaged with the field in different ways. Quite simply the desire to just have fun sometimes ran up against the need to assess and grade.

It also highlights the limits of analysis. Playful mapping is not something that produces a static outcome in the form of maps, or writing or theoretical insight. As such knowledge is partial and outcomes provisional. As Dodge, Perkins and Kitchin21 foreground in their performative-focus on modes, moments and methods – mapping is about doing and about thinking, processes that do not cease at the end of a field course, or at the completion of a case-study. The moments chosen in this chapter are designed to underscore the fluidity of using playful mapping in the field, while at the same time demonstrating the heterogeneous and personal outcomes that the decisive intertwining of play and mapping augur. The modes deployed during each of the moments show a significant personal investment by students

21 Martin Dodge, Chris Perkins and Rob Kitchin, ‘Mapping Modes, Methods and Moments: A Manifesto for Map Studies’. 
in the field. They were willing to approach and experiment with modes of mapping, and to engage in new ways with a novel pedagogic context that challenged previously taken for granted research methods. This active engagement was a fundamental component to the success of playful mapping as a pedagogical tool. It also showed how researchers and course facilitators can use playful mapping to set out the development of specific learning skills (while leaving critical room for detours, failures and resistance along the way). But the analytical answers are inevitably limited.

Perhaps above all, by situating and exemplifying mapping practice and setting this against conceptual arguments about the relations of mapping and playing we have highlighted the importance of mapping moments and modes as framing devices that can be used to understand the often complex and heavily situated evidence produced as part of playful mapping activities. The role of actually enacting (not just theorizing) playful mapping also informed conceptual understanding. Relations that would otherwise have been difficult to pinpoint, or to describe, erupted in powerfully telling moments. Tensions between pedagogic and rule-based structures sparked against the potential of open-ended play, arising from the diversity of learning styles, teaching styles, field experiences and disciplinary backgrounds. It also emerged in differences between students and facilitators as they interpreted and engaged the field through their experiences, the uneven process of grading and assessment and the desire to just have fun.

Finally, the temporality of playful mapping as a way of learning was also revealed to be thoroughly important in assessing the success of the design and implementation of the course. The strict boundaries around individual games and around the course bled into a hybrid experience of the course impacting not just on student’s knowledge, but also onto their critical outlook of the world around them. Students probably have not changed the way they now encounter the world in everyday experiences – so in that sense the derives and the tasks they performed are likely to be of a limited impact– yet the boundaries of the field course are deeply porous, encouraged, we believe, by the team-building cooperative activities of playful mapping as an experimental mode of learning. In this way, playful mapping emerged in the case as a frequently useful ludic activity, deployed to do work but also played out, in situated island encounters, as an active part of a mutable assemblage, that was imagined, made, remade, enacted, and which was never complete.
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