

(W)ARCHIVES

Materialities of War, Digital Archiving, and Artistic Engagements

Daniela Agostinho, Solveig Gade,

Nanna Bonde Thylstrup, and Kristin Veel

This book explores the changing role of archives in contemporary war, the cultural and political impact of digitization upon the war-archive nexus, and the ways in which the artistic field has responded to these changes. *(W)archives* proposes that in order to understand the rationale of contemporary wars, we need to investigate the increasingly structuring role played by digitization and digital archives within warfare. At the same time, to grasp the changing role of archives in light of digitization, we need to explore the ways in which archives are deployed to an ever-greater extent as technologies of warfare, venues for dissent, and demands for accountability. The book further suggests that the space of artistic production constitutes a fruitful site from which to address and critically engage with the current (w)archival regime. *(W)archives* thus situates the archive as an epistemic structure of war in times of digitization, as well as a practice of critique, opposition, and sensorial-affective response to the consequences of historical and ongoing wars.

Historically, archives have served as technologies of warfare. Building on processes of intelligence gathering, surveillance, and reconnaissance, war archives have been instrumental in identifying an enemy's location, behavior, and anticipated future tactics and strategy. It is through these archival procedures that bodies, territories, and infrastructures come to be selected for targeting, injury, and destruction. In this sense, archives have always been "key technocultural forms" constituting "structures of enmity," as Kevin McSorley reminds us in his chapter in this book. Consequently, war archives have been well guarded by those entrusted with the right to interpret the information they contain. This archival gatekeeping echoes Jacques Derrida's

reflections in his landmark 1995 book *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*, where he reminds us that the Greek noun *archive* initially referred to a house where official documents were filed and guarded by *archons* on whom was bestowed the authority and power to access and interpret the archive's contents.¹ Given this history of archives as locations intimately bound up with the issuing of laws, one might think that they are to be seen as only authoritative within theoretical approaches: as the origin "from which order is given,"² as a "totalizing assemblage,"³ and even as an institution that lays down "the law of what can be said," as Michel Foucault puts it.⁴ However, even given the totalizing, ordering will of archives, they are by no means static or stable institutions that are invulnerable to transformation.⁵ As mid-twentieth-century post-structuralist thought and feminist, queer, postcolonial, and critical archival studies have shown, the archive as a technology, authoritative though it may be, is never immune to internal contradictions or external dissent.⁶ In fact, in post-structuralist and theoretical terms, archives have always been regarded as dynamic and generative of knowledge. In *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (1969), Foucault characterizes archives as constituting a "web of which they [the holders of the archive] are not the masters."⁷ In Derrida's feverish archives there is an "aggression and destruction drive," such that a number of internal attributes subvert archival order from within.⁸ Rather than neutrally storing knowledge, archives produce what can be known through hermeneutic operations of selection, preservation, and modes of permitting (or denying) access, all of which add to archives' dynamism and knowledge-creating nature.⁹

(W)archives mobilizes and expands this extensive body of critical archival thinking to reflect on the changing role of archives as technologies of warfare under conditions of digitization. We take into account the archive as a site of authority and power, as well as inflections of that authority, to consider how current practices of data production, gathering, treatment, and distribution extend—but also profoundly transform—archival regimes of war. In today's connective, digital age, the analogue archives that constituted the source material for previous archive theories are increasingly giving way to ever-growing networked archives of data. Warfare today overlaps with the datafication of everyday life,

through which data is generated and recorded across permanently updating and reconfigurable archives that reach deep into the most intimate spaces and quotidian gestures. This is what Kevin McSorley terms “immanent digital archiving”: practices of data collection that are integral to contemporary living, and within which much of embodied existence is premised on “being-archived,” with racialized populations disproportionately exposed to its most dangerous effects. This immanent digital archiving, which in principle is always at work, everywhere and all the time, fundamentally challenges our understanding of archival time and space.

Not so long ago, growing possibilities for digital connectivity gave rise to the notion that we are all potential contributors to a global (w)archive, as we are able to access, upload, and share digital content on a greater scale and with increasing speed. Particularly in the wake of the Arab uprisings, these possibilities enabled widespread hope in the potential of the digital to create crowdsourced counter-archives that would more fully supplement and challenge the heavily guarded and opaque archives kept by those in power.¹⁰ Palestinian artists Basel Abbas and Ruanne Abou-Rahme, in conversation with Tom Holert, refer to this act of producing and sharing subjective and horizontal archives in terms of a “living common archive” fueled by the multivocal desire for an “archival multitude.”¹¹ At the same time, as they acknowledge, this archival multitude is necessarily entrenched in digital networks, and therefore subject to various sorts of capture. Most of the corporate social media platforms that have allowed a living common archive to take shape lodge this archival multitude in information economies that inflect their liberatory potential and render dissenting subjects and archives vulnerable to various forms of power and control.¹²

Indeed, over the years, numerous disclosures of information, including those by Edward Snowden, Reality Winner, and Brittany Kaiser, have raised public awareness that digital connectivity also creates the opportunity for asymmetrical access to and treatment of information, particularly in the form of blanket surveillance and the algorithmic misuse of data harvested from everyday digital engagements.¹³ This immanent digital archiving further overlaps with an increasing investment in new forms of social network analysis, risk profiling, predictive analytics, machine

learning, and artificial intelligence, all of which strengthen the military and police apparatus. Indeed, the datafication of everyday life is shaped partly by defense funding and military projects that become naturalized and integrated into infrastructures of digitally-connected living, with commercial and military regimes often overlapping with and informing one another. These overlaps make war rationalities ever more integral—even if inconspicuously so—to everyday life.¹⁴

Developments such as these, we argue, have fundamentally changed the materiality of warfare by enfolded the digital into it. In the 2010 preface to her book *Frames of War: When Is Life Grievable?*—written before these mutations became available to public scrutiny—Judith Butler reflected on the visual and discursive dimensions of war and their structuring role in warfare. Within this context, she urged readers to rethink the received terms of materialism in order to understand how cameras work as instruments of war, not only in their capacity to shape public perceptions of the reality of war, but also as actual weapons by virtue of the “operative images” through which violence is inflicted upon populations, for instance in drone warfare.¹⁵ Here Butler issued a call to consider images as part of what she termed an “extended materiality” of war.¹⁶ With *(W)archives* we take up and extend this call to consider how immanent digital archiving has become part of this even more extended materiality. In addition to pointing to how digital archiving has become integral to warfare, we wish to emphasize the very material effects of digital archiving, in order to push back against the idea (prevalent in military discourses) that current war destruction is more precise and less damaging as a result of the growing capacity to extract, process, and act upon information. We thus wish to counter the disappearance of the corporeality of war attempted by military reason, and instead to bring into view the materiality of conducting, experiencing, and living with and under digital warfare. *(W)archives* suggests that this extended materiality of war is composed not only of weapons, information, infrastructures, technologies, and images, but also of bodies, senses, gestures, memories, imaginations, structures of feeling, textures, intimacies, and natural environments. Finally, *(W)archives* emphasizes the materiality of artistic production by foregrounding the various media—from photography to film,

sculpture, bodies, and movement—that artists have engaged with to account for the differentiated experiences of living with and under war.

The book shows that this new digital materiality of war reconfigures the “archival impulses” that have shaped artistic practices over the last decades.¹⁷ In many ways, as Basel Abbas and Ruanne Abou-Rahme note, the interrogation of the archive to which artists have devoted themselves has come alive through the practices of the archival multitude, especially in the ways these new living archives challenge notions of authenticity and the document, and in how they push against the gaps and boundaries of archival regimes of war. At the same time, these digital transformations call for renewed artistic engagements with the challenges posed by the global (w)archive. Throughout this book, artistic practices emerge as potential sites from which to intervene in the epistemological gaps produced by datafied processes, to “make sensuous” what has been abstracted,¹⁸ and to rearticulate the archival promise of witnessing and testimony. In doing so, artistic practices reconfigure what counts as an archive, and imagine new possibilities for social justice from within the aesthetic field.

(W)archives emerged from an international workshop on war, archives, and art organized by Solveig Gade and the Uncertain Archives research group (Daniela Agostinho, Nanna Bonde Thylstrup, and Kristin Veel) at the University of Copenhagen in August 2017, which included presentations by Susan Schuppli, Kevin McSorley, Anders Engberg-Pedersen, Anthony Downey, Mariam Ghani, Nisrine Boukhari, Louise Wolthers, and Sarah Tuck, and the performance of *Probable Title: Zero Probability* (2012) by Hito Steyerl and Rabih Mroué. In commissioning the content for this book, we were deeply inspired by the discussions that took shape during this two-day workshop, which brought together scholars, artists, curators, and cultural practitioners to think through the changing relationship between archiving, war, and artistic production. The contributions to this book explore many of the questions discussed at this event: How do we account for military violence when warfare is increasingly based not only on material acts, but also on imagined futures of wars, brought about by predictive data-driven technologies? How do we demand accountability when the perpetration of violence is diffused along

opaque chains of often automated and privatized commands, as in the case of drone warfare? How do we gauge the credibility of images that claim to represent war and conflict in an era when digital manipulation prevails, and when violent imagery is strategically used to an unprecedented extent to shape the perceptual fields of war-affected populations as well as global spectators? How do we make sense of operative images made by and intended for machines, rather than for the human eye? What is the role of the senses in apprehending and opposing war, at a time when sensing is technologized more than ever? Finally, how do we safely gather, store, and preserve vulnerable and contested information when today's war archives are dispersed across the unstable and uncertain archives of social media?

Guiding the workshop and this book is the conviction that different knowledges and epistemic practices are required to apprehend the mutations of war; that we can look to earlier vocabularies, concepts, and practices to make sense of current developments; and that the contemporary moment calls for sustained critical engagement to offer an account of war that goes beyond its available framings. Such a sustained critical engagement demands new epistemic alliances in order to more capaciously register, respond to, and oppose war. The book thus brings together scholarly and practice-based essays, interviews, roundtable conversations, and visual and written contributions from artists renowned for their long-term work on archives and warfare. In this way, multiple ways to conceive of archives in relation to war come together to problematize different archival usages and potentials. In addition, the book puts different regions and contexts into conversation, including contexts where wars and conflict are currently underway (Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria, Palestine, the Mediterranean Sea) as well as contexts where the opening up of archives of past wars continues to generate pressing effects (particularly Chile and Argentina). While these various contexts are informed by specific political and regional dynamics, we consider that there is much to be gained from examining them in relation to broader technological and material structures pertaining to the extended materiality of war. Moreover, pulling these various contexts into conversation is also crucial to make legible the “imperial formations”¹⁹ that continue to produce

devastating effects on the lives of various populations, as well as transnational alliances between these regions and across times.

The book is divided into four parts, each bringing into view different dimensions of the extended materiality of warfare that we wish to foreground:

- A ARCHIVING WAR Spatiotemporal Reconfigurations
- B THE AESTHETICS OF DRONE FORMATIONS Counter-Archives, Mediations, and Interventions
- C SENSING WAR Technologies, Intimacies, and Bodies
- D EVIDENTIARY AESTHETICS Documenting, Witnessing, Redressing

In the following pages we discuss how these different dimensions testify to the changing nature of war and archives, and we offer an overview of how the contributions in each section shed light on the extending materiality of war.

ARCHIVING WAR Spatiotemporal Reconfigurations

In contemporary warfare, the collecting and archiving of large amounts of data through digital surveillance technologies has led to altered notions of spatiality and temporality. In the nineteenth century, Prussian general and military historian Carl von Clausewitz, informed by the Napoleonic Wars, defined the battle site as “a sector of the total war area which has protected boundaries and so a certain degree of independence.”²⁰ He continued that as being “not just a part of the whole, but a subordinate entity in itself,” the “theater of operations” was affected not directly but only indirectly by events happening elsewhere in the war area.²¹ According to this conceptualization, the theater of operations refers to the spatio-geographical territory where a war event takes place, and where men who are equally willing to put their lives on the line meet face-to-face. At the same time, however, the concept suggests the existence of a plurality of theaters of operations, which all follow their own rules and only indirectly affect one another. Arguably, Clausewitz’s notion reflects above all the wish to project an order of sorts onto the unpredictable and violent

condition of war. Nonetheless, the suggested autonomy of the theater of operations on the ground may serve as an important backdrop against which to pinpoint the ways in which contemporary war takes place across a multiplicity of different sites.

As James Der Derian points out in *Virtuous War* (2001), computer simulation, mediatization, global surveillance, and network-based information technologies are deeply entangled with the battle on the ground in contemporary warfare.²² Indeed, with digital technology permeating all levels of warfare from communications to weapons technologies, the means of *representing* war can almost be collapsed with the means of *waging* war. A case in point is the first Gulf War, often referred to as the video game war. This war is famous for its footage of air raids and so-called precision bombing recorded by cameras aboard US bombers, and its unreal, “virtual” character for global spectators has often been emphasized. By the same token, the Western media’s live transmission of footage during the war, supporting the narrative of surgical strikes and the notion that it was a war without bloodshed, has been foregrounded as a success for the Pentagon and US military.²³ Since then, the phenomenon of image war—the shaping of collective imaginaries through visual, often live representations of war events circulated across various media platforms—has established itself as an increasingly important factor to be reckoned with in today’s warscape.²⁴ In other words, mediatized representations of violent events, and the continuous addition of these representations to the gigantic digital (w)archive, have effectively dissolved the autonomy of the material battle site envisaged by Clausewitz.

More recently, the ability of digital technologies to disrupt spatial as well as temporal constraints has reached new levels with the consolidation of drone warfare. Drone warfare renders obsolete Clausewitz’s notion of war as entailing a face-to-face battle between two bodies putting their lives on the line. As Grégoire Chamayou observes, it may be the notion of the *manhunt*, rather than war, that applies to the profoundly asymmetrical situation where a drone operator seated in a container in Nevada can follow the annihilation of men, women, and children on the other side of the planet in real time.²⁵ For populations subjected to this predatory and radically asymmetrical war, this spatiotemporal reconfiguration means that war has become integral to their

everyday embodied lives: it is constant and everywhere, drawing no distinctions between the battlefield, the home, and other everyday spaces.

In different ways, the contributions in this section investigate how contemporary warfare breaks with the autonomy of Clausewitz's theater of operations and instead unfolds across multiple, deeply entangled sites, ranging from geographical territories to digital and virtual sites. Moreover, the essays shine a light on transformations in the archival rationale of wars and conflict by examining how different technologies have reconfigured the archive as a structure of war.

In "Archives of Enmity and Martial Epistemology," Kevin McSorley explores the ontologies of enmity that are produced in and through new archival practices characterized by ubiquity and automation. These mark a reconfiguration of spatiotemporal relations that result in "discontinuous and open-ended military violence directed across the globe against networked and individual antagonists." Central here is the anticipatory logic of the predatory war, which entails not only the traditional idea that particular suspect communities might become subject to more targeted surveillance, but also that the mass archiving of the lifeworlds of entire populations might lead to the emergence of new forms of knowledge and targets, surfacing currently unknown unknowns. Paving the way for pattern-of-life analyses that may enable military data analytics and algorithms to "connect the dots" in the behavior of those under surveillance, big data is increasingly deployed not only to monitor the present, but also to predict security risks that may emerge in the future. Thus, in data-driven warfare, models of causality give way to a preemptive logic according to which military action is triggered by potential, not-yet emergent future threats.²⁶

In "Event Maps: The Cartographic Archive and Imagined Futures of War," Anders Engberg-Pedersen shows that the historical phenomenon of the war map can indicate how attempts to imagine and thereby control the futures of war have long been key to military tactics. Moving from the astrological chart in Friedrich Schiller's *Wallenstein* (1799) to the topographic map in Leo Tolstoy's *War and Peace* (1869) and thence to the war game in Roberto Bolaño's *The Third Reich* (1989), he outlines how recent developments in computer simulation, and its instantiation in ever more advanced war

games used for military purposes, mark a shift toward increased control over the futures of war, and also toward a widening of the military future and its increasing virtuality.

In the final essay in this section, “The Cerrillos Archive Project: Machines, War, and Nonhuman Rights,” Cristián Gómez-Moya looks at the archival potential of land through a study of the territories of the University of Chile. The essay focuses on a historical event from 1976, when the military dictatorship moved the Faculty of Architecture from the Cerrillos campus, located in a peri-urban industrial zone, to a central area in the city of Santiago, and handed over the campus territory to the Carabineros (the Chilean national police force). As a result of this intervention, of which there is limited documented evidence, around thirty hectares of the Cerrillos plot were lost. Through the Cerrillos Archive Project, Gómez-Moya reads this loss of land as an “archaeological wound,” and approaches the land itself as a document. The Cerrillos Archive Project today seeks to provide an activist counter-archive through the use of drone footage that surveys and recomposes the lost land. In this context, the drone functions as an archival machine that registers the traces in echographic terms, a non-human documentary trace that also activates other forms of human rights. Ultimately, by considering the nonhuman rights of the territory of Cerrillos through drone technology, Gómez-Moya prompts us to think about human rights beyond legal subjects, and to think of archives beyond their recognizable human forms by means of other archival machines.

THE AESTHETICS OF DRONE FORMATIONS

Counter-Archives, Mediations, and Interventions

Within the spatiotemporal reconfigurations charted in the first section, the drone repeatedly emerges as a key vehicle for transformations of the archiving of war. The reorganization of space, time, and lived experience produced by drone warfare is therefore a prime example of the expanded materiality of war that we foreground in *(W)archives*. As Lisa Parks and Caren Kaplan suggest in *Life in the Age of Drone Warfare* (2017), drones are part of extended drone formations, which have wide-ranging material effects: they embody broader cultural imaginaries, drawing upon

and generating particular ways of perceiving the world; they are biopolitical machines that have the potential to alter life in the most material ways; they are sensory and perceptual machines embedded within histories of aerial observation and remote sensing, intensifying colonial aerial practices that have evolved over time; and they interact with embodied difference and affect, generating new racializing and gendering processes, and radically redefining the affective experiences and everyday social realities of populations targeted by drone surveillance.²⁷ Across these different registers, drones produce numerous material effects, across the sky and from the ground up.

Although drones are often referred to as “vision machines” and associated with recent developments in digital technologies, the privileged view from above offered by the drone can be traced back to phenomena such as anchored balloons equipped with telegraph wires, airborne cameras on reconnaissance aircraft, and remote sensing satellites.²⁸ In *Aerial Aftermaths: Wartime from Above* (2017), Caren Kaplan shows the importance of aerial imagery to modern visual culture and its ability to enforce colonial power, demonstrating both the destructive force and the potential for political connection that come with viewing from above.²⁹ As scholars and researchers such as Priya Satia and Madiha Tahir have argued,³⁰ the technological novelty of the drone often obscures these historical continuities—hence Chamayou’s description of the drone as a “weapon of an amnesiac postcolonial violence.”³¹ Yet Kaplan also challenges the notion that the view from above must always entail power and control; she argues that the view from above can also be appropriated by artists and activists to challenge military claims, collect and make visible new data, and draw attention to otherwise obscured experiences on the ground.³² The contributions in this section examine this extended materiality of drone warfare by homing in on the drone’s “techno-aesthetic”³³ dimensions, bringing into view drones’ relationships to imperial histories and biopolitical encroachments, their sensorial and perceptual complexity, and their potential to disrupt power through artistic experimentation.

In “Drones as Big Data Archives: Mimesis and Counter-Archiving in Contemporary Art on Military Drones,” Kathrin Maurer goes beyond the scopic regime of the drone by attending to drones as

“archival machines” implicated in the accumulation and storage of memories, images, experiences, and situations. The chapter turns to theories of mimesis as conceptualized by the Frankfurt School, which she argues can be productive to capture the deterritorializing aspects of drone technology and its archiving modes. Through the notion of mimesis, Maurer foregrounds how artworks that engage with military drones can create counter-archives to the drone “by problematizing its fluid forms of surveillance.” The chapter focuses on two films to examine how the aesthetic production of counter-archives takes shape. First, it suggests that Trevor Paglen’s *Drone Vision* (2010) performs an aesthetic mimesis of the temporality of drone archiving, aligning itself with the perceptual apparatus of the drone in ways that enable threshold moments of critical engagement. The chapter then turns to how Omer Fast’s *5,000 Feet Is the Best* (2011) accentuates the spatial disruptions of drone archives by mimicking them, thus tackling the drone’s unstable spatial orders. As a “form of sensory imitation and enactment,” mimesis emerges as a way of making visible “the drone’s decentralizing and disorienting effects” and thereby foregrounding the vulnerabilities of those targeted by the drone strikes enabled by big data archives.

In “Avian Prophecies and the Techno-Aesthetics of Drone Warfare,” visual artist Heba Y. Amin discusses her ongoing project *The General’s Stork* in conversation with visual culture scholar Anthony Downey. Accompanied by video stills and installation shots from the project, the conversation discusses the relationship between the techno-aesthetic dimension of drones and broader histories of colonial occupation in the Middle East. *The General’s Stork* revolves around a viral media story about a migratory stork to which a tracking device had been attached by Hungarian scientists. The stork was detained and accused of espionage in Egypt in 2013, an episode through which Amin explores the historical conditions of paranoia, and the politics of aerial surveillance from both a bird’s-eye view and remote-controlled drones. Embedded in a vertical power hierarchy, both gazes are associated with airborne technologies used to survey, map, and administer Middle Eastern territories and to fix and produce subjects in a political economy of difference and inequality. With this project, Amin speculatively investigates how conquest from the sky and its

techno-aesthetics are inherently tied to the Greater Middle East, while also speaking to broader issues pertaining to sovereignty and the right to access and interpret information under growing conditions of digital obscurity.

The relationship between the techno-aesthetics of the drone, biopolitical encroachments, and the potential of artistic experimentation to disrupt such techno-political developments is central to “Watched by Drones: Photographic Surveillance in Art, War, and Protest,” a conversation between Svea Braeunert, Sarah Tuck, and Louise Wolthers based on their individual and collaborative curatorial practices on drones. Reflecting on three exhibition projects in the United States, Sweden, Cyprus, and Pakistan, the conversation skillfully navigates numerous questions: the drone as an object to explore the changing ways of defining and describing images in digital culture; the drone’s vertical relationships of power and domination; the use of drones as counter-hegemonic tools to challenge and claim power; the history of photography, colonialism, and visual sovereignty; the relationship between local and global histories, and the possibility of forging solidarity across time and space. Throughout the conversation, Braeunert, Tuck, and Wolthers discuss the contributions of various artists to the critical understanding of drone formations, while also charting new directions for scholarly and curatorial engagement with drone warfare and datafication. Crucially, the conversation foregrounds the ethics of curatorial (re)presentation, the curatorial and institutional responsibility of actively producing and shaping the (w)archive, and the need to tackle the power asymmetries of visibility and invisibility that arise with datafication and the wider sensorium that a technology such as the drone brings forth.

SENSING WAR

Technologies, Intimacies, and Bodies

The relation between war and the senses is central to the third section of the book. In *Frames of War*, Butler suggested that any effort to understand how war is waged and experienced must consider the technologies of war and how they work on the field of the senses. For Butler, the question of the senses is fundamental because war functions as an assault on the human senses—for its

victims and survivors, but also, in a radically different way, for its global spectators. For this reason, she argues, transforming the senses is crucial to “develop an anti-war politics that focuses on the dispossessed and those rendered precarious.”³⁴ Written a decade ago, these reflections emerged at a tipping point for the war sensorium. At the time, Butler’s text was concerned with the perception of wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, how war photography and media reports established the “sensuous parameters of reality itself,” how images recruited publics into the wars waged by US empire, and how these images ultimately rendered non-Western lives ungrievable. These reflections were situated within a specific war sensorium, one mostly defined by a field of human vision delimited by photographic cameras and publics solicited by visual and narrative media discourses. Yet as Butler’s book was being completed, one month after Barack Obama’s election to the US presidency, the “sensuous parameters of reality” were already undergoing decisive transformations that were then perhaps too opaque to discern.³⁵ This period witnessed a new stage in the “forever war,”³⁶ in which the front lines more clearly began to expand into spaces of computation and complex human-machinic assemblages, “beyond the thresholds of human perception and their attendant regimes of publicity.”³⁷ Due in particular to the expansion of the US drone program, these new computational spaces have splintered the frames of war into a complex field of sensors and data signals across the electromagnetic spectrum. While these changes have not entirely replaced but have rather transformed earlier regimes of the perception of war, they prompt a reconsideration of the relationship between war and the senses. How does this new war sensorium challenge the ways in which wars are waged, experienced, and felt? How does it solicit different publics, both ethically and politically? As Susan Schuppli contends, if we are to “to intervene politically in the electronic fields of weaponized data,” we need to bring about new critical vantage points and new decoding practices.”³⁸

The contributions in the third section of *(W)archives* engage with the sensory, phenomenological, and embodied aspects of war to think about questions of distance and proximity to war raised by historical and current archival regimes. Throughout this section, the question of “transforming the senses” to bring

about more capacious ways of registering and accounting for the experience of war beyond predominant (w)archival regimes emerges as crucial. Common to the various essays is the question of how to develop archival and aesthetic strategies to go against prevailing frames of war, and which in turn may help to surface the underlying and different ways in which we are situated in relation to war. As such, the essays in this section also consider how to account for the situated and partial perspectives of those representing and witnessing conflict.

In the essay “Cruel Intimacies,” Daniela Agostinho reflects on the transformations that datafication has brought upon the global war sensorium through the lens of intimacy. The essay contends with the modes of perceptual proximity enabled by datafication, which have led to the emergence of notions such as “distance-intimacy” to refer to the ways in which war is brought up close. In dialogue with Richard Mosse’s video installation *Incoming* (2014–2017) and Solmaz Sharif’s book of poems *LOOK* (2016), Agostinho thinks through the moral, affective, and material intimacies afforded by the global war sensorium through the term “cruel intimacies.” The chapter argues that the proximities enabled by digitization fold global spectators into the (w)archive of violence and conflict through relations of cruel intimacy. These cruel intimacies, she suggests, form the very sensorial-material infrastructure through which global spectators sense, feel, and engage with war. Cruel intimacy thus translates the materialist realization that we are always implicated in—and in relationship with—the suffering of others through everyday engagements with the digital materiality that makes up our networked lives. Finally, the chapter suggests that these cruel intimacies can lay the foundations for conjuring more reparative forms of intimacy in spite of the sensorial solicitations of the global war sensorium. Informed by Tina Campt’s notion of hapticity and Wendy Hui Kyong Chun’s considerations on touch, Agostinho concludes that the cruel intimacies of the global war sensorium may elicit a sensorial transformation toward “haptic intimacies” that bring about more textured affective grammars and ways to tend to one another.

In “*A Probable Female, a Probable Child: Civilian Casualties, Remote Monitoring, and Recognition Work in the Air War against ISIS*,” Sophie Dyer addresses the perceptual and ethical challenges

that remote wars pose to the reporting of civilian casualties. Drawing on her experience as a researcher and advocacy officer at Airwars, a nongovernmental organization that monitors civilian harm claims in conflict zones, Dyer draws attention to the growing importance of remote monitoring projects in the context of the West's increasingly remote and air power-dominated military operations, which tend to underreport harms to civilian populations. Drawing on Christina Sharpe's writings, she proposes the term "mis/seeing" to describe the ways in which civilian casualties go unseen and unrecognized by the Coalition in the war against ISIS, and asks whether remote monitoring can become a practice of seeing and properly recognizing the lives that constantly go unaccounted for. Her chapter shows that remote monitoring has been made possible by the growing archive of documentation by civilians, state militaries, and militants alike—who upload content to the Internet in near real time—and how this documentation can be leveraged to demand accountability. At the same time, Dyer examines the ethical challenges raised by such archives, the relationship between sensed and sensing bodies, and how investigators are positioned in relation to the lives for which these archives are meant to account. In particular, she describes how "remote" translates into a position in which one has a "restricted view" that requires one to rely on others who are more proximate to the violence. As a consequence of this "remote" position, Dyer notes that these monitoring projects also risk reinscribing the detached colonial optics that render killable the very lives these projects seek to record and recognize. In response to such ethical challenges, Dyer proposes imagining a civilian casualty-recording project on explicitly feminist and anticolonial terms, and offers notes toward what such a remote monitoring project might look like.

The question of distance and proximity to sites of violence is also taken up by artist and scholar Oraib Toukan in "(Touring)," where she expands her earlier reflections on "cruel images" to think through the cruelty of capturing and touring tragedy and ruins. Moving through different photographic and filmic scenes, from Mohammad Malas's *Quneitra 74* (1974) to Omar Amiralay's *A Plate of Sardines—or the First Time I Heard of Israel* (1997) and Susan Sontag's *Promised Lands* (1974), Toukan's essay reflects on distance not only as a phenomenological question of detachment

and degrees of separation from a cruel event, but also—and more crucially—in terms of who has the right to capture that cruel event. Toukan thus asks how one can navigate images in a way that allows one to think of “I” and “Other” as more than visual elements, and rather in terms of the prerogative of who has the right to call herself local when representing cruelty.

The following two essays in this section deal with the question of how to represent cruel events through embodied practices, thus opening up the sensoriality of war through the incorporation of voices, bodies, gestures and textures.

In the visual essay “The Subversive Body,” Dutch-Argentinian visual artist Aimée Zito Lema shows installation shots and archival images from a project whose starting point is images of revolutionary and guerrilla movements during the last dictatorship in Argentina, gathered from the Argentinean national archive. The original archive images have been rephotographed to focus primarily on bodily gestures. Close-up and abstracted, the images become traces of physical resistance against political terror. The images are then printed in black and white on large paper that has been shaped and stiffened into a new corpus, the mold for which was the artist’s own body. According to the artist, once paper has taken a certain form, the fiber “remembers” this information, resulting in a sculpture that has a “double memory”: it recalls a shape as well as a historical event. With “The Subversive Body,” Zito Lema investigates bodily memory, the traces that sociopolitical conflicts leave behind, and how to capture those traces beyond documentary inscription. The project thus intimates that the materiality of historical archives might be understood in extended ways to encompass how the human body and different materials register and remember events, thereby gesturing toward more sensuous ways of inscribing, accounting for, and witnessing the experience of war and violence.

Also pursuing the question of how archives can be embodied, in “Archives of the Flesh: Reenacting Memories of Torture” performance artist and scholar Sofie Lebech reflects on her performance piece *This Is for Her* (2017), in which she discusses the relationship between torture and therapy in three parts. In the first part (reproduced in the essay), she reenacts interviews conducted with survivors of torture during Argentina’s Dirty War; the second

part reenacts the Abu Ghraib photos through bodily gestures and language to reflect on the use of torture in armed conflicts; and the third part discusses the effect of therapy on victims of torture and soldiers coming home from war. The performance links these three seemingly disparate events and geographies in order to discuss Denmark's different engagements with and positions on torture. In linking these events, Lebech reflects in turn on her own situatedness, and on the limits and possibilities of narrating and embodying the archives of others. Informed by Rebecca Schneider's ethics of call and response, Lebech prompts us to consider testimony not as an isolated moment in time but as a "durational act." The essay traces testimony as a figure that navigates between the people she interviewed, the script, the performance, and the audience, "and how in each of these instances a new layer of testimony arises, creating a written, spoken, and embodied archive that exists both then and there and here and now." In seeing testimony as a durational event, Lebech proposes to understand moments of violence as something that we continue to witness and that continues to call for account, gesturing toward the need to reconceive the meanings of witnessing to more capaciously register the effects of violence of war across time.

EVIDENTIARY AESTHETICS

Documenting, Witnessing, Redressing

While relying upon the logics of the archive—collecting, interpreting, and circulating streams of archival data—contemporary war practices also pose major challenges to the notion of the archive as a repository of evidentiary documents and to the formation of "witnessing communities."³⁹ While the evidentiary and testimonial status of documents and archival material has never been unproblematic, current warfare practices further complicate archives' potential to demand accountability. Historically, the document has been associated with its indexical, evidentiary function. Assumed to point back toward or even provide a link to reality, documents have been characterized by their authenticating, proof-like quality, and by their ability to confirm that events took place.⁴⁰ This applies particularly to photographic documents, which, as Charles Peirce

famously suggested, have been considered physical traces that index back to reality.⁴¹ However, the “proof of truth” character of the visual document has been decidedly shaken since the latter part of the twentieth century by the emergence of a global visual culture marked by mediatization and digitization. Indeed, within today’s connective, digital mediascape, images are produced, distributed, recontextualized, altered, and recirculated at such dizzying speed and to such an extent that we have almost come to expect them to have been digitally manipulated. Alongside insights gained from post-structuralist critiques of representation, these technological innovations—including the spread of cheap DIY technology for producing and distributing visual and audio documents—have put unprecedented pressure on the notion of indexicality associated with the document.⁴² In addition, the emergence of the aforementioned operative images, produced by and aimed at machines rather than human perception, have further complicated received notions of the evidentiary character of visual documents. As a result of the use of operative images in automated, remote-led warfare, traditional evidentiary images are increasingly rare, which brings forth new “regimes of unaccountability.”⁴³ Consequently, the concept of evidence has been revisited and critically expanded to include virtual imagery production, which is increasingly utilized as evidence where there is none.⁴⁴

While the evidentiary status of documents and materials seems to have become ever more debated, the relation between the archive and prevailing power structures has been equally emphasized. As Eyal Weizman and Thomas Keenan contend, when considering the documents that do make it into the archive and are granted evidentiary status, it is by no means a question of simply stating “what is objectively there.” Instead, the status allotted to documents is heavily dependent on the conditions and political context in which they are embedded. Positioning themselves against prevailing “police forensic practices,” Weizman and Keenan have proposed the concept of *forensis* or *counter-forensics*. While the former could be said to rest on a notion of the ability of facts and evidence to provide a scientifically approved account of truth, as it were, the latter pays just as much attention to the nontransparent processes and the conditions that determine, for instance, whether something in the courtroom is

or is not assigned the status of evidence.⁴⁵ As Weizman phrases it: “Forensis [...] introduces both the production of evidence and the querying of the practice of evidence making.”⁴⁶

Investigating, probing, and challenging processes of evidence making amounts to challenging the laws of the archive, and in turn, the ways in which history is preserved and handed over to posterity. This point echoes Derrida’s *Archive Fever* once again, where he reminds us that the archive is, in fact, not so much of the past as of the future: “The question of the archive is not the question of a concept dealing with the past that might already be at our disposal or not at our disposal [...]. It is a question of the future, the question of the future itself.”⁴⁷

The contributions in the last section of (*W*)*archives* all grapple with the vexed question of evidence and of how to take responsible action for tomorrow by claiming the right to access, build, challenge, reinvent, and interpret the archive. A revised version of a previously published essay, Ariella Azoulay’s “The Imperial Condition of Photography in Palestine: Archives, Looting, and the Figure of the Infiltrator” approaches the archive as a place of imperial violence, a site where documents of the past are neutralized and naturalized, thereby making history seem inevitable. She is particularly interested in the performative—and very real—effects of the archive’s categories and taxonomies, that is, in how documents can work to violently manufacture material worlds. Refusing to accept the address of imperial archives—specifically the logics and categories according to which the Palestinians’ expulsion in 1948 was documented by not only the Israeli state but also the international community—Azoulay sets out to enter the archive with a Palestinian companion. The companion is an elderly Palestinian man whom she encountered in the archive, in a photograph that shows him sitting down and refusing to leave his home, even though the state of Israel commanded him to do so voluntarily. Rather than adopting the categories with which he has been labeled—“infiltrator,” “refugee”—as *evidence* of a certain identity or behavior, Azoulay insists on investigating the *conditions* for the fabrication of those categories. Furthermore, the essay relates to the categories and taxonomies of the imperial Israeli archive, as well the ongoing looting of Palestinian archives, not merely as a violation of Palestinian property and rights,

but also as a continuous performance of national sovereignty. Performed as an ongoing project of the partition of populations into distinct, differentiated groups, Azoulay contends, sovereignty makes violence between the two groups both the pretext and the effect. In a new addition to the essay, she focuses on the Great March of Return, a series of demonstrations that took place in the Gaza Strip during 2018 and 2019, when thousands of demonstrators demanded that Palestinian refugees be allowed to return to the lands from which they were displaced in 1948. By connecting the march to the figure of the archive, Azoulay's analysis makes clear how the challenging of imperial documents and categories may make the past liquid, as it were, and allow a radically different imagining of the future.

In "Necropolis: Walking through a List of Deaths," choreographer and performer Arkadi Zaidēs offers insight into the research and working process behind his stage project *Necropolis* (2019–). Acclaimed for his investigations and transformations of archives of violence into what he terms "documentary choreographies," Zaidēs has dealt consistently with the ways in which political and social contexts affect bodily movements and gestures. In the artistic research project *Necropolis*, he turns to Europe's current so-called refugee crisis (or as he suggests, following Gurminder K. Bhambra, "crisis for refugees"⁴⁸) to explore—together with his team of collaborators—the notion of collective responsibility. In his essay, Zaidēs accounts for the hybrid methodology developed by the project, which consists partly of a documentary and investigative approach inspired by the expanded practices of forensics, represented by Forensic Architecture mentioned above, and partly of a physical choreographic investigation. The project takes its point of departure in a list (carefully assembled by the organization UNITED for Intercultural Action) of the many thousands who have perished on their way to Europe. Referring to the list as both "a digital archive" and a "mass grave of evidence," *Necropolis* sets out to acknowledge and account for the dead by digitally locating and marking their burial sites, subsequently visiting them in person to pay last respects. As its title indicates, the project at the same time gestures toward a city of the dead, an invisible community or ghostly double that continues to haunt and demand a response from the world of the living.

In “Forensic (Im)probabilities: Entering Schrödinger’s Box with Rabih Mroué and Hito Steyerl,” Solveig Gade is preoccupied with the notion of evidence as it is formulated in several art theory discourses informed by the concept of forensics. Contesting the often surprisingly positivist take on the concept of evidence, and pointing to the danger in some discourses of reducing documentary works to unambiguous showgrounds for the presentation of equally unambiguous evidence and “truth-telling,” Gade turns to Hito Steyerl and Rabih Mroué’s lecture performance *Probable Title: Zero Probability*. Engaging with persons that have gone missing in war or conflict and been left unaccounted for by official archives, the lecture performance argues that the missing inhabit “a space of zero probability.” This space is able to swallow “all sorts of objects. Whole buildings and even whole landscapes. Lots of people have disappeared into this space, which is just slightly beyond the edges of representation.”⁴⁹ Entering the work through an approach that could be described as a combination of the forensic and the hauntological, Gade is interested in how the notion of evidence can be read not just as a “proof of truth” that points objectively to reality, but rather as a testament to the political conditions—and in a broader sense, the distribution of the sensible—that determine when something is allotted the status of evidence and when it is not. Furthermore, she argues that unlike supposedly objective facts modeled according to the prevailing distribution of the sensible, uncertainty and improbability may contain a critical potential that can challenge and make us rethink the framings through which we perceive reality.

In the last essay in the book, “*Transitional What? Perspectives from Syrian Videographers on YouTube Takedowns and the ‘Video as Evidence’ Ecology*,” media scholar Dima Saber examines the stakes of the increasing reliance on corporate social media platforms such as YouTube to store and preserve documentation and evidence of human rights violations, particularly from the war in Syria.⁵⁰ Such documentation is often removed by these platforms for various reasons pertaining to their content moderation policies, putting at risk important evidence-gathering efforts. In her essay, Saber makes a case for including the Syrian videographers themselves in discussions about the value of their documentation of the uprising and war. Drawing on interviews with fifteen visual content creators

based both inside and outside of Syria, she argues that while Western-based legal, intergovernmental policy and human rights stakeholders mourned YouTube's removals of videos of the Syrian war with reference to concepts such as "postwar accountability" and "video as evidence of human rights violations," the videographers themselves (particularly those still based in Syria) did not necessarily identify with those notions. Rather, what was valuable to them was that these materials allowed them to bear witness to the experiences of their people in community-centered, affective, and personal ways. While making clear the limitations of relying on social media platforms to preserve crucial evidence of wars and conflicts, Saber's analysis also highlights that it is vital to take account of the desires and needs of those who produce such content in the first place within ongoing and emerging efforts to create sustainable archives of war. Without their input, she argues, there will be no hope for transitional justice, or for postwar accountability.

Guided by the archive as a conceptual prism, material object, and imaginative practice, *(W)archives* thus seeks to shed light on and help us better understand the increasingly structuring role played by digitization and digital archives in contemporary warfare. Throughout the book, the (w)archive emerges as a term to grasp the extended materiality of contemporary war, wherein immanent digital archiving, as a structuring condition, intersects with images, bodies, senses, infrastructures, environments, imaginaries, memories, textures, emotions, and structures of feeling. By foregrounding this extended materiality, our hope is to capture the material effects of digital archiving, but also to more clearly reposition archives as sites for making political demands, to invent new forms of evidence-making, and to make sensuous the experience of living with war. These are urgent questions which, we argue, call for new epistemic alliances to more capaciously register, account for, and oppose war. If we are to make sense of and respond to the current era of warfare, we need to be able to navigate between different and constantly shifting perspectives, forms of knowledge, and epistemic practices. We are grateful to the authors for trusting us to edit their work and for advancing our understanding of the materialities of war in such generative and enriching ways.

1. Jacques Derrida, *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*, trans. Eric Prenowitz (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 36.
2. *Ibid.*, 1.
3. *Ibid.*, 77.
4. Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith (New York: Vintage, 2007), 4.
5. According to Annie Ring, Foucault's writings present an especially dynamic vision of the archive, stemming from what he saw as "an an-archic energy that pushes out from the lives that [the archive] ostensibly governed." Annie Ring, "The (W)hole in the Archive," *Paragraph* 37, no. 1 (2014): 387-402.
6. For an overview of these various theoretical contributions to a critical understanding of archives in digital times, see Nanna Bonde Thylstrup, Daniela Agostinho, Catherine D'Ignazio, Annie Ring, and Kristin Veel, "Big Data as Uncertain Archives," in *Uncertain Archives: Critical Keywords for Big Data*, ed. Nanna Bonde Thylstrup, Daniela Agostinho, Catherine D'Ignazio, Annie Ring, and Kristin Veel (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2021), 5-8.
7. Foucault, *Archaeology of Knowledge*, 143.
8. Derrida, *Archive Fever*, 19.
9. Thylstrup et al., "Big Data as Uncertain Archives," 5-8.
10. See Anthony Downey, *Dissonant Archives: Contemporary Visual Culture and Contested Narratives in the Middle East* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2015).
11. Basel Abbas and Ruanne Abou-Rahme, "The Archival Multitude," *Journal of Visual Culture* 12, no. 3 (2013): 345-63, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470412913502031>.
12. See also Donatella Della Ratta, Kay Dickinson, and Sune Haugbolle, eds., *The Arab Archive: Mediated Memories and Digital Flows* (Amsterdam: Institute of Network Cultures, 2020); and Dima Saber and Paul Long, "'I Will Not Leave, My Freedom Is More Precious than My Blood': From Affect to Precarity: Crowd-Sourced Citizen Archives as Memories of the Syrian War," *Archives and Records*, 38, no. 1 (2017): 80-99.
13. On the politics of such truth-telling gestures, see Daniela Agostinho and Nanna Bonde Thylstrup, "'If Truth Was a Woman: Leaky Infrastructures and the Gendered Politics of Truth-Telling,'" *Ephemera: Theory and Politics in Organization* 19, no. 4 (2019): 745-75.
14. As Louise Amoore notes, more than algorithmic calculation leading to a militarization of society, or to a commercialization of security, what we are witnessing is algorithmic war as a "continuation of war by other means" in the Foucauldian sense, "where the war-like architectures of self/other, here/there, safe/risky, normal/suspicious are played out in the politics of daily life." Louise Amoore, "Algorithmic War: Everyday Geographies of the War on Terror," *Antipode* 41, no. 1 (2009): 49.
15. Harun Farocki defines "operative images" as "pictures, made neither to entertain nor to inform [...]. Images that do not represent an object, but rather are part of an operation." Harun Farocki, "Phantom Images," *Public*, no. 29 (2004): 17.
16. Judith Butler, *Frames of War: When Is Life Grievable?* (New York: Verso, 2010), xi.
17. Hal Foster, "An Archival Impulse," *October*, no. 110 (2004): 3-22.

18. Ronak K. Kapadia, *Insurgent Aesthetics: Security and the Queer Life of the Forever War* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2019).
19. Ann Laura Stoler, *Duress: Imperial Durabilities in Our Times* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2016).
20. Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*, ed. and trans. Michael Eliot Howard and Peter Paret (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1976), 280.
21. *Ibid.*, 280.
22. James Der Derian, *Virtuous War: Mapping the Military-Industrial-Media Entertainment Network* (New York: Routledge, 2009).
23. See Nathan Roger, *Image Warfare in the Age of Terror* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013); Kevin McSorley, ed., *War and the Body: Militarisation, Practice and Experience* (London: Routledge, 2013).
24. See Nicholas Mirzoeff, *Watching Babylon: The War in Iraq and Global Visual Culture* (London: Routledge, 2005); W. J. T. Mitchell, *Cloning Terror: The War of Images, 9/11 to the Present* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011); Jens Eder and Charlotte Klönk, *Image Operations: Visual Media and Political Conflict* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016); Jan Mieszkowski, *Watching War* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2012); Anders Engberg-Pedersen and Kathrin Maurer, eds., *Visualizing War: Emotions, Technologies, Communities* (London: Routledge, 2017); Mette Mortensen, *Journalism and Eyewitness Images: Digital Media, Participation, and Conflict* (London: Routledge, 2014); Lina Khatib, *Image Politics in the Middle East: The Role of the Visual in Political Struggle* (New York: I. B. Tauris, 2012).
25. Grégoire Chamayou, *A Theory of the Drone*, trans. Janet Lloyd (New York: New Press, 2015), 30.
26. See also Brian Massumi, *Ontopower: War, Powers, and the State of Perception* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015); Louise Amoore, *The Politics of Possibility: Risk and Security Beyond Probability* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2013); Claudia Aradau and Tobias Blanke, "Politics of Prediction: Security and the Time/Space of Governmentality in the Age of Big Data," *European Journal of Social Theory* 20, no. 3 (2017): 373-91; Johan Lau Munkholm, "The Pursuit of Full Spectrum Dominance: The Archives of the NSA," *Surveillance & Society* 18, no. 2 (2020): 244-56.
27. Lisa Parks and Caren Kaplan, *Life in the Age of Drone Warfare* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2017), 9-11. See also Lauren Wilcox, "Embodying Algorithmic War: Gender, Race, and the Post-Human in Drone Warfare," *Security Dialogue* 48, no. 1 (2017): 11-28; and Caroline Holmqvist, "Undoing War: War Ontologies and the Materiality of Drone Warfare," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 41, no. 3 (2013): 535-52.
28. Nicholas Mirzoeff, *How to See the World* (New York: Basic Books, 2015), 102-18.
29. Caren Kaplan, *Aerial Aftermaths: Wartime from Above* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2017).
30. Priya Satia, "Drones: A History from the British Middle East," *Humanity: An International Journal of Human Rights, Humanitarianism, and Development* 5, no. 1 (2014): 1-31; Madiha Tahir, "Bombing Pakistan: How Colonial Legacy Sustains American Drones" (paper, Costs of War, Brown University, Providence, RI, 2015).

31. Chamayou, *A Theory of the Drone*, 95.
32. See also Caren Kaplan, "Atmospheric Politics: Protest Drones and the Ambiguity of Airspace," *Digital War*, <https://doi.org/10.1057/s42984-020-00005-y>; J. D. Schnepf, "Unsettling Aerial Surveillance: Surveillance Studies after Standing Rock," *Surveillance & Society* 17, no. 5 (2019): 747-51.
33. The phrase "techno-aesthetics" is drawn from Anthony Downey's "There's Always Someone Looking at You: Performative Research and the Techno-Aesthetics of Drone Surveillance," in *Heba Y. Amin: The General's Stork*, ed. Anthony Downey (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2020), 8-30.
34. Butler, *Frames of War*, x.
35. The acknowledgments in the 2010 paperback edition of *Frames of War* end with a tantalizing reference to Obama's election, and with the caveat that "we have yet to see what concrete ameliorations of war may take place under his administration." Butler, *Frames of War*, viii. According to the Bureau of Investigative Journalism, there were ten times more air strikes in the covert war on terror during Obama's presidency than under his predecessor, George W. Bush. Jessica Purkiss and Jack Serle, "Obama's Covert Drone War in Numbers: Ten Times More Strikes Than Bush," *Bureau of Investigative Journalism*, January 17, 2017, <https://www.thebureauinvestigates.com/stories/2017-01-17/obamas-covert-drone-war-in-numbers-ten-times-more-strikes-than-bush>.
36. Our usage of the term "forever war" here echoes Kapadia's critical appropriation of the term. Rather than reproducing the temporality of the original military term, which described the open-ended war against terror inaugurated by September 11, 2001, Kapadia locates the genealogy of the forever war in the *longue durée* of US colonial expansion and war-making in the Greater Middle East throughout the long twentieth century and into the early twenty-first century. He thus examines not the US "at war" but the US "as war." Kapadia, *Insurgent Aesthetics*, 5-8.
37. Susan Schuppli, "Media as Conflict Zones" (paper, (W)archives workshop, University of Copenhagen, August 21, 2017).
38. Ibid.
39. Michael Richardson and Kerstin Schankweiler, "Affective Witnessing," in *Affective Societies: Key Concepts*, ed. Jan Slaby and Christian von Scheve (New York: Routledge, 2019), 166.
40. Phillip Rosen, *Change Mummified: Cinema, Historicity, Theory* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001), 234. See also Daniel Schultze, *Authenticity in Contemporary Theatre: Make It Real* (London: Bloomsbury, 2017).
41. Charles Sanders Peirce, *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*, vol. IV, book II (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1933), 447.
42. Solveig Gade, "The Promise of the Index in Contemporary Documentary Performance," *Nordic Journal of Aesthetics*, nos. 55-56 (2018): 41-64.
43. See Kris Paulsen, "Rogue Pixels: Indexicality and Algorithmic Camouflage," *Signs and Society* 6, no. 2 (2018): 412-34; and Lila Lee-Morrison, "The Forensic Architecture Project: Virtual Imagery as Evidence in the Contemporary Context of the War on Terror" (paper, Virtual Zones of Peace and Conflict, University of Copenhagen, Centre for Resolution of International Conflicts, January 12-13, 2015).

44. Lee-Morrison, "The Forensic Architecture Project."
45. Eyal Weizman, "Introduction: Forensis," in *Forensis: The Architecture of Public Truth*, ed. Forensic Architecture (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2014), 12.
46. Ibid.
47. Derrida, *Archive Fever*, 36.
48. Gurminder K. Bhambra, "The Current Crisis of Europe: Refugees, Colonialism, and the Limits of Cosmopolitanism," *European Law Journal* 23, no. 5 (2017): 399.
49. Rabih Mroué and Hito Steyerl, "Probable Title: Zero Probability" (unpublished script, 2012).
50. See Jeff Deutch and Hadi Habal, "The Syrian Archive: A Methodological Case Study of Open-Source Investigation of State Crime Using Video Evidence from Social Media Platforms." *State Crime Journal* 7, no. 1 (2018): 46-76.