

April 2020

Affect, Space, and Everydayness: A Reconsideration of Waste in Academic Inquiry

Tim C. Wells
tcwells1@asu.edu

Lauren Mark
lauren.mark@asu.edu

Jorge Sandoval
ventos@asu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/taboo>

Recommended Citation

Wells, T. C., Mark, L., & Sandoval, J. (2020). Affect, Space, and Everydayness: A Reconsideration of Waste in Academic Inquiry. *Taboo: The Journal of Culture and Education*, 19 (3). Retrieved from <https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/taboo/vol19/iss3/3>

This Article is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Scholarship@UNLV with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Article in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.

This Article has been accepted for inclusion in Taboo: The Journal of Culture and Education by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship@UNLV. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@unlv.edu.

Affect, Space, and Everydayness

A Reconsideration of Waste in Academic Inquiry

Timothy C. Wells, Lauren Mark, & Jorge Sandoval

Abstract

In this article, we engage with notions of space, affect, and waste in relation to academic research. Specifically, we seek to make present the ignored and absent aspects of our daily lives and experiences. We pay particular attention to affect and its relationship to space, exploring and theorizing how space becomes (un)productive or differently productive. In doing so, we return to the lived aspects of daily life and the everyday (Lefebvre, 1991) with non-representational theory (Thrift, 2008), hoping to not only better represent the formative, figurative, and relational aspects of experience but also that of the research process. It is our contention that such an approach to space will reengage the rhythms, intensities, and practices that enable a kind of becoming, a kind of unfurling and exploration, that is often absent and wasted in academic scholarship.

Introduction

“[Space] is the surface on which life floats”

—Thrift, 2008, p. 91

In his book, *Wasted Lives: Modernity and its Outcasts*, Zygmunt Bauman surveys the “progresses of modernization” and proclaims the planet is full, a statement referring less to the physical capacity of the planet and more to “the ways

Timothy C. Wells and Jorge Sandoval are doctoral candidates in the Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College and Lauren Mark is a doctoral candidate in the Hugh Downs School of Human Communication, all at Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona. Email addresses: tcwells1@asu.edu, lauren.mark@asu.edu, & ventos@asu.edu

© 2020 by Caddo Gap Press.

and means of its inhabitant” (Bauman, 2004, p. 5). Most specifically, the planet’s fullness refers to the ethos of modernization, the pervasively felt drive towards progress, be it global, economic, or “order-building.” However, as Bauman asserts, “the new fullness of the planet means, essentially, *an acute crisis of the human waste disposal industry*. While the production of human waste goes on unabated and rises to new heights, the planet is fast running short of refuse dumps and the tools of waste recycling” (Ibid., p. 6). At issue is not the technical problem of determining what to do with the waste but a standpoint that retains waste as a persistent and inevitable byproduct of progress.

Something not lost in Bauman’s alignment of progress with waste is the problematic worldview that retains static conceptions of the material world, equating objects and forms with determined and innate qualities—some valuable, others not. At its heart, this worldview presupposes the nature and direction of the progress. The risk of this lies not just in ignoring the dynamism within materiality but the differing potentiality that resides within the world, what many refer to as affectivity (e.g. Bennett, 2010; Massumi, 2002; Seigworth and Gregg, 2010; Thrift, 2008). When considering waste, the dynamic and affective dimensions of materiality are nearly impossible to ignore, despite our best efforts to do so anyway. Bauman’s assertion that ‘the planet is full’ might be thought of as a call for not only reckoning with the totalizing effects of modernization but also with the affective potential that resides within all materiality, whether deemed waste or not.

It is here, within this shift towards affective conceptions of material worlds, that we approach the issue of waste in academic inquiry. If Bauman’s assertion that waste is endemic to all productive processes is true, then it remains true of academic production as well. And if the problem of waste resides in its assumed static and inert nature, then something of the same should apply to academic waste. Therefore, in this paper, we reconsider the waste—the static, the inert, and the disregarded—of academic inquiry. This reconsideration led to the study of space and its place in everyday academic life. By analyzing our own sites of academic work, we suggest that space itself is the waste of academic inquiry. It is disregarded, deemed static and inert. When it is attended to, it is conceptualized in a way that fails to consider affect, leaving a primary driver of movement and change unaddressed. Alternatively, we aim to approach space and the larger issue of waste with an attention to affective movements and processes. In doing so, we enact a non-representational theory (Thrift, 2008), focusing on the lived aspects of daily life and the everyday (Lefebvre, 1991), seeking not to represent or interpret but to revitalize and extend academic work and life.

This article unfolds in the following manner. First, we consider theory in the study of space, suggesting that space is increasingly defined by its affective capacities. In building upon this, we review Thrift’s (2008) tenets of non-representational theory and Lefebvre’s (1991) notions of everydayness as a way to make felt the affective capacities of space. Then, drawing on this theory, we present three indi-

vidual analyses of the spaces that we conduct our everyday academic work. Lastly, we close with a discussion of various potential engagements with space, affect, and waste in academic inquiry.

Social Theories of Space

Studies of space find a natural home within the field of geography. Most geographical analyses of space up until the 1970s favored an absolute understanding of space (Shields, 1997), where it was understood as a system of organization and visualized as geometry, or “a kind of absolute grid, within which objects are located and events occur” (Curry, 1995, p. 5). These systems then gave rise to ideas of historical and representational spaces, followed by object-like visions of abstract space that focused on “things/signs and their formal relationship, such as: glass and stone, concrete and steel, angles and curves, full and empty” (Lefebvre, 1974, p. 49). Such notions came to represent a kind of objective correspondence between the matter and its form. Yet, for some, these materials came to symbolize the functioning of capitalism, in which differences are forced into symbolic forms.

More recent conceptions of space begin to take on some of the more ephemeral qualities associated with affect, particularly, socially produced space. Henri Lefebvre was one of the strongest advocates for socially produced space. His theory of space sought to merge conceptions of “*physical* space (nature), *mental* space (formal abstractions about space), and *social* space (that of human action, conflict and ‘sensory phenomena’)” (Merrifield & Lefebvre, 2000, p. 171). Lefebvre described the production of space in three levels, beginning with spatial practices (or the perceived), such as movements, migrations, routines, and other influences on human endeavours. He saw spatial practices as instrumental to (re)producing the city. Following, he detailed the representation of space (the conceived), as objects that made sense of space, such as books, films, and images or maps. These representations contained the power to reproduce space within themselves by legitimizing or delegitimizing certain spatial practices. Lastly, Lefebvre identified spaces of representation, which although sounding suspiciously similar to the representation of space, denotes lived space, or the experiences that transpire in spaces. Lefebvre viewed representations of space and spaces of representation suspended in tension with one another, which in turn produced spatial practices. He also viewed ideological and political battles occurring within the context of spatial conflict rather than grounded within class struggle. Therefore, he believed that forces such as capitalism could be overpowered with the production of new spaces and alternate ways of life.

Crang and Thrift (2000) have also helped lead a sustained critique of absolute, essentialized ideas of space. In its place, they propose a relative understanding of space as a human production of socio-spatial relations that encompass cultural, social, political and economic relations. Thrift (2008) considered spaces to be “fluid

forces that have no beginning or end and which are generating new cultural conventions, techniques, forms, genres, concepts, even senses” (p. 90). He saw space as an entity that assumes a point of view and as a sort of background upon which all human activity depends. Thrift considers materiality such as roads and lighting to be a ‘first wave of artificiality,’ and digital influences such as screens and wireless signals to comprise a second wave of artificiality. Space, for him, is more like “invisible forms which structure how we write the world...[or] the technological unconscious...bending bodies with environments” (p. 91). This conceptualization of space, as an invisible grounding on which the “recursivity of the world” writes itself through repeated performance, foregrounds not geometrical form but virtual processes. It is here that studies of space shift towards notions of affect and relationality. In the following section, we situate this thinking about space within non-representational theory.

Non-Representation Theory

In approaching space outside that of absolute and static representationalism, we find value in the tenets of non-representational theory (Thrift, 2008). According to Thrift (2008), non-representational theory is an umbrella term for theories and practices that engage aspects of life that resist representation. These are theories that return to affect, movement, sensation and process as generative of being. The aim is less about uncovering the building blocks of experience or reinterpreting social life than about extending and opening possibilities for lived experience to unfold differently. The notion of supplement plays well here as the aim is less on reduction than on addition and extension. For Thrift (2008), the field of non-representational theory is demarcated by a series of tenets that foreground the “leitmotif of movement” in its many forms. However, we extend upon three specific tenets in our exploration of academic waste.

First tenet, the everyday, is reconsidered for its vital and life-giving potential. The work of Seigworth and Lefebvre figure strongly here as they work directly *within* and *through* the everyday. For Seigworth (2000), this means considering the excesses of everyday life, what he terms the overflow of the banal; for Lefebvre (1991), this means considering the homogenous life flux found within *everydayness*, which he distinguishes from *daily life* and *the everyday*. For both, the everyday suggests an avenue into immanent life (*everydayness*), an experience that extends beyond representation (*the everyday*) and practice (*daily life*). It is an approach that suggests the everyday houses within itself not simply lifeless habit or alienation but potential. It is this potential, the excess and flux, that remains absent and wasted from traditional approaches of the everyday.

Second tenet, space, is reconceptualized as dynamic and generative. This means foregrounding affect, process, and relationality instead of objects, distances, and locations. Underlying this rethinking of space is the idea that these non-representa-

tional entities enable not just the background of an environment but the process of becoming (Thrift, 2008). As Toscano maintains, “the ontology of the sensible is not separable from the constitution of material assemblages and processes themselves” (as cited in Thrift, 2008, p. 257). For Thrift (2008), movement produces a kind of “onto-ethology,” permitting not static forms but beings and becomings. Within this thinking, space becomes non-representational, dynamic and generative, not to be studied as an object but always extended and supplemented. It is in resisting the tendency to objectify a space with static parameters that non-representational theory returns value to what is traditionally excluded and wasted in academic research.

Third tenet, affect, is similarly reconceptualized in less representational and more relational terms. Drawing from a traditional dating back to Spinoza, affect is thought of alongside encounters within a constantly becoming world (Thrift, 2008). It has been defined as the capacity to affect and be affected (Massumi, 2002) with less interest in its symbolic meaning than in the generative outcome that an encounter affords. It becomes something similar to a product or property of an encountered, extending beyond individual bodies and subjects. Underlying this rethinking of affect is the affirmation that more exists within space than the material forms and meanings attributed to them. It is what others have considered the “accumulative beside-ness” (Seigworth & Gregg, 2010) or the “more-than” (Manning, 2013) of our existence. It is this non-representational surplus that might again be thought of as the waste within traditional academic research.

It is with the reframing of these three conceptions—everyday, space, affect—that we approach the waste of academic inquiry. In three distinct analyses, one from each co-author, each of us took non-representational theory to our own spaces of work. These are what we considered the spaces of the everyday, always more than themselves and latent with affect. It is here in our own workspaces that we sought to rediscover the waste of our academic work. We strove to write about our experiences in these spaces as they unfolded, a process which involved a combination of thinking with theory and feeling our way through affect. What results is not simply an analysis with representation but an extension of the spaces of academic work. In doing so, we respond to calls for “doing research” differently in ways that attune to movement without presupposing the contents of space and spatial arrangements (Bright, Manchester, & Allendyke, 2013). It is our contention that such an approach to space will reengage the rhythms, intensities, and formative practices that enable a kind of becoming, a kind of unfurling and exploration, that is often absent and wasted in academic inquiry.

Space, Affect, and Everydayness

The following sections present each of our three analyses. Each analysis addresses a space chosen by the author as a familiar site of work and study. We sought not to describe the space as it exists but to instead explore the ways each

space actualizes, with particular attention to the excluded and wasted aspects of this process.

Conceptions, Perceptions, and Lived Overflows of Space

At times, when at a table in a space where many units are closely packed together, like stalks emerging from seeds planted too closely, conversations spill over into other spaces. It can seem dissembling to pretend that we're not privy to those conversations, despite the book or computer screen open before us. I refuse to arm myself with headphones at all times to allot you and me blocks of privacy between shared airspaces, unless the noise coming from other corners is so distracting that it crowds out all of my own thoughts. The affective energies of your words, your laughter, your plaintive sighs, enter my space, unbidden. Here, we are strangers, girdled by unwritten mores of decorum that promise us exclusive interaction with the people we sit down with. Yet sometimes, you invite me into those spaces when I break the fourth wall by leaking a reaction. You comment on it, leaving the conversational door ajar long enough for me to decide whether to poke my head in. In that instant, we become entangled, allowing the temperature of that space to be modulated by both of our energies. You are no longer just a disturbance that I am trying to drown out with the grit of my distracted concentration. I no longer have to push away the inadvertent judgments that float into my consciousness about the contents of your conversation. After all, how could I not react when I hear you claim such a ridiculous idea that noodles should not be eaten with chopsticks when they come in soup?

"Right? That's what I said! And then she laughed at me for eating with the wrong end of my chopsticks!"

The illusion had been sustained. Or else, he wouldn't have felt the need to recount an exchange that had taken place just a few moments ago when I was sitting a mere eighteen inches away. You are writing me into your story. I am becoming *someone* based on what I say next.

"That's no big deal. With those disposable chopsticks, they basically look the same at both ends."

De Certeau (1984) compares narrative structures with spatial syntaxes. He contemplates space's capacity to intervene in the production of narratives when individual stories' interrelatedness draw passages from one to another. This meeting of stories, no matter how momentary, can produce "geographies of action" (De Certeau, 1984, p. 115) that have the potential to become vital parts of one another.

Spaces officially shared with colleagues have a much more complicated set of social rules. Graduate student offices in the Communication department are crammed with ten to seventeen cubicles in a single office, where studying, fraternising, and student meetings are all intended to take place. Some students avoid the space

altogether aside from scheduled office hours, preferring to work in libraries and cafes, where the sanctity of their workspace is more clearly delineated.

Lefebvre (1988) spoke about the everyday in triadic terms of daily life, the everyday, and everydayness. He wrote about complements to these notions in terms of “three moments of space” (1974/1991, pp. 36-46), which include spatial practices, representations of space, and representational space. Seigworth (2000) has offered a colloquial translation of these terms as the perceived, the conceived, and the lived.

The layout of the graduate office space is ostensibly conceived to keep colleagues in the same vicinity while crouched over one’s own work, facing the grey felt backing of one’s cubicle adorned with whatever decorations of loved ones and paraphernalia that one chooses. The cubicle units themselves are high, topped with closed shelves, so that in order to see beyond one’s row into the rest of the space, one either has to stand up and perch on the balls of one’s feet, or physically migrate into another aisle, depending on one’s height.

As students, we navigate around the physical borders of the space with the modulation of our voices. Our lived spatial practices begin conversations with those in our peripheral vicinities, and based on their level of engagement in the topic being discussed, others may chime in from the sheltered obscurity of their cubicled aisles, roll their chairs over to poke their heads around the corner of their aisles, or most proactively, walk out from their aisle to make eye contact and offer their physical presence to the conversation. There is typically one extra chair in the office, set on rollers, seemingly stocked with the intention of serving as a seat for visiting students, on the off-chance that a visitor enters when all other seats are occupied by other graduate instructor bodies.

Aisles are designated with specific characteristics, such as the lively middle aisle, where chatting is far more likely to occur than work. The aisle in the back, farthest from the office door, is the studious aisle, where students opt to bury themselves as far as possible in an attempt for their earphones to muffle the noise from ongoing conversations happening a few inches away.

Attempts at private conversations are held in whispers, which at times, can cause confusion when certain members of the office default to whispering for any conversation when viewing office mates simultaneously attempting to work. The affective residue of these whispers becomes diluted with vestiges of consideration or knowledge hoarding, based on perceived intentions. In this space, one is always privy, to a certain extent, of what is happening and whether one is invited into a conversational space. The spatial practices and spaces of representation begin to blur, where the expectations, experience, and semiotics of whispering begin to take on mixed forms. Earphone sets are not sufficient armor to drown out the affective vibrations of whispered words.

The attempt/ability to work in this space is continually in conversation with the affective intensities that arise from the frequency, duration, and tones of environ-

mental encounters. The sound of whispers can produce ruptures with conventional collegial understandings of comradery. At times, these understandings are embraced openly and dialogically with audible invitations to conversation, or nurtured by a studious solidarity buttressed by cubicle demarcations and a mutual quiet intended by the space. One's situatedness within the informal student network directs the intensity of the ruptures and the interpretations of the space. Collaborative inclusions to work jointly on independent studies, conference panels, or papers can produce whispered affects that lead to a sense of agency to be productive, encompassed by others' concern. A lack of inclusion in collaborative work, on the other hand, can lead to a deterritorialization of productivity, where the most silent of moments can become fractured by anxieties of being acted on by larger conceptions of exclusion well beyond individual agency.

Becoming-Student in Folds of Everydayness

"Movement is everywhere, always, at all scales, speeds, and slowness"

—Manning, 2013, p. 134

It is a weekday afternoon, on the third floor of the education building, and the graduate student space hosts a not-so-everyday event. Catered food trays and drink containers line the first row of circular tables as disparate conversation fills the room. Earlier, the event organizers presented about a student organization they represented with listeners crowded amongst the circular tables that occupy one side of the room. Now that the event is largely over, unrelated talk of apartment complexes, transportation routes, and local schooling oddities carries the space. The mood is light and open. It is undirected and marked by a moment of in-between-ness. Shortly, however, the conversation will crescendo, and the space will take an altogether different tone, one more serious and focused, quieter and tenser. It is this space, the everyday of the graduate space, that is explored below.

Enter the room and you are confronted with an over saturation of both light and chilled air. You feel the light from above but also in the glare off the walls and the tops of tables. It is pronounced as it touches your cheeks just below your eyes. You feel the air rush across your body as the door closes, marking yourself and the space as indoors. If you pause for a moment at the door, you feel the materiality of the room as it unfolds. You feel the weight of the furniture in front of you. You feel the pull of the chairs, calling you to a seat. It is an urge to move from the doorway. If you remain still and perhaps close your eyes, you register sounds, the buzz of the lights, the groan of the refrigerator, and the chirping of birds carry through the walls from outside. You begin to register something subtle and fragrant coursing through the air. A smell that had previously gone unregistered. Remain still longer and you begin to feel in ways that extend beyond recognition. You find that the weight of the furniture subsides. You feel the pull of the tables and chairs ease as the space unfolds in an altogether different manner. The static closeness that once held the furniture in

place gives way to a fluxing distance. What was visually proximate loses its hold as distance itself melts into a kind of singularity. The emptiness that once occupied the space between the furniture is now feels full and vibrant. It is here in this space that you begin to register not objects and things but movements and affects.

Return to the everyday and you return to routine, you become-student. Without much thought you move from the door and find a seat to place your body and a desk to place your work. A slouch settles into your back as the computer draws in your gaze. The vibrant affect and sensation that once moved the space now goes unregistered. The materiality of the room turns static as objects and bodies settled into form. With distinct boundaries and functions, cubicle walls, desk chairs, slitted windows, supply cabinets, whiteboards, and waste bins now occupy the room. The space becomes an office. It becomes a place of work. Utility and need prevail to the exclusion of much newness and differences. It is here, with movement localized to the realm of thought, that the space becomes *the everyday*, it becomes conceptual. It confines itself to the understood and the represented. In this way, becoming-student is becoming-conceptual, becoming-abstract.

Pause again at your desk. Resist the tendency towards thought alone and feel the space once more. You feel your body folded in the chair: hinged hips beginning to slouch, creased knees beginning to pinch, a rounded back beginning to throb. You find the desk tucked tight against your stomach as gravity strains your shoulders forward. The urge to return to thought alone is strong. Resist this urge and you begin to feel the sound of the outdoors once again bleeding through the walls. You feel the chilled air settling across the tops of your forearms and back of your neck. Soon the enclosure of the cubicle walls and the containment of the body underneath the desk lifts. No longer simply constraining as the desk becomes an extension of the body and the body an extension of the desk. Your desked body reattunes to the environment enabling the unfolding of a different space. It is a space that is not simply confined to the abstracted thought but equally registers a collective relationality. The collective is what is absent in the tendency towards thought alone.

The question remains, however, as to what drives the movement, the presence and absence within the space. In the present case, it is not simply individual or institutional but equally material. Consider the abundance of chairs that populate the graduate space. When caught up in the everyday, the function and utility of these chairs are presupposed. While some may be different than others, they all serve the same purpose. They are actants moving bodies in much the same way as does a conscious individual or institutional discourse. In fact, they come to constitute at least in part what it means to be individual and institutional in this space. Knowledge of everydayness recognizes this function but it also the limitations that routine perception places upon the chair. It recognizes the ways that material furniture both function and exceed their function within an environment. This could be aesthetic (as so many artists have demonstrated) but can always be something else. As simply as a chair might be, the potential within the chair is infinite. It is

this openness to difference and what is not intellectually known that everydayness provides.

Similar things could be said for the ways that researchers approach a study. Aspects under study are assumed and presupposed (i.e. students, classrooms, experiences). The difference that underlies such aspect is what traditional research methods ignore. Again, what is wasted is the very impetus towards greater movement and affect, what we might term life. An intuitive method operates in a reverse logic: it is not the extraction of objects from life that create the movement but the leaning into the difference of life itself that is the movement. It is this, centrally affective dimension, that academic research too often wastes.

Anarchived Lived Experiences

When I contemplate the geography of the ASU campus, images with particular affective qualities come to mind that recall a long and familiar history. The campus itself becomes a plane of multiplicity, full of material elements entangled amongst human perceptions of touch, smell, texture and light, tethered through linkages of structures recognizable to both previous and current day experiences. As these impressions dissipate into a broader field of resonance, what remains constant is a movement of corporeal and ethereal elements always in a state of flux. As I make my way into the school of art building, banal impressions of everyday lived experiences greet me as I enter a unique plane that moves in parallel with the perceived and non-perceived in singular direction. The resulting impact of conscious and subconscious create new constructs and perceptions of lived experiences that unfold beneath the level of perception. As Blanchot (2015) describes, unperceived and banal experiences are forces that establish everlasting and generative qualities, intensified to produce a “vital vibrancy” that plays along the thresholds of consciousness and unconsciousness to impose new imprints of experiences before such intensities fade away to the unperceived depths of unconsciousness. In effect, what resides in my own psyche, has resided within these architectural spaces with no actual measure of beginning or end in time. These spaces continue to retain their own potential for creative energy that inspires through a multiplicity of mediums, contexts and forces.

These everyday, banal, multidimensional spaces saturate ASU. A multiplicity of material elements possess power of various intensities that continue to unfold and produce new and sometimes fruitful “engenderings.” When I choose to do my school work in a vacant painting classroom, or gallery located in the school of art, it is not only because of a personal affinity I feel for the space, but also because I intuitively feel the potential for emergent affective qualities, as I recall through nostalgia for the place. This saturated environment, where I’ve felt comfortable to study in, continues to contribute through the creative potentials from what becomes generative in new directions of flight and possibilities. What this means

is that the environment extends beyond perception to include a multidimensional plane where lures inspire personal agency and new meanings and purposes can be applied through the various potentials and contexts. A place where intersections of inhabitants, both human and non-human, become entangled and activate each other to produce things anew.

The experience of working in a vacant painting classroom becomes active with entanglement. The excesses of the space generate productive engenderings, which may or may not be perceived, but nonetheless contribute to new creations that effectively repurpose architectural environments intended for another purpose. I find I am drawn to familiar surroundings that unwittingly act as lures towards deeper understandings of already familiar objects or elements. These “figurative” springboards generate new perspectives that connect the familiar with the unfamiliar. These events, inextricably tethered to past experiences, inspire me to work within an architecture imbued with affective, material qualities. The painting classroom, reverberates with vibrant and material elements, such as different colors, the smell of paint, fluorescent light, all more than just a part of a banal experience I am already familiar with. In this way, the many material elements that coexist within this creative space provide the sources that come to life and weave together the thoughts and emotions I bring into the environment at the present time, and work as a force-form (Manning, 2013) to create new forms, individuations. An excess that is active and alive with a vitality of not yet being restrained or reaching a finite form (Manning, 2018). As Manning describes (2018), this taking shape occurs as an excess, but is more than an ornamental detail that serves as a function for redirecting the course of an event’s taking shape. The cuff of a sleeve is not just ornamental, it serves to stop the event and redirect the flow, such as the cuff peaks at the end of the sleeve, reshapes the form and redirects movement back upon itself. In essence, a folding onto itself. Similarly, I assimilate this to the crest of a wave as it peaks and begins to curve. An ornamental crest that becomes alive in excess of possibilities. This redirection of energy, turned back onto itself, slides down the backside similar to an ocean wave forcing a crest that gives it its shape and recognizability. This abrupt redirection of force, as Manning suggests, is a “folding”, or the point at which the wave crests and shifts direction and folds upon itself, is where one form can be perceived as recognizable.

This reduction of a larger set of events takes place, hidden of all the multiplicities in movement, produces a recognition of shape that are the elements that inspire my thoughts as I work within the art school environment, and leads to new encounters and possibilities. Manning (2018) describes these brief happenings as appetitious enthusiasm, not just reduced, but through its subtraction is emphasized by the excess of potential that it carries with it, carrying forth the traces of previous forms. This frothing of whitewater, as it peaks at the crest of the wave, can be described as a minor gesture, reduced in form so much that it becomes recognizable, in this instance the basic shape of the wave. This coming into view is a reduction

of form within a vitality events not always seen, but may be felt. An experience beyond what can just be seen, tasted, or smelled, the shaping of an intensification where the ineffable is felt (Manning, 2018). The force of the wave in which the surfer can set his sights and experience the full force of the event. The wave itself can be described as a metaphor of events coming together at once, an intensity of movement that erupts all at once as a force that is felt, coinciding with other events that overlap in time (Massumi, 2002). Manning (2018) describes these vitality forms as a part of the experience of the event in which the exuberance and intensity creates a calling forth that manifests in excess of the actual forms, pushing forward towards the coming to be, as the felt experience before the taking of form.

The lived of the banal exceeds the everyday (Seigworth, 2010), unperceived actions, such as when I paint, the smell, texture, transformation of paints mix and blend into new colors that intensify into brief emotional responses that lead me to create images of recognition, representation. As unfoldings develop, they carry with them the potential to inspire and generate deeper thoughts. Incapable of capture, the unperceivable multiplicity of elements that interact and exist below the level of consciousness. In this place where I like to paint, I'm allowed to make mistakes. The environment instills creative potential derived from understandings of infinite potentials. If one solution doesn't lead me to a predetermined goal, adjustments are made through remixtures and reblendings of colors and paint; in essence the same questioning process occurs. Previous sketches and explorations were merely a starting point from preconceived solutions, not knowing where they would lead but open to the understanding that each trajectory leads to new possibilities and solutions – within this plane of unperceived perceptions. This plane of immanence where bodies come into view, interact and merge through a force a potential to produce new individuations that I can either choose to capture or let dissipate and change form into something else.

As I situate myself for work in my chosen space, I may not be completely aware of all the elements at play within the territory I have entered—perhaps the banal. The more-than-human, material elements I described earlier are already in interaction with each other. The way the light filters into the space interplays with the colors of wasted paint splattered on the walls, reflecting images of itself on shiny utility sink faucets as they catch glimmers of flashes of light coming from the floor to ceiling train-station windows appeal to non-neurotypical attentions, as I am drawn by minor gestures of flashes of light, color, smell and even taste. The work space I chose is situated within ear-shot of an open door classroom currently in session and as I open my Word application and begin to glance over previously written texts, feeling fairly content with what I have written, my attention is captured by the appeal of a multitude of sensor perceptions, affective reactions from past experiences. These dephasings leave brief impressions redirecting a current thought. Upon the recollection of my instructor's advice, I'm reminded not to fall in love with my work as I've come to understand the dangers of seduction and the

terminality of creativity if captured. I avoid the restraints of seduction by continuing my writing process, carving out new directions and possibilities. Opposed to acceptance of the larger image, my work progresses with awareness to the minor elements that hover at the periphery of consciousness, some noticed others wasted.

Revaluing the Non-Representational

Thrift's approach to non-representational theory returns value to that which resists representation. It marks a disposition that favors practice and process over objects and things. This means paying particular attention to affective atmospheres and movement tendencies. These are the aspects that precede the subject and object constituting the space. It is here before the constitution of the individual, the object, and the subject that non-representational theory directs its analysis. Likewise, it is here that traditional research methodology stops its analysis. Traditional methods begin with static objects over dynamic movement and becoming. The result is a conception of space that lacks vibrancy and affect. Our interest in this paper was to challenge such conceptions and return to the formative processes in which affect makes itself felt.

In foregrounding the non-representational, Lefebvre's work on the social production of space proves useful. His conception of everydayness in contrast to daily life and the everyday provides a way to consider the affective, vibrant, and lived production of space. Our use of everydayness refers to that which encompasses and extends beyond the practices and representations that characterize a space. It refers to the immanent excess that is always present even within the banal moments of everyday life. It is here in the lived excess, the everydayness of the banal that we explored our own spaces of academic work.

The first analysis, "Conceptions, Perceptions, and Lived Overflows of Space," points to the implications that presumed affiliations carry in demarcating invisible boundaries of shared spaces. It attempts to reveal how pre-existing assumptions can result in vastly different affective responses to seemingly uniform sensory elements, such as silence and audibility. It points to the shaping that the movements of spatial practices (the perceived) and the experiences of spaces of representation (the lived) enact on the ground that can yield or stifle creative and academic potential. Spatial practices such as physically navigating around cubicle walls or using physical borders to maintain intellectual boundaries engender spatial experiences formed more saliently by intent or affective excess than by material determinings alone.

The second analysis, "Becoming-Student in the Folds of Everydayness," works towards the always latent present within space. It considers how the simple act of entering a room incites a space to unfold in a particular manner. Yet, it is an unfolding that always holds something more within the space. The tendency of students and academic researchers is to ignore this unfolding and treat the space as a site of production through utilitarian frameworks. However, when we resist the

tendency to interact and move through a space in routinized ways, the space unfolds in a different manner. It no longer becomes a space that resides simply within the realms of perception and thought, what Seigworth termed the perceived and the conceived and what Lefebvre termed daily life and the everyday. It now becomes affective and vibrant, or 'lived' in 'everydayness' to put it in Seigworth and Lefebvre's respective terms. The lived and the everydayness is the non-representational and it is what this analysis sought to identify as routinely extracted and ignored in academic inquiry.

The third analysis, "Anarchived Lived Experiences," presents the lived experience of working in a space charged with affective qualities that impact and direct attention to new and divergent constructs. In choosing the school of art for the lived experience, it is suggested that this site would be an ideal location in which past and present experiences of the everyday and banal would become generative of new potentials and lines of flight. Here, the unperceived banal overflow results in variations of intensity that oscillates upon an immanent plane (Seigworth, 2000). A plane in which lived experience intermingles with minor gestures (Manning, 2016), redirecting attention in new trajectories. In this experience, what happens is an extension beyond the limits of what the initial intention of the space was—a sort of repurposing of space. In defiance of being wasted, the space becomes re-activated in which the banal and everyday result in a "vital vibrancy" that plays along the thresholds of perceptual awareness. These events subsequently impose new imprints of experience that extend and open up possibilities in which lived experience can unfold anew.

Each of the three analyses addressed a different space. The first two were of different academic office spaces, while the third was of an art studio. The different nature of each space brought out different aspects of non-representational theory. The analyses of the two office spaces often worked within and through the perceptions and conceptions into the lived overflow of the space, while the analysis of the art studio began and largely remained within the lived overflow, Lefebvre's (1991) everydayness. Across the three what is seen is how different spatial environments unfold and engender different experiences in ways that are not simply reduced to the perceived actors and objects of the space. The spaces were always more than the sum of their parts. They retained something non-representational.

The tendency across the three spaces is to background the non-representational. These are tendencies that occur not within the spaces themselves but through a relational encounter. It is event-based and founded upon movement. Therefore, no subject, object, or space is the sole driver of this movement but are themselves an effect of the movement. What the three analyses sought to represent is how this primary movement enacts the very existence of the space, "the surface on which life floats" (Thrift, 2008, p. 91). The event of office space unfolds quite differently than the event of art studio, yet each unfolding is always more than itself. It involves that which cannot be captured but which affords life its potential. This uncapturable

potential is the non-representational, present differently in each of our three spaces. While presenting this paper at a recent congress, one individual asked us how we plan to move this work beyond a state of awareness and into our work in general. The potentiality that we address in engaging the rhythms, spatial perceptions, and formative practices here does not presume an inevitability that a linear process of cause and effect could entail. Attuning to affective and intensive spatial flows allows us to more intentionally choose pathways toward becoming potential, specifically applied to the circumstantial crafting of our lived everyday spaces. By allowing for greater concentrations of potential to actualize, we seek to diminish the amount of time, energy, and solitary affects that might otherwise be wasted.

As the call for this special issue suggests, waste is a pervasive product of modern culture. We argued that waste is an equally pervasive product of academic inquiry. We attempted to draw attention to the extraction of movement and process to expose a theoretical ideal that cultivates, knowingly or not, a mentality of rigid boundaries and assumed exteriority. It is a mentality of waste. We called for the reconsideration of the affective potential in all materiality—a way to re-engage the waste of academic inquiry. Such reconsideration opens thought not to simple dichotomies (use—waste) but to the processes in which environments become actualized differently. For it is this interest in process that might enact an inquiry that not only taps the vitality of waste but also breaks up the taken-for-granted within inquiry practices.

References

- Bauman, Z. (2004). *Wasted lives: Modernity and its outcasts*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Bennett, J. (2010). *Vibrant matter: A political ecology of things*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Blanchot, M. (2015). *The writing of the disaster*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Bright, N. G., Manchester, H., & Allendyke, S. (2013). Space, place, and social justice in education: Growing a bigger entanglement: Editors' introduction. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 19(10), 747-755.
- Crang, M. and Thrift, N. (Eds.) (2000). *Thinking space*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Curry, M. (1995). On space and spatial practice in contemporary geography. In C. Earle, K. Mathewson, & M. Kenzer (Eds.), *Concepts in human geography*, (pp. 3–32). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Gregg, M., & Seigworth, G. J. (Eds.). (2010). *The affect theory reader*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Lefebvre, H. (1988). Toward a Leftist cultural politics: Remarks occasioned by the centenary of Marx's death. In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 75-88). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space*. (D. Nicholson-Smith, Trans.). New York, NY: Basic Books. (Original work published 1974)
- Manning, E. (2013). *Always more than one: Individuation's dance*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- Manning, E. (2016). *The minor gesture*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Manning, E. (2018). *What things do when they shape each other*. Manuscript in preparation.
- Massumi, B. (2002). *Parables for the virtual*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Merrifield, A., & Lefebvre, H. (2000). A socialist in space. *Thinking space*, 9, 167-182.
- Seigworth, G. J. (2000). Banality for cultural studies. *Cultural studies*, 14(2), 227-268.
- Seigworth, G. J., & Gregg, M. (2010). An inventory of shimmers. In M. Gregg & G. J. Seigworth's (Eds.), *The affect theory reader* (pp. 1-25). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Shields, R. (1997). Flow as a new paradigm. *Space and Culture*, 1(1), 1-7.
- Thrift, N. (2008). *Non-representational theory: Space, politics, affect*. London, UK: Routledge.