

Editorial **Remix**: Open Access Anthropology 2.0 as a type of **altermodern experimentation**

Àngels Trias i Valls

Institute of Contemporary European Studies
Regent's College, London
triasiva@regents.ac.uk

1.0 Beta

1st May 2009 was the first **Open Access Anthropology Day**. Organised by Sarah Touta, anthropologist and blogger, the Open Access Anthropology Day was soon supported by the Open Access Anthropology blog, had an entry in **BlogUnited**, and it was followed by many anthropologist in the **microblogging**, **twitter**, **web 2.0** and **internet** communities. I was one of the people that joined that movement. As a mark of the first open access anthropology day I proposed the creation of a new open access anthropology journal. Here is the editorial of the first issue of that realisation. The editorial remix is an experimental article, in an altermodern sense, a mixture of pieces and articles, hyperlinks, re-mixed anew, treated as a creative journey that looks at open access, web-mediated and networked anthropology.

Going Viral

In 2009 I approached the Open Access Anthropology Day with enthusiasm and worry about where it was going to lead us. I felt encouraged by the small group of twitters and bloggers that surrounded me and kept me grounded to the electronic media as to see this project through. I blogged, I joined the forums, got a badge, twitted...Weeks later the initiative started taking a momentum of its own. It wasn't only the open access anthropology that was reaching momentum; the whole picture of electronic mediated anthropology was changing at the

fabulous pace that internet communication technologies spin our lives into. The excellent Norwegian antropologi.info (Khazaleh, L (Ed. 2010), a multilingual anthropology portal with news blog compiled lists and articles, Karim (P. Kerim Friedman) set the anthropology twitter (twibes) creating a **viral moment of shared ideas**, Keith Hart's open anthropology co-operative was born too. The co-op had the largest social impact for anthropology in decades, stream of names joined in to support the new **alternative to academic associations**. Max Forte's Zero Anthropology, John Postill's Press and his organization of the MediaAnthro mailing lists (EASA) consolidated anthropology blogging with new **distinctive network voices**; a storm of blog sites by anthropologists worldwide, from the group blog of Savage Minds to Wesch's (2007) **Anthropology of youtube (2008)** defined the anthropology online scene; Further afield Goldsmiths anthropology department research papers, the Durham anthropology journals (DAJ) and the ASA (Association of Social Anthropologists) journal '**anthropology matters**', among others in the UK, were harvesting their earlier seeds in the field of online postgraduate and research publications freely available (albeit not as within the Open Access movement when they started they were genuine forms of open access; Anthropology Matters Journal introduced open access publishing in 2010)). In early 2010, Anthropology Today, started its own network as a forum for their readers and its editors introduced blogging to the printed topics and network discussions. I was self-archiving the first e-learning anthropology degree in the UK, and many more academic wikis and student groups were being created. New visual systems mushroomed under a new weather of excitement, experimentation and under user-mediated productions of internet pages, wikis, and networks.

The excitement on the net was palpable, we were indeed **witnessing, inventing and creating new networks of relatedness amongst anthropologist in a way it was not possible through conventional academic practice**. Shortly after, (around that viral time' would be appropriate), formal anthropological associations across the globe started paying attention to the way in which they presented themselves and communicated with the rest of us. 2009 and 2010 saw a 're-vamp' of academic websites, with the AAA (American Anthropological Association) gradually making its appearance into the twiverse (**twitter universe**) and the British Royal Anthropological Institute and other associations transforming their websites and points of contact to much higher standards. This also saw the gradual phasing of the home-made looking, unpaid,

voluntarily made websites and forums for the new, paid, designed-to-impress ones. The whole image of anthropology as a discipline, the visual systems that had been used from the late 90s' through the [labour-intensive individual websites](#), eventually started to give in and leave room to [new types of online visual systems](#) and to new ways of defining new visualisations of anthropological networks and connections. Along these changes, what was happening I would argue was [a reconfiguration on the power and dynamics between producers of online image and online content and users of these online sites and online/personal networks](#).

Open Access

In parallel to all of this, supporters of Open Access, building on the pioneer work of Peter Suber, Stevan Harnad, Hitchcock and others started to see a reward of the many years of dedication to the open access cause (see also Davies 2010). Suddenly, between 2004 and 2008 the number of electronic open archives, self-archiving, OA repositories, and [OA journals grew exponentially](#). The Directory of Open Access journals, developed by Lund University Libraries since 2003 hosted more than 4000 journals, in more than 1000 countries (DOAJ 2010). Behind these were two critical years, 2002 to 2004, that saw the declaration of Open Access principles by the [Budapest](#), the [Bethesda](#) and [Berlin Open Access Initiatives](#) (Suber 2003). These three stand for the forums for the international declaration of Open Access to knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities, signed by worldwide scientific and academic organisations, with a statement that commits to the implementation of a definition of open access on publications that meet two conditions:

1. "The author(s) and copyright holder(s) grant(s) to all users a free, irrevocable, worldwide, perpetual right of access to, and a license to copy, use, distribute, transmit and display the work publicly and to make and distribute derivative works, in any digital medium for any responsible purpose, subject to proper attribution of authorship[2], as well as the right to make small numbers of printed copies for their personal use.
2. A complete version of the work and all supplemental materials, including a copy of the permission as stated above, in a suitable standard electronic format is deposited immediately upon initial publication in at least one online repository that is supported by an academic institution, scholarly society, government agency, or other well-established organization that seeks to enable open access, unrestricted distribution, interoperability, and long-term archiving (for the biomedical sciences, PubMed Central is such a repository)" (Suber, 2003)

Whilst I have discussed elsewhere the impact of this definition and conditions of open access publication, here I want to point out that this journal, shares with OA others the fundamental principles of the declaration in that we acknowledge the complexity derived of [implementing changes to the conventional structures of authorial practice and academic publishing through a different type of approach to publishing and citation](#). This journal aims at re-considering publishing not only at the light of the implementation of this declaration but also the role of anthropology as a discipline in the promotion of open access in research and teaching.

The OA declaration had a gradual but fundamental impact in changing the landscape of what is perceived as 'academic publishing' and to who is to hold the rights of adscription to such label; to the extent to which we agree on the transparency of peer-reviewed processes; and how changing these parameters may have an impact on research, funding and traditional academic practice.

Academic Publishing: access and gate-keeping

Along with the OA declarations and the increased volume of OA publications there have also been attempts by the larger publishing and academic institutions to assess their potential as gatekeepers of this new situation. The critics of OA argue (Worklock 2004, Poyner 2006) that the increased volume of free, unrestricted publication has had the effect that there are now very long lists of myriads of publications, articles upon articles deposited freely on the wide expanding internet ether, a new universe of distant galaxies that we may never access, read or only make very specialized use of (see Gye 2010 on being lost and found online). However, regardless of the often commented feel that one does not know of the actual impact of OA (something that could be said of nearly all paid or free publications, in either hard copy or on the Internet) I would argue that the impact of OA is one and very specific: it [questions the nature of academic publishing, its relation to a number of pivotal elements of academic practice](#): reviewing, ranking, academic promotion, funding, research, academic versus non academic relations, the role of academic conferences, self-archiving, , teaching online, interdisciplinarity. It help us question the disparity of inequality in the access to the production (sharing and practice) of academic knowledge across cultures, and other divisions of inequality surrounding learning, teaching and the validation of certain kinds of knowledge in favor of others.

The virality of internet communication brought about these and other realisations at the time it also brought a simultaneous need to engage users and producers of the Internet at different levels of power than the kinds of engagements we had (or didn't have) at our disposal was when the Internet was first created. The Massachusetts Institute (MIT) consolidated its presence online as one of the largest repositories of open access teaching materials. Intute, JSTOR, Athens, JISC and many others gradually came to occupy a complex presence in the gatekeeping and accessing of what should be free, unrestricted electronic distribution and sharing of academic publications. Open Access, with a new emphasis on peer-review for open access, incorporated new guidelines and agreement forms between open access publishers, libraries and open access users; many repositories were formalised, and creative commons licensing became a way to the gradual empowerment of authors in self-archiving, re-mix, sharing of academic resources and the visualisation of these (see the repositories of JISC, MERLOT, Open Humanity Press, Lockss, and [Creative Commons](#) to name a few). The institutional discourses on Open Access, however, are still surrounded by a large debate on how authors and institutions are meant to collaborate with each other.

Lagging behind this vertigo of changes, unsure on what to do, unsure of for how long to wait to do something about it were academic, paid, publishers and their academic libraries and universities. They were caught in a storm, a double helix one. The electronic world was transforming the world of publishing. It was transforming the academic world. It was also transforming the relationship and interdependence between the two and between academic work and academic recognition. Publishers were committed to producing new websites, new searchable indexes and new strategies for customer engagement. They had a new market to invent, reach to and sell to. Whilst this was possible, it was unclear what to think or do about the growing number of free, unrestricted publishing academic materials on the internet. It was also hard to know what to do with the many competing non-internet based publishing market too. For the case of the relationship between conventional publishing (including academic authors, reviewers and universities) and the new OA people, it wasn't just an issue of competition, or one of loss of market shares, it was one of [boundaries](#) of who controlled the new production (including peer-reviewing and [localisation](#)) of academically published work online.

The AAA mets the OA

An example of this tension came in 2006 with the American Anthropological Association (AAA). In a year when OA (Open Access) had gained great momentum and started to displace traditional gatekeepers of knowledge, the Anthropological American Association (see [antropologi.info](#) archives) was publically reluctant and opposing of Open Access (Lorenz 2006). The AAA chair's letter in regards to OA was written in a tone nearly condemning OA as the quasi-evil that was going to erode peer-review and bring down the whole academic establishment (see also Kamrani 2006, Golub 2006) and undermine 'the business model of revenue generation':

- 1 would [further] undermine the value-added investments made by publishers in the peer review process;
- 2 would duplicate existing mechanisms that enable the public to access scientific journals by requiring the government to establish and maintain costly digital repositories
- 3 would position the government as a competitor to independent publishers, posing a disincentive for them to sustain investment and innovation in disseminating authoritative research"

Indeed, OA threatens to break down the relationship between research, publications, funding and academic viability of anthropology departments, and so the legitimacy of any academic association. It undermines the neo-liberal 'business model' of academic financing. The battle, however, is not about conventional peer-reviewed publications versus free, unrestricted peer-reviewed publications as the AAA and the critiques to the AAA would make us believe. Harnad (2010) criticism of the AAA 'fussing' about copyright reforms, peer review reforms argues for an institutional and collaborative adoption of open access mandates rather than one of opposition.

Ultimately, as I have argued elsewhere, the battle is not one of simple opposition between models of financing, but about understanding internet mediated media as something people transform into new types of academic knowledge, and how, who acquires political power and how this political field of contestation, opposition and defiance is dealt through what I call '(dis)oppositional' (displaced oppositional) narratives. I was thus very keen to publish Barassi's article that illustrates an example of oppositional narratives from an ethnographic perspective.

In the episode of the AAA mets the OA, the AAA reacted somehow defensively on critiques against the AAA's initial opposition. The AAA attempted to re-addresses the debate by giving 'green light' to

Open Access and conceded, with a narrative of some sort of simultaneous defeat-but-resistance to the OA wave (Lorenz 2006, Harnard 2010). The AAA 'opened' up provisionally-and-with-restrictions some of its conventionally 'paid' and 'kept within walls' publications, for two months.

The AAA debate was, on the one hand, good in bringing institutions to discuss taken-for-granted boundaries, albeit only moderately; it was not successful, on the other, in addressing the core issues of the implementation of open access (see Harnard 2010 for a critique). However, by late 2009 and early 2010 several British academic departments started re-thinking their position vis-à-vis Open Access, and academic publishing. The Oxford Journals were converted to open access and anthropological associations widened user's access to online libraries. It is unclear, however, how these institutions related to the 'green' and collaborative mandates on open access, but it meant a larger move towards some integration of practice.

In addition to publishing, new network sites were created, these put people in contact with each other, generate exchange of ideas, create its own group of discussants. These were indeed, the forums for the discussion on open access. This produced new types of encounters, and more importantly I'd argue, what was created were new ways to govern individual and group relationships generated within this gradually generalised academic internet use. In other words, [networks of groups of anthropologists appeared online and aimed at finding new types of governance](#) (of each other and of our relationships online) [for their own groups](#).

The next stage of mixed virality(ies) soon reached the academic community with several colleges, departments and associations re-thinking the way in which they published and made anthropological knowledge available to new audiences. Similar parallels exist in nearly all disciplines. This included projects like the large C-SAP open educational resources that set up the creation of toolkits and educational wiki for the universal sharing of anthropological, sociology and politics teaching materials. We owe to Strathern the theoretical possibility of thinking of such relations as these academic 'virtuosity' and as partial and multiple ontogenic relations and realities (Strathern 2004). Perhaps, we could argue, these processes we see in open access and networked anthropology groups are, to borrow Strathern's term, process of academic 'virtualism' as well as realizations of academic 'responsibilities' and of the promotion of different accounts (what I call, mixed virality(ies), divergent dimensions of the realization of such responsibilities (Strathern 2000)

The journal that we have here is the outcome of those mixed virality(ies), the original proposal to contribute to open access specifically for anthropology from an online (not just textually) based perspective; as such, the journal is released this month to commemorate the young history of open access anthropology and to join the many new publications under the practice of open access. It works towards institutional, author and shared agreements of open access mandates. Like many others ARDAC has its own network, its own types of governance, and its own type of resistance and defiance to conventional publishing, as well as, the same need other open access journals have in trying to explore a new context of relationships, and above all trying to explore new types of creativity and new types of producing academic knowledge within different types of boundaries. The journal, however, does not sit in any specific boundary as such, it is created specifically to travel between different boundaries and it focus in the nature of journeying itself. I believe this is something that defines many OA journals as well, what I call its altermodern 'journeying' condition.

ARDAC, Open Access Anthropology 2.0

Dealing with the creation of a distinctive open access anthropology publication within the background of web 2.0 technologies meant we had to re-consider what open access meant for anthropology as well as for us in particular. The aim of ARDAC is to produce an open access anthropology research based review aimed at the academic community at large. Its purpose is to produce responses to cultural politics from an anthropological perspective, with reflexive articles, commentaries and reviews produced in textual and non-textual formats. As its first editor, back in may 2009 I was keen to create not only a publication in the textual sense of the word, but a space that would incorporate web 2.0 technologies, photography, video, internet-based content as well as traditional text. We didn't want to transform existing published (paid) sources into open sources (this was an initiative later taken by the Oxford papers, for example) but to create a new journal from within the new context of internet communication technologies.

As a result, the journal was developed from within a web 2.0 platform called Ning, linked to and following the success of the open anthropology co-operative of which I was also one of its early members; the co-operative used the same platform. The journal you have in your hands was born within the ARDAC forum at Ning and developed through

various communication technologies. It will inevitably migrate from Ning, as this platform announces that it is becoming a 'fee' paying service. We will then move out of Ning and adopt a new free home, this will inevitably pose delays, changes to our visual system, and will change our relationships. Most likely, it will change the journals internal composition too.

ARDAC will inhabit, as it did from its conception, different repositories simultaneously; it is located in a recognised institutional site. It inhabits creative commons through its license. In time it will re-apply for a position in the OER repositories, and hopefully it will embed some aspect of networked relationships in other non-paying sites, open access repositories. These are also many of the aspects of 'journeying' that an OA anthropology journal takes on.

Open Access (Anthropology) and the cultural politics of dissent

As I have argued above, Open Access is by no means a new¹⁰ event in the academic and publishing world or to anthropology, for anthropologists, however, open access anthropology was, and still it is, I believe, a politically minded strategy (albeit a tangential one). It is perhaps fair to say that the history of publishing anthropology has had a strong current of non-traditional publishing in publications such as Hart's early 90s [Prickly Pear pamphlets](#), the first Jay Rub's articles on [visual anthropology](#) in early years of the Internet, and more recently the initiatives of the Goldsmiths online research papers, the [DAJ](#) (Durham Anthropology Journal) to name a few (many more exist across the world, see [antropologi.info](#) open access anthropology journal list)

I think of it as an [anthropology of online networks](#), or an '[anthropology of the network age](#)', (Anthropology 2.0) none of it very permanent, 'creolised' (in the Altermodern use of the word), and very susceptible to change. This 'anthropology of/in online networks' may present us with the possibilities of creating new critiques on locating and dislocating power.

¹⁰ The discipline of anthropology has built a phenomenal body of knowledge and shared practice through conventional printed, paid publications. The actual realisation of open access and self-archiving poses one of the most challenging dilemmas in contemporary academic practice. If open access and self-archiving (including peer reviewed open access) were to become a way for academic knowledge to be disseminated, with full, un-restricted access to all academic publications through the medium of the Internet, the boundaries of scholarly practice, legitimacy and funding would come into question.

What I mean here is that the '[anthropology of the network age](#)', what I call the '[altermodern anthropology](#)' (I don't limit it altermodern anthropology to the online network context at all, the network context is one of the several many altermodern times and directions, journeys we have), may help us to think through [non postmodern](#) ideas. I believe that postmodernity, as a counter dominance critique to post-colonialism had its moment. I believe it enlarged itself towards its ages of liquidity (Bowman 2000, 2006) and it went from being a reasonable counter-critique to becoming another type of dominant critique (see also Lee 2006) (this is why I feel attracted by the altermodern prepositions by Bourriaud, altermodernity being the period that follows the death of post-modernity. I comment below on altermodernity).

Nothing I am saying here about 'anthropology of the network age' however, is new. Anthropology of the 2.0 network age, altermodern anthropology, is just [another¹¹ anthropological perspective, another positioning, equally engaged, politicised and aiming at contesting social and academic boundaries](#). Marylyn Strathern has, for many generation now, brought us to the attention of anthropological knowledge situated in relationships rather than in the opposing, us-other (Strathern 2006). Furthermore, Strathern's work on academic relations as well as virtual relations is relevant here because in treating academic as well as virtual relations as Strathern does, as embedded in 'multiplications and divisions' these become prone to, as the case of open access reveals, making it difficult for us to conceptualise relations (2004:53). Strathern reveals one of the difficulties for an anthropology of the network age to give shape to relations, in particular, I would argue, relations of production as those debated in the case of anthropological online publications.

I am using Strathern here to argue the case that one of the underlying issues on the debates on the creation of a virtual academic publishing and practice, as exemplified in OA and online networks, and one of the reasons for the inconclusive nature of the AAA debate with its critics, owes to the fact that both academically and virtually we live in a world that struggles at making sense of relationships: "certainty itself appears partial, information intermittent" (2004:xxiv). We could argue that perhaps, the virality, the exponential nature of

¹¹ Open Access Anthropology, Anthropology 2.0, Altermodern Anthropology, Visual, Applied, African, Feminist...[Each of these traditions comes to question the position where knowledge is created, validated and made legitimate as partial connections](#).

online relations is an index of such struggle and attempt to re-address it such partiality in connections.

Anthropology of the Network Age: academic relatedness online

The anthropology of the network age, this altermodern anthropology is predicated, I argue, in sets of relationships, in appropriating the direction of global journeys, rather than being constructed as an opposition to the traditional academic discipline that is underpinned through the paid, walled, and restricted within academic circles and their publications.

At a superficial level, web 2.0 networked anthropology, Open Access anthropology, are presented as if they were in opposition to traditional discipline locations. Altermodern anthropologies such as the OA anthropology movement, the co-ops, the twitter groups, like some of the ethnographic cases in this issue, are not just about dissenting to a more dominant view of the world. Whilst they dissent, their cultural politics are about the fact their relationships are constructed different. In other words, the anthropologist that publishes on a conventional publisher that sells through Amazon, and the same anthropologist that self-archives her own articles online are not an anthropologist divided (it may feel so from within), but an anthropologist that construct different types of anthropologies through the self, an anthropologist that holds different sets of relationships about anthropology, that holds different 'anthropologies'¹² (see Wright and Rabo 2010 for a beautiful contextualization of the tensions and dilemmas of academic practice under university reform)

Other boundaries affected by open access, are, not surprisingly, the redefinition of scholarly practice, community engagement and applied practice. I

¹² A way I understand these possibilities (or rather sustainable possibilities of academic engagement) is through Kondo's (1992) theory of 'crafted and multiple selves' in Japan. In Kondo's description of Japanese artisans use of multiple and contradictory social positions, she presents how individuals are able to craft different multiple social selves in different social realities. Japanese artisans in her article hold different selves all as the whole (not a global unity) of many positions one can be (Kondo 1992:63), 'deeply felt' selves. I find Kondo's descriptions useful in that they mirror the kind of contemporary academic 'deeply felt' selves, contradictory and fractioned. Our academic picture, however, moves beyond the world of artisan and skilled labour, into one that Wright and Rabo (2010:7) describe as the grim place academics occupy in our present of university reforms, the new proletarian academic. The parallels with Kondo, tangential as they may be, reflect for me a transformation of the kinds of 'artisan' knowledge (the crafted ethnography by a skilled ethnographer in a hierarchical workplace) into partial kinds of dep-professionalisation of academic practice under current reforms. Open Access is one of these many attempts to craft the academic self.

believe Open Access has a point in saying to us that the way in which we teach and fund research -their precarious relationship of value- needs to be re-assessed from [another perspective, from another set of 'partial connections'](#) (the problem being on how to translate connections and partialities across perspectives). The way in which we rate and rank academic departments, academic production, and academic value of such production (within the gated precincts of university paid degrees) are narrated as being under threat of Open Access. However, as Wright (2009) has argued for university reforms, I extend the argument to say that is not OA that poses any kind of threat to ranking, academic value and so on (in the AAA cautionary approach). One could argue that [OA is reformative in the sense it offers what Wright and Rabo call 'a suitable language for protest'](#) (2009, p.8.) It is the academic managerial structure and the way it addresses 'the economy' and markets that refuses to acknowledge the power of dissent and relationality that is a threat to [all](#) genuine academic endeavors. Here by genuine I mean academic actions, whatever form these take in themselves or in relation to non-academic contexts, that express what Wright and Rabo call '[effective resistance'](#) (*ibid.*, p.8).

'Effective Resistance': OA and Anthropology 2.0 as 'languages of academic protest'

Imagine for a second that the open anthropology co-operative, and other anthropology 2.0 networks were to become recognized as what they are, ways of academic association. Imagine these supported by all anthropological publications to be freely available online, at any time, with no restriction of access. Imagine then how to re-conceptualise how we conduct academic practice anew, starting with how peer-reviewed is done; we ought to ask, who is to make meaningful sense of the discontinuities in practice and understanding in publishing anthropology?; and also who would be the new gatekeepers (I believe there are already few) of the process by which we produce knowledge through open access?.

In a period of academic reform and crisis, it would be really exciting to be able to reconceptualise academic practice anew. This is, however, unlikely to happen soon because whilst anthropologist, as well described by Wright and Rabo (2009, p.5) are left to fight from within those managerial structures in universities (with an arm and a leg tied up at the back -call it the many competing obligations from within), people in open access are gradually encountering the menace of a largely 'paid' internet

service provision and institutionally 'closed' provision to academic access and lack of institutional support for open access mandates (ibid Harnad). We are still unable to assess if academics have a chance to change the managerialisation of universities and the current commoditization of degrees but I know that Open Access has a chance as a social movement for change, as a social movement for academics -until internet providers stop being free, that is.

Open Access is not an easy option, it is impossible to assure the continuity of its existence without specific institutions, its impact on an exponentially growing cloud of internet exchanges; OA is easily appropriated by institutions and people who only pay lip service to the genuine idea of 'open access'. Open access accentuates the fragmented and partiality of connections of relationships online. However, each open access journal that it is published today is an effort in helping us re-think the boundaries of our existing academic practice, and in that, small as all these ventures are, fragile as they are in the vast electronic oceans of information, dissenting as they are to the conventional, paid, forms of academic publishing, hold an important approach to how knowledge is created in our contemporary altermodern times and our future ones as well.

Activism and Sharedness as political categories

Open access practices, self-archiving, Open Access Anthropology 2.0 are interested in creating a context of access (by this it is meant electronic, internet based, unpaid, un-restricted access) to both publications and relationships, in the promotion of new open access anthropology journals, the transformation of previously edited electronic, restricted, free or subscription paying into open sources, and in the promotion of self-archiving among everyone in the academic community. I don't believe it is a particular utopia.

From my point of view, OA is more of a movement of displacement from one place to another rather than a situated 'place' that can be enacted or imagined as such. There is a tendency to imagine acts of resistance and languages of protest, as well as online networks that do so as situated in a place, in the 'online' or in the networks in parallel to these. Here I conceptualize these acts of resistance (effective, ambivalent, partial, unsuccessful alike) as movements of displacement instead.

Online practices are situated in HTML pages (and similar formats), electronic formats that fundamentally support all electronic exchange.

These include the new types of email exchange and large websites and 2.0 networks. Here I argue, whatever it is we imagine 'online' to be -and there are many examples of different types of cultural imaginations about the Net (see Miller 2000)- here, I argue, looking at the case of OA, and the imagined online spaces it inhabits, online categories of existence (network, OA publishing, networked anthropology) are a movement of dis-placement. What I mean by this is that the production of online materials is a movement of 'placing' things online. A page, a flash, a music file is placed and stored somewhere, and then exchanged, shared or simply put elsewhere (see Nick White in this volume). In this sense, the use of 'things' online is often one action of 're-placing' 'things' and relationships elsewhere (in another computer or server so to speak), whilst simultaneously this re-placing putting things out of place, and thus susceptible to be re-imagined, re-told in their journey.

Because displacement is a predominant feature of all online interactions, political action (such as OA publishing or anthropology networks) through the medium of the Internet is a different type of political action and must be theorized differently, as illustrated in three papers in this volume. If I read Barassi correctly, she proposes a very original argument in that the ways in which people believe about what they refer as 'the internet' affects 'the way in which people understand political action and opposition' (Barassi 2010). I agree with her that internet technologies, what I see as the possibility of creating the internet -creating, making, producing content for the internet, not just using the content created by others- is a means of what she calls 'empowering activism'. I take it further to argue that OA is a possible form of what Wright and Rabo define as 'effective resistance' (ibid. p.8). If we take Open Access as a form of activism, in Wright's sense of a 'pressure point', I would argue that Open Access members' use of networking and posting on the Internet, make possible, in Barassis's terms 'a privileged mode of oppositional politics' (ibid.). I leave to her article to outline the problematic and 'ambivalent' positions of these politics to a much finer detail. I find Wright and Rabo illuminating in that I feel, they are able to address how to articulate what they call 'pressure points of transformation' in academic contexts (ibid. p11) as to how academics and students organize themselves (either be it, as I suggest, through open access anthropology, web 2.0, online co-operatives, or a mixture of all these) for, in Wright and Rabo's term the possibilities of 'alternative futures' (ibid. p.11).

'Pressure Points'

My interest in OA and Anthropology 2.0 came about my belief that Open Access and online networks had to be able to transcend the mere predicament of a reproduction of the 'safe' quarters of peer-review in conventional publishing and academic association. Reflecting on my past work e-learning I am biased in my views that things produced for the internet can not be mere transpositions of something else that happens elsewhere (Trias i Valls 2002). An example at hand is e-learning in this issue. E-learning represents a new type of learning context, it explores new types of access to learning. Whilst e-learning is a challenge to inequality in access, it is often appropriated by institutions that reproduce similar issues of inequalities (fees, international access of the internet, Eurocentric use of the Internet, institutional, privatised use of the Internet and so on). Producing a learning context in an e-electronic place can not be produced by reproducing what happens at residential, inside the walls of a departmental room, level (see also OER project). The same is true for OA journals and anthropological online associations.

Following the argument above, this journal and network aims at not reproducing the ways in which traditional journals operate. We had a particular vision that the journal had to be inclusive all types of submissions, opinion articles, working papers, research papers, non peer-reviewed and reviewed publications, multimedia (including audio, video) and internet based data. This remains one of its objectives. We also argue many people who publish in English are not English speakers, and that the assertion of English and how English is edited is often taken for granted. The journal takes submissions in other languages, as well as, it makes an effort in accommodating non-native uses of English. By this I mean that non-English speakers are allowed to express themselves in the kind of English that they feel familiar with rather than the kind of edited English that is standard in publications. Needless to say it accommodates submissions from areas that share interests with anthropology, like educational practice, media, cultural studies, gay and lesbian studies, sociology, criminology and many others.

In addition to changing the ways of reproducing the journal I also meant for the journal to incorporate the work of individuals at early stages of their academic career as well as more senior academics and inclusive of the academic community at large. For this purpose a review process was set up through an editorial board that consisted of different individuals at different stages of their careers, individuals from different anthropological backgrounds from applied anthropologists to

anthropologists that worked outside anthropology departments and from people that were working within anthropology departments to individuals who had a background in anthropology but had moved into new academic directions and non-anthropologists. They all had in common a sense of adventure, willingness to submit to the rigors of peer-reviewing workloads and a sense of experimentation of new media. In this sense the journal encourages a broad, critical, speculative and experimental interventions in discussions concerning anthropology and cultural politics with a particular emphasis on political voices in communication technologies, social media, political, popular and social cultures, research and teaching, engagement and intervention in society and any broad topics on technologies and experiences of social engagement and relatedness.

Altermodern at last

We wanted an anthropological journal that opened up to current analysis of cultural and political issues as underpinning the character of relationality of global issues. In the analysis of cultural politics, the journal is interested in social responses to the future of culture in the public domain in the age of globalisation. In our initial statement, I remember calling the journal (of the 'age of globalisation') an altermodern journal.

Altermodern is a concept created by Nicolas Bourriaud in 2009 as a result of his many years of critical work on the world of contemporary global art and 'relational aesthetics' (2002). In his work altermodernity is broadly defined as the period (our current period) that followed the death of postmodernity. Altermodern and altermodernity are two ideas that came to suggest a way of defining a contemporaneity of thought and experimentation in the creation of art (and by extension other types of social and cultural creations) and social practice. Based on examinations of art in today's global context, the altermodern was a form of dissent or rather, in Bourriaud's term a 'reaction against' imagined standards and commercialism. It emerged from a series of theoretical and art discussions and served as the epistemological background to a series of art exhibitions (later web 2.0 mediated) curated by Bourriaud himself. Altermodernism as a term was first coined by Bourriaud in 2005 as a 'new modernity based on translation', a way in which cultural values are translated as forms of connection to world networks. Bourriaud called this a 'reloading process' of modernism (ibid). The movement attached to the altermodern is underpinned by ideas and practices such as creolisation, re-telling, heterocronia, docu-fictions

(all of these can be explored further in the Tate Triennial website 2009). In their art context the altermodern artist is 'working in a hypermodern world or with supermodern themes' (ibid.) The original altermodern context is the world of contemporary global non-western art and it is a useful concept much beyond the remit of art as it plays with the relationship that discussions in art (modernism, surrealism) have had with discussions elsewhere in society and culture. Whilst I have always been cautious of the altermodern manifesto, in particular their 'invocation of play' of the term modernity, I feel it does well in that it takes the death of postmodernity towards new reasons for political reaction and protest against oppressive regimes of production. It does so, however, from within new narratives, new forms of art, new types of visualising and re-telling lives, arts and cultural stories.

I believe ARDAC (and many open source publications) can be defined through the tenets of altermodernity. These include the ideas of a consideration for a new emerging modernity, 'reconfigured to an age of globalisation'. Other principles, that I felt, put ARDAC in the context of altermodernity is the way in which open access produces knowledge itself and it is, as I have argued, created as a challenge to the classic peer-reviewed publications that are confined to academic circles and controlled within the auditing and managerial processes that define current University life. Thus, the challenge of altermodernity is one that aims at [exposing the increased communication between fields of thought, a migration of ways of thinking, a complexity of journeys that embrace an element of chaos and mixture of universalisms in translation. I feel OA and the anthropology of network age, shares these identifications and can be defined by them.](#)

In an altermodern sense, the editorial direction of these first numbers propose a journal that could explore bonds between ideas, representation, text, image (in their postmodern sense), but also a mash and remix of authorship and appropriation (in their Altermodern sense) (see Tofts' and MacRea excellent *What Now? :The Imprecise and Disagreeable Aesthetics of Remix* 2009). And like Altermodern attempts at re-mixing, an open access anthropology journal feels 'imprecise and disagreeable', it is felt sometimes, like a kind of 'ugly' form with resonances of anger, [unsettled at the point of creating pressure](#). If we take altermodern as a possibility through which to explore academic uses of web 2.0, OA anthropology may direct us to explore the colliding existence of finalised, un-finalised, reviewed, un-reviewed knowledge, re-mixed authorship, author-edited, externally

assessed, mixed, appropriated, re-mixed, contested, dissenting views, in the way like an altermodern artist does, by ['transverse a cultural landscape saturated with signs and create new pathways between multiple formats of expression'](#) (Bourriaud 2009).

ARDAC is at stage of meeting pathways, it is not completely there yet, but it is journeying, and in doing so it aims at re-narrating our contemporary lives by looking at the political intersections between culture and globalisation, production and appropriation, and specifically, the way in which human relations are mediated through political voice and cultural innovation.

Replica, Dissent and Electronic Sheeps

It is this 'political' voice, I allude above, that brought about the term 'dissent' to the title of the journal. My initial thinking was to use the term 'replica', in the double meaning of the practice of ancient Greek theatre and the postmodern use of it. The idea of replica in ancient Greek theatre is one where a group of actors respond, often in a chorus, to the main performing voices, sometimes the same word is repeated, echo like, others the replica answers back, dissents from the main voice, adds tone, reiteration, memory, contradicts it. I understood replica then, in a postmodern sense, as [a copy \(a generated repetition\) and an 'answer back', an emotional response, a way of contesting the production of meaning](#). One can think of contemporary use of this dual meaning of replica found in science-fiction/literature films about humans and cyborgs. Ridley Scott's 1982 early postmodern *Blade Runner* (based on 'Do the androids dream of electric sheep' by Philip K Dick in 1968) exemplifies the duality of the term replica in the characters of the 'replicants' which also echo the complex relations to cloning, copy, original, authentic, appropriated, dissenting in contemporary thinking.

The term replica, however, embodied many elements I liked about postmodern thinking about humanity, otherness, and time but there was a sense of nostalgia, lament and utopia that didn't fit into the altermodern idea at the core of ARDAC. Bourriaud argues that the [modernist idea of time](#) is that of advancing in a [linear fashion](#), with the [postmodern idea of time advancing in loops](#) (Bourriaud 2009). Following him, I wanted to find a more altermodern preposition for the journal/review, a term that in Bourriaud's [altermodern use of time 'captured the chaining, clustering together of signs from contemporary and historical periods which allows an exploration of what is now'](#).

I felt dissent was a better term for this clustering of signs and this exploration of the now. I felt the term dissent was one that could allow for the possibility of taking those postmodern echoes, clones and copies and be mashed and re-used with the original ones to the point of dissolution of those postmodern dichotomies and loops and thus, open up to the examination of new possibilities, in altermodern sense, what Bouriaud beautifully calls 'heterocronia', an exploration of ideas into 'different times' (ibid.).

In that respect we were immensely lucky that the first contributor, Veronica Barassi, send us an article that ethnographically narrated understandings of dissent and cultural politics through the analyses of discursive technologies and political action. Nick White looked at the pertinent issue of 'copy' and the issues of legality and illegality in music filesharing on the Internet. Hagai van der Host produced a fascinating review of the film *Avatar*, mirroring some of the ways in which film mythologies correspond to political realities, and how the levels of allegory and projection spoke for discursive discussion on orientalism, the morality of counterfeit and cultural imperialism in the American / Iraqi conflict.

I was thankful of the opinion articles, from Clare Perkins and Stavroula Pipyrou, because they made distinctive points about the possibility of 're-directing the ethnographic lense' (in Clare's case of using anthropology to think about genetically modified products) and re-telling the social appropriation of violence (in Stavroula's Calabrian Mafia) in a way in which both articles convinced me of the possibility of using anthropology to re-position ourselves theoretically and in research practice in larger communities of knowledge.

At the closing of this number Maria Paulina de Assis and Maria Elizabeth Bianconcini de Almeida brought an article that looked at the relationship between education and digital exclusion from an educational perspective and on the possibilities of multi-educational strategies for global educational contexts that have now consolidated through the Internet.

With the volume ready, textually speaking, I felt it needed to transform its textual format with a sense of experimentation and to go beyond the mere replica into one of dissenting text. At this point I introduced the word clouds for each article. I copied and pasted each article into an electronically generated word cloud. The reason for doing so was that in taking a full text and immersing it into an electronic mashing of key words, by an algorithm neither the authors nor myself had access to, the articles became re-ordered in their meanings. The word clouds, I felt, went beyond the conventional

abstract, written to be read, like an article does, into a re-told visual story, preceding their original article-based narratives with some power of their own. It is indeed, possible, to read the articles through their clouds, but it is not possible for the articles and the cloud to tell their own shared stories other than by opposition to the process of re-narrating, they meet in a time of their own. The world clouds illustrated for me some of the prepositions I had experienced in the Triennial Altermodern in re-telling narratives from various perspectives that were generated, island like, in a documentary fashion, a fiction of the article and moments of time; and where at each time of generating a cloud, would generate a different re-telling of the articles themselves.

In addition to the word clouds, of which there were many versions before their final ones here, I thought the journal needed a cover work that reflected the sense of altermodern journeying. I wanted the cover to be an internet passport. I wasn't sure how an internet passport could look like but I thought it had to be a passport that could convey the multitude of moments in time, including electronically online times, in a kind of genetically modified violence of online personifications of places; a passport that would 'misplace' these places somehow. If there was ever an internet passport, it would certainly look like a series of IP (Internet Providers) addresses, number on strings, like a GATTACA of sorts, which for me spoke for the ontogenic quality of such electronic journey similar to those already visualized in the postmodern period. However, I was concerned with the social, the global and personal journeys encountered in the altermodern sense of it all. It couldn't be a passport of numbers; it had to be a passport of sites that some how we visited, but not, with stamps, in the actual presence of having crossed those lines of creolised online spaces. The result is then a cover art that shows an actual electronic passport, superimposed on a genuine passport, stamped with the many web 2.0 sites explored in this volume, as passports do, with stamps overlapping across each other, superimposed, their ink fading in their journey to another site. I owe an immense debt of gratitude to *nenée* for her art work. I wanted an artist to enter the journal, to visualize for us some the underlying dreams and hopes of the journal. I gave *nenée* the idea of the electronic passport, explained her the centrality of journeying and re-telling, the clustering of signs in these journeys, and the many elements that altermodern artists used. She took it all in and disappeared into an art world of rare access for me. Few days later she emerged with what I think is an amazing cover. It has a mesmerizing quality. *Nenée* understood the brief so very well, up to the point of including word clouds of *nenée's* very own reading

of the journal, and her own reflection of a passport that re-tells this our journey. She defined the open access logo as a counter-image to the ARDAC title, and challenged my perception of fonts and dispositions with it all.

I broke the editorial into pieces and **mashed and mixed** the different 'journeys' and ideas that made this first edition into a different narrative, placed differently in the journal, with the full editorial narrative coming last, within the cover that re-told it again. I felt, each author created a distinctive voice that was elliptic of that condition of altermodernity I wanted to discuss. Whilst the authors here do not define themselves as altermodern, the journal is defined itself as such, as it travels through different journeys of modernity, globalisation, cultural critiques, and dissent. The editorial in this volume builds up a picture of the ways in which 'altermodern' discourses can be created and felt present. The articles presented here are larger than the scope of the journal. They are a mixture of levels of interaction with formally peer-reviewed articles, postgraduate articles in progress, research papers, film reviews and opinion articles, all the articles bring different levels and different moments of appreciation on how knowledge is created and shared. They also illustrate how different anthropological and educational styles may become less visible an enunciated than others, depending on their research process and their own journey. In doing so, all the contributions make this edition an example of how anthropology (and related disciplines like educational studies, music, geography in this volume) in its critical review processes, can make a contribution to understanding the dissenting voices and to larger anthropological reviews of cultural politics in this our altermodern times.

References

- Bauman, Z., 2000. *Liquid Modernity*, Cambridge. Polity.
- Bauman, Z., 2006. *Liquid Times: Living in an Age of Uncertainty*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Bourriaud, N., 2009. *Altermodern*, Tate Publishing.
- Bourriaud, N., 2002. *Relational Aesthetics*, Presses du reel: Paris.
- Davis, P 2010 Rewriting the History of the Open Access Debate, in the *Scholarly kitchen*. Society for Scholarly Publishing
<http://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2010/03/11/rewriting-the-history-on-access/>
- Dick, P K., 1968 (2007). *Do Androids Dream Of Electric Sheep?* Gollancz; New Ed edition
- Forte, M., 2007. *Zero Anthropology*
<http://zeroanthropology.net/>
- Friedman, K., 2004 Open Source Anthropology: Are anthropologists serious about sharing knowledge? in *Antropologi.info*
http://www.antropologi.info/blog/anthropology/2004/title_6
- GARP., 2010. *Goldsmiths Anthropology Research Papers* Department of Anthropology Goldsmiths, University of London. <http://www.gold.ac.uk/anthropology/garp/>
- Gye, L., 2010. 'How can you be found when no-one knows that you are missing?'] *In What now?: the imprecise and disagreeable aesthetics of remix*. Fibreculture. ISSN 1449-1443
http://journal.fibreculture.org/issue15/issue15_gye.html
- Harnad, S., 1998. The invisible hand of peer review. *Nature* [online] (c. 5 Nov. 1998)
- Harnad, S., 2010. *Priorities in Open Access Archivangelism*. <http://openaccess.eprints.org/>
- Hart, K., 2010. Open Anthropology-Cooperative <http://openanthcoop.ning.com/>
- Hitchcock, S., 2010. The effect of open access and downloads ('hits') on citation impact: a bibliography of studies. *The Open Citation Project*.
<http://opcit.eprints.org/oacitation-biblio.html>
- Houtman, G., 2010 (Eds.), *Anthropology Today* Ning Network. <http://anthropologytoday.ning.com/>
- Kamrani, K., 2006 'The American Anthropological Association's ignorant opposition of Open Access'. *Anthropology. NeT*
http://web.archive.org/web/20060708065716/http://anthropology.net/user/kambiz_kamrani/blog/2006/06/12/the_american_anthropological_associations_ignorant_opposition_of_open_access
- Kart, K., 1993, *Prickly Pear Pamphlets* (Prickly Pear Press)
<http://thememorybank.co.uk/2009/05/25/prickly-pear-pamphlets/>
- Khazaleh, L., Open Access in *antropologi.info*
<http://www.antropologi.info/>
- Kondo, D., 1990 Multiple Selves: the aesthetics and politics of artisanal identities in *Japanese sense of self* (Rosember, N (Ed.)). University of Chicago Press:Chicago
- Lee, M. R., 2005. Bauman, Liquid Modernity and Dilemmas of Development' *Thesis Eleven*, Number 83:61-77. Sage:London.
- Merli, C., (GenEdit) (2004) *DAJ Durham Anthropology Journal* ISSN 1742-2930
<http://www.dur.ac.uk/anthropology.journal/>
- Miller, D., 2001. *The Internet: An Ethnographic Approach*. Berg Publishers
- Open Access Declarations and DOAJ:
<http://oa.mpg.de/openaccess-berlin/berlindeclaration.html>

- <http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/bethesda.htm>
- <http://www.soros.org/openaccess/read.shtml>
- <http://www.doaj.org/doaj?func=loadTempl&templ=longTermArchiving>
- Pollard, A., 2009 (Ed.) *ASA Anthropology Matters Journal* (Association of Social Anthropologists) ISSN:17586453
<http://www.anthropologymatters.com/>
- Postill, J., 2009. *Media/Anthropology*.
<http://johnpostill.wordpress.com/>
- Postill, J., 2010. *Media Anthropology Network*, European Association of Social Anthropologists
<http://www.media-anthropology.net/>
- Poynder, R., 2006. Open Access: death knell for peer review? In *Open And Shut?*
<http://poynder.blogspot.com/2006/10/open-access-death-knell-for-peer.html>
- Rex., 2006. The American Anthropological Association lobbying against open access is so, so misguided, *Savage Minds*.
<http://savageminds.org/2006/06/12/the-american-anthropological-association-lobbying-against-open-access-is-really-really-wrong/>
- Ruby, J., 2009. *Jay Ruby Home Page*
<http://astro.temple.edu/~ruby/ruby/>
- Ryan, B., 2009. *Altermodern: A Conversation with Nicolas Bourriaud in Art in America*.
<http://www.artinamericamagazine.com/news-opinion/conversations/2009-03-17/altermodern-a-conversation-with-nicolas-bourriaud/>
- Savage Minds., 2010. *Notes and Queries in Anthropology – A Group Blog* <http://savageminds.org/about-savageminds>
- Scott, R., 1982 *Blade Runner*. Warner Home Video.
- Strathern, M., 2000. 'Abstraction and decontextualisation: an anthropological comment on the for ethnography in *Virtual Society? Get Real!* Cambridge University.
<http://virtualsociety.sbs.ox.ac.uk/GRpapers/strathern.htm>
- Strathern, M., 2004. *Partial Connections* Updated Edition. Altamira Press. Originally published in 1991 by the Association for Social Anthropology in Oceania.
- Strathern, M., 2005. Anthropology and Interdisciplinarity. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education* 4, 125-135.
- Strathern, M., 2006. A Community of Critics? Thoughts on new knowledge. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 12, 191-209.
- Suber, P., 2008. *Open Access Short Overview*
<http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/overview.htm>
- Tate 2009 Tate Triennial: *Altermodern*
<http://www.tate.org.uk/britain/exhibitions/altermodern/explore.shtml>
- Tofts, D., and McCrea, C., 2010 'What Now?: The Imprecise and Disagreeable Aesthetics of Remix. *Fibreculture*. ISSN 1449-1443
<http://journal.fibreculture.org/issue15/>
- Trias i Valls, A., 2002. 'Online teaching: The role of visual media in the delivery of Anthropology online' in *Visual Learning, Visual Teaching* (ed. S.Pink, L Kurti) Anthropology in Action 2002, Volume 9, Issue 2. ISBN: ISSN 0967-2019.
- Wesch, M., 2007. What is Web 2.0? What does it mean for Anthropology? *Anthropology News* May 2007, Vol. 48, No.5, pp. 30-31. *Anthropology News*, 48, 30-31.
- Wesch, M., 2007. *YouTube ethnography project*. Kansas State University <http://mediatedcultures.net/>. Wesch, <http://www.pbs.org/idealab/2008/02/michael-wesch-toward-an-ethnography-of-youtube005.html>
- Worlock, K., 2004 The pros and cons of Open Access. Nature Publishing Group.<http://www.nature.com/nature/focus/accessdebate/34.html>
- Wright, S., and Rabo, A., 2010 *Introduction: Anthropologies of university reform*. *Social Anthropology* 18, 1 1-14. European Association of Social Anthropologies.

All sites accessed in May 09

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 3.0 Unported License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, 171 Second Street, Suite 300, San Francisco, California, 94105, USA.