Catalyst: Thinking Methodology as Digressive

For days now, I have been mulling in something you said about the difficulty of writing through the staccato of the day. This mulling calls me to write to you, to further consider how this cadence of disconnection affects a writing life. My life as a qualitative researcher is continuously, incessantly punctuated. Perhaps this is why I prefer to write as the evening light slips from blue to black, as the pulse of interruption falls quiet. Perhaps my tiredness softens a fear of failure, eases a slip into inattention, invites joyful digression... 

In the spirit of artists working through the postal system to make and exchange works of art, we enter the ideas at play in this special issue focused on unsettling traditions with the premise that “(m)ail art is a catalyst” (Chambers, 1985, p. 15). This premise allows us to consider and think methodologies as joyfully and generatively digressive (Massumi, 2002), while also unearth possibilities for us to abandon the confines of hypercapitalism found within academia. In what follows, we playfully experiment with unsettling by way of inviting digression to work on methodology. Specifically, we attune our experiments through one phenomenological tradition: postintentional phenomenology (Vagle, 2010, 2014, 2018), a poststructural methodological offshoot of phenomenology that is rooted in social change.

Our digression occurs through a focus on the process of correspondence art and takes form as a network of conceptual provocations, or modes for thinking methodology differently. Each provocation we crafted, inspired by principles of the mail art movement, imaginatively converses with Vagle’s five components of postintentional phenomenology (Vagle, 2010, 2014, 2018). By working through these modes, we attempt a careful loosening of the soil around the traditional to (a) explore the reach and amplitude of postintentional methods; (b) invite the aesthetic and material into the folds, margins, captures, and flows of what postintentional phenomenology does and, therefore, what it might become; and (c) craft something within an inherently capitalist/neoliberal system that disrupts the very tenants of that system (i.e., speed, competition, individualism, commodification).

As qualitative researchers drawing on the aesthetic, material, creative, invitational, and relational potentialities of inquiry (see, Hofsess, 2013, 2015, 2016; Hofsess & Thiel, 2017; Thiel, 2015, 2016, 2018; Thiel & Jones, 2017; Vagle & Hofsess, 2015; Wohlwend & Thiel, in press), we (the authors) found ourselves writing letters back and forth to one another about our quests. This exchange quickly became vibrant, messy, lively, and digressive—with circled and highlighted phrases, notations flooding the margins.
imagery in words and photographs made and folded inside. Letters spilled over desks into envelopes and boxes for safe keeping—for holding onto, circling back to, dwelling with.

Therefore, in this conceptual article, we attempt to write through the ways we gave ourselves over to the capacities and thresholds of digression (a phenomenon that is rejected by a hypercapitalist system)—and how we can imagine mail art as a digressive catalyst working on methodology—while also holding the questions that sparked and guided us along the way. Our wonderings include,

How does mail art invite the aesthetic and material into phenomenological inquiry?

How do the very qualities of mail art—reciprocity, surprise, playfulness, materiality (see, Chambers, 1985)—act as forces that unsettle the ways in which we think and do methodology?

And, how do these qualities push back against neoliberal discourses that urge us to produce quickly and in great quantities?

To give a sense of where we are headed, we first discuss letters/whitespace as digressive. Next, we situate mail art in the context of contemporary art practices and review scholarship that has engaged with this art form in qualitative inquiry and inspired our experimentations. With these contexts in place, we put the concepts of mail art to work in postintentional phenomenology to explore how the aesthetic and material become activated. We theorize five provocations, or modes of inquiry, inspired by mail art concepts that can be taken up in multiple theoretical or methodological contexts, yet frame them through postintentional phenomenology. Finally, we think and question how and why digression matters to methodology. These ambitions are playfully amplified through excerpts from mail art exchanged between us (the authors) as we were crafting this article.

**Margins and Folds: Thinking Whitespace as Digressive**

*In the texture of my digression, I feel the geographies of interruption that punctuate our letters to one another. My movements in and out embody the departures necessary in digressing; departures that provoke in the margins, create new folds.*

As I begin to write this letter, now within the witching hour, I am at once struck by your notion of textuals encounter with digression and I am overwhelmed with the yearning I have been struggling with since we started this project. Where has this struggle erupted from you ask? From the desire and need to manipulate these letters with my hands and the tools of writing—pens, sticky notes, highlighters. It feels as if the whitespace begs me with its vibrancy to crinkle the edges, doodle in the margins, and bear the stains of circular coffee cup rims—a material topography. How do I find ways to feed this need and answer the whitespace?

The first gesture toward writing this article was perhaps the underlining of this passage in Brian Massumi’s (2002) *Parables for the Virtual*:

> Take joy in your digressions. Because that is where the unexpected arises. That is the experimental aspect. If you know where you will end up when you begin, nothing has happened in the meantime. You have to be willing to surprise yourself writing things you didn’t think you thought. (p. 18)

As researchers, we (the authors) have often shared stories about the tensions we experience between writing and reader, research and researcher, scholarship and scholar. We have complained about the many material-discursive happenings—dogs barking, faucets dripping, food composting, dust settling—that have pushed and pulled and dragged us away from what we thought we should be doing—writing, researching, reading, or at least what our academic spaces made us feel we should be doing. These were the remnants of digression that we held onto, cleaved to, if only to throw them back at the world in spite.

It was not until we began reading Massumi’s (2002) text that we started to forget about how digression is supposed to be read, lived out, and embodied and started wondering how digression might be read, lived out, and embodied. We began to wonder how digression might be a window into what Tsing (2015) calls a “precarious noticing”—of the things that flourish and grow despite capitalism’s stronghold. But what does this look like? We mulled over this for quite some time—a necessary place between digression and progression that engulfed us. A place we still both sit, willing to be surprised by the ruptures.

Often, digression is felt as disappointment, frustration, and defeat. Starting as correspondence via letter writing, we found ourselves curious about what digression might produce as an apparatus of social change. How might clinging to and actively sitting in digression allow us to move along polyphonic assemblages (Tsing, 2015) that have multiple rhythms rather than adhering to unilateral patterns that push a singular methodological pathway? As Tsing’s (2015) words in the *Mushroom at the End of the World* resonated, adding other relations, or at least noticing that other relations are possible, allows us to see, hear, touch, and taste new and different stories that are moving and shifting and proliferating around the world and have absolutely nothing to do with the commodification and industrialization of bodies. It might be said that polyphonic waves reverberate
social change. Our letters, a polyphonic whisper, are a small gesture to reconfigure the phenomenon of digression.

Marginalia and enfolding images became aesthetic sparks that incited wrangling with digression and its generative possibilities in our research practice, unhinging the phenomena from its hypercapitalist and colonizing tendencies that see digression as the opposite of progress. And perhaps, it is. But “progress stories have blinded us” (Tsing, 2015, p. viii) into believing that progress is the only way to imagine life on earth and “is embedded . . . in widely accepted assumptions about what it means to be human” (p. 21), which are most often entangled in the notion that bodies are resources to be used. Tsing writes,

... the rise of capitalism entangles us with ideas of progress and with the spread of techniques of alienation that turn both humans and other beings into resources. Such techniques have segregated humans and policed identities, obscuring collaborative survival. (p. 19)

We seem to neglect that which does not resemble progress and, therefore, anything close to digression is quickly put at bay. However, our attentiveness to digression offered a way to unearth something in our researcher selves that had gone unnoticed. We recognized digression as an important link to newness, a rupture that can propel us to envisage avenues for qualitative-ness that pushes aside the dismissiveness habitually associated with digression and begins to deconstruct and tease out the not-yet-thought. Rather than seeing digression in neoliberal times as despair, our correspondence offered glimmers of hope for justice-right-now rather than justice-to-come (Barad, 2010). We found, like so many unnoticed things or things that are seen as time-consuming and less efficient, our letters were “unencumbered by the simplifications of progress narratives, the knots and pulses of patchiness [were] there to explore” (Tsing, 2015, p. 6).

But how might those initial letters unfold a new way to think about and produce qualitative research? We grapple with this question by drawing inspiration from the mail art movement and its polyphonic rhythms. Mail art embodies slowness, anticipation, and idiosyncrasy. Defying the social constructs of time, it takes time to craft. It takes time to send. Defying the economic constructs of scalability, it defies mass production. It defies commodification. In a way, it is digressive. Perhaps, mail art offers us a way to engage in qualitative research digressively.

Mail Art and Qualitative Inquiry

My work as a visual artist, teacher educator, and qualitative researcher are connected—though not seamlessly so. The articulation of my digression shifts as I live out, in, and through words, images, textures, memories, teaching, writing, drawing, stitching, making photographs and manuscripts . . .

Mail art gained speed as a movement in the 1960s as artists sent poems, collages, and other artworks through post rather than commercial networks including galleries and museums. Exchanged in various forms, mail art arrives as postcards, letters, packages, journals, emails, and more (Chambers, 1985; Held, 1990). Sending, receiving, waiting, anticipating, responding, traveling, arriving, departing, wandering—we find mail art to be robust with affective and material divergency. Furthermore, “mail artists are politically active” (Chambers, 1985) calling for social change. Mail art as a material-discursive apparatus (Barad, 2007)—a phenomena that creates spaces, boundaries, and contexts—might be seen as “a response to growing public awareness of fast-moving technological advances and also of contemporary political developments linked to the limitations of economic globalization” (Braidotti, 2016, p. 13).

Many scholars in qualitative inquiry have responded conceptually and methodologically to the premise that “(m)ail art is an exchange system for ideas” (Chambers, 1985, p. 15). Often—but not always—evoked by arts-based researchers, mail art has been used to provoke new insights in educational research. To offer several examples, Springgay (2008) put mail art to work with students in pedagogical modes that examined how meanings are relationally, corporeally created and exchanged. McGregor (2015) employed mail art and autoethnographic writing with new teachers to trouble normative understandings of gender and gender expression. Hofsess (2016) wrote about teacher renewal through epistolary form, inviting readers into the findings of a qualitative research inquiry by unfolding a yearlong correspondence of letterpress-printed postcards and hand-rendered letters exchanged with K-12 art teachers.

Shields and Hanawalt (2018) investigated how material disruptions and conceptual proddings in the form of gifts sent by mail might be theorized as creative acts of mentoring with early career art teachers. These experimentations embolden our conceptual project of thinking methodology as digressive through mail art and inspire us to consider the ways mail art might be a polyphonic thread that unravels and frays away from the commodification of art and research. As this article continues, we pepper our theorizing with tenants from Chambers (1985) list, “101 Things You Should Know About Mail Art.”
Fold: Thinking Aesthetically and Materially with Postintentional Phenomenology

Historically speaking, qualitative researchers have employed philosophies of phenomenology to open up and contemplate particular phenomena (i.e., love, death, racialization, etc.) by asking the question “What is _____.” Eager to push the boundaries of phenomenological research, Mark Vagle envisioned postintentional phenomenology as a hybrid methodology of qualitative inquiry rooted in poststructural philosophies. A rupture in descriptive and interpretive traditions, postintentional phenomenologies see the phenomenon as always slipping away, not quite an understanding that one can corral, a brief glimpse into the possibility of awareness “allow(ing) for a more nuanced reading of lived experience and . . . embrace(ing) the important philosophizing and theorizing that has taken place since the old phenomenology” (Vagle, 2014, p. 112). This, to us, seemed a bit like digression—trying to reach an understanding that we know we can never obtain, yet engaging in thought that provokes us to explore potentials.

Postintentional phenomenology also embraces the potential of thinking with theory (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012) to see what happens when philosophies and theories are put into dialogue with one another to make sense (albeit briefly) of the phenomena at hand. We are encouraged that “(m)ail art brings art and life together” (Chambers, 1985, p. 15) in ways that embody the postintentional call to embrace a theoretical assemblage where we might enact Haraway’s (2016) notion of string figures or cat’s cradle,

... passing patterns back and forth, giving and receiving patterns, dropping threads mostly failing but sometimes finding something that works, something consequential and maybe even beautiful, that wasn’t there before, of relaying connections that matter. . . . (p. 3)

By picking up (and dropping) some of the threads of postintentional phenomenology (Vagle, 2014) as well as the threads of feminist new materialism (Barad, 2007; Braidotti, 2013), a new polyphonic cadence has the potential to emerge in our research practice, one that hearkens back to curiosity rather than progress. One that tells us to sit with and ponder rather than rush through hastily. One that beacons to joyfully digressing in a world that loudly exclaims we should be doing otherwise. As Tsing (2015) posits, “(o)ur first step is to bring back curiosity” (p. 6) without the constraint of progressive narratives. Theoretical assemblages begins with curiosity and mail art allows for the exploration of the patchiness found within it. As such, we believe borrowing certain things from each tradition will be a generative way to create a new hybrid space of doing phenomenology and feminist new materialisms alike. Like archeologists, we call for a careful loosening of the soil around the traditional, to unsettle postintentional methods and invite an aesthetic material phenomenology into the fold.

In what follows, we outline how we envision unsettling each of the five components of postintentional phenomenology (Vagle, 2010, 2014, 2018):

1. **Identify** Unsettle how a phenomenon works in its varied contexts around a social issue.
2. **Devise** Unrest how a clear, yet, flexible process for gathering constructing, fabricating, dwelling with material appropriate for might entangle with the phenomenon under investigation.
3. **Make** Untether how a postreflexion plan seeks material-discursive intensities.
4. **Explore** Unearth how the postintentional phenomenon overlaps, bends, and spreads using through theory, phenomenological material, and postreflexions.
5. **Craft** Unfold how an aesthetic, material text engages the productions and provocations of the postintentional phenomenon in varied contexts around a social issue.

We strikethrough not as a critique or not as an invocation of Derrida’s (1976) concept of “sous rature” (placing text under erasure), but rather as an acknowledgment of the generativity this structure has offered us in previous works (see, Hofsess, 2016; Thiel, 2014), as we embark on a creative experimentation to think methodology digressively. Perhaps, in this way, we are taking up how Springgay (2008)—extending Derrida through Spivak—theorizes striking through as acts of tracing that reimage

the metaphor of the palimpsest from vessel or archive of past meaning, which would imply a container of closed boundaries, to a more rhizomatic configuration, where the act of crossing out turns from a remainder or an absence, towards a reconfiguration of mark making as not only new knowledge, by knowledge that points to possibilities that are yet to come, further tracings. (p. 87)

Subsequently, we see the striking as a way to engage in the collaborative survival that Tsing (2015) marks as imperative.
to endure living within the precarity of capitalism’s ruinations. As such, we explore the reach, the amplitude of postintentional methods as we continue—inviting further and further tracings of phenomenologies to body forth.

**Provocation: Thinking Mail Art in Modes of Inquiry**

*These letters reek of my writerly life, my researcherly life, and my academic-y life. I can’t escape those things and I don’t know why I constantly try to divorce myself from them, compartmentalize them—pulling and pushing as if they won’t come flying back to each other in grandiose and sneaky ways. So why do I try to push them into separate corners of the ring? Are they fighting, competing with each other? I have come to the conclusion that I am trying to control them, command them in ways that are impossible.*

When we began to toy with the idea of what it means to be digressive in our methodologies and thus, work differently than the neoliberal academic forces we felt tethered to in so many ways, we realized that step-by-step, linear procedures seemed antithetic to our endeavors. In its very nature, digressiveness calls for an undoing, a step backward, and at times, a stillness of bodies. Digressiveness rears its head at procedures—with a history of interruption and directional change. Digressiveness seemed more like a mode of expression, a polyphonic wave, with potential unknown that cannot be corralled into linear methods.

Inspired by Merleau-Ponty who writes, “the body is our general medium for having a world” (p. 169), we seek to include the bodies of space, time, objects, and otherwise into the fray. It is the amalgamation of these things that opens up the potential for phenomena to unfurl. In what follows, we put our five digressive modes of inquiry—unsettle, unrest, untether, unearth, and unfold—to work on postintentional phenomenology as an example of how qualitative researchers might engage in digressive methodologies in their own research endeavors. Although we choose to unsettle phenomenological methodologies, these modes can be useful for any researcher trying to undo the knots of neoliberalism.

**Unsettle**

“To truly appreciate mail art demands participation.”
~ Chambers, 1985, p. 14 ~

To engage with postintentional phenomenology (or any phenomenological method for that matter) is to identify a phenomenon (such as we have done with digression). However, to dive into a phenomenon in its “multiple, partial, and varied context” (Vagle, 2010, 2014, p. 121); by asking *what something is* for us, has somewhat limited aesthetic and material capacities. A phenomenon, such as digression is lived out in many things—not just human endeavors. Therefore, in phenomenologies that attend to the aesthetic and material, seeking what a phenomenon *can do* replaces the traditional phenomenological question of “What is”? Using digression as an example, when thinking about the phenomenon rather than focusing on the subject, one might ask,

- What is it to find digression? What does digression do?
- How is digression working?
- For whom and for what? (social, cultural, political, material implications)

Traditionally, phenomenological research is an isolating practice insomuch as the researcher operates as an individual seeking new understandings about a particular phenomenon. Seeing the researcher and the phenomenon as always, already multiplicitous (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987), we find generativity in disrupting the quest of the individual researcher from the start by working in partnership. This collaborative endeavor also produces something different than the neoliberal academy, which tends to operate in silos and individualist competition. We are drawn to mail art in its inherent demands for engagement and participation in picking up and exchanging social, cultural, political, aesthetic, and material threads.

**Unrest**

“The postcard is the most commonly used support in mail art.”
~ Chambers, 1985, p. 15 ~

We replace and disrupt traditional phenomenological interviews and observations by offering aesthetic, material postcard evocations for doing-making-thinking-being (Figure 1). This disruption occurs through our concern with the agential capacity of materials and within the unrestful space of art making. For example, during our exchange of correspondence, Brooke created postcards and stationery using risograph printing technology. The vivid neon orange ink, the feel of cotton paper in hand, called to us, urged us to seek new ways to explore digression more thoughtfully in both human and more-than-human endeavors curated through mail art.

When considering postcard options, any postcards will do, as postcards are forgiving. Postcards are meant to incite data creation and fabrication by simply asking one to contemplate the research questions and “critique unknowing”
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(Vagle, 2014) through various everyday entanglements including social, political, environmental, aesthetic, embodied, and technological. Researcher should seek the blurry and in-between-ness of the material and discursive productions of the phenomenon under study. One possibility for a project design would be to collaboratively consider a particular phenomenon such as digression (what does it do, how does it work, etc.) through daily activities such as walking, running errands, during transitions that move between roles and space, in the present moment, conversations, and through social media. Glimpses of the phenomenon in these moments would be shared collaboratively via mail art postcards. Evocations would likely shift for other projects and phenomena.

Untether

“Mail art is usually stored in cardboard boxes . . .”
~ Chambers, 1985, p. 15 ~

Postintentional phenomenology calls us to create a bridling plan where we contemplate and analyze data regularly through writing in a journal. Rather than a bridling journal, we enter the phenomenon with a box of any size, shape, or material at the ready. We see the box as a leaky, sticky space rather than a harness, a space where bits and pieces of the phenomenon as a material-discursive apparatus might coalesce. Think of that which the mail artist tucks away, archives, finds interesting. We call this a material-discursive intensities archive, not unlike the scrappy piles of interesting material that an artist or writer would accumulate during a project.

Although a journal still constitutes material, it is typically ordered in nature, consistently pointing back to the handwritten, the verbal, the retelling, the human. The box shakes up the idea of order and offers a way to account for material artifacts as a way to “stretch openness and humility” and discovery (Vagle, 2010). Artifacts could include photos, artwork, postcards, a letter, salient objects, lyrics, a CD, a video, an article, sticky notes, and so on. These artifacts dwell with the research and the researchers as the process of inquiring continues to unfold. After all, “(t)ime is not linear, and neither is mail art” (Chambers, 1985, p. 14).

Unearth

“To look at a mail artist’s collection of responses is like seeing every other link in a numerous array of chains.”
~ Chambers, 1985, p. 14 ~

Postintentional phenomenology calls researchers to read and write their way through their data in a systematic way. Rather than writing through systemically, we take up a diffractive practice. Barad (2007) writes,

Diffraction as a methodology is about studying how differences get made in such a process and the effects difference make; what is excluded and how these differences and exclusions matter. (p. 30)

To unearth these differences and exclusions, we call for a series of analytic letters or postcards that are sent to coresearchers and/or participants throughout the inquiry’s journey—a back and forth of fleeting moments that are unstable, unfolding, and unsettled. As researchers, we look for overlaps, bending, spreading of a phenomenon and share where those differences and exclusions seem to bubble up. In addition, coresearchers are encouraged to share their material-discursive intensities archives with each other, sharing the ways phenomena under investigation have emerged over the course of the research project and seeing the endless links, chains, possibilities.

Unfold

“Mail art may not be in its final state after posting. Recipients may alter the work and return it, or post it to someone else.”
~ Chambers, 1985 p. 14 ~

We embrace places of pause—where one “writes up” research not because their endeavors are complete but because one must take a moment to think thoughts they might not have thought otherwise and might not think again. This involves moving in and through the previous four

Figure 1. Risograph-printed stationery Brooke made in the process of this inquiry.
components—unsettle, untether, unrest, unearth—before working through unfolding an aesthetic, material text that “captures tentative manifestations of the phenomenon in its multiple, partial, and varied contexts” (Vagle 2014, p. 121). Therefore, unfolding a text can take on many arts-based forms. It might become fabricated as a visual art project or a sculpture. Or perhaps it takes on the form of a poem or a children’s book. Whatever the form, analysis serves as an artful manifestation of the phenomenon that is sent onto the reader. Like in mail art, this reader may alter, reject, or share this form with someone else.

**Digression: Thinking and Matter/ing**

But now it is past midnight and technically I and the letters and the paper and the sun have faded into the next date and I am still yearning to find the words to articulate the multiplicities of being in the digression of limits—limited through the reality that there aren’t any scissors here and I am left with what feels like a void—unable to make textually and visually the images floating and tangled in my mind.

We have been exploring this process through postintentional phenomenology, but wonder what might happen when we explore other phenomena of import, or invite others into our queries. As such, we wish to close by inviting you to engage with us in unsettling digression by contemplating the questions we posed earlier in this article in relation to your own research interests and inquiries:

- What is it to find digression? What does digression do?
- How is digression working?
- For whom and for what? (social, cultural, political, material implications)

We offer the postcard below (Figure 2) as a gift for readers to engage with these questions and take up other ideas that compel them to work digressively and possibly use mail art as an apparatus of social change in their personal research projects.

The work of unsettling is not a simple task and as daily headlines and everyday lifeworlds illustrate, we have much unsettling left to do. Even as we wrote and edited this article, we were faced with digressive forces that continued to slow us down, make us pause, help us realize what needed our attention the most in the moment. Sometimes, it was our own health or the health of our children. Other times, it was facing the injustices that seemed paramount, demanding our attention (i.e., children locked in cages at our borders, school shootings, #MeToo, #BlackLivesMatter, Dr. Ford’s testimony). Once, a hurricane had us on the edge of our seats (and on higher ground) hoping our homes would not flood (see postscript). While other digressive times were born from the sheer exhaustion of the day-to-day neoliberal academy. And of course, there were moments when it was just because we wanted to spend time with our families, the people we love. Through it all, digression was telling us to slow down, take a minute, breathe; and we heeded the call. Heeding helped. It gave us new perspectives, new directions, and new horizons. Perhaps, engaging with digressive methodologies offers the same possibilities for qualitative inquiry? Perhaps.

**Dear Readers,**

I write to you in the late, late hours—you know the ones that are neither night nor morning but somewhere in between? They are the hours that I often find clarity, while either dreaming or thinking or possibly both. Brooke and I urge you to seek out spaces of digression in your research and otherwise, as it is a place where one comes to intimately know themselves and their interdependence with the people, places, and things we immerse ourselves in daily. Only then can we truly engage in social change—when every decision seems to matter, when every word seems diaphanous, when every action (even the small ones) seems more crucial than the last.

**Postscript**

The work of unsettling tradition is not an easy resting space. The ever-changing weather of our world teaches this as storms unroot things tiny and large. Yet, when we sit down

---

**Figure 2.** Blank risograph-printed postcard Brooke made as part of this inquiry.
to create/write/think, unsettling becomes generative. Sifting through the contents of a satchel—bent, crumpled papers, pamphlets, cards, empty cellophane bags and other bits bound for the recycling bin somehow have the capacity to coalesce; offering a digressive snapshot of what is becoming these days. These postcards (Figure 3) are bound for a gallery in Black Mountain, North Carolina, for a mail art exhibition—just as these pages are becoming bound as a manuscript. In letting both go toward encounters with other readers and viewers—we continue to loosen the soil, we continue to unrest, trouble, and create.
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Figure 3. Postcards Brooke made from a local weather report of Hurricane Florence (left) and remnants found at the bottom of her satchel (right).
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