

Furthermore, to capture the sense of theatricality and performance involved in participating in new kinds of fiction, I drew heavily on drama teaching strategies. These strategies (such as drawing a ‘photograph’, writing in role, role-playing, soundtracking, flashbacks) provided children with an engaging and meaningful narrative authoring structure, one which gave them time to develop a strong context for the quest, time to develop rich and complex characters, time to create episodes of narrative action, poetic action, and reflective action (as described by Neelands & Goode 2000). This enabled the authoring process to be on the one hand controlled, purposeful and effective, yet on the other hand also highly engaging and somewhat chaotic. This created a pleasurable tension with the children as what felt like playing, performing and having a lot of fun with the *iFiction* application was clearly at the same time teaching them about English, about literature, and about literary and grammatical techniques to use to entertain, engage and emotionally affect their readers.

6 Conclusion

Inanimate Alice and *iFiction* both offer many opportunities for teachers to introduce the reading and authoring of digital fiction into their classrooms. In Australia, digital texts and multimodal authoring have been named as significant new inclusions in the national English curriculum. As curricula change to embrace the opportunities afforded by new media, teachers are searching for meaningful and relevant ways to incorporate and blend the new within existing classroom contexts. Both *Inanimate Alice* and *iFiction* reflect either born digital texts or remediated digital texts which draw from a long literary tradition, and both seem eminently suitable as ways to bridge the gap between what teachers are familiar with already, and the new, more radical kinds of texts that new digital media artists are creating. What I have been working on with both of these new forms of storytel-ling in the classroom is developing sound pedagogical resources for teachers to assist them as they embrace the new curriculum.

References

- Aarseth, E. (1997) *Cybertext: Perspectives on Ergodic Literature*. Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Alexander, B. (2011) *The New Digital Storytelling*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.
- Allen, M. (2003) ‘This is not a Hypertext, But...: A Set of Lexias on Textuality. Ctheory’. http://ctheory.net/text_file.asp?pick=389
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. By Michael Holquist. University of Texas Press: Austin.
- Barthes, R. (1971) *S/Z. trans.* Howard, R. Hill and Wang: New York.
- Betcherman, M. & Diamond, D. (2004-2005) ‘The Daughters of Freya’. http://ctheory.net/text_file.asp?pick=389
<http://emailmystery.com/dof/index.php>
- Bevan, R. & Wright, T. (1999-2000) ‘Online Caroline’. <http://www.onlinecaroline.com>
- Bolter, J. D. (2001) *Writing Space: Computers, Hypertext and the Remediation of Print*. (2nd Edition). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Campbell, A. (2008) ‘Undreamt Fiction’. http://www.dreamingmethods.com/uploads/resources/Undreamt_Fiction.pdf
- Chandler-Olcott, K. & Mahar, D. (2003) ‘Adolescents’ anime-inspired ‘fanfictions’: An exploration of multiliteracies’ *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*. 46(7). pp. 556-566.
- Cope, B. & Kalantzis, M. (2009a) ‘Multiliteracies’: new literacies, new Learning’ *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 4 (3), pages 164-195.
- Cope, B. & Kalantzis, M. (2009b) ‘A grammar of multimodality’ *The International Journal of Learning*. 16 (4). pp. 361-426.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1987) *A Thousand Plateaux*. University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis.

Douglas, J. Y. (1996) ‘Virtual Intimacy and the Male Gaze Cubed: Interacting with Narratives on CD-ROM’ *Leonardo*. 29, 3. pp. 207-213.

Dresang, E. (2003) ‘Radical Change: A Theory for Reading and Writing in the Digital Age’ *Wisconsin Symposium on Reading Research*. June. Florida State University.

Hayles, N. K. (2000) ‘Flickering Connectivities in Shelley Jackson’s Patchwork Girl: The Importance of Media-Specific Analysis’. <http://www.iath.virginia.edu/pmc/text-only/issue.100/10.2hayles.txt>

Jackson, S. (1995) ‘Patchwork Girl’. *Electronic*. Eastgate Systems. 1995.

Joyce, M. (1989) *Afternoon, A Story*. CD Rom. Eastgate Systems.

Kress, G. & van Leeuwen, T. (2006) *Reading images: the grammar of visual design*. 2nd ed. Routledge: London.

Landow, G. (2006) *Hypertext 3.0: New Media and Critical Theory in an Era of Globalization*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Lankshear, C. & Knobel, M. (2004) ‘New literacies: Research and social practice’. Opening plenary address presented at the *Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference*. San Antonio, 2 December 2004.

Lankshear C. & Knobel, M. (2006) *New Literacies: Changing Knowledge and Classroom Learning*. London: McGraw Hill.

L’Engle, M. A (1962) *Wrinkle in Time*. New York: Crosswicks Limited.

Morgan, H. (2004) *Exploring Hypertext’s New Reader: Some Theoretical Approaches*. http://www.athabascau.ca/courses/engl475/archive/morgan_exploring.pdf

Moulthrop, S. (1994) ‘Rhizome and Resistance: Hypertext and the Dreams of a New Culture’ in Landow, G. (ed.) *Hyper/Text/Theory*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Moulthrop, S. (1997) *Practical Criticism for Hypertext*. Ohio State Univeristy Colloquium, Ohio. April 1997. <http://iat.ubalt.edu/moulthrop/talks/osu/>

Neelands, J. & Goode, T. (2000) *Structuring Drama Work: A handbook of available forms in theatre and drama*. London: Cambridge University Press.

New London Group (1997) ‘A pedagogy of multiliteracies’ *Harvard Educational Review*. 66, pp. 60-92.

Page, R. (2010) *New Perspectives on Narrative and Multimodality*. New York: Routledge.

Saltz, D. (1997) ‘The Art of Interaction: Interactivity, Performativity and Computers’ *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*. 55. 2. pp. 117-127.

Thomas, A. (2004) ‘Digital Literacies of the Cybergirl’ *For: E-Learning*. vol 1. no. 3, pp. 358-382.

Thomas, A. (2005a) ‘Fictional Blogs and the Narrative Identities of Adolescent Girls’ *Blogtalk Dowunder Conference*. Sydney, Australia, May.

Thomas, A. (2005a) ‘Blurring and Breaking through the Boundaries of Narrative, Literacy and Identity’ in *Adolescent Fan Fiction*. NRC Conference, Miami, US.

Thomas, A. (2007) *Youth Online: Identity and Literacy in the Digital Age*. New York: Peter Lang.

Thomas, A. (2010a) ‘Children’s Writing Goes 3D: A case study of one school’s journey into multimodal authoring’ *Learning, Media and Technology*. EJ ISSN 1743-9884.

Thomas, A. (2010b) ‘Developing a transformative digital literacies pedagogy’ *Nordic Journal of Digital Literacy*. 6 (1-2) pp. 89-101.

Thomas, A. (2012) ‘Points of Difference: Humour, Pathos and Irony in Children’s Multimodal Texts’ i: Djonov, E. & Zhao, S. (eds.) *Critical Multimodal Studies of Popular Culture*. Routledge, 2012 (in press).

Thomas, A., White, J. & Lippis, R. (2012) ‘Inanimate Alice: A practical approach to teaching new literacies’ in Unsworth, L. & Thomas, A. (eds.) *English Teaching and New Literacies Pedagogy: Interpreting and authoring digital multimedia in the classroom*. New York: Peter Lang (in press).

Unsworth, L. (2001) *Teaching multiliteracies across the curriculum: changing contexts of text and image in classroom practice*. Buckingham, United Kingdom: Open University Press.

Unsworth, L. (2006) *Literature for Children: Enhancing Digital Literacy Learning*. London: Routledge.

Quinn, M. (2004) ‘Talking with Jess: looking at how metalanguage assisted explanation writing in the Middle Years’ *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*. 27 (3). pp. 245-261.

Walker, J. (2003) *Fiction and Interaction: how clicking a mouse can make you part of a fictional world*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Bergen, Norway.

Wardrip-Fruin, N. & Harrigan, P. (2004) *First Person: New Media as Story, Performance and Game*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Wardrip-Fruin, N. & Harrigan, P. (2009) *Third Person: Authoring and Exploring Vast Narratives*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Wardrip-Fruin N, & Harrigan, P. (2010) *Second Person: Role-Playing and Story in Games and Playable Media*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Wither, J. Allen, R. Samanta, V. Hemanus, J. Tsai, Y.T. Azuma, R. Carter, W. Hinman, R. & Korah. T. (2010) ‘The Westwood Experience: Connecting Story to Locations Via Mixed Reality’ in *ISMAR 2012: Proceedings of the International Symposium on Mixed and Augmented Reality, Arts, Media and Humanities*, pp. 39-46.

RE-READING THE DIGITAL: AN INQUIRY THROUGH PRACTICE.

Penny Florence

Friendship is [the] possibility of reading the other’s messages. (Baldwin 2012).

Introduction

Digital reading is not the same as reading a book, for several reasons. The main focus of this short piece brings together two of them: varying and implicit but usually hidden technological relationship/s; and a new and more complex construction of the reading Subject/ivity. More of these in a moment – and they are mutually imbricated – but first some definitions and explanations to situate the work.

By ‘eReading’ I mean interpretive textual activity that requires the digital. That is, simply reading a book or a conventional poem on a screen does not constitute eReading. Examples of eReading are surfing, reading anything streamed or, as here, reading text that is being created as you read by an electronic Reader. None is possible without digital media.

The practices through which these thoughts arose are complex, but they all stem from an initial historical question: how new is e-poetry? That question can be re-phrased to be, what is the relation of e-poetry to the avant-garde of the 20th Century, including, visual poetry, caligrammes, Concrete poetry, Modernist painting that incorporates words (including, for example, Cubism and later art, such as the work of Rauschenberg or even pop artists such as Lichtenstein) and the comic book. Underlying these questions, for me, is less an issue of history as chronology or facticity, but history as shifts in Subjectivity and sociality.

The practices just referred to include making e-poetry, transposition between word and image and translation between languages – and re-thinking the impact of all of these on critique. The existence of all these options seem to require a kind of reading that crosses and re-crosses reading, critique, transposition/translation, and writing. But a key point is that it *is* reading. It is not just looking or watching.

I stress this because of the prominence of the following view:

One feature of these [e-poetry] creations is that the texts that constitute it are initially perceived as images, animated metaphors or visual texts. The texts and documents become images, they no longer read, they are to be seen: their linguistic dimension has been subsumed under their iconic function.¹ (Gervais 2011).

The relation between word and image is clearly in play, but once the iconic takes over, it ceases to be poetry in any meaningful sense. It can be poetic, but not poetry.

Examples: e-Readers

The first image below is a screen shot of an e-Reader in action – or, rather, of two in action at the same time. The blue and the yellow words are each produced by a different e-Reader.

When you, as the human reader, open the app you see the base poems as they might appear on paper. You click on a number (here, from 1-4), and an e-Reader begins. It can be paused by clicking on 5-8. Varying actions can be started or paused by clicking on any of these numerical keys at any time.

You see the base text fade in and out in patches, and words in blue and yellow appear and disappear while the base text does not move. It is, however, modified by the movements across and through it.

Yeux, lacs avec ma simple ivresse de renaître
Autre que l'histrion qui du geste évoquais
Comme plume la suie ignoble des quinquets,
J'ai troué dans le mur de toile une fenêtre.

De ma jambe et des bras limpide nageur traître,
À bords multipliés, tenant le
Hamlet! c'est comme si dans distil a thousand
Mille sépulères pour y vierge tombs

Hilare or de soudain onces walked irrité,
Tout à coup le soleil as flesh so cold
Qui pure s'exhala de ma fraîcheur de naere,
Bare breath breathes out a pearly mist,

Rance nuit de la peau quand sur moi vous passiez,
Ne sachant pas, ingrat! que c'était tout mon sacre,
Ce fard noyé dans l'eau perfide des glaciers.
Sour benighted skin, when you were passing
Unknowing, ungrateful, that it was my soul
This drowning greasepaint, betraying, freezing.

have to select how much of this movement you want to follow, how deliberately, and for how long. The act of reading is brought to the fore.

Even when a passive approach is taken, it has to be chosen; you have to make a choice between several ways of reading, one of which might be to un-focus your attention and allow meanings to emerge. In so doing, you alter the role of syntax. The question arises whether this is a new form of syntax. Where, as here, more than one language is involved, you also have to decide what kind of attention to give to translation.

Eyes, lakes, drunk in desire for rebirth, naïve,
Other, no self dramatizing gestures invoked
As the pen the foul sooty trace of smoke
the veil, looked beyond, conceive.

limpide nageur traître swim
bonds, denying an evil
Hamlet! As if in floods I distill
A thousand tombs to die, virgin

Crazed cymbals shaken fists of gold
While the sudden sun as flesh so cold
Bare breath breathes out mother-of-pearl fresh air

Sour benighted skin, when you were passing
Unknowing, ungrateful, that it was my soul
This drowning greasepaint, betraying, freezing.

In this example, the base text on the right is a fairly free, verse translation in English of the text on the left in French.² The words in blue and yellow have been programmed into the e-Reader, either with different translations or according to varying critical principles ('critical' in the sense of 'pertaining to literary criticism or theory'). Some of these critical principles may involve transposing words from different poems, thus commenting on extrinsic movements within and between the base poems.

In the screen shot below, the blue text is generated by a second e-Reader, started by me as the human reader, and running at the same time as the yellow one above.

Yeux, lacs avec ma simple ivresse de renaître
Autre que l'histrion qui du geste évoquais
Comme plume la suie ignoble des quinquets,
J'ai troué dans le mur de toile une fenêtre.

De ma jambe et des bras limpide nageur traître,
À bords multipliés, tenant le
Hamlet! c'est comme si dans distil a thousand
Mille sépulères pour y vierge tombs

The fact that reading has always been technologised is brought to the fore by stopping and starting these Readers, while at the same time you are made more aware that reading has always been more social than it appears because there was always the question of authorship – was there an individual author of a given text, and if not, how did it come about?

To these questions are added others, such as how does it work? Who programmed it? What is the logic – or what are the logics? How far are they technical logics deriving from programming languages and operations? Is there a random element, and, if so, how does it operate, and to what effect? Even by arising, this questioning alters your relation to the text.

The following two images are screen shots of close-up details of the same e-Readers in action as the one above, showing different moments.

Repeated bonds, denying an evil
Hamlet! As if in floods I distill
A thousand tombs to die, virgin

Crazed the fists of gold
While the sudden sun as flesh so cold
Bare out a pearly mist,

Sour benighted skin, when you were passing
Unknowing, ungrateful, that it was my soul
This drowning greasepaint, betraying, freezing.

The screen shot above captures the words 'the sudden sun' as they emerge from a single spot in the base text. The overlap this creates while in process disappears as the words move apart. The base text fades or darkens simultaneously. As you read, you

These effects can be quite subtle, and they may not always be equally conscious, nor indeed might they always be as prominent as they are at this historical moment. I would speculate that such effects might become only about as noticeable as the difference between poetry and prose. They won't disappear, nor will their reconstruction of you as the reading Subject. However, they will inflect how the act of reading a book is understood, because its cessation as the only way of reading, which is already in process, will have moved further forward.

Digital Reading and the "inextrinsic"

Digital, or eReading, both brings sociality to the fore, and reconfigures how reading in general has been understood. It inaugurates an 'active associative animated dynamic reading-in-order-to-interpret', which we have agreed to call 'inextrinsic'.³ This work concerns inextrinsic reading by means of electronic Readers. It is 'inextrinsic' because it embodies a contradiction, or tension ('in-ex'); because it is about going deeper into poetic language than was possible before e-poetry (intrinsic); but also because it then moves to foreground associative, or metonymic, traces (extrinsic).

There is a simple example of a linguistic element related to the inextrinsic, which is feature of much e-poetry. Punning (or, technically, paronomasia). I would say that this is comparable to an inextrinsic figure because it works by taking the reader into a figure of language, the direction of which then goes outward – it moves in, then out. It is also useful as an example because it has a visual element that transposes to sound. Lastly, it's right on the edge of consciousness, which is perhaps the most important. Innovative language is necessarily oblique in terms of what is currently known. The joke work, like the dream work, is what enables perception of the unconscious or preconscious, or that in which reason or the Symbolic is embedded. Electronic, inextrinsic Readers work on this threshold.

Something very similar can occur in the practice of programming through 'type punning', though I have not gone into this as yet. As far as I understand it, type punning is where programming concepts are deliberately misused. Since this involves re-interpreting what a given type represents in terms of another type or types, sometimes including, for example, text-images (which make no sense in programming terms), it is directly analogous to punning in natural language. It is similarly subversive of stable meaning, and it similarly courts the absurd.

It is also the point at which we can begin to glimpse the ways in which the reading Subject is shifted from the individual towards the social. Inextrinsic reading implies an intervention in the imaginary. This is because the same dual movement that happens in language happens in the reading Subject: s/he becomes aware of themselves reading, while simultaneously having to be responsive to a technologised reading that is both impersonal and yet carrying an implicit human Subject or Subjects. The e-Reader is therefore a hybrid Subjectivity that constitutes the human reader in new ways. These ways cannot be accounted for in classical psychoanalytic terms.

New Subject, Old Left

Subject-formation, since Freud, has been understood as a complex of structures involving mirroring, visuality and language. Without getting into too many of the details, to privilege the

visual over the verbal in poetic invention is to vitiate the potential of poetry to effect change. This is the level at which poetry is political because it is where poetry affects the Subject and its constitution in language.

This brings us again to what I stated previously – that inextrinsic reading implies an intervention in the construction of the Subject, or the relation of the Symbolic and the Imaginary. Let me very briefly indicate why. Poetry is event in the Mallarméen sense, which is close to, though not the same as, Badiou's more recent, and to some extent possibly derivative, definition. What they have in common is the idea of the emergence of a truth that would otherwise not be discernible. For Mallarmé, this is an operation of poetic language alone. But Mallarmé, in my view, is no Platonist, while Badiou is. This isn't the place to argue it fully, but Mallarmé is the more radical in his understanding and deployment of the Subject in language. The Subject is always in process, and the truth is more dynamic because it's about relations. Mallarmé is also an atheist; Badiou's philosophy runs far too close to theology for this sometimes terrifyingly unstable, but highly inventive, universe. Badiou's philosophy has the great merit of being explicitly political. But it misses much that is in Mallarméen Subject (as does Rancière, but that is another story). The point, again, is how it constructs the imaginary.⁴

The reason this matters here is precisely at the level of this dynamic Subject. The processes of inextrinsic reading and transposition both bring the Subject into an uneasy place where innovation and change become possible. Think of the Kristevan eruption of the avant-garde into meaning, but transpose it into something more like the Deleuzian subject-in-process, and you come close. A big difference, however, is what I might call the structured dynamism of this process, and it is sexed-gendered, if you must.

(An aside – Many prominent male thinkers today are hampered by their lack of knowledge of recent philosophical writing by women. The reasons are many and varied, but the effect is similar and deeply unhelpful.)⁵

E-poetry deploys motion. That is one good reason why it is especially appropriate for the articulation and critique of a dynamic sense of language-in-process, or perhaps becoming-poetic, or again, becoming-truth. It is also why it is especially interesting in relation to translation. It is motion, a change in the temporality of language and an intervention into syntax, which in play with each other constitute the innovatory potential of e-poetry.

If the Subject is altered in this way, then so is collectivity. That is why these seeming-specialised matters have something to contribute to questions of the social. The same goes for what has hitherto been understood as 'the aesthetic'.

Both sociality and aesthetics have fairly recently – within the past 5 or 10 years, at most – come back into debates about media and art, but they have returned falteringly. They are mired in the thinking of the old Left, and vulnerable to the accusation that they simply reflect an uncritical nostalgia for some of the old 'certainties'.

Modernism was an idea built on revolutions. In remediating the social, we are not talking about revolutions, strictly speaking, though the effects may actually be more 'revolutionary'. This is an evolutionary model rather than revolutionary ... in other words, there are always continuities. But evolution is characterised as much by shifts and extinctions as it is by long and gradual change.

These continuities are suppressed in the general narrative of modernism and efficiency, by which I mean in this context, adherence to a certain tight and undifferentiated analytic. In aesthetics, it manifests in the dominance of individualism and abstraction, of difficulty and of a contemporaneity that only an élite can interpret.

In brief and provisional conclusion

It keeps coming back to the construction of the Subject as an individual, and often as the One-Who-Knows. Ideas of ebb and flow, of process and networks (rather than separateness), have been around for some time. But they have not fully replaced the outmoded individual Subject. This is partly because radical thought has been in the past so heavily invested in oppositional discourse that it finds it very hard to give up what it understands as revolutionary fervour.

This is inimical to connected sociality. The maturation of born digital thinkers should go a long way to ushering in the new evolutionary shifts that have been under way, I would argue, since about the mid 1800s. But it is only since the mid 1900s, and the spread of the digital, that it has had the media its logic necessitated – and made inevitable.

Notes

1. Gervais is right that they are often perceived in this way, but clearly I dissent from the view that the linguistic is subsumed to the iconic.
2. The poem is *Le pitre châtivé* by Stéphane Mallarmé, published in 1884, written in the 1860s. As the author of *Un coup de dés jamais n'abolira le hasard*, widely cited as the seminal text of avant-garde poetics, Mallarmé's work is especially relevant to e-poetry. See also Florence 2000.
3. 'We' here refers to my primary collaborator, John Cayley, and myself. The e-Readers we are working with were devised and built by John Cayley, based on his collaborative *Readers Project* (thereadersproject.org) with Daniel C. Howe. They can be programmed to perform different operations according to poetic or critical principles, which is where my primary interests lie.
4. I mention Badiou and Rancière because of their prominence in recent discussions related to this paper, and also to my work on sexed universals. (Florence 2004)
5. Elizabeth Grosz (eg 2008), Kelly Oliver (eg 2004), and many digital theorists, whose work should be more widely referenced, just for a start. I am not saying the work is not known. I am saying it has wider resonance.

References

Badiou, A. (1997) *St Paul: The Foundation of Universalism*. Stanford: Stanford UP.

Baldwin, S. (2012) Unpublished presentation. *Electronic Literature Organization (ELO)* conference, June 20-24 2012.

Florence, P. (2000) *Un coup de dés jamais n'abolira le hasard* by Stéphane Mallarmé on CD-Rom, edited, translated and introduced by PF. Interactive CD and essays 75 pp. Concept and Design by PF, programming and design by Jason Whittaker. With accompanying essays by Florence, one with Whittaker. Oxford: Legenda.

Florence, P. (2004) *Sexed Universals in Contemporary Art*. New York: Allworth Press/School of Visual Arts.

Gervais, B. (2011) Unpublished blurb for the session *Digital Aesthetics* IAWIS/AERTI (International Association of Word-Image Studies) conference. Montréal.

Grosz, E. (2008) *Chaos, Territory, Art. Deleuze and the Framing of the Earth*. New York: Columbia.

Oliver, K. (2004) *The Colonization of Psychic Space : A Psychoanalytic Social Theory Of Oppression*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Rancière, J. (1996) *Mallarmé: La Politique de la Sirène*. Paris: Hachette.

RE:MIX

PARALIPOMENA: (DRAFT OF NOTES STRIPPED BARE, EVEN . . .) [IPHONE VERSION 2.0]

Mark Amerika

What does it mean to program desire in a robotic world that strains to create?

These interstitial rubbings, these moments of textual frottage, why is it all stimulating me?

Writing is the flesh I just can't keep my hands off of.

It's driving me wild, again, always, and I really can't stop myself.

I just want to touch it – to lick its outer edge and slowly, if it will let me, go in deep.

To take hold of the machine and make it come.

To turn it on (explicitly).

A profusion of uncensored scratch marks that tell the tale.

A pungent rain of text discharged from the invisible cloud.

An Unexpurgated and Voluminous Zip File Ready for Immediate Download.

But I'm not even here, so how can I dis-re-member this prodding packet of transmitting desires?

Was I here?

I haven't even left and I already forgot how I was when I appeared.

It's like that.

It's like remediating the social – remediating the social *medium* – in asynchronous realtime.

The asynchronous social medium persevering through atemporal times.

The asynchronous social medium that becomes transmission itself.

That becomes the appearance of an apparition.

Duchamp – in his *Green Box* – writes:

A Guest + A Host = A Ghost

These remediated social bodies are starting to rub off on me, and something, it's hard to say exactly what, is leaving its feint imprint.

Is making an appearance.

An allegorical appearance.

An apparition of an appearance.

This is where **you, Desire**, come in.

An email, a website, a text message, a tweet.

Desire is the desire for an Other.

I myself do not exist (cannot exist, and this the thing I like most about me).

Desire: the asynchronous social medium that *becomes* transmission itself.

Desire asks: 'What does it feel like to submit?'

'To submit to the machine that triggers yet more desire?'

Why the desire to submit?

So that one can then make an appearance.

One submits, and waits, and then, by fluke of imagination, if intuition is optimally programmed into the environment, another ghost transmission arrives in response to the submission.

It's an acknowledgment of receipt followed a short time later by a message of acceptance.

Your submission has been accepted.

You, Desire, Have Been Accepted.

I, meanwhile, am always (an)other.

Welcome to the Remediated Social Machine.