

Embalmed|Unembalmed: the problems of the lived event within media studies 2.0

●Tony Richards

Lincoln School of Media, University of Lincoln, UK

ABSTRACT ● Media Studies 2.0 seeks to rewire the discipline of media studies from prevailing notions of aggregate third-person, top-down or imposed identities (as found within the domain of industrial mass communications media) toward what it sees as the communication of new bottom-up, first-person or singular reflexive identities favored within the post-fordist, post-industrial spaces of the internet, social networking sites, second life-like domains and computer game spaces. This article will point toward many of the hidden, though still important, intersections between these two supposedly separate conceptions through the use of a case study that throws notions of clean “communication” into question. From this it will go on to argue for a recognition of such new media spaces as better conceptualized through Bataille’s notion of ‘General Economy’ and Derrida’s notion of ‘Undecidability’, as dually taken forward in the work of Arkady Plotnitsky. The conclusion? *Far* from modern teletechnologies offering a new sense of micro-community or as channels of individual self-expression (a new Rousseauian or McLuhanesque global village of intimate contact), these emergent teletechnologies serve to further displace or *undecide* the locus of any signature context of communication, which this article takes as a cause for celebration. ●

KEYWORDS ●undecidability ●first-person ●third-person ●identity ●alterity ●performativity

Introduction

It is also said that different or distant places can communicate between each other by means of a given passageway or opening

Jacques Derrida, ‘Signature Event Context’

For well over a decade now, the general shape of the object under media studies’ optic has been mutating with some notable rapidity. Some are consequently coming to ask whether the supervening academic study of this mutating object is itself in the best of shape to track such transformations. In response to these somewhat dissonant and lately heard notes, some reflexive recognition of these difficulties is in many places making itself apparent. Within one such example of this resonantly felt necessity, Gauntlett (Gauntlett 2004), in attempting to gain some theoretical traction on this currently surging and still somewhat protean “new media” landscape, believes that the still largely prevailing traditional linear or mass media based communications models are more and more providing a very poorly calibrated compass or orientation toward these new and emerging spaces. What of these mutating spaces?

Though somewhat haphazard at present, patterns are nevertheless forming either within the construction of more and more responsive third-party *provided* texts (e.g. television such as talent shows, computer games, certain websites, etc.) or first-party *user-generated* texts or smartefactsⁱ (mobile ‘tele’ interactions, social networking sites, responsive environments, youtube uploads etc.ⁱⁱ) and other still more protean forms of currently emerging practices that as yet have no shape (tracked for instance by Rheingold 2002 on a somewhat anthropological expedition to Tokyo, Japan). Along with his ongoing (Giddens inspired) reflexive-sociological work on media, culture and identity, Gauntlett provides a somewhat polemically-inspired manifesto approach that seeks to, in his words, *rewire* media studies to concentrate its energies and resources on these more widespread bottom-up participant creative spaces, rather than somewhat clumsily forcing tools tempered for a previous more

top-down age, where formerly dominant media interestsⁱⁱⁱ produced one-way quite stage-based and tightly controlled media spaces. In tackling the ageing, though still dominant, tendencies of existing media studies he points out that these have a manifest:

[T]endency to celebrate certain 'classic' conventional and/or 'avant-garde' texts, and the focus on traditional media in general, is [within his proposed media studies 2.0] replaced with –or at least joined by– an interest in the massive 'long tail' of independent media projects such as those found on YouTube and many other websites, mobile devices, and other forms of DIY media. (Gauntlett, 2007)

These independent DIY media 'projects', on spaces such as Youtube, represent then the constructing or exhibiting of identities that would seem *not to have been imposed from some large-scale third-person 'without'*, but appear instead now to be self-driven excursions or 'projects-of-a-self', producing maps of its navigations through the complexities of the current social terrain^{iv}. But these more *personable* spaces are also very hard to properly 'pin' or nail down for study within currently dominant conceptualisations. For these emerging practices are operating along and across many confusedly staked media territorial or liminalised boundary lines and tracking this change is beginning to 'feel' really quite palpably difficult with current media analytic technologies. In answer to this and related difficulties, for Gauntlett and others (for instance Merrin 2006 and Jenkins 2008), a timely re-thinking of the disciplinary regime is of absolute necessity. The rewiring, reprogramming or urgent recalibrating of the superstructural instruments of a seeming abstract media studies is discordantly finding resonances within the concrete, and somewhat stressed, media educational institutional disciplinary apparatus: being pulled, so to speak, onto the rocks of these quite threatening techno-infrastructure global transformations that it cannot gauge. A new study vessel is needed; realignments clearly, even if lagging, then 'will' have to happen. The discipline must then listen closely and with a well-tempered ear for these rumbling 'internal dissonances' if the analysing 'theorist'^v is not to lose grasp of this disciplinary, somewhat morphous object *that is actually also its own quite immediate institutional audience*. In some agreement with Gauntlett, but concentrating also on this latter media educational audience, Merrin somewhat more confessionally (and in the borrowed rhetorical language of the creation myth) speaks of a sort of decisive moment, of a momentous epiphany, when he first realised the changing shape of his own discipline's dual objects:

Between my childhood media world and my son's there is a chasm. My son's world is also my student's world. I realised this a few years ago when a student came to see me about their essay and handed me a USB memory stick – the first I'd ever seen [...]. It brought home the absurdity of being a media studies lecturer when your students know more about the media than you do. We know the discipline and the texts, ideas and the arguments but our students surpass us in their knowledge, use and navigation of the contemporary media world: they are at home in it. (Merrin, 2007)

There is a strong sense here then of a precariously borrowed time for the currently operating media theory and a need to urgently 'act' before completely losing any sense of scholastic timeliness. Gauntlett and Merrin point out that although then the shape and detail of these responsive 'smartefacts' are undergoing rapid change (indeed dizzying intra and inter-boundary transformations that have yet really to settle into a formulariseable stability), a clear pattern is nevertheless forming that makes the necessity of the clarion call for a significant paradigm shift or a *renewal* of Media Studies clear enough for us to hear. And to further amplify the resonant power of this clarion-call, both have independently^{vi} (and both *somewhat* polemically) proposed this call-to-arms be called "Media Studies 2.0"; giving a clear eschatological signpost to those of us still left a little too far behind. By the application of such a 2.0 digital-integer appellation, the game can be shown to have really changed out of all "1.0" recognition. There can thus be no *pre-integer* incremental "**.5*" (or 'floating' point) release for this update or "rewiring" (Gauntlett, 2004) and certainly no fine adjusting or fudging of any existent "*1.**" top-down too ideological state apparatus-based outlook^{vii}. Let us look in a little more detail at Gauntlett's own particular flavour of the 2.0 iteration.

1. The stage divide(s): iterating the differences

In order to see more evidently what this digital switchover might ‘theoretically’ entail and to more clearly signpost the significant differences between a proposed “2.0” and its (retroactivated) “1.0” oppositional ‘other’, we will take Gauntlett’s own Butlerian concept (Gauntlett, 2008)^{viii} and use this as an ambit or orbit around which to tease out some of these supposed key differences: first person stage-crossing reflexivity or ‘*Performativity*’ versus a third-person stage-based or theatrical pre-reflexive ‘*Constativity*’. For Gauntlett and many others at the present time, these Austinian terms (Austin, 1975) form a highly influential framework that, specifically for him, helps clarify some of the key differences in approach (from the previously dominant and now mishandling, as we have seen, ‘1.0’). As we will later see in more detail, notions of performativity proved to be very important within a theoretically rich section of the disciplinary field of gender studies (Butler, 1990, 1993 & 1997 as well as Sedgwick, 2003) for pointing to the unfinished or relatively open nature of *gender performances* (in relation to a notionally “natural”, “prior” or “given” sex). Gauntlett, as we will later see, reworks^{ix} Butler to provide an idea of personalisable spaces wherein ‘an’ identity can reflexively play with a less and less *given* or generalisable identity, an identity that is not then, in itself, either solidified or final^x:

The internet’s scope for anonymous interaction, and therefore identity play, is significant for the way in which it fits in with contemporary queer theory. Queer theory suggests that people do not have a fixed essence, and that identity is a performance (Butler 1990a; www.theory.org.uk/queer). We may be so used to inhabiting one ‘identity’ that it seems natural to us, but it’s a kind of performance nonetheless. (Gauntlett, 2004)

So much for the monadic individual, but what of the constitution of spaces where identity is deployed or externally activated? Again these spaces or stages, where such performances take place, are changing also. As well as in gender studies, *performativity* has also proved to be influential as a concept within the more obvious domain of performance studies where it has helped in conceptually framing the equally open nature of contemporary dramatic “simulation”, complicating a previously taken-for-granted “supplementary” or “parasitic moment” of more traditional forms of theatrical ‘representation’ (see for example Phelan and Lane, 1998). This previously dominant ‘parasitic’ moment or stage-citation, that was the framed and ‘finished play’, now comes to bleed over, as performances connect up to worlds *beyond* the constative confines of such stage-based divides (in a sense quite similar to the never-finalised liveliness of Artaud’s ‘theatre of cruelty’). Such spaces are no longer carved off or apart from the world, as we shall later see complicated, but form a sort of Goffmanesque extension of the performative act that makes of the world *a stage* and of the stage *a world*. Leaving these spatial-bleeds aside for the time being, it must be pointed out that while ‘performativity’ is certainly of undoubted key importance within a number of domains, we will argue in the next section that the particular *flavour* of performativity that Gauntlett works with is perhaps a little questionable within its reading of the concept, as well as, more importantly, being questionable as a key operational lever or guarantor for his own particular problematic.

1.2 Gauntlett’s issues with 1.0 media and their immanent 1.0 study

One of Gauntlett’s main issues with the use of the prevailing modelling of media studies is that it tends to adopt an inappropriately pre-reflexive or pre-performative reading of the contemporary user’s relation to their media: views which were not only methodologically questionable within their prior incarnations within the previously dominant linear-industrial media exemplified by a top-down novel, radio or television apparatus (for example in his arguing for a conception of *semantically* active audiences in ‘*TV Living: Television, Culture*

and *Everyday Life*' as opposed to the hypodermic readings of these apparatus theorists) but which today are positively anachronous as audiences now literally step over the dividing lines of their variously positioned 'stages' and have thus become highly active hyperexpansive-diegetic performers^{xi} or actors in their own right. Thus there is a sort of double-outdatedness to these outmoded 1.0 hypodermic or apparatus conceptualisations. From previously arguing, at one remove, then from a position of defending 'semantically' active audiences within their various 'uses and gratifications' of old linear 1.0 media, the proposed Media Studies 2.0 argues from a powerfully-positioned second remove (from this anachronous 1.0): *that a more radical 'syntactically' and performatively active audience is now quite literally 'at' play with their hyper-expansive texts* (rather than tragically or machinically 'caught' within them like some robotic "Hamlet on the Holodeck" playing a still tethered narratological game).

Any valid conceptualising work on new media then should abandon old third-person constative models and spaces and theoretically realign itself to these more operant or generative first-person performative models and spaces. What then, we may ask, is the relation between these two genres of media space? For Gauntlett it is clear that these differently positioned spaces match up to a surrounding social world of 1) a *departing* industrially '*reproductive*' space versus 2) an entering and now dominant post-fordist '*responsive*' individualised space. Enclosing this within a schematic oppositional table might help us to establish some of the key totemic differences to orient us further:

Media (/Studies) 1.0	Media (/Studies) 2.0
Closed texts stage divided but semantically playful	Open texts stage erased and "syntactically" playful
Top-down paternalist, cultura/colere	Bottom-up autonomist, subculture/'anarcultural'
Third-person past participle: citational "echo"	First-person present participle: experiential "origin"
Constative pre-reflexive	Performative reflexive immanence
Industrial does not 'take-a-stand' on its being = "fixed identity"	Post-fordist does take a stand on its being= "hyper-identity"

In general then, within a move from the left-hand column to the right, we will progress from a centrally organised or *centripetal* state-provisional space of national third-person "subjecthood" (as exemplified and symbolically supported by nationally inclined media broadcasters such as the Britain's BBC) toward an untethered more *centrifugal* space of cosmopolitan free reflexive "individualism" where such prior lifelong subjecthoods (Giddens, 1991) that accompanied the fordist industrial age now decrease in volume, to be replaced by local-personally centred interests that tend to transcend such prior national interests (exemplified for example by internet tele-communities untied to geo-locality): something, that the traditional 'ends' of television, would seem not to be able to reach. The constative imposition of a previously dominant *external* framework seems to loosen here then to a first-person *interiority* of reflexive self-driven interests. How does first-person performativity then operate exactly?

2. First-personhood: reflexive performativity

According to Austin a constative utterance^{xii} sits above or *describes* its particular 'object' from an external position; as a sort of third-person agency placed 'outside' of an action that is presumed 'in' itself to be internal 'to' itself (i.e. "it is raining" describes something external to the statement being made). In media productive terms this takes the form of an external (temporal-spatial) *reporting* of a prior or ideally independent "EVENT" that *does not cross over from the other side of the stage divide to become an active part of the reporting performance itself* (e.g. that *subject-1* comments on *object-1*; *subject-2* listens to report on *object-1* from *subject-1*: by keeping subjects and objects in this sense separate, we will not

mix up the *reporting* on the rain for making or *causing* the rain!). In terms of such an important canonical separation of the functional spaces, and taking the differing actions of running and apologising as illustrative examples, Austin points out that:

This difference is marked in English by the use of the non-continuous present in performative formulas [...] We might say: in ordinary cases, for example running, it is the fact that he is running that makes the statement that he is running *true*; or again, that the truth of the constative utterance 'he is running' depends on his being running. Whereas in our case it is the happiness of the performative 'I apologise' which makes it the fact that I am apologising: and my success in apologising depends on the happiness of the performative utterance 'I apologise'. This is one way in which we might justify the 'performative-constative' distinction -as a distinction between doing and saying. (Austin, 1975, p.47)

A report then (that someone is presently performing a 'run') depends upon the *truth-verifiable* reporting of a notionally fixed, past-participle, pre-reflexive^{xiii} event-capture or 'frame' *that is perfectly external to the reported upon phenomena*, in a fashion very similar to an optical apparatus involved in observing any phenomena of the discipline of physics. This apparatus should clearly be external to and not *implicated* within the constitution of the phenomena that its (peer reviewable) observer is presently involved in examining. This 'reporting-of-reality' should certainly not then be *performatively implicated in 'being-a-part-of' that from which it should adequately take its distance*.

In this last regard, we will examine later in the important theoretical work of Arkady Plotnitsky (work that could certainly be of benefit to a media studies involved in examining complexly-interactive media phenomena) the further difficulties of any supposedly clean 'constative constitution', where object-relations are ***always-already*** performatively refracted within the 'interest' or the 'performative appropriation' of a 'localised' or 'graphic' economy^{xiv}. Although this takes us a little further into the argument than is required at this time, I would like the reader to keep hold of the problem that *constative reporting^{xv} distance is always involved within a performative effect on what it is observing^{xvi}*.

For now however, as something then notionally 'separable' from the account and thus externally third-person positional in 'nature', these reports or mediations of the external event can be ideally tackled or verified on the grounds of some *teleological approximation to a criterion such as 'truth'*. In terms of linear 1.0 pre-reflexive media, and in being 'fixed' and 'third-person' in nature, they tend to tether and aggregate identity into unresponsive categorical complexes (audiences). In a 'progressive' response then to this former aggregational accounting, new and emergent 2.0 media on the contrary plastically *co-respond* and are available for either first-person^{xvii} 'malleability' (the internet, computer games, etc.) or first-person singular 'generation' (youtube, social networking, etc.).

Clearly here within the age of 2.0 media we seem to have something akin to Austin's interior-'doing' ("I apologise") rather than external-'saying' ("he is running"). Such, similarly, are the knotted series of narratological ideals discussed famously in Janet Murray's paradigmatic book^{xviii} on virtual reality narrative called '*Hamlet on the Holodeck*' that saw an age soon to come that would finally^{xix} *involve* an audience making the 'step' over the threshold from being an audience^{xx} for a prior screened 'play' to being *existentially bound up as reflexively implicated actors* involved in the first-person active constitution of hyper-narrational space-time events^{xxi}. In sympathy with Murray's democratic optimism of participation^{xxii} in what were previously *imposed* by the one-way traffic of stories, Jenkins points to increasing first-person performative participation within stories 'written' more in unison with the "providers":

I will argue here against the idea that convergence should be understood primarily as a technological process bringing together multiple media functions with the same devices. Instead, convergence represents a cultural shift as consumers are encouraged to seek out new information and make connections amongst dispersed media content. This book is about the work -and play- spectators perform in the new media system. The term, participatory culture, contrasts with older notions of passive media spectatorship. Rather than talking about media producers and consumers as

occupying separate roles, we might now see them as participants who interact with each other according to a new set of rules that none of us fully understands. (Jenkins 2008, p.3)

Thus “audiences”^{xxiii} are now participants, and are more and more moving on to direct their own more playful plays^{xxiv} and have thus moved significantly on from the merely ‘mentally’ responsive semantic-symbolic play of yore to an active, performative and generative ‘indexical-motility’; a syntactically playful transformational *plasticity* that serves their own local *concerns* rather than the more normative or formative concerns of an aggregated and distant majority. This significant move within media apparatuses across the previously constituted stage-divide (separated from their ‘own’-‘local’-‘real’ interests) is, as we saw Giddens-*through*-Gauntlett point out earlier, symptomatic of larger shifts within the more generalised social soil (or base/*infrastructure*, to use the classical Marxist spatial metaphor). In sympathy with Jenkins, Gauntlett (explicitly after Giddens, 1991) points out that identity is now no longer to be handed-down from an unassailably assigned top-down position, *but now* arrives from an active, reflexive and highly malleable ‘self’ that involves itself in temporary creative projects^{xxv} and so is not any longer located on the right frequency to receive the organisational or regimented calls or hailings of an outdated fordist industrial mass media apparatus (here the superstructure would be lagging behind a move within the constitution of the base, just as a 1.0 media studies lags behind its students).

This new media highly interactive ‘object-space’ and the media studies 2.0 ‘optic’ upon that object forms an intimate tripartite linkage with a famous and larger ongoing sociological debate around neo-fordist processes and techniques^{xxvi} of flexible identities logically transposed or extended back into the quite contiguous or immanent realm media studies^{xxvii}. Of this performative or reflexive relation of the previously distanced optic to object, Giddens somewhat programmatically points out that:

Such writings [‘Second Chances’ by Wallerstein and Blakeslee] are part of the reflexivity of modernity: they serve routinely to organise, and alter, the aspects of social life they report on or analyse. Anyone who contemplates marriage today, or who faces a situation of the break-up of a marriage or a longterm intimate relationship, knows a great deal (not always on the level of discursive awareness) about what is going on in the social arena of marriage and divorce. Such is not incidental to what is actually going on, but constitutive of it –as is true of all contexts of social life in conditions of modernity [...] Each of us not only has, but lives a biography reflexively organised in terms of flows of social and psychological information about possible ways of life. (Giddens, 1991, p14)

In appreciation of Giddens’ point of view Gauntlett points out that:

Giddens is fascinated by the growing amounts of reflexivity in all aspects of society, from formal government at one end of the scale to intimate sexual relationships at the other [...]. Doing things just because people did them in the past is – is the opposite of modern reflexivity. (Gauntlett, 2002, p97)

Thus reflexivity within the present stage of modernity is constituted by a keen self-awareness that performatively^{xxviii} unites actor ‘immanently’ with the apparatuses that they are bound up with and not as third-person subjects of something that previously came before them on the opposite side of a stage (in a sort of play that they were merely reflex characters within). Reflexivity here then gives the sense of someone *ahead of a game they are nonetheless immanently caught up in playing*. Modernity according to Giddens then *reflexively tools-up the modern social actor to self-direct their own temporary performative ‘plays’*. It must be said here that we do not agree with either of these readings of reflexivity (especially of the rather tautologous-individualist flavour favoured by Gauntlett), so we will now visit some these difficulties with performativity before arriving at some other ways of reading these changes within the individual-media interface. Following a genealogical thread back to Austin’s origination of performativity we will find some key contradictions that do indeed prepare the way for such readings (of a relatively pure groundless-figural relationship)

but which miss out on the subsequent deconstructive moves that Butler and Derrida make to exhibit (and then productively *use*) these contradictions; clarifying thus the rather thorny status of 'causal-agency' within the modern reflexive social 'game'. These issues within the conceptual framework of classical performativity will then help us toward unpacking some of Gauntlett's problems with framing these as singular or atomic 'lived' events, which we will then go on to question with our own Derridean inspired performative (within our main case-study in section 3). The following section is necessary then to complicate the concept of reflexivity and performativity to be ready to tease out some of the paradoxes of the performative within that section following.

2.1 Performative contradictions: haunted by constatives and vice versa

For Austin, it is true that performativity was a much anguished over concept^{xxix}. There are problems with the use of performativity that Austin himself pointed towards and which caused him to constantly refine his apparatus (without however managing to totally jettison its sticking points). As we stated earlier, performative utterances are *speech acts that perform an act in the very act or occasion of their saying*, as opposed to constative utterances, which *merely recite or relate a state of affairs distantly external to and 'causally' divisible from themselves*. The latter then is ideally merely the dead citational or recorded echo of a previous state of affairs (the truth or falsity of which being thus arguable, even if perhaps infinitely postponed), while the performative **'actions' or 'accomplishes' something, making either the truth or falsity of a judgement entirely erroneous or external**^{xxx} to the veracity of the act: it simply, self-sufficiently and internally 'is'^{xxxi}. To take one of Austin's famous examples and coincidentally echoing a little, some of the modern difficulties^{xxxii} with marriage that Giddens makes above: "*I do*" is a performative utterance of *force*, the inarguable^{xxxiii} consequence of which, is that it *actions-commits* the agency to an 'immanently' occurring course of action *within the very same immediate and simultaneous present* (within marriage ceremonies, within court cases, within the enactment of street bets, etc.) These various "I do's" **'verb'** doubly *in the sense of both speech and indivisibly as action*).

To recapitulate before developing: as a first-person immanent *process* then, the performative (speech) act is conceptualised by Austin as a self-present, freestanding substance or self-standing atomic^{xxxiv} 'thing'; a thing that una-void-ably *folds* or *unites* both words and deeds *under one powerfully indivisible atomic roof*.

2.2: Derrida's move: internally riven performatives

Taking this very influential model of generative action (or 'ordinary language') as another typical figure of the metaphysics of 'self-presence', Derrida (Derrida, 1998) (and later carried further by Butler within the field of 'gender studies'^{xxxv}) problematised this opposition by pointing out that Austin's theory (while wishing to establish the address or the indubitable *coordinates* of 'illocutionary force' as the immovable boiled-down or 'economically reduced' immovable ground of the performative) *unavoidably undermines its own claims of oppositional cleanliness* through the irresolvable problem of the sustainability of a supposedly singular intentional act that would *nevertheless still need much more than 'itself' 'to be' itself* (in an ana-logous sense to Husserl's difficulty of positing an internal intentional 'expression' clean of external denotational 'indication'^{xxxvi}). Derrida points out that the illocutionary-performative is always already operating within a traced, marked or iterative (pre-existing, though differing) network or context beyond its own supposed sovereign or majestic^{xxxvii} immediacy. Indeed, Austin cannot help but say (though representationally-repressed as mere niggling marginalia) as much himself^{xxxviii}. The intention, within the doing, is not a freestanding atomic entity; *the performative is thus not purely 'performative'*!

Derrida then goes on to re-function, re-mobilise or re-direct this now internally problematised 'performative' term and use it (*sous-rature*^{xxxix}) within his own more

disseminative^{xi} theoretical apparatus. He has then at his disposal a re-coined performative internally and immanently marked, traced or riven by a third-person contextual constative (which one could economically re-house under a portmanteau word such as 'iteratoperformative'^{xli}). It is important to point out however that Derrida is only more 'openly'-opening a 'dehiscence' within the supposedly safe or closed oppositional framework that was itself always already internally riven, traced, traversed or somewhat en-crypt-ically "archived" by such compound difficulties. *It is this quite suspicious 're-working' then that we intend to utilise here as a lever into some difficulties with Gauntlett's use of reflexivity and performativity and the supposed first-person activities of these now actively self-present stage-crossing signature-bearing audiences.*

2.3 iMediation: iLocation iLegality iLlocution

In problematising then this 1.0 versus 2.0 model, rather than these so-called 2.0 'first-person' new media offering a clean move across (from our left-hand to right-hand tabled entries in section 1) from the previously dominant top-down, re-citational, paternalist, super-egoistic, 'though-must' of some industrial paternalist-programming environment, the performative actions of these so-called first person media *cannot themselves help but take their place upon a prior-existing context or ground outside of their own supposedly now free and sovereign performative acts or actions*. As we will see within our case study in section 3, any notional intentionalist performative *needs far more than the sovereign internality it wishes to circumscribe for itself*. To underline the *problem* of the lived supposedly circumscribed 'monad', Derrida uses the famous time-shifted indivisible representative-of-the-self (according to Austin) that is the *signing-signed-signature*^{xlii}; 'the' supposed self-standing intentional source, guarantor or integrator of author-ity:

Not only does Austin not doubt that the source of an oral utterance in the present indicative active is 'present' to the utterance [enunciation] and its statement [enonce] [...] but he does not even doubt that the equivalent to this tie to the source utterance is simply evident and assured by a signature [...] in the transcendental form of a presentness [*maintenance*]. That general *maintenance* is in some way inscribed, pinpointed in the always evident and singular punctuality of the form of the signature. Such is the enigmatic originality of every paraph. In order for the tethering to source to occur what must be retained is the absolute singularity of a signature-event and a signature-form: the pure reproducibility of a pure event. Is there such a thing? ***Does the absolute singularity of signature as event ever occur?*** [my signature emphasis, T.R.] Are there signatures?
(Derrida 1977, p11)

While hardly doubting the empirical *functioning* or the *pragmatic everydayness* of the signature as event, Derrida goes on to point toward the signature's somewhat impossible, aporetic and inherently divided "position":

Effects [my emphasis] of signatures are the most common thing in the world. But the condition of possibility of those effects is simultaneously, once again, the condition of their impossibility, of the impossibility of their rigorous purity. In order to function, that is, to be readable, a signature must have a repeatable, iterable, imitable form; it must be able to be detached from the present and the singular intention of its production. It is its sameness which, by corrupting its identity and its singularity, divides its seal [sceau].
(Ibid. p.11)

According to Derrida then, the internal-integral-*integrity* of the stamp or signature-seal is *already* imminently and immanently *problematic* and ***does not thus await any errant agency or alterity to tamper with its privately held 'properties'***. There always-already *has-to-be* an internal-external or determinable-*interminable* repetition; conventional markings;

contexts; or *archival* mechanisms, for a signature at all “to-be” (Être) or for an *event* to ever occur or ‘count’^{xliii} as such, but (*and this should intra-echo to/from section 3.3 where we talk about the problem of prosthetic-directions*), in a symmetrical reverse and highly problematic joint reciprocal process, any prior context is always *unstable* and cannot thus guarantee *in advance* any clean receptivity for the recording or registration of the already problematised singularity (of any incoming signature/event or signature-event). ***One cannot transport the essence or the ‘soul’ of one’s signature-‘signature’, but equally, the signature is never itself, any earlier than this, a soul-sovereign ‘thing’.***

Although this may seem a rather unnecessarily lofty (perhaps even a rather *dry*) discussion, models of communication (even the most modern and seemingly less linearly-inclined, least ‘process’ based ones) tend to ignore or conveniently brush aside this inherent and unavoidable instability within any notional trans-portion of ‘meaning’ (both in the sense of ‘contained’ or indicative meaning and the ‘illocutionary force’ or the expressive^{xliv} *meaning-to-say*, presumed prosthetically ‘capturable’ in repetition-mechanical or otherwise). ***This will form the nub of our argument in studying new media in section 3.* below.***

This quite simple re-inscription of the problematic displacement of the singular, the self-sufficient and self-generating monadic atom with its self-possessed or professing-accountable qualia^{xlv} (whether that be either the self-enclosed micro-sovereign-self of first-person 2.0 or the larger but still self-enclosed macro-nation-state of third-person 1.0 media that is much more internally-riven-by-exteriority than it-*itself* overtly thinks^{xlvi}), will have some far reaching implications, as Butler will go on to argue with this problematised immanent-dehiscence of the intentional performative.

Butler is concerned here with the very *operation* of the sex and gender border divide (where the former would ‘presumably’ be a scientific third-person ‘constative’ to the latter’s more operant first-person lived or socialised ‘performative’). But, according to Butler, sex is never simply something easily or materially ‘*given-over*’ in some clean transportation from the dressing-room or antechamber of the womb to being presented upon the main-stage that is the womb’s objective *outside*, but *is inherently destabilised by any receiving or greeting ‘context’^{xlvii}*. For there is *always-after-all* a nervous or secondary-pregnant moment of difficulty contained within the awaiting of the equally-pregnant-though-seemingly transparent-interpellation or binary pronouncement that: “*it’s a boy!*” that is always-already ***threatened by that which might fall liminally-outside of it***. Taking an obvious exception to this normally untroubled^{xlviii} and untroubling ***norm*** Butler speaks of an inevitable dehiscent ‘harrying’ of such a seemingly easy biologised norm:

Is it not a purely cultural convention to which Page and others refer when they decide that an anatomically ambiguous XX individual is male, a convention that takes genitalia to be the definitive ‘sign’ of sex? [...]. The point here is not to seek recourse to the exceptions, the bizarre, in order merely to relativize the claims made on behalf of normal sexual life. As Freud suggests in *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*, however, it is the exception, the strange, that gives us the clue to how the mundane and taken-for-granted world of sexual meanings is constituted. Only from a self-consciously denaturalized position can we see how the appearance of naturalness is itself constituted. (Butler, 2006, p. 149)

Thus any pre-baptismal but nevertheless ‘baptismal’ performance of the performative of the pregnantly-awaited interpellation: “*it’s a boy!*”^{xlix}, always finds itself chased by an unavoidable or spectral other-possibility that nevertheless, somewhat hauntologically, lends it its very own integral *dueness*.

Before finally arriving at some more decisive theoretical conclusions for such ‘undecidability’ within these performative/constative inhering contradictions that Derrida and Butler point out, I wish to turn for a time from these theoretical abstractions toward a more immanent and concrete case study to illustrate such aporetic problematics of the performative and in placing of ‘any’ signature or act. ***This case study will form the foundation for a conclusion that proposes a theory based less on certainty, than in recognising the inherently uncertain “nature” of these teletechnological stages.***

3.1 The aporetic stage(s) of tele-presence

This section provides the preceding argument with a case-study or a relatively concrete example of the current tendency of teletechnologies operating “interactively” across borders, which demonstrates I hope to show, some of the inherent complications in conceiving such “communications” (for “*communications*” should not be employed as some *semantically* innocent byword for the transportation of information, but as something involving highly differentiated and also quite *pragmatically* embodied powers) as mere extensions across an expanse of space-time. Here, as we hope to show through this section’s main example of a performative internet communication, there can be no digital fulfilment of McLuhan’s global villageⁱ; a culmination that would finally vanquish the barrier or the border within the simultaneous act of crossing of it (or perhaps to the contrary: that such borders return *already-again* to haunt these very cross-border *acts*). Such cross-border *acts*, as we hope to show, are something far from a mere stepping over, with the help of some extending digital prosthesis, and so are not the culmination of some of television’s ends^{li}.

Our example here involves *the highly practical and practible affair of hunting real animals across an internet connection, the aim of which is that one can tele-presently or teletechnologically hunt in a place where it is legal to kill, but from a place where it is not, via the tele-portation or tele-transportation possibilities of internet connectivity*. But far from this being some simple step outside of the restrictive platonic cave of “representation” into some cyberspatial real (as the inventor or provider of this proposed service inherently supposed), this simple neoliberal entrepreneurial act provides us with a very concrete example of the *difficulties of place* and topography haunting the supposedly clear communicative scene of John Perry Barlow’s^{lii} hoped for independence of the notionally unified^{liii} space of cyberspace.

In the year 2005 a native Texan, one John Underwood, bought himself a piece of Texan territory and planned to erect on this plot an expansive animal compound where distantly situated (prosthetically tele-present) hunters^{liv} could fire at the very same animals that it would be illegal to hunt within their own presently embodied territories. Of Mr Underwood’s seemingly quite simple sovereign entrepreneurial act^{lv} are born quite a number of issues and further *abyssal* difficulties that will tether us squarely into some important Media Studies 2.0^{lvi} reflexive unsolvables, which reveal themselves when approaching closer some of the split ends of emergent teletechnologies^{lvii}.

It must be reinforced again finally, before substantially embarking on an analysis of this somewhat troubling example, that this study does not seek *as its goal* any resolution of the question or the problem of the extension of teletechnologies across borders, but that the very *insolvability itself* is our overriding focal interest. The aim here then is not to erect any final-theoretical framework of analysis that would legislate either for macro ‘national’ (1.0) expression or micro ‘self’ (2.0) expression, but to point toward a *further layer of difficulty* that would not elide but foreground the undecidability of any reading of (inter)actions within emergent teletechnologies. This then will be our aim as we come out of this study: *Communicative intentionality is not an easily transportable commodity, as intentionality itself does not exist as any simple object or objective of transportation*. What then is the difficulty involved in constructing such a cross-territorial teletechnology that Mr. Underwood is embarking upon here?

3.2 Mr. Underwood’s inter-territorial hunting engine

The ‘practical’ process for constructing Mr. Underwood’s most helpful apparatus is itself quite simple. A rifle is mounted on a servomotor driven mount that is then in turn mounted by a camera-eye to help envision and thus then direct its territorial movements. This camera-eye or video technology (analogous somewhat to those video-conferencing teletechnologies which unproblematically bring people from geometrically separate or ‘foreign’ lands closer together^{lviii}) then links across an internet connection to the final end-user/consumer, who, through the adjustments of a sensorimotor driven control, moves the distantly placed rifle carefully around, following the tracks and traces of its tele-distinguished

quarry, and, when ready, firing off a shot through the depressing of a mouse button or perhaps the trigger of some semiotically designed prosthetic^{lx} that reproduces the tactile feel of the more situated prosthetic that is the rifle^{lx}. After the trigger is pulled and the decision transmitted across the internet, the now deadened kill, at the other geo-distant 'wet' or business-end, can then be optionally stuffed, mounted and sent "physically"^{lxi} back to its distinguished hunter, along with an accompanying signed certificate of authenticity from one of Mr. Underwood's witnesses placed at the coordinate-of-the-kill itself (who witnessing the skill so undoubtedly deployed, recorded and captured as evidence-by-proxy of this actor's intentional 'standing-reserve'^{lxii}). If we pause for thought we find a reworking here of a quite classical model of communications "technology". *What then of such quite common technological recordings that would seem now to allow us to transport our intentions toward entities placed distantly across borders?*

Under classical conceptions, recording technologies store-up pre-existent live intentional acts (like the marks phonetic writing make that transcribe and transport an apparent prior-present speech) and through an indeterminate and perhaps even inordinate stretch of space-time, is finally freed or set-off upon its run within a ideally symmetric and effective or reinvigorated discharge that maps out, matches up to, the intentional expectations experienced at the time of the depositing of the original trace left upon the recording apparatus itself some perhaps inordinate time ago (a one-to-one, though shifted, mapping). Much as with Formula 1's timeshifted KERS technology (Kinetic Energy Recovery System), the force, energy or charge is imprinted, deposited, saved or stored-up, to be cashed-in at some other 'elsewhere' and 'elsewhen' point in space-time. Nothing could apparently be more transparent, neutral or non-ideological than this 'input-storage-output' model (the *embalming-unembalming* hinted at in our title) self-enclosed reflexive cybernetically looped system.

Taking this briefly sketched classical Cartesian model as a metaphorical piece of tracing paper to place over and recover Mr Underwood's idea, we have the simple bootstrapping breach or broaching of the self-reflexive or self-generating performative act much like any supposed self-present intentional context-free speech act from the long western teleological tradition^{lxiii}. It would seem to be nothing more, or in excess of, the recording-and-recovery of some pure quanta of intentionality (the classical Cartesian *res cogitans*), shot through, driven upon or piloted^{lxiv} along some neutral encapsulating telescopic physical embodiment or extension (the secondary Cartesian *res extensa*). Like some occupant of a SUV-Hummer vehicle, our intentionally deposited trace would seem to be able to survive any crash with a foreign boundary or figure-of-alterity. The foundations of our intention would seem to be left intact after such a border-crash. Again what of this classical conception of intentionality, that such border-crossings live off? We would seem to be able to say of such a self-generating or bootstrapping performative that:

"[T]his mode of sovereignty functions as a foundationist event -also known as an explicit performative and a bootstrap performative- in which the act of referring to the event or thing actually creates the event or thing. This form of subjectivity is illustrated by many terms – the autological subject, the parvenu, the self-made man, die autonomie. [...] The subject-in-love is experienced and understood like the self-governing subject insofar as both are ideologically oriented to the fantasy of the foundational event...it is what exfoliates the social skin. (Povinelli, 2003)

In line with this reading of the supposedly 'causally intimate act' that Povinelli here outlines so well, we should not read Mr. Underwood's apparatus as so easily parcelling up any clean intentional or cleanly performative "state". We have situated *here*, I believe, a quite irresolvable, undecidable and haunting aporia that short-circuits such a 'bootstrap' metaphor of the originary performative (of, for example, being unable absolutely to logistically or mathematically to fix the geometrical origin or position of the act 'in-itself'). To underline this impossible aporia of geo-metric and geo-graphic positioning we need to revisit Mr Underwood's quite wonderful machine.

If we go back around then to view this example we have to ask where and under what classical (Kantian) conditions of possibility does the shooting itself take place? If the aim of Mr Underwood's well designed little schema is to allow for the killing of certain animals^{lxv} within a domain where such killing is legal but from a domain where it is not, then where has the act

taken place to be able to adjudicate upon its presence, absence or on its stable ontological value? Where exactly is the 'place' of the act? When I am, as a hunter, placed within a place where it is illegal, I am not located within the place of the animal that it is illegal to kill, in the place that I am^{lxvi}. I am also, of course, not indexically holding the gun that itself holds the bullets that would have the fingerprints of my signature-singularity placed upon them (at 'the' scene of a Locardian^{lxvii} exchange) and taken away as evidence of an indexical imprint or coupled with a charge; recovered later as a just co-ordinate of my former presence. The 'smoking' gun is within our example, of course, somewhat problematically mounted and situated within a territory that is owned and within the purview of an owner (the context of Texas itself upon which Mr. Underwood underwrites or signs his rightful ownership of the gun and the right to hold it within his territorially situated compound) who is not I and is not where I am placed. Here then we have an important question that is altogether something more than a, perhaps, sophistic philosophical thought experiment: **Where 'was' I at the time of the shooting?** According to the traditional commonsense jurisdictional laws of intentional presence I (and my "body") were most certainly placed within a place where it was illegal to shoot, but the shot was surely not shot 'there', even if it may be argued later to have been shot 'from' there. Along these lines, but countering the ability of this last classical 'intentionalist' rule to properly adjudicate or hold its ground(s), one may then subsequently counter-charge that the intentional act of an actor is to be placed within the place where it is illegal and so can be followed from the target 'back' (if that is the place?, and this is still very much the question) to the intentional-source and so be situated upon the solidity of the ground upon which the invigilating law itself should also co-presently stand (our decisional algorithm here being that the place of the -res cogitans- intentional act should be 'extradited' from the geographic 'site' of the "physical" killing to the 'legislative territory' of 'my-own' occupied territory, where I should then be fit and able to presently stand trial). This topo- or tropo-graphic grounding^{lxviii} does not solve the still significant problem however that the animal was killed by a weapon 'placed' or situated within a distant legal space where it is perfectly legal to 'perform' the killing. The performance was on another stage, even if directed from afar (mise-en-scene). *So where 'has' the animal died?* Has it died within the "tele-present" (from-afar) illegal place or in a "physical-present place" (on-the-scene) where the killing of the thing itself is perfectly legal? Surely this too can be further complicated? **Where, really, is where?**

To be impartial, let us flip this scenario. If the place of 'intentionality' is the present-marker of the act, then what if the coin is reversed or placed in the other direction, as it were? What if in a space where it is 'legal' to kill, a button or trigger is depressed that extends a prosthesis electronically to a space where it is illegal to kill this same "naturalised"^{lxix} animal? Surely one can then not be extradited (and brought to trial) from our intentional-legal space, given the setting up of such an intentional rule as the sorting or the archiving-rule? Because intentionality may have been adjudicated to be the presence-effect in one direction, it must surely be deemed acceptable that one must be able to "originate" or perform an intentional act on one stage, even if it bleeds-over, so to speak, into this other. Is there then an unequivocal or 'decidable' direction in either of these two directions? If not, then are we truly left within a sort of 'actioning-limbo' or on the undecidable edges of a paradox that can call for no final truce, synthesis, sublation or aufhebung?

We are stuck or situated then on the porous-double-borders of a technological aporia and the uncertain site of an intimate and animate topographical crime that cannot be the actual mise-en-scene of a crime (within a readily available and easily identifiable pre-technological territory). Such a geo-expansive tele-technology (and here we would take this local ontic example as tentative evidence of a larger ontological rule) does not then introduce any 'clean' and 'present' extension of intentionality to just any indeterminate elsewhere or anywhere and is then not a clean or ideal intentional/performative act upholding mechanism.

3.3 Decisive decisions: on the prosthetic compass effect

To enact the 'decision' we are forced to take on deciding the place of the act we have been describing here in some detail, one must mystically reboot what I would propose to call

the 'prosthetic compass-effect', by performing what is called within legislative circles a 'bootstrap doctrine'^{lxxx}; a sort of fresh doctrinal decision on the scope of the space of jurisdiction, which nevertheless comes upon some countervailing borders even if that doctrine, effect or reboot is not concretely contested by any empirical party. For the necessity of such a 'mystical reboot' bears witness to the stage of an aporetic 'scenic crime' or more properly of an aporetically criminal 'scenario'. Through the illustration of this case study, I believe, any model of a performatively secure sovereign actor acting reflexively on the innocent other side of the projected other end of 1.0 media's third-person constative boundedness (taking a nationally interested television as an obvious example of this latter form of boundary) cannot use reflexivity or classical performativity (of the relatively pure species suggested by Austin and handed down to Gauntlett) as its fixed and certain alibi. For the act cannot be adjudicated on the basis of a decisional tending to the actor's own lived event: for the supposedly lived act is in its very self (if one can still use that word) *intimately divided*.

Though any concrete or ontically exemplified "performative" act may not decidedly act or be unproblematically shown to stand on either territory or ground^{lxxxi} (in Texas or wherever else) it certainly cannot stand upon its *ownmost* own performative or signature ground either. It does not in any event "transplant" or "transport" itself across some seemingly *antiseptic embalming technology* and be transported in a 'just-so' manner merely 'out-there', to then be (later) unembalmed, rehydrated or resuscitated as some prior uncontaminated signature 'act'. Here (/there) is *where* the logic of the undecidable^{lxxxii} disrupts any presence of place: as objective place, or more importantly for our present argument as a subjectively intended act. This form of subjectivity is at the centre of performative-reflexive theories such as media studies 2.0 and in the next section we will see why we must add Derridean undecidability^{lxxxiii} to bring to light a little more of this prosthetic compass effect that we believe these media to exemplify.

4.1 In/Conclusion - Closing the border(s): the common-thread(s) of 1.0 and 2.0

I am able to be both here (in L.A.) and there (in Dallas), both then (1963) and now (2002), but I am always present, moving, live, in command [...] If early television promised to bring us the world, on the Web, our own volition in relation to this travel gets foregrounded. Microsoft asks, 'Where do you want to go today?'. (Mcpherson, 2004)

Here, according to Mcpherson, there is a teleological promise within emergent teletechnologies that extends the reach of early television's 'live' and 'lived' ontological promise (after Feuer) and where the new would bring to fruition the voyages and dreams of the old. The concrete borders of the media have moved (in the sense that they are now performative and interactive) but they nevertheless partake of the same 'sovereign' and 'sanctified' ground of a desire for *completion*. If we revisit the column from earlier and zoom out a little, we can perhaps see some telling continuities between the conceptions of both 1.0 and 2.0 in terms of their dual adherence to *borders* and their formative protection of what one could conceptualise, after Derrida, as the desire for the 'ownmost'. For both iterations^{lxxxiv} place a border around an identity that would ward-off what impeaches its rule. The right-hand column provides a list of entities that the left would like to *do without* but which haunt nevertheless as an uncanny visitor already in residence. The question of degree remains perhaps: do these modern teletechnologies move further inland, within some "safer" borders? We would have to answer yes in current iterations of media studies 2.0 of the flavour of Merrin's and especially of Gauntlett's. The final section provides some sketches toward a conception that would put the emphasis more openly on this right-hand column.

Both 1.0 & 2.0	Their Other
Prediction	Alea
Mastery	Alterity
Veracity	Unexpected
Arché (monad/qualia: “signature”/”event”)	An-arché (“divided seal”)
Hostility to chance	Hospitality to chance

4.2 The prestige of representation or renewable energetics: embalmed, unembalmed, undecidable.

In a very impressive book ‘Complementarity: Anti-epistemology After Bohr and Derrida’, in a chapter titled ‘The Age of Quantum Mechanical Reproduction’ Arkady Plotnitsky writes:

This loss in presence make the quantum theoretical economy a general economy and the efficacy at issue analogous to Derridean alterity-efficacy which “makes us concerned not with horizons of modified –past or future- present, but with a ‘past’ that has never been present, and which never will be, whose future to come [l’ ‘a-venir’] will never be a production or reproduction in the form of presence” (Derrida, Margins, 21). There are only ‘photographs’, which would have to be described as always – always already- taken too late to allow one to describe or even to speak of a reality behind quantum phenomena. These phenomena are always incomplete and, from the classical point of view, contradictory. (Plotnitsky 1994, p.105)

Like these problematic uni-conceptions of a ‘presence’, notions of reflexivity and *first-person* performativity (as key nodal points within Media Studies 2.0’s arsenal) are inadequate to the task of ‘recording’ both the *decision* and the *act* that arises from the problem of the decision we exemplified within section 3.1. The purpose of this ontical or regional example, has been to map out some of the difficulties involved in tracing out any narrowcast topology or ontology. We are faced more with a map that depicts more (im)properly, a *hauntology*^{lxxv} of the act. By being unable to resolve this ontically immanent and regional act *into* either a ‘logics-of-presence-or-absence’ (2.0 Vs. 1.0 respectively), we are left instead on the porous borders or the wobbly *membrane* (under erasure) of a vast vibratory *différance*; a *haunt* that cannot land us anywhere+anytime *cleanly*. This is the threat *and* the opportunity of the so-called “new media” that operate on the other side of the projected ends of the previously dominant industrial apparatus of television. Seemingly empirical or accidental examples such as this confront us with an irresolvable *double-border* or Derridean double-bind that cannot be seen *cleanly* from one side *or* another but forces us to witness^{lxxvi} any *one* side of a border as unable to bend over and take up (aufhebung) or *master* the difference *of* the other side (a sort of ‘box’ or Escheresque *space* where the inside of one is the outside of the other’s inside, as we keep on flipping *undecidably between*). In a sort of quantum decisional *act* we are *forced* to interpretatively choose one rule of law *or* another, *but* in choosing are fully-*faced* with the haunted other side of the other-law *un-chosen*, *that we cannot simply leap over to and become* as if through our freely-chosen performative self-motivating dis-position: the act *is* in one place *and* the other, *yet* in neither place and *at once*.

4.3 Of is’s, ands & ats: *or* of copulae that cannot copulate

If *tele*-techno-communications (or a *tele-techné-tactile-teleology*) are still be *seen* or conceived as the transferal of some present-to-itself *lived* energy or the renewal of an energy

coded or put into suspended animation at one side and later revived untouched at the other, the immersion within the event *of* the lived experience and transferred out into a global representation, would seem to bring the representation and truth close and immanently together. Far then from this 2.0 conception of media being a threat to the border territories of the *ends* of television (as Merin and Gauntlett proffer), these wishful-ends that are seen within these new media spaces are in fact deepened and complicated as their ideological roots thrust further into the 'seeming-soil' of a notional self-presence. If such reading of apparently empowered immersion (as 2.0 lived event that we could compare to Rheingold's empowered bottom-up temporary gathering of smart mobs) is read as correct, then the *ends* of television will not have too much concern in stretching their borders to accommodate or *incorporate* (if not perhaps a more problematically indigestive psychoanalytic *introjection*?) this *living* of the event from the experiential 'ground floor' end.

If however this positioning is more problematic and that a *dispersal of energy* (rather than a transferral) through an indigestive *introjection* takes place, through as I have argued a fundamental *division-of-stages* (evidenced by the need to apply a *prosthetic compass effect*) or a *différance-of-stages*, then the ends of television and the continuing humanist project may be stuck with some quite sticky indigestible *matter* within the desired cleanliness of the body proper, as such 'borders' may have some further (i.e. not lesser) breachings to contend with. The ends may still be yet to come but they are haunting with yet more *excess* or uncontrolled energy and this constitutes an *excess* that cannot be *re-machined* or honed away. Perhaps instead we should recognize (and without sublime pathos) and if only glimpsed a little, that we are attending here to the wheel of a rather uncontrollable *différance* engine? And that we are not driving any closer to the end(s)...

...for such projected end(s) are always moving (away) with every seeming step.

Preliminary Bibliography

- | | |
|-----------------|--|
| Althusser, L. | Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses |
| Artaud, A. | The Theatre and its Double |
| Austin, J.L. | A Plea for Excuses |
| Austin, J.L. | How to do Things with Words |
| Baca, G. | Nationalism's Bloody Terrain |
| Barlow, J.P. | The Declaration of Independence of Cyberspace |
| Bataille, G. | Accursed Share, The (General Economy volume) |
| Baudrillard, J. | The Evil Demon of Images |
| Baudrillard, J. | Simulations and Simulacra |
| Biocca, F. | Communication in the Age of Virtual Reality |
| Bok, B.M. | Experiential Foresight: Participative Simulation Enables Social Reflexivity in a Complex World |
| Butler, J. | Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex" |
| Butler, J. | Excitable Speech: Politics of the Performative |
| Butler, J. | Gender Trouble |
| Davenport, G. | Self-Reflexive Performance: Dancing with the Computer Audience in Culture |
| De Landa, M. | Meshworks, Hierarchies and Interfaces |
| Denzin, N.K. | The Reflexive Interview and a Performative Social Science |
| Derrida, J. | Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression |
| Derrida, J. | The Beast and the Sovereign |
| Derrida, J. | Dissemination |
| Derrida, J. | The Ends of Man |
| Derrida, J. | On Touching: Jean-Luc Nancy |
| Derrida, J. | On the Aforementioned Human Genome Project |
| Derrida, J. | Signature Event Context |
| Derrida, J. | Speech and Phenomena |

Derrida, J	The Animal That Therefore I Am
Derrida, J	Typewriter Ribbon: Limited Ink (2)
Derrida & Stiegler	Echographies of Television
Dienst, R.	Still Life in Real Time: Theory After Television
Dolan, J	Producing Knowledges that Matter: Practicing Performance Studies Through Theatre Studies (in <i>The Drama Review</i> , 40 4 1996, MIT)
Fagan, M. et al	Conclusions: The Im/Possibility of Closure, in 'Derrida: Negotiating the Legacy'
Feuer, J	The Concept of Live Television: Ontology as Ideology
Fish, S.E.	With the Complements of the Author: Reflections on Austin & Derrida
Gauntlett, D	Creative Explorations: New Approaches to Identities and Audiences
Gauntlett, D	Media, Gender and Identity: An Introduction
Gauntlett, D	Web.Studies: Rewiring Media Studies for the Digital Age
Giddens, A	Modernity and Self Identity: Self and Society
Goffman, E	The Presentation of the Self in Everyday Life
Heidegger, M.	The Age of the World Picture
Heidegger, M.	Being and Time
Heidegger, M	Letter on Humanism (in <i>Pathmarks</i>)
Heidegger, M.	The Question Concerning Technology
Jenkins, H	Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide
Jessop, B.	Governance and Metagovernance: On Reflexivity, Requisite Variety, and Requisite Irony
Johnson, C.	Derrida and Technology
Keenan, T	No Ends in Sight (from <i>Ends of the Museum</i> conference)
Kristeva, J.	The Powers of Horror
Kurzweil, R.	The Age of Spiritual Machines
Kurzweil, R.	The Singularity Is Near
Lenggenhager, B.	Video Ergo Sum: Manipulating Bodily Self-Consciousness
Leroi-Gourhan, A	Gesture and Speech
Meyowitz, J.	No Sense of Place
McGonigal, J.	This Is Not A Game: Immersive Aesthetics and Collective Play
McLuhan, M.	The Mechanical Bride
McLuhan, M.	Understanding Media
McPherson, T	Reload: Liveness, Mobility and the Web
Murray, J.	Hamlet on the Holodeck
Nagel, T.	What's It Like To Be A Bat?
Norris, C	Contest of the Faculties: Philosophy and Theory After Deconstruction
Nooy, De C.	Derrida, Kristeva and the Dividing Line: An Articulation of Two Theories of Difference
Ong, W.J.	Orality and Literacy
Phelan, P & Lane, J.	The Ends of Performance
Plotnitsky, A	Complementarity: Anti-Epistemology After Bohr & Derrida
Plotnitsky, A	Reconfigurations: Critical Theory and General Economy
Poveinelli, A.P.	The Cunning of Recognition: Indigenous Alterities and the Making of Australian Multiculturalism
Rheingold, H	Smart Mobs: The Next Social Revolution
Richards, T	Differance Engine: Videogame as Deconstructive Spacetime
Rodney, IP et al	Location and Interactive Services Not Only At Your Fingertips but Under Your Skin
Sartre, J.P.	Existentialism and Humanism
Searle, J.	Speech Acts
Sedgwick, E.K.,	Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity
Soros, G	The Theory of Reflexivity
Spivak, G.	Revolutions That As Yet Have No Model: Derrida's Limited Inc., <i>Diacritics</i> 10:4 (1980; Winter), p.29
Stiegler, B.	Technics and Time: The Fault of Epimetheus
Swan, J.A.	In Defence of Hunting
Swan, J.A.	The Power of Place

Tichi, C.	Electronic Hearth: Creating an American Television Culture
Turkle, S	Life on Screen: Identity in the Age of the Internet
Turkle, S	The Second Self: Computer and the Human Spirit
Virilio, P.	Negative Horizon: An Essay on Dromoscopy
Warwick, K	Upgrading Humans via Implants – Why Not?
Whitehead, A.N.	Adventures of Ideas
Wills, D	Prosthesis
Wills, D	Technoology or the Discourse of Speed

i

ⁱⁱ These differences can also be conceptualized along the lines of ‘push’ and ‘pull’ models of distribution (if one can subtract, for a moment, the stage-frames that we are discussing). A younger demographic is tending not to watch traditional broadcast ‘push’ media, but is interacting with provided media in ways that cannot be calculated via traditional methodologies. “Media” are being ‘pulled’ via online communities (that do not quite follow the traditional model of the semantic play of fandom) that again threaten the idea of a convenient border or frame around a media object.

ⁱⁱⁱ This means national or centripetal socio-political authorities as well as media corporations. Obviously media corporations continue to crop up, to develop and to thrive within these spaces (facebook, google, news corporation, Microsoft, Yahoo etc.), but their existence far more precarious as competing models (based on *pull*, rather than *push* as discussed above) continue to develop. Where television previously was a relatively unified space, cyberspace offers many different methods of interaction that any reader knows will change out of all recognition within the next five years. No doubt the listed companies will still be providing developed versions of existing products, but they will be joined by other companies and other forms of space: such *otherness* is much less predictable than the development of televisual genres between 1970-1975.

^{iv} Sherry Turkle makes similar points about the use of new media spaces in ‘Life on Screen: Identity in the Age of the Internet’ and ‘The Second Self: Computers and the Human Spirit’.

^v Gauntlett finds this position (of the authoritative or ‘meta’ “theorist”) itself a little problematic and perhaps something equally bygone and thus equally to *jettison*, as well as the current inadequacy of the theories themselves. It is at issue here then that media *theorists* tend (hopefully soon to be in the past-tense of a sort of museum plaque reading “tended”) to use a complex language that distances itself from the ordinary lived and the everyday living experiences of their students or pedagogic subjects. Along with the outmoded frameworks there is then an outmoded linguistic complexity or *distance* that are also now being outmoded by their student’s immanent practices. The media 2.0 scholar should then actively and performatively begin to distance themselves from this avant-garde theory that “screen” theorists perhaps “best” (or *worst*) tended to embody. This second part of the 2.0 issue with 1.0 is not however convincingly explained and as an existential ‘ethic’ of classroom comportment, seems a little clumsily *glued-on* (or sutured?) and is ‘voiced’ in a rather disconcerting manifesto tone and as some initiating rule from someone painting themselves into a position to *set rules in play* (performative bootstrapping without adequate explanatory framework). One gets the nagging feeling that one is reading the declaration of independence!

^{vi} This independent calling of the discipline by the same name reminds us of the independent invention of calculus by both Newton and Leibniz. The independent coming to the same conclusions, in a similar fashion to these latter parties with their calculus, makes the call all the more resonant to our possibly pre-2.0 ears.

^{vii} These 1.0 apparatuses do not just *study* or sit innocently above their object counterparts but *just as* reflexively power-knowledgably (Foucault) partake as much as their reflexive 2.0 replacements. This immanently-placed *drive* of 1.0 conceptions can no longer however immanently secure a productive berth, as the harbor (or containing infrastructure) has mutated and re-shaped itself. The machines they also reflect upon/within (as an externalizing exhaust focused back into the drive shaft) must find new immanently-placed power-knowledge machines and here 2.0 finds itself in better shape to moor itself. There has however been a deepening of the (always-already) immanent relationship which more or less

maps what George Soros (in 'The Theory of Reflexivity') has stated about predictions within financial markets and which leaders of the discipline such as Henry Jenkins seem well aware of in hooking up their disciplinary regimes up to the institutions that they are *studying* (his influential book 'Convergence' is full of examples where the MIT Comparative Media Studies department that he heads helped to conceptualize issues along with television stations his students were studying). That is to say, overtly, that *a more reflexive and embedded or performative relation is forming between the media academic optic and what it looks at*: reflecting upon the changes that very reflection is helping to master.

^{viii} In 'Media, Gender and Identity: An Introduction', Gauntlett

^{ix} Or "*rewires*". For as we will see (and as I study in more detail another context) Gauntlett must retrofit Butler's concept of performative (and its Derridean questioning of the performative as an essentially different category to the constative and so giving it a free-floating flavour that Butler never herself "intended")

^x In a study of videogames **** theorizes identity as a form of open or hyper identity, just as a hypertext is a form of open-text. Thus he theorizes that we do not, any longer, have 'final' identities but dip in and out and morph and change. This ties in to many theories of what have been termed 'portfolio' or the reflexive identities (as theorized by Giddens) that we are soon to look at.

^{xi} We will see later the complications of the diegetic divide that complicates issues of the textual border, but also of any sense of narrative trajectory in the traditional sense of the word. Rather than simply *expanding* the notion of diegesis (as Murray is famously apt to optimistically and programmatically –i.e. in the days of the dreams of 'virtual reality'- predicts in 'Hamlet on the Holodeck'), diegesis itself needs to be questioned as a personhood local restricted economic (Bataille) paradigm. Any sense of expanding a diegetic spatial-trajectory cannot wish away the undecidables that will always-already come back to haunt it. This was already so before, but becoming much more so (as I will argue) now and later.

^{xii} To the extent to which such statements can be cleanly cleaved apart from the performatives that they take their conceptual distinctions from, as we will later see.

^{xiii} The pre-reflexive subject does not apparently take a stand on the choices available for its being-in-the-world. By receiving a series of fixed codes-of-conduct or life programming, the 1.0 being (and its media).....~~delete?~~ **As doesn't flow from specific point here?**

^{xiv} Simply put, for now, but different to a Foucauldian power-knowledge (*pouvoir-savoir*): a, for example, 'national interest' is always-already performatively performed within any avowedly constative constitution of the other, no matter how distinct the optic seems to be in relation to what is (out-there) viewed. We are not dealing with matters of astronomy. This *graphic economy* should remind us of 'writing' in the Derridean sense (i.e. not in the empirical local sense of phonetic writing) of that which does not make contact (as in phonetic interiority) with what it "refers" to. A graphic economy then is a little like a Bataillean general economy in that undecidability and excess are foregrounded, rather than hidden behind the veil of a constative objectivity.

^{xv} While reporters face the camera all the time and seem to address the viewer directly, it is obvious (obviously) that there is no "you" being spoken to in the present-tense but a "he/she" in the third-person. The second-person present-tense is of course an interpellative-effect that is tightly striven for, but also kept within a sober distance (and of course sometimes mistaken by certain viewers outside of the code!). Nevertheless, sometimes television is forced into the mode of a sort of direct-address to injured parties that demands the performative 'doing' of the first to second person address (rather than third-person) that is the apology. The performative speech act "*we apologize for any upset*" that the (normally hidden) station makes is framed or stems from a position seemingly entirely apart from flow of the programming but nevertheless forms a sort of tacit admittance that a performative was inherently contained within the constative that was the original offence itself (hence a certain *necessity* to carve itself off as a singularity).

^{xvi} And that this should also be seen as the difficult (as in the sense of questionable) concept of bias. Such an external view of viewpoint, does not adequately encapsulate the involvement of any constitution of the object. Such a viewpoint is never a 'view' but an involvement that breaks-ground instead of merely mis-mapping it in a disagreeable fashion. In a fashion similar to the Nietzschean unconcealment of the 'will-to-knowledge' as a disguised 'will-to-power' and the Heideggerian embodiedness of 'being-in-the-

world' as opposed some Cartesian visitation by an evil demon merely offering misshapen images, this involvement is performative within highly embodied formats.

^{xvii} This fetishisation of the first-person reaches its acme in Gauntlett's book *Web.Studies*, which critiques the use of overly theoretical and difficult language. In speaking to a different audience Gauntlett believes one must (should) succumb to their lived language. This co-requisition itself would need further unpacking.

^{xviii} become famous totem-phrase

^{xix} This 'finally' is often couched as the return on a higher scale to a sort of super responsive 'campfire closed-orality' (as, for example, a BBC executive producer spoke of interactive storytelling at a session at the now defunct Dublin campus of the *MIT-Medialab Europe*). Within a Rousseuan scattering, writing brought in a system of rules to a once closed-community, that although taking us forward, stole away a primacy of contact. Now with the advent of such sophisticated and multimedia-rich technologies (that we are seemingly catching glimpses of), there is a return brewing, to this oral-closedness (McLuhan, Ong, etc.). It is the ultimate communications-based *aufhebung*.

^{xx} i.e. pre-reflexive third-person constative inactive

^{xxi} Just as there were expansive 'happenings' in the late 1960's in New York and recently the famously transitory flashmobs (that burst upon the world and ideally leave little in terms of an archival trace), lately new media artists have begun playing with the media-world interfaces such as 'augmented reality games'. Here instead of the game being merely 'screen-based', players interact in real-3D landscapes (shopping centers, etc.) to fulfill tasks set via mobile communications technologies. Here again the division between 'diegesis' and a *supposed* 'extra-diegesis' (i.e. the so-called real world) are thrown into some difficulty. See McGonigal (2003) as well as her website (avantgame.com) for some interesting writing and reflections on her own practice within this growing field.

^{xxii} Of course there is a remaining issue here of the possibility of still having our narrative cake and yet also eating it interactively. For '*Hamlet*' is a famously very tightly controlled Shakespearean tragedy whose many pieces fit together to form an archetypal Aristotelian fine dramatic whole. *Being-on-the-stage* as a Hamlet *ourselves* inevitably sets up something of a dynamic conflict between meta-narration and our own movements within its now supposedly loosened ambit. These *difficulties* of freedom-and-control within the *possibility* of interactive narrative spaces (and where this is perhaps a somewhat *classical* contradiction in terms) has been explored convincingly by Meyer in an impressive essay titled 'Dramatic Narrative in Virtual Reality' (in Biocca 1997). Interactive narrative (of the virtual reality variety) has since the 90's however become something of a lost cause, which is partly the result of the recognition of some these narrative difficulties, rather than some sticky issues with mere technological mimesis.

^{xxiii} to use the sous-rature suspicions of inverted commas and somewhat to support Gauntlett's points about 'active' audiences never receiving a univocal "message" (but this was also quite common, it must be said, within traditional 1.0 readings such as A Bakhtin/de Certeau inspired Fiske, Iser, Fish, Ang, Jenkins, Barker and many others besides).

^{xxiv} "Play" should be read here as an undecidable term to divide the linear 'play' (as in screenplay or theatrical play) from the pluri-dimensional non-linear 'play' that moves from being a 'text' to an interactively mobile 'process' that places a "/" within "screen/play".

^{xxv} Another *quite* important problem with such first-person conceptualisations (and one which does not form the nub of our own difference but which informs it within a neighbourly critique of a self-encapsulated "idealism") is that they tend to ignore or thrust aside the continuing (and perhaps better operating) social soil that they form a part of. By arguing for 'play' (with gender identity say) Gauntlett tends to elide the continuing power of 'the social' (which can certainly survive the advent of new media: for this is hardly a revolution, in the Marxist sense) and hands power symbolically down to a self-motivating monad.

^{xxvi} The division between process and technique here is also malleable and mobile. A 'process of flexible identity' would be something that is mapped or organically comes to pass, whereas a 'technique of flexible identity' would operate on a more reflexive level (as Soros says for economic reflexivity models that point out a performative relation in relation to a seeming constative reading of the market)

xxvii Again we should recognize here that the discipline of “Media Studies” does not sit above its object in any truly objective manner but is very clearly an integral part of the social sphere that it “comments” on a part of. Here George Soros’ points about the relationship of the speculative optic on market movements (in his essay on reflexivity) should be taken in reflecting on the place of media studies within its surrounding social tissue. No matter how ‘constative’ it seems, it is very much performatively involved in the very thing it thinks it takes a distance from. Again we find echoes to Foucault’s power-knowledge compound concept. Here we should listen carefully to Giddens’ point below and begin to think of its relation to media studies.

xxviii Some would call this stage of modernity ‘empowerment’, instead of being at the call of something notionally ‘prior’ to one’s intimate interests, but this would be to mistake an individual response to something more intimately tied up with a surrounding social eco-system. ‘Empowerment’ (taking one’s existence into one’s own space) is not a product of the individual grasping now what is theirs, but a response to a change within the constitution of the social soil that only perhaps *allows* for such empowerment because it fits with the work of the surrounding ecology or environment (a sort of mobile-umwelt). *Empowerment* is not to be thought along such intimate lines.

xxix ‘How To Do Things With Words’ is itself a performative transformation of the conceptual framework that develops it while simultaneously laying out its framework. Rather than starting off with a finished article that could be outlined within a preface or introduction, Austin starts seemingly confident with *one definition* (the clean opposition of constative/performative) and ends with quite another (the establishment of illocutionary/perlocutionary forces instead). The Harvard lecture series is itself then a witnessing of the performative problems in grappling for a solution to certain practices or games of ordinary language, rather than a simple constative outlining of some atemporal finalized framework that would exist from the opening of the work. While Derrida celebrates such undecidable-uncertainty in the work of Austin, Searle wishes *to consign this remaining play* to the father of speech acts’ (Austin’s) untimely death (that if he had lived the book would now have been safely closed around the framework). As we will see, Derrida feeds from some of these contradictions and difficulties and reworks the performative in a much more *dis*-seminatory fashion.

xxx Searle, Speech Acts

xxxi Thus fulfilling on the level of discourse, the Cartesian ground of the self-certain subject sure of its own enclosed *ground* (and thus akin to Husserl’s expression versus citational indication, see note below)

xxxii **Reword: perhaps ‘ambivalent something or other?’**

xxxiii Here we foreshadow the legal aspect of intentionality as it hooks up to the *perlocutionary* and especially the acts of *illocutionary* force, thus forming an evidential nexus for the judging of the exact *location* and the exact *palpability* of an act (for the *force* of emotion is integral to the legality of the *act*, which must not be a *recitation* or be induced by any ‘fictional’ elements or contexts, otherwise, *surely*, many radio, stage and screen actors would be on trial for bigamy along with those who had certain other complications). An illocutionary *force* is the *intentional substance* that should be present in the saying of “I do” (instead of reading from a book or under gun-point as a form of quotation or citation) would seem to be the unshakeable ground of the western episteme. Our case-study in section 3 will however point to how new media augment a *fracture of the ability to position of this intentionality* (*‘augment’* as this fracture is nothing new or introduced by the entrance of new media upon the scene, but a symptom and amplification of something always-already there) and show that we are dealing with something more than simply the written transcription of a live-intentionality transported and unwrapped on the other side of the planet. In short, *we cannot divide here our intention from the law that surrounds us*. It must also be stated that Derrida points out (working to point to instabilities in the other direction) that the context is something that can destabilize the act also and this inherent destabilization of context will form the context of our own depiction of the problems of intentional communication across spacetime (without also being able to retreat behind the safety of a border where the performative would be able to reign within a sovereign security). **Fill in later and maybe bring up into the main body of the text?...**

xxxiv The allusion or reference here to atomic physics is purposeful, as later we will see through the work of Arkady Plotnitsky that there are analogous difficulties of separating spaces that should be recognized within the theoretical optic, rather than elided (an elision which we believe Gauntlett to be perpetuating)

xxxv Judith Butler (or “*Judy*” to some who would wish for a totemic leader) has contested the idea that she has contributed to the formation of a field of enquiry that could be labeled ‘gender studies’ for “gender-sex” for her is not something that is entirely performative (in this traditional sense or in the sense that Gauntlett would understand it). We have visited this subject in relation to Gauntlett’s use of Butler’s two books (the misunderstood ‘Gender Trouble’ and the corrective of such misunderstandings ‘Bodies That Matter’) in a previous paper (Richards, 2009).

xxxvi Derrida explores this analogous issue of Husserl’s thorny difficulty of keeping the *sign* of ‘indication’ away from the *sign* of ‘expression’ in his ‘*Speech and Phenomena*’. This, as in the present case surrounding “John Langshaw Austin”, concerns the very issue that would wish the depositional, supposedly self-present-to-itself, *signing* (again as *verb-ing*) to be altogether done *with itself* (done with itself, as in *eliding the truth of its re-citation-al-re-flection*) as some infrastructurally decided conventional signage. For in not being able to be done with the helping-hand of the *sign* in *signifying* something to oneself, one finds oneself external to one’s own notional enclosure at any possible moment of self-reflection.

xxxvii Freud and first-person primordial id-filled (human-) animality as opposed to a late-arriving super-ego which would be the pre-programmed steps of a code (of conduct), whether that be godly or societal. Derrida looks at the relationship between the history of concepts of bestiality and sovereignty in his last seminar course titled “The Beast and the Sovereign” (which both live outside the law, or here with a Freudian refraction, through the domain of the ego)

xxxviii And why the Harvard Lectures “How To Do Things With Words” are often an allegory of this very unsustainability.

xxxix Translates as ‘under-erasure’ which originates from Heidegger’s use of ‘being’ with a cross through it, so that it can still be read underneath. It can still be read *underneath* (even though it is very clearly crossed-out) because we cannot *simply* be rid of a concept but must still operate within its gravity and its pull, even as we *simultaneously question* its solidity. Derrida *borrow*s (early on in his career he sometimes employed this explicit crossing-out, but later this became a more linguistic/rhetorical strategy of mis-appropriation) this technique to *carry on* using a concept, but this time *keeping the contradictions* as a “productive” aspect of his argument. His writing is famously full of borrowed *misrepre-nted* or internally-fissured concepts that *speak of* (as concerning their possible-positionality) *undecidability*.

xl One must hear within the *reception* of this word a difference to the conventional sexual *inseminational* meaning (the conventional linear information theoretical laden sense) of *disseminating* a message. To clarify, Derrida famously makes a false etymology of male *semen* and *seme* (as in semantic) to question the *phallogocentric* connotation of *planting* meaning or seed upon a fertile and *receptive* ground. Dissemination points out that *messages* (like copulative sperm) can be scattered un-cashed rather than linearly *sent/received* and rather than simply having polysemic *potential* in opposition to this unisemiosis (still operating within an horizon of receptive-singular meaning) are always divided, undecidable and undeliverable in potential, as we will go on to *point* out within the ongoing argument. This will be revisited in *note....*

xli This is our own neologism. Iteration, as Derrida clearly points out, is different to repetition or citation. Although it calls attention to ‘likewise’ element it contains within itself its difference to ‘itself’ (in terms of the *repetition of an identity*) a differing *within* the repetition: in the repetition something is lost and something gained. Thus iteration already contains the difference of performative/constative negating the need for the addition of the word ‘performative’ as a portmanteau modification. I include ‘performative’ here as a pedagogic re-pointing, however which this footnote hopefully causes to recognise.

xlii Even now, within the azure polymorphous sky of this new media age, we are not at all to be done with the ‘ideology-of-the-signature’. For in this hypertextual, hyper-identity age, we would still seem to *need* the anchor of the standing-reserve of the intentionality of a subject that is evidenced within the signature mark(s) that “they” leave: the trace or the remainder known as the signature, perhaps bears a signature *testament*, so to speak, of a remaining marker of identity that is necessary still on the supposed other end of television’s domination (for ‘after television’s age’, we are supposed to be done with identity, in the tense of a constant). Again, we could perhaps tease-out further some of these contradictions.

xliii To return to the mythopoetics of a privately-powerful language: Derrida uses a thought experiment (SEC, p.***) to illustrate the *necessity* of a third party to any first-second party communication. **Two-person language...** Though this section is necessarily ‘dry’ (to use his encryption from much later in the

essay), it connects to the *inherently* exotic mystifications of the many of the most seemingly *mundane* of telecommunications that we will be exploring under-cover in section 3.*: *namely* that we can, through these teletechnological apparatuses, supposedly communicate a clean intention over a border without any loss of personal income. ***We will find ourselves, within our message, unembalmed over this spacetime that will seemingly defy borders.***

^{xlii} For a comparable deconstructive reading of Austin's 'constative'/'performative' opposition in 'Signature Event Context' see Derrida's 'Speech and Phenomena' for a deconstructive reading of Husserl's opposition of the *indicative* 'external' colloquational sign verses the *expressive* 'internal' or soliloquational sign. Again the heartland of the interior is forever haunted by the external's errant alienness which is not of itself the master.

^{xlii} Similarly to Wittgenstein's famous pronouncements on the impossibility of a private language, Derrida's 'postcard' can be seen also then as a reply to the problem of the impossibility of 'the *enveloped* letter' (both then in Lacan's sense of the 'agency' of a letter that always reaches –like the repressed's return- its destination, but more importantly here, in answer to Wittgenstein's point about the impossibility of a private language or of a mythological letter that could not be opened, of a letter that is ***also*** not the alternate model of some *super-available* postcard). If a postcard always *bears* the trace of the subject along the contour of a contextualisable *outside* (in answer to a letter's possible loss-of-reception of its unopened or lost interiority; *unopened* by a receiver and thus *lacking* a receiver), it would not for all that *make* of the subject someone in *privation* of privacy (but also does not return the subject to the philosophically comfortable pre-linguistic realm prior to Wittgenstein's helpful linguistic *turn*). The image of the postcard instead provides a strong illustrative *counter metaphor* where *what is written* along the outside (as opposed to locked in privacy, in the space of my own experiential monadically echoing *qualia*, for example) is not a guaranteeable *availability* to a context external my "borders", but a message that, though not mine to *hide* or *dispense with* when asked to *open* by the law-of-context, can be lost, disseminated (see **note v**) and one that does not *belong* to me anyway, in any case. This *metaphor* then can do with some further useful conceptual teasing out and connected back to the problem of the archival depositing *performative* in relation to the postcard and the system that allows for its circulation within a info-technological system. We must also not forget that the metaphoric image of the Derrida's postcard allows for the further image of a contextual *power* that Wittgenstein's own 'letter-metaphor' does not quite as well *iron(-ise)* out.

^{xlii} Of course this is a domaining and domineering energy behind many forms of nationalism (without wishing to first-person 'blame' nationalism on any parties that individually feel or embark on its presence, for these are also no-doubt overdetermined also by fluctuations in the market, to say the least). An internal Kristevian abjection is born witness to where the outside is cast aside by some internal recognition of a lack of clean internality. There is a significant amount of overlap here that bears witness to a significant overlap between Kristeva and Derrida that De Nooy investigates in her book that compares their differences and similarities on the problems of *difference*.

^{xlii} And here we would refer to the importance of what Derrida calls the *counter-signature*. Such a counter-signature cannot be expunged from any notional information pipe-line (no matter how pre-prosthetic it might seem) and so forms the irresolvable difficulty or law(s) of context that always already prevents the signature from being itself (even if it seems to be received without countersignature-and often here a joint-context is elided and read as some purity of signature-transport). This irresolvable presence of the counter-signature forms behind the case-study within section 3.* below.

^{xlii} But *is* the norm untroubled if it awaits a reply (or a *counter-signature*) to the question that the pregnant waiting poses? As Butler will argue, the expectations one implicitly makes (of the usual seemingly empirical functioning) of the hospital institution (that provides the care of pre-birth and birth, as in information, support) supports *also* a whole signficatory norming operation that polices anything that might fall outside its bounds. Though one may (socio-psychically) agree with it before one enters its physico-geometric parameters, this does not stop it, for all that, providing many possibilities of undecidability that (as Butler's next quote points out) harries it as it simultaneously supports: answers will have to be forced and *baptism will not await a naming that comes later*.

^{xlii} Butler points out a connection here with Althusser's theory of interpellation, hailing and his famous "hey, you there" function of ideology and how it transforms individuals into subjects (here read supposed naturalised constative into a performative). This interpellation however does not require an agency of authority to bring out the 'belonging' in us, but takes place through all sorts of physical (rather than psychical) movements. Institutions, as Foucault would go on to examine, operate in geometric ways.

ⁱ 'Digital McLuhan' by Paul Levinson. As a former student of McLuhan (just as with Searle and Austin), Levinson wishes that his old mentor were still around to see his prophesy fulfilled. For Levinson believes the technology of Internet communication to have fulfilled the reproduction of close-clean orality on the level of technological reproduction. Just as Walter J. Ong sees the speech model (what is ideologically wrapped-up within its mythological cloth) as what the technological model should strive for (and indeed in the end, to *get* there), so Levinson believes transportation of the self to the other (and vice versa) is what the internet (or its children) will bring. Levinson proves then to be very un-Levinasian in that the latter (Levinas) saw an *ethic of distance* (instead of proximity/totality) and acceptance of alterity/infinity (an an-arche) that Levinson would wish to vanquish. Interestingly Ong does tackle Derrida's problem with the logocentric speech teleological model, but does not provide a very solid case. Indeed he is forced to (actively?) misinterpret some of Derrida's difficulties with McLuhan to make him fit more easily.

ⁱⁱ The fascinating (for social-historical reasons) and rather quaintly-McLuhanesque book called "4000 years of Television" (1946) sees within the newly emerging medium of television, the closing of a teleological journey that began (and depicted somewhat *cutely*) within caves where certain young bucks began to break out of their parent's oral traditions and work to create primitive communications that could store up intentions for later consumption. All work over the last 4000 years has been heading towards television's magnetic north, and we are the very lucky beneficiaries of this *tele-work* and its (end of history) conclusion. In a more complex argument (that works to uncover these seemingly innocent democratic ideologies of televisual 'world-shrinking' communication) Dienst (1994) unpacks some of the (ideologically positioned) historical voices (for example Arnheim, Vertov, Sartre, etc.) that were framing the place for television's *job* around its time of launching.

ⁱⁱⁱ As a fellow-traveler of our own Mr. Underwood (who we are soon to discuss), John Perry Barlow has moved from the concerns of his own piece of American land and his freedom to protect and survive on it, to a defense of the freedom of a space he calls cyberspace. In his impassioned individualistic "Declaration of Independence of Cyberspace" (a declaration that would obviously call for a reading very similar to Derrida's of the performative act that was the original -and as he points out rather apoeretically voiced "we-the-undersigned"- 'Declaration of Independence' that it somewhat citationally echoes (and we should, of course, be getting used to this tendency of performatives to inevitably find a need to strongly echo, if not to downright copy and paste as do the best of plagiarists, previous seemingly clean-handed performatives)...

^{liii} This space remains a very Cartesian or Euclidian space, even as J.P. Barlow wishes to free it from any situated responsibility that could have a law or compound placed around it. In fact Barlow tethers this azure-free space to a conceptuality of ground at-the-very-unique-moment he wishes to till it and turn it over for other purposes...

^{liv} Some hunters of a Thoreauan manly-philosophical persuasion have argued for the *situatedness* of hunting and concomitantly that hunting via a distant or remote prosthesis is an inherent crime against the essence or ontology of the hunt. James A. Swan, for example, argues that one must be within and *amongst it all* and have the beast's blood and sticky-smell upon one's hands and that this wet or gluey *experience* of 'being-within-the-hunting-world' is quite another story to something that takes place over clinically-cowardly distance of some distancing (perhaps voyeuristic-masturbatory) information pipeline. In an ESPN sports entry specifically against Mr. Underwood's cyber-connective proposal that we are here looking into, he argues for an essence of co-presence with the quarry. Similarly, in a series of books concerned with *being-in-nature* ('Power of Place', 'In Defense of Hunting', etc.), he argues that there is a path toward *spirit* and the sacred that makes all hunters feel compassion for the hunted (right before they kill them) p.35. In such a worldview the co-presence of the animal prevents hunting from becoming some sort of a 'sitting stale supermarket'. This obvious replay of the 'being-there' argument itself could do with some further unpacking as 'being-there-with' (*mit-da-sein*) is perhaps not as *entirely* situated as it often supposes itself to be.

^{lv} This, of course, is a further replay of the supposed neo-liberal accomplishment of free market dispositions that would seem to operate (within this ideological formation) above historical-contextual determination, which we will talk about later in the study

^{lvi} To remind ourselves of our argument earlier, media studies 2.0 replaces industrialized-final identities with free identities located now at the ground-floor level of the individual. While 1.0 media were concerned mainly with solidifying the audience identity within a larger (read national) framework, the inhabitant of 2.0 media spaces (the many spaces mainly of the internet) match more with identities that are temporary and are not based around industrial but post-industrial identity formations. We must keep

in view here that there is a significant quantity of overlap within what 2.0 asks of its media that repeats 1.0's presuppositions.

^{lvii} Television is of course struggling to maintain some links with these *other* ends and to contain within its somewhat stretched body-proper these aspects that threaten it also (obvious examples but mention a few such as youtube shows, website followups/hooks, time-shifted offsite iplayers, etc.).

^{lviii} Advertisements for computers, software and mobile phones are filled with smiling images of technologies and global village de-babelising *connections* that naturally *favour* a free market democratic *ground*. This again demonstrates the power of such seemingly innocent (that is to say disembodied) neoliberal ideology that powers, so to speak, the ideology of the internet "revolution".

^{lix} We will ask later whether such teletechnological *prosthetic extensions* also extend a *supplementary* secondarity to the preceding professed *state* of immediacy itself that is the situated rifle that so concerns traditional "analogue" hunters. If a secondary *stage* originating *away* from the intimate action *robs* the scene of its intimate naked *truth*, why is this disdainful distance in itself so threatening to the truthful and unitary intimacy? Perhaps, later, once this secondarity spooks this *primal scene* (that comes to supposedly *divide* the *intimate* intimacy of the hunter *from* the hunted) whereupon the primacy itself comes to be seen to be operating under some spectral division or erasure, a division that was already there from the very outset of the intimacy. The point may be that the threat from errant *outside* (from these teletechnologies that separate) was always already *intimately*-present before the dishonest or soiling *extension* came upon the scene: that the rifle *itself* was already a teletechnological extension, and hardly a primary nature. Similarly, and more central to our technological *concerns* here, *television's* homeland defenses and ring-fencing *of* the homeland's borders does not just come under threat from some foreseen contra-community 'ends' (those people who lose the locale of community by crossing borders via the internet), but this apocalyptically foreseen *after-end* brings forth (or retroactivates) an *end* that was there from the beginning, *always already*. Much work within Media Studies 2.0 and the former 1.0, often unknowingly, goes to bury this *unity* between such a seeming natural "beginning" and the ends projected outward. A deconstructive study would aim to further unpick some of these paradoxes that cannot help but crop up, like unwanted weeds, within various corners and margins of these fields of research.

^{lx} We can easily foresee a Nintendo Wii control that would utilize an accelerometer that would transport information across the internet to the servo-operated gun at the other end. Such *bringing-close* of the operations at one end would, no doubt, serve to *secure* a strong subjective sense of 'being-there', but would not in any way solve the problem of legality and borders that we are investigating here: immersion can never simply be about "immersion". Also the sense of loss is perhaps a little apocalyptically mourned or celebrated, for just because an operand might gain a sense of 'involvement', does not, for all that, mean that this equates to a loss a la suture theory (see Richards 2009, Cybercultures argument)

^{lxi} Just as accelerometers and digital compasses within the above note have joined with other similar indexico-semiotic *environmedia* in revolutionizing the mode-of-engagement with generic interfaces such as games or augmented-reality-engines (and seemingly "immersing" subjects now into object-spaces, making those of a Baudrillardian and Virillean persuasion worry about a seeming implosion or loss of cleanliness of in subject-object confrontations), so we should revisit (lately –and certainly- affected by techno-interlaced-networks-of-engagement) *what it is to be in contact with a physical object* that we might get to touch or have a haptic-tactile relationship with. Formerly (for the techno-hunting saboteur Swan et al and Virilio for different reasons) mounting a head after a hunt might have meant something solid had taken place, but is there not something equally as virtual involved here, even before an extended prosthetic might lead to subject's victory over an object. We can foresee a situation (very soon) where an augmented technology would allow a HUD (heads-up-display) to watch a formula one car go past us that is not even going past a camera placed (and transmitting to us) on the other side of the world (i.e. no cameras will be needed to transmit a telepresence, in the old fashioned sense). For here an gps sensor placed onboard the car would send a *message* to a satellite that locates its local xyz-object>xyz-spatial geometry that will then allow a subject (placed in a mapped position) to pin itself to a place on the circuit reconstructed on the HUD (which can of course be "cut" to another position on the circuit once the *local-xyz-1* has passed – and here the subject will be the judge of how fast they can move to a local-xyz-2 and then *local-xyz-3* before losing the suture-location-sensation: *no doubt* the fluidity-of-locations in such as space will, at some point, provide "*the fun of it*" (as Welles said of certain chicanes within narratives) to be able to pivot along a static xyz to be able to gain the sense of watching the object pass 'here' but that has passed 'there' at the same time. Thus a live-timespace is transmitted to another timespace that obeys the same object-coordinates, as if the subject's coordinates were glued.

At such a point the resources of being-there will outstrip *being-there* (though a nostalgia for the 'nature' of the stairs will no doubt lead to a disposal of the culture of the lift, to use Virilio's example), but will we be able to say whether we have lost or gained anything that was previously not virtual. The question of the virtual and where technics sullies purity, is not an easy question to have answered.

^{lxii} Again the notion of 'intentionality' (Brentano, Husserl, etc.) has come under question for quite some time now from thinkers such as Heidegger and Derrida. The supposed transportation of intentional content over a network connection does nothing to reinvigorate this doxa of some transposal of intimacy and could do with much more unpacking than it often does (surprising in an age where the individual agency is coming under increasing suspicion from thinkers such as Rheingold). Intentionality is however tending to be *transposed from an individual to a collective level* with everything that supports it left relatively intact. The notion of the *oikos* or the housing is taken from being housed, as it were within an individual frame, to being housed within a more distributive, but nevertheless totalized economy.

^{lxiii} For though often the currently experienced state of 'present-day' technology seems always badly measured for the wrapping up of the mythological once 'lived' event, there is always the dream of rekindling a distance-coming-nearer, that technology will, upon this day, match up to what the communicating "father" (for there is a relation between patriarchy and the ideology of the arché; the *law-of-the-unified-first*) required when setting off the child-of-communication along its way. Techné will finally contain and set free the encryptions, codes or magic words of the once lived origin. On such a date, the child will be nothing 'other' than the father unembalmed and reborn. And at this point: the future as 'uncertainty', dies. Here then we have a politics of futurity that desires of futurity calculation (and which we will revisit in our table in section 4.1). While this would deserve another argument, teletechnologies, within their very remit, presuppose a swallowing of temporality as uncertainty. Our entire argument here however is that these technologies, in their currently evolving form, far from offering a furtherance of this patri-archal father-law (as we could coin it) contain seeds that do not bridge or inseminate such fatherly intention but undercut or *dis-seminate* it. This is no digital McLuhanesque domain.

^{lxiv} The *pilot in his ship* being the platonic-Cartesian ideal of the *deux ex machina* or the soul and the body returning eventually to the realm of the ideal. Within this conception, the body is either itself dirty or a thing that discolors some notional prior purity, or a husk to finally be cast off without *essentially* affecting the essence which would live-on or remain (this lately has been updated with fantasies of downloading "the self" into a computer without any difference to the thing *called* consciousness, by for example futurologists such as Ray Kurzweil: one should perhaps visit Merleau-Ponty to question again the mind-body split that this desire presupposes). This then is the still Christian ideal that, reacting specifically against a strain of German Idealism still apparent, Nietzsche and later Heidegger brought into question by bringing the temporality and materiality of the body-mind coupling back to haunt this Platonic ideal. Many idealists within the new media space, however post-human they imagine themselves to be, tend to *live-off* this very humanist idea of a *living-on*.

^{lxv} Or of certain *types* of animal: for we are bound to ask where we draw the all so important demarcation lines in a country where some are classed as vermin or multitudinous or some others as fair game or others to be ruled out of season, etc.

^{lxvi} Incidentally Descartes' certain ground of the psyche's self-certitude was problematised at the time by who replaced the *cogito* of the *cogito ergo sum* with a new arché of *moto ergo sum* as equally impervious to philosophical prosecution of what runs the vessel (replacing the captain driving the ship, with the ship driving the captain). Here we find strong echoes in Heidegger's concentration on the physical institution as *writing* the movements of the occupant that proved to be so influential in the work of Althusser, Foucault and Bourdieu, as they would later admit.

^{lxvii} Edmund Locard, as one of the fathers of modern forensic science, pointed out through his notion of his famous 'exchange principle' that any act leaves traces. Thus soil from a scene can be recovered later on the shoes of a suspect and by examining the *trace* of this exchange, a prior occupation or act can be deduced. Any excavation-of-the-act, in the usual archaeological sense, classically demands the traces of presence evidenced though some indexical guarantors. Again we come upon the politics of the signature and the law-of-the-arché-father.

^{lxviii} This neologism '*tropo-graphic*' or '*tropo-logical*' (as opposed to *topographic* or *topological*) is not playing fast and loose or to merely perhaps have some *play* with language, as a trope involves the transport of one figure (a proper figure) by another figure (an improper figure) that reflects our issue here with transportation. The classical trope, that is metaphor for example, is a *form of transport* from a

proper place or point of departure to an improper place of destination (science would famously wish to do without the mud of metaphor, even though it is always composited within the very soil of their “explanation”). Here we are questioning concerning what exactly a ‘space’ is when borders are involved. We will later underline that this is not an argument for remaining ‘within’ or retreating ‘behind’ borders, but that the visibility of the difficulty of these borders only brings out what was always-already within the border, in a very Kristevian sense (abjection, etc.).

^{lxi} For, as we are beginning to see, there is here an insoluble *politics-of-the-decision*, which is faced with the bottomless (‘mise-en-abyme’, rather than ‘mise-en-scene’) decision of deciding *what* the status of the animal is. Linguistics is thrown onto the horns of a dilemma as we are not carving up an *object-with-properties* but are faced with a reflection of our own linguistic categories as we look through the optic of this fly-by-wire apparatus that we have here been investigating. The translation of what is *foreign*, as Derrida demonstrated in ‘Of Grammatology’, is not the transportation of any clean signified across a border (through an exchange of signifiers: “*cat for chat*”) but a question of the existence of the signified as a stable origin in any sense. As we will see later, in looking through this apparatus to spot the status of this ‘cat’ we are faced with something not entirely dissimilar to the famous physics thought experiment concerning Schrödinger’s famously slippery “cat” (that is wanted, though not *available*, as decidedly dead *or* alive).

^{lxx} This is where a court’s jurisdiction to determine its own jurisdiction is decided by the court itself. This self-sealing can get jurisdiction out of some sticky situations...

^{lxxi} Territory is to ground as law is to nature, as writing is to speech and as techné is to physis. *Ground* then is indivisible and an underlay upon which a law is written upon or imposed some time afterward. For ground (the *what*) to be divided from territory (the *who*) the ground must hold something that territory cannot *saturate* or colonise (the primary holds back any secondary totality)

^{lxxii} In an interview in ‘Limited Inc.’ Derrida points out that *undecidability* is very different to *indeterminacy* (which opponents often accuse him of deploying) as there is always a dynamic between places or positions within a field of meaning. Meaning cannot just be located nowhere or anywhere.

^{lxxiii} This undecidability, again, is not something that is transported or parachuted in within any imposed reading, but is an *irresolvable* part of the text itself long before such a reading is undertaken or demonstrated. However much one might wish to avoid or tuck away such weeds or contradictions, the teleology of some *space* where all decisions are final will never come to pass. Here we should at least begin to unpick some Rousseauan or McLuhanesque dreams of de-babelised, de-bounded global villages.

^{lxxiv} For the use of the language of a progressive 2.0 inherently *continues* the identity of a program through a determinate iterative coupling of a sameness-within-difference, just as Photoshop 1.0 shares a strong identity with Photoshop 8.0. This is why 3.0 would not be a desire for this particular study, not through some wish to surpass an identity but as a questioning of such identity much earlier than its forming.

^{lxxv} This is Derrida’s neologistic pun on ontology explored most fully in his ‘Specters of Marx’. Hauntology in relation to videogames was explored in this author’s chapter titled ‘Presence-Play: The Hauntology of the Computer Game’ where positions were shown not to be ontological singularities but positions intimately haunted by other time-space positions (différance).

^{lxxvi} i.e. not from some unsituated, decisionless view from nowhere that some *science of the media* would be able to unpack.