

Distributed Writing, or Geodiscursive Writing¹

Prolegomena: of non-newness, and one trajectory of its historicity.

There is a disconnected history of distributed writing, and it is this multivalent history, and the multivalence of history, that survives in the shadows of deficit; unrecognized. From the accretionary oral revisions performed under the guise of pathos in Greek epic poetry, the globalism of the Gothic Mediaeval Cathedral, the canal system of Nanjing, Cortazar's *Hopscotch*, the plateau of human achievement landscaped by Deleuze and Guatari: all systems in their own right of distributed writing; each of them denying their conventional formations and in so doing establishing a second order form (in sequence, the denial of time, function, space, narrative, and authorship, and then the subsequent reinvention of each of these same forms). The compilation of particular histories themselves (of this history in particular) reflecting the choice in trajectory and belying the disconnection.

Microscope: neural paths and biological information; the secret life of ideas transcribing their morphophoric energies in bioinformatic branching from host to offspring, virally from host to host, and fanning in explosive diversities of spontaneous evolutions and mutations. Deleuze rightly speaks through biology: "...as Kant's *Critiques* were (roughly speaking) the epistemology, metaphysics, ethics, and aesthetics of a world of Euclidean space, Aristotelian time, and Newtonian physics-and just as they (perhaps inadvertently) pinpointed biology as the key science that did not fit that world - Deleuze works to provide the philosophical concepts that make sense of our world of fractal geometry, anticipatory effects, and non-linear dynamics- and to highlight biology as the key science of our time."² The oft-used notion of the *rhizome* indicates enough of a parallelism, distribution of resource, and biological transcription to begin the restructuring of both history - making the implicit explicit - and the present.

¹ This document was produced in an "acute" session of distributed writing, and as such spends little time on overt reference to other creative research. We have tried to footnote the most densely packed areas, and extract an originator of a thought, or two, but it must be said that- in living in the vanguard of exactly what this document proposes- we willfully contribute to the dissolution of distracting quotation and move towards the biological logic of digestion.

² <http://www.artsci.lsu.edu/fai/Faculty/Professors/Protevi/Introduction.html>

The matter at hand suggests that distributive writing is the unacknowledged child (the excremental product, the excretion awaiting symbiotic usage)³ of experience. It seems that all histories, and all products therein, partake of a long, and more or less unmapped inter-dialogic foundation. In simple cases, the accretionary and evolutionary process of narrative (oral sediments building to stories) and in complicated cases the distribution is covered by layers of other (distributive) elements: the plagiarized idea, the anonymous work, the collective consciousness, the unexplained aberration. Texts intend their veneer of singularity and finality to convince of, if not uniqueness, then of its "sum of all histories"⁴, while eschewing recognition of their true teratogenesis; the frankenstein-stitching of the limbs and organs, the hybrid covalence of molecular information. Historically, the moments of clairvoyance reveal the concept of distribution clothed in the animus of a demiurge, fomenting in the poet of the stream of consciousness, plaguing the nightmares of Jung, or Enlightening the universal planet through the *weltanschauung*, the *Zeitgeist* boogeyman beneath Jung's bed. In all of these cases, even where the concept of distribution might have something to discuss (and not *be* just the discussion), it has maintained a mythical status, shadowing in operation the missing hand of the creator God and putting in its stead the amorphous false democracy of a multitude. Even presently, while the "fuzzy geography"⁵ of our communication-in-flux-networks offers up a fertile field of multi-planar growth opportunities, we are still deprived of its nourishing illuminations by the shadow an authorial monolith.

Out-lining: non-newness in a newly configurable space.

"We have built pyramids when we are in the process of again becoming nomads, when an architecture for a new exodus is needed." -Pierre Levy

In this particular case the interest lies in exhibiting, developing, and maximizing the modes of distribution as they relate to *voice (parole)* in the digital realm. That such distribution may occur

³ note: this is, of course, Bataille, but with a Deleuzean twist.

⁴ Note: along the lines of Richard Feynman's work in quantum mechanics.

⁵ Note: as if there were a geo-spatial analog to fuzzy logic or fuzzy numbers.

elsewhere is both true and irrelevant to the project at hand. The distinct goal, and unsung hero of this text, is the proposal for the creation of just such a digital repository of writings; a new form of journal that makes prominent the modes of creation believed to be essential but considered of atrophied significance. Explicitly, this possibility of developing a platform for distributive writing over clustered networks lies precisely in the fact that the network can (and will) be exposed: the only place to find writing with provenance and pedigree.

While notions of pedigree often define a status of purity, and provenance associates a value in its history of *taste*, distribution in this case merely offers a receipt for the speaker each time ‘two-cents’ are added. Or, in a generative model, distribution provides both the materials and structure for adding to (mutating) the genetic code. Speciation, the theorized teratogenesis of evolutive mutation, suggests that a mutation may finally (and quite arbitrarily) be so different so as to be *called* a new entity; in this case, all entities are no longer ontologically (ontogenetically) isolated (their genetic progress always being documented), nor are they ever dependant (the mapping of such progress can always be repositioned according to the map-readers preferences). How is this possible?

There are at least two distinct levels to consider here, both of which are mutually interrelated. The first level is that of the productive structure, the second are the entities that form its constituents. Neither of these relationships are immutable for any aspect under scrutiny.

Structurally the flat space of the digital screen appears to deny the modes of its production.ⁱ In this case, the format of each [resolution] must define to a greater or lesser extent the boundaries of its presentation: the 3:4 ratio of the monitor, the range of possible colours, the dependence upon the OS and upon the browser, the limits of language (both as a subtextual programming interface, and as the interface itself). Yet as Manovich has successfully argued, these parameters are also deceptively unfixed.⁶ The boundary of the rectangle forces an interior collapse: everything within the rectangle can swirl like gas (*kaos*), its modularity is not just ‘plug-and-play’, it is add and stir, mix and match, excrete and digest.

⁶Manovich, Lev. *Language of New Media*.

In this case the open space between the rectangle becomes a surface area for representing vectors of data (data visualization: statistical , analytical, aesthetic, etc.). It may not be limited to a single visualization, or any visualization at all. In fact, it is quite susceptible to infinite collapse, a fractal depth of mathematical and semiotic strata. No matter how it may come to pass, the rectangle is a pre-fabricated dynamic space corralled to expose itself as self-reflexively as possible through the implementation of, among other data visualizations, a diagram of valences between the collected informations that populate the repository - the data objects.

This data object, the so-called second entity, initially takes several more conventional forms: image, sound, text, are among the most common; other types may include game, 'raw' code or applet, link, etc.. These bodies are placed into the general structural mechanism by contributing 'authors' where they can thereby act upon and be acted upon by other contributions. Each contribution (organism) receives upon entry a designation instantiating its positional uniqueness (dp). Subsequent reiterations, interactions, mutations by users of the [resolution] will not be tracked as alterations, but as generations; thereby acquiring their own dp.

The data object does not necessarily maintain any kind of bodily primacy or integrity. It can be altered within its own content-type, or used as fodder for another related or separate process. The text (or a string form the text) can be used to generate a visual, vice versa, ad infinitum, etc., with each subsequent resubstantiation constituting a generation (a new data object), and also presenting the possibility of establishing a new content-type.

The nexus itself will be the shifting architectures of connecting "lines" between contributors: a clustering of resources (primarily distributed memory) and participant's "client" interfaces - visual or textual software that arrange and engage the population of data. Assuredly, visual conceits to the interconnectedness of the structure will be initially coded and distributed; in that, the impetus is to construct "viewers" (software interfaces) that can comprehensibly represent not only the pedigree but the connections (of extractable elements) between data-objects thriving even in disparate "evolutionary" threads.

Ultimately, this becomes a question of cartography, of making explicit the topography and

geology of vast tracts of consciousness and praxis; each a shadowed inner landscape that has informed the dreaming of our poets and explorers but has never been traced to this extent, has never been so accessible and still resistant to the capriciousness of *the wind*.

Tagging: glimpsing the midnight writers with a pen light, and other stories

Moving lithely around manifestos, the songs of drunkards in a tavern of ideas, we move around the corner and into the dark alley. Here we encounter all of the signs we expected to encounter. A flickering street lamp fading into dark night, an alley cat in a dumpster with fishbones under its paws, the pungent smell of alcoholics' piss, the cardboard villages for nomads – not the Christian Dior or Diesel Nomad who is resident to the world entire, but the dispossessed, the nomad who is so because there cannot be a home anywhere but in water soluble *unité d'habitations*,⁷ of puddles that never evaporate, and at the very end of this alley, an opening that goes no where in particular. This is where we wish to be. It is where we may begin to catch sight of writing that is beyond the manifesto, and beyond their poetic clichés. Beyond the alley's other opening, its end and the beginning of the *other*, the space reopens and three (de)central things confront us: the lights and air of our megalopolis city, the horizon demarcated by the convolutions of the fluvial freeways, and the billboards that radiate their *signs* onto the countless byway bypassers by bylines. Bye bye manifesto, hello transphysical organic network.

In that distributive writing has been re-cognized, so we must admit that it is because it has its foundation in an organic network that is apparent on several levels. For starters, we view in our city the churning, the din, the no more ebb and flow but the constant on the go; we see the surfaces it occurs on (the air paths, the highways, the surface roads, the beaten paths, and the *signs* of spatial possession). We notice it in our systems which purport to mimic certain cognitive structures of our minds.⁸ We connect seamlessly, or so we wish to imagine it as such, across a digital spread spectrum, from Cellphone to WiFi; information superhighways that clog or cruise, and all of them meeting their ends in the wasteland of the deeply rural space; the city

⁷ cf. Virilio, Paul. *Crepuscular Dawn*. Trans. by Mark Taormina. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2002.

⁸ cf. Dallow, Peter. "Digital Media as Simulation of the Analogical Mind" in *Technospaces: Inside the New Media*. Ed. By Sally R. Munt. New York: Continuum, 2001; p. 57-70.

slickers version of Icarus' sun. Finally, through these channels we bear witness to our communications, linguistic and otherwise. As a disjunctive community we speak across channels, from postcard to SMS, from email to dairy, from poster to Congressional print. More importantly we interrupt one another constantly, and yet the final product is always continuous. Continuously broken, fragmented, but so nearly periodic that it appears to reflect the periodization of high-frequency sampling; in short, existential hyper frames.

This is the organic network. It corresponds to how we are; we build it to do just that. It reflects structures of our power, it voices those already in possession of agency. But it also provides blank surfaces awaiting reinscriptions (because nothing is truly *blank*; it only waits for the intentionality of fulfillment, the semiosis that is its communicative chrysalis, which brings it from some *blank* to some other *blank*). What distributive writing does is take advantage of as many of these surfaces as possible. It does this precisely because it is already implicated in the network. The difference in this case, however, rests in the acknowledgement of this condition. The surfaces are not somehow 'free' and 'open'; *blankness* is always confiscated from some alternate territory. But it is different from a Situationist subversion (though Situationism could easily be incorporated, just as the corporate network could also). The difference here is that distributive writing does not take place in opposition to a dominant position; in fact, it uses both dominance and submission. Distributive writing writes across the network. It writes in fragments that are, perhaps, later reconnected. It writes as we speak, or don't speak;ⁱⁱ it writes across everything already built, razed, or developed. It is an exercise in writing that mimics the organic network, and yet here there is an attempt to make it less elusive. This is an attempt to catch writing always in enaction.

Blinking dotted lights act as nexus for the city. They are joined by the network that has grown up with them, and the two, lights and network, mark out the city and freeways above. But what of the signs? They are the so-called blank spaces. They are the writings joined to earth, but written in the sky and illumined by metal halide suns. But there is more than just the sign post, or the sign itself. As any freeway driver will tell you: the signs are often covered or marked by various 'tags,' symbols of territorial possession beyond the civic authority. These tags are edits upon the signs, but as such, they add to the sign rather than detract from it. There is a

sedimentation that occurs. On the surface is the tag, beneath lay the traces of the sign, then beneath that are other signs and other tags, and at the bottom of these layers is the slate of the billboard, the scaffolding, the construct of the sign. Then there is also the compounding of signs upon signs. The sign is tagged by a sign because of its proclamative position as a sign: it is a well-lighted billboard and everyone can see it, so it is reclaimed by the tag. No doubt the ‘taggers’ likely don’t care so much for the aesthetic contribution to the sign as a whole, so much as they do the accuracy with which their own signs (their tags) may be observed. Unbeknownst to them however, they have partaken in the layering of a collage, and their meanings register within the framework of this style. Yet the collage is also affected. Each tag is more or less indecipherable to the greater public, and to this extent then each tag looks similar to any other tag. A homogenization of the strangest variety occurs. A plainness in subversion exists on the surface of the common (billboard) sign. The layers of meaning add to and cancel out each other in various ways and according to different viewings. Thus the sign is complicated in at least two ways: in its physical layering, and in its semiotic layering.

This layering is identical to the scenario of distributive writing. In the dwz there is a layering of time (specific times pertaining to when changes are made), a physical layering through versioning sediments, mutations, branching, and simple edits, and finally there is a semiotic layering that occurs when layers are impacted through time and through interaction, proximity, relation, etc.. There is also a distinct lack of attributable authorship and possession; because traceable authorship is identical to territorial claims and ownership of space. The homogenization that occurs is not one of ideological impact, for readers of the signs always know what the signs mean to them. It occurs in that aside from the knowledge that the sign exists, there is no known author; and for those that merely pass by and pay no heed – for this is a bona fide option – the dwz is a meaningless intrusion upon a bland space: a disruption on the level of a fruit fly; small, insignificant, a minor nuisance; noticeable only in the most liminal proprioceptors. Baudrillard has his endless simulacra because he cannot stop to look. It simulates only because it writes and only because it is read as writing. It is still only blank space. At any moment someone, some thing may possess it and write upon it. At any moment something can be added, and something can be subtracted (erasure is also (re)writing).

In the dwz there is the problem of authorship. Authors are replaced by position indicators; tags upon tags, if you will. Each tag on the modular body (the text) is tagged with a stamp indicating its relative position. The position includes its relative time to the body and to other tags. It indicates value of change and frequency, how many and what kind. Unlike the physical sign, the dwz is transparent, or its geneology is present and discernable. All layers can be viewed simultaneously, and one at a time, depending on the framing of the space and the interface layout conditions. Anything is possible, but this is the key: anything must be possible.

Authorship should dissolve entirely. If anything must be possible then the tag must account for complete erasure, or absolute absurdity. It must account for loquacity, silence, redundancy, and absence. It can trace by means of valences the number and position of any qualia within a preset range,⁹ and that range can be preset to anything present, and if beyond the present, then demarcate the limit space of absolute zero. At points, it seems prudent to have a system that compiles all of the changes into a kind of new-modular body, a type of meta-index known as versioning. The conditions under which this occurs are not clear, and the version itself may be more accurately depicted as a significant branch instead of the sole heir to some lexical lineage. The numerous options for multiplicity reflect the possibilities encountered in lived existence. Authorship is an artificial function designed to commodify and control space. What any author states only has meaning in the context of the relational value of the statement. The dwz is only context, and the writing is its fodder. What is on the table are the ideas, and egos are checked at the gateway. Thus if the statement is what we hear (the author is first the word, and the body proceeds from this function as per Foucault), then the statement is the value. It is no longer about tagging to control space, but pinging to know who's out there to read the tag, and then adding more tags, tagging tags, writing everywhere. It does not matter who writes it. What must be considered first is the value of the statement to the project of all writings' momentum. The concept of authorship preservation is exactly what haunts and contributes to the failure of earlier attempts: Quilt, Duplex, Jabber, AIM, IRC, enCore, Buddyspace; besides individual drawbacks, each system was obsessed with maintaining the clear identity of traceable authorship. This is especially true in synchronous modes of dwz where simultaneous changes are effected (in an asynchronous dwz whole modules are downloaded and uploaded as discrete mutations).

⁹ cf. Benjamin Fry's *Valence* project. <<http://acg.media.mit.edu/people/fry/valence/>>

Instead the system branches. Mutations are any subsequent addition, whereas branching is a change in vector, related but distinct as a subset. The two are not exclusive. One is vertical the other is lateral. Each object, be it mutation or branch, can be viewed singularly, or in relation vertically or laterally, or as a three dimensional space (vertical, lateral and occipital): mutation, branch, and time. A valence algorithm would disrupt this further by adding user specifiable dimensions, new categories of relationship; the mutation, the frequency of $f(x)$, the time when $f(y)$, the cartography of branching as perceived through $f(\text{time} * z)$. Anything that can be written can act as a category or variable; everything is writing. When something branches, it also mutates, and vice versa. The dwz must account for these possibilities as a condition for its historical depth (it could not do otherwise anyway).

Lastly, to detail this is only to catch a glimpse. We see the writing and make conclusions based on what we'd like to believe we're seeing. It's another kind of hermeneutic circle. As the project unfolds we learn more about the nature of tags, their power, and their limits. We learn what surfaces archive the inscriptions and what surfaces explode with perception but fade quickly from view. This is all achieved through a conscious desire to design a memory for memory. And yet it is achieved in crepuscular light. We think the shadows are what we wish them to be. Yet we already understand that the shadow is already always an effect. So we post a sign on a utility pole: lost signs, please call if found; and thereby add ourselves to the dialogue of presence.

ⁱ 5/7/03, 20:43: hey : hey : did you get the url? : for the prole? : prolegomena?: 20:45: no url yet : oh yes : <http://leda.ucsd.edu/~nsclark/writings/prole.html> : resend please : hnx : re would get the old terminal chat too : forgot about the ytalk | UNIX eh | two screen chat like we did b4 <== might scroll yes | lessmake sure you logging | i just save it at the end... but we should rememvber to log or it will dissappear : we could start with a problem area : like the flat scree 4:5 area : define the problems : articulate a few of them and try to dialogue methodically? : ys : what about flatscreen? 20:50 : paragraph? : Structurally the flat space of the digital screen appears to deny the modes of its production. In this case, the format of each [resolution] must define to a greater or lesser extent the boundaries of its presentation: the 3:4 ratio of the monitor, the range of possible colours, the dependence upon the OS and upon the browser, the limits of language (both as a subtextual programming interface, and as the interface itself). Yet as Manovich has successfully argued, these parameters are also deceptively unfixed.⁶ The boundary of the rectangle forces an interior collapse: everything within the rectangle can swirl like gas (kaos), its modularity is not just 'plug-and-play', it is add and stir, mix and match, excrete and digest. : and the paragraph afterwards : proolly the most confusing part : aren't you speaking of the ability of the production (eg light, glass) to beget other things...? : we should dumb down : like: flate screen

opens into a universe of thought;;; conversations i'm not sure we deny the mode of its production here the accretions of layered thought and writing we can gloss over it, but deny it? it seems to reductively confrontations confrontational the rest of it seems to make sense, though it is like the glass of a window though... u begin to take it all for granted forget about it look to what else is revealed no, i think this is a common trope that people assume that what we see somehow denies how it got there but what if what we see is also how it got there and more a layered viewing is that what data visualization is? viewing what the production is? i don't necessarily agree the data visualization is oriented toward a final structure not always the flux of its own creation and most times, the parameters of vis. are hidden or taken for granted data visualization = dv; it's a re-presentation, then but the mistake made most often is the ignorance of the filter... and that becomes sometimes the most interesting thing BUT 20:55 it IS forgotten a lot on the other hand, the filter, it might be argued, is the data; what we see is what we have; this would be a structuralist argument hence "appears" ahh no... the data isn't what we see we see a construct with data as fodder or incept does this mythologize data, sublimate it; is it some kind of distant God we tap into? we have certainly mythologized data it is often spoken of as the GOD we trap into tap let's debunk the myth; or what does the myth offer us; is it accurate? do we need another God? no- what is data, after all our process of visualizing a concept; which is preformed, hence the algorithm as i argued, dv might be the d to begin with such that all v is d; or so interdependent as to be inseparable chiasmatic ha but here, let's break a bit down even more: it's a nested loop you make: data v. is the data, but dv visualizes what? what i mean is, what is data in the first place? dv is the concretization of one vector what are the other vectors? i have to ask entelchy on the way to concrete vector paths yes, the other vectors; this is good unlimited vectors define entelchy Entelchy En*tel*e*chy, n. L. entelechia, Gr. ?, prob. fr. ? ? ? to be complete; ? + ? completion, end + ? to have or hold. (Peripatetic Philos.) An actuality; a conception completely actualized, in distinction from mere potential existence. 21:00 data is descriptive. the misconception arises though from our daily language that data is the force that causes our economy now to flow OED: 1. In Aristotle's use: The realization or complete expression of some function; the condition in which a potentiality has become an actuality. 2. In various applied senses (apparently due to misconceptions of Aristotle's meaning): a. That which gives perfection to anything; the informing spirit. b. The soul itself, as opposed to the body. 3. The name given by Leibnitz to the monads of his system. but data is descriptive of some other phenomena or is it the phenomena or rather is it the Noumena? noumena: thought, idea it becomes so the phenomena we deal with it as if it were the phenomenon so form noumena to phenomena seems to be the same mechanical route between (d) and dv and this is a different kind of unspoken distance we cover; in the algorithm? where? The quantities or relations which are assumed to be given in any problem. datum we can only manipulate it as phnm but we gather it from nm phnm = phenomena, nm = noumena which seems to turn the screen idea back on: so: is the screen known, epistemologically? screen turns nm to phnm shit... let's make an axiom so we can move on do we or don't we accept this or with what caveat? a moment i suggest we say it is known i would agree "known" as phnm good 21:05 so... dumb down then and it represents for us, and others, a common starting point: namely this screen we see before us so then, how are we hiding this process we engage in presently? and do we distinguish between its "production" now as opposed to a record that someone reads later? i suppose we hide it by engaging in the phnm roland barthes death of the author (barthes: death of author, life of author function) in s/z i think yes ok: but we took this to a deeper less easy level so then is it possible to hide its production but the production seems to be this and then the code that produces this but do we count the paper from trees or the graphite mined for pencils? yes we count paper... but we don't count words... books... stories explain 21:10 every medium exerts its inscription on the act that passes thru it, over it, on it, in it. and the code that produces our text, we have variances... hence the AIM tonight and not IRC, Jabber. contradiction arises in the fact that the medium (and this is McLuhan isn't it) has pretenses of transparency but is actually a very powerful agent in production so the screen is this: its appearance denies, its presence affects but

with books, as with ideas represented, there is a sudden unhinging, and that is because we are in the short-hand world of symbols which, while imperfect, manage to encapsulate infinitudes in finite glyphs and icons... 21:15 to adopt this stance and carry it to its logical end would suggest that we need to address the whole system of language itself - already a systematic intervention into the presentation of noumena - to the point that while yes, the screen denies, it also projects and amplifies; and while the presence effects (and affects), it is also a presence that we cause to speak (and hence there appears to a certain level of transparency); to the effect that while you are correct, to what degree we allow this correction is of the utmost importance, lest we find ourselves making borish claims and the limit of "new media" when those limits are no different from lived existence in general (whatever those limits and generalities might be) and that's why i never really fully agreed with McLuhan he's making a manifesto, and it has its place; but beyond that... i don't know i was just getting to your "no different from lived experience" in my head... and i agree but also with McLuhan: it is a warning isn't it? as we should be warned about language... we need to engage critically not blindly 21:20 so bringing this back, we begin to make a claim here in the 2 paragraphs and we need to resolve what we're trying to say (hair on the small of her back) we set up the image of limitation, and say then that it implodes and explodes 21:25 [the lips] fuck off but it is a prelude to the data vector describing the dynamic digi-pedigree of the dist. writing so i think what it's saying is that the screen is its own (language) limiting value; the appearance of denying the mode of production is 1) a double entendre on appearances as being phenomenologically how we experience it but also we we interface with it (the two not being exclusive) ok i agree totally as in , we type; something comes out we see what we type we see our mistakes while typing we are introducing the ecstatic language of utopia here. digitopia. dinotopia 21:35 (the second half of the 1st paragraph; the whole 2nd paragraph) structurally the flat space of the digital screen appears to deny the modes of its production: --> i agree with this as we've explicated it, but i opt for something more flatfooted perhaps; or maybe i was just low caffeine and couldn't grasp it (i opt for the second of these) and another thought: are we distributively writing or are we brainstorming for a big writing afterwards we have caffeine now we end the difference between these two modes just as the you and the me becomes the "author" ok; understood as if one person were working out a thought in conversation with him/herself but there is possibility of extraction and exploitation yex, but opensource is about that possibility how do we copy protect from that without losing integrity? the exploitation part was a joke: oh, i only mean that we can cull exact sentences from this dialogue oops there have been great moments no way oh, okay in that case L I P S ripe for exploitation 21:40 or just ripe i would like to talk about two things: what we do not achieve is clarity in the prole ideal structure as we see it (or one of the ideal ways to manifest it) for distributive writing (interface, and other aspects, however) 2? ideal structure would seem to be far less sequential and more "kaos" a simple optimization could occur with multiple inputs affecting, in realtime, the same document or the "whiteboard" that is already present in some of the commercial conference softwares drawing, writing, sketch space less structured than the "bld" program Jon has and limits to the distributive element (do we or can we make a limit for it, does it need a limit, or is this a postmodern condition whereby we foreground the interconnectivity of all knowledge production while also denying an author) does new media (nm) enhance this beyond other modes? 21:45 wireless chinese chinese crazy russians and technophilia the above will not be stricken from the record as Lev is a prime source hahah well, if i understand the 2nd question, we spoke of this: from glasnost to isae miyaki try out that vector! 21:50 You left the chat by logging out or being disconnected. 5/7/03, 22:41 mu lambda mu interface ideal and limits or other issues (how about temporal interference for starters?) does tech add to the interface? interface ideal: ideal: change/take away? well, both enables yet structures but limits are not always limits and plain total open-endedness can lead to a great deal of noodling while a bit of structure in the right place issues forth edicts, signposts, directions. fagin tried to tell me something like this 2+ yrs ago 22:45 so structure is like a steering wheel? the interplay of structure and kaos yes interplay between road and driver? car and driver? hotrod magazine tooob

steak 22:50 perfection is rather lame i like that ay-haties so we're trying to elicit an interface and infra-structure that allows for a robust type of expressive freedom while guiding it useful directions 22:55 and this is the idea of editing not in reworking the inputs into new outputs but making inputs filtered conceptually 23:00 this is- in my terms- the failure of mesh: our structure was facile, so thereby never had any interesting constriction 5/7/03, 23:15 so let's discuss our choice for names: ted or ive i think this helps explain our wn vector Nathaniel has joined this chat. Jon has joined this chat. excellent why r u in 2x? kidproto huh must be a linux error 4 ppl in room- kid in 2x fuck os x not in my window just kp, you, and me and your mofo crashing unix box LINUX box crashing and that a user error i am sure ok ok let's get on it why ed or ive? it's way past my bedtime let's finish this particular discussion and then call it well well, work what we have to but let's work i made a symbolic link to distributedwriting so you can type in either... haha cool i suggested ive on account that lexically ed seemed to be subset of ive in all cases (OED; just for ref. ed = distributed, ive = distributive yes...but the computational metaphor we calling thor on is -ed) -ive is the case, -ed is the affect -ive seems also to be the computational connexion but we start there and work out works well...will keep okay... onward... we could call it parallel but i argue our writing is -ed, or synergistic so deegan...meet you at 9:45 at your studio...brush up...on shit onward where? point your finger 23:20 fire that get's stricken from the log huh...you guys and your word decorations what? lets let him see this log hah yes!!!! toob

steak hahahahahaha hahahahahaha naty has more laughs, he wins tube socks i laughe more than u boaz's feet (biblical ref.) watch out or i'll have to get recursive (script) on you natty shit yeah i need to program more script tease naty and threaten more too ok: thoughts after the -ive learn how to fork-bomb rather than kniving haha fork is stronger than the knife haha technology makes certain aspects of this possible or more profiled the realtime attributes and diminutes others collapse of space (Virilio) sure.. sure that'll be 50cents for the use of realtime pleeze what does it lessen? diminute? sense perceptions involved in human conversation oy.... okay... body language haptic things the sharing of an ineffable place/space/document/noumena/phenomena sure. ah, the HAPTIC sense can we distributively write a sentence that describes this project? also, a conversation isn't always sequential like this look at main page: <http://cabbage.ucsd.edu/preview/distributivewriting/index.html> hey that's just a brainstorm crack! it's even gpot the 3 papers we're "writing" 23:25 not anymore distributive writing: a systematic exploration of dialogue via a foregrounded techinterface but more... we should post up the papers from Lev more... yes, naty we should have a clear but potent descr. a manifesto? no thanks this is like englebart attributes? augmenting what we do already limits? ahhh.... yes, naty, true ehat do we do? deja vu did we do this b4? deja moo: we've all seen this same bullshit before so dw is not new but now it is and how is that and why do we care? new D b/c we can do it for starters i don't give a shit...we came up with this idea while drinking and now we're trying to make it real (like all ideas i think) we finally have the tech as a global unti to have an go at a unified language of conversation ul (unified lang) is the interface,, the method, and the product in the end no? unti=unti i got it: let's all speak one language it's kind of that way computer = debabelizer i'm trying to come up with the most problematic "piece" for my crit soon with statements like that last one or rebabelizer, in that we all babel and are familiar with the sounds it makes i lie rebabelizing better if you believe wolfram okay... because we have enough editing out the voice need a sentence about distributive writing as i can see it babel and hubbub we're not melding and assimilating global din yes true N noise 23:30 noise... that's something 1.) realtime distributive writing 2.) distributive writings, aka the journal the journal os to help the neophytes making explicit the inherently collaborative nature of writing Journal OS it represents the link b/t the event and the past it seeks to interpolate bringing peeps up to speed with the 21st century cell connect, bluetooth a signpost statement we can theorize the shit pout of it collapses the time and space with which writing is normally assimilated, edited, and published using the power structure (physical foucault) to achieve a kind of anti-democracy but we need to guide our initial ppl not representive democracy, but a kind fo

greater sociality; true, jon; it's about cluing the ppl into the possibility of this now; yes; what can we distill? but it's scary because it is the loss of an oldr form of individuality; or extract? but it does not efface indiv. entirely; transforms it; yes, and an eradication of quotation in its understood form; makes it about the dialogue and not about the product; shifts the very concept of authorship to the production and away from the producer; denies consumer channels; but we're making a journal; product arises somewhere; by making us the producers at each and every point; Distributive Writing collapses the time and space with which writing is normally assimilated, edited, and published, into an extracted form created by several authors. this is like the pierre levy writing; a last minute product for the capital obsessed; for those who feel the need to commodify it; (x)=capital obsessed; by grades, or capital; exactly N; we are really proposing 1.) writing events 2.) distilled output (journal); Pass/Fail here baby; writing events: this is an open sense of the expression "writing"; how open? no limit; but writing events without always being events; a continuous event; writing times; a sporadic event; yes N; we blink it: relativity; yes; film frames; 23:35; one limit: limit of unknowing; the only philosophically defensible limit to have; a limit that changes always, but can posited as fixed: calc, limit --> zero/inf; Distributive Writing collapses the time and space with which writing is normally written, assimilated, edited, and published, into an extracted form generated by several authors. we know a limit exists, but we DONT KNOW where, and that's all we can ever say; too product focused KP; Distributive Writing is collective authorship on texts. distributive writing foregrounds the possibility of recent global communication channels, meto-organism structures; one gateway of which is the publication of the journal as a type of historical distribution in progress; or is that too vague? too vague... i say we call it as it is... but it needs to be more than the creation of a journal... don't you think? then what is it? i like the organism reference; it's a conversation is what it is; even tho it's used a lot; i'm just going back to what we discussed earlier... about the two levels of it... a digital dialogue; but that is a living thing; it's symbiotic; synergistic; it depends on others; it is the other; and that is my interest: all writing does; so we show it; it collapses us/them; and accent it; true... but organism is a bit far from the def... facilitate it; 23:40; hwo so jon; we are positioning ourselves as cells within a greater organic structure; we lay a biomimetic structure; e.g. metaorganism; globalism; we should speak of synaptic vessels; yes; that's what it is: we've just discovered a new channel for the synapses to travel along; a new way of thinking, write literally; Currently, it takes the focus as a RealTime Online Writing system and a Journal that is distilled from a Content Management System. not just interfaces, but a medium through which ideas travel; ROSW; ROWS; ROWS ROWS ROWS YUR BOAT; ether; digital global crepuscular ether; u worked it in there!!! crepuscular!!! i like that; i have a crepuscular on my ass, this chair is so hard; we could reference the "cloud of unknowing" - re: pd earlier; the pre-heisenberg uncertainty principle; kp: like the overview direction; rows; yues, pre-H; maybe we just need a single word-name; distributive; creeping pus cholera; puss; pus; disbutive; disputin; punny, no? disputin the monk; i drank what? as opposed to tributive? retributive writing; because we deny the end-author; it is retributive against the "old" system; N is fading; 23:45; Distributive Writing is the collective authorship of texts. i thkn we have enough to present something; more than texts; we are really presenting a system which is an ethos; more; yes N; more than texts... yes; no zoom out; distributive everything; metalanguage; text is less than system; system is huge; yes, this is huge; system includes everything; not all systems are huge; this can; opne system; limit of H; but we are trying to bite off enough to chew right; no we start center and expand, but we need to set open limits; agree... think: bigbang; haha; 30 minutes till that; think: eternally recurring minibangs; only takes me 5; release early release often; how do we define writing then; in the snow?; ture; now whos asking big questins? zoom out; kidding; writing system: metawriting; writing in the air; without a preformed alphabet or ideogram; we're talking, so it's Platonic: speech; i'm but a simple lad; then why does it take you 30 minutes? hahahahaha; i'm waiting; writing is the nascent point in which we begin the expansion; a word; but not a language, not a text; all texts; 23:50; so a system; Distributive Writing is the collective authorship of systems. but P: we're doing the same thing that we did with the screen; and we hope that it

will expand; or rather it will expand, and we hope to be cognizant of it—we are taking it all apart only to find we must put something together—mapping the explosion—yes yes yes—so i'm saying: the screen, fine; but it's not just computers—it's more—it has to be—it's a start—of course...—we move to wetware eventually—but we don't start with the screen—what we start with is the important thing now—so we say this is indicative of a total system redefinition, and not a text for one screen—i agree—fine, that's my argument for a language/system, not a text/product—i argue for act consciousness—and system integrity—and amplification—wordsmithing—system: an open system, cf. Eco: opera aperta—open work; limit = unknown—fine, a text—wordbirth—with no end, no lines—no punctuation beyond each moment—hardly hard—a text in the way that all things are read in the subjective language of existence accumulated—a fuzzy geography of convivial convocations of symbols—but we define the valence between these subjective texts as a language (Wittgenstein); hence a system—natty...you got password access...edit you fuck—i am going 2 bed—i can't edit until 2 morrow—i will erase all trace references (x)—but the smut remains—

ⁱⁱ let's dig in — sure... let's address some of Crandall's questions — crandall thinks we have poetic resonance — do you think that this dwz is limited to types of texts (and JC provides a typology of some of these texts)? — (you're cute, and resonating) — i.e.: — wheee! — i.e.: whee! — theoretical, conversational, end-oriented, etc. — 21:30 — it rhymes!!! — got you — well, isn't it dependent? — yes — can't all be worked out? — i mean, *prole* is a theoretical text — i think it's dependent on the typology afforded: what distinguishes these texts from one another, really? — intention — and execution — mostly — and *prole* is also project based — and the belief of the reader: what's fiction and fact (we know it depends on the reader's own interaction) — it's level of conversation is..... — *prole*=white paper=cluster suite — so i think that as text (however it may be categorized), the dwz can accommodate them all, or at least all of the ones in known existence because, i would argue, the dwz is solely (at this stage) about text, and its morphology — of course — and the appropriateness of a certain style is due more conversation, project, diary, name it, it can happen — to the users than the system — so it's a question then of a qualitative difference — surely — and i think that might be — true, but how? — how are our conversations differ here... — than any other text based system? — there — are differences imposed by the form — we discussed that bit last time — sequence=scrolling — 21:35 — there is writing by longhand — but that seems to be less an issue w the nte interface — there is editing — and more about IM — right right... are u asking what diff. in NTE?? — no, across theboard, but we, i think, need to consider the whole damn board — since they are all viable options for the dwz (the dwz is not program specific) — i would say that the software form determines certain parameters IM is one kind of primitive DWZ, but still a dwz — but not as much as the mindset of the user — (because of i intentional space?) — true — primitive, ubiquitous, and what we use! — and also true — the ubiquity is important yes — accessibility — profile — it's hot, eh? — [yup] — i wish to say that at least the first two issues that JC proposes can be easily negated — i am reading over the questions — on account of their technical bases: we need to have a lower threshold — i think i would agree; only because they are not specific to this form — dwz is not some totally equal space for all humans; that's just silly-talk — they are universal questions about any enterprise — use of the tool is requisite, even if knowledge of that use is relatively simple — to write anywhere you need master both the pen and the calligraphy — your scrawls need to be part of the conventional comprehension — it is the midpoint between extension and inhibition — 21:40 — even if that means a purposive incomprehension (noise generated by pen holders) — elaborate on your point: — that the tool extends the power of the user, but we have agreed, also chisels the product into pre-definable areas — trying to find a way to say it — another point is that i can talk this faster than i can type it; and this is a point of frustration and limit upon me and my thinking — take your time — but you never see your words floating in the air afterwards — sure do, but there are a lot of words; here they encounter a bottle neck — no: i said it... we must agree that the tools we use open up near-infinite vistas of expression — but do take away, in broad terms, some arena of expression as well — it's true, but even in that same moment we can also feel other spaces constrict — old argument — [true] — don't think we should restate it — go back to your point — except in passing — extension <space> inhibition — the tool sits at the fulcrum — it is the rotation point — between agency and silence? — sure.. maybe not silence — (exactly what extends as an extension?) — hammer — word — 21:45 — bicycle — what is its extensional value? — make sense for me because i don't follow — amplification of energy — what energy? — sometimes amplification on a more focussed area — depends on tool: — well, try the dwz for instance... — hammer extends the energy of the arm-in-motion — and any tool within it — but this is a physical extension; what about text? — dwz extends the the space

of mental overlap † where was this space before? † the blurring area of consciousness where you don't really end and another is kind of beginning † it was there † in conversations † kisses † then inhibition? † looks on t street † books † news shows † inhibition: no body language † no haptic aspects † that's silence † ok: i mean, little haptic † inhibition, i suggest, has a particular negative constraint † silence implies a total cancelling out no, it implies nothing at all † connotes † you can't hear it, what can it imply? † (you can think it implies something, but YOU THINK it to be the case) † the word silence in your previous phrase implies total negati opf some quality, as silence is the negation of sound † it is the absence of sound † silence itself is silence † i agree † inhibition, i suggested, has a negation involved † 21:50 † lack of tool is not absence of the energy † i the absence of the extended part of the energy † it is an absence, i believe i am laughing † i have to † sure it i an absence † inhibition would be inability to access tool, but that might mean not merely from lack of knowledge of use, but possible through coercion † fine then: extension and silince/absence †.] 1. To check; to hold back; to restrain; to hinder. † extension, and zero † (back at 1s and 0s are we?) † A stopping or checking an already present action; a restraining of the function of an organ, or an agent, as a digestive fluid or ferment etc.; as, the inhibition of the respiratory center by the pneumogastric nerve; the inhibition of reflexes, etc. † s i'm correct † hrrmm † last time i go to the dictionary † and i still prefer a non-value silence † as if that's some kind of authority † ok † Derrida would have you for breakfast on lexiphilia † i got to ask someone † should i ask derrida? † we'll hammer it out here, i think is the point of the dwz for certain exercises: defning our own conversational constraints ihibiting ourselves † or accepting a certain measure of silence † of course † could be said, though, that a measure of inhibition † opens up a focus on other areas? † may be present † i would s: maybe, but not necessarily † there seems to me to be no causal link † when we do not allow ourselves the sul matrix of non-verbal communication † what must we do to compensate? † the only thing we can say for siler is what we speak for in the palce of silence (cf. Spivak) † 21:55 † there maybe a subtle matrix, but what does that matter in the dwz? † where there is either text † or ___ †? † [not] † exactly my point † it seems moot † o we accomodate by not writing (e.g. silence) † i am trying to suggest that perhaps other modes emerge or become accented by the deprivation of more relied-on aspects † and really, is the dwz the sum total of all possible communicational models? † no † or does it simply add to them one particualr model that is, in many ways, a meta-level? † not a sum total † true † are we arguing? † well, what modes might those be? † that is tl question † and a good one † conversing i believe; it's not interesting to always agree.. especially when we're working something out † thisis old school dialectic † (cf. Abelard, Sic et Non) † i am intrigued bythe idea th: has something to do with the text staying in front of you † speed of scroll as an emtional barometer? † yes † : what might non-textual interventions be? † that's a good one † let me suggest: †. †. †. †. †. †. †. †. † The AIM service could not send the message: You have sent too much data too quickly. Please wait a little while before sending more. † The AIM service could not send the message: You have sent too much data too quickly. Ple wait a little while before sending more. † The AIM service could not send the message: You have sent too much data too quickly. Please wait a little while before sending more. † The AIM service could not send the message: You have sent too much data too quickly. Please wait a little while before sending more. † The AIM service could not send the message: You have sent too much data too quickly. Please wait a little while before sending more. † The AIM service could not send the message: You have sent too much data too quickly. Please wait a little while before sending more. † The AIM service could not send the message: You have sent too much data too quickly. Please wait a little while before sending more. † interesting † 22:15 † 21:55 † The AIM service could not send the message: You have sent too much data too quickly. Please wait a little while before sending more. † we hit a limit † patrick overscrolled the AIM and now he's gone † The AIM service could not send the message: You have sent too much data too quickly. Please wait a little while before sending more. † 22:00 † The AIM servi could not send the message: You have sent too much data too quickly. Please wait a little while before sendin more. † Patrick? † i believe that patrick can see my messages † but cannot enter any of his own † The AIM service could not send the message: You have sent too much data too quickly. Please wait a little while before sending more. † exactly: there is extension (N) and there is silence (P) † The AIM service could not send the message: You have sent too much data too quickly. Please wait a little while before sending more. † 22:05 † {we have reconvened in the dining room near the linux box to finish} † {P broke the dwz} † there is somethi so metaphorical about that † the more i look at the questions, the less i really think they're appropriate † [how so?] † they're appropriate to the design of the interface, the coordination of the meetings... but not really to th theoretical groundwork of dwz.... † [but i think they're useful for defining "real world" use value; although i inclinded to agree with you: the teoretical basis of our argument is far deeped than a quwsestion of interface fuck you naty] † 22:10 † it's like the difference between setting up the UUDP, UseNet, or IRC server system

and the establishing of consensus rules of behavior on the sites.... ‡ [true. but one thing that JC does provide is that we did hit a 'sound barrier' tonight that we could not exceed -- and this becomes a direct question of theory (ontology) versus praxis (application) - and in this sense he's right.. what we right is now limited more quickly than we previously had imagined.. so that we did two things: find non-textual modes of communication (and a space of transgression), and find a design flaw (but a theoretical error)] ‡ [... but NOT a theoretical error] ‡ ok understood ‡ The AIM service could not send the message: You have sent too much data too quickly. Please wait a little while before sending more. ‡ ok: and the questions of identity and authority; these deeply embedded in the ideology of it. i just find it difficult to think that many of the answers would change depending on the context of the situation ‡ and there is the crux: part of my understanding of this to make this as open as possible to different modes of conversation ‡ 22:15 ‡ to make many portals, tunnels, ‡ configurations ‡ many views ‡ your silence, dear Patrick ‡ suggests that your extension has reached its end the tool has spoken ‡ but not allowing your speech ‡ The AIM service could not send the message: You have sent too much data too quickly. Please wait a little while before sending more. ‡ what happens to the battle, though ‡ when the reinforcements don't arrive? ‡ JP is the "fucking" right hand of god ‡ ok : enough for tonight ‡ more later ‡ {goodbye ‡ [goodnight ‡ [love you natty ‡ love you to P