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Stalking the Continuum

Adelheid Mers

finnder Flusser

Gerlinde gave me the small pamphlet, the Bentel edition of „Krise der Linearität“: she had received it from Ursula, who had met Flusser in Marseille, but was now over him, at least in

term

Some of the German titles are: “Kommunikation,” “Medienkultur,” “Nichtgeschichte,” “Bodenlos,” “Iris Universalis der technischen Bilder,” “Die Geschichte des Teifels,” “Die Schlief,” and “Vom mystischen Reflexionen der Medien.” I turned the pamphlet over and found the address of the number
one, I was able to read the entire thing. The next day I read both König and Müller, filled my big-wheeled suitcase and took it all back to Chicago. He had been dead for years.

Gerlinde’s old book is something of a challenge, for the first floor of the Academy of Media in Cologne (where Flusser had moved to Berlin) I have heard. The setting feels medieval, windows open both onto the street and into the driveway that cuts through the front building and connects to the courtyard, this would be a line spot for the castle’s garden. With my digital camera I took a leap into the archives, lined up in shelves binders, I find the word “teletextology”, as I thought it might, Flusser’s own library is housed upstairs. There’s a copy of a book called “from the seventies, Whorf’s “Language, Thought, Reality,” like Mary Poppins, Silvia clings onto a shelf with an umbrella. I have to admit that I don’t know very much... I watch a video, Flusser talks. Comfortably seated across from me, he is a cyborg now.

reading Flusser

“Towards a Philosophy of Photography,” “The Shape of Things,” “Writings,” “The Freedom of the Image,” are editions that are available in English. In Europe, Flusser became well known with “Towards a Philosophy of Photography.” I gather that his work is still mostly discussed in the context of media studies. Three of my favorite essays are “Celebrating,” “Exile and Creativity,” and “Line and Surface” (all can be found in “Writings.” In “Celebrating,” he develops the idea of an “other program” (as opposed to an “own program”) that can be read as a plea for open-source software. That’s a nice, frosty peak the essay whips up, but I prefer to read it through a different lens. What if the notion of the ‘other program’ leads to a critical survey of the reader’s very own promises, in preparation for a mutual exploration of contingencies that have programed not software, but individuals! How do I make sense, and what prompts me to do it so just so? Celebration comes into play when ossified (implicit) structure is discarded and brought back to life (made explicit and thus again pliable), when a new capacity for absurdity

continued on page 19

Archiving the Future: The Media Burn Independent Video Archive

by Tim Ridlen

What has gone wrong with America is not a randomization of forces that have assumed control of the American system. These forces are: militarism, monopoly, and the mass media. Mass media monopolizes control by their control of information. And who can deny that we are a nation addicted to television and the constant flow of media? And not a few of us are frustrated by this addiction. Now I ask you, my fellow Americans: Haven’t you ever wanted to put your foot through your television screen?

I originally came across Media Burn in an effort to find a history that I knew existed in Chicago. This was a history I had only seen in images, but sought to find in the flesh. What I found in the end was an archive. The Media Burn Independent Video Archive was started by Tom Weinberg who also produced the video of the Art Farm happening, Media Burn (1975), quoted at the beginning of this text. In spirit, it’s hard to separate the event organized by the art and architecture collective, Art Farm, and the web archive founded by Tom Weinberg. Although Media Burn, the event, occurred in San Francisco in 1975, and the Media Burn Independent Video Archive officially launched from Chicago in 2006, both came with the promise to change fundamentally the experience of the moving image. In the generation between the two, the images of history became animate and the potential to fulfill the promise of video technology came within reach.

Chip Lord, Doug Michels, Curtis Schreier, and Uncle Buddle were the members of Art Farm for the event in the parking lot of Cow Palace where a modified Cadillac was driven through a flaming wall of televisions. The intended message, as President John F. Kennedy (Doug Hall) articulated, was an expression of frustration with mass media in the form of television. Although it was right there, along the now ubiquitous technology made popular by Internet youth culture has only been practical for the last few years. Many of the projects produced originally for broadcast television have now found a home on the web, and Weinberg’s collection of his own material makes up the majority of his Archive.

From 1989 to 1993, Weinberg co-produced with Joel Cohen a series called “the 90s” for cable television, which featured work from independent videomakers all over the world. This is a particularly poignant part of the collection, perhaps, because of its close connection and uncanny resemblance to the present (the first Gulf War, the first President Bush). In addition, there are several tapes of raw footage from this series. It is in these raw tapes that you find the image, not the episode, of history. In an attempt to be able to watch old television shows, this allows anyone to create a new context for the images. Weinberg boasts that the archive is “unique anything you’ve been able to do, except maybe in an editing room.” I would agree, and add, it is the ability to see unedited images from our past that renew the promise of video as a decentralized medium.

An archive, on the other hand, seems contrary to any idea of decentralization. Even the most democratic archive still represents a consolidation of information. By referring to the image as both banal and expressive in function, Allan Sekula has made the case for “a generalized, inclusive archive, a shadow archive that encompasses an entire social terrain while positioning individuals within that terrain.” Giving privilege to the eye that looks—at the criminal mug shot or the family portrait—that those who might look upon an image define its potential to enter into the archive. In one case it is formalized through images, the archive finds its center, its consolidation of information, where the lens of the camera takes over the eye of the beholder; that which could be seen is that which could be archived.

The potential of an archive such as Media Burn, then, is in the power of appropriation. This does not have to amount to a literal appropriation of the images held in the archive, but rather an appropriation of its function. Through dispersion, access, and control, perhaps the archive could become a way to generate new meaning. The episode of the past can be recast as raw image, the technology of streaming video, which Media Burn has in a way pioneered, is now behind the movement. There are few websites with the database and flexibility of Media Burn. Granted, it is not a free-for-all of moving images—there are other sites for that—but under certain terms, you can submit non-fiction videos to be held in the archive for free. So far, the site with the potential for global contribution that can only expand. Without sounding overly zealous, I would like to say that now is the time to make good on the promise of video, if only through mass dissemination of an entirely different sort than that of broadcast television.

The categorical distinction lies in the laws that govern the digital world: most importantly, the impossibility of deterring digital copying. It is imperative to set new precedents for electronic video on the web, and Media Burn may or may not be doing that, yet. It is still uncertain how the website will function, despite the intended outcome. A major challenge is not only funding the operation, but also the immense amount of storage required for streaming such large amounts of video.

Media Burn does not just exist on the web. The tapes, many of which are not yet available online, are housed in a storefront location on the northwest side of Chicago at 4270 W. Irving Park. Of course, if you visit, as I did, there isn’t really a way to search the extensive amount of material. It is more to get a sense of the operation that one might visit Media Burn in person. There exist thousands of hours of footage stacked tightly among towing shelves. Alfonso Moneo of Ant Media Burn is in the process of saving the material, not only preserving the physical medium, that is, but also to put it into the next form so it can continue to be seen. It is with this sentiment in mind that I stand by my observation: it is not the current form of the archive that will redefine our awareness of the world and its image, but rather how it is used in the time to come.

2. Tom Weinberg, Independent Videos from the Media Burn Archive, Chicago Film maker’s, Chicago, 29 Oct 2006.
4. In an email correspondence, Weinberg said, “The template for a streaming video website we developed in conjunction with Enomaly inc. in Toronto, has enormous potential for other producers, colleges, and global communities who do politically alternative video by the thousands. We have started that application process.”
supercedes habits and truths. “Exile and Creativity” describes how to be uprooted forces one to appropriate tools for permanent migration (the witnessing of structure) promotes conditions of creativity (the teasing of structure). What are the means available to perform and to express these operations? They are image and text. In “Line and Surface”, Flusser assesses how they are intertwined. At all times, humans attend to facts. Initially, images mediate. As the notion rises that images are mass-media, texts are invented to explain the images (iconography). As the notion rises that texts are mass-media, techno-images are summoned to model the texts (textologies), that have earlier served to explain the images and still contain their traces.

In “Kommunikologie” (not available in English), Flusser offers something that I take to bolster my art practice diagramming, or “conducting surveys of premises.” Again, an important distinction between implicit and explicit structure is performed: Flusser expands the term “techno-image”—that is, an image that codes a text—into “mass-techno-image” (implicit structure) and “elite techno-image” (explicit structure). The elite techno-image is what I wish to claim, but first I’ll like to set up the more complicated mass-techno-image. Mass-techno-images are created when an operator uses a code or an apparatus to produce images. (For example, a photographer uses a camera, or the Hubble Space Telescope is programmed to record images of space.) An apparatus is an instrument that can be used to produce written or visual symbols about the history that shaped the apparatus and about the limits the apparatus promotes, an image created with it does not reveal its mode of production. It just appears to show an instance of truth. A picture of a pretty girl, a cute puppy, a galored galaxy, a compassionate conservative. Mass-techno-images are not only rooted in the texts of science, but in addition they lend themselves to the ends of manipulators, and Flusser strongly advises education about their inherent framing. About their capacity to be Trojan horses for ideologies, in short, about the entirety of their implicit, mass-made texts.

“...but this is not the entire truth. There also are techno-images that are not part of the apparatus- operator complex that is grinding everything into stereotypes. These elite techno-images can be seen everywhere: in science and technology, in politics and in art, and they are distinguished from mass-techno-images by the fact that only specialists are able to read them. They are conscious efforts to make terminology unimaginable. [...] Thus, our predicament permits two conclusions: (1) Either the apparatus-operator-complex will imbricate all texts to recode them into techno-images and to then broadcast them around while also gladly elite the techno images into muck, (2) or the elite techno-images will show a new awareness of the vantage point of what it will be possible to liberate the world that is encoded in techno-images from the grip of the apparatus operator complex, to serve true human communication.” (Kommunikologie, Frankfurt am Main, 1998, pp.156, my translation.)

An “elite techno-image” is a means of communication that has as its purpose to construe an existing text, or even to propose new construction. A text is engaged by the person who creates it. Flusser writes, “It will be possible to liberate the world that is encoded in techno-images from the grip of the apparatus operator complex, to serve true human communication.” The elite techno-image, who educates herself about the text’s history, is aware of its artifice, of its life, and who wishes to share what she found. The elite techno-image is honest about its own premises and limitations, does not hide its own inherent ideologies, but exposes them as far as possible. Examples Flusser gives of elite techno-images are blueprints, charts, designs or diagrams.

The hypothesis to be presented here is: Occidental culture is a discourse whose most important information is stored in an alphanumeric code. We are currently being replaced by other, differently structured codes. If this hypothesis were accurate, we would have to count on a fundamental change of our culture in the near future. The change would be fundamental because our thinking, feeling, desiring, acting, and even our perceiving and conceptualizing are at a high degree shaped by the structure of the code in which we experience the world and ourselves. We are >>Western people<< because our >>forma mens<< is shaped by the linear logic of the alphabetic code. Should our children and grandchildren experience themselves through differently structured codes (for example through technical images like photos, films, television, and through digitization) then they would be in the world in a different way than we are, and than our predecessors were. The following thoughts will examine this hypothesis.

From childhood on we are so familiar with the aligning of signs (letters and numbers, for example) that we don’t always clearly perceive this gesture’s objective. It is first the gesture of enumeration, and only secondly the gesture of narration (of accounting to the end). For example, this gesture can be recognized in the stringing of shells to make a necklace. Accordingly, this gesture is ancient and can probably be found in all cultures. But this gesture of lining up has a unique history in the eastern Mediterranean that lasted a few thousand years and finally, around the middle of the second millennium BC led to the invention of the alphabet, to be a mark of our culture of the second millennium B.C. led to the invention of linear writing. (For the following reasons, the invention of linear writing believed that the hunt still existed; it was a guide for future actions (for instance for the pony hunt). The function of the picture as a plate for orientation is significant here (our intent is to consider what motivates linear writing). The process of lining up pictograms began when trust in pictures as guides for orientations in the world started to diminish. But one cannot do justice to the matter if one does not attempt to zoom in on the gesture of picture making. Stepping back from the object (for example, from the pony) could be a mysterious movement if all of us hadn’t concretely experienced it. One doesn’t just step from one place into the other (for example onto a hill above the pony) but one steps to a non-place (into one’s own interior). One becomes a subject of the thing to be envisioned. One doesn’t continue to insist in the objective world but one now ek-sists. This human (mysterious) ability to step back, to become subject, to exist, is called >>the power of imagination<<, and it has consequences. An abyss of alienation opens between the human being and the objective world, and from this distance, objects are no longer >>manifest<< (graspable). Our arms are not long enough to bridge the abyss. The world no longer a resist-ance against which we push, but it becomes an apparition, which we behold. We now doubt if this phenomenal world that we are imaging here really is objective. Still, this unpleasantness has an advantage: We cannot grasp the things any longer, but we can oversee the circum- stances. (We only see the forest after we cease to bump into the trees.) This is the function of our imagination. Even though it is ontologically doubtful, it serves a subsequent handling of the objects. (One is better able to hunt the pony if one has previously made a picture of it for oneself!) For the following reasons, the inven- tions of linear writing believed that the hunt still did not go well enough.

The vision one gains when stepping back from an object is fleeting, and it has to be fixed in a new medium by diagramming. The power of imagination alone is insufficient when it comes to image making. Storing the vision in a memory demands that it be codi-fied. That means translated into symbols which can be interpreted by others. Image making demands that the subjectively seen is translated into intersubjectivity (that something private is being published). It now becomes obvious that the image codes are necessarily constitutive that they allow divergence interpretations by their receivers. (Detonative images, encoded to allow just one reading, become possible only after the invention of linear writing) If images can be interpreted differently by each receiver, they are not reliable models. A further, iconoclastic consideration com- plicates the thought: Like all mediations, images suffer from...
an inner dialectic. They are intended to mediate between human beings and the objective world (to bridge the abyss of alienation), but thus they also take the path between the world and human beings. They present them- selves in front of the objects instead of pre- senting them, and so they increase the alien- ation they were supposed to alleviate. What follows is that humans don’t use the images as orientations in the world, but vice versa: They use their experiences with the world to get orientation in the images in function of the world, but treat the world in function of the images. Such a reversal of the ontological position of images is called >>degenerated<<. The shifting mode of action is called >>imagical<<.

The motivations of the inventors of linear writing may, somewhat anachronistically, be phrased like this: an imagination is an ontologi- cally doubtful stance, the resulting images are connotative, and they are subject to the inner dialectic inherent in all mediation. But it is inevi- table to make images before one undertakes to act. Accordingly, these images must be sub- jected to a critique that allows to clarify their ontological position, to denote their codes and to clear away the ideological confusion they initiated. Particularly for the purpose of critique linear writing is the most appropriate tool (admittedly somewhat modernizing) phrasing, the invention of linear writing was given the word as the germ of future, Western culture.

In this phrasing all linear writing appears as a description of images, as a critique of the imagi- nation based on a new mode of thought. What characterizes the new method of thinking is that it is not structured in a two- dimensional, planar way like the imagination, but one-dimensionally, line-like. Critique of images is basically a transcribing from line to plane. The new thinking that becomes a contender with the invention of linear writing is poorer by one dimension than pictorial thought, it is more one-dimensionally, line-like. Critique of images has its own criticality.

That means: The code of the spoken language could have possibly been even more connota- tive than the code of the images. The alphabet makes the code of language (subordinate it to the clear and distinct rules of linear writing) and to refashion it into an effec- tive tool for a critique of the imagination. That is why we also call it >>imagical<<. In the plain language we articulate language (to -de-mythologize it) and then to use language to critique the imagi- nation (to -de-magize the images). Initially, the attempt was to speak clearly and only then it teaches us to critique our imagination. It teaches us to think un-mythically and to act un-mythically.

This pedagogical function of alphabetic writ- ing is an extensive process, biological as well as historically. The gesture of stringing letters expresses a specific way of thinking, but then refers back to this way of thinking and reinforces it. The more texts one writes (and reads), the more textually one thinks, and the more textually one thinks, the more one writes and reads. The feedback between think- ing and writing has an effect on brain functions. The brain begins to classify the different sets of writing and functions of writing in the brain. Our brain is differently organized and it processes the acquired information differently to the way it would have done with the same (the magico mood) is replaced by the problem of cultural conditioning of inher- ited traits has to be excluded here.

Conversely, it is imperative to quickly sketch the mental revolution that followed the alpha- bet. The material world is no longer perceived as a circumstance, but as a bundle of linear processes. That means that time no longer circles above to order everything, but it now streams and forcefully carries all things with it. The world of objects is no longer scenic, but historic. Every situation becomes the result of causes – and the cause of results. Nothing in the world repeats anymore, but each moment is unique. The mood of the eternal return of the same (the magic mood) is replaced by the dramatic mood of linear progress (and it is sec- ondly if this progress is seen as a fall from a perfect original situation or as a rise to utopian situations). Differently said: the alphabetic cri- tique of the imagination leads to a linear, causal explanation of images. Sketched here is histori- cal consciousness.

It further needs to be said that the close con- nection of writing to speaking through the alphabet had the distinctive result that the rules of writing were defined by the rules of speaking. This is why >>orthographic<< (<i>alpha</i>logy, a code) and >>grammar<< (<i>alpha</i>logy, the rules) are expressed: Linear, process-oriented, histori- cized. Linear writing entered into the stream of processes. This is why a process that was <<explained>>, the alphabet soon proved to be a code not entirely adequate for the critique of imagination. Other, non-phonetic, ideo- graphic symbols, namely numbers, had to be introduced. These symbols express a differ- ent mode of thinking than the logical mode, and in spite of extraordinarily spirited efforts (see Russell-Whitehead) attempts to bring logical thinking onto a common denominator with mathematical thinking were not success- ful. The alphanumerical code is divided within itself, and this internal contradiction had to lead to its crisis, as we can discern from our current vantage point. From the perspective of the considerations undertaken here, this indirect contradiction can be formulated as such: While we travel through the world of objects in lines, numbers grind this surface into points and intervals. While literal thinking spoons scenes as processes, numerical thought com- pletes these scenes into intervals. For long a time the different modes of thought could walk jointly, with literal thinking keeping the upper hand because both modes were directed against surface thinking. But as images became increasingly enlightening, numerical thinking had to pose itself against literal thinking, to submit it to its grinding, ana- lyzing critique. Linear, process-oriented, histori- cally thinking sooner or later had to fall within to analytical, structural, zero-dimensional, point-thinking.

Mathematical consciousness began to attack historical consciousness quite early, as indi- cated by the names >>Heraclitean<< and >>Democritean<<. While for Heraclitus >>everything flows<<, everything is process-oriented, Democritus describes dots that ac- cidentally deviate from their paths and collide to constitute the world of objects. Already, the difference between imagery and the use of numbers in front of the objects. The imagi- nematic consciousness are clearly discriminate. For Heraclitus everything is necessary (caus- ally explainable), with Democritus everything is explained statistically. We cannot fully comprehend now why the ancients saw sadness in Heraclitus’ causality and joy in Democritus’ chance, while we rather feel absurdity as we are about to enter into the mode of Democritus.

During the course of history Democritus’ >>mathematical<< thinking was suppressed (and images were treated as unsuitable), and the numerical thought was perceived as empty. Actually, the numerical code is so clear and distinct, that unfillable intervals gaps between each two numbers (1 and 2) can never be filled with numbers, for example 1.1, so that what is to be enumerated, for example 1.2, slips out between the numbers 1 and 2. When linear writing only a few hundred years after the imagination had been explained away the object world demanded numbers (or that letters demand to be recoded into num- bers), the emptiness of this code had to be confronted. Descartes began to fill the inter- vals, and calculus as invented by Leibniz and Newton transformed the numerical code into an instrument that permitted the description of processes. This is why a process that was explained by a differential calculation was not explained by linear writing. The only way to undertake was the attempt to recode the equation back into letters, for the benefit of non-numericians. A condition already quite demanded: What is not mathematical could not be so. The invention of computation machines made it unnecessary to painstaking fill in the intervals by artful floats of calculation: the machines spit out numbers automatically, in a quantity that deposes of all linearity.

Interestingly in the assess of numbers against letters is the observation that numeri- cal thought (entirely counter to its name) does not enumerate (and does not say, but) that it pulls apart into point elements and then mold those elements in a heap. An algorithm is not an enumerated, but an initially broken up and then re-computed circumstance. Someone who is mathematically trained can discern a number of circumstances from the construction of an algorithm, all connected to each other by a common structure. Numerical thought, as it is currently emerging from literal thought, is a for- mal, entirely abstract thought: It is zero-dimen- sional and so a step further removed from the world of objects than literal thought. This high- est possible abstraction as it is reached in mathe- matical thought was perceived as empty. The literal thinking throughout history: Algorithms formed islands within texts made from let- ters. For a while now, mathematical, calculating and coding machines are brought together with an alphanumerical, code, is claiming independence, and it is turning against linear thought, to ana- lyze it, and (surprisingly, but certainly not unex- pectedly) to lead to a new form of imagination. In other words, it begins to no longer encode itself in numbers, but in differently character- ized point symbols, and it is opposing those new codes to the texts. This recording of cal- culating thought is most clearly visible in its first emergence from linearity, in photography, and for that reason must be given closer scrutiny.

The camera is a contraption that takes in light and captures it on molecules of a chemical compound. The reactions thus initiated result in a negative copy of the objects from which the light originated. This can also be shown differently: The camera is a contraption that catches information, calculates it in bits, sto- ries into a series of chemical operations in a way that it can be called up as images. The first characterization of the camera function is as a process. <<Heraclitean>>. The pho- tograph is another process, that is consoli- dated by optical and mechanical processes. The second
presentation of the camera function is calcu-
ling, <<Democritian>>. In it, the photogra-
phy operated as a processing of data. The first person who explains the camera is a
moral sense: as the result of previous, scien-
tific and technological developments. The second presentation explains the camera in a
projective way as a primitive computer. In the second
presentation, the new thinking that is no longer
linear comes to bear.

For which purpose was the camera invented?
The inventors themselves may have answered:

on the outright calculating and computing, it
is imperative to consider the >>photographic
view<<, through which we see the world and
our world, and in that sense which we have
already jumped out of linearity.

The fact that we are increasingly experiencing
the world through graphic-like photos and TV
and less through printed, linear texts is not
obviously not responsible for construing more
and more as a heap of particles and less as a
flux. Conversely, it can be claimed that the
new, graphic images enable us to factually see
the information not our cogni-
tion, but our worldview is informed by pictures
of that kind. This >>photographic view<< of ours
shall be presented through several exam-
ple, first in a short series of >>epistemology
<<, photos, and then in an even shorter series
of >>ethic-aesthetic<< photos.

(1) We no longer imagine that objects sur-
round us, that is, that they envelope us in a
condition and us; but rather that particles rush
around in the void (outside as well as within
us), and that somehow process this rushing
particle stream. The Democritian rain, which
live in a world in which matter is moved by
forces (for example stars by gravitation, or metal
shavings by magnetism), but rather that we are
immerged in undulating fields, in the vales of
which we had previously envisioned material-
ity. (3) We no longer imagine that life on earth
consists of organisms that cooperate or fight
each other, but rather that an undulating mesh
(the >>biomass<<) covers the surface of the
doctorship, that the droplets (the >>nuclides<<) con-
tain genetic information (particles ordered in
dots, the droplets continuously divisible, that
in this process information may acciden-
tially be transmitted falsely, and that organisms
are outgrowths of these aberrations, which
rise from the much just to sink back into it. (4)
We no longer imagine that mental processes
(for example perceptions, imaginings, feelings,
wishes, thoughts or decisions) are some kind
of entities, but rather, that this is about com-
putations of point elements, which are pro-
cessed in the synapses of the brain. (5) We
no longer imagine that we contain some solid
objects, but rather that we keep >>a spirit<< or >>a
soul<< in us, but rather that we are immersed in a collective psychic field, from which
we emerge like temporary bubbles. (6) We no
longer imagine that the individual cultures that shape our life are some kind of independent
structures, but rather that we are immersed in an undulating field of cultures, from which the individual cultures emerge through computation, just
to blur again, while it remains open how much
of that is accidental or intentional.

These six >>photographic<< are images of calculations and models for manipulation. They
are not images of digital codes, but rather that
they are artificial matter, artificial living beings, artificial intelligences, artificial identities, artificial cultures. They are examples for a new power of imagi-
nation that we presently have available to us.

(7) We no longer imagine that society is a