Forsaking

*Abstract:*

*This article takes up the borders of writing and research as its topic. The experimental text questions how creation (learning) undermines previous conceptions of the self and world. As learning never ceases, the text explores how writing and reading (and their technological constructs) offer various in-progress subjectivities and landscapes. The losses, overlaps, and bricolage representations enhance the in-progress ambiguity endorsed by the text itself.*

```
dreams are lost as we wake from them. Each
etimes I attempt to tell myself, to re-tell
he breakfast table (though rarely am I the
ome of the scenes seems to absurd to tell.
 lost. The felling, the feeling, gone. (Th
idental word stand) A personal world that d
ers are too fluid, not social enoguh? (I d
 Freud, he said.) I am riding in the back
ather driving, kids up there with him. An
 camera is for the attendant. To watch the
irawing praise for his new car. How did you
'd be surprised. I am riding in the back of
feet dragging in the water. We have picked
```

To question, to dream, to think an alternate we must question what counts as

real. This means questioning thought itself. More specifically, the structure of thought itself. The transparency of language, machines, translations. The transparency of transparency.

Don't let me make you think that I can do that. Nor can you.

At least, not as a leap anyway.

"Lots of small change adds up to a dollar."

A boot strap sequence. Pull yourself up by your bootstraps.

And diagonal lines (of flight) cut across.

Intersect.

Concrete walls and encroachments. As if it would be so easy. The net is always multiplying, tightening, offering new pre-ordained possibility-limit highways. Finer points. Greater granularity. I am here. You are there. Yesterday I  bought a new soul. The latest model.

Here it is. A digital masquerade of analog. Neo-pre-post-industrial. A look forward to looking back to looking back. Layers of nostalgia, denial, and ambiguity, that's what little selves are made of.

possibilities continued.

ᵗᵉˣ ᵃ  ᶜ ᵢˡ   ᵇ  ᵒ   ᵖ  ᵖ  ᵃ ᵈ

(ascii art) as-key art

(since this predates ascii)

Doctored keyboard (like the doctored piano)

 (not willing to screw with this typewriter - but m

one.)

ooOOOOOOOOlllllllllllll2222222ᵉ3333333333344444444

666666ᵍᵍᵍ ᵍᵍᵍᵍᵍᵍᵍᵍᵍᵍᵍᵍᵍᵍᵍᵍᵍᵍᵍᵍᵍᵍbbbbbb

88888888888888888888888888888888888888888dkdkdkfjslskd

ᴛ ᵗ ᵐᵐᵐᵐᵐᵐ ᵐᵐ ᵐ mmmmmmmmmmmmmmmm mmm

0-6 button seems to adjust the return of the keys o

how hard it is to pepr depress

Six makes the m return faster

                but harder to press

oO zero is slowest i tnink so can have keys nit e a

othe causing double or missiig characters if type t

(missing or doubled characters being a nother possi

multiple tab sets.

and the margin release                      jdjd

jjd


quick margin adjustment. 5 and 65 can quickly becom

         like 20 and 50 as seen here this oj e

A Scrapyard

This text isn't about me.

Every sketch of myself, my (fictive) true self, is only one more mirage with which I hide my blindness. I don't need any more photographs. Hardly.

No. This text is a vehicle. A bunch of them really. A used car lot. A scrapyard.

Yeah. A scrapyard. Filled with so many frames and engines. (And all I needed was a door-handle...)

And none of it works. Not on its own anyway.

That's ok. I don't want to inhabit someone else's vehicle. I want to scrap them for parts.

I already started scrapping. Little notes about this one or that. Questions at the ends of paragraphs that seemed so tidy and complete and resolved. digging in and re-opening (Barthes & Heath, 1977; Deleuze, 1966/1988, p. 8; Derrida, 1967/1978, p. 298; McLuhan & Fiore, 1967; Derrida, 1967/1976; Derrida, 2001/2005; Derrida, 1980/1987; Benjamin, 1950/1959).

*Criticism... should reflect [changes of attitude toward fragmentation] not only in what it chooses to focus on, ...but also in how it writes about them (Feuer, 2006).*

what any child, and any real artist knows, is how to discover, expose and most importantly, jump or bridge the belief system enclosing them.

*It is the artist of life who takes the vehicle not as the inverse promise of the (absent) possibility of utopia, but as the immediate tool that can break the very limits it was built to construct. The text escapes the possible meanings given, the possible worlds provided, through an opening, a creation, which is and is not its own. (Tillett, 2003)*

Writing is a search. I hope to (re)create new machines, new connections. I use "writing-as-permitting, writing-as-making-possible, writing-as-beginning other forms of human perception and behavior" (Said, 1975 p. 20). I am reworking the border/intersection of self/other while within it. I am inhabiting the interstices, the skin, the text. The reflexion of writing modifies the subject/object relationship. Writing is *immanent* (Deleuze's term) rather than *transcendent*. Writing is the modification of the text simultaneous with its creation and destruction. Writing about writing is not meant to turn writing into power OVER writing. I am writing about writing because *I have no choice* if I am to write.

> [W]riting itself, as a practice, is everything: writing as experiment, as exploration, as active assault on reality, no holds barred.... here you find writing at its purest and most desperate: writing that feeds on writing, writing that soars and dips inside writing, writing wrapped up in the problematics of writing and struggling to get out, writing that absolutely must be written, with all the force that this necessity implies. (Fischer, 1999).

I am inherently involved as the subject within writing.

I said this text wasn't about me.

```
And how much awake life and ink did we lose for that, a personal

re-enactment of bvisions yes, b-visions, (another beautiful typo), played

across my eyelids of libido.
```

```
Need to research. Lines, small-runs.
:e . and - and ' produce a sort of braille
age. (The feeling would not be easy to
:cale unless used varied impact or impact


:ss of darkness of text as defined by

: keyboards.

verwrite or partially overwrite whole wo
                  overwrite
(this and overwrite could be done with

can adjust the spacing.
'our but perhaps not as easily.)
single or double
```

To proceed I must choose a voice, a style, a subject(ivity), a location, a conversation. But how do I choose them? How do I write? How am I writing?

And
yet,

another letter and then another appears on the screen. So it is not like I am going to lay out the perfect matrix of writing modes and then choose one before I even begin. There isn't time. Instead, I MUST proceed. I do proceed. I *practice* writing.

I mark out a journey. I point to the cutting edge of the text, the self, the vehicle. While the form of the relationship remains unclear, my *way* is to inhabit that relation.

avoid taking (only) the outside stance of the critic, that essentially leaves the framing/battleground/platform intact. non-binary vectors take root from the old and spring forth in tangential (or elliptical) directions (See the Introduction in Deleuze, 1966/1988). Diagonal lines cut across the pure intersections of this-is-mine and that-was-hers (footnote, footnote).

salvage what I can, modify at will, use as (part of) a vehicle until it stops going the direction I want to go.

Knowledge and knowledge of death are the same. It is by splitting into finitudes that we create objects, relations, knowledge. The bite of the apple gave us knowledge and death — simultaneous, for they are inseparate.

the narrator is a liar.

a damned liar.

all the books and the printed pages and the words eeked and squeaked out of so many

they all tell how it never was. so many (dis)comforting yodels to avert our ears from a profound silence

　　　that runs through the soul

we have five million different methods for capturing a reality in which we can believe.

give me gps and temperature readings and infrared thermosensorial gestriculators with imago-spatial giga-pixel milli-color true mappings. and of course i need 4d time-space rebuilds to re-adjust my perspective. hell, make it 5d - add the audio in thirteen channel 5hz-25khz sound with minimum distortion.

```
'irst you have to wrap the ribbon from one reel to the other past th
 the ribbon. Maybe that holds the inked tape to some non inked ta
 nnects to the reel. The tape is a sort of nylon like fabric that
 on your fingers if you touch it. Unless it has been out too long
 and it has dried. The empty reel goes to the left, with the side
 slots around the middle to catch the post on the typewriter
 ns the reel a little with each keystroke. Then there is a round
 it the ribbon wraps around (a small knob to the left of the reel
 llows you to move it close to the cylinder to make it easier to g
 then there is a slot of steel it goes through. Then there is a
 teel rectangle the ribbon goes behind. a spring loaded triangle
 . flips- flips 6 up to hold the ribbon there. Before that is anot
 ctangle with a small roller that rolls vertically placed int the
 I have tried the ribbon behind there but q it slips out. So i gue
 ; doesn't go there. Then after the triangle ribbon holders is the
 eel rectangle that goes up and down to go between the hammer and
 : guess so that you can see what you just typed. Otherwise the rib
 scure the view. This is the place where all converges. The mind
 s a thought, a sentence, a word, a letter, cast to a finger, that
 down on a black key outlined with silver. This circular key has t
```

with minimum distortion, my ass.

HYPOCRISY AND PARADOX

So let us take failure and hypocrisy as the starting point. Rather than taking it as an exception to be solved or explained away by the latest (let's-not-appear-to-be-) dialectic. We are all participants in the systems which destroy us. We are all chained by our own images of form.

Reword the paragraphs above and below into a similar voice, provide a transition and eliminate the repetition.

```
Discursive possibilities of the old-fashioned typewriter

The overwrite.

     Words, works : works

text thought repeat, empty/full. possibility/limitation
```

Hypocrisy is not simply a natural byproduct of these texts, but one of their fundamental tenets. The idea of a singular theory, a universalizing space, is hereby dissolved. Those hoping for purity or simplicity or synthesis can burrow into their cozy couches and read some book on virtue while awaiting the great revolution. Instead, I hope to position my self within the texts, not exterior to them. I reject the idea of moral purity (too preachy) and the thought that somehow one can separate from the system of exploits and power relations. I must look at the limits of the media, tools, vehicles, selves, bodies, beliefs, and positions that I inhabit (Richardson, 1997).

How to proceed?

Each new line of action/theory leads in some circular fashion back to this essential question of

What am I to do right now?

Always pressing, like all of time itself, down upon me.

What am I doing right now? How am I to go on another second? How can I affect everyday life? Where is the way? How can I inhabit it? (Debord, 1961/2006; de Certeau, 1980/1984; Suzuki, 1956; Vaneigem, 1967/1979) haunting, the unforgotten urgency of the present deep within the present, the death that may spring upon me without resolution.

Yes, I always wish for resolution. Death is resolution.

My own, that is. For me.



If I have a clear outline in my head about what I am going to say then the project is uninteresting and usually remains unwritten. Instead, I ramble and search and repeat themes and when I feel like I am starting to get somewhere, when there is some sort of breakthrough, I go back and I edit and edit. I cut and paste all the different things into some sort of order; because my rambling thoughts don't go in order.

go back and follow these troubling little fractures. Yes, I want to resolve them. I want to learn where they lead.

What if, instead, I widen those fractures (ADILKNO, 1990/1994)?
What if I quit wishing for resolution?

resist the inclination that my latest thought is the best one and unifying the text around that. The text contradicts. Deal with it.

I: (Sighing) I was going to find a multitude of positions regardless. I'm not building just one vehicle.

How am I already living?

you know they have been mapping human emotions - imagine when we can enter. mind-altering drugs will be about as exciting as a cigarette.

FRAGMENTS

What if I reveled (weak word, pompous too) in that incompleteness and in those scraps. What if I embraced them and forgot about the unity. After all, if the scraps are organized in any format whatsoever, there IS a unity. (That modernist unity of absence, the hidden structure.)

Every time I attempt to make something that embraces the scraps, I end up creating something more complicated and structured.[i]

*According to [Tyrus] Miller, mimicry of multiplicity is a way of being while not being destroyed by it (Feuer, 2006).*

It isn't fair, don't you see, that text is linear. You should be reading all these texts at once. I mean, for you to properly be me, for you to properly inhabit the I that writes this sentence...

My 2 year old daughter walks in...

Now how am I going to inhabit that sentence? Definitely not ambiguous enough. Even if I have a daughter, she is not walking in right now. It puts the vehicle of the "I" as exterior.

She walks in again now, but she is 12.

So what to do? When I put it all together, all polished, it never seems as interesting as when it is all these different scraps, different fonts, different times... there is a real fascination there. Why not include the timetable of sunrises and sunsets I printed out the day before yesterday so I'd know when to get up to go fishing? But as an artist, I don't give the explanation of *why* I printed out or included the timetable! That ruins it. It makes it autobiographical.

<Insert timetable here>

No. Leave it full of ambiguity and possibility, that's what the commodity artist does. That way everyone can carve out their own position and we're all empowered and live happily ever after thanks to this great space of potential we've bought! Yes, I am such a good consumer.

*Anxious critics today, like Adorno and Eliot before them, feel cut off, with nowhere to turn; and so they shore up fragments against their ruin, seeking desperately to assuage their narcissistic wounds (Shaviro quoted in Feuer, 2006).*

but i am not lamenting the death of reality. hardly.

it is quite the opposite - our proliferation of reality. bound, bundled, broadcast real-time so that we can see ourselves undress. so many clothes to see ourselves undress.

PROBLEMATICS

Problematic | Prob`lem*at"ic |

Problematical | Prob`lem*at"ic*al |

a. L. problematicus, Gr. ?: cf. F. probl'ematique.

1. Having the nature of a problem; not shown in fact; questionable; uncertain; unsettled; doubtful; as, his theory is problematic because it fails to explain several facts. -- Prob`lem*at"ic*al*ly, adv. --1913 Webster

2. Having characteristics which will create difficulties or undesirable consequences; -- of a proposed action; as, the proposed law is problematic because it will cause many people to lose their jobs. --PJC

The structure of a text constructs a membrane that acts simultaneously as link and separator of self and other. As a writer, as a reader, the understanding of how this membrane is constructed is of vital (word reeks of a pretense of authority) importance, for without conscious design of this architecture, I remain blind to the limits I am constructing around myself. (Tillett, 2004)

Where do I, as author, position you, as reader? Where do you, as reader, position me, as author?

Text is always a production which justifies itself with the privileged position it offers to its author and its readers.

It is not enough to reveal and objectify the structure of power. This structure of power must be dismantled in its relation to the self, *my self*. It is not possible to deconstruct the text by objectifying what the author believes *as an other*, for what must be deconstructed in the text is that which I, as reader-writer, believe within it. To deconstruct the power of the text is to deconstruct that which is within my self that gives the text its power. Exterior criticisms are only attempts at further defining a self by what it is not. Only interior criticism can truly deconstruct the power of the text, *a power manifested by the reader-writer*. (For if there is no power given by the reader-writer, then what is there to deconstruct?)

| Day | Jan. Rise h m | Set h m | Feb. Rise h m | Set h m | Mar. Rise h m | Set h m | Apr. Rise h m | Set h m | May Rise h m | Set h m | June Rise h m | Set h m | July Rise h m | Set h m | Ris h |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 01 | 0718 | 1631 | 0703 | 1706 | 0626 | 1741 | 0534 | 1816 | 0447 | 1849 | 0418 | 1919 | 0419 | 1930 | 044 |
| 02 | 0718 | 1631 | 0702 | 1707 | 0624 | 1742 | 0532 | 1817 | 0446 | 1850 | 0418 | 1920 | 0420 | 1929 | 044 |
| 03 | 0718 | 1632 | 0701 | 1709 | 0623 | 1743 | 0530 | 1818 | 0445 | 1851 | 0417 | 1921 | 0421 | 1929 | 044 |
| 04 | 0718 | 1633 | 0700 | 1710 | 0621 | 1745 | 0529 | 1820 | 0443 | 1852 | 0417 | 1921 | 0421 | 1929 | 044 |
| 05 | 0718 | 1634 | 0659 | 1711 | 0619 | 1746 | 0527 | 1821 | 0442 | 1854 | 0417 | 1922 | 0422 | 1929 | 044 |
| 06 | 0718 | 1635 | 0658 | 1712 | 0618 | 1747 | 0525 | 1822 | 0441 | 1855 | 0416 | 1923 | 0422 | 1928 | 045 |
| 07 | 0718 | 1636 | 0657 | 1714 | 0616 | 1748 | 0524 | 1823 | 0440 | 1856 | 0416 | 1923 | 0423 | 1928 | 045 |
| 08 | 0718 | 1637 | 0655 | 1715 | 0614 | 1749 | 0522 | 1824 | 0438 | 1857 | 0416 | 1924 | 0424 | 1928 | 045 |
| 09 | 0718 | 1638 | 0654 | 1716 | 0613 | 1750 | 0520 | 1825 | 0437 | 1858 | 0416 | 1925 | 0424 | 1927 | 045 |
| 10 | 0718 | 1639 | 0653 | 1717 | 0611 | 1752 | 0519 | 1826 | 0436 | 1859 | 0415 | 1925 | 0425 | 1927 | 045 |
| 11 | 0717 | 1640 | 0652 | 1719 | 0609 | 1753 | 0517 | 1827 | 0435 | 1900 | 0415 | 1926 | 0426 | 1926 | 045 |
| 12 | 0717 | 1642 | 0650 | 1720 | 0608 | 1754 | 0515 | 1828 | 0434 | 1901 | 0415 | 1926 | 0427 | 1926 | 045 |
| 13 | 0717 | 1643 | 0649 | 1721 | 0606 | 1755 | 0514 | 1829 | 0433 | 1902 | 0415 | 1927 | 0427 | 1925 | 045 |
| 14 | 0716 | 1644 | 0648 | 1723 | 0604 | 1756 | 0512 | 1831 | 0432 | 1903 | 0415 | 1927 | 0428 | 1925 | 045 |
| 15 | 0716 | 1645 | 0646 | 1724 | 0603 | 1757 | 0511 | 1832 | 0431 | 1904 | 0415 | 1927 | 0429 | 1924 | 045 |
| 16 | 0715 | 1646 | 0645 | 1725 | 0601 | 1758 | 0509 | 1833 | 0430 | 1905 | 0415 | 1928 | 0430 | 1923 | 050 |
| 17 | 0715 | 1647 | 0644 | 1726 | 0559 | 1800 | 0507 | 1834 | 0429 | 1906 | 0415 | 1928 | 0431 | 1923 | 050 |
| 18 | 0714 | 1648 | 0642 | 1728 | 0558 | 1801 | 0506 | 1835 | 0428 | 1907 | 0415 | 1929 | 0431 | 1922 | 050 |
| 19 | 0714 | 1650 | 0641 | 1729 | 0556 | 1802 | 0504 | 1836 | 0427 | 1908 | 0415 | 1929 | 0432 | 1921 | 050 |
| 20 | 0713 | 1651 | 0639 | 1730 | 0554 | 1803 | 0503 | 1837 | 0426 | 1909 | 0416 | 1929 | 0433 | 1921 | 050 |
| 21 | 0713 | 1652 | 0638 | 1731 | 0552 | 1804 | 0501 | 1838 | 0425 | 1910 | 0416 | 1929 | 0434 | 1920 | 050 |
| 22 | 0712 | 1653 | 0636 | 1733 | 0551 | 1805 | 0500 | 1839 | 0424 | 1911 | 0416 | 1929 | 0435 | 1919 | 050 |
| 23 | 0711 | 1655 | 0635 | 1734 | 0549 | 1806 | 0458 | 1840 | 0424 | 1912 | 0416 | 1930 | 0436 | 1918 | 050 |
| 24 | 0710 | 1656 | 0633 | 1735 | 0547 | 1807 | 0457 | 1842 | 0423 | 1913 | 0417 | 1930 | 0437 | 1917 | 050 |
| 25 | 0710 | 1657 | 0632 | 1736 | 0546 | 1808 | 0455 | 1843 | 0422 | 1914 | 0417 | 1930 | 0438 | 1916 | 050 |
| 26 | 0709 | 1658 | 0630 | 1737 | 0544 | 1810 | 0454 | 1844 | 0422 | 1914 | 0417 | 1930 | 0439 | 1915 | 051 |
| 27 | 0708 | 1700 | 0629 | 1739 | 0542 | 1811 | 0453 | 1845 | 0421 | 1915 | 0418 | 1930 | 0440 | 1914 | 051 |
| 28 | 0707 | 1701 | 0627 | 1740 | 0540 | 1812 | 0451 | 1846 | 0420 | 1916 | 0418 | 1930 | 0441 | 1913 | 051 |
| 29 | 0706 | 1702 | | | 0539 | 1813 | 0450 | 1847 | 0420 | 1917 | 0418 | 1930 | 0442 | 1912 | 051 |
| 30 | 0705 | 1703 | | | 0537 | 1814 | 0448 | 1848 | 0419 | 1918 | 0419 | 1930 | 0443 | 1911 | 051 |
| 31 | 0704 | 1705 | | | 0535 | 1815 | | | 0419 | 1919 | | | 0444 | 1910 | 051 |

No longer is a judgment of the text possible as if objectively deriving the author's beliefs, for this only serves to further the position of the critic by objectifying the text as an object relative to the critic's own belief landscape. Instead, the position of self that is offered in relation to a text must be uprooted. *The position offered by the division of the self and text must be (re)configured*. For it is from this division, and the relative positioning that it affords (distribution), that power stems. Power is the relation of positions. The structure of power within a text is the space of possibility, the possible positions/truths, offered in relation to the text/belief. Whether or not the reader claims a position interior or exterior to the text or its beliefs, if the reader takes a position relative to the text, then the ground of belief is accomplished through a mutual creation by division, a simultaneous genesis of power relations. Self and other are created. Space and position are created. Belief and truths are created. Relations and power are created.

A PROGRAM FOR THE SELF

> *'Selves' are socially constructed through language and maintained in narrative. We think of a self not as a thing inside an individual, but as a process or activity that occurs in the space between people. (Freedman & Combs, 1996 p. 34)*

What sort of self is inhabitable? What bodies/vehicles are inhabitable? What makes a vehicle inhabitable?

1. 1.      As a reader/writer, I would like a vehicle that will take me somewhere I could not otherwise go. After all, what is the point of inhabiting different bodies if they do not provide different landscapes? Thus, a vehicle/body/self allows me to inhabit modes of belief that construct a different truth landscape in addition to the one(s) I inhabit otherwise.[ii]

2. 2.      There must be significant overlap onto modes that I already have operated within. If the vehicle is too foreign, it might be inoperable, or invisible.

3. 3.      There must be escape mechanisms.

4. 4.      The vehicle should be modifiable. I suppose all are, but having some ambiguity might help.

5. 5.      The process of re-constructing a self should remain open. Otherwise I end up with fascism.

*We produce every play on the assumption that it will be still unfinished when it appears on the stage. We do this consciously because we realize that the crucial revision of a production is that which is made by the spectator. (Meyer-hold quoted in Wunderer, 1999, p. 256)*

yes, and so, the im-mediate? is that your reality?

(dodging the question, as if that is a fault - to refuse to accept the frame)

our (blind) obsession with death is the source of our continual re-enactment of that death. each capture, each representation attempts to freeze time, and points to a death over-ruling us. an obsession with product, the "real" product, is a reflection of a ridiculous attempt to overcome finitude with the finite.

yes, and so, the im-mediate? is that your reality?

ì+3R    *½=½ÁÁ

"It the prison is the generic form of architecture this is primarily because man´s own form is his first prison. man´s revolt against prison is a rebellion against his own form, against the human figure. The only way for man to escape the architectural chain gang is to escape his form, to lose his head. This self-storming of one´s own form requires, in fact, an infinitely more

)141WrÞ±?½$½½  Á  3½..................... one of simple destruction or escape ~ Man must
\■Þ $½■?"±±Á$■  .....................

be dissembled; meaning must be dismembered. Bataille wrote, ^Man will escape his head as a convict escapes his prison.¨ii

(Hollier, 1990/1992, p. xii)

THE SELF AS VEHICLE: TINKERING WITH MY BODY

Who is this "I" that is talking, that you, projected future reader, are now inhabiting? The "I" is a shell that I/you inhabit as writer/reader. Anyways, can't we conceptualize it like that? The "I" is not a static thing pointing back to the author. It is a vehicle that the writer/reader inhabits.

> Yes, dear reader, I am suggesting that you are not a "you" as you read this, nor are you a "reader" either. Rather you are inhabiting the "I" as a vehicle. The "I" you read is the "I" you write - in that you must construct it. Thus, I am the writer/reader.

*In poetical language, there is no "I" that just stands for myself. The "I" is there; it has to be there, but it is there as the site where all other "I's" can enter and cut across one another. (Trinh, 1992 p. 122)*

Once I conceive the "I" in this manner, I see the self not in terms of image or identity or truth, but rather in terms of function, sets of possibilities, and different structures of self/other.

*The self is no longer cathected as the possessor of the truth but, rather, as source of, and incessantly renewed capacity for, creation (Castoriadis, 1992 p. 274).*

The "I" is a vehicle - inhabitable, modifiable, scrappable. The "I" is modified to take on the directions, commands, desires of the inhabitant. In this way, I am the driver, the re-author.

So this is how I finally found the first person "I" with which to write. The "I" is a shell, a temporary construct, a set of parameters, reifiers, objectifiers, beliefs that compose a vehicle. Ultimately, the "I" which I am using to describe the vehicle and landscape is not to be mistaken for what my ultimate purpose is - to move beyond the "I". The "I" is a first step of division (subject/object), from which forms and texts flow.

*[W]e are creating ourselves continuously (Bergson, 1911/1998 p. 7).*

> Eventually, the vehicle must be abandoned when I get to where I want to go. Indeed, it must be abandoned to get where I want to go.

I am not suggesting that I can ultimately escape all vehicles (selves).

*To inhabit a vehicle, to re-conceive the "I," "(t)o begin to write, therefore, is to work a set of instruments, to invent a field of play for them, to enable performance." (Said, 1975 p. 24)*

And why does it have to be an "I"?

creation is a sort of undermining of the self and the environ of the (space/possibility/belief).

# Manifold Introductions

You, as reader/author, (re)write this text with this reading. The text becomes, like an oral his without origin, without truth or fiction, but valued (only) in its (re)interpretation and (re)iterati
<to be read/written aloud simultaneously by multiple reader/authors>
its moment of (re)manifestation. Within *this* moment, the present one, are the multiple iterat

(re)add. (re)create. (re)write.

Sometimes a quiet steady voice, sometimes loud and erratic, but always, when spoken out
Text should not contain itself, but instead should be a seed of life implemented within diff
a relation to the elements around, an interaction before/upon re-entering the ear of the one
environs. The whisper of someone reading as it waits above and below the hum of a fan.
spoke it. In this way we listen to what we are saying - as neither author nor reader, neither se
multiple interactions when a group of people each picks a different place within a text and
other. The relation, the timing, the way your words fall between the hum or the sudden |
out loud simultaneously. The sound of a (non)synchronized silence. As you hear your
conversation, strikes you as neither designed nor undesigned. In this way, the text beco
among the other sounds. There is no silence. There is no creation. There
physical and merges with multiple physical times and environs. A non-relation with the env
abstention. "We die and we do not die" (Shunryu Suzuki, Zen Mind, Beginner's Mind 25))
ment is impossible. "For to perceive, a beholder must create his own experience."
As you hear your voice reading a text, realize your role as both author and reader simultaneo
*as Experience 54)*
No matter where you are, read this text out loud, even if it is a whisper only audible to you.

Reading and writing of this text, the sound of the tracks, the hum of the fans, the quiet cor

THE OTHER AS ANOTHER SELF: VEHICLE: THE POSSIBLE, THE MULTIPLE SELF

> Look, I try to make the meta-cognition explicit. I want to see the decisions of writing as I write them. I want to be self-aware, in that I am aware of the structure of self/other I am (re)creating. (Re)creating is modifying the underlying belief structures, of which self/other, body/landscape, and truth/fantasy are products.[iii]

Doesn't it seem like, throughout this text, despite my intentions, I have only reinforced the binary of self/other by acting as if it is a starting point? Am I assuming the human as singular? Am I disjointing spirituality from analysis (Chakrabarty, 2000 p. 16)?

Tell me, grandfather, what allowed you to live?

There are dawns above the tan-grey harvest fields, and I am there to harvest them.

There are water drops falling to the thirsty dust, and I walk among them.

There are grandchildren walking behind me as I drive the open tractor spinning. They throw rocks onto the flatbed trailer. I walk behind myself. And I ride in front of myself walking behind. Sometimes the rocks roll off the trailer and I pick them up again.

So, wait, have I just split myself? Or am I just playing with the "I" - it is such an empty shell anyhow. What strategy is that? The divided self (James, 1902/2002, p. 184)? The multiple self? Multiplying subjectivities? Schizophrenia?

Let's take a step back. See, I am trying to watch myself think. Watch as each letter appears on the page. Where is the genesis? 

(I leave that one there as an unanswerable.)

Anyway, this is supposed to be academic writing? This is just me rambling with myself pretending to be my grandfather.

Why so cynical?

> I do not propose that I can simply abstain. Hardly does abstention
> remove the burden or the urgency of how to act.

The water drops fall thirsty for dust, and I walk among them.

(Look at that last line there. I can hardly resist writing to some sort of resolution. Maybe its like turning off the light before I go to sleep.)

THE ABSENT SELF: A PRAYER

> *Reification implies that man [sic] is capable of forgetting his own authorship of the human world (Berger and Luckman quoted in Freedman & Combs, 1996, p. 25).[iv]*

Server not found

Firefox can't find the server at www.XXXXXX.com.

* Check the address for typing errors such as ww.example.com instead of www.example.com

* If you are unable to load any pages, check your computer's network connection.

* If your computer or network is protected by a firewall or proxy, make sure that Firefox is permitted to access the Web.

(blinking light on my modem...)

The mutual effects of reader-on-author and author-on-reader are rarely denied, yet the separator-link that structures the binary division is overlooked. Perhaps this is because discourse always relies on such a division. The structure of discourse presumes a form-al separation-link. The absent self is the lost object, the unattainable origin, to which one continually refers back by *not* referring.

Why do I use the voice of an absent self above?

> *(B)y objectifying ourselves out of existence, we void our own experiences.... We create the conditions of our own alienation (Richardson, 1997 p. 19).*

I found out the hard way, building the dining room lamp. If you put the lights all connected, end to end, in series, the path goes through each line of resistance (the filament creating light and heat). And the room was dimly lit.

> Text lives (only) as a (re)iteration in multiple physical environments, a sort of minimal seed re-created within and through each of its multiple readings/writings. Text is a certain compression, and this compression (which may or may not be identified as that particular text) will

If you connect the wire so it goes in a loop, the breaker flips. The electricity races around ecstatic and builds and is cut, instantly, for my own safety. And I flip the switches and try again.

So, to properly wire it (and I use that term loosely given my (in)experience as shown above), you have to connect them in parallel. Each light is able to create its own loop when screwed in. Through the same main wire, multiple circuits branch forming complete separate loops. The lamps are still equal in brightness, but each pulls maximum voltage through the productive resistance it can handle. (Too many circuits on one loop would overheat the wire, or, more likely, blow the fuse.) The room was brightly lit.

At the main wire, where there is a switch, I put a dimmer.

we should be exploring modes, not pre-formed self-reflective emotive environments.

When the mind sends the signal to the muscle that pu
e muscles that push down a finger onto this key, the
steel bar beneath transfers the energy through a hing
e attached hammer flying forward in an arc to the gui
the hammered force to the same point each time, no ma
e selected. Thus, each key has a bar attached to a h
ammer rises, so does the ribbon holder, which places
the hammer and the paper. The force of the hammer pus
bbon. Onto the paper, which is backed by a rotating
ribbon paper sandwiched between the steel hammer wi
age of the symbol of which the finger pushed, then a
  allows a compression that squeezes ink from the ink
the letter which the mind thought of onto a physica

## Faith

As a reader, as a writer, I jump selves. I constantly flow through, inhabit multiple, refuse, re-negotiate, breach, contain.[v] I am constantly changing belief structures. I am learning. I am (re)creating.

> *Thus there is good news and bad news about the clearing: The good news is that the cultural clearing is constructed by social practices, and therefore its horizons of understanding are somewhat moveable. The bad news is that the horizons of the clearing are difficult for any tradition to move quickly under any circumstances, and because horizons are tied to the moral vision, economic structures, and power relations of the society, certain individuals and groups will forcefully resist any attempt at change. (Cushman, 1995)*

creation is a sort of undermining of the self and the environ of the self (space/possibility/belief).

Are there not traditions of moving horizons? Are there not many traditions of moving beyond belief? Are there not many traditions moving on faith, on opening, on not prescribing or enclosing their selves? Is it seen as fundamentalist to have spiritual guides, rituals, traditions?

Kierkegaard's (1843/1985) faith moves beyond the ethical/rational (Kierkegaard,). Zen Buddhist thought moves beyond the limits of the self (Suzuki, 1956). James (1902/2002) inventories religious experiences. Deleuze and Artaud (1980/1987) build a Body Without Organs and search for lines of flight (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987).

It is time to demystify faith. Instead of seeing faith as if it is a radical leap I am about to make, I can look at it as a daily, even moment-by-moment process that I am already engaged in. Instead of seeing faith as if it is me about to jump off a cliff, I can see that I am already constantly in freefall. Instead of seeing faith as something which transcends, I can come to see it as simply the realization that my daily practice is blind (Feyerabend, 1970/1975; Kierkegaard, 1843/1985; Tillett, 2003). Faith is simply the fact that I MUST proceed in the darkness. More than that, faith is the fact that I AM proceeding in the darkness. The demystification of faith begins with its reconceptualization as something not beyond, but rather ordinary, inescapable, and already in progress. (Re)creation, "that blind instant where the self goes beyond the self" (Tillett, 2003), is continuous. Belief is therefore impossible; it cannot enclose itself.

So what are the traditions of escape? What are the theoretical tools that allow us to proceed? Where are the flows, the desires? How are horizons moved? How does the mind avoid shaping itself to the body? (Wollstonecraft quoted in Bordo, 1993 p. 18) How do we change belief systems? What modes do we take up in order to change our own limits while within them? How are boundaries of the possible displaced? (Foucault, Burchell, Gordon, & Miller, 1991; Nietzsche, 1891/1999)

coudl could do so/me modif/ca/tions that include both.

And how is looking at this going to change us? "(I)f we can no longer separate the work of proliferation from the work of purification, what are we going to become?" (Latour, 1991/1993 p. 12).

Why have you forsaken me?

How else can the binary be broken? How else can we create?

Creation is a sort of undermining of the self and the environ of the self (space/possibility/belief).

The holy spirit continually replaces the ethics and divisions, the possibility-limits of yester-moment.

We turned to each other and held out the bread and spoke, This is my body, broken for you.

For me.

For us.

New overlapping ambiguities. Body circuits.

Forsaken, yes. But redeemed?

References

ADILKNO. (1994). *Cracking the movement: Squatting beyond the media*. (L. Martz, Trans.). New York, NY: Autonomedia. (Original work published 1990)
Barthes, R. (1977). *Image, music, text*. (S. Heath, Trans.). New York, NY: Hill and Wang.
Benjamin, W. (1969). *Illuminations*. Arendt, H. (Ed.). (H. Zohn, Trans.). New York, NY. Schocken. (Original work published 1950)
Bergson, H. (1998). *Creative evolution*. (A. Mitchell, Trans.). Mineola, NY: Dover. (Original work published 1911)
Bordo, S. (1993). *Unbearable weight : Feminism, western culture, and the body*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Castoriadis, C. (1992). Passion and knowledge. In *Figures of the thinkable* (pp. 249-275). New York, NY: Not Bored!. Retrieved from http://www.notbored.org/FTPK.html
Chakrabarty, D. (2000). *Provincializing Europe : Postcolonial thought and historical difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Cushman, P. (1995). *Constructing the self, constructing America : A cultural history of psychotherapy*. Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley.
de Certeau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life*. (S. Rendall, Trans.). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. (Original work published 1980)
Debord, G. (2006). *Perspectives for conscious changes in everyday life*. (K. Knabb, Trans.). Berkeley, CA: Bureau of Public Secrets. Retrieved from http://www.bopsecrets.org/SI/6.everyday.htm (Original work published 1961)
Deleuze, G. (1988). *Bergsonism*. (H. Tomlinson & B. Habberjam, Trans.). New York, NY: Zone Books. (Original work published 1966)
Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus : Capitalism and schizophrenia*. (B. Massumi, Trans.). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1980)
Derrida, J. (1976). *Of grammatology*. (G. Spivak, Trans.) Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press. (Original work published 1967)
Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and difference*. (A. Bass, Trans.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1967)
Derrida, J. (1987). T*he postcard: From Socrates to Freud and beyond*. (A. Bass, Trans.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1980)
Derrida, J. (2005). *Paper machine*. (R. Bowlby, Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. (Original work published 2001)
Feuer, M. (2006). If this space is for rent, who will move in? From modernist to postmodernist forms of criticism - Criticism as art or advertisement? *Ctheory*. Retrieved from http://www.ctheory.net/articles.aspx?id=506
Feyerabend, P. K. (1975). *Against method : Outline of an anarchistic theory of knowledge*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press. (Original work published 1970)
Fischer, N. (1999). Review of Overtime: The selected poems of Philip Whalen. *Big Bridge, 3*. Retrieved from http://www.bigbridge.org/Issue3/fischer.htm
Foucault, M., Burchell, G., Gordon, C., & Miller, P. (1991). *The Foucault effect : Studies in governmentality : With two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Freedman, J., & Combs, G. (1996). *Narrative therapy : The social construction of preferred realities*. New York, NY: Norton.
Hollier, D. (1992). *Against architecture: The writings of Georges Bataille*. (B. Wing, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. (Original work published 1990)
James, W. (2002). T*he varieties of religious experience: A study in human nature: Being the Gifford Lectures on natural religion delivered at Edinburgh in 1901-1902*. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications. (Original work published 1902)
Kierkegaard, S. (1985). *Fear and trembling*. (A. Hannay, Trans.). Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin Books. (Original work published 1843)
Latour, B. (1993). *We have never been modern*. (C. Porter, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1991)
McLuhan, M., & Fiore, Q. (1967). *The medium is the massage*. New York, NY: Bantam Books.
Nietzsche, F. W. (1999). *Thus spake Zarathustra : A book for all and none*. (T. Common, trans.). New York, NY: Project Gutenberg. Retrieved from http://www.gutenberg.org/etext/1998 (Original work published 1891)
Richardson, L. (1997). *Fields of play: Constructing an academic life*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
Said, E. W. (1975). *Beginnings : Intention and method*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
Suzuki, D. T. (1956). *Zen Buddhism: Selected writings*. W. Barrett (Ed.). Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
Tillett, W. (2003). *Textual Explorations Book 1*. Retrieved from http://281c9c.org/2003/05/11prologue-textual-explorations-book-1/
Tillett, W. (2004). *The plan abandoned*. Retrieved from http://281c9c.org/2004/03/30/the-plan-abandoned/
Trinh, T. M. (1992). *Framer framed*. New York, NY: Routledge.
Vaneigem, R. (1979). *The revolution of everyday life*. (J. Fullerton & P. Sleveking Trans.). London: Rising Free Collective. (Original work published 1967)
Wunderer, M. (1999). Presence in front of the fourth wall of cyberspace. In S. A. Schrum (Ed.), *Theatre in cyberspace: Issues of teaching, acting and directing*. New York, NY: P. Lang.

---

i    Personal examples from my own writing and artwork include: the "multi" post in *the_scheme, El Nada No. 1, create-your-own-structure, create-your-own-space*. All of which created empowerment spaces of separated randomness.

ii   In fact, if I position the vehicle as other, it allows me to try out different modes even while I externalize them. This is a safety strategy that allows prevention of re-constructing/re-conceptualizing the self. That is, the vehicle constructs a possible. The non-self, the other as possible, is most likely the mode of the traditional reader. It positions the reader to see what it might be like (simile). The idea of multiple perspectives of the same reality allows one to sort of reverse the self/other relationship and state that all bodies have their own views of the same truth. Thus a core belief/self is preserved despite the inhabitation of "different" bodies.

iii  I just read this review and an excerpt of a Calvino book about reading a book. The reviewer stated that the book made Calvino the Escher of writing. I hope that isn't what I'm doing here. Is this just a cheap trick? Cute? Novel? An illusion?

iv  Does Freedman and Combs externalization technique make the human control of the structure of the binary clear, or does it merely redistribute the undesired quality to the other side of the binary (the other)?

v   This idea of position jumping comes from a paper I was writing parallel to this one. In the paper, I tried to analyze the progress of student meta-cognition in an open-ended classroom project. The result was that I had to instead analyze the various roles that the students and I took on, and what modes of cognition those entailed.