Making Public

Paul Soulellis Fondation Galeries Lafayette Paris 22 June 2015

- 1 Is posting publishing?
- 2 Malls, bedrooms and balconies
- 3 Designing the place of memory
- 4 Poor media and physical space




1 Is posting publishing?

First, I'd like to talk about making public.



Because I tend to think about publishing in these terms, or rather, in this term — fundamentally, to publish is to make public. All instances of the word work here:




when we publish we work publicly, we make and serve a public, we make content available, we disperse material, in an exposed, public way, in the institution, in the street, in public spaces. And if we're talking about digital publishing, then we might speak about the nature of shared, public space on the network, usually as a post in one form or another.



The post has a rich history that includes horse and rider, relay stations, keeping informed, markers, supports, announcements, denouncements, displays, newspapers, signs and door construction. This beautiful accumulation of meaning through time, with associations carried over from the nailing of news to the door, to the transport of mail, to the modern newspaper, we could say that all of this is embedded within every current use of the word post.



So, is posting always publishing? The word publish means to make publicly known through an act of announcing or declaring,




and it comes from the Latin *publicus*, meaning "of the people" or "open to all." So the easy answer is, yes, posting is publishing, depending on <u>where</u> one posts, and how "open to all" the posting really is; we need to look at context and conditions. To post may be to make public,



but is it as simple as uploading the file, copying and pasting the link or making the code live, or is there more to it than flipping a switch. I've been thinking about this particular question for awhile, in my own work, suspecting that the post itself might be at the start of, or maybe even at the heart of how we investigate the current and future state of publishing.



For Printed Web 3, a project that I publish, which for this latest issue was an open call that compiled the work of 150 artists, I designed it in multiple formats — a paperback reader, a series of zines,



a special edition with fabric PDFs,



and a GIF -



but first as an Apache server directory on the front page of Rhizome.org and a post announcing the project. This post was the publishing of the project and it worked because it was exposed; but, I've never been able to get too much further than this: that to post is to make public, to make it available. Until recently, when I read Michael Warner's "Publics and Counterpublics" essay.

Quarterly Journal of Speech Vol. 88, No. 4, November 2002, pp. 413-425

Publics and Counterpublics (abbreviated version)

Michael Warner


This essay has a public. If you are reading (or hearing) this, you are part of its public. So first let me say: welcome. Of course, you might stop reading (or leave the room), and someone else might start (or enter). Would the public of this essay therefore be different? Would it ever be possible to know anything about the public to which, I hope, you still belong? What is a public? It is a curiously obscure question, considering that few things have been more important in the development of modernity. Publics have become an essential fact of the social landscape, yet it would tax our understanding to say exactly what they are.

Several senses of the noun *public* tend to be intermixed in usage. People do not always distinguish even between *the* public and *a* public, although in other contexts the difference can matter a great deal. *The* public is a kind of social totality. Its most common sense is that of the people in general. A public can also be a second thing: a concrete audience, a crowd witnessing itself in visible space, as with a theatrical public. Such a public also has a sense of totality, bounded by the event or by the shared physical space. A performer on stage knows where her public is, how big it is, where its boundaries are,

It's a crucial text for us. In it, Warner examines the concept of public in multiple senses. He begins by describing "the public" as a kind of social totality, as people in general. For example,



we might refer to a crowd bound by an event or a shared physical space as the public, like at a concert or sports event, playing in public, where people gather around common visibility and action.



But Warner describes "a public" differently — not as a physical space but as a space of discourse, organized by nothing but the discourse itself. "A public" he says "is autotelic; it exists only as the end for which books are published, shows broadcast, websites posted, speeches delivered, opinions produced. It exists by virtue of being addressed." So this idea of a public is text-based, text here referring to actual texts or speech or visuals.




The public emerges from the conversation, whether it's the chatter of a DJ or a poet performing a new work. And this is key for us, as an institution, that "a public" might be a self-organized form that does not exist outside the discourse that addresses it. The discourse forms a public by virtue of being addressed — looking at it this way, making a public is performative.



Publishing, then, is also performative.

Warner also says that personal identity does not in itself make one a part of a public, that publics differ from groups, like race or nations or professions. I might identify as a graphic designer as a kind of permanent state of being, as something that saturates my identity, even, but this title, this identification with a profession doesn't form any kind of public until I participate in some way; he says merely paying attention — allowing myself to be addressed, to engage — can be enough to make me a member.



So, we might look at the social base of a public discourse, like who tweets a hashtag,




or who uses a particular slang word, or who critiques that poet's performance on facebook, and identify what appear to be common interests, but by Warner's definition of "a public" that base is projected from the discourse itself, not the other way around.



I think we saw a remarkable example of this last week when the art collective Liberate Tate occupied Turbine Hall, copying texts onto the floor as a protest against BP sponsorship at the Tate. The texts included the UN's reports on climate change and critical essays and dystopian works of fiction.



They slowly moved up the ramp for 25 hours, inscribing the texts as a rising tide, completely covering the floor.




They described it as a textual intervention but I also see it as a kind of radical publishing, a re-publishing of texts into an institutional space for the sole purpose of creating discourse.


Various publics were formed by virtue of being addressed by the protesters' texts, from the visitors to the Tate staff to media to people like us, talking about it from a distance. This makes a public, and we're stitched together by our active relationship to the event itself.




Getting back to the post. Let's say that posting is usually "making public," but publishing is making "a public" by creating a space for the circulation of discourse. I would argue that while posting can be and often is publishing, not all posts do it in the same way. Shouldn't we consider the space that's created around the material, how it's framed, how it travels — all of this allows a public to perform the work into its published state. Also, posts take different forms. Is it a link embedded in a feed,



or a file posted to an archive, or text and image composed in the browser?




These are all posts and we can make them public, but they aren't necessarily publishing until some kind of space for discourse is allowed,




or maybe we should say allowed to be performed, as the link or the file or the URL circulates. Of course, how that happens exactly will differ for each of these different modes — and I really want to get into this in the workshop —




but if the act of posting itself puts the work into circulation then yes, I think posting is publishing.



I'd like to propose that when we talk about publishing we speak about strangers joining together. There is no general public "out there" that we're going to bring in to overlay onto Re-Source; your public isn't pre-determined. Rather, the institution will make a public through its engagement with events, publishing and otherwise, that are produced here.




The artifacts of artistic production — the texts, the images, the sketches, the correspondence, the proposals — don't create publics on their own, but dispersing them does, allowing for relationships to surround and connect these artifacts in a social way.



This is a performative scheme, but only as long as we encourage this kind of engagement in and around the material. How do we design for this? Publics have activity and duration — if there is no discourse,

File numbers m	arked by an asterisk (*) indic	ate oversize material that has been separated to the end of the collection n issuing a request for such material.
Series	Folder Range	Box
I.A	1-2, 4-13, 15, 17-19	1
I.A	20-22, 24-28	2
I.A	29-38	3
I.A	39-48	4
I.A	49-53, 55-58, 61-62	5
I.A	63-72	6
I.A	73-77	7
I.A	78, 80-84	8
I.A	85-90	9
I.A	91-95	10
I.A	97-103	11
I.A	104-110	12
I.A	111-113, 115-116	13
I.A	117-121	14
I.B	1-13	15
I.B	14-21	16
I.B	22-24	17
I.C	1-5	17
I.C	6-18	18
I.C	19-26	19
I.C	27-36	20
I.C	37-40	21
I.C	41-43	22
I.D	1-10	22
I.D	11-29	23
II	1-7	24
II	8-15	25
III.A	1-8	26
III.B	1-3	26
III.C	1-5	27
III.C	6-10	28
III.C	11-15	29

if the conversation stops, there is no public. Artifacts that sink into the archive risk becoming absorbed into a nostalgic space, out of sync with current conditions. Keeping the material active and relevant might be a grand challenge if Re-Source were to exist only as a digital network, where time is continuous and flattened out.



But paired with the event-based space of the architecture itself, I imagine the archive and the physical space spilling over into each other, a constant performance.

I've been talking and writing about 'performing publishing' for awhile, in my own writing and research,

To publish is to make public.

.
.
.
.
To publish is to make *a public* through the circulation of discourse.

but I think this idea of the performative space of discourse now gets closer to a kind of definition that's relevant here as we think about how to design Re-Source. And so my first proposal for our discussion, a sort of core, baseline question, is this —

Is our publishing agenda focused on the post?

How do we structure various forms of posting to cultivate multiple publics?

Is our publishing agenda focused on the post? How do we structure various forms of posting to cultivate multiple publics?




2 Malls, bedrooms and balconies




This archive and physical space spilling over into each other is a compelling image. And it makes me wonder about the <u>nature</u> of the space we're creating here. And by space I mean the physical space but also the problematic metaphorical space of the archive-network, which will exist not as a place but as wires, servers, routers, computers and software. How do we design this experience? What are its qualities? When we publish through Re-Source, do we imagine a specific kind of engagement that is more or less regulated, highly or loosely collaborative, more public than private? Borrowing Keller Easterling's word, what


is its disposition — what is the network's tendency.




Is our publishing platform loosely bound by codes of behavior like a pedestrian navigating a busy street or more tightly controlled, like in an airport. Is there space for surprise or risk — chaos, even — Twitter and Reddit come to mind — or more like a closed,



gated community for friends who "make public" around the performance of identity — the publishing spaces of Facebook or Slack, or group DMs.



Or is it a police state, and maybe this is Wikipedia, where publishing is a highly regulated activity, surveilled and monitored by editors and algorithms who keep ideas formatted and filed, with controlled vocabularies and little or no room for creative expression.




Or is it a place of commerce, like Amazon or ebay. Recently, at the New Museum's Ideas City festival in New York, performance artist Penny Arcade

". . . the strategy of a mall is to fill all possible space, materializing desire and fear, so that visitors have no option but to engage (or leave). A mall is a site of extreme visibility."


http://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2015/jun/03/ideas-city-new-york-festival-space-invisible

said that "the strategy of a mall is to fill all possible space, materializing desire and fear, so that visitors have no option but to engage (or leave). A mall is a site of extreme visibility."




It's not too difficult for me to imagine a publishing scheme with a disposition for making everything available, sharable and ownable; the ability to add anything to the cart. A site of promiscuity, if you will, where everything is networked and possible; I'm thinking specifically of Alexander Galloway's Google Deleuzians. Why not.


The archive as network as mall, as site for infinite desire, curation and availability,




where all possible commodities are indexed and exchanged, we could even say purchased, sold or published.




We might consider these artifacts of the archive as valuables, as items for purchase, playing out this fantasy that the more I possess, the more I curate, the more I create.




Maybe we see this publishing-archive as promoting a kind of research that yields an accumulative value.



In all of the networks that I've mentioned so far, there is an element of the mall,




where posting and commodification mingle. Texts, objects, images, artworks, fortunes and identities are scoped, scooped and shopped.



This is the dream or is it the nightmare of the never-ending network where we are ubiquitously on,




in a state of permanent surveillance. Identity itself a stream of data and revenue in the marketplace.




I think one of our biggest challenges here will be to reconcile this thought — the drive towards the commercial and the commodified, which endlessly permeates the internet (and creates it) — against the ideology of the art institution, in service of the artist, the artist's practice, and the publics it creates.

I understand that that's an oversimplification, but my question comes back to this: what are the qualities of the work space that we're creating here. How open is the work? How exposed is the space? Who profits, and how?




As we imagine a publishing platform that encourages sharing, circulation and exposure, how could our making publics incorporate private space, semi-public porosity, even intimacy.



I'd like to propose that we architect a hybrid structure that allows for various — or all — of these levels of making public and that the nature of the artist's practice demands it. Perhaps we can even learn from the peer-to-peer marketplace, where private space circulates with elements of personal identity attached, where character and voice are visible and travel with and frame the product in a local, temporal way.




Also at Ideas City, Rhizome and Airbnb Pavilion hosted a series of salons in an actual rented airbnb apartment around the idea of making one's private space public, and I'd like to think about this idea in relation to a publishing platform. Airbnb is also a kind of mall. But I'm interested in what actually happens here, between the anticipation portrayed in a photo like this one, and my departure from the apartment. The sudden public/private experience that it enables here.




As I enter the rented apartment, I take on the identity of its inhabitant. It's a temporal exchange. He and I carefully negotiate space, playing out a narrative that allows me to engage with his domesticity and perform my own story into it. It begins and it closes. It's a performance. Can the making public of institutional publishing be less like flat object-drive mall-space and more like the sudden, unlocked access to a performative, private space? Of course, this is already happening in your new building scheme, as surfaces appear and disappear to create sudden shifts in the narrative of space.

How do we approach this within the publishing activities of Re-Source — is this even something we want? Is there room for private, public space and personal narrative? What might that look like?




We know that Re-Source is conceived as three levels — generative, informative and collaborative. It seems that each level builds on the previous one, a kind of entry and progression up. Maybe the collaborative level resembles this


hybrid condition that I'm trying to describe, inside the apartment, where there's some kind of opportunity for intimate exchange that crosses boundaries.




And as I think of this interior space in relation to Re-Source's modes of engagement, I move out onto the balcony and Constant Dullaart comes to mind, and his brilliant Balconism manifesto, a declaration for artistic expression in the spirit of the internet.



Published as a statement in various forms, as a pop-up box on his website, as a page of text in Printed Web #2, as a rave that he performs — Constant acknowledges that we're "all outside on teh balcony now."



This is less about vertical movement and hierarchies and more about moving out and into other kinds of space,



crossing over horizontally, lateral moves that expose, bridge, hide and reveal.



This is already in the DNA of your architecture, this is who you are.

Constant says, "Standing on a platform made out of a tweet into corporate versions of public space ... We are in the brave new now, get ready to choose your balcony, to escape the warm enclosure of the social web, to address, to talk to the people outside your algorithm bubble."




Constant asks us to take control. His balcony is a perfect metaphor — or is it a reality — for a kind of publishing, for positioning private space in public and circulating discourse. Find your space, connected but separate, public but private, Constant demands that we challenge traditional — and I should say, comfortable — posting and publishing agendas. He asks us to understand context.

He says, "Speak out on the balcony, free from the storefront, free from the single white space, but leaning into people's offices, bedrooms and coffee

tables, leaning into virtually everywhere. On the balcony, contemporary art reclaims its communicative sovereignty through constant reminders of a freedom once had on the internet."




Rhizome hosted their annual 7on7 recently, where they pair artists with technologists to create new work, this time including Ai Weiwei and Jacob Appelbaum in Beijing, since Weiwei can't leave his country, and Abbelbaum can't return to his.




For 24 hours they created a new work together, and Laura Poitras, the director of citizenfour, was also there, to film the experience, which was released recently — published — as a post at NYT.com.




It was also screened at the 7on7 event at the New Museum a month prior.



In the film we see Weiwei and Applebaum shredding piles




of public NSA documents given to Poitras by Edward Snowden in Hong Kong




and stuffing the shredded documents into toy pandas.




Inside each panda, they also placed a micro SD memory card containing a digital backup of the documents.




The pandas were then dispersed to the US, Germany, China, Britain, Russia and Canada,



presumably to enter private and institutional collections.



It's a powerful project that reverberates as a performative act, as a documentary film, as a distributed archive and as dispersed art objects.



Its versions allow it to occupy several positions at once.



The title - Panda to Panda - is perfect - panda is the slang term for the secret police in China, and the word is actively used to subvert censors:



in Mandarin, 'national security' sounds like 'national treasure,' a.k.a. the panda.


peer-to-peer communications

"a method of decentralized networking and
a philosophy of egalitarian human
interaction on the internet."


Laura Poitras, "The Art of Dissent" http://www.nytimes.com/2015/06/09/opinion/the-art-of-dissent.html?_r=0

But also, it refers to peer-to-peer communications, "a method of decentralized networking and a philosophy of egalitarian human interaction on the internet."

Panda to Panda was an intimate collaboration, a meet-up narrative involving the re-publishing of secrets, archival documents as a kind of embedded backup, the digital inserted into the physical, the creation of a private network of nodes — the toy pandas — circulating and making a public as the process is filmed, the pandas dispersed and the project posted.




The work's purpose is to generate discourse, to make publics that connect these ideas, events and the conditions surrounding these actions. I see it as a kind of perfect balconism project, and a radical act of publishing.




Let's learn from artists who publish in this way, those who expose and circulate their work outside the normative conventions of the publishing industry — think of renting, rather than buying, where you attain the right to occupy a particular space inside someone else's world, where various levels of intimate exchange are negotiated. Secrets can be revealed, or hidden, on the artist's own terms. On the balcony. It's the space of the Instagram feed, hacked, choreographed and exposed. Maybe this continues the trajectory of the democratic multiple. The artist controls the production of her own material but circulates it


publicly and locally; she takes on the labor to make it accessible in a more direct way. Maybe the PDF zine is a kind of quick, one-nighter in a stranger's apartment, a view into someone's feed, the artists' book more like a one-week stay in the whole house, a bit more of a commitment, a bit more risk. These are private spaces that are exposed; there is transaction but it's an intimate exchange; you might be negotiating with the artist directly, at her table at a book fair or on Snapchat.



I'm talking about independent, experimental publishing, and I don't just mean artists' activities but open access archives where self-publishing is flourishing (like arxiv.org). Let's contrast this with an exhibition catalogue,



from MoMA or Tate or Gagosian, the kind of object-driven publishing where intimacy drops away and the artist is flattened within institutional structures, marketing, PR and publishing "industry."




In this sense the publishing space of the balcony, of the temporary room extended out into view, if you will, is a private-public hybrid to the publishing industry's normative language of commerce, and this is inspiring.

Of course, for us, it's not either-or. We're not here to push pandas or operate social media feeds — our publishing agenda must contain a multiplicity of spaces and conditions. We need to talk about disposition. What is this platform's character and what can it become? And this is my

second question for us as we think about how to design the Re-Source network.


How can a publishing agenda provide multiple levels of collaboration, privacy, intimacy and exchange for all of its publics? Where is the artist located in our publishing schema?

How can a publishing agenda provide multiple levels of collaboration, privacy, intimacy and exchange for all of its publics? Where is the artist located in our publishing schema?



3 Designing the space of memory

The third topic for discussion that I'd like to propose is flow.




And by flow I mean time, and by time I mean a three-way relationship between this publishing platform, the archive and physical space. In Boris Groys' "Entering the Flow," he writes about how we understand the museum not as a storage place for artworks, but rather as a stage for the flow of art events. I can imagine that Fondation Galeries Lafayette will very much live up to this idea of the stage, of a place where things happen. It already does.

And the museum <u>documents</u> its activities on the internet, he writes. Online, the museum functions

as a blog, presenting the institution as information and events. Even if the permanent collections can be reproduced on the internet, its activities can only be recorded.

And this presents an interesting dilemma for us as an art institution with a publishing archive. If we see a curatorial project as a narrative event — an installation, a performance, with a real-time end and start — then we can only document it. We cannot reproduce it, because it can't be isolated from the flow of time. So when we think about the material of artistic production entering the Re-Source platform at the generative level, one essential question is — how do we position it in time?




Is the thing — let's say it's a photo taken by one of the artists working on a project at the foundation, posted to his instagram account — is it active, representing a work in production, and therefore part of that work? Does the live work, as a theatrical event occurring in physical space, extend its narrative into Re-Source? By this logic, Re-Source becomes part of the time-based curatorial space. Or do we mark that photo as documentation, an artifact for the archive.


From the perspective of the archive, we could ask it this way — what is outside vs what is inside

the archive? I imagine that how we resolve this will be essential to the design of the Re-Source experience. Are we creating a system that publishes what's happening inside the institution, as it's happening — a recording. Or is it documentation, showing what happened, already indexed and archived.


There's a fundamental difference, in that publishing could become a performative aspect of the production of art, as it's happening. In fact, this process is already the product, says Groys. If the public follows our activities, then this starts to enter the art event itself. Performing the publishing as an activity that can be entered, like an event in the building. This is exciting but it means that our publishing system must be designed in a temporal way. That the publishing itself, which we've already identified as performative, as actively forming a public in its circulation of discourse, is also narrative in structure. The act of publishing could be designed as an event, with a start and an end, and perhaps this narrative leaves traces of itself in the archive. Maybe our publishing platform has the potential to take over as "the place of memory because the internet records and documents the activities of the artist even before his or her work is brought into the museum."




And I really want us to look at the work of Robert Ochshorn, especially his re-imagining of archive interfaces, like this one for an archive of Godard films.




Ochshorn works to expose the timeline and index of the work in its viewing, not just as a visual, but as the interface itself.



It's great stuff and there's not enough time to examine it closely here, but we will in the workshop.




What happens when the event is over?




The reality of course is that the artifacts enter the archive as documentation, as having happened in the past, and they "produce nostalgia for a missed presence, a missed opportunity...this nostalgia provokes the desire to reenact the event 'as it truly was,'" says Groys. We are confronted with irreversible time.

And so I think it's worth considering how we'll reconcile this. As Re-Source matures, the archive of past events will increase in size. Does re-staging them in the network somehow rescue them from this nostalgic condition? It's tempting to

think of the internet as infinite flow, rendering its objects timeless. As always on, everywhere, without a fixed relationship to time. But the internet is anything but that. Groys characterizes mechanical reproduction, the Walter Benjamin kind, as copies that are siteless and de-territorialized. Physical books and photographs multiply themselves out there in the world and are ultimately detached as objects in space. But a network-based archive of materials — these images and texts and scans and videos — they're all digital files.




And as copies on the network, as files, they are always traceable, always locatable — the network, after all, is a space of permanent surveillance. Every file, every link and instance of a browser carries with it its time stamp and location. And when that file is retrieved it's performed, again and again. If the goal of the museum was ever to stop the flow of time, that role has now been taken over by the internet.



CONTENTS


Dexter Sinister's Serving Library acknowledges this kind of time-stopping quality of the network. As their archive of materials grows, in the form of texts published — posted — as PDFs, this content accumulates, compiles and is then published again as printed collections — Bulletins from the Serving Library.



Their agenda is to be an archive that publishes, and a publisher that archives. The work becomes the archive.



Download and preserve the content for future use. Upload later to view your archive. For free. No sign-up or browser extensions required.



For any questions, comments, inquiries or feature requests,

And the WebRecorder tool, developed by Ilya Kreymer in partnership with Rhizome, has tremendous potential to change the relationship between the network-based archive, the web and time. It "records" the site with all of its activity, including all embedded materials, packages it and allows you to perform the archival session locally.




This time-marking quality built into the work makes me think that using the network to pause materials, to disperse them as a way to slow them down and draw attention, away from the relentless acceleration that occurs elsewhere on the network — this might be something for us to consider. This idea of slow publishing. I don't mean anything crafty like slow food or slow design. I mean designing a platform that in its dispersion of materials allows us to resist ultimate dissemination, the horizontal blur, to borrow Seth Price's term.

Are we designing the place of memory? How do we orchestrate temporality into a networked, archive-publishing platform?


And so my third topic for discussion in our workshop is this:

Are we designing the place of memory? How do we engineer temporality into a networked, archive-publishing platform?



4 Poor media and physical space

One last topic, quickly, but an important one. I've talked about the post and making publics, and the possibly collaborative and porous and performative nature of the publishing work space of Re-Source, and the idea that files, links and browser experiences might have the ability to slow down the flow of the art institution in creating a place of memory. I'd also like to include more material modes of publishing in our discussion, and how we might approach the design of Re-Source as a physical experience.




This machine has been on my mind for a long time but especially since I started thinking about Lafayette Anticipation. It's Vannevar Bush's famous Memex device, a desk that he proposed in his essay "As We May Think" in 1945. It's more than a desk, and more than a fantasy of a kind of google embedded in the furniture. It's a way of thinking about knowledge as flat, rhizomatic and networked.


". . . associative indexing, the basic idea that any item may be caused at will to select immediately and automatically another. The process of tying two items together is the important thing."

Vannevar Bush, 1945 http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1945/07/as-we-may-think/303881/

Bush called it "associative indexing, the basic idea that any item may be caused at will to select immediately and automatically another. The process of tying two items together is the important thing." He writes about the user building trails of associations that may be stored, retrieved and sent to others. And he says the trails do not fade. It is an enlarged, intimate supplement to his memory, an infinite memory machine.



Recently, James Bridle designed and built a Memex-like machine as a commission for the V&A in London.



It's called Hyper-stacks and it used their digital archives to analyze over a million objects




and build a classification and connections engine.




Some of the trails end up in the galleries.


There's a lot to consider here, as we imagine how trails form in Re-Source, as threads that might lead to acts of publishing, but also as associations that could occur in and out of physical space. The Memex intrigues me because it imagines the internet as a piece of furniture in physical space.




And it reminds me of something else I came across recently, another awkward, frankenstein of technology,



also at the V&A in London. It's the FOMO, created by Space Caviar, an Italian design and technology group.




To use it, you tweet a postal code to its twitter account,




it warms up, searches the network for images related to that postal code -



I think it crawls through local ads — grabs images, generates a PDF layout and prints a zine.



The whole process takes about ten minutes.




There's nothing especially remarkable about what the FOMO produces,



but it does perform a kind of publishing-on-demand experience in physical space that's oddly satisfying,




and I think we need to seriously consider what kind of role print-on-demand




Michael Mandiberg, Print Wikipedia, 2015 http://printwikipedia.com/


might play in the design of Re-Source.




The Walker Art Center is using it as part of a publishing agenda that occupies multiple positions,




including a Living Collections Catalogue that is presented as a publication in their book store even though it's browser-based,




an area for intangible art objects and publications, and a print-on-demand series called




Artist Op-Eds that is both browser-based



and cheaply printed on-demand from Lulu.



All of this approaches but does not really arrive at what Alessandro Ludovico calls truly hybrid publications, able to mix running code and unchangeable content, and I hope to hear more about that from him in the workshop.



For now, let's refer to the PDF, zip files and print-on-demand as "poor media." It's Silvio Lorusso's term, from his razor sharp "In Defense of Poor Media," where he writes about poor media as privileging circulation over quality, media that is "characterized by the conscious, serene renunciation of embellishments in favor of accessibility and spread."

And so I'll it end here with this, my last open position for discussion today.

How can a network-based publishing agenda occupy physical space and use "poor media" (esp. print-on-demand) to extend its publics? Are truly hybrid publications possible?

How might a network-based publishing agenda occupy physical space and use "poor media" (esp. print-on-demand) to extend its publics? Are truly hybrid publications possible?

Making public

- 1. Is posting publishing?
- 2. Malls, bedrooms and balconies
- 3. Designing the place of memory
- 4. Poor media and physical space

I'm really looking forward to digging deeper into these topics and many others, I'm sure, in the workshop. And yes, I've posted the talk at this address, so let's call it published. Thank you.



References

Library of the Printed Web

Printed Web 3

Michael Warner, "Publics and Counterpublics" (PDF)

Liberate Tate

Alexander Galloway, "Forget Deleuze"

Constant Dullaart, Balconism (pop-up)

Laura Poitras, "The Art of Dissent"

Amalia Ulman, Excellences & Perfections

Boris Groys, "Entering the Flow: Museum between Archive and

Gesamtkunstwerk"

Robert Ochschorn

Dexter Sinister, The Serving Library

WebRecorder

Vannevar Bush, "As We May Think"

James Bridle, Hyper-stacks

Space Caviar, FOMO

Robert Ochschorn, Hyperopia

The Walker Art Center, The Living Arts Catalogue

The Walker Art Center, Artist Op-Eds

Silvio Lorusso, "In Defense of Poor Media"

Paul Soulellis, "Digital Publishing, Unzipped"