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Abstract
This introductory article to the following “cluster of articles” proposes to apply the term “signal” as a theoretical and analytical category for a new approach to the bearings of electronic and new media in particular. As the term “sign” was formerly developed from linguistics, the term signal was developed from Norbert Wiener’s writings on mathematics and cybernetics. The electronic signal is a technological fact dating back to the telegraph that in a substantial way set the agenda for contemporary (popular) culture (electronic music, youth, and performance culture) and further facilitated the digital code and the Internet. In this article, as well as in the following articles, the term signal is above all applied in its broader sense to explore possible signaletic modes and characteristics in contemporary art and new media culture. It is thus a key point that technological implications could never be causal to aesthetic variations and cultural modes. Departing from this, this article explores artistic and cultural manifestations from the 1960s and onward in the light of the signal in order to analytically grasp the changes or supplements to the sign that in a contemporary culture is bringing new forms of events and affects to the fore.
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Today it seems obvious that a major attraction of digital, global media is the transmission of “real-time” signals, where the singular message is of minor importance. The connectedness to other people and places through electronic devices and signals has become a common denominator very different from reading signs in books, newspapers, galleries, or approaching the sign as a visual representation. According to McLuhan, all media are spatial extensions of human senses, so the book extends seeing and radio extends hearing.

One could add that film extends seeing, listening, and our sense of physical movement and time, not necessarily connected to the representation of space,1 that video and television extend seeing and listening, as well as the sense of physical movement and real-time through direct transmission, feedback operations, and so on,2 and finally, that the Internet and cell phones extend seeing, listening, movement, and interface embodiment in an ubiquitous hypermediated global space.3
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In our current realization of the “global village,” the real-time control of digital interfaces has superseded earlier ideas about time and space, where time was measured according to the movement of bodies in space. Space is no longer the stable grounds for measuring time as movement, creating linear narration coordinated by cause and effects. The linguistic sign prioritized linearity, the ability to differentiate between past, present, and future time, as well as cause and effect relationships. The prevalence of the electronic signal and the ability of digital technology to synthesize waves by codes and to create interfacial relations between (in Anna Munster’s phrase) “being in the body and representing/mapping the body from the outside” can hardly be understood within the parameters of classical time and space. Since the “presentness” of the transmitting electronic television signal from the 1950s and onward fostered the outlines of a globalized world that related former disparate places and bodies, the demand for affective, relational situations created in the gaps between actual and virtual sites has gradually proliferated.

So, this gradual transition from a sign regime, based on the letter to a regime based on the electronic signal and the digital code has been in the pipeline for a long time, since the experience of the electronic signal of television and video was already one of “liveness,” when the iconicity of the filmic image yielded for grids of dots and lines. With the feedback and replay function of analog video technology, the images could follow the waves of the electronic signal and through the energy of light, which was always present as dots of “salt and pepper”, the video could contract and render time visible as matter. With the advent of digital programming, synthetic images no longer carried the indexical impression of light and the perception of real space. On the other hand, the contraction of time-matter proceeded much faster and the impression of duration as a spatial phenomenon could be created. So what we identify as the real-time signal of new media is in fact created by reducing intervals of time, as Maurizio Lazzarato explains it, “Digital technology permits all wave-formed phenomenon’s to continue and to crystallize, from which the complete perception is composited.” This new media situation has to be considered in all analyses of media and art, because the affective involvement of the user in real-time transmission and interface controlling is the ubiquitous actuality. Real-time interface signals create new kinds of affective involvements between bodies and bodies and machines. Truth no longer resides in the index by way of media (e.g. light as trace of an actual “having-been-there” in the photograph). On the other hand, digital coding has made communication very direct, immediate, and very close to, for example, oral, face-to-face authentic experience.

In art production, the ability to digitally record something in fast motion and replay it in normal speed has been used in artistically skillful ways to investigate and give value to the affective and vibrating qualities of sense and perception. Bill Viola’s *Five Angels for the Millennium* (2001) and Lars von Trier’s *Antichrist* (2009) are able to give credibility to the experience of actualized time. It has been suggested that the “truth” of the “indexical rhetoric of cinema’s pre-digital photo-chemical past thus survives in the digital age, albeit now recast in the form of the temporal indexicality of the real-time surveillant image.”

In this article, the procedures of “the signal” will be traced from the filmic time-image to the vibrating pattern of electrons in “live” video and further to the real-time digital interfaces in order to qualify Levin’s notion of the “temporal indexicality” of digital coding. The key question will be: How can real-time interfaces produce affective connections and encounters between actual spaces, sites and bodies and signaletic renderings of these?

**THE “SIGNALETIC MATERIAL” OF NEW MEDIA**

According to Gilles Deleuze, the sense of transformation was produced in the film media in two ways: first, as movement of images with represented space functioning as the stable ground for the actions of the protagonist and, second, as free-floating signifiers of “pure time,” no longer related to the cause-effect chain of narration nor to the representation of space and movement. But even this latter type, termed the time-image by Deleuze, could not escape the media features of film—being recorded or “canned” information.

This might be the reason why Deleuze is very engaged in explaining how the automatism of film
images entails problems for the linguistically oriented French film criticism and at the same time makes him favorably disposed toward electronic media (television, video, and information technology). To grasp the material of film media, Deleuze proposes the term “signaletic material” (matière signalétique), which:

includes all kinds of modulation features, sensory (visual and sound), kinetic, intensive, affective, rhythmic, tonal, and even verbal (oral and written). [...] But, even with its verbal elements, this is neither a language system nor a language. It is a plastic mass, an a-signifying and a-syntaxic material, a material not formed linguistically even though it is not amorphous, and is formed semiotically, aesthetically, and pragmatically. It is a condition, anterior by right to what it conditions. It is not an enunciation, and these are not utterances. It is an utterable.13

Deleuze prefers Charles Sanders Pierce’s semiotics to Christian Metz’s failed ambitions to apply linguistic semiology to cinema, as Pierce was well aware that “the language system only exists in its reaction to a non-language-material that it transforms.”14 In the aforementioned introductory statements to Cinema 2: The Time-Image, Deleuze makes it clear that it is his main purpose to pave the way for an alternative understanding of modern film in which time, like rhythm in music, actualizes the composition as a direct sensation of time. With modern film (starting with Italian Neo-realism and French Nouvelle Vague), time can be sensed directly as pure time, since images and their relations no longer refer to the story told as a (changing) whole. As time in modern film “is out of joint” with the movements, actions, and affects of bodies in represented physical space, images can be thought provoking through compositions where virtual time can dominate actual as well as represented space. In his conclusion of Cinema 2: The Time-Image, Deleuze’s resistance to understanding cinema in terms of narration and semiology surfaces once again, as he continues his line of argument concerning “the signaletic material” and states that “[c]inema is not a universal or primitive language system (langue), nor a language (langage)” but a “non-linguistically formed ‘content’.15

We should identify Deleuze’s research into the “signaletic material” of cinema as succeeding Walter Benjamin’s interest in the automatic movement of film in “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction.” Benjamin’s vision of the reproductive (or automatic) qualities of film is continued in Deleuze’s positive vision on electronic and digital media, since film, the “automata of movement, made way for a new computer and cybernetic race, automata of computation and thought, automata with controls and feedback.”17 He succeeds in extending the impact on the “signaletic material” of cinema, in describing electronic media (tele, video, and numerical) as follows:

The organization of space [...] loses its privileged directions, and first of all the privilege of the vertical which the position of the screen still displays, in favor of an omni-directional space which constantly varies its angles and co-ordinates, to exchange the vertical and the horizontal.18

He continues to characterize the image as constantly being cut into another image, being printed through a visible mesh, sliding over other images in an “incessant stream of messages,” and the shot itself is less like an eye than an overloaded brain endlessly absorbing information.19 This description comes very close to Lev Manovich’s view of the image in new media, that it “in a traditional sense, no longer exists.” The “sequential scanning—circular in the case of radar, horizontal in the case of television” never gives us a simultaneous representation (an image), but only “tracks on a surface.”20 Maurizio Lazzarato adds time to this description:

The division in lines or frames is just a graduation in time: the opening or closing of the time-window that internally marks the active periods of the continuing flow of electrons. The image is in this way a living and dynamic field of energy, an oscillation that only seems fixed to the extent that it exceeds our capacity to a degree to perceive small units of time.21

Thus the “image as sign” has through the works of Benjamin, Deleuze, Manovich, Lazzarato, and others increasingly been replaced by “the signaletic material” that became present on the surface of the video-screen as electronic lines and dots, leading neither to a representation of time nor space but to a becoming of time itself in the live signal and further to time as the dominant vector...
of digital variation, even within the production of images.

In elaborating on the aforementioned Deleuzecitation, Anna Munster concentrates on “the way in which a dynamic between sequential and non-sequential variation (chronological and non-linear time) begins to function as a set of temporal coordinates for digital aesthetic production.” In describing a “general shift from a located, spatialized aesthetics to a distributed, temporal aesthetics,” she states that,

[i]t is as if images can no longer be located as distinct sets of coordinates upon a grid providing them with place and context in a system. They are now laid out on a plane, to be organized principally by directions and speeds in time: backwards, forwards, fast, and slow.

I would argue that those dots, lines, and “salt-and-pepper” noises of the video that can also be seen as pixelations on digital surfaces indeed are the denominators of the paradigm of the signal or “a distributed, temporal aesthetics.” Those variations on the surface plane can otherwise be described as “haptic” in the theoretical tradition arising from Alois Riegl, Gilles Deleuze, and Félix Guattari, as well as Laura U. Marks. However, in a new media framing the “haptic” surfaces have scattered all over, surpassing the inscription of the materiality of the grid in the tradition of avant-garde minimalism or abstract aesthetics.

The “signaletic image” has indeed exceeded the grid in a way that was only dreamt of by Deleuze but that—on the other hand—was well under way in the video technology. What—according to Lazzataro—characterizes the video image, could apply for electronic and new media in general: “A place, a movement space for time as such. It is no longer quite simply about an image that is going to be seen but about an image in which you interfere, with which you work (a time of events).”

The social and cultural implications of the signal could be further expounded by Lazzarato’s coinage of the term “immaterial labor,” which describes the cybernetic computer control of labor in a post-Fordist industrial culture and also the intellectual and creative labor that everybody produces creating subjectivity in a consumer culture (fashions, artistic markers, norms of behavior, etc.). In a wider context, the widespread use of the term “performativity,” which also marks the transformation from sign value to a valuation of signal matter in an ongoing process of transformation and repetition without beginnings and endings, might also be seen in the context of this new paradigm of the signal. Erika FischerLichte, Judith Butler, Jon McKenzie, and Philip Auslander are among the many (visual) cultural analysts who have critically reminded us of the key feature of repetition and recording within the (accumulative and transformative) value of performance and performativity.

Thus, this article proposes to establish a general distinction between sign (and object) and signal (and interface), where the latter refers to the real-time transmission of electronic and new media in particular, since manipulation, feedback operations, and control are integrated parts of both the electronic signal and the digital code. The increasing transition from the sign as prevalent mode to the signal has occurred since the 1960s. The electronic live signal had certainly an overwhelming impact on the art scene at this time—both in the avant-garde as well as popular culture, especially in the music scene—but it is only recently that the operations of the signal has become ubiquitous in all art- and media-genres.

**THE SIGNAL IS THE MESSAGE**

With digital electronic media, the famous saying of Marshall McLuhan, “the medium is the message,” becomes with Malcolm Le Grice strikingly true as each “component of the image, normally assumed to be a ‘pixel’ or single point of the image is stored as numerical data giving precise value to its intensity (or luminance) and color (or chrominance)” within the software program. “The flow of information is inscribed in a (non-discursive) mathematic language and can neither be grasped as matter nor light,” but we can with Maurizio Lazzarato understand all electronic and new media images as “transformations and combinations (compositions) of intensities, energies and fields that are played out in the flow of power. Electro-magnetic power in the case of video, optic power in the case of the telematic algorithmic flow of the computer.” So when we in the field of literature, art, and media would like to analyze new media and its implications to older media (i.e. remediation; Bolter and Grusin) on both a broad scale and on a small scale, it might be
relevant to remember just how Norbert Wiener expressed himself in 1948, inspiring McLuhan in 1964 and Nam June Paik in 1966. Wiener wrote, “the signal, where the message is sent, plays an equally important role as the signal, where the message is not sent.” It is striking that Wiener stresses “the signal,” not “the medium” as McLuhan did. This seems far more precise considering that the newest innovation of digital, global media and art alike is the control of “real-time” signals, where the interfacing of signals is the message that affects us. The (electronic) signal and the importance of being “connected” in “cybernetic space” is our new common universality that slowly supersedes dominance of the (linguistic) sign.

This increasing emergence of the regime of the signal have had vast effects. Theories of the event have become predominant in aesthetic and cultural theories, and laws of copyright are being undermined. The signal is not just that by which messages are sent or fictions created. Nor is the viewer/reader/listener inserted in the waves of the signal. We should rather understand the “signaletic interface” as the creation of situations in which the flow of information infinitely could generate actions and thus creative time. The software carries information and information is software, just as images and the things they used to portray can no longer be separated. Thus, understanding the features of the electronic signal might prove to be the “missing link” to a clearer understanding of many contemporary artworks. The first work selected here shows the procedures of the signal as an aesthetic marker in making the sensation of it visible, audible, or felt. The second work is chosen in order to enable or provide a possible realm of understanding the operations of the interface as an embodied fold between virtual and actual time.

JON KESSLER, THE PALACE AT 4 A.M.

Jon Kessler’s One Hour Photo (2004) has been exhibited as a part of The Palace at 4 A.M. in venues such as the Danish Museum of Modern Art, Louisiana, 2008. This example clearly marks the transference from sign to signal and in doing so it stresses one implication of the signal: the haptic, time-transmitting surface of the monitoring screen. We are looking at (Figure 1) the monitored real-time digital filming of postcards showing the World Trade Center in Manhattan. In simulating the pilot’s perspective from one of the suicide flights toward the World Trade Center.

Figure 1. Jon Kessler: One Hour Photo (2004). Detail from installation © Jon Kessler.
on September 11, Kessler has placed different postcard icons of New York on strings attached to a motor that slowly lets various perspectives of the twin towers pass before the camera as they are transmitted real time to the camera monitor. This process leads the visitor to consider the threefold relation between

1. The 3D illusion of a photographic sign (a NY icon).
2. The vivifying scan of the surveillance camera.
3. The “signaletic” transmission of the real-time filming process on the monitoring screen.

Kessler’s work, created in the aftermath of 9/11, lets the exhibition visitors witness the transformation of sign to signal as a traumatic event, since the appearance of the haptic opaqueness of the screen is marked as a result of this passage. The image as sign disappears for another sensation: the haptic sense of the scanned now on the real-time surface. This procedure also makes Kessler’s work a performance, since the sign as a representation of a real physical object in space is transformed to a doing, a scanned happening, showing the (Figure 2) “signaletic material” of digital video. The optical mastering of 3D space is transformed into a transmission report to be played and sensed over and over again. So, the bodily time-based movement in space, which Deleuze and Guattari call striated space or mapping of space in order to territorialize land, has been partly replaced by smooth or nomadic space, where space is just as unknown to us as time.

Framed differently, Jon Kessler’s work reminds us that space as based upon cybernetic time procedures has to be explored as haptic space, i.e. as time, coded to electronic signals. But when looking on this artwork as a performative installation in real physical space we also get a sensation of how our own body—positioned equally as the (absent) photographer, flight-captain and the viewer—is inscribed into the interface folding between the 3D illusion of space to the 2D surface of a real-time illusion. The repetitive performance of One Hour Photo in other words shows us the operations of embodied involvement, in which the (illusionary) space of a sign (the postcard) is transformed to the (illusionary) real time of the signal. So even though we know that the postcard is only representing 3D space as a sign (a postcard) and might share the opinion of D.N. Rodowick that the “video image” is a “discontinuous, fluctuating and pointillist” signal, that is ignorant of “both spatial and temporal unity,” the viewer’s performative interface with the installation is bound to create some kind of affective involvement created in the “space” between the two image forms. This performative installation has the potential of forming an event, in which the infinite, repetitive relation created between the sign and the signal has implications for the viewing body. Jon Kessler’s work in other words describes the embodiment of the observer by giving the viewer the active role of observer and receiver at the same time.

**HAPTIC SENSATIONS OF “NOW-HERE”**

We know that real-time transmissions relate distant places and spaces by means of the scanning of the signal. Local time (chronological time in a specific place on earth) is made obsolete in real-time transmissions, as evidenced by all TV viewers on 9/11. But the sense of “liveness” of real-time immediacy is produced as we, the users, witness the electronic surface scanning of the signal. Filmic “reel-time” was effectively replaced by electronic real-time with Nam June Paik’s installation, Point of Light (1963), in which the sound signal of a radio was sent through a TV-receiver and thereby transformed to an electronic signal of light. This light on the radio transmitter could be switched on and off by the guests in the gallery witnessing one of the first signaletic performances.
of the transmitted “now.” Time could now be presented directly as “liveness” or “event” within the signal, as became clear in many of the manifestations of the 1960s.

Since then the art scene has witnessed various artworks, mostly within the performance scene, where similar kinds of “signaletic events” or “live” decoding of electronic signals are essential for the sense of real-time experience. This “live” decoding is identical with sensing the “now” of the signal, the scan, the re-wipe, or the transmission as electronic lines, salt-and-pepper dots, or digital pixels on the monitor. Time as real-time, as intensity or “now-here” (as opposed to “nowhere”), has become one of our most familiar experiences of time with new media.

This is the “haptic event” of new media. The term haptic has recently been applied to documentary film, video, and new media by Laura U. Marks. She bases her work on Austrian art historian Alois Riegl’s separation of “optic” and “haptic” art in his book *Late Roman Art Industry*, in which he uses the Greek word “haphe” (meaning to grab, to touch) to make explicit the capacity of visual perception to experience a kind of “touch” when looking at patterns, carvings, and details in woven materials, like some ornaments and carpets. The optic capacity is active whenever visual decoding is more oriented toward lines and perspective in depth. The haptic quality is normally found in surfaces seen at close range.

Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari also explore the “haptic” in their collaboration *A Thousand Plateaus* describing the nomadic qualities in rhizomatic structures. In Chapter 14, haptic or smooth space is described as a possible response to variations and changes in physical spaces as well as artistic ones, when lines are active between dots and points, and do not create conjunctions and connect one point to another. A haptic line has no beginning and no end, and its law is variation. It has expression, but no form, and it creates repetition and rhythm without symmetry. Relating this to the haptic surfaces of new media, the electronic transmission has become inseparable from the salt-and-pepper dots or digital pixels that obstruct illusionary depth.

In Deleuze’s book on Francis Bacon, the haptic as an analytic term is explicitly used to characterize Bacon’s special kind of expressionistic realism. So while Laura U. Marks is relating the haptic to an almost physical encounter with the screen surface as body, Deleuze relates haptic compositions and affects to expressionistic art after Cezanne. With new media this difference between the two interpretations of the haptic has been effaced. And this effaced condition, where haptic compositions and surfaces can actually have various layers of meanings within the sensation of an embodied “now-here,” must be one of the key points for an exploration of the signal’s bearings in a broader mode.

**THE INTERFACE AS A FOLDING THAT CREATES AFFECT**

In her chapter on “Interfaciality,” Anna Munster is very precise in describing the interfaces between humans and machines as “the interstitial space between matter and code,” in which the affective quality experienced in viewing a film (i.e. the sensing of “the signaletic material”) becomes a folded experience. In the interface “[m]atter has become a substrate readable and accessible only in the third person, and the third person is a perspective rendered by the machine.” She interprets this technological rendering of the body positively. Like Benjamin and Deleuze before her, she acknowledges that the technological “impersonal process of subjectivity” contributes indeed to the definition of affect, but it is important to understand that information aesthetics operates with “expressive dearth” rather than excess.

To better understand the interface as a folding in the “the interstitial space between matter and code,” I would like to refer to Bill Viola’s description of video-artist Peter Campus’ method, created in the 1960s. Viola is inspired by Campus’ dissociation of the live surveillance camera from the eye and thereby making it “an extension of the room.” This statement can be exemplified in Campus’ installation *Interface* (1972). In this work the visitor entering the gallery room was filmed by a video camera positioned behind a big glass rectangle, which like a mirror reflected the visitor’s body. Thus, the mirror representation was doubled by the projected filmed representation of the same body, as the video camera formed a short circuit connection with a projector standing on the same side of the glass rectangle as the
Bill Viola comments on this and other works from Campus:

Video literally evokes the third person. Co-existing with one’s own self-image is an inherently paradoxical, tautological situation. Up to this point it had only been a philosophical conundrum described in literature, but now, with the advent of live camera, it was given palpable form. Through the new technology, Campus was able to experience himself from outside himself—to objectify his subjectivity and to directly engage his Double [ ... ].

So, in this way video art should also be acknowledged as an anticipation of contemporary interfaces as “a topological mapping of self as a pattern of microcompositions traversing the gaps between interiority and exteriority.” In fact, it is this interfacial folding between an actual body (experienced from the inside) and a virtual body (experienced from the outside), that for Munster paves the way for affective sensations “between sensing and rendering” and thus makes new media accessible to aesthetic creations of many kinds:

Affect arises relationally and is produced out of the difference between being in the body and representing/mapping the body from the outside. Affect sustains the singularity of sensing and of representing as a differential experience of embodiment, one in which alterity has a place. And in any interface between bodies and technology we will always encounter this difference. Informatic affect is a process of subjective bodily re-composition that occurs in relation to the alterity that pattern and code renderings open up for us.

Munster is inspired by Brian Massumi’s use of the term affect that theoretically derives from Deleuze’s readings of Spinoza. Therefore it is important to recall Massumi’s constant warning that affective sensations are not somehow directly related to new media interfaces producing 3D immersive sensations. On the contrary: affect can easily arise from analog art works and 2D relations, and Massumi seems to be favorably disposed towards haptic spaces and a “diaphanous surface that’s everywhere and nowhere at the same time, a dimensionless semblance of lived space.” What interactive art and interfaces can do according to Massumi is to “take a situation as its ‘object’ and open “micro-intervals” in creating “performative envelopes” or “dynamic or operative frame[s].”

I think it is reasonable to state that all manner of interfaces of new media has the potential to create affective encounters of many kinds. As long as a folding relation between in Munster’s words “being in the body and representing/mapping the body from the outside” is created, the way can be paved for new understandings of how identity patterns might be created in the new societies of control. The concept of “individuality” might, as Deleuze proposes, be replaced by “dividuality,” and this might be an improvement. Apart from the ability to create affective encounters within the folded operation of the signal, new electronic and digital media can also bring the sensation of affective involvement within the experience of the signal to the forefront. This can be done—as showed with the example of Jon Kessler’s One Hour Photo—by emphasizing the haptic surface experience.

**WHAT CHARACTERIZES THE SIGNAL?**

The photographic indexes and New York icons are transformed into digital video signals before our eyes in Jon Kessler’s One Hour Photo. It is the media transformation from sign to electronic signal that is the main aesthetic event in this work exploring the new haptic surface of user interfaces. In Peter Campus’ Interface, the folding operation of the interface is explored in a way that elucidates the affective involvement within the embodiment (an outside view is experienced from within and visa versa).

In his article “The Apparatus—a World unto itself,” Peter Weibel discusses how modern art (and especially the avant-garde) in the twentieth century has certainly been intrigued and inspired by the machine. The possibility of real-time transmissions of digitally encoded electronic signals has not only given access to the quality of the signal itself as a material that could be explored through the haptic surface. It has also given access to interfaces in which the real body can interfere with ones own body or other virtual bodies in “pure” real-time encounters in a hyperspace in which according to Deleuze “space [...] is born from time.” Such space is by now familiar to us. This space has no depth, since hyperspace is
constructed within the electronic time of the signal. However, the sensation of the signal might appear as haptic surface space in contemporary real-time transmission and art alike. If the proposed change from sign to signal has to be taken into account some profound theoretical issues surfaces. The signal and its operations has to be described in detail, and a media-archaeological perspective also have to substantiate how the prevalence of the linguistic sign was attributed to the Gutenberg galaxy, literary syntax and grammar, and the illusion of perspective of depth in painting. Modern Western civilization has obviously predominated by prioritizing the optic over the haptic and the individual over the “dividual.” In contemporary culture narration as a forthcoming, historical production of memory according to the operations of the sign has gradually been superseded by rhizomatic grids of modulating haptic surfaces. This has to be analyzed in relation to the a-syntactic transmissions of the electronic signal. The perspective of Western thinking based on a topologically centralized eye and corresponding gaze from the outside has to be reflected in relation to the new interfaces in which the image-screen has been replaced by affective folding between inside and outside. The everywhere and nowhere of perspective outside narration has been transformed to a quest for the “now-here” of the “live” man-machine interfaces. New kinds of sensations are changing individuals to “dividuals,” and the increasing, haptic noise of the signal deserves interpretation.
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