GREGORY CHATONSKY: A FICTION WITHOUT NARRATION

Any number can play. The tools are available. As director Werner Herzog has
enthused recently, with the means and digital models at hand any taxi driver can make his
or her own movie. *Each way she behaves seems to react to a different way*. Never the
same twice. There is a necessity, though, in what is put into play. In this time, and the
different modalities of this time. There are glimpses in the break-beats, the "hang-time"
and the "glitch-funk" in hiphop and electronica, and decades ago already in John
Coltrane's peculiar modal shifts.[1] Atmospheres full of what Burroughs called "nameless
divinities of dispersion and emptiness."[2] They are transitional or threshold states.
Thresholds that invite ritual scansions and breaths. As Australian media theorist Ross
Gibbon writes, "We need to know the times of our lives. 'Future cinema' can help us
that way."[3] Once these intervals produced were compared to a writing blotter, and then a
tape machine. Freud wrote of a "mystic writing pad." Like the earliest writing on
cuneiform tablets of clay and wax, a stylus makes its groove on the wax. To remove what
has been written, one merely pulls up the coverlet or cover sheet. The pad is then ready
for fresh inscriptions. The writing vanishes, each time, the sheet is pulled up and the wax
slab conserves the impression. For Freud, "This agrees with a notion I have long had
about the method in which the perceptual apparatus of our mind functions."[4] The
"writing pad" is a model at once of consciousness appearing, and disappearing, of
memory, of the 'unconscious,' of differential spacing as temporality. It is visibility that is
a flicker, a flash, a feeler. As Derrida wrote in his commentary on Freud's 1925 essay,

[1] Ross Gibbon. "The Time Will Come When…," in *Future Cinema*. Ed. Jeffrey Shaw
and Peter Weibel. Cambridge/Karlsruhe: MIT Press/ZKM, 2003. p. 571.
[2] William S. Burroughs. *The Cities of the Red Night*. New York: Holt, Rinehart &
Winston, 1981.
[3] Gibbon. "The Time Will Come When…" ibid.
[4] Sigmund Freud. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Works of Sigmund Freud*. Vol.
XIX. London: Hogarth Press, 1927. p. 231.

"Its *maintenance* is not simple." The pad is held with two hands. "The ideal virginity of the present (*maintenant*) is constituted by the work of memory. At least two hands are needed to make to make the apparatus function, as well as a system of gestures, a coordination of independent initiatives, an organized multiplicity of origins."[5] A complex enaction, in other words. The hands are an indication, if not an omen, that "we must be several in order to write, and even to 'perceive.'"[6] A teeming multiplicity results. *Each click produces a life*.

What Derrida elaborated as a writing or impossible arché-writing of the trace, Blanchot grappled with as version of the theory of Nietzsche's "eternal return." "*Everything comes again*" for Blanchot was bound up with all the logos of totality, the paradoxes of which he argued we do not possess the language, much as Nietzsche himself lapsed into silence. Nietzsche can only come after Hegel, but always before and always after Hegel he comes again and again. This Nietzsche must always come after, since this "eternal return" can only assume a completion of the full circle, of "time as present and its absolute destruction," so that the "eternal return," "affirming the future and the past as the only temporal authorities, authorities identical and unrelated, freeing the future of any present and the past of any presence, shatters thought up to this infinite affirmation: in the future will return infinitely what could in no form and never be present, in the same way that in the past that which, in the past, never belonged in any form to the present, has returned."[7] Only "writing" can respond to this exigency, but it is a "mad writing." In Derrida's phrase, "we are written only as we write."[8] This most radical exigency of the "return" is the profound disjunction that prevents any "identifying other than as the difference that repetition carries."[9] Yet this difference in Blanchot is not Derrida's trace as mark of present, or Freud's aid to memory, but rather a scansion, a suspension, "A movement, in any case, that has no preceding thing to which it relates and no term capable of determining it," freeing thought "from the primacy of signification

---

[5] Jacques Derrida. "Freud and the Scene of Writing," *Writing and Difference*. Trans. Alan Bass. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978. p. 226.
[6] Ibid.
[7] Maurice Blanchot. *The Step Not Beyond*. Trans. Lycette Nelson. Albany: State University of New York, 1992. p. 22.
[8] Derrida. *Writing and Difference*. p. 226.
[9] Blanchot. *The Step Not Beyond*. p. 16.

understood either as light or as the retreat of light," liberating it from the "exigency of unity…since writing is difference, since difference writes."[10] *All this has already happened.*

Other writings of Blanchot's at times perhaps better evoke this blanched writing as a platform, or launching pad.[11] Since we are increasingly in a period – as Blanchot described "either as light or as the retreat of light"—receding from these human-centered depictions. Despite all the profound advances in thinking and comprehending difference we find here, and the immense shedding and delimitation of traditional metaphysical thought, it is difficult for these literatures of the trace and differentiation, to move toward the positivity of self-organization, to really broach the issue of "material self-ordering" in all its fullness.[12] Since just about all of the phenomena of networked daily life, from the bailout of U.S. and world investment banks in the fall of '08 to Internet spam or identity-theft, call on one to do, to think, or experiment with philosophy,[13] this is not a matter for the seminar room. If it is increasingly difficult to separate our 'selves' from the images we are or see, it is because our very being is wrapped up in multi-dimensionalities of time, scansions of the body that perhaps 'traditional' cultures were more prescient in recognizing and organizing their existence around.[14] It is at least premature, if not silly, to speak of the death of cinema, Gilles Deleuze maintained decades ago, because "the

[10] Maurice Blanchot. *The Infinite Conversation*. Trans. Susan Hanson. Minneapolis; University of Minnesota Press, 1993. p. 165.
[11] Maurice Blanchot. *The Space of Literature*. Trans. Ann Smock. Lincoln/London: University of Nebraska Press, 1983.
[12] John Protevi. *Political Physics*. London/New York: The Athlone Press, 2001. p. 82. This is true since Derrida "performs the labour necessary to shake free of millennia of philosophical idealism, thus moving us from the pretensions of the cultural stratum to the point where a Deleuzean investigation of the material forces of all strata can begin." Ibid. p. 2. So despite these advances of 'deconstruction,' it falls short particularly in thinking "the ontology needed for mid-range complexity theory work (the notions of phase space, attractors, bifurcators, emergent effects, and so on) that Deleuze's notion of the virtual enables us to think." ibid. n. 13 p. 203.
[13] Alexander R. Galloway and Eugene Thacker. *The Exploit*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007. p. 13.
[14] José Gil. *Metamorphoses of the Body*. Trans. Stephen Muecke. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998. In a similar fashion, the resources of indigenous or 'traditional' societies can also offer 'political' and 'social' alternatives, or at least actionable insights, if we are open to them. See for instance the essays in David Graeber. *Possibilities*. Edinburgh/Oakland: AK Press, 2007.

cinema is at the beginning of an exploration of audiovisual relations, which are relations of time."[15] And we are at the beginning again. *Another world can start.* Notwithstanding all the pedigreed precedents and prefigurations, however disparate, that take on renewed relevance in the digital age, whether Mallarmé's silence, or Artaud's ritual screams, the white writing or telling fragment in Alain Robbe-Grillet, the "movement of the interminable"[16] in a text like Nathalie Sarraute's *Tropisms* (1957), the spirals of Blanchot's own *récits* that often seem to have the sense of altered states, [17] technologies have moved the game into different paradigms and endgames.[18] One can differ on how well contemporary pundits or thinkers have responded to this post-Gutenberg situation. George P. Landow and Gregory Ulmer, for example, argued that Derrida's line of thinking already reflected "an internalization of the electronic media."[19] Yet marking metaphysical closures is one task, waiting and paying attention to sensory and perceptual associations and fluxes another, and then there is what Félix Guattari termed "the 'futurist' and 'constructivist' opening up of the fields of virtuality."[20] It is the vital role of artistic activity, if not Guattari's "aesthetic paradigm," to re-create just about every interconnected, and networked activity, indicating what Chatonsky has called a type of *economie 0,* for the moment located both within and without the properly denominated economy, where new relationships beyond the usual parameters of value find their

---

[15] Gilles Deleuze, "The Brain is the Screen: An Interview with Gilles Deleuze," in *The Brain is the Screen: Deleuze and the Philosophy of Cinema*. Ed. Gregory Flaxman. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000. p. 372.

[16] Blanchot's phrase in *The Infinite Conversation*. p. 344.

[17] George Quasha and Charles Stein, "Afterword: Publishing Blanchot in America," in *The Station Hill Blanchot Reader*. Ed. George Quasha. Barrytown: Station Hill Press, 1999. p. 522.

[18] Just one example would be the dynamic capacity and promise of open source/access and archiving via digitalization and the world-wide web to completely transform academia, the university, and the nature of research. See Gary Hall. *Digitize This Book!* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008.

[19] Gregory Ulmer. *Applied Grammatology*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1985. p. 303. Similarly, Landow wrote of the "digitalized, hypertextual Derrida"of *Glas* and *Of Grammatology*, see Landow. *Hypertext*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1992. p. 2.

[20] Félix Guattari. *The three ecologies*. Trans. Ian Pindar and Paul Sutton. London/New Brunswick: Athlone Press, 2000. p. 38.

generation.[21] The forms taken by this organization of multiplicities constructing and adapting their own thoroughgoing self-valorization, cannot be adequately defined in advance, *apriori*, but rather "always in the heat of action – in a process that is the process of human *action* itself."[22]

Chatonsky's contribution is to move these issues through relations of time, through an enaction, at once ordinary, quotidian, and profoundly revelatory. "What does memory look like?" Elizabeth Bard wrote of Chatonsky's work, "Not a memory, but the system we use to catalogue and to recall flickering moments or precious feelings…it looks a lot like the Internet."[23] Like lines of some of Leslie Scalapino's recent poetry that seem to go so far beyond the 6 x 9" page as to require an infinite space for extension – as the late American Zen poet Philip Whalen commented of her work, "She makes everything take place in real time…everything happening at once"[24]—we're placed in positions of present navigation and decision constantly starting over and beginning again with another deck, negotiating infinite folds. Individual actions and occurrences in the "world" – confabulations of "inner" and "outer" – fold out in all their simultaneity, multiplicity, and anonymity. Chatonsky seems to suggest we cannot help our auto-grammatizations, our myth-making, the detours through habit and archaisms, the daily, preconscious constructions of sense – we like our stories and our coffee in the morning – while making us as aware as possible of their machinations and mechanisms, their profound dependence on movement, and ultimately of their auto-construction, since in the modes of interactivity of a Chatonsky work, we must build up our own scaffolding, leading to even further perceptions. In sketching the outlines for an ecology of the imaginary, or a "mental ecology," Guattari limned some of the same conditions – "Pure creative auto-reference is impossible in the apprehension of ordinary existence…These

---

[21] See the collection of activities at http://incident.net/theupgrade.economie0/

[22] Antonio Negri. *The Porcelain Workshop*. Trans. Noura Wedell. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2008. p. 137.

[23] Elizabeth Bard, "Phantom of the Metro," *Contemporary Magazine* at "Press," www.incident.net/users/gregory/.

[24] See the poems from "DeLay Rose, " in Leslie Scalapino. *It's Go in Horizontal: Selected Poems, 1974-2006*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008. A similar intricate and intertwined melding of action of subject and object is what distinguishes the long poem "What" by Ron Silliman from being merely extended free association. See Ron Silliman. *What*. Great Barrington: The Figures, 1988.

focal points of creative subjectification in their nascent state can only be accessed by the detour of a phantasmatic economy that is deployed in a random form."[25] A random form, Chatonsky would likely add, that is combinatory and recombinatory. That radiates and flickers with the perception of time. *A young woman is in her room. She seems sick. Sometimes she looks better.* Revolving around the mystery of the inner and outer, perhaps at once prompting the greatest *mystere,* that of Nietzsche's cry "There is no outside!" So this art still mimes some of the earliest arts, like those of the sundial, while its radical flux takes one out of *l'habitude* of most multi-media work. Chatonsky is utilizing the means at hand in an electronic age of cyberspace and the Internet, while illustrating Michel Serres' point that all relations of subject and object are interdependent and dynamic systems of time, of *durée*. Serres uses the example of the first philosopher Thales measuring the shadow of a pyramid at a particular time of day. For Serres this is representing, in geometry, the interdependent relationship between an object at rest (pyramid) and an object in motion (the sun). In enacting measurement as the tempo of this relationship, Thales has made of math a narrative. Thus these activities of (subjective) narration and objective correlates or processes such as motion, are intimately and interactively connected. Narrating and literal navigation at a certain point become indistinguishable, or rather a group or sequence of *liens,* a series of interactive encounters conditioned by their relations of time.[26] Another way of saying this is envoking Francisco Varela's "virtual self," that self defined as "the cognitive self is its own implementation: its history and its action are of one piece."[27]

---

[25] Guattari. *The three ecologies*. p. 57.

[26] Michel Serres, Bruno Latour. Ed. *Conversations on Science, Culture and Time*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995. p. 117. For Serres' example of Thales, see *Hermes: Literature, Science and Philosophy*. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1982. p. 90. For the usefulness of Serres' understanding for contemporary media art and practices, in terms of multi-temporal navigation and movement, "the dynamic potentiality of utilizing complex interrelationships between diverse durational components…of interactive post-processing in terms of this bond," see Neil Brown, Dennis Del Favero, Jeffrey Shaw, Peter Weibel, "Interactive Narrative as Multi-Temporal Agency, "in *Future Cinema*. p. 314.

[27] Francisco J. Varela. *Ethical Know-How*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999. p. 54.

In Chatonsky's *oeuvre* it is movement that is provoked, as Bruno Latour has written, "It is *traveling* from one frame to the next that we want to achieve."[28] Yet this is far from, say, the Futurist infatuation with the brutalism of sheer speed, a kind of blind movement, rather it has to do with creating and following affective and perceptual tonalities, with connectivity, with what has been described as the processual paradigms of self-ordering. Although each Chatonsky work plunges one into emergence, he often starts with the building blocks of a given story or narrative, whether that is lines from the microblogs of Twitter, or a film like Sidney Lumet's *Twelve Angry Men* (1957*)*. As he wrote in notes for the Internet-based *Incident of the last century 1999, sampling Sarajevo* (1999),

> What is recounted history? To decide that this indecision is interactivity, not as technique, but as new affectivity…To experiment through an interactive récit which is not the "book in which you are the hero" founded through subjectivity, it allows rather to understand the anonymity which we traverse, the neuter. To forget the arborescence which supposes a master. To conceive only of fragments detached one from the others, like our body, and which are able, as the machine decides to connect itself indifferently from some to others.[29]

It is often from a kind of accumulation, the self-activity of moving from given to constructed elements, or items more obviously in flux, that we become aware of our own programs, if not our depthlessness. *The internet user can find pieces of an history*. Instead of Godard's a girl and a gun as the basic variables, in *Sur Terre* (2005) Chatonsky provides three characters, a station, and a train. Characteristic of much of Chatonsky's work, there is a "base," in this instance, derived from nearly 900,000 media fragments from railway transport archives, that when allied with or generated from Internet programs produces an infinite, aleatory stream. Certain plateaus coalesce, then dissolve again. The torn photographs, the individuations of the 'characters' – the user is invited to the links, and to make the links. These dialectics of presence and absence and gesture can be defined down, as in *Amateurs* (2005), where there is an analytic of vision, but unlike the Straubs or Godard's Dziga Vertov Group or early work with television, it is primarily an analytic of affects. It serves to place one in the manifold, much like a certain trajectory

---

[28] Bruno Latour. *Reassembling the Social*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. p. 186.
[29] Gregory Chatonsky, notes on *Incident of the last century 1999, sampling Sarajevo* (1999).

of visual yet performative work from Robert Morris to Warren Neidich. *Each one of our lives is another life*. Chatonsky's work gives force to the user in multiple manners, as in the Internet-based installation *1+1 + 1+ 1+1+1+1+1+1+1+1* (2004), where the viewer can edit *Twelve Angry Men* according to the seat of their character in the film, their position as viewer/character, or *1=1* (2004), where the viewer in front of a split-screen version of David Lynch's *Lost Highway* (1997), itself featuring a "double" as the lead actress takes two roles (Renee Madison/Alice Wakefield), can edit the film as they please. There is an extraordinary French tradition of treating the double, from Alfred Jarry to Raymond Roussel and the treachery of the "virtual" double in Artaud's theater manifestoes. But Chatonsky brings to bear the "virtual" face of the contemporary double, much as in Katherine Hayles' sense that "not only our world but the great cosmos itself is a vast computer and that we are the programs that it runs."[30] What Varela described as the "nonsubstantial self that acts as if it were present, like a *virtual interface*."[31]

That this "virtual interface" takes the form of fictions is part of the demonstration-lesson of a work like *Sous Terre* (2000), made for the centenary celebration of the Paris Metro system. The thousands upon thousands of archival material and documents – on various themes and incidents, stations and travelers – surpass any attempt to traverse them. At once a sort of documentary or "technological sublime,"[32] in navigating the profusion of *Sous Terre* the participant/viewer is led into forming their own field/ground relations, enacting a kind of intimacy with the various encounters, the labyrinth of themselves. Here what is enacted is a melancholy movement of a collective memory and forgetting. A line of text starts the journey – "When I traveled on the subway as a child, I put on small shows to make the travelers laugh" – but this suggested narrative is more a mnemonic trigger, a network to activate other potential and infinite networks. Playing off the five year difference between the birth of the Metro and the cinema, Chatonsky creates a dream-like alternation between intimacy and distance, while relations of image and word often fuse. While *Sous Terre* doesn't fail to act as an archive, and even invites

---

[30] N. Katherine Hayles. *How We Became Posthuman*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999. p. 239.
[31] Varela. *Ethical Know-How*. p. 61. Italics in original.
[32] Jeremy Gilbert-Rolfe. *Beauty and the Contemporary Sublime*. New York: Allworth Press, 1999.

viewers to email in their own Metro memories and encounters, it also de-realizes the "actual" Metro which transforms into the imaginary *derive* and *drift* of a contemporary *flaneur*. Frenetic exchange combined with strange suspensions of silence – this was also characteristic of Chatonsky's *Flussgeist/L'attente* series (2007), at once a portrait of globalized social reality and an experience of that reality splayed into a virtual field. In this instance 900 discrete videos of different Parisian railway stations and phrases and images culled from Twitter and Flickr provided the given elements for an Internet-generated field that gave way to varying tempos and dramas in differential and real time. In the tradition of Lautréamont's advocacy of plagiarism (at least in its use of found elements), or Rimbaud's experiment with advertising jingles, its effect was the product of what Chatonsky calls the "*impossible accord*"[33] of juggling the disequilibrium accentuated in an image culture. If the patternings in relations of time can often have an entrancing effect in such a work, the effects are even more dramatic perhaps in another work of de-realization like the photographies of *Hisland* (2008). Triggered by the given in this case of a single fingerpint, processed by Chatonsky's interactive installation *I just don't know* (2008), the fingerprint activates a program which automates a visual and cinematic fiction, with overtones of travel, of glacial forests and ice fields.

All this plumbs the poetry of the "ghosts" in our "machines," sometimes in a more direct fashion, as in his *Revenances* (2000). *The memory of a life, pictures of anonymous persons which seems to belong to another time*. Again, it is the quotidian, unsigned happenstances, or interstices, the links that provide the hooks – a phone call, a nondescript apartment. *Only lines that can be crossed*. What we are in the presence of is not so much a new thinking of the "outside," in Foucault's sense that "the being of language only appears for itself with the disappearance of the subject,"[34] as positing it in electronic media. So what we have is an updated ontological investigation of our ongoing fragility, what Foucault described writing of Blanchot's novels and *récits* and criticism as "a listening less to what is articulated in language than to the void circulating between its words, to the murmur that is forever taking it apart…the fiction of the invisible space in

---

[33] http://incident.net/users/gregory/wordpress/06-laffect-de-art/
[34] Michel Foucault, "Maurice Blanchot: The Thought from Outside," in *Foucault/Blanchot*. Trans. Brian Massumi. New York: Zone Books, 1990. p. 15.

which it appears."[35] An interrogation of "who are we now?" There are many attempts to trace this new subjectivation, to grid it, and manipulate it, to be sure, or name it (as in Spinoza's "common name") as a "multitude" or "commons," what Negri calls the "cooperative constitution of the real."[36] Chatonsky's sociology is an affective one, one of many "peoples." His various stints at "anachronic cinema" invite this absent or "new people." *Their number increase with every visit, they are a people*. Chatonsky brings up to date Rimbaud's "*Je est un autre*" in the collective memory and fluid movement of the Internet present – *Each one of our lives is another life*. The life of the cinema, Deleuze claimed, "depends on its internal struggle with informatics."[37] In Chatonsky's work, for all his formidable intellectual chops, this is not such a cerebral affair, but one of shifting affects and percepts, evoking a response. This response, in Deleuze's account of any artistic creation, invokes a "people," however enigmatic and ambiguous its form. For instance, "you write with a view to an unborn people that doesn't yet have an language."[38] It's the greatest artists, Deleuze claimed, who must invoke, and find they lack, "a people."[39]

Not simply due to new media technologies, but exploring the modalities they allow, Chatonsky reveals a "people" in all their anonymous, paradoxical self-construction. It is a context brought on by multiple ruptures, heterogeneities that "cross the thresholds that constitute one world at the expense of another."[40] These fragments, catalytic details, elements of what Guattari defined as "a-signifying points of rupture" – logos speeding across the screen, a hand reaching for a phone receiver, a now intimately close Metro passenger – are all capable to prompt the "production of a partial subjectivity."[41] For Guattari, such "symptoms" or refrains can begin a "proto-subjectivity," much as Julia Kristeva has claimed that details uttered on a psychoanalyst's

---

[35] Ibid. pp. 25-6.
[36] Negri. *The Porcelain Workshop*. p. 75.
[37] Gilles Deleuze. *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*. Trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Robert Galeta. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989. p. 270.
[38] Gilles Deleuze. *Negotiations*. Trans. Martin Joughlin. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995. p. 143.
[39] Ibid. p. 174.
[40] Guattari. *The three ecologies*. p. 54.
[41] Ibid. p. 56.

couch or scenes glimpsed from TV dramas may be banal, but are continuations nonetheless as architectural fragments from the great cathedrals, since the same function of the imaginary is involved.[42] This sort of oceanic collapsing of public and private, its possible integrations, and bifurcations, or sort of existential "breaks," in the "psyche" of the viewer, is the very function of a work like *E'tat du monde* (2008), where CNN feeds in "real time" determine the more or less ill stage of the woman who appears, changes, and dissolves. *As the day goes by she has trouble breathing, she calms down and then she stands and collapses.* We become our own event horizon. By grasping onto certain "keywords," and flotsam of the "real," we are forced to navigate ourselves. Perhaps the scansion here is a tightrope thrown over the chasm between the flailing "structure," still dominated by loops of feedback, and dreams of "eternal return," and an even more groundless chaosmodic folding that we can only glimpse now – one that promises an unpredictable emergence, more threatened, and enveloped, by catastrophe, accident, the abrupt finitude of death, than by Baudelaire's yearning for infinity.[43] This is a perpetual sort of difference unleashed by a fuller autopoiesis, "based on disequilibrium, the prospection of Virtual universes far from equilibrium."[44] We can only begin to sketch out the "radical ontological reconversion" involved, and the various forms of complementaries it relies upon, relations of alterity and *enoncé* of neither God nor man, yet still a proto-subjectivity, or "proto-subjective diagram."[45] *We do not live on the network*. A language for what or who do not yet have a language, as in poet Bob Perelman's "birth and existence as if the body/moving made spaces it could understand."[46] Chatonsky unveils that future, already present, where "alterity and

[42] Catherine Francblin, "Interview with Julia Kristeva," *Flash Art* 126. p. 45.
[43] Charles Baudelaire. "Hymn to Beauty,"*Flowers of Evil*. Ed. by Marthiel and Jackson Matthews. New York: New Directions, 1955. pp. 30-1.
[44] Félix Guattari. *Chaosmosis*. Trans. Paul Bains and Julian Pefanis. Bloomington/Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1995. p. 37.
[45] Ibid.
[46] Bob Perelman. "A Literal Translation of Virgil's Fourth Eclogue," *Virtual Reality*. New York: Roof Books, 1993. p. 80.

intimacy have been expanded to the point of recursive interpenetration."[47] No navigation but ourselves.

from: Gregory Chatonsky: Capture. Orléans: HXY Editions, 2009.

---

[47] Francisco J. Varela. "Intimate Distances: Fragments for a phenomenology of organ transplantation," *Journal of Consciousness Studies* 8 no. 5-7 (2001): 259-271. p. 271.