

POOL

**Fuck 6 Women Per Week Guaranteed:
Pornography Advertising as Mainstream Content Cycle**

By Erik Stinson

In my recent essay *Idea Porn and the Age of Obscure Commodity*, I tried to undermine the fashionable singularity of compelling visual information. I tried to attach the valuable infographic to a condition in which an infographic might be a wonderful currency in the bargain for our psychic health.

Now, I would like to focus on a different user experience journey: pornography. In his essay “The Ecstasy of Communication,” Baudrillard writes:

“[T]oday the scene and mirror no longer exist; instead, there is a screen and network. In place of the reflexive transcendence of mirror and scene, there is a nonreflecting surface, an immanent surface where operations unfold—the smooth operational surface of communication.”

He speaks of media functioning, and of the obscurity of the functioning. He understands how modern media can be violent and cool and calm, all at once.

Pornography does not flow from the same origin as hyper-graphic information (hyper being the intensified, hyperlinked infographic). Here, there is a smoother purpose, something sweet and playful, though still screen-based. Pornography is the sexual tradition of moving images. It is theatrical – it pulls with a different rhetoric. The motives behind pornography are clearer, less political, maybe.

And yet, there is something very emergent in the way pornography is being digested en masse, in the form of online porn aggregation. The forum where images of sex appear, free of change and with a vast variety, is a recent construction with perhaps no precursor. These websites – xtube, redtube and youporn among others – collect and distribute clips of full length pornographic films, making revenue from advertising which appears both as content and as Flash banner ads to the side of the video frame.

Ostensibly there is a quality of amateurism in these sites. There is something tantalizing about a free exchange of smut. As Zabet Patterson writes in *Going Online: Consuming Pornography In a Digital Era*, “The amateur subgenre most significantly engages with the opportunities for ‘interaction’ and ‘self-production’ offered by the Internet.”

A theorist might see the opportunity to merge reality with fantasy – a typical porn user will be aware of the ways porn conventions carefully separate the two sexual poles.

The problem with this potential-of-amateur-web-porn observation: not much porn seems to be amateur. There might be instances of people uploading their own home-made porn. However, the vast majority of clips

appear to be somewhat produced. Many are explicitly the work of exterior paysites. So, the separation of fantasy and reality remains intact, even in 2011 (ha poststructuralists!). What may be deteriorating is the separation between content and corporation. Let me focus on this point.

The line between content, content creation, and advertising is becoming blurry in an unsettling new way. These porn collection sites actually replace every traditional node in a media consumption ecosystem with two fundamental locations: search and upload. Baudrillard might still try to call these functions “screen and network” but we understand he was thinking – in the widest possible sense – about media interaction. Both nodes are selling, neither nodes involve a sale. Sexually speaking, it’s an economic disaster waiting to happen. Lots of screens, lots of buttons with nice gradients, not a lot of money changing hands – but we still get off.

Behind the search function is the individuals desire for a specific content. For example, a certain fetish might impel someone to search for a specific kind of content, like green alien porn. The search is accomplished and clips appear. Most of these clips will be ads for full-length films.

The upload function has been accomplished by the makers of alien porn. We will call them professionals because they hired talent, rented cameras, and attempted to follow the porn laws in their remote municipality. They provide these images, with the hope that we will pay for others.

But what if we never pay? What if the alien porn clip does the trick? What if we never visit the paysite?

Or, more pressingly, isn’t this exactly how YouTube works?

It’s a devastating model for media, and pornography is at the forefront. The line between advertising and content disappears and we become accustomed to the free stream of images – the paywall is never crossed. The entire porn search aggregation system actually conditions us to accept the sell as the product; in the same way, the music video becomes a satisfying replacement for the vinyl album.

It’s happening in porn because our culture doesn’t value sex – or rather – banishes it to the far reaches of the deleted browser history. We don’t feel great about watching porn – so we accept this brave new media model. Will acceptance in this area fuel a total distortion of traditional media venues? Will the cinema ads at beginning of feature films begin to lengthen until the feature itself is an end to the story of consumption offered by the endless series of sponsor motiongraphics?

Probably not.

Tumblr actually ends most of the anxiety arguments concerning the degradation of media quality. And Tumblr is just a visual version of Napster. People like quality enough to steal it. They hate marketing enough to avoid it whenever they can. Tumblr solves the spiritual problem of content-as-advertising, without solving the economic one. Napster did

POOL

the same thing with music, ensuring a level of quality by making everything accessible, but at the same time destroying the business model for all paid media.

Porn aggregation locates a venue for a hyperdense advertising model – a model only sustainable because the content being sought is so objectionable, so taboo. (Are you smiling as you read that? Can we really say porn is taboo anymore?) [Formerly] taboo subjects offer advertisers a window into a world where they can do whatever they want, fashion entire landscapes of fantasy and consumer conditioning. They get a pass, for now, because we haven't completely come to terms with porn, as a culture.

Porn isn't meaningless or marginal. It's a modern user experience journey, like any other. We click a link and search for a term. Eventually we are satisfied. In the process, we change the way the world functions, we change our relationship to people and images.

**A Discussion of Mimesis on the Polder-net or:
You Have No Chance to Survive Make Your Time**

By Jordan Tate

When one thinks about mimesis in its classical context, bereft of the weight of the memes and tropes that pervade internet culture, it is apparent that the contemporary idea of mimesis is not necessarily conducive to the critical engagement with internet based / internet aware / post-internet works of art.

In the classical sense, mimesis was adaptive. Contemporary mimetics, as defined by Richard Dawkins, rests on an analogy of Darwinian evolutionary theory, yet is presented within the context of reproduction/replication. The Greeks viewed mimesis differently, as more of a translation (albeit with the aim of reproduction) than the contagious spread of discrete packets of cultural currency. To an extent, the structure of contemporary computing works against the evolution of data, yet excels at the dissemination and replication of information. With the transmission and replication of data so readily available, the traditional ideas of mimesis have been usurped by the internet-epidemic model of akin to the spread of Zero Wing from 2000/02.

Across the board, autocorrect, spell-checker, and program based dictionaries suggest that I write Internet rather than internet. As such, It is important to establish how the internet specifically functions in the context of this argument. A more appropriate distinction would be to define the internet as one (of many) subsets of the Internet. For example, while there is ostensibly only one Internet that is the vast sea of networked computers and server farms; functionally, there are a multitude of internets each with their own aesthetic, concerns, and semiotics (contemporary examples are 4chan, tumblr, etc.) I argue that the appropriate structure for this discussion must allow individual internets to be represented as isolated entities with individual character, yet still be connected to the broader Internet.

Enter the polder model, and the idea of the internet-polder. A polder is defined as “a low-lying tract of land enclosed by embankments (barriers) known as dikes, that forms an artificial hydrological entity, meaning it has no connection with outside water other than through manually-operated devices.”²¹ In short, the structure of the internet-polder places the role and function of individual/isolated internets within the context of an artificially enclosed system that is (and this is an important distinction from an island) isolated, rather than elevated, from the Internet. By placing memes and mimesis in the context of the polder model, we can explore and illuminate the context of the concerns of the internet while simultaneously positioning the Internet as a necessary collective space for these mimetic, temporal, and dynamic inquiries into the form, structure, and purpose of media.

The isolated nature of the internet polder allows for, and encourages, a reasonably unified voice or aesthetic that can promote significant critical dialogue – or serve to homogenize dissenting voices and shift mimesis away from its evolutionary context. While synchronicity is an undenia-

POOL

ble phenomenon, the chorus of these voices can often emerge as a single note without regard to the subtle differences that distinguish one work from another. However, if the concern of any single voice fails to reach critical mass afforded to it by the weight of the polder (and other similar voices), it becomes difficult to engage in a discussion of the cultural significance of those ideas.

The danger lies in the fact that the internet has the potential to exaggerate our worst tendencies, forcing us into seeking constant self-validation, turning chorus into collective consciousness, mimesis into meme and potentially brilliant ideas into punchlines. This pattern threatens to turn a dialogue of what is allowed into the canon of contemporary art into the easily disregarded trope of “Greek New Media Shit.”²² The transition of mimesis to meme potentially ignores the validity of this work, and silencing more thoughtful criticisms that occur in comment threads (the internet’s most liminal spaces). This is not to say that memes are bad, but they can a black hole for critical inquiry; focusing on on small packets of easily reproducible content.

Sterling Crispin’s archive (Greek New Media Shit) is the perfect example of the propagation of meme over mimesis. While Crispin, Brian Droitcor, and the plethora of contributors to the comment thread of *It’s Only Humanist*, have approached the ideas of greek new media shit (quotes omitted) deftly, the primary export from this internet-polder is the diluted critique of contemporary art that takes the form of technologically mediated busts, devoid of the potential of the rich theoretical implications of this trope. As was the case with *Zero Wing*, a poor translation can lead to the viral spread of content but often does not do justice to the sophistication or intent of the original work.

A basic structure:

CAPTAIN: WHAT HAPPEN?

MECHANIC: SOMEBODY SET UP US THE BOMB

OPERATOR: WE GET SIGNAL.

CAPTAIN: WHAT!

OPERATOR: MAIN SCREEN TURN ON.

CAPTAIN: IT’S YOU!!

CATS: HOW ARE YOU GENTLEMEN!!

CATS: ALL YOUR BASE ARE BELONG TO US.

CATS: YOU ARE ON THE WAY TO DESTRUCTION.

CAPTAIN: WHAT YOU SAY!!

POOL

CATS: YOU HAVE NO CHANCE TO SURVIVE MAKE YOUR TIME.

CATS: HA HA HA HA

1. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Polder>

2. <http://rhizome.org/editorial/2011/aug/17/its-only-humanist/>

Reciprocity in the Age of Reversal and New Public Spheres

By Robert John

When talking about reciprocity within the web, we are talking about dialectical exchange between people viewed as equals. Baudrillard's "Requiem for the Media", a critique of Enzensberger's "Constituents of a Theory of the Media", poses a starting point from which we may begin to understand how to better organize social structures within the web for reciprocity. Baudrillard disagrees with Enzensberger's notion that the reversal of transmitter-receiver relationships using media technologies will allow for reciprocity. It is not enough to just change who can transmit messages, we must change the very way in which messages are transmitted.

1. The Reversal of Transmitter-Receiver Dynamics

The reversal of transmitter-receiver dynamics has already occurred with the rise of blogs, Youtube, and the like, allowing everyone a free means to produce messages and distribute information. 4chan's users regularly produce content that circulates the internet independent of any standardized production or acknowledged authorship. The group Anonymous circulates messages and organizes direct action campaigns without central leadership or an authoritative source of distribution. There are blogs on every subject, from every point of view, pet grooming to radical politics. This has not necessarily opened up web platforms to true communicative exchange though.

Reversibility provides for the same attention economy present in big media on an individual scale. Often we see bloggers compete for views; and if not for ad cash, then for reputation. Content becomes reductive, slick images, conversations of quick quotes and quips or copy-pasted text, video meant to shock or amaze. This reduction is certainly not universal but it does represent a rather grim norm. A billion opinions ejaculated into the void. A billion screaming voices asking to be looked at, demanding to be taken into account. Everyone has their soapbox and having seen these dynamics opened, Baudrillard's insistence that, "reversibility has nothing to do with reciprocity,"¹ now holds more truth than ever.

Everyone having a voice doesn't necessarily mean we are talking with each other and it certainly doesn't guarantee anyone is listening. Free access has little to do with interest. A multitude of sites and freedom of choice creates inequalities in whose voice is noted and whose is not. Searching for any news worthy event leads us more often than not to several pages of mainstream news organizations take on the event. It takes a good bit of digging to find an actual individual's blog post on the same event. The argument has been made that what "matters" on the web will float to the top of discussion. Content is democratized thus allowing reciprocity, we hear, votes are made with comment rating, hyperlinks, and bounce rate.

When done through comment rating we see further reduction as a comment is decontextualized from its original place in a discussion. Speech

on the internet needs to be left intact and historized even if that history is only two hours old. It would seem ridiculous IRL to reduce an entire night of discussion to a few simple comments everyone involved liked. Comment rating allows users to push what they like to the top but it doesn't encourage dialogue between users. It, in fact, fractures dialogue in its reduction of discourse to a few quotes. Often these comments prove to be the type of quick sentiments that tie together popular opinion or bait a fruitless argument. Neither outcome encourages reciprocity.

Hyperlinks as votes seem equally ridiculous and fragmentative. Voices of individuals in referencing their points and facts ultimately hyperlink to larger voices of institutions and media giants which with systems like PageRank in turn increases the search engine rank of the large voices and pushes individual voices further back.

The information we can gather about a site from its bounce rate is equally useless unless the bounce rate is extraordinarily high, meaning it provided none of the information just about everyone who stumbled on to it was looking for. Bounce rate is determined by dividing the number of users who only visit one page on a site and then leave the site over the number of pages on a site. This also means sites with less content but the same number of bounces as a site with more content get a lower bounce rate. Bounce rate is great for marketing purposes but extremely poor in establishing content value to a user. A site providing valuable essays or individual opinion is over looked because people visit it for specific content or conversation on a page and leave, returning later for other content and conversation. Value is subjective but bounce rate fails to aid in addressing what a particular user may value in a site, or the sites relevance to a search.

Content is thus not democratized but structurally monopolized through these systems. Reciprocity is not created, and exchange is abstracted at all points of access. When dealing with the web it is hard to speak in such generalizations, when everything has an exception. Wikipedia has surely democratized its content. All users have the ability to be editors and debate focus of content. Wikipedia is also well moderated though too. Wikipedia has become a part of many people's interactions with the web, so its entries usually get a high search rank. Wikipedia is definitely not the entire web though. However, democratization in platforms is a step towards reciprocity.

2. Two Views on the Public Sphere

Democratization (and even the illusion of democratization) within the web brings about a Public Sphere of the web. Jurgen Habermas sees the public sphere as force enabling participatory democracy as citizens engage in discourse of public matters. A Kierkegaardian perspective on the Public Sphere critiques the public as ignorant, lacking responsibility and disinterested in committed action. These two poles hold their own truths when put the question of internet reciprocity and the role of a Public Sphere.

Habermas believes the Public Sphere to be the space rooted in the history of Enlightenment reasoning and 18th century culture with the rise of the press, social clubs and coffeehouses.² This culture was prime for critical analysis and discussion of public matters. The rise of mass media however, he sees as turning this this active critical Public Sphere to a passive consumer sphere. Habermas' Public Sphere is based around an active, critical, and educated populace. Democratic society requires this Public Sphere to hold it's government accountable and citizenship engaged. Reciprocity is a necessity in Habermas' Public Sphere.

The Habermas Public Sphere is guided by rules laid out in his Ideal Speech Situation. These rules—though basic—set about the framework of reciprocity for Habermas:

1. Every subject with the competence to speak and act is allowed to take part in a discourse.
 - 2a. Everyone is allowed to question any assertion whatever.
 - 2b. Everyone is allowed to introduce any assertion whatever into the discourse.
 - 2c. Everyone is allowed to express his attitudes, desires and needs.
3. No speaker may be prevented, by internal or external coercion, from exercising his rights as laid down in (1) and (2)³

These rules, at first glance, appear to justify most internet speech as the Ideal Speech Situation. Every user has the literal competence to speak; through commenting, posting videos, writing blogs, etc. Everyone with a computer can participate in the internet, question or assert whatever they want by the same means. There exist plenty of platforms for expressing attitudes, desires and needs too. Also no one can be barred from the entirety of the internet. However, once again we find that this is not reciprocity. The Ideal Speech Situation applies to *dialectical* participation not simply participation.

When establishing these rules Habermas neglected to install responsibilities to his discourse, for there to be reciprocity, speech and the responsibility of response are required. If engaged in discourse among competent users we have a responsibility, not simply to other users, but to the notion of reciprocity to respond actively to questions and assertions of others. This is particularly true if these questions and assertions are made on our points and opinions.

Habermas sees structure as primarily responsible for deciding how members of the Public Sphere interact. He blames mass media for the disintegration of his 18th century rooted Public Sphere and ignores any personal responsibility that could be leveled on members of the Public Sphere individually. He sees, much like Ezensberger, new media and technological structures as his Public Sphere's saving grace for their communicative and networking possibilities. While structures encourage and deter

particular interaction this does not remove responsibility of a public's chosen interaction within a structure, especially not in the case of a voluntary structure such as the internet. In all forms of communication the quality of discourse and reciprocity has to be leveled upon the individual members, despite structural inequalities and deterrents to this end.

Kierkegaard first recognized a lack of responsibility and quality in his view of the Public Sphere which Hubert Dreyfus insightfully points out in his essay on why Kierkegaard would hate the internet,

“The public sphere thus promotes ubiquitous commentators who deliberately detach themselves from the local practices out of which specific issues grow and in terms of which these issues must be resolved through some sort of committed action. What seems a virtue to detached Enlightenment reason, therefore, looks like a disastrous drawback to Kierkegaard. The public sphere is a world in which everyone has an opinion on and comments on all public matters without needing any first-hand experience and without having or wanting any responsibility.”⁴

Kierkegaard sees the Public Sphere somewhat in reverse of Habermas. Dreyfus locates this clash saying, “For Kierkegaard the deeper danger is just what Habermas applauds about the public sphere produced by the coffee houses and cosmopolitan press, viz as Kierkegaard puts it, ”a public ...destroys everything that is relative, concrete and particular in life.”

To Kierkegaard the Public Sphere represents the lack of a committed and competent public. The Public Sphere is the place where people absolve their responsibility and resign themselves to useless punditry. The detached nature of Enlightenment Reasoning allows endless commentary on issues, no one stands behind Public Opinion and commentary becomes a substitute for action. This substitution then reduces any reversal of transmitter-receiver dynamics back to the one to many means of distribution.

The Public Sphere shifts its responsibility to the failure of “They” to fix the issues the Public Sphere comments on. Artie Vierkant in his essay, “The Image Object Post-Internet”, states,

“‘They’ implies an alienation from production, a continuous deferral to action. It is a vacant critique, either proposal for the perpetuation of the same image unchanged (“They should release this on another platform”) or proposal for an iconoclasm which will never take place, the genesis of the proposition being encased entirely in a passive mode of reception. This deferral is an act which accepts dogma, accepts a dominant image paradigm as an unchanging absolute rather than the result of a complicated history of new approaches.”⁵

The very use of “They” as a critique is not just a continuous deferral of action by the Public Sphere but also the negation of any importance that the Public Sphere could hold. “They” is thus not only the resignation from action and importance as a Public Sphere, but each individual that makes up a Public Sphere resigning any effect of their individual actions and their possible importance as individuals. Reciprocity collapses if speech has no commitment behind it into detached speculation and useless punditry.

3. The Possible Solution to Reciprocity on the Web Must Be Individualized

True reciprocity cannot be structurally mass induced. It cannot rely on Ezensberger's hopes in reversals and technological advancements, nor in Habermas' dreams of Public Sphere potentiality activating and it cannot be found in Kierkegaard's exclusive higher public of intellectuals. True reciprocity must become an individualized responsibility. If we are to seek discourse it must be a committed action. This dialogue should be democratic based around the rules for the Ideal Speech Situation proposed by Habermas and centered in the principles of accountability and action Kierkegaard found lacking in the Public Sphere.

Due to the reversal of transmitter-receiver dynamics we are still prone to the one to many mode of distribution. Blogs, commenting, status updates, video posts still abide by this mode of distribution. Producers of content on all levels gear distribution towards some faceless abstract target audience and in doing so push reciprocity to the side. If reciprocity is to exist we need to create more modes of distribution and discourse similar to IRL ones with one to one engagement. It is in this engagement we find reciprocity through the active pursuit of others to discourse with, collectively distribute content amongst and to produce collaborative efforts and projects.

Throughout our internet wanderings, we should be productively trolling for other users whose comments, videos, blogs, etc. pique our interest or ruffle our feathers. These users should then be invited to engage in dialogue on user run public platforms, opening dialogue to all other users interested in participation. Dialogue can be collectively moderated and through active involvement and a shared goal of reciprocity the user becomes collectively accountable for one another. A commitment to productive dialogue and a user base that is held accountable for one another, will spawn committed action.

There can be no standardized platform, no set solution to materializing web reciprocity. These platforms must be created as users see fit and evolved through the dialectics of the Public Spheres they create. They should overlap, intersect, link in and out of each other, as to not create a monopoly site or sphere of discourse. We must resist the blogger's urge to focus discourse on these platforms around one to a few voices attempting to speak, to many, and resign ourselves as humble participants in dialogue generated through the platforms we create. It is our individual responsibility to create reciprocity and make the discussions, projects, we want to happen happen. No one else can be trusted with this task, but us.

1. Baudrillard, Jean. "Requiem for the Media." Trans. Charles Levin. *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*, p. 164-184.


2. Habermas, Jürgen. "The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society." Trans. Thomas Burger. (excerpts available: <http://www.users.muohio.edu/mandellc/myhab.htm>)

POOL

3. Habermas, Jurgen. "Discourse Ethics: Notes on a Program of Philosophical Justification." Trans. Christian Lenhart and Shierry Weber Nicholson. *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*. p. 86.
4. Dreyfus, Hubert. "Kierkegaard on the Internet: Anonymity vrs. Commitment in the Present Age." http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~hdreyfus/html/paper_kierkegaard.html
5. Vierkant, Artie. "The Image Object Post-Internet." <http://jstchillin.org/artie/vierkant.html>

Desert Diary – Excerpts from Drifts and Desert

By Robert Lorayn



The Internet has been my greatest teacher in life. By that I mean much of what I've learned has been attached to the Internet. I don't believe the things I've learned are new to humanity, nor novel, but I do believe I'm in a place and time where my mode of learning might be new. The Internet has given me the opportunity to experience life in a remarkable way and in a way that I think emphasizes certain aspects of humanity while discouraging other aspects. So in a way these experiences are mine but they aren't limited to me.

I used to see the Internet as a place without shape, if that can be called a place at all. I had presumed that the qualities that made the Internet unique were invisible qualities. However, it became apparent to me that it's only the context of these qualities that makes them unique, and with that in mind the Internet as a place was acutely visible.



POOL

It seems to me that in all of these prior images of the Internet there is blindness, or accepting that I have eyes, an illusion, which causes them to fall short. This stems from a misunderstanding of the Internet as a place with itself. The Internet-as-ocean and sprawling city are merely surfaces which drape over a core. That core is the Internet by itself and that place is a desert.


While a desert can come in many forms there are similarities to connect them. The most prevalent would likely be the lack of life in them. Or rather a lack of quantity in life. Where an ocean implies a boundless quantity and a movement of life, a desert isolates and binds to what life it finds. To see the beginning of this shape in the Internet all I need to ask myself is “What lives here?” The answer is very little and I would go so far as to say that this Internet is a desert filled with only one life, mine.



...where might I find shade on the Internet? Where can I settle? Where can I create a habitat and comfort for my self? Those places that seem to allow some form of self limit the environment and in this way each site forces mere survival, not living.

As almost all things lack in this place so too does perspective lack. Like an ever present mirage my lack of perspective sits as the film which is both veil for, and portal to, this desert. It is not surprising—but definitely disheartening—to think that the Internet, as it exists now, cannot be removed from the mirage which colors my view of it. Indeed after all these misperceptions and misinterpretations I feel like I’ve been tricked by that cliché mirage, the mirage of oasis, and taken it to its extreme out of desperation. It now seems foolish to consider this place anything but a desert and my interaction with it anything but a mirage.

POOL



Among the many other illusions this mirage is capable of it seems that the most potent is its ability to form an image of itself as a city of people... I seemed to interact with many others, watching them grow and move. What I did instead was willingly give my water to the desert and watch it sway in the heat. The mirage gave me the illusion of growth and movement. There is neither movement nor growth here and therefore no real connection between myself and the silhouettes of this desert.

It seems to me that this mirage worked on the common belief that through the Internet any person could connect to any other person; that I could find someone to interact with living in any corner of the globe... Now I interact, presumably, with those people whom I know from the outside world, friends/family/colleagues. Their worldly selves acting as shell which the mirage uses to interact with me.




POOL

The mirage merely tries to distract me from the knowledge that every single person on the Internet is merely a mirage of a person who's already given something to the Internet... It sits between me and the desert, and ultimately between me and any other person.

The mirage gives me the privacy of solitude along with the impression of connection so that I feel comfortable and appear connected to the people who interest me... but I recognize in some sense that I am alone, which makes it easy and preferable to speak, act, and give as if alone, yet I am fed the impression that I am with others, which gives me the awareness that others may see what is mine.



It is my impression that this conflict will lessen as this place develops, for as it develops it will shrink further... In this way the mirage intends to evolve into the mirror. The mirror gives me a view of myself which is unavailable to me otherwise... In whatever way I seek to manifest my internal, the mirage would seek to act as a mirror of it in the hope of attaching itself to me completely so that my act of giving is never broken.



It seems to me that when the city crumbles and the ocean dries there is still the desert. When I leave there will still be the desert. Nevertheless,

POOL

I can't help but feel apprehension. In a way I feel a premature regret for the loss of the desert. For it seems to me that when the mirage turns mirror the desert will still be here, but I will not see it any longer.



Colophon

All text (set in the classics *Times New Roman*¹⁹³¹ and *Arial*¹⁹⁸²) has been horizontally scaled to 99% of regular height.

– *Rasmus Svensson*