

Like remediation itself, this book has its own genealogy. And like the genealogy of remediation, our book's genealogy is one of historical affiliations or resonances, not of origins. In examining these affiliations, we would begin by noticing "the myriad events through which—thanks to which, against which—they were formed" (Foucault 1977, 146). Indeed, the initial affiliation was our own, which began on the January evening in 1991 when President George Bush ordered the bombing campaign for what has been characterized as the first totally mediated war.

We could also trace the book's descent to the resonances set in motion in September 1994, when one of us (JDB) decided to sit in on the graduate seminar the other (RG) was offering: "The Visual Genealogy of Multimedia." Each of us brought to that course the conception of one of the three genealogical traits that our book traces: JDB the trait of immediacy, which he was beginning to outline in a project whose earliest manifestation appeared on the Internet under the name of "Degrees of Freedom"; RG the trait of hypermediacy, which (operating under the name of multimediacy) provided the organizing logic of the seminar. Remediation itself was our third trait.

We might more precisely trace the book's beginnings to May 1996, when we were completing our first truly collaborative venture, a team-taught version of the original genealogy seminar, in which the contradiction between immediacy and multimediacy formed the organizing principle of the course. It was in May 1996, in a meeting in his office with Sandra Beaudin, that RG was reported to have coined the term *remediation* as a way to complicate the notion of "repurposing" that Beaudin was working with for her class project. But, as most origin stories go, it was not until well after the fact, when Beaudin reported the coinage to JDB, who later reminded RG that he had coined the term, that the concept of "remediation" could be said to have emerged. Indeed although the term *remediation* was coined in RG's office, neither of us really knew what it meant until we had worked out together the double logic of immediacy and hypermediacy.

If *remediation* can be traced to that fateful day in May, the book itself, as a jointly authored collaboration, has its own lineage. The idea of collaborating on an essay was set in play in 1994, during the first genealogy seminar (which ended up being more or less team-taught itself). Almost from the first class meeting, we realized that between us we had grasped something exponentially more powerful than what either of us brought to the table. For more than eighteen months, we

took turns telling each other that we should collaborate on an essay. We passed each other in the hall; we sat in one another's office; we chatted in the faculty lounge or before and after department meetings and lectures. But our daily obligations prevented us from seriously undertaking the project that would eventually become this book. Indeed it was not until the Olympic summer of 1996, when RG was about to embark on a trip to Oxford, to teach in a Georgia Tech summer-abroad program, that the decision to collaborate on an essay was finally made.

It is hardly accidental to the thesis of this book that it was only when we found ourselves on either side of the Atlantic Ocean, communicating with each other through the medium of email, that we were able finally to undertake the collaboration we had been discussing for more than a year. In what was in many senses a reversal of roles, RG found himself traveling through Europe, thinking through the histories of Western art from the medieval period to the present; while JDB was at home in Atlanta, watching the Olympics on TV, thinking through the relations among contemporary media, sports, and the culture of entertainment.

The genealogy of the book is well documented through that summer's emails: as multimediacy evolved into hypermediacy; as the initial idea for an essay (which was published in the fall 1996 issue of *Configurations*) evolved into our plan for a book; and as we began to work through the way in which the concept of remediation helped to make sense of the apparent contradiction between our two logics of mediation. What is also well documented in those emails is the evolution of a mutual friendship and trust, a growing respect and admiration between two very different (indeed in many basic senses opposite) individuals. If we are right in characterizing remediation as reform, then it would be fair to say that among those things that *Remediation* reformed were ourselves.

We wish to acknowledge here the encouragement and thoughtful critiques that we received from colleagues and friends.

Those with whom we have shared our ideas include Gregory Abowd, Amy Bruckman, Matthew Causey, Sandra Corse, Stuart Culver, Mark Guzdial, N. Katherine Hayles, Henry Jenkins, John Johnston, Dalia Judovitz, Alan Kay, Wendy Kellogg, Irene Klaver, Ken Knoopel, George Landow, Candace Lang, Elissa Marder, Robert Markley, Pete McGuire, Rebecca Merrens, Jacob Nielsen, Greg Nobles, Claire Nouvet, Cíaran O'Faolaín, David Porush, Ashwin Ram, Alan Rauch,

William Ribarsky, Ben Schneiderman, Ian Smith, Ellen Strain, Laura Sullivan, Jay Telotte, Bruce Tognazzini, John Tolva, and Greg VanHoosier-Carey.

Those who commented on various portions of the manuscript, and from whose counsel we benefited, include Phil Auslander, Hugh Crawford, Terry Harpold, Howard Horwitz, Michael Joyce, Richard Lanham, Blake Leland, and Anne Wysocki.

Jim Bono and Kathy Onofrio worked with us on the original essay, "Remediation," which appeared in *Configurations* 3 (Fall 1996): 311–358. We thank them and the journal for allowing us to refashion (if not remediate) material in chapters 1 through 3 of this book.

We thank Lance Strate, Ron Jacobson, and Stephanie Gibson, and the Hampton Press for allowing us to reuse in chapters 15 and 16 of this book material from JDB's "Virtual Reality and the Redefinition of Self" originally published in 1996 in *Communication and Cyberspace: Social Interaction in an Electronic Environment*.

We wish to thank Robert Prior of The MIT Press for his indispensable advice and support. Thanks also to Managing Editor Michael Sims and to those at The MIT Press who put their expertise and enthusiasm into the editing, design, production, and marketing of this book: Julie Grimaldi, Yasuyo Iguchi, Vicki Jennings, Ori Kometani, Terry Lamoureux, Thomas McCorkle, Gita Manaktala, Bev Miller, and Sandra Minkkinen.

Like all other teachers, we have learned much from our students, in particular, those in the graduate program in Information Design and Technology of the School of Literature, Communication, and Culture here at Georgia Tech. Since 1994 we have offered three graduate seminars in the genealogy of new media. In each case, the students in these courses have helped us define and refine our ideas. Also during this period, Kelly Balcom, Rhonda Nelson, Aida Najarian, and Vicky Pickens served as intelligent and enthusiastic research assistants and made a real contribution to the research and production of this book. Our students Michael Koetter, Debbi Faye Levin, and Ian Seymour produced the first *Remediation* video.

David Joseph Bolter provided helpful information on the remediating strategies of animated film. Sarah and Sam Grusin offered important lessons on the inseparability of mediation and reality.

We cannot exaggerate the contribution made by Lori Levy, who took on the important task of helping us locate, interpret, and present the various graphic images that appear in this book. To this task, she

brought her fine graphic and computer skills, as well as her aesthetic and critical judgment and her extraordinary energy and dedication. Without her, this book would not have the visual documentation that it needs and would certainly not have been published on schedule.

Our colleague and friend Anne Balsamo proved to be our most dedicated reader. She devoted many hours to a patient and yet critical analysis of portions of the manuscript—in particular, those sections in which we deal with the gender implications of remediation. As a result of her insightful suggestions, these sections have been vastly improved. If our text remains in some ways insensitive or incomplete in its treatment of these issues, the failings are in part due to our inability fully to appreciate and respond to her critique.

Atlanta, Georgia
February 1, 1998