

A Vade Mecum of Urgent Editing

[Miriam Rasch](#)

Abstract

Urgent publishing links speed and relevance, as it moves across contexts. This is asserted through a situated, relational practice — it is in the midst of things. Comparably, the editor is often understood as being an ‘intermediary,’ meaning they work in the space between author and text and reader, between publisher, production, and printed matter. They bring out the best possible realisation of the intention or goal of the publication; rationalising it, putting it in context, relating it to public debate, literary history, or stakeholders. Often, the editor and the editorial work remain invisible to the outside, and are supposed to. This invisibility even extends to discussions about (innovating, digitising) the publishing process.

There is plenty of discussion about design, revenues, marketing, software, tools, and the role of the author, but what about the intermediary between all of those? At most, we often hear that in the age of social media and self-publishing, no one needs an editor anymore. Moderators, fact-checkers, and coders are the new intermediaries, and in the end the editor will surely lose their job to automation. This too makes it urgent for the editing profession to reconsider their role. This experimental (and experiential) essay offers some ideas about what that role could be, conceived from the perspective of urgent publishing.

A Note on Form

This essay is conceptualised and published using Twine, an application which allows the reader to pursue their own path through the text. At the end of each chapter and section, options for the next step are presented based on connections within the different parts of the content. The reader can choose however they like, whether intuitively, rationally, or randomly. There’s also the opportunity to read the essay in a linear manner. For those who wish, there’s also a PDF version available. In short: be your own editor.

[\[Introduction\]](#)

Introduction

Urgent publishing can be understood as a movement that travels from speed to relevance, linking the two in moving. This means urgent publishing is a situated, relational practice—it is *in the midst of things*. This understanding of urgent publishing was the main focus of the project ‘Making Public,’ carried out by the Institute of Network Cultures, Willem de Kooning Academy, and ArtEZ in 2018–2020, and was described in detail in the final publication of that project, *Here and Now? Explorations in Urgent Publishing*. The practice of urgent publishing as a situated and relational one suggests a possible rethinking of the different roles and functions within the publishing process.¹

This is especially palpable for the role of the editor, since context, relations, and articulating relevance have always been considered part and parcel of that role. Moreover, the editor is often understood as being an ‘intermediary,’ as I argue in the first chapter of this essay. The editor works in the space between author, text, and reader, and between publisher, production, and printed matter. Ideally, they are expected to bring out the best possible realisation of the intention or goal of the publication. They rationalise it, put it in context, relate it to public debate, to literary history, to all possible stakeholders. An ever so urgent practice in times of disinformation overload and deterioration of meaning making and shared epistemologies, which I briefly deal with in the second chapter.

The editor and editorial work often remain invisible to the outside world, as they are supposed to. This invisibility even extends to discussions about (innovating, digitising) the publishing process. There is plenty of discussion about design, revenues, marketing, software, tools, and what it entails to be an author in the age of social media—but what about the intermediary between all of those? At most, we often hear that in the age of social media and self-publishing, no one needs an editor anymore. Moderators, fact-checkers, and coders are the new intermediaries, and in the end the editor will inevitably lose their job to automation. It is helpful to demarcate editing against these other processes, which I do in the third chapter.

Not only is editing an urgent practice, it is also urgent for the editing profession to reconsider itself. Using the lens of urgency can help to envision a future conception of their role, which is sketched in the final chapter of this essay. The urgency lens offers a speculative view of what the editor might be able to do and accomplish, and what value they might add when they bring their situated and relational position to the fore and start moving across more traditional boundaries and thresholds, like between academia and the arts, or between different publics and formats. This speculative editor may find themselves in different domains, as urgency may be applied both to the academic, cultural, or journalistic editing professions. Here I relate primarily to the domain of what may be called public knowledge: non-fiction information for the non-scholarly audience.

In what follows, I will sketch out different spaces in which the urgent editor might move. Some of those movements are persistent throughout this essay and may be kept in mind while reading:

The move from closure to openness
From passive to active
From invisible to voiced
From standardisation to polyphony

Go to the first chapter:

[\[What Is Editing? Some Definitions\]](#)

Or, choose a chapter to your liking:

[\[What the Editor Is up Against: Some Challenges\]](#)

[\[What I Am \(Not\) Talking About When Talking About Editing\]](#)

[\[Urgent Editing Planes\]](#)

[\[Conclusion: Where to Go From Here\]](#)

More on Making Public:

[\[Making Public: A Case Study\]](#)

You can also download the full [\[PDF\]](#)

What Is Editing? Some Definitions

The Invisible Watchmaker

In his good-natured collection of essays on the craft of writing, John McPhee writes about his dream as a

young man to be published in *The New Yorker*. Never had it crossed his mind what that would actually entail: working through your text with someone else, from start to finish, from the first idea down to the very last comma. ‘I wasn’t aware of any of that before 1965. There was no masthead, and I had never heard of him (William Shawn, editor of *The New Yorker*). Like most readers, I thought *The New Yorker* was put together by some sort of enlisted tribunal, a consortium of editors “we.”’²

Most casual readers probably think of editing as little more than copy-editing: correcting spelling mistakes and commas, occasionally rewriting a sentence for clarity. The power that the position holds in many contexts is less considered. No wonder, since the editor is mostly invisible to the outside world. That was the case even back in the days when an editor could occupy one of the most powerful positions in American culture, like William Shawn did, a ‘singular, charismatic, and male exemplar,’ or like T.S. Eliot (*The Criterion*), Thomas Mann (*Mass und Wert*), and Jean-Paul Sartre (*Les Temps Modernes*).³ Less romantic and patriarchic, a good editor may be considered to function as a ghost writer,⁴ working to erase any trace of themselves and remain forever anonymous. Combining authority and invisibility, the editor might seem akin to a great watchmaker: quietly working their manoeuvres, out of sight of gullible readers and aspiring authors.

Such masculine and authoritative appeals to editorial egos deserve an update if we want to consider the urgency of editing. While there is ample talk about the changing roles and professions in publishing in the post-digital era—both where it comes to the feminisation of the trade, even if it still remains a white and non-diverse stronghold, and to how writing has changed, how reading habits develop, and the impact of digital technologies on the production and distribution of books and other publication types⁵—the role of the editor remains largely unaccounted for. Handbooks of digital literary studies or publishing often don’t include an index entry on editing.⁶ The editor’s invisibility, one could say, expands even into research.

Go to the next part:

[\[The Creative Intermediary\]](#)

More on invisibility:

[\[Adding Value\]](#)

[\[Politics\]](#)

More on power and authority:

[\[Scholarly Editing\]](#)

The Creative Intermediary

Invisibility is characteristic for the position of the editor, as the editorial aim often is to let a publication ‘speak for itself’ and the editor’s role in the publishing process stands in service of authors or makers and their texts. A positive description of the editor and their invisibility could be to regard them as being primarily an intermediary, in different senses: as gatekeeper who selects what and whom will be published and as a stand-in between writer and reader, working in-between different drafts and the final text and contextualising a work within a publication medium, in cultural and societal tendencies, and over time.

But the editorial intermediary is not just a passive mover. The word ‘editor,’ writes Susan L. Greenberg in *A Poetics of Editing*, derives from the Latin, meaning ‘someone who puts forth or gives out,’ in other words, someone who is ‘making public.’ Greenberg remarks that early definitions of edition/editor/editing all contain a notion of fecundity and originality. Rather than just working on a text passively, the editor

creates something new. In *The Design of Rhetoric*, Sam Dragga and Gwendolyn Gong even state that ‘Editors are artists.’⁷

It is important to add that such creation will always happen in collaboration. The editor simply cannot work in isolation. Looking at the history of European cultural journals, Matthew Philpotts distills a list of criteria for ‘What makes a great magazine editor?’ All have something to do with ‘editorial plurality’—in style, competences, persons, and so on. While the image of the male star editor remains dominant, even those exemplary editorships were essentially plural: ‘Far from one-man editorships, these were in each case examples of collective social practice.’

Go to the next part:

[\[Scholarly Editing\]](#)

More on gatekeeping:

[\[The Myth of Immediacy\]](#)

[\[Curation\]](#)

More on creativity:

[\[Fact-checking\]](#)

[\[Poetics\]](#)

Scholarly Editing

A short mention should be given to ‘scholarly editing,’ the discipline that is an exception to the rule of editorial invisibility, both in research and practice. Scholarly editing refers to the making of editions of important texts, often literary or philosophical classics, or historical texts or manuscripts. Theory of edition is heavily researched, taught, and practised, including its transformations in a digital environment.⁸

Traditionally, scholarly editing is concerned with ‘the idea of the most authoritative text.’⁹ It has long been regarded as primarily a philological discipline that specialises in tracing genealogies and concerns itself with drafts, versions, and authorial intent. In that sense, it has functioned as the institutionalisation of ultimate gatekeeper-hood. A lot has changed over the past decades, thanks to digital developments and evolving conceptions in the humanities in general.¹⁰ A concept such as the ‘social text,’ drawn from D.F. McKenzie, has moved scholarly editing away from its closed and authoritative strivings. Dino Buzzetti and Jerome McGann write about the social text as method in scholarly editing: ‘McKenzie regarded documents as complex semiotic fields that bore within themselves the evidence of their social emergence. The critical editor, in his view, should focus on that field of relations, and not simply on the linguistic text.’¹¹ This notion of the social text as a constellation of more fluidly operating entities and their relations could open up interesting parallels with urgent editing as it is proposed here.

Since my focus first lies on new publications, rather than on existing or historical works, and second on publishing that is aimed beyond the scholarly domain to a more general public, I will not go deeper into the field of scholarly editing here.

Go to the next part:

Closure and Cuts

The fecundity in the act of making public takes shape in the different stages of the editing activity: selecting, shaping, and linking the material on offer, deciding when it is good enough to publish, finalising the publication, and sending it out into the world. Editing as a progression of these stages is seen as a practice that brings the text at hand to its ‘final’ or ‘definitive’ form—usually also normatively understood as being its ‘best.’ It is working towards closure.¹²

An example of such a closed view on editing can be found in many more scientific or scholarly accounts of editing. W.A.M. Carstens, for example, writes about editing as a process that aims ‘to realise an effective text that “communicates 100%, at the first read”.’¹³ It’s important for the text to meet its own goals and a reader’s expectations, according to Carstens, quoting Jan Renkema. Knowing what these goals are doesn’t seem to present a problem, because a schema of clear authorial intent is implied. However, I would argue that what a publication does and how it functions isn’t reliant for a large part on authorial intent or preconceived goals. The same goes for readers’ expectations: How can they be envisioned so clearly beforehand? Publications in an account like this are stable, transparent, and one-directional communication media that don’t carry surprises, or uncertainty, or progress with them.

A desire for closure is understandable from the perspective of print: print is itself a form of closure, of fixation. But fixation in or on print is not the necessary end stage anymore in the post-digital age.¹⁴ Post-digitality signals fluidity between publication formats, a fluidity that extends to other areas of the publishing process, like the blurring boundaries between roles such as authors, readers, and editors, which have become unfixed themselves.¹⁵ The notion of closure thus seems old-fashioned in itself, belonging to the era of the masculine star editor or the scientific discipline of scholarly editing. Urgent editing, on the contrary, departs from the notion of fluidity and as such demands a ‘rejection of closure.’¹⁶

Within a fluid approach to making publications, moments of decision will still occur. A way to understand such moments is through a perspective on editing as ‘making the cut.’¹⁷ All writers know that a text is never 100% finished; all editors know that at one point you have to declare it finished. This is what the editorial variation of the ‘agential cut’ performs. Thinking in terms of an agential cut denies the idea of textual stability and communicative intents and expectations. Instead of working towards closure, the editor is seen as working with or towards openness. As such, urgent editing is opposed to notions such as the definitive, most communicative, or most authoritative text.

The editorial cut is not a new phenomenon. In the video ‘How Does an Editor Think and Feel?’, which is about film editing, Tony Zhou makes it very clear: editing is all about (quite literally) making the cut. There’s something to learn for text editing on when to make the cut. The video shows how it works: to know when to make the cut, you have to look at the eyes of the actors. The eyes disclose the moment when change happens and decisions are made; in other words, what the moments of urgency are. That’s the place to make the cut.

The video teaches another lesson as well. By closely observing the eyes of the actors and cutting on intense moments of change and decision, the editor doesn’t just shape the film, but the response of the audience as well. Making the cut in an urgent manner means doing so at the moment that something is happening, something that is taking place, but is yet unfinished. In this way, the audience gets involved emotionally in the story that is presented. Such a focus on opening up the material to involvement of the readers rather than on the final product is helpful for editors in other disciplines as well who want to get something moving.

More on decision:

[\[Moderation\]](#)

[\[Disinformation\]](#)

More on openness:

[\[Ethics\]](#)

[\[Making Public: A Case Study\]](#)

About the star editor:

[\[The Invisible Watchmaker\]](#)

Scholarly editing:

[\[Scholarly Editing\]](#)

Go to the next chapter:

[\[What the Editor Is up Against: Some Challenges\]](#)

What the Editor Is up Against: Some Challenges

Adding Value

The editor is one of many participants in the publishing process, a process that can also be regarded as a *value chain*.¹⁸ In every part of the chain, professionals add value to the product made. The pivotal change that digital technologies have brought about in the publishing landscape, effectively allowing anyone to enter the market with their home-made publications, has upended the question of value. Now more than ever, professional publishers find their added value in filtering the input (function of gatekeeper) and in quality control (both of design and editing).¹⁹

Editors have been around for many centuries, so their function must inherently add something of value or something that is considered valuable. Take out the editing phase and that something will be lost.

Traditionally, this has been located in the key values mentioned above: filtering and quality control. How do they change in the context of urgency? A first notion may be gained by looking at the challenges that editors face nowadays, after the pivotal change brought on by technologies. What battles does the editor face? Who are their contenders? And how do quality control and filtering shift under the pressures?

I fear that without a renewed understanding of these values and positioning editing as an urgent practice, we lose not just another profession to the digital revolution; that loss will be a win for the dark agents of the digital revolution, from producers of disinformation to troll factories, and other propagandists. Value can thus be found in what one is fighting against.

Go to any of the other parts in this chapter:

[\[Disinformation\]](#)

[\[The Myth of Immediacy\]](#)

[\[Automation and Standardisation\]](#)

More about pressures in the online environment:

[\[Ethics\]](#)

Disinformation

The editor's first enemy in a digital environment is obvious: disinformation and its ilk. UNESCO has defined disinformation as 'Information that is false and deliberately created to harm a person, social group, organisation or country.'²⁰ Disinformation has many guises, ranging from a continuous stream of tweets from Russian trolls to official statements made by world leaders. Solutions are sought in actively hunting down and reporting fake news, in a posteriori fact-checking, or in adding disclaimers with additional or corrective information (as Twitter started doing in 2020).

The relation between disinformation and editing is ambiguous. If editing is understood as a process of bringing about the full potential of a publication—in other words, communicating a message to its fullest—then producing and spreading disinformation must be the result of a heavily edited process itself. It could be argued that disinformation is fought with editorial machinery precisely because the creation and spreading of such disinformation is an editorial activity as well. In such a battleground, the notions of quality control and filtering remain important articulations of what the editor brings to the table.

However, it is also important to stress that the naming of disinformation as such is the result of an editorial decision, or a 'cut.' Such a decision demands contextualisation and contrasting with other information. An urgent response that departs from open-endedness instead of closure should take into account that there's no ultimate source of trustworthy information to (re)direct to, but rather a field or informational network across which publications travel. Information should be read in the plural, as a polyphony. Thus, the resistance to closure is not just epistemic but also practical, since it is impossible to remove all disinformation from the network (due to the character of it being a network). Urgent editing means understanding how information and disinformation behave in an online context.

Go to any of the other parts in this chapter:

[\[Adding Value\]](#)

[\[The Myth of Immediacy\]](#)

[\[Automation and Standardisation\]](#)

More on editing as closure:

[\[Closure and Cuts\]](#)

More about polyphony:

[\[Poetics\]](#)

[\[Curation\]](#)

The Myth of Immediacy

If everyone has become a publisher online, it doesn't mean everyone now appreciates the editor. From its very beginning, internet publishing has dreamt of crossing out intermediaries, in effect arguing for an anti-editing stance. Greenberg names this 'digital romanticism,' which may be understood as a push against: against gatekeepers, experts, and professionalism—against editing. 'The main result is that all three of the selecting, shaping and linking tasks that used to be the sole province of the professional editor are now potentially practised by anyone.'²¹ In other words, the editor is either ostracised, or swallowed up whole.

The drive towards immediacy and authenticity still haunts online publishing. But while it's true that everyone can now publish online more or less without having to deal with traditional intermediaries, that doesn't mean gatekeeping and filtering are no longer at stake. These functions have been captured by monopoly platforms; they are outsourced to algorithms or to zero-hour contract workers such as moderators or timeline cleaners. In the end, these gatekeepers remain as invisible as traditional editors were. Also, new types of intermediaries have entered the stage, such as social media platforms or self-publishing services. One could even argue that a phenomenon such as the troll farm is the new type of intermediary, in the way that it rolls out a pre-ordained carpet of hate for a few bucks at a time.

The myth of immediacy demands debunking everywhere and all the time. It means battling not just disinformation but a false sense of truthfulness that hides its own ideological roots and hierarchical structures. The immediacy that digital publishing offers may be what distinguishes the problem of disinformation from the long histories of propaganda, censorship, and biased news, which precede our era of 'fake news' and 'post truth,' but it doesn't wipe out the problem itself. De-acceleration, however costly it might be, seems a valuable editorial stance across from these tendencies. Explicitly taking up the position of intermediary instead of blotting out their own position, the editor can operate as a halting point and as a passageway at the same time, turning the speedy into the relevant.

Go to any of the other parts in this chapter:

[\[Adding Value\]](#)

[\[Disinformation\]](#)

[\[Automation and Standardisation\]](#)

More about gatekeepers:

[\[Curation\]](#)

More about ideology:

[\[Politics\]](#)

Automation and Standardisation

On the list of endangered species at risk of losing their job to automation or artificial intelligence (AI), editors do not come last. The fact that editing work often remains invisible probably doesn't help in making the case against it being automated. Moreover, if even software applications for handling text, for example Markdown or HTML, are called editors, what stands in the way of cutting the human out of the loop altogether? Editorial software might be another intermediary, but it mostly suggests standardisation, reducing editing to the task of copy correction.

For now, what isn't covered by the algorithms is what Alexander Galloway terms 'the problem of meaning.' For this we still need humans: 'Remove the humans and you lose the meaningfulness. No humans, no signification.'²² In a fully automated society, the human will present a hiccup. The editorial

sides with the human in this sense, in its careful approach to meaning-making, which never pursues speed without relevance.

Opposing the automatic ideal comes close to opposing the myth of immediacy, while insisting on the value of filtering and quality control. Being a hiccup in a fully automated society is of course a reason for platforms to claim that editors are counter-productive and should be automated away. But any statement that computers or robots will take over editing work should thus be simply dismissed as irrelevant; don't feed the trolls. Elsewhere I've called this a politics of de-automation.²³

Go to any of the other parts in this chapter:

[\[Adding Value\]](#)

[\[Disinformation\]](#)

[\[The Myth of Immediacy\]](#)

More on automation:

[\[Moderation\]](#)

More on standardisation:

[\[Rhetoric\]](#)

Go to the next chapter:

[\[What I Am \(Not\) Talking About When Talking About Editing\]](#)

What I Am (Not) Talking About When Talking About Editing

Curation

Curation was a buzzword in the early phase of the web, right through to Web 2.0. Bloggers were the new curators, with their blog rolls and link posts being like an exhibition of sorts. Now, everyone can be a curator: DJs curate music, forum shitposters curate memes, tech workers curate news articles, teachers curate source texts, newspapers curate both-sides, doctors curate possible treatments. But not all curators are equal. Some become the new gatekeepers.

The editor-as-curator isn't completely off-the-mark. A nice example of editorial curation is the #syllabus, 'annotated, open, dynamic, multimedia collections of "must-read" contents,' which have gained traction as urgent and activist publishing activity.²⁴ Compiling a syllabus demands the well-known editorial tasks of selecting, shaping, and linking. But instead of working towards a final and fixed document, the syllabus is open and temporary. It doesn't imagine some ideal reader with go-to expectations, but tries to instigate a dialogue with and between readers. It doesn't pretend to communicate its intention with 100% clarity, but offers a polyphonic presentation of materials. The editor in this case does not stand invisibly in the background, but acts out in the open as, surely, an intermediary, but with an out-spoken agenda.²⁵

Go to the next part:

[\[Fact-checking\]](#)

More on polyphony:

[\[Poetics\]](#)

[\[Disinformation\]](#)

More on closeness and openness:

[\[Closure and Cuts\]](#)

Fact-checking

Fact-checking has understandably gone through a renaissance in the post-truth era. But while fact-checking may be commissioned by editors and sometimes even performed by them, the editorial function must be understood as going beyond that practice. If there is fecundity at the roots of editorial work, then it is clear that the editor's task must comprise something more creative than the retroactive gesture of fact-checking.

Perhaps the urgent editor is not so much interested in facts as in the context wherein facts exist and operate; the construction, performance, and workings of fact. In short, in meaning. What does it mean to be a fact? For whom is or isn't the fact factual? And should that change?

Instead of fact-checking a more apt description may be fact-framing. Alexander Galloway writes about the problem of meaning that continues to exist throughout automation and proposes a role for metadata to act as intermediary: 'meta means amidst (being in the middle), but it also means frame, as in the conditions of possibility framing any knowledge whatsoever.' Could an editor take up such a 'meta' position regarding the 'data,' both framing and being amidst them at the same time?

Go to the next part:

[\[Moderation\]](#)

More on disinformation:

[\[Disinformation\]](#)

More on fecundity:

[\[The Creative Intermediary\]](#)

More on meaning:

[\[Automation and Standardisation\]](#)

Moderation

If one thing speaks against the romantic myth of immediacy, it is the incessant need for moderation that an environment characterised by such immediacy requires. Editors may find themselves working more

and more in the capacity of moderators, keeping check on the activity of others who are not so much authors of as participants in publications (to put it nicely).

Moderation, in the sense of keeping check on unwanted contributions to interactive digital platforms, seems quite passive and thus like fact-checking far removed from the creative side of editing. Posts, reactions, or uploads are held against ‘community standards’ (or just plain terms and conditions) and judged accordingly. It is an activity that demands interpretative and editorial decisions in itself, just like naming a piece of information as disinformation, and despite promises to the contrary, it remains a human and not automated job. More important in comparing moderation to the practice of an urgent editor, such technocratic moderation moves towards standardisation and closure.

Moderation as we know it from public discussion events or panels offers another model. A good moderator makes sure that all participants get to speak, so that a polyphonic happening occurs. They make it possible for something new to emerge from the discussion: the whole will in fact be different from the sum of the parts. Such a moderator may well serve as a model for the urgent editor. Is it possible to moderate a text into a multi-voiced discussion without the need for a final say?

Back to:

[\[Fact-checking\]](#)

More on immediacy:

[\[The Myth of Immediacy\]](#)

More on automation:

[\[Automation and Standardisation\]](#)

More on polyphony:

[\[Curation\]](#)

[\[Poetics\]](#)

Go to the next chapter:

[\[Urgent Editing Planes\]](#)

Urgent Editing Planes

Making Public: A Case Study

The contours of the urgent network are drawn, how to colour them in? If urgent editing is an open and always unfinished business, it follows that it can be approached from different directions or navigated on different planes. These do not provide direct answers to the ever urgent question of ‘What to do?’, but may serve as guiding lines for action.

First, I want to shortly mention the three key notions that came out of the Making Public research project, which lies at the base of this journal publication. In this practice-based research project, publishers, designers, and programmers were involved in the development of (what turned out to be) urgent

publishing prototypes.

Making Public asked the question how research publications can find more resonance with a broader reading public, by adopting hybrid publishing strategies. As described in *Here and Now? Explorations in Urgent Publishing*, three outcomes of the project may serve as an illustration of the urgent editing principle. All revolved around and brought into play the key notions of *relations*, *trust*, and *remediation*:

Relations: This key notion is ‘starting from the idea that adapting a different way of structuring materials in a publication implies an alternative way of thinking. This requires a different way of looking at content at the start of the publishing process, where authors, editors, and publishers work together on the concept of a publication. By cutting up content, and taking a cue from modular processes in digital publishing, different relations between the content elements become apparent. These relations make new structures and reading paths possible.’²⁶

Trust: This key notion addresses the question, ‘How can small online publishers benefit from each other’s reach of niche audiences, and by doing so help the positioning of content beyond a platform’s already established network of readers? One possibility is to refer readers to interesting content on other platforms.’ Trust is paramount: ‘Sharing both content and readers in such a network requires trust: between publishers who should be trusted to provide quality content and use a fair referencing system, and trust from readers who expect a certain quality.’²⁷

Remediation: This key notion looks into ways of prolonging the urgency of publications: ‘Acceleration does not only mean that information comes into the world at an ever-increasing speed, but also that it is forgotten again in no time.’ Remediation, the adaptation of content to a different format, ‘could not only prolong their relevance, but also allow for interaction of the reader with the content.’²⁸

Urgent publishing turns out to be about ‘being in the right place at the right moment, and with the right thing in hand.’²⁹ The editor plays a pivotal role in all key notions. They are the ones who put them into practice, getting them moving. Another concept that was invoked in the project is interesting in this regard: the parasite as a conceptual figure. The idea of parasitic publishing ‘deals with accepting the evolution of publication into new forms, allowing them to flourish beyond your control. Parasitic publications need each other to come into being and can start to thrive on one another when allowed the space to do so. The afterlife might just become a new start.’³⁰ A publication is never just a stand-alone object, but rather an actor in a field. What can the publication do is a question for the urgent editor to ask — without prescribing or giving orders.

Go to one of the next parts:

[\[Rhetoric\]](#)

[\[Poetics\]](#)

[\[Politics\]](#)

[\[Ethics\]](#)

Rhetoric

One strand of the Making Public project investigated multi-linear content structures as alternative means

of relating urgency. Resisting argumentative linearity, and thus the authoritative, declarative voice that is the standard in academic books and articles, opens up other narrative possibilities. Other stories, told with different voices, techniques, and contents, can unfold, telling of other urgencies than are usually heard.³¹

Editing is related to rhetoric—according to Sam Dragga and Gwendolyn Gong, the two are even intimately related. In *Editing: The Design of Rhetoric*, they write that editors can greatly benefit from applying ‘the rhetorical canons—invention, arrangement, style, and delivery—and the corresponding rhetorical objectives of editing—accuracy, clarity, propriety, and artistry.’³² While these seem obviously applicable capabilities, they should be turned upside down and inside out to find a sense of urgency in them. Instead of putting rhetoric to work for closure and standardisation, how can it be used for opening up? What then happens to the age-old rhetorical canons of invention and arrangement?

Invention doesn’t have to stop at figuring out the ‘purpose or aim’ of a text, which is then communicated in a straight way according to the needs and traits of the audience.³³ A publication may also be regarded as an actor that evokes new and unpredictable connections and relations between contents and with readers. It asks what the publication does and tries to listen to the possible answers. The arrangement will transform accordingly. Arrangement, write Dragga and Gong, concerns ‘organization of a text, the ordering of information according to appropriate cognitive patterns.’³⁴ Instead of pursuing content structure that is as efficient as possible, a focus on potential relations to be drawn within the text (and without!) asks editors to open up the text as much as possible.

Taking a cue from ‘The Carrier Bag Theory of Fiction’ by Ursula K. Le Guin, a ‘Carrier Bag Theory of Non-fiction’³⁵ would argue for openly structured, multi-linear, and polyphonic works, in which relations within the (multimodal) text are foregrounded, thus challenging the idea of authorial intent and authoritative voice, and opening up the story to the context and experience of the reader.

Go to the next part:

[\[Poetics\]](#)

More on the key notion ‘relations’:

[\[Making Public: A Case Study\]](#)

More on flipping the rhetoric:

[\[Closure and Cuts\]](#)

[\[Moderation\]](#)

Poetics

Another plane on which to approach the urgent editing practice is poetics. In her book of the same title, Susan L. Greenberg proposes a ‘poetics of editing.’ Poetics refers to making in the Aristotelian sense and thus stresses the creative act of the editor. In its contemporary form, writes Greenberg, this offers a reflection ‘sympathetic to the making process in its own right, with all the imperfection, doubt, uncertainty and failure that goes with that.’³⁶

More interesting still is what Bakhtinian poetics bring into play: the polyphonic and dialogic potentialities of text. A Bakhtinian poetics of editing works explicitly on ‘the effort to connect different rhetorical voices’ and thus, with ‘multivocality,’ according to Greenberg.³⁷ Instead of melting such different voices or registers down into a closed format, such a poetics argues for allowing polyphonic openness.

To do this, a specific competence is required, namely listening. The act of listening is an act of curiosity—the listener does not know what will be said, otherwise they wouldn't have to pay attention. It's not out to determine the true or definite meaning or goal of a text, but, as Greenberg points out, mirrors a 'capacity to imagine what the text might become.'³⁸

I would like to add: what the text might become in the minds and hearts of the readers. Then, a poetics of editing could take a turn away from any misinformed ideas of authenticity and transparency, while still allowing for 'imperfection, doubt, uncertainty and failure.'

Go to the next part:

[\[Politics\]](#)

More on polyphony:

[\[Disinformation\]](#)

[\[Curation\]](#)

More on transparency:

[\[The Myth of Immediacy\]](#)

More on listening:

[\[Ethics\]](#)

Politics

As a situated practice involving power structures such as gatekeeping, publishing is inherently political, as Nicholas Thoburn, for example, argues extensively in *Anti-book: On the Art and Politics of Radical Publishing*. When regarding the politics of editing specifically, the problem of the invisibility of the editor resurfaces. An invisible editor might come across as an a-political 'medium,' in the sense that certain information is passed on simply as it is. But there is no such thing as a neutral vessel carrying meaning from one side (the writer's) to the other (the reader's). And therefore, there's no escaping a form of politics.

The editor as political actor could easily be conflated with the old-fashioned star editor and his ego. How to match political awareness with a touch of modesty? In this regard, Thoburn offers an interesting analysis of the 'political editorial.' The editorial of old resembles the authoritative, centralised party line. But that needn't be the case. Thoburn asks, 'what might a diagrammatic editorial paradigm look like, one that no longer seeks to be the external projection of a centralized party line but has, instead, a distributed and emergent quality?'³⁹ The different strands contemplated here—open-endedness, visibility, movement, polyphony—might offer the beginnings of an answer to that question.

Go to the next part:

[\[Ethics\]](#)

More on power:

[\[The Invisible Watchmaker\]](#)

More on the star editor:

[\[Closure and Cuts\]](#)

More on authority:

[\[Scholarly Editing\]](#)

Ethics

If editing is an act of creativity and thus, active and performative, we cannot escape the notion of ethics. It is a huge domain, so I can only touch upon a few points of reference here. At the Urgent Publishing conference in May 2019, part of the Making Public project, the need for developing an ethics in publishing was briefly discussed. The editor being an intermediary from the start—standing in-between human and non-human entities alike—the editing practice specifically could also be understood from the perspective of ethics of care.

Such a perspective immediately points out practical issues to be addressed, as for example became clear in the talk by Axel Andersson. He proposed making the editor more visible, by expanding the editing practice in space and bringing it outside of the publishing house and in the midst of events or gatherings, as a starting point. Not with the aim of bringing new fame to the editor, of course, but to organise spaces for people to come together and have their voices heard, which is what Lídia Pereira, another speaker at the panel, aims for with her self-hosted online Pervasive Labour Union zine.

Janneke Adema and Gary Hall, who also participated in the discussion, organised the Coventry University event ‘Radical Open Access II - The Ethics of Care’ in 2018, which proposed to commit to ethical forms of publishing, asking questions around diversity, (under)representation, accessibility, revenue models, and labour conditions.⁴⁰ Ethics of care implies a thoroughly relational practice, involving multiple actors in a non-hierarchical way.

On a more abstract level then, an ethics of editing can, again, be related to the notion of openness. Resisting closure and allowing for active reflection and discussion to arise from the text and in between the people interacting with it may signal a certain ethical approach to the editorial practice.

More on invisibility:

[\[The Invisible Watchmaker\]](#)

More on organising dialogues:

[\[Moderation\]](#)

[\[Curation\]](#)

More on openness:

[\[Closure and Cuts\]](#)

Or, go on to the end:

[\[Conclusion: Where to Go From Here\]](#)

Conclusion: Where to Go From Here

To move from closure to openness

From passive to active

From invisible to voiced

From standardisation to polyphony

Taking up a position in-between, as intermediary, should allow one to see opposite (or multiple) sides. While such in-betweenness can be signified as a special position—as I have done in this article as well—it can also be argued that everyone is occupying such an intermediary space in one way or another. Can't we presume that the majority of us stand in-between some things, all in our own ways? Or, if we restrict this to publishing, might an author not regard themselves as an intermediary between their subject and the reader, or the reader between an amateur and a professional, or the publisher between an entrepreneur and a cultural worker? The shared condition of in-betweenness that characterises the editor to a high degree (and I would hold, a higher degree than others) demands attention and explication. Instead of glossing over such a position, letting it coincide with invisibility, it can be activated, positioned, and so made urgent.

Elsewhere, I've argued for bringing friction back in the online domain⁴¹—this goes for editing and publishing practices as well. Allowing openness and recognising the situatedness of publications, their ever unfinished polyphony will surely cause friction. That's when the good stuff starts. Without a publication coming to life, rubbing in some energy, there's no urgency to start with.

This is not just serious and hard. In *The Pleasure of the Text*, Roland Barthes writes about the joy a work of literature brings that resists closure. He renounces 'the peculiar idea that pleasure is simple.'⁴² The reader of a text experiences pleasure when they are lured to give themselves over to a text without knowing where they will end up. It's about losing control. It's also about losing your indifference to what you will encounter. That might be the scariest of all: losing control and indifference at the same time. That is an urgent experience.

Back to the beginning:

[\[Introduction\]](#)

Or, download full [\[PDF\]](#)

PDF

Download the PDF here (you already got it!).

Miriam Rasch

Miriam Rasch is a writer, researcher, and lecturer, and was project lead for the two-year research project Making Public. She works as research coordinator at the Willem de Kooning Academy, after having worked at the Institute of Network Cultures (Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences) for eight years.

She's also a freelance critic and essayist. Her book on life in post-digital times, *Zwemmen in de oceaan: Berichten uit een postdigitale wereld*, was published in 2017 by De Bezige Bij. In 2018 *Shadowbook: Writing Through the Digital 2014–2018* was released, an (open-access) collection of experimental essays. In May 2020, *Fricctie: Ethiek in tijden van dataïsme*, her book on data ethics and the possibilities of de-automation came out. It was awarded the Socrates Cup for the best philosophical book of the year.

Back to [[Introduction](#)]

Bibliography

Adema, Janneke and Gary Hall, 'Urgent Publishing Session 1: Janneke Adema & Gary Hall.' Urgent Publishing Conference, May 15–17, 2019. <https://vimeo.com/344048731>.

Ampatzidou, Cristina and Irina Shapiro, 'Governance and Scalability: Circles of Trust and Federated Platforms.' *Making Public*, February 6, 2020.
<https://networkcultures.org/makingpublic/2020/02/06/governance-and-scalability-circles-of-trust-and-federated-platforms/>.

Andersson, Axel, 'Urgent Publishing Session 1: Axel Andersson.' Urgent Publishing Conference, May 15–17, 2019. <https://vimeo.com/344049221>.

Barthes, Roland, *The Pleasure of the Text*. Translated by Richard Miller. New York: Hill and Wang, 1975.

Bryant, John, *White Paper Report; Melville, Revision, and Collaborative Editing: Toward a Critical Archive*. Hempstead: Hofstra University, 2010.

Bullock, A., *Book Production*. London, New York: Routledge, 2012.

Burnard, Lou, Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe, and John Unsworth, eds, *Electronic Textual Editing*. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 2006.

Buzzetti, Dino and Jerome McGann, 'Electronic Textual Editing: Critical Editing in a Digital Horizon.' In Burnard, O'Keeffe, and Unsworth (eds). *Electronic Textual Editing*, 53–73. Available at: <https://tei-c.org/Vault/ETE/Preview/mcgann.html>.

Carstens, W.A.M., 'Text linguistics and text editing.' In *Text Editing: From a Talent to a Scientific Discipline*. Edited by Kris Van de Poel, 22–35. Antwerp: University of Antwerp, 2003.

Darnton, Robert, 'What is the History of Books?.' *Daedalus* 111 no. 3 (1982): 65–83.

—, 'What is the History of Books? Revisited.' *Modern Intellectual History* 4 no. 3 (2007): 495–508.

Deegan, Marilyn and Kathryn Sutherland, eds. *Text Editing, Print and the Digital World*. London, New York, 2009.

Dragga, Sam and Gwendolyn Gong, *Editing: The Design of Rhetoric*. London, New York: Routledge, 1989.

Driscoll, Matthew James and Elena Pierazzo, eds. *Digital Scholarly Editing: Theories and Practices*. Cambridge, UK: Open Book Publishers, 2016.

Galloway, Alexander R., 'Analog Hall of Fame: Scale.' January 1, 2020.
<http://cultureandcommunication.org/galloway/analog-hall-of-fame-scale>.

Graziano, Valeria, Marcell Mars, and Tomislav Medak, 'Learning From #Syllabus.' In *Statemachines: Reflections and Actions at the Edge of Digital Citizenship, Finance, and Art*. Edited by Yiannis Colakides, Marc Garrett, Inte Gloerich, 115–25. Amsterdam: Institute of Network Cultures, 2019.

Greenberg, Susan L., *A Poetics of Editing*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018.

Hejinian, Lyn., 'The Rejection of Closure.' Poetry Foundation, 1983.
<https://www.poetryfoundation.org/articles/69401/the-rejection-of-closure>.

Here and Now? Explorations in Urgent Publishing. Amsterdam: Institute of Network Cultures, 2020.

Ireton, Cherilyn and Julie Posetti, eds. *Journalism, Fake News & Disinformation: Handbook for Journalism Education and Training*. UNESCO series on journalism education 38. Paris: UNESCO, 2018.
<https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000265552>.

Le Guin, Ursula K., 'The Carrier Bag Theory of Fiction.' 1986. Available at:
<https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/ursula-k-le-guin-the-carrier-bag-theory-of-fiction>.

Ludovico, Alessandro, *Post-digital Print: The Mutation of Publishing Since 1984*. Eindhoven: Onomatopée, 2012.

McGann, Jerome, 'From Text to Work: Digital Tools and the Emergence of the Social Text.' *Romanticism on the Net* no. 41–42 (2006). <https://www.erudit.org/fr/revues/ron/2006-n41-42-ron1276/013153ar/>.

McPhee, John, *Draft No. 4: On the Writing Process*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2017.

McPherson, Tara, *Feminist in a Software Lab*. Harvard: Harvard University Press, 2018.

Pereira, Lídia, 'Urgent Publishing Session 1: Lídia Pereira.' Urgent Publishing Conference, May 15–17, 2019. <https://vimeo.com/344049571>.

—, Miriam Rasch, and Kimmy Spreeuwenberg, 'Urgent Publishing Debris.' *Pervasive Labour Union zine*, 2020.

Philpotts, Matthew, 'What Makes a Great Magazine Editor?' *Eurozine*, May 4, 2018.
<https://www.eurozine.com/makes-great-magazine-editor/>.

Pierazzo, Elena, *Digital Scholarly Editing: Theories, Models and Methods*. London, New York, 2016.

'Radical Open Access II - The Ethics of Care.' Conference, Coventry University, June 26–27, 2018.
<https://www.coventry.ac.uk/research/about-us/research-events/2018/radical-open-access-ii-the-ethics-of-care/>.

Rasch, Miriam, 'The Art of Criticism First Meet-up Report.' December 19, 2017.
<https://networkcultures.org/artofcriticism/2017/12/19/the-art-of-criticism-first-meet-up-report/>.

—, 'State of the Art: The Phase of the Post-digital in Publishing.' Out of Ink blog, June 28, 2017.
<http://networkcultures.org/outofink/2017/06/28/state-of-the-art-the-phase-of-the-post-digital-in-publishing/>.

—, 'Divide and Conquer: The Future of Online Criticism.' Art of Criticism blog, April 25, 2018.
<https://networkcultures.org/artofcriticism/2018/04/25/divide-and-conquer-the-future-of-online-criticism/>.

—, 'From Modularity to Relationality: Other Forms of Writing, Thinking & Publishing.' Making Public, January 27, 2020. <https://networkcultures.org/makingpublic/2020/01/27/from-modularity-to-relationality-other-forms-of-writing-thinking-publishing/>.

—, 'Friction and the Aesthetics of the Smooth.' *Eurozine*, May 11, 2020. <https://www.eurozine.com/friction-and-the-aesthetics-of-the-smooth/>.

Siemens, Ray and Susan Schreibman, eds. *A Companion to Digital Literary Studies*. London: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013.

Tanselle, G. Thomas, 'Greg's Theory of Copy-Text and the Editing of American Literature.' *Studies in Bibliography* 28 (1975): 167–229.

Thoburn, Nicholas, *Anti-book: On the Art and Politics of Radical Publishing*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2016.

Thompson, John B., *Merchants of Culture: The Publishing Business in the Twenty-First Century*. Cambridge, Oxford, and Boston: Polity, 2010.

Upside Down Inside Out: Discover the Hidden Structures of your (Digital) Content. Amsterdam: Institute of Network Cultures, 2020.

Van de Poel, Kris, 'From Language Practitioners to Editors: The Domain of Text Editing.' In *Text Editing: From a Talent to a Scientific Discipline*. Edited by Kris Van de Poel, 7–21. Antwerp: University of Antwerp, 2003.

Zhou, Tony, 'How Does an Editor Think and Feel?' Vimeo. May 12, 2016. <https://vimeo.com/166319350>.

-
1. A. Bullock, *Book Production* (London, New York: Routledge, 2012); Robert Darnton, 'What is the History of Books?' *Daedalus* 111 no. 3 (1982): pp. 65–83; Robert Darnton, 'What Is the History of Books? Revisited,' *Modern Intellectual History* 4 no. 3 (2007): pp. 495–508; John B. Thompson, *Merchants of Culture: The Publishing Business in the Twenty-First Century* (Cambridge, Oxford, and Boston: Polity, 2010). ↩
 2. John McPhee, *Draft No. 4: On the Writing Process* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2017), p. 72. ↩
 3. Matthew Philpotts, 'What Makes a Great Magazine Editor?' *Eurozine*, May 4, 2018, <https://www.eurozine.com/makes-great-magazine-editor/>. ↩
 4. Kris Van de Poel, 'From Language Practitioners to Editors: The Domain of Text Editing' (Antwerp: University of Antwerp, 2003), p. 16. ↩
 5. Miriam Rasch, 'State of the Art: The Phase of the Post-digital in Publishing,' Out of Ink blog, June 28, 2017, <http://networkcultures.org/outofink/2017/06/28/state-of-the-art-the-phase-of-the-post-digital-in-publishing/>. ↩
 6. See for example Ray Siemens and Susan Schreibman, eds, *A Companion to Digital Literary Studies* (London: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013). ↩
 7. Sam Dragga and Gwendolyn Gong, *Editing: The Design of Rhetoric* (London, New York: Routledge, 1989), p. 11. ↩
 8. See for example John Bryant, *White Paper Report; Melville, Revision, and Collaborative Editing: Toward a Critical Archive* (Hempstead: Hofstra University, 2010); Lou Burnard, Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe, and John Unsworth, eds, *Electronic Textual Editing* (New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 2006); Marilyn Deegan and Kathryn Sutherland, eds, *Text Editing, Print and the Digital World* (London, New York, 2009); Matthew James Driscoll and Elena Pierazzo, eds,

- Digital Scholarly Editing: Theories and Practices* (Cambridge, UK: Open Book Publishers, 2016); Elena Pierazzo, *Digital Scholarly Editing: Theories, Models and Methods* (London, New York, 2016). [↩](#)
9. G. Thomas Tanselle, 'Greg's Theory of Copy-Text and the Editing of American Literature,' *Studies in Bibliography* 28 (1975), p. 170. [↩](#)
 10. See for example the overview given by Dino Buzzetti and Jerome McGann in 'Electronic Textual Editing: Critical Editing in a Digital Horizon,' in Burnard, O'Keeffe, and Unsworth (eds), *Electronic Textual Editing*, pp. 53-73, available at: <https://tei-c.org/Vault/ETE/Preview/mcgann.html>. [↩](#)
 11. Buzzetti and McGann, 'Electronic Textual Editing.' See also Jerome McGann, 'From Text to Work: Digital Tools and the Emergence of the Social Text,' *Romanticism on the Net* no. 41-42 (2006), <https://www.erudit.org/fr/revues/ron/2006-n41-42-ron1276/013153ar/>. [↩](#)
 12. Susan L. Greenberg, *A Poetics of Editing* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), p. vi. [↩](#)
 13. W.A.M. Carstens, 'Text linguistics and text editing' (Antwerp: University of Antwerp, 2003), p. 29. [↩](#)
 14. Alessandro Ludovico, *Post-digital Print: The Mutation of Publishing Since 1984* (Eindhoven: Onomatopee, 2012). [↩](#)
 15. Miriam Rasch, 'Divide and Conquer: The Future of Online Criticism,' Art of Criticism blog, April 25, 2018, <https://networkcultures.org/artofcriticism/2018/04/25/divide-and-conquer-the-future-of-online-criticism/>. [↩](#)
 16. Lyn Hejinian, 'The Rejection of Closure,' Poetry Foundation, 1983, <https://www.poetryfoundation.org/articles/69401/the-rejection-of-closure>. [↩](#)
 17. After Karen Barad's phrase, see Janneke Adema and Gary Hall, 'Urgent Publishing Session 1: Janneke Adema & Gary Hall,' Urgent Publishing Conference, May 15-17, 2019, <https://vimeo.com/344048731>; Tara McPherson, *Feminist in a Software Lab* (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 2018). [↩](#)
 18. John B. Thompson, *Merchants of Culture: The Publishing Business in the Twenty-First Century* (Cambridge, Oxford, and Boston: Polity, 2010). [↩](#)
 19. This was an important outcome of the preparatory research done for the Making Public project. [↩](#)
 20. Cherilyn Ireton and Julie Posetti, eds, *Journalism, Fake News & Disinformation: Handbook for Journalism Education and Training* (UNESCO series on journalism education 38. Paris: UNESCO, 2018), <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000265552>. [↩](#)
 21. Susan L. Greenberg, *A Poetics of Editing* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), p. 116. [↩](#)
 22. Alexander R. Galloway, 'Analog Hall of Fame: Scale,' January 1, 2020, <http://cultureandcommunication.org/galloway/analog-hall-of-fame-scale>. [↩](#)
 23. Miriam Rasch, 'Friction and the Aesthetics of the Smooth,' *Eurozine*, May 11, 2020, <https://www.eurozine.com/friction-and-the-aesthetics-of-the-smooth/>. [↩](#)
 24. *Here and Now? Explorations in Urgent Publishing* (Amsterdam: Institute of Network Cultures, 2020), pp. 36-7. [↩](#)

25. See for example Valeria Graziano, Marcell Mars, and Tomislav Medak, 'Learning From #Syllabus.' In *Statemachines: Reflections and Actions at the Edge of Digital Citizenship, Finance, and Art*, edited by Yiannis Colakides, Marc Garrett, Inte Gloerich (Amsterdam: Institute of Network Cultures, 2019), pp. 115–25. [↩](#)
26. *Here and Now? Explorations in Urgent Publishing* (Amsterdam: Institute of Network Cultures, 2020), p. 19. [↩](#)
27. *Here and Now?*, p. 21. [↩](#)
28. *Here and Now?*, p. 23. [↩](#)
29. *Here and Now?*, p. 117. [↩](#)
30. Lída Pereira, Miriam Rasch, and Kimmy Spreuwenberg, 'Urgent Publishing Debris,' *Pervasive Labour Union zine*, 2020. [↩](#)
31. *Upside Down Inside Out: Discover the Hidden Structures of your (Digital) Content* (Amsterdam: Institute of Network Cultures, 2020). [↩](#)
32. Sam Dragga and Gwendolyn Gong, *Editing: The Design of Rhetoric* (London, New York: Routledge, 1989), p. 9. [↩](#)
33. Dragga and Gong, *Editing*, 11. Recall the ideal of a text communicating its message 100% to the reader, in W.A.M. Carstens, 'Text linguistics and text editing' (Antwerp: University of Antwerp, 2003). [↩](#)
34. Dragga and Gong, *Editing*, p. 12. [↩](#)
35. Miriam Rasch, 'From Modularity to Relationality: Other Forms of Writing, Thinking & Publishing,' *Making Public*, January 27, 2020, <https://networkcultures.org/makingpublic/2020/01/27/from-modularity-to-relationality-other-forms-of-writing-thinking-publishing/>. [↩](#)
36. Susan L. Greenberg, *A Poetics of Editing* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), p. 238. [↩](#)
37. Greenberg, *A Poetics of Editing*, pp. 237–8. [↩](#)
38. Greenberg, *A Poetics of Editing*, p. 239. [↩](#)
39. Nicholas Thoburn, *Anti-book: On the Art and Politics of Radical Publishing* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2016), p. 256. [↩](#)
40. Some of these points were also addressed at the 'Art of Criticism' meeting held in 2017, zooming in on editing practices of art and cultural criticism and publishing: [↩](#)
 - Transparency and integrity regarding financial aspects, including fair pay. This is primarily a responsibility on the side of the publisher.
 - Challenging the pressure of newness and acceleration and critically evaluate the use of tools, platforms, formats, etc.
 - Aiming at diverse and inclusive media sphere, both on the side of writers as reading audiences.
 - Collaboration instead of competition, use of cooperative models, networks, and methods.
 - Educational aspects.See: Miriam Rasch, 'The Art of Criticism First Meet-up Report,' December 19, 2017,

<https://networkcultures.org/artofcriticism/2017/12/19/the-art-of-criticism-first-meet-up-report/>.

41. Miriam Rasch, 'Friction and the Aesthetics of the Smooth,' *Eurozine*, May 11, 2020, <https://www.eurozine.com/friction-and-the-aesthetics-of-the-smooth/>. ↩
42. Roland Barthes, *The Pleasure of the Text*. Translated by Richard Miller (New York: Hill and Wang, 1975), p. 23. ↩