Introduction

Within the technological imaginary, developments in communication systems are often represented as a series of decisive shifts and abrupt breaks. The new technology emerges, it seems, out of nowhere, escaping the tentacles of historical materiality. Devoid of a past and promising a future perfect, this narrative of progress helps serve global commodity relations in its uncritical celebration of the new. As a response to these socio-technological representations, this paper argues that the relation between old and new media is more complex than is often assumed by contemporary media theory. Narratives of change are dramatically complicated by the striking continuities between different communication systems. What follows teases out some of these continuities by exploring how geographically distributed postal networks produce affective and aesthetic relations of intimacy.

This is not, however, to deny the problematics encountered by critical historiography. The historical approaches of poststructuralism, for example, have offered a rejoinder to a certain universalising version of history that wants to erase

* Sections of this paper were originally published in Fibreculture Journal 1.2 (2003) as “Email and Epistolary technologies: Presence, Intimacy, Disembodiment.”
difference. In its effort to see difference where hitherto there had existed the smoothness and functionality of structuralism, poststructuralist media theory celebrates rupture and aporia to reveal the disjunction of history and its representation.\(^1\) Yet even as “discontinuity” has been a useful conceptual framework though which to understand activist poetics and avant-gardism,\(^2\) it is quite remarkable that some of these rhetorical strategies can end up confirming that very methodology and ideology they wish to confound. That is, while arguing for historical rupture against the totalising view of historical seamlessness, these kinds of studies may be seen actually to rejoice in the unbroken narrative of history.

_Presence_

Intimacy, affect and aesthetics are always intertwined at the level of technology. As an avant-garde strategy, for example, the practices of mail-art are enabled by the material conditions of the postal exchange.\(^3\) In turn, the economies of this exchange are underpinned by the dance between absence and presence: writing a letter signals the absence of the recipient and, simultaneously, aims to bridge the gap between writer and recipient. As William Decker puts it, “exchange of letter sheet thus articulates and substantiates the central paradox of epistolary discourse: that the exchange of personally inscribed texts confirms even as it would mitigate separation.”\(^4\)

“Presence” has emerged as a major focus for researchers and artists of digital culture, computer networks and new medical, communication and entertainment technologies.\(^5\)

---

3 See Annmarie Chandler and Norrie Neumark (eds.), _At a Distance: Precursors to Art and Activism on the Internet_ (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT/Leonardo Books, 2005).
Presence refers to the degree to which geographically dispersed agents experience a sense of physical and/or psychological proximity through the use of particular communication technologies. In areas as diverse as virtual reality, video conferencing, MUDs (multi-user domain), newsgroups, electronic discussion lists, telemedicine, web-based education, flight simulation software and computer gaming, a sense of presence is vital for the success of the particular application.

It ought to be noted that the term “telepresence” has been used both interchangeably with and in opposition to the term presence. Jonathan Steuer, for example, adopts the latter use arguing that the point of departure between the two terms depends on the degree to which the subject experiences their environment as technologically mediated. As he explains, presence “refers to the experience of natural surroundings ... in which sensory input impinges directly upon the organs of sense.”6 In contrast, telepresence refers to “the experience of presence in an environment by means of a communication medium.”7 Steuer’s model, however, has been criticised because it relies on a mistaken dichotomy between, on the one hand, “real,” “natural” presence and on the other hand, “mediated” telepresence. This, argue Giuseppe Mantovani and Giuseppe Lombard and Theresa Ditton, “At the Heart of It All: The Concept of Presence,” Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication 3.2 (1997), http://www.ascusc.org/jcmc/vol3/issue2/lombard.html; William J. Mitchell, “e-topia: ‘Urban life, Jim—but not as we know it’” (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1999); Sheila C. Murphy, “Lurking and Looking: Webcams and the Construction of Cybervisuality,” Moving Images: from Edison to the Webcam, eds. John Fullerton and Strid Söderbergh Widding (Sydney: Libbey, 2000) 173-180; Marie-Laure Ryan, “Immersion vs. Interactivity: Virtual Reality and Literary Theory,” SubStance 28.2 (1999): 110-137; Thomas Sheridan, “Musings on Telepresence and Virtual Presence,” Presence: Teleoperators and Virtual Environments 1.1 (1992): 120-125.

6 The emphasis appears in the original. For the remainder of this paper I note only those instances where the emphasis has been added by me. It may be assumed, therefore, that if there is no notation, the emphasis appears in the original quotation.

Riva, fails to acknowledge the mediated, culturally constructed nature of all communication environments. As they put it:

> presence is always mediated by both physical and conceptual tools that belong to a given culture: “physical” presence in an environment is in principle no more “real” or more true than telepresence or immersion in a simulated virtual environment.8

In addition to these critiques, a number of writers have attempted to historicise the socio-critical formulations of presence, telepresence and virtual presence but these phenomena have usually been confined to representations within electronic media.9 The past several decades have also produced a substantial body of work that explores the ways that global communication networks reconfigure our experience of time and space. As a result of the rapid flow of data through digital information systems, distance appears to shrink and time seems to collapse. The speed up of communication and the concomitant perception of a collapsing time and space will often produce an intense, quasi-spiritual sense of presence: “through the computer, thought seems to come across like a flowing stream from mind to mind.”10 This sentence is instructive because it collocates “disembodiment,” “presence,” and an eclipse of the material vehicle of communication, conditions, that, as we shall see, are a defining formal property of the communication systems under

---


investigation. However, current theorising about what David Harvey calls “time-space compression,” generally limits itself to a history that begins with technological inventions such as the telegraph. What remains under-examined is the extent to which older technologies, such as the postal service, also foster the sense that the constraints of space and time can be overcome. In response, this paper traces the persistence of tropes of presence and intimacy though the texts and socio-technological representations of three sites of communication: letters, postcards and email.

**Epistolary Presence**

The construction of imaginary presence is a fundamental feature of letter writing. In Claudio Guillén’s words:

> there is hardly an act in our daily experience, rooted in life itself, that is as likely as the writing of a letter to propel us toward inventiveness and interpretation … the “I” who writes may not only be pretending to act upon a friend … but acting also upon himself, upon his evolving mirror image.\(^{12}\)

These epistolary inventions are both performance and interpretation. The letter writer performs a version of self and the recipient reads that performance. These interpretive acts help to produce the imagined bodies of epistolary communication. As Ruth Perry has observed, through the “solitary pleasures” of reading and writing, the lovers of epistolary relationships “summon up images of each other, without need for the visible presence of the other, and then react joyfully to their own creations.”\(^{13}\)

In face-to-face communication, questions of presence can seem unproblematic. Epistolary communication underlines the

---


fact that, as Jacques Derrida has argued, presence depends on and is the effect of a complex set of assumptions and strategies. As I shall argue, “presence” is dependent on (and in part created by) rhetorical strategies and effects such as intimacy, immediacy, spontaneity and disembodiment. At first sight, the last of these terms might appear not to belong to this list; yet in email and epistolary correspondence, presence often depends paradoxically on a type of disembodiment. In some instances this involves the eclipse of the material medium that supports and the temporal or physical obstacles that would otherwise thwart communication. As the author Elizabeth Barrett Browning (1806-1861) remarks to one of her closest epistolary friends: “thanks warmest & truest, my dearest Miss Mitford, for your delightful letter, which is certainly delightful, as it made me feel just as if I were sitting face to face to you, hearing you talk” (16 September, 1844, 9:136). Disembodiment, as this quotation suggests, is in epistolary communication coincident with the emergence of a fantasy of bodily proximity or presence.

In a letter sent to Mary Russell Mitford (1787-1855), Barrett Browning provides insight into the ways in which the signifiers of presence operate within epistolary discourse. Barrett Browning writes:

If I do not empty my heart out with a great splash on the paper, every time I have a letter from you, & speak my gladness & thankfulness, it is lest I shd. weary you of thanksgivings! (EBB, 24 March, 1842, 5: 269)

---


15 All the letters referred to in the text are from The Brownings’ Correspondence, eds. Philip Kelley and Ronald Hudson, 14 volumes (Kansas: Wedgestone Press, 1984). The in-text citations provide details of the date of letter, volume number and page number. For the purpose of the in-text citation, Elizabeth Barrett Browning is abbreviated to “EBB” and Mary Russell Mitford is abbreviated to “MRM.”
Barrett Browning’s claim that she writes letters by emptying her “heart out with a great splash on the paper” suggests authenticity, intimacy, immediacy and spontaneity. However, Barrett Browning’s claims that her letters are written in blood that spurts from the author’s heart also draws attention, in a somewhat macabre fashion, to the body. Within a discourse of disembodiment, there is a complex relation between the imagined body of epistolary discourse and the real “flesh and blood” corporeality of the epistolary actors. Since one is not physically co-present with one’s interlocutor, references to the corporeal body play significant rhetorical and social functions in the production of meaning within letter writing practice. The physical absence of one’s epistolary partner provides both the impetus and the “material” for a range of strategies, language uses and technological functions aimed at creating an imagined sense of presence. References to the physical body, to the scene of writing, to the place where the letter is received or to postal technology are often used by letter writers to convey and invoke a sense of immediacy, intimacy and presence:

Mr Kenyon is here. I must end & see him—for the post will be fast upon his heels (EBB, 24 March, 1842, 5: 268);

this tiresome post, going when I had so much more to say (EBB, 19 September, 1842, 6:83);

You will never guess what I am doing—my beloved friend—or rather suffering!—oh—you will never guess. I am sitting … rather lying for my picture. That sounds like vanity between two worlds, indeed!—only the explanation excuses me (EBB, 16 April, 1841, 5:36).

By referring to the “here and now” of corporeality—“you will never guess what I am doing … lying for my picture”—these correspondents strive to collapse the time and distance that separate them. Depending on the skill and eloquence of the letter writer, the recipient can feel as if he/she is actually face-to-
face with them. But, of course, a key point is contained in that small phrase “as if.” Were the two writers present to one another, there would be no need to correspond. Yet for many letter writers of the nineteenth century, the face-to-face encounter is not necessarily superior to epistolary communication. Indeed, on some occasions, epistolary discourse may be the superior mode. Letters can provide one with the opportunity to express what was unsaid, or could not be said, during a physical meeting. After Mitford had visited her friend Barrett Browning in London, for example, the former wrote:

My beloved friend how can I thank you enough! You came—you went away like a dream and as if it were a real dream, I never expressed or tried to express all the thankfulness & sense of your great goodness, which penetrated me through and through. You will let me thank you now, will you not?—and you will believe in the earnestness of the thoughts which revert to that day & go forward to you? (MRM, 18 November, 1843, 8:50)

For many correspondents, then, “absence” is creative; it opens a discursive space in which desires and subjectivities that might not otherwise be articulated can be explored.

Letters—like postcards and electronic mail—are conventionally understood as a technology that allows communication between bodies that are absent from each other. Epistolary communication is to that extent “disembodied.” Yet the boundary between disembodiment and embodiment in epistolary practice is difficult to maintain strictly. Writing and reading letters are, of course, operations in which the body must play a role. As noted, the body of the absent correspondent can become “visible” in letter exchanges when, for example, the author refers to the epistolary scene of writing, its material supports and delivery systems or makes mention of the letter’s temporality. These strategies aim for a sense of immediacy and presence by foregrounding the body of the
writer. A related but not identical epistolary convention is one where the materiality of the letter is made to stand for the correspondent’s body. Due to its physical proximity or contact with its author the letter can work metonymically; a function most obvious in amorous epistolary discourse where the letter is kissed, held, cried over or adored in place of the lover’s body. In this way, the gap between letter writer and reader seems bridged. As Barrett Browning writes in a letter to Mitford, “I should like to be near you my beloved friend, to kiss both the dear hands twenty times which wrote & touched the paper of this most tender letter!” (30 March, 1842, 5:286).

Illustrations such as these may seem relatively unproblematic as signifiers of “embodiment,” proof that the fleshly body of the epistolary author is “present” at the time of writing and therefore can guarantee authenticity of communication. But even in cases we may call unproblematic, the sign that stands for the body seems at times to eclipse its own materiality. Still more remarkably, at times the materiality of the body that writes, along with the signs it makes on the paper, are eclipsed for the reader by a strong sense of communion between minds or spirits.

Barrett Browning gives an eloquent illustration of this “eclipse” in a letter written shortly after Mitford had visited:

My dearest friend’s letter was like a shadow of her presence thrown back & brought to mind so strongly all the pleasure I had had in the “dear Sunshine” that the letter itself was for the moment annihilated … not thought of! I thought of YOU too much. Oh, what a happy week for me! (EBB, 19 June, 1844, 9:23)

Barrett Browning is describing a transparency which many forms of communication have as an unachievable ideal: in the moment described, the material conditions of representation are effaced, “annihilate,” “not thought of.” Interestingly, then, this suggests that on occasion the media of epistolary systems may need to be forgotten in order to function efficiently, or conversely, that there are times when the materiality of a letter...
seems actually to get in the way of its ability to communicate. Arguably, this is a feature of representation in general; the desire to experience unmediated “reality” appears satisfied when the material conditions of representation (the pen, the screen, the keyboard) are eclipsed. The presence, intimacy and immediacy created between epistolary subjects relies upon a complex dynamic between, on the one hand, materiality, physical locatedness and embodiment and, on the other hand, references to the material conditions of epistolary communication and the corporeal body. In order to create a sense of presence and immediacy one may refer to the material conditions of the postal service or the corporeality of the letter writer. But if too much attention is drawn to the vehicle that is creating the sense of presence, then the construction and artifice of this “immediacy” becomes apparent; one sees the signifier not the signified. What, at first glance, may appear to be a reference to the materiality or “embodied” quality of letter writing actually might be operating at a different register since the letter’s materiality turns into a sign for the presence of the absent correspondent: “Your letter, my dearest friend, is twenty times welcome—& stands for you, for that coveted presence, right worthily” (EBB, 21 November, 1843, 8: 53).

Paradoxically, then, references to the real, lived, situated, physical body of the epistolary exchange can produce a “fantasised body.” That is, the letter form allows correspondents to enact an identity and even adopt a persona that may differ from their “real” or lived body and personae. This is not meant to imply there exists an authentic self from which the letter writer departs. Rather, this “imagined body” or virtual self is a productive effect of the epistolary exchange. As Lori Lebow notes, “letter writing involves the writing self as a joint venture undertaken by the writer and reader. Writer and reader construct identity from textual cues based on the received responses from the selected audience.”16 The

performance of presence in nineteenth century epistolary culture is enacted by a complex interplay between absent letter writers, face-to-face meetings and the material, epistolary system that renders problematic a strict dichotomy between embodiment and disembodiment.

**Postcard Presence**

Epistolary communication has been formally and aetioologically viewed as closely related to privacy, the “confidential inscription of private, inward, individual experience.”17 For Decker, the expectation of privacy and confidentiality is the “enabling condition” for the production of intimacy.18 What happens, then, to Kittler’s “discourse network” of the nineteenth century when these categories of affect are put in question by the 1865 invention of the postcard? Descriptions of the shift from a system dominated by the letter to one that employed letters and postcards are often couched in terms of apocalyptic loss and destruction: “Differing from a letter, a postcard is a letter to the extent that nothing of it remains that is, or that holds. It destines the letter to its ruin.”19 Indeed, the postcard has provided critical practice with an eloquent trope for representing transformations to certain regimes of symbolic and material organisation.20


For correspondents of the late nineteenth-century, the postcard introduced a new system of postal writing in which traditional epistolary values and protocols were challenged and questions of class were raised. Fears were regularly expressed that postal clerks or servants would spend their time reading the postcards that passed through their hands. A newspaper of 1870 warned of the “absurdity of writing private information on an open piece of card-board, that might be read by half a dozen persons before it reached its destination.”²¹ Yet, those who have noted the threat to epistolary privacy posed by the postcard have invariably overlooked the point that in some sense, at least, the privacy of epistolary communication has often been at risk. During the mid nineteenth-century, for example, there was the distinct possibility that government officials, on the pretext of protecting national security, might open one’s letters.²² Even if one’s letter arrived inviolate, one could not always assume that it would remain with its intended recipient. Quite often Barrett Browning, Mitford and their other friends would circulate letters without first securing the permission of their authors.

The disjunction between the imagined privacy of communication and the actual or possible dissemination, of this message to a wide audience, suggest that the latter must at least in part be occluded if epistolary communication based on the former is to continue. When intimacy or immediacy is the desired effect of a letter (not all letters strive for these qualities: business communication, for example, is informed by other characteristics), correspondents assume a level of privacy and act accordingly. It is worth noting, then, that privacy is a historically contingent and culturally determined term. Cultural theorists who posit the postcard’s erosion of privacy, are fantasising about a level of epistolary privacy that, perhaps, has

never been available. This is not to deny that the postcard dramatically changed postal communication. Perhaps for the first time the postcard made visible the discursive practices of the general public. The texts of “the everyday,” the products of “ordinary” writers, were now being circulated and read in a manner and on a scale that had not previously been possible. Nevertheless, this loss of actual (as opposed to imagined) “privacy” did not make impossible epistolary effects such as intimacy, immediacy and presence.

The correspondence between William and Elsie Fuller provides a rich archive for mapping the degree to which narratives of presence and intimacy play out in postcard communication. William Robert Fuller was born in 1899 in Richmond, a suburb of Melbourne. In 1915 he enlisted in the Australian Army, serving as Lance Corporal with the 21st Battalion and was awarded the Distinguished Conduct Medal in June 1918. He was repatriated to Australia on 20 October 1918 and died of Spanish influenza in July of 1919 aged twenty.23 The earliest postcard in the collection is dated February 1916 and the last is August 1918. During this eighteen-month period, Fuller sent his sister, Elsie, about 140 cards.24

Aesthetic affect plays an important role in the production of presence and intimacy within the Fuller correspondence. The images carried by these postcards convey a range of emotions, desires and fears as well as fulfilling particular rhetorical functions. Fuller commonly uses the postcard to reproduce for his sister something he has seen or felt. The assumption seems to be that if both writer and reader look at the “same” sight, the

23 Biographical and historical notes about the Fuller family are obtained from two sources: Papers of William Robert Fuller, Accession Number MS 9701, La Trobe Australian Manuscripts Collection, State Library of Victoria, Melbourne and Australian War Memorial database: http://www.awm.gov.au/.

24 This calculation includes only the cards that bear messages. Fuller also sent Elsie cards without messages and counting these the full collection of postcards numbers about 170. Since William and Elsie share a last name, they will be referred to in the text by their first names.
latter will share the experience of the former: “at that building I have been on duty and where you see that person sitting I have also sat.”25

The relation between picture and message is complex and takes a number of different forms. Sometimes, as with the above example, William appears to have seen the same monument, figure or streetscape that the card depicts. On other occasions, however, presence is produced despite the fact that William may not have seen the actual monument to which the postcard refers: “these are a few photos of what I have seen or intend to see, I have not seen the pyramids yet but I intend to see them. They are only a few miles out of Cairo. I will tell you about them.”26 In this case, a shared present is created by the fact that neither William nor Elsie have seen the pyramids. It is strengthened by, perhaps, their shared desire to see the pyramids and by the simulacrum of the pyramids that they have both seen on the postcard. In this case, the simulacrum helps to effect an intimacy one assumes is felt as natural and spontaneous.

A sense of intimacy, therefore, is not dependent on a close relation between image and text. One of the postcards sent to his sister, for example, carries on one side a picture of “the mosques of Sultan Hassan and Al Rifai” in Cairo. On the other side of the postcard, however, William describes a scene one would not expect to see on a commercially available postcard:

While we were waiting for the train to go, at Suez, I saw a terrible sight, it was a young native boy about sixteen, he had legs about one inch thick and could not walk on them so had to walk on his hands with his knees doubled up under his chin. Just for all the world like a monkey poor chap. I gave him four piastres (one piastre worth 2½d) and he almost went mad. Some of our chaps got onto the river and just to pass the time


away they would push the natives into the water. It was very funny to see six of them in the water at once, but it did not hurt them for I could almost swear most of them never had a wash for months.  

While conveying the young boy’s plight, William reveals something of his own “position” as a young Australian soldier. The language—a mix of emotional commentary and masculine bravado—tells much about the colonial discourses that help shape his views. This establishes an intimacy that is heightened by descriptions of difference and “foreignness.” Although Elise does not view a visual representation of what William is able to see—the picture on the card is not the image, event or feeling that William wants to tell her about—a sense of intimacy is generated by the ideological position they share.

These instances provide the basis for thinking through the claims made by contemporary media theory that the postcard, as emblematic of a certain institutional and technological regime, brings to an end structures of intimacy, presence and affect. As noted above, a number of theorists focus on the letter as articulating a certain symbolic capital and cultural formation. The epistolary subject, so it is argued, is autonomous, has faith in authorial power, and believes that communication is the transparent exchange of thoughts from one consciousness to another. In short this is the Romantic subject re-worked by Postmodernism. Siegert, for example, argues that the combination of photography and the postcard had a significant impact upon contemporary regimes of representation and the belief in the originality of subjectivity. He writes:

In addition to standard postage, standard format and standard text, there now was a standard picture, as well. With the advent of the picture postcard, visual memories departed from the human soul, only to await people thereafter on the routes of the World Postal Union. The picture postcard opened up the

---

territory of the World Postal Union as an immense space of forgetting, the object of which was the world itself ... Once memories circulated as picture postcards that could be sent any place on the globe ... travelling itself became unnecessary.28

Yet people continued to travel. However standardised early nineteenth-century correspondents felt their postcard images to be, they did not stop collecting and sending them. Siegert’s argument about the relation between letters and postcards is based on a misreading of the cultural significance of “standardisation.” It misses a key point about how dreams of presence, immediacy and intimacy endure in the postcard era rather than, as he seems to suggest, dissipate. The difficulty with Siegert’s argument is that he opposes the formal, standardised, mass-produced format of the postcard to notions of intimacy, privacy, presence and individuality. The latter qualities, he argues, are tied to the epistolary era and are thus made problematic with the new media of the postcard. But why should standardisation rule out the subjective and individual realms? After all, commodity culture and mass production are shored up by the belief in the individual and the rhetoric of “choice.”

Contrary to popular and academic belief, therefore, the postcard did not destroy postal intimacy. Refuting commonly-held views that the standardisation of postcard media threatened individuality because it removed the privacy in turn assumed to be necessary for intimacy, the Fuller correspondence demonstrates that postcard communication can in fact increase levels of individuality, presence, intimacy and affect. The postcards exchanged between Elsie and William illustrate the extent to which privacy is performed and imagined rather than existing as a real, empirical condition. Despite the fact that the Fullers’s correspondence was available for the wartime censors to read, a fact of which the Fullers were

28 Siegert, Relays, 161.
aware, these siblings found ways to construct their correspondence as private and intimate.

**Conclusion**

Seen through the lens of contemporary cultural theory, the relation between text and technology is too often conceived in dichotomous terms. Either technological materialities effect decisive, irreversible changes in the content of communication or the socio-cultural articulation under investigation transcends the particularities of the technological infrastructure and regimes of circulation. This tendency towards technological or textual determinism has been particularly acute in new media research which focuses either on the geo-political form of informational networks or the located practices of the ethnographer’s text: form / content; global / local; theoretical / empirical; production / consumption. Rather than view these foci as strict binaries, however, I have attempted to map their symbiotic and dynamic relation. These dynamic relations underwrite the use by postcard correspondents, for example, of public communications systems to convey private emotions such as desire, fear and intimacy.

Recognising that fantasies of presence are embedded within material infrastructures and historical practice provides a critical framework within which to locate a theorisation of contemporary affective relations and “immersive aesthetics.”

Postal poetries continue to exert institutional, symbolic and technological force on new media forms such as email and mobile telephony. As Chandler and Neumark remind us, in

---


order to assess the future of an effective and affective art practice one needs to acknowledge that the very idea of “the new” is, of course, very old. As they put it:

in each era, the “new” plays a specific role, to carve out a territory as well as to provide the energy that throwing off the weight of tradition can require. However, pursuit of the “new” risks becoming a tradition itself, heavy and obligatory, if it refuses access to its precursors, the “new” of the recent past.32

In tracing epistolary intimacy and presence though geographically dispersed networks, this chapter has argued for a nuanced understanding of the postal conditions underpinning the relation between new and old media.

32 Chandler and Neumark, *At a Distance*, 442.