Slash as Queer Utopia

Dr Ika Willis

School of Humanities, University of Bristol, UK

ABSTRACT

In *Text*, John Mowitt writes that textuality can be understood "in terms of the interplay between what takes place within a cultural production… and what, as yet, has no place within the social". In this paper I will be trying to tease out the complicated topography produced by this interplay between what takes place and what has no place, in its specific relation to the utopic and queer spaces produced by slash fan fiction. I argue that Mowitt's understanding of the text allows us to interrogate and to reframe the relationship between textuality and historical/social context (often metaphorized as 'situatedness', fixity, location). In this way we will be able to read the utopics of slash, not as the 'no-place' of a desire free from the constraints of the social, but as a model for politically and ethically responsible textuality.

This paper is driven by the term 'utopia', and it originates in an intertextual coincidence. I was reading John Mowitt's book *Text: The Genealogy of an Antidisciplinary Object*, which deals in part with the utopian impulses of reading; at the same time, I noticed that, in my writing on slash, I had occasionally described myself as a "utopian" slash fan, and I started to wonder what I meant by that, given the profoundly dystopian universes in which I read and write slash.[i] For example, the show I'm going to be talking about in this paper, *Blake's 7*,[ii] is about a small group of people based on a ship called the *Liberator*. The narrative is, at least at first, loosely centred on their attempts to resist, undermine and/or overthrow the Federation, the totalitarian galactic government; however, Blake, the leader and one of only two explicitly politically committed members of the crew, leaves the show after two seasons, leaving Avon, a cynical computer scientist, in charge of the ship. After a season of slightly undirected wandering on the part of the *Liberator* crew, the Federation get hold of a mind-control drug and the political situation worsens to the extent that Avon is finally forced to focus his energies, first on various means of opposing or outrunning the Federation, and later on finding Blake again, in order to try and form a last-ditch defense. When he does find Blake, in the final episode of the fourth and last season of the show, there are a series of misunderstandings and Avon ends up killing Blake, moments before the Federation infiltrate Blake's base and kill the rest of the crew.

Given this narrative, I began to be slightly puzzled about what I meant when I called my relationship to this show "utopian". And I found that considering the spatiality of the word "utopia", via John Mowitt's use of the term in *Text*, in fact resolves a problem I've found in a lot of thinking about slash, and resolves it in a way which has more general implications for thinking about spatiality and textuality.

Slash is often thought of in spatial terms, as an operation of intersection: slash fans map the points where the specific content of a particular text intersects with a certain queerness. Whether that queerness is thought of as originating "inside" the text, as a subtext or potential alternative text, or "outside" the text, in the slash fan's head, what *counts* as queerness is, of course, determined by social forces which run through the text but also go beyond and outside it. Some writers, accordingly, seek to determine the queer-political value of slash – its position on a spectrum of "resistance" and "incorporation"[iii] – by mapping the particular intersection between *text* and *queer* that a particular slash fan creates. What interests me here is an occasional tendency to attribute queer-friendly politics to a particular piece of slash based specifically on the fan creator's *location* vis-à-vis a queerness that comes before, or extends beyond, both the text being slashed and the resulting slash text.

For example, Christine Scodari, in an essay on the politically problematic dimensions of some slash writing (including, for example, assertions – clearly open to homophobic readings – that male characters having sex with other men remain heterosexual), writes that "slash featuring women and penned by lesbians… is transparently resistive".[iv] Here, the political value of lesbian-authored f/f slash as "resistive" seems to be guaranteed

by the author's location as "lesbian" *outside* the text, which serves to determine that her stories must be written and read according to a particular queer-political orientation – regardless, apparently, of the content of the stories, or of the specific interventions they perform on the canonical text. [v]

In order to understand what is at stake in this appeal to the "outside" of the text, I want to pause for a moment over the topography of the text as it has been evoked by one of its earliest theorists, Roland Barthes. Space and place are recurrent metaphors for textuality in Barthes' work: in the foundational essays "The Death of the Author" and "From Work to Text" Barthes insists that "a text is not a line of words… but a multidimensional space in which a variety of writings, none of them original, blend and clash",[vi] and that an experience of the text is like a stroll through a landscape, where "what [the reader] perceives is multiple, irreducible, coming from a disconnected, heterogeneous variety of substances of perspectives". [vii]

In these metaphors, space is appealed to principally in order to evoke the organized heterogeneity of the text: the experience of space is multisensorial, heterogeneous, multiple, irreducible, discontinuous, and so on. The spatiality of the text thus refers to the quality (which perhaps defines the *text* as opposed to the *work*) whereby incommensurable codes from different fields participate in creating the particularity of a text. The text, Barthes writes, is not just a "line" – it does not simply refer to the specific arrangement in space and time of words, images, sounds and so on that make up a particular cultural production: it is a "multidimensional space", in which multiple lines, which traverse the space of the text, cross.

In his essay "Writing Reading", however, Barthes refers to the space, not of the text, but of culture: he writes that the "rules" according to which we read come from "that vast cultural space through which our person (whether author or reader) is only one passage". [viii] The relationship between the heterogeneous space of the text and the "vast cultural space" crossed by infinite possible "passage[s]", is somewhat unclear at first sight, and it is the topography of this relationship that I think is at stake in Scodari's mapping of incorporation and resistance in slash.

For Scodari's argument, it seems to me, depends on being able to map out the route of the slash fan's "passage" through "cultural space" in advance, according to the fan's starting point: a location on a determinable set of queer co-ordinates. Although the argument therefore depends on the existence of a secure boundary between extratextual (cultural) and textual space (since the fan must be a lesbian in a way which securely exceeds and precedes her relationship with the canonical text), it also depends on there being no border trouble at the boundary between the two spaces: that is, the fan's interaction with the text must not disrupt the fact that, or the way in which, she identifies as a lesbian. She must be able to pass smoothly into textual space without the slightest swerve from, or stumble in, the path which has been laid down by her identification, her desire, and her politics. The text itself, for Scodari, is reduced to a blank, empty space; the path taken by the reader through it is wholly determined by "outside" forces, and the text's spatial specificity, which might offer particular resistances to any such path, is wholly effaced. The heterogeneity and multiplicity of the text which the spatial metaphor, I have argued, was designed to convey, are now reduced to a multiple and heterogeneous set of starting points in a 'cultural space' designated as *outside* the text.

I see, therefore, two main problems with constructions such as Scodari's of the relationship between reader, text and culture which obtains in the reading and writing of slash. Firstly, as just noted, these constructions empty out the space of the text, making it continuous with a political/cultural space which nonetheless remains extratextual. Secondly, they locate slash writers in a specific queer or nonqueer, resistant or incorporated, position *only* in relation to this *extratextual* space. I would like to argue for a reading of slash – and, more broadly, of textuality – which allows for a more topographically complex way of understanding the relationships between text, reader and culture. In order to do so, I will turn to John Mowitt's reinscription of textuality in *Text*, where he writes, for example, that textuality can be understood "in terms of the interplay between what *takes place* within a cultural production… and what, as yet, *has no place* within the social" (my italics).[ix] Hence, textuality, "insisting upon the 'utopic' location that arises in a group's engagement with a particular cultural production", allows "politicized cultural interpretation" to "engage the texture of a particular production while making the task of doing so assume responsibility for the utopic impulses that emerge within it".[x]

Let me pause here and try and give a textual account of *Blake's 7*: that is, an account which engages the texture of the show in all its particularity, but attempts not to do so in such a way as to efface either the mechanisms of reading by which I came to an understanding of that "content", or the utopic impulses that emerge in the reading itself. In what follows, then, I will try to give an account of the ways in which *Blake's 7* succeeded in producing the set of subject positions that I occupy as a utopian slash fan.

The crucial characteristic of the show, for me, is that it involves a pattern of implicitness and explicitness on two main fronts: firstly, the fraught, tactile and highly emotional relationship between the two male leads, Blake and Avon; and secondly, the shifting series of arguments between the shifting cast of characters about the tactics, aims, and possibilities of political resistance. Whenever the latter subject is debated explicitly, the narrative of the episode contrives not to "answer" the points raised in discussion by the characters, but to block the possibility of action on that particular issue for the moment.[xi] Furthermore, the political arguments *can* never be resolved, because the fictional universe in which *Blake's 7* takes place is not consistent. Although the narrative of all four seasons takes place in the context of political and/or violent resistance to the Federation, the questions of whether Blake can possibly overthrow the government, or how he might be able to, are never consistently answered.[xii] One fan, Sally Manton, has said that *Blake's 7* is simultaneously set in a universe where one man can change the world and a universe where this is not possible;[xiii] this means that there is ultimately no guidance from the show itself as to what its narratives are meant to mean, and readers are consistently unsettled and unsure of what position the text is asks them to adopt vis-à-vis a particular narrative or political issue.

A similar pattern of contradictions obtains in relation to the relationship between Blake and Avon. Here, some of the contradictions are to do with the characterization of the two men, especially Avon: accordingly, these can be made relatively explicit in ways which fall clearly within the conventions of

romance - Blake destroys the rationalism of the aggressively self-proclaimed rational and self-interested Avon. In *Star One*, Avon loudly proclaims his dislike of Blake and his desire to "be free of him", insisting that he himself only stays on *the Liberator* in order to get access to the ship's superior alien technology. In the third season, he gets what he repeatedly claims to have wanted: Blake is lost in the confusion of the war that takes place between Seasons Two and Three, and Avon is in sole charge of the ship. However, Avon ends the third season, in the episode *Terminal*, risking – and, as it turns out, losing – the *Liberator* and his continued safety for a chance to reunite with Blake. The question of why he does so, when it so clearly contradicts his stated desires and priorities, is not raised.

The relationship between the two men, like the political dimension of the show, also touches on the question of what is and is not possible in this fictional universe – and, again, we are ultimately given no guidance on how to frame this relationship. Although Avon's and Blake's relationship is characterized by intense eye-contact and by unexplained and frequent touches (see Figures 1-3), it is not presented according to the conventions which elsewhere in the show imply heterosexual sex or coupledom.[xiv] On the other hand, no relationships or characters are explicitly named as homosexual in the show, so we have no idea how this future society manages same-sex desire.

These two dimensions of the show – the political, and the relationship between Blake and Avon – are profoundly intertwined with one another, and carry the most narrative weight in terms of the overall arc of the show. The fight against the Federation motivates the majority of individual episodes in seasons 1, 2 and 4, and also provides the narrative connection between episodes and seasons. The relationship between Avon and Blake is given major interpretative weight by being highlighted in the series finales of the second, third and fourth seasons, and by driving the finales of the third and fourth seasons: many of the major events in the plot of the show conceived as a whole, therefore, come about as a result of, or are focalized in relation to, Avon and Blake's feelings about each other. In *Star One*, the finale of Season 2, Avon leads the crew in battle against an alien army: the moment when he takes command is introduced by a conversation with an injured Blake. Avon asks whether or not Blake trusts him; the last line of the conversation, before we move into the battle scene, is Blake's reply – "For what it is worth, I have always trusted you, from the very beginning" – which turns the conversation into one about the emotional content and shape of his relationship with Avon, not about their roles in relation to the political/military task at hand. In the finale of season 3, Terminal, Avon goes into what he strongly suspects to be a Federation trap because, he says, he 'had to', if there was a chance that Blake was still alive:[xv] it turns out that his desire to see Blake again was what enabled the trap to be set in the first place.[xvi] It's his feelings for Blake, then, which drive the plot of the episode. Finally, Blake's death at Avon's hands, at the end of *Blake*, the finale of the fourth and last season, is similarly emotionally motivated ('Have you betrayed us?' Avon asks in their last confrontation, and then: 'Have you betrayed *me*?')

The show as a whole therefore presents us with a narrative in which things are made to happen by queer desire[xvii] as that desire is bound up with a political struggle. This narrative, however, takes place in a universe in which the co-ordinates according to which we are to read those two dimensions – a struggle against a totalitarian, imperialist form of power, and an emotional relationship between two men – are not determined.

It is this which gives *Blake's 7* its specifically textual character - or rather, readings of *Blake's* 7 along this line are textually oriented. Here I borrow a characterization of the text from Stoianova's analyses of the *musical* text, via Mowitt:

> Seen from a textual perspective, music has as its foundation the socially mediated relationship between three positions: the composer/author, the performer, and the listener… Traversing these fundamental positions are the varying signifying practices that will provide them with sociohistorical definition. A composer, for example, must weave together the drives and fantasies that constitute his/her personal history and the various strata of the musical idiom: the graphic notation, the sonorities, the gestural practices, and the historical traditions binding them together. A listener, on the other hand, begins from the same subjective place, but s/he has to negotiate the point of intersection between the musical idiom and the institutions of reception – institutions which encompass the technologies of listening as well as the critical discourses that dictate taste categories… From [Stoianova's] insistence on the positions that constitute the sociopsychological basis of the musical apparatus, the production of music goes hand in hand with the production of multiple subject positions, some of which are sufficiently incompatible with one another to destabilize both the listening and the composing subjects… Obviously, against the avant-garde stand the various elite and popular musics that mobilize the resources of the musical apparatus in order to subordinate the play of subject positions to a dominant position whose coordinates fall well within the interpellative mechanisms of society. [xviii]

Of course it is possible to read *Blake's 7* as 'popular' in this sense – that is, it is possible to subject the play of subject positions produced by the show to a dominant position whose coordinates fall well within the interpellative mechanisms of society, and being a slash fan is not necessarily a guarantee against this. However, read in terms of the two factors I have sketched out – the unresolved relationship between an explicit focus on, and multiple implicit contradictions within, the sexual and imperialist politics of the show; and the close narrative relationship between queer desire and revolutionary impulses – it is also possible to read the show in terms of its *failure* to produce such a singular, dominant position. Such a reading sees *Blake's 7* as provoking viewers to be aware of, and to take responsibility for, the negotiation between personal history, televisual idiom, and the institutions of reception which creates a specifically textual apparatus mediating between authors/producers, performers/crew, and viewer/listeners.

Let me conclude by demonstrating how slash can negotiate, to return to Mowitt's terms, the "interplay between what takes place within a cultural production… and what, as yet, has no place within the social"; how, by "insisting upon the 'utopic' location that arises in a group's engagement with a particular cultural production", slash can "engage the texture of a particular production while making the task of doing so assume responsibility for the utopic impulses that emerge within it".

Here is a passage from the *Blake's 7* slash story "I Do Not Need Anyone At All", by Nova. The specific conditions of its circulation[xix] – it is one of seven stories in a collection, one from the point of view of each member of the Season 1-2 crew – mean that the story can be making no claim to be the "truth" of the text, since each of the stories in the collection presents a different narrative and different versions of the characters' backstories, motivations and personalities. The "I" of the story is Avon.

> I stood… in the *Liberator's* medical unit and watched Blake toss on the narrow bed, muttering, "Renounce, renounce": a voice from his past, a voice from the Federation's indoctrination programme. He jolted upright, the mutter rising to a shout, and I caught hold of him, saying, "Easy, Blake! Easy."
>
> While he struggled against me, time collapsed and I found myself simultaneously experiencing all the moments when I had held him like that before. Tackling him as a charge exploded in Hold Three and falling together to the floor, telling him (and myself) that the instinct to save him was an automatic reaction. Steadying him as the *Liberator* lurched under an attack from Travis,[xx] my arms still around him while we argued about whether to ram Travis's ship – or whether to trust each other. In the empty hall that was Central Control, holding Blake while he came to the realisation that we had been trapped, his hand knotted in the front of my jacket as he confronted Travis.
>
> Arguing with each other and holding each other. All of a sudden that pattern of moments seemed to be the only thing that had mattered in the past two years.[xxi]

All the incidents referred to in this passage "take place" in *Blake's 7*: the framing scene in the medical unit takes place in the second-season episode *Voice from the Past*, and the moments Avon remembers are clearly identifiable as incidents in, respectively, the first-season episodes *Time Squad* and *Duel* and the second-season episode *Pressure Point*.[xxii] The "utopian" moment here is the collapse of time, which allows the incidents Avon remembers to be rearranged thematically – according to their participation in a "pattern" of "arguing and holding each other" – rather than according to their varying narrative function in disjoint episodes.

Whether or not this rearrangement is possible, or legitimate, or legible, thus depends upon the way in which a reader relates the contents of the show – what *takes place* in the show – to the institutions which determine what she can imagine being possible in the fictional universe. Because the fictional universe is inconsistent, and does not guide the reader as to what is or is not possible (whether same-sex desire is or is not recognized in that society; whether one man can or cannot change the world in this fiction about the world), the reader has to *make up* the framework of possibility. And that is to say, the reader has to decide not only what readings of the show are possible, but what is possible in a (fictional) universe – and this decision must necessarily engage what she believes is possible in her own universe. It is here, I think, that the utopian emerges, and it is through the utopian that I am able to respatialize the relationship between textual and political location with which I began this paper.

For to say that Blake and Avon are in love is not only to make a claim about the content of *Blake's 7*; it is also to make the claim that queer desire exists and can be recognized – crucially, even in places where it is not subordinated to the currently-existing social mechanisms for its representation. In slashing Blake and Avon, then, one is making an implicit claim about what Mowitt calls the "piratability" of texts.[xxiii]

This claim is double. Firstly, it is a claim that the text can be read according to the "subversive pressure of the 'not yet'":[xxiv] to say that queer desire can be recognized in *Blake's 7*, and that arguments about the writers' and performers' intention do not impinge on the mechanisms by which we recognize it, is to claim that the text *as such* can be "pirated" by mechanisms of reading which were not predicted by its writers, performers and/or producers. But by the same token, this is *not* a claim that the text has a fixed truth or meaning; it is a claim that the text is *produced* through specific mechanisms of reading, and that these mechanisms are bound up with the subject positions which are available for readers of the text. The slash relation between what "takes place" in the text and what "has no place" in the social thus reorganizes the boundary between textual and cultural space with which I began this paper: instead of being a blank space traversed by lines whose trajectory is determined by their starting point in cultural space, the text is that collection of heterogeneous elements which produce a play of multiple subject positions. This play itself serves to unsettle and to disrupt the relationship between textual and cultural space – but any play can, of course, be subordinated, giving way to "a dominant position whose coordinates fall well within the interpellative mechanisms of society". What is specifically utopian, then, is the text's potential to produce and foster subject positions and collectivities which *do not yet exist*. Furthermore, we recognize this potential in the text – the text's ability to go beyond, not only mechanisms of reading which would "incorporate" it within the social order, but also mechanisms of readings which produce the subject position(s) from which we read the text – in the same moment, in the same movement, as we recognize ourselves in what takes place in the text.

And so it seems to me that in calling myself a utopian slash fan, I was gesturing towards what, for me, *matters* in *Blake's 7*, and in all texts: the piratability of texts which affirms the possibility of change, not only in reading, but in the social institutions according to which we read.

Source: *Blake's 7*, BBC, 1978

Figure 1. Avon and Blake in *Time Squad*

Source: *Blake's 7*, BBC, 1978

Figure 2. Avon and Blake argue in *Duel*

Source: *Blake's 7*, BBC, 1979

Figure 3. Avon and Blake in *Pressure Point*

---

[i] In this paper, "slash" is taken to include fiction, artwork, songvids, daydreams and other productions which posit a sexual and/or romantic relationship between two existing fictional characters of the same sex. I will use the term "slash fans" (rather than "slash readers", "slash writers", "slash vidders", etc) to refer to anyone producing slash in any of these media.

[ii] *Blake's 7*, various writers, various directors, BBC 1978-1981.

[iii] For an introduction to the terms of the debate over "resistance" and "incorporation" in readings of popular or mass cultural texts which has framed much scholarship on slash, see Nicholas Abercrombie and Brian Longhurst, *Audiences: A Sociological Theory of Performance and Imagination*, London: Sage, 1999, pp. 15-36.

[iv] Christine Scodari, "Resistance Re-Examined: Gender, Fan Practices, and Science Fiction Television", *Popular Communication* 1 (2003), pp.111-30, p. 114. Scodari doesn't specify *what* such fans are resisting; from the context I assume the resistance is to the homophobia/heterocentrism in the dominant culture.

[v] Scodari does not entertain the possibility that lesbian fans might write slash featuring *heterosexual* women having sex – which would presumably be open to the same homophobic readings as the m/m slash she mentions which insists on the untarnished heterosexuality of its protagonists: presumably the fans' extratextual identification as "lesbian" is thought to preclude this possibility. Her argument – in which the textual reading of slash is entirely subordinated to extratextual factors – has a similar basis to those defenses of slash which cite the tradition of donating money from the sale of slash zines to AIDS organizations. Again, here, there is no reference to the *content* of the zines sold, or to the relationship between their content and the (here, economic/ financial) circumstances of their circulation.

[vi] Roland Barthes, "The Death of the Author", in *Image – Music – Text*, trans. Stephen Heath, London: Fontana, 1977, pp. 142-54, p.146.

[vii] Barthes, "From Work To Text", in *Image – Music – Text*, pp.155-64, p.159.

[viii] Barthes, "Writing Reading", in *The Rustle of Language*, trans. Richard Howard, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1986, pp.29-32, p.31.

[ix] John Mowitt, *Text: The Genealogy of an Antidisciplinary Object*, Durham: Duke University Press, 1992, p.17.

[x] Mowitt, *Text*, pp.18-19.

[xi] For example, in the second season episode *Voice from the Past*, Blake joins forces with a small band of disaffected Federation functionaries in order to mount a legal challenge to the government; when they reach the conference at which they were to present the evidence, the Federation army massacre the key figures in the conspiracy, and Blake is lucky to escape with his life. The escape provides closure to the

individual episode, and the question of the possibility of a legal challenge to the government is left in abeyenace thereafter. Similarly, in the first season episode *Project Avalon*, Blake attempts to rendezvous with another rebel leader, Avalon: however, she has been captured by the Federation and replaced by an android. The defeat of the android and the successful rescue of the real Avalon close the episode, and the question of what was accomplished in relation to the rebel alliance is dropped.

[xii] Compare, for example, the recent film sequel to *Firefly*, *Serenity* (Joss Whedon, 2005), in which the narrative centred around Mal's attempt to broadcast a message on a major network. Although it was unclear exactly how this decontextualized broadcast would bring about any political change, it was clear from the narrative structure of the film that achieving the broadcast constituted victory. Even this level of clarity is absent in *Blake's 7*: for example, much of the narrative arc of Season 2 revolves around the crew's attempt to destroy Star One, the Federation's central control computer. The crew explicitly debate the ethics and the practicalities of this move, but no resolution is reached, and the narrative does not provide us with enough information to make a decision about the value of this plan (Blake abandons the attempt to destroy the computer, but it is accidentally destroyed in the course of a war with an alien enemy which takes place between first and second season: it is unclear exactly what effect this has on the Federation's power, since in the absence of Blake the crew are not politically active in Season 3).

[xiii] Personal communication, 2005.

[xiv] Avon is one of the few members of the crew to have a canonical heterosexual relationship in his past, with a woman named Anna Grant, whom he meets again and kills in the episode *Rumours of Death*. On the commentary track to this episode on the DVD version – produced twenty years after the episode was first broadcast – Chris Boucher, the script editor and the writer of both *Rumours of Death* and *Blake* (the Season 4 finale, in which Avon kills Blake), says: "Avon kills both the people he loves: both Anna and Blake", aligning Avon's relationship with Blake with a canonically sexual relationship via the romantic term "love".

[xv] "When you transmitted the recording of Blake's voice," he says to Servalan, the President of the Federation and the setter of the trap, "Zen [the Liberator's computer] did a print analysis and confirmed that the voice could be genuine. On the strength of that, I had to follow it up."

[xvi] Servalan says to him, when she reveals the workings of the trap he has fallen into: "You were my greatest ally, Avon. You made it easy because you wanted to believe it. You wanted to believe that Blake was still alive."

[xvii] I anticipate myself here by talking about it as queer desire, since it only becomes queer desire in being recognized as such.

[xviii] Mowitt, *Text*, pp.184-5. Mowitt is referring in particular to Ivanka Stoianova, *Geste, Texte, Musique*, Paris: Union Generale d'Editions, 1978, and Stoianova, 'La musique repetitive', *Musique en jeu* 26 (1977).

[xix] Here I talk about the circumstances of circulation in ways which, I hope, illuminate the respatialization of textuality when compared to the way in which 'circulation' functioned in the defense of slash referred to at note 5.

[xx] Travis (a recurring character in first and second seasons) is a high-ranking officer in Space Command, the Federation army. He is in charge of tracking Blake down.

[xxi] Nova, "I do not need anyone at all", *Bend Me, Shape Me*, Sydney: Manannan Press, 2000, pp.95-107, p.97.

[xxii] See Figures 1-3.

[xxiii] See, for example, Mowitt, *Text*, p.46: "the text insists that artifacts mean both what we make them mean and what others might make them mean if we stopped trying to represent their interests for them. Of course, we are in no position to know what this might be, and we have to struggle to structure what we do so that it might be pirated by those whose struggle against disciplinarity might well be unrecognizable to us."

[xxiv] Mowitt, *Text*, p.221.