

How does our interaction with git — and through to each other — become, as Lewis states, “... a [metaphor] for information retrieval rather than dialogue, posing the danger of commodifying and ... reifying the encounter with technology”? (Lewis 1, in Born 32) And in what ways do our interactions with Git successfully avoid this fate?

Working with git successfully, that is, avoiding merge conflicts¹, making experimental versions of a collaborator’s contribution — branching — etc., has potential to engender a ‘dialogic imagination’ (Lewis in Born 33) To co-inhabit the repository, such a protocol positions one’s attention toward the activity(s), milestones, hinderances, collective handshakes of one’s collaborators. Perhaps a strategy for shared attentional states in situ with improvisation. That cognition is distributed among agents and artifacts.

This connection occurred to me when I created a merge conflict as Doug and I were both actively restructuring the dispersion-lab repository: I began my work session by pulling the repo, changed some parts of the repo’s file structure, making commits, during the course of about ten minutes. Doug had also been making changes to some of the same folders and pushed before me, and my push returned the merge conflict warning. I reset part of the local HEAD and proceeded to add, commit, pull, push *frequently*. In this anecdote, git afforded an interaction between two mildly divergent paths in a short time. This interaction made me aware of our presences, I imagined Doug’s engagement with the repo, which made me reflect on my own engagement and imagine how to go forward.

In what ways do our interactions with git afford us “...speculations into the mental [lives] of” (Johnson 202) our collaborators, contemporaries, historical figures, etc? How does this affordance then enable us to articulate our own ‘mental lives’? The git merge conflict constrains our own ideal workflows, such that we are forced² to scrutinize the work of others, so as to understand how our

¹ although in a later note you are saying the merge conflicts aren’t something to be avoided, what should be done when they occur, is the current place of debate, since they are the points of articulation where our own ideals are confronted

² Probably not forced, right, since up to now we have usually backed out or gone around, as was the case in my example above.

own work(s) fit in. In opposition to the practice of 'usability trials', which Gibson also rejects, this supra-workflow aligns with Gibson's view "that the affordances of objects could be 'directly perceived': for it may be that a fleeing lizard perceives the shape in front of it directly in terms of its affordance as 'a place to hide' (while an observing human may equally characterize it as 'a rock.')73" (Gibson 1979, in Hutchby 448)

Therefore, merge conflicts can tune us in to the varying design considerations of our fellow repository members that might otherwise go unnoticed. "For Gibson, 'the affordance of something is assumed not to change as the observer changes. '(Gibson 1982: 409)" (in Hutchby 448) This is suggestive of multidominance, where lab members do not have to share the same pursuits for something other than them to flourish. My interest is not to pursue the flaws in the ways that our codebase is built and interacted with. To the contrary, our interaction patterns are emergent and in particular stigmergic because we as agents are pursuing our own attractors: goals, questions, theories, etc., each of which present varying affordances to us⁴. I suspect that this a case for the study of distributed version control in the selectively permeable system that is a/the laboratory context.

- Git's Branching and merging may be to git, what multidominance⁵ is to voyager. On branching as yes-and, recall Doug asked whether the yes-and was liminal or atomic.

- How did the composers who used Forth and HMSL navigate difference and deference?

Howison et al. state that "explicit coordination mechanisms are those where the work of (the articulation work) is performed as separate, identifiable work.

³ Hutchby's footnote: "This does not mean, however, that affordances are always, or necessarily, directly perceived."

⁴ This is isn't to say that constraints would be ignored either, but I question whether git should be taught by anyone.

⁵ The one-app-open paradigm of smart phones antithetical to multidominance. So to is menu-diving >> can vr and/or sensorial immersion present multidominant user interfaces?

Most clearly this work involves making specific plans, such as meeting early to decide a work breakdown and standard, documented APIs, and executing these plans.” (Howison et al. 2012: 1)

Does git have an embedded political ideology? Can specific ideologies be claimed to govern separate modules of git’s system structure? “As projects grow in size their social networks become progressively more decentralized, while project components fracture into increasing modularity.” (Palumbo 2017, on Crowston and Howison 2005:1)

Of Thompson, Lewis states "Thompson sees the black Atlantic visual tradition [20] as displaying 'a propensity for multiple meter' [21], and his references too Mande cloth work as incorporating a conception of 'rhythimized textiles' makes a direct connection with both African and African-American music [22]. Similarly, Douglas connects the visual with the sonic : 'the predisposition to use multiple types of rhythm in musical construction speaks equally to a distinct aesthetic as does the multiple user of visual elements. "(Lewis 34) On the 'principle of rhythmic and implied metrical contrast ' (Lewis 34) what about the circadian rhythms and other biometrics of distributed collaborators? What if dispersion[dot] developers wore bitolini while they work? Could lead to something like: Nan Zhao’s *Mediated Atmospheres* (Zhao 2017), for sensorial immersion, worldmaking. Would be great to come up with a repository-as-compositional-structure performance / composition / artthing idea(s) with you, Doug.

Lewis describes voyager in Rowe's "player" terms, "...where the computer system does not function as an instrument to be controlled by a performer." (Lewis 34) Is git a player or instrument?

Works Cited

Born, Georgina. “On Musical Mediation: Ontology, Technology and Creativity.” *Twentieth-*

Century Music, vol. 2, no. 01, Mar. 2005, pp. 7–36. *CrossRef*, doi:[10.1017/S147857220500023X](https://doi.org/10.1017/S147857220500023X).

Crowston, Kevin, and James Howison. “The Social Structure of Free and Open Source Software Development.” *First Monday*, vol. 10, no. 2, Feb. 2005. *firstmonday.org*, <http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/1207>.

Gibson, James J., et al. *Reasons for Realism: Selected Essays of James J. Gibson*. L. Erlbaum, 1982.

---. *The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception*. Houghton Mifflin, 1979.

Gibson, James Jerome., and Edward S. Reed. *Reasons for Realism: Selected Essays*. Erlbaum, 1982. /z-wcorg/.

Howison, James, et al. *Stigmergy and Implicit Coordination in Software Development*. 2012.

Hutchby, Ian. “Technologies, Texts and Affordances.” *Sociology*, vol. 35, no. 2, 2001, pp. 441–456, doi:[10.1017/S0038038501000219](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0038038501000219).

Johnson, Steven. *Emergence: The Connected Lives of Ants, Brains, Cities and Software*. Scribner, 2004.

Lewis, George E. “Too Many Notes: Computers, Complexity and Culture in Voyager.” *Leonardo Music Journal*, vol., 2000, pp. 33–39, doi:[10.1162/096112100570585](https://doi.org/10.1162/096112100570585).

Palumbo, Michael. *Software Version Control Systems as Tools for Research-Creation in the Fine Arts: (Or) Using Git to Write a Paper About Using Git*. 20 Mar. 2017, <https://michaelpalumbo.github.io/self-referent/>.

Zhao, Nan, et al. “Mediated Atmospheres: A Multimodal Mediated Work Environment.” *Proc. ACM Interact. Mob. Wearable Ubiquitous Technol.*, vol. 1, no. 2, June 2017, p. 31:1–31:23. *ACM Digital Library*, doi:[10.1145/3090096](https://doi.org/10.1145/3090096).