A METAREALIST TALE ABOUT THE SUPERSUMPTION OF MODERNITY

YVES CITTON*

Abstract Can there be a "resumption" of modernity? After Jürgen Habermas famously qualified modernity as an "unfinished project", after Jean-François Lyotard declared it "liquidated", should we now attempt to "go back" to it?[1] Obviously not. Even if some of us estimated such a resumption was desirable, there is no going back in historical times. Always forward—towards a glorious future or closer to the cliff — but always forward. Here is a tale about future reckonings of Bruno Latour's AIME project.
Keywords Modernity, modes of existence, speculative realism, Bruno Latour.

Resumption of modernity is impossible because of what Toni Negri (after Marx) described as the "real subsumption" of our forms of life by the logic of capital:[2] the dynamic of financial investment does not content itself with extracting profit from pre-existing modes of production (as in "formal subsumption"); it directly or indirectly generates and structures most of our activities.[3] The problem with this "real subsumption" is that it eats away, undermines and hollows out both the remainders of the traditional social orders modernity started to overcome and the bases of the new individualistic order modernity promised to establish. Thus does subsumption preempt any possibility of resumption.

What is to be done in such a situation? Go forward, always forward, towards what could be called a *supersumption* of modernity: no going back (*re*-sume), no reconfiguration

[1] Jürgen Habermas, "Modernity: an Unfinished Project?" in Craig J. Calhoun (ed.), Contemporary Sociological Theory (London: Blackwell, 2007); Jean-François Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984).
[2] Michael Hardt & Antonio Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001).
[3] Randy Martin, *Knowledge LTD. Toward a Social Logic of the Derivative* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2015).

from underneath (*sub*-sume), but superposing layer upon layer of speculative modes of improbable survival patched upon the decaying infrastructures inherited from the traditional as well as from the modern orders (*super*-sume).

Because of its intrinsically speculative nature, such a supersumption cannot be taken seriously. One cannot believe in it. And yet, it will prove harder and harder not to believe in it. One can only walk the contemporary walk[4] by putting one foot inside of the supersumption tale, while keeping the other foot outside of it, just like a movie-goer or videogame-player is simultaneously fully immersed in the fiction (fearing and even crying according to the fate of the fictional protagonist) and perfectly aware of watching a movie or playing a game—in a deeply ambivalent position Lev Manovich labelled as "metarealist".[5]

Such is our attitude toward the impossible resumption/supersumption of modernity. We have never been modern, because we never totally believed in (the whole of) it. We will never be postmodern, because we cannot help continuing to believe in (some of) it. This metarealist stance commands our attitude towards ideology: as (illegitimate) heirs of modernity, we can neither fully identify with, nor totally do without, some form of ideology.

The most accurate vocabulary at our disposal to describe and understand such a metarealist stance is provided by literary studies, since (consciously) living with/in fictions is the most common form of metarealism. In the following pages, I will therefore sketch in the form of a tale the singular narrative elaborated by Bruno Latour to pave the way for a supersumption of modernity. This tale goes like this:[6]

> *According to some highly respected members of my tribe, modernity was supers-umed around 2011, when an actor-network identified as BL released her masterplan for universal LOVE. The story is inherently controversial, but it should start with a brief summary of the plan.*

Resumamus. According to BL[7], the antities composing our common universe are perceived as agents insofar as they enter into networks (NET) allowing them to reproduce their existence (REP), metamorphose their identity (MET) and develop habits (HAB) which tend to concatenate chains of heterogeneous operations into units of action. At this first, basic level, these antities demonstrate both a capacity to persevere in their own being (comparable to Spinoza's *conatus*) and a propensity to (self-)plasticity which allows them to adapt to constantly changing environments.

---

[4] Lionel Ruffel, *Brouhaha* (Paris: Verdier, 2016); Jacob Lund, *The Changing Constitution of the Present. Essays on the Work of Art in Times of Contemporaneity* (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2022).

[5] Lev Manovich, *The Language of New Media* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2001).

[6] Yves Citton, "Fictional Attachments and Literary Weavings in the Anthropocene," *New Literary History*, 47:2-3 (Spring & Summer 2016): 309-329.

[7] Bruno Latour, *An Inquiry into Modes of Existence* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013).

In the course of this adaptation, they elicit the apparition of three types of "quasi-objects". Through the zigzagging invention of technical objects (TEC), they devise short-circuits allowing them to fold long series of operations into speedy and seemingly effortless tricks. With the help of fictions (FIC), they sustain worlds capable of living off of their own coherent (self-induced but not autonomous) systems of resonance. Thanks to more or less rigid procedures of reference (REF), they elaborate cognitive constructions allowing them to secure access to phenomena and causalities far removed in space and time. This second level provides the antities with various types of extensions of themselves, folding time, space and agency along ever more complex lines and dynamics.

Such foldings generate three types of "quasi-subjects" which, in their turn, further the development of yet more unpredictable extensions of self-plasticity. Through politics (POL), the antities circularly convince each other about what ought to be the best common course of actions, speaking obliquely again and again about the same topics always to be reconsidered under a slightly different light, never really agreeing, but producing along the way larger antities in which a collection of "I" tends to cohere in a collective assertion of "we". Through law (LAW), the antities devise (and conform to) certain means designed to validate proper forms of translation through various domains of action, originally heterogeneous to each other. Through religion (REL), the antities feel called to be something else (or more?) than ephemeral networks, they gain in subjective consistency by being addressed as "persons", expected to respond for the purposes and implications of their actions, well beyond their brief individual existence on earth. At this third level, POL, LAW and REL together invest the antities' agency with experiences of subjectivation, which provides them with a very relative, very dubious, but nevertheless very necessary sense of autonomy within the multiple levels of intra-actions constitutive of our multiverse.

In order to articulate more finely and more strongly quasi-objects with quasi-subjects, a fourth level of analysis focuses on the links which tie them together—with the explicit goal of providing an alternative to the operation devoted to economics (about to be fully subsumed by financial capitalism) at the turn of the 21st century. In spite of their necessary sense of relative individual autonomy, quasi-subjects cannot help but experiencing attachments (ATT) to countless other forms of beings: their emotions, passions, desires, needs and interests constantly remind them how dependent they are on each other, as well as on a wide variety of other means of subsistence, comfort and pleasure. ATT accounts for *an economy of (often unequal) interdependencies*. The management of such complex forms of attachments requires a great deal of organization (ORG): quasi-subjects devise stacks upon stacks of ingenious scripts, in order to ensure that the appropriate elements of their environment will be at the right place at the right time to meet their desires, needs and interests. All scripts, however, were not born equal. Some are broader, more intense, more commanding, more powerful than others: macro-scripts absorb micro-scripts within vertical and entangled trees of inclusion, integration and subordination. ORG accounts for *an economics of hierarchical management*. There seems to be an irreducible gap, delay and *différance* between the ever more clever devices invented to manage the organization of our attachments and our intuitive

perception of balance and fairness in the exchanges of goods, services and favours. Morality (MOR) manifests itself through the nagging scruple that a transaction may have left one of the parties short-changed, while other parties gained more than their fair share. The face-value of procedural justice constantly needs to be readjusted to the fair value of a more substantive perception of justice, attentive to the singularity and relative weight of the contracting parties. MOR questions the dominant accounting procedures in the name of *a moral economy*.

BL's masterplan was a LOVE story. Its tale called for LOVE to emancipate these twelve modes of existence (REP, MET, HAB; TEC, FIC, REF; POL, DRO, REL; ATT, ORG, MOR) from their current suppression under the collapsing weight of real subsumption by financial capitalism. BL's masterplan was not to resume but to "re:set modernity", by reversing or bifurcating the evolution that led to the tyrannical and suicidal rule of one undifferentiated "science"— "economics"—deconstructed here as an unstable, indiscriminate and inconsistent mash-up of ATT and ORG, pretending to have set itself free from MOR thanks to a supposedly value-neutral use of REF, and imposing its totalitarian criterion of accounting to areas of concern which, in reality, required other, specific criteria of judgement. In order to operate this re:setting of modernity, LOVE relied on the use of the prepositions (PRE) succinctly described in this summary: these three-letter operators were devised both to ensure the relative autonomy recognized to these various modes of existence, and to help their pluralist articulation within our multileveled forms of collective agency.

> *So far, BL's masterplan did not strike its readers as being a tale, a literary experimentation in suspension of (dis)belief. That can be explained in part by the deeply ambivalent status of literature within (post)modernity: modern science constituted itself in differentiating itself from literary tales, while modern literature unfolded itself in overcoming any preexisting boundary of literariness. In other words: literary experimentations developed metarealism to a point where it could supersume claims of scientificity. BL's LOVE story spelled out the accomplishment of the metarealist supersumption—even if BL herself was not fully (openly?) aware of this.*

Interpretemur. At first, no-one really understood why this tale presenting itself as an impressive and all-encompassing conceptual construction was called "LOVE" (or "AIME" among members of its original French tribe). Some suspected BL to launch yet another remora, provocatively asserting her Christian beliefs in the increasingly anti-religious context of the local intelligentsia. Others imagined her having a good laugh, slightly surprised to see the combinatory dynamics of her acronyms spontaneously assert hippie values she was deeply, if discreetly, fond of. Whether puzzled, amused or disconcerted, no-one really dared to object— and the name caught on: LOVE it would be.

Of course, in this latter-day hippie context, PEACE was the ultimate goal of LOVE. Asserting the plurality of the fourteen modes of existence (4x3+2) was merely a means designed to wage an all-out effort of "diplomacy" expected to bring peace among all Earthbound creatures. LOVE's fictional anthropologist was supposed to observe those

"moderns" who had never been modern in the first place, to record their behaviours, rituals, discourses, myths and beliefs, in order to extract a potentially shareable platform of negotiation from their entanglement of powerful illusions and illusionary powers (a.k.a. "factishes"). For such types of inter-cultural, inter-national, inter-continental, inter-religious, inter-ideological rounds of talks, negotiated roadmaps and laborious protocols of agreements were all the rage at that time. It had slowly become clear that there was no alternative to diplomacy in the age of the Anthropocene: all earthbound antities discovered they were "bound" not merely to coexist and cohabit on earth, but to invent common (and, if possible, consensual) frames of inter-action and intra-actions.

Paradoxically enough, LOVE's diplomatic endeavour took the form of an epic war staged between BL and DC (a.k.a. Double-Click). If not (yet) a call to arms, LOVE clearly pointed the finger towards a common enemy: DC was unmasked, and tied to the whipping post, as the secret agent who had inspired the moderns in the reckless attitudes and policies that had sacked and wrecked our common Earth (aka "Gaia"). What was DC's main trick? Short-circuiting (and short-changing) the roundabout ways that defined each mode of existence. Under DC's nefarious (and illusionary) influence, "things" could get "done" by merely pressing a button (TEC), describing reality (~FIC), being scientific (REF), talking straight (~POL), acting legally (LAW), banning superstition (~REL), calculating interests (ATT), managing rationally (ORG) and paying one's debts (~MOR).

LOVE was meant to re:set modernity by throwing a wrench in each of these apparently unproblematic automatized (and potentially clickable) mechanisms. The inquiry into the modes of existence brought to light a typical hiatus, a specific trajectory, a particular alteration, under felicitous or infelicitous conditions, within each of these chains and networks of operations, which DC had collapsed into something triggered at a finger's tip.

LOVE was meant to bring peace on earth by revealing to the moderns that modernity's backstage did not look so different from what their earlier anthropologists had found in "other" cultures. Once DC's foolishness was put at bay, the unfolding of the various modes of existence would provide common ground for negotiations between all earthbound cultures. Anthropocene diplomacy could begin.

Refutemus. Of course, it soon became clear that BL had gotten it all wrong. First, the actual world was ruled by envy and resentment, not LOVE. It was (and will continue to be) driven by war, exploitation, struggles, fear and violence, not peace and diplomacy. POL, here reduced to rhetoric, confused the vicious power games fuelled by big money and criminal threats (that were real politics) for gentlemen's conversations tapping around "issues" in search for persuasion (that were mere cover-ups for the wheeling and dealing performed backstage).

Second, and along similar lines of criticism, the deconstruction of economics into three relatively independent modes of existence (ATT, ORG and MOR) simply repeated a well-known, well-meaning, but highly ineffective, line of wishful preaches calling for the "moralization" of the economy (MOR as an external counterweight to the inherently self-serving dynamics of ATT+ORG). Here too, the modes of existence were bound to work as

smokescreens, hiding heavy infrastructural determinations under the veil of cheap superstructural guilt-psychology.

Third, instead of becoming a tool for empowerment, LOVE merely helped identify more precisely the knots that caused the dominant feeling of powerlessness—without breaking free from the illusionary (and typically modern) hope that rational knowledge would bring effective power by its own magic. Thanks to BL's brilliant construction, one could understand much more clearly that the overall paralysis and inertia towards industrially-induced climate change was due to the ubiquity of fossil-fuelled TEC at the core of REP and HAB, curbing FIC, POL and LAW to perpetuate ORG in a way that polarized ATT against the most legitimate claims of REF and REL, leaving MET to miscarry suicide-bombers. The trap was thus made crystal-clear. The exit, though, was nowhere in sight.

> *And yet: LOVE* did *change the world after all… And BL's intervention—blessed Her initials!—was indeed pivotal in twisting modernity out of its suicidal dementia…*
> *For, according to other (no less respected) members of my tribe, modernity was rather re:set on March 25, 2032, when a splinter group self-named LOVE$_2$ launched a shrewd project which proved much more drastically disruptive than anyone had anticipated.*

Fingamus. BL posed as an anthropologist, but her true (and most effective) being belonged mostly to FIC. Her first followers were devotees of REF: they originally met mostly in universities, in small groups, all over the planet, during a few months between 2012 and 2014, discussing LOVE as if it was yet another "research agenda". Soon, however, the participants realized REF had become hollow, unless relayed by FIC.

BL herself openly turned into the show-woman she had always been deep inside (MET), writing plays, staging theatrical events, parading in costumes with a spear in her hand. Inspired by her example, more and more followers used their scholarly identity as a mask allowing them to infiltrate public spaces in which to inject counter-fictions.[8] Only such counter-fictions, made of a strange alloy mixing FIC with REF and MOR, could inspire scripts likely to recast ATT in a light capable of inducing new ORG. While some of these counter-fictions surfed on the development of new TEC, others cultivated a contagious distrust towards DC's inherent presence in TEC, and strongly relied on the virtues of "unmediated" presence instead.

This generated an internal split between the followers. Some claimed that TEC, REF, LAW and ORG were irretrievably poisonous, because of the inherent rigidity of their procedures, which made them a natural host for DC. This belief led them progressively to withdraw from participating in any NET beyond a very narrow local scale: POL, ATT and even REL could only be conceived within limited configurations, in zones known as ZAD (*Zone à Détruire/Zone à Défendre*)—hence their name "Zadists".[9]

---

[8] Yves Citton, « Contre-fictions: trois modes de combat », *Multitudes* n° 58 (March 2012): 72-78.
[9] Isabelle Fremeaux & Jay Jordan, *We Are 'Nature' Defending Itself* (London: Pluto Press, 2021).

Others claimed that the problems faced in the Anthropocene were global in nature, and required to be addressed through the TEC, LAW and ORG most likely to be effective on this global scale. According to these "Accelerationists", modernity could not be "set back" (resumed), by a return to local zones of autonomy, but only "set forward", by using the increased powers of TEC to accelerate and precipitate changes in POL, LAW and ORG.[10]

Of course, both Accelerationists and Zadists were right—as it turned out when LOVE's most dramatic (and most surprising) blind spot finally came to light.

Mediemus. While LOVE admirably beat around the bush of mediation, it totally missed the crucial point of media power. Given BL's early flirts with mediology, her strong emphasis on the importance and ubiquity of translation, and her attempt to mobilize several forms of medium (books, exhibits, websites, plays, moocs) to bring LOVE to the world, it was extremely curious to see LOVE devote so little attention to media as such.[11]

In a way, of course, LOVE's main purpose was to develop, refine, enrich our understanding of mediation. The all-out war against DC launched by BL in the name of diplomacy simply reasserted what had become a main tenet of her theory for many years: against the modern hope to master the world at a distance through the use of "intermediaries" (instruments that transmit without transforming), the composition of a common world constantly requires the intervention of "mediators" (subjectified antities that necessarily adapt and alter what they translate)[12].

LOVE, however, brought a tremendous improvement to this important but basic intuition. Instead of claiming (generally and unspecifically) that mediation (or translation) "was everywhere", the fourteen modes of existence provided us with much finer tools that helped discriminate between very different modes of mediation. At the macro-structural level, LOVE brilliantly showed how the quasi-subjects of POL, LAW and REL resulted from the media apparatuses elaborated by TEC, FIC and REF (all "extensions of men"[13] providing instruments capable of "folding time, space and agency"[14]). LOVE also showed how it was this interaction between subjectivations and media (resulting in mediated subjectivities) which steered REP, MET and HAB to produce certain valorisations within ATT, ORG and MOR.

LOVE was indeed media theory in its highest achievements. But it was also destined to be media theory's swan song. Follovers soon found out that media theory could no longer have its end in itself (a very modern assumption, once again). Its complement was less media

---

[10] Nick Srnicek & Alex Williams, *#Accelerate! The Accelerationist Reader* (Falmouth: Urbanomic, 2014); Benjamin Bratton, *The Terraforming 2019* (Moscow: Strelka Institue, 2019).

[11] Yves Citton, *Mediarchy* (Cambridge: Polity, 2019).

[12] Bruno Latour, "Les médias sont-ils un mode d'existence ? Entretien avec Yves Citton," *Revue INA Global*, n° 2 (2014): 146-157.

[13] Marshall McLuhan, *Understanding Media. The Extensions of Man* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1964).

[14] Jussi Parikka, "Media Ecologies and Imaginary Media: Transversal Expansions, Contractions, and Foldings," *The Fibreculture Journal*, n° 17 (2011).

practice (since everybody "practices" media all the time) than mediactivism: a tactical disruptive implementation of counter-media devices within mass-media flows.

A turning point was reached when follovers, instead of housing erudite scholar exchanges on Harvard campus or at Sciences-Po Paris, resolved to occupy a corner of the ZAD at Notre-Dame des Landes, on a contested airport construction site in the North of France. Modernity was supersumed, rather than re:set, here and elsewhere, by launching IMDs (Improvised Media Device) which worked altogether as hackerspaces, websites, radio stations, nomadic universities, film production cooperatives, mooc suppliers, and experiments in permaculture.

Zadists thought they had won the day, until an unfortunate series of events—a major accident in a rashly decommissioned nuclear power plant, an epidemics of deadly skin disease suspected to be caused by the ubiquitous presence of nanoparticles, a terrible drought resulting from the unchecked increase in global warming—proved the Accelerationists right in their claim that there could be no local solution to inherently global problems. Of course, networks had already been built to share information and coordinate actions across various ZADs. But, as Accelerationists were quick to point out, there is a long way from a sum of minoritarian interventions to the transformative power of majoritarian policies. No matter how smart, innovative, inspiring the Notre Dame des Landes IMD could be, it stood no chance against the CNN, CBS, Fox News or TF1 of the world. There could be no re:setting of modernity without re:setting the media. This had to be the most "immediate" goal in order to supersume the Capitalocene!

In being (rightly) suspicious towards the notion of representation, in articulating more finely the various modes of mediation, BL left the artificial enhancement of visibility by mass-media apparatuses haunt LOVE as a ubiquitous phenomenon, but as an unattended issue. The power of FIC and REF to steer future forms of LAW, ORG and ATT was hijacked by the current forms of ATT and ORG through their capacity to use TEC in order to enhance visibility according to their agenda—effectively neutralizing POL beyond very limited zones of local diplomacy. Visibility and its correlate, attention, were traded asymmetrically as industrial goods, as if they were one item of trade among others—while they were in fact the crucial factors conditioning the value of all other goods.

The turning point of the story came when Zadists and Accelerationists finally agreed: if LOVE were to impact our social evolutions fast and broadly enough to prevent climate change the sixth great extinction from totally wrecking our life-forms on the planet, it needed to bring mediactivism to a whole other level.

This turning point can only be grasped once FIC has been reformatted as the most powerful operator of social supersumption. BL only saw half of FIC when she stressed how we could "care for" fictional antities (in spite of their supposed inexistence). Much more important was FIC's capacity to launch speculative operations and gather

speculative communities.[15] This turning point came about by literally turning around metarealism, from a weakness ("you don't really/fully/totally believe in anything") to a strength ("you do somewhat believe in what is not") and to an opportunity ("by somewhat believing in states of things that are not—yet!—empirically observable, you may contribute to make them happen in real life").

Here again the literary explorations in novelistic experimentations played an underground but decisive role. While Old Regime novels increased our mental and social plasticity by accustoming us to project ourselves in fictional worlds, late 19th- and 20th-century literary experiments increased our epistemic plasticity by multiplying the meta-narrative levels from which plots could be reconsidered, toyed with, speculated upon—i.e., supersumed. The narrative arts (novels, plays, movies, videogames) built-up our counter-fictioning capacities by training us to imagine counter-factual realities, as well as by accustoming us metarealistically to move in and out of speculations with fluidity and agility. Our ability to supersume a catastrophic reality resulted from our literary-induced ability to add layer upon layer of speculation and (dis)belief.

Mediagamus. It is only at this point, around the beginning of 2032, that the name finally made sense. Whether BL had planned it all from day one remains a mystery. But followers had an illumination when LOVE$_2$ spelled out the words behind the acronym: the Levelers Of Visibility Enhanced. It was not about theory or practice. I was a matter of hacking. They released a virus. Its first symptom was a sort of whiteout. At the beginning, a simple paleness. In April, 2032, Apple started to recall its entire new generation of iPads, iPhones and iMinds because their colours were not as vibrant as those of the competition. In effect, LOVE$_2$ had managed to crack the codes of their latest OS, make everything look desperately pale on Apple devices, bringing the firm down in a matter of months.

Then it was Google's turn. Starting in October 2032, the highest ranked sites on PageRank had started to disappear. At first, they were just harder to access, overloaded, slow: saturated. Then you could not find them at all. Gone! Google was reeling: anything and everything it valued tended to disappear. Ads started to dwindle: nobody wants to disappear.

The same thing was happening to Facebook, Amazon, Alibaba, Baidu and Tencent: the more a product elicited curiosity, the more it was recommended and bought, the quicker it disappeared from our screens. The process was the same every time: colours would go pale, then the image was attacked and devoured by a whiteout produced by saturating its pixels. Within a few months, all the great empires of the digital economy had bitten the dust (and the supposedly "real" economy followed the same course, since every sector had been digitalized at this point by the virtue of real subsumption). Whether they were peddling gadgets, celebrity or exposure, it did not matter: whatever they were showing tended to disappear.

---

[15] Aris Komporozos-Athanasiou, *Speculative Communities. Living with Uncertainty in a Financialized World* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2022).

The trick devised by LOVE$_2$ was terribly simple: concentrated attention caused an overexposure that rendered invisible whatever had its visibility enhanced beyond a certain (very low) threshold. That was the genius of the virus: it had embodied the abstract right to opacity in an algorithm that concretely reconditioned social visibility, i.e., social relations, as a whole.

The disappearance of the overexposed completely redistributed collective attention.[16] Thousands of alternative practices became visible, though only on a small scale and at a local level. Anything that threatened to gain the high ground would be undone, erased, by its very success.

Of course, there were some unfortunate collateral damages. BL's true name was also erased from the records: too famous for her own sake! Only her initials survived, for initials were immune to the virus (as long as there was no copyright on them). In fact, all celebrities fell into oblivion. Some people minded: "culture", as they knew it, relied on celebrities, famous writers, canonical artists. They said we lost our collective memory, our sense of "History". We are no longer sure what they meant by such words.

From now on, modernity re:sets itself every month or so, depending on the chaotic behavior of attention attractors. There are media, there are masses, there are indeed a lot of memories circulating on our networks—but only at a small scale or for a short time. LOVE$_2$ prevents the massification of media. It supersumes the distribution of notoriety. Visibility can only last as long as it remains minoritarian; majoritarian spells, artificially enhanced or not, are bound to be ephemeral.

LOVE$_2$ re:sets modernity as tribal and perpetually naive. Are we still modern? Have we ever been? Do we still care? LOVE$_2$ is about a constant re:setting of the standards of visibility. Is that modernity? It may very well be all modernity ever did—and needed.

---

[16] Georg Franck, *Ökonomie der Aufmerksamkeit. Ein Entwurf* (Munich: Karl Hanser Verlag, 1998); *Mentaler Kapitalismus Eine politische Ökonomie des Geistes* (Munich: Karl Hanser Verlag, 2005); Franck, *Vanity Fairs. Another View of the Economy of Attention* (Berlin: Springer, 2020); Yves Citton, *An Ecology of Attention* (Cambridge: Polity, 2016).