

I forårssemestret 1995 deltog Institut for Litteraturhistorie i pilotprojektet HUMANITIES (Historic Universities Multimedia Network for Innovation in Education System) under det Europæiske universitetsnetværk COIMBRA. Projektet var et forsøg med at integrere telematikstøttet fjernundervisning i et traditionelt humanistisk universitetsmiljø. Vi arbejdede med at inddrage teknologi som Internet, videokonferencer (bl.a. via satellit) og audiokonferencer i et tværeuropæisk undervisningsforløb tematiseret omkring storby- og modernitetsproblematikker.

HUMANITIES projektet har gjort en række erfaringer med en undervisningsform og nogle teknologier, som vi sikkert kommer til at se mere til i fremtiden. Det er vigtigt, at vi selv debatterer, hvordan vi med fordel kan anvende ny teknologi og deltager aktivt i planlægningen af fremtidens undervisning for at sikre, at den bliver forenelig med niveauet for universitetsundervisning. Forhåbentlig kan denne evaluering bidrage til debatten om, hvordan vi bedst udnytter ny teknologi og internationale kontakter til fremtidig undervisning og forskning indenfor humaniora og litteratur.

På Litteraturhistorie og på Aarhus Universitet var en lang række inddraget i arbejdet med at få projektet til at køre. Ledende og koordinerende var Per Dahl, som stod for de indledende kontakter og planlægning, Peter Nielsen og Søren Pold. De to sidstnævnte stod for afviklingen af undervisningsforløbet.

I forhold til førsteoplaget er tilføjet en kort tekst, der blev holdt som led i præsentationen af HUMANITIES på Open and Distance Learning kongressen, Kongresshalle am Alexanderplatz, Berlin d. 23. november 1995

1. Preface

The HUMANITIES (Historic Universities Multimedia Network for Innovation in Education System) project was from the presentation a very promising project. The idea of open and distant learning (ODL), the general structure of the course, and the technology used for implementing the course seemed well considered and well fitted for the purpose of bringing distant education into classical, humanistic, academic environments. It proved to be fairly easy to convince local university authorities and students into active participation, and the special demands concerning both technology, financial support, and flexibility in connection with curriculums and exams was met in a rather flexible manner without major problems or delays.

Still the project cannot be characterised as an overall success. The professional level in connection with the content of the course has not been entirely satisfactory – compared to the large economical and working resources that has been put in the project, both locally and on the European level. The knowledge produced by the six telelectures and the European interaction has mainly been in connection with the technology while the professional outcome in connection with content of the demo seminar has been limited.

In the following I will analyse the project in order to point out some of the reasons for this rather critical evaluation of the project, both from me and the students involved. This evaluation has been discussed and agreed upon with both my co-teacher/tutor, Peter Nielsen, the students and Per Dahl (Head of Department).

2. Local preparation of the demo seminar

In Aarhus we had to start with planning of the course already in February, knowing that the educational semester practically ends in the middle of May because of exams. At that time we did not know anything specific about the content of the joint European demo seminar, we had no indication of a common ground in literary texts or/and theoretical approaches/definitions. We only knew the titles of the telelectures in the demo seminar, and from these titles we understood that the common theme could be described as questions around literature and cityscape. From this still very broad basis we constructed a series of guest lectures given by different Danish researches in this field. (2.b.) As well as these guest lectures we

prepared our students for the demo seminar through an introduction (2.a.) and workshops with Internet and explanations of the technology (2.c.).

2.a) Introductions to HUMANITIES

We started with an introduction (3 March) where we told the students about the way we planned to implement the course and gave some information about using Internet resources in literary studies. This introduction, though only attended by few students, led to the gathering of a thematic study group (TSG) of about 20 students.

Of course this introduction had to reflect that we barely knew anything about the demo seminar's lectures (the approach, the content, the professors), as well as the tutor's workshop, which was supposed to answer some of the questions around the implementation of technology, had been postponed until just before Easter. After the tutor's workshop in Leuven we held a second introduction to the project on 21 April. On this occasion I presented some of the still very sparse information on the content from the discussions at the tutors workshop in Leuven and continued about the technology and how we could use it in Aarhus. Given my general feelings about how the project evolved I stressed that HUMANITIES was a pilot project acquiring some pioneering spirit on behalf of the participants. Though not being able to conceal that not everything was well prepared and in order, I asked for a constructive attitude where we tried to get the best out of it - a request that the students have willingly met.

After this we discussed the student's attitude towards - and interests in the project, and they filled out the student's start up questionnaire. From this questionnaire one can deduct that some of the greatest anxieties were with the technology (which we solved through purchasing of new computers and a new satellite receiver - and all students have been offered satisfactory and sufficient training in using the Internet facilities) and with the planning of the content and outlining of the thematic study field.

2.b) The guest lectures "Metropolis and Modernity"

Our aim with this series of guest lectures was to give a theoretical framework and overall view of the theme's way of presenting the problems (Svend Erik Larsen), to cover some of the cities mentioned

(Paris, Vienna) and to give some local points of departures for the theme (Aarhus, Kristiania/Oslo). We hoped in this way to cover most of the issues involved in the theme and to prepare the students for active participation in the demo seminar in this way, as well as to present good lecturers and good literature. The series of lectures was called *Metropolis and Modernity* and it looked like this:!

10. March: Svend Erik Larsen: Can Literature Perceive the City? - About the city as space; historical and literary. (Kan litteraturen se byen? - Om byen som sted; historisk og litterært)

17. March: Jens Peter Lund Nielsen: Megalopolis of Shame - Knut Hamsun's Kristiania and the poetics of modernity (Skammens Megalopolis - Hamsuns Kristiania og modernismens poetik)

24. March: Søren Pold: The City as Phantasmagoria - How the city is perceived and the perception is urbanised in Honoré de Balzac's *Le père Goriot*.

24. March: Peter Madsen: The Double City - Baudelaire's Paris (Den dobbelte by - Baudelaires Paris)

3. April: Marianne Ping Huang: Ametropole Aarhus - About Svend Aage Madsens *Tugt og utugt i mellemtiden* and *At fortælle Menneskene* (Ametropol Aarhus - Om Svend Aage Madsens *Tugt og utugt i mellemtiden* og *At fortælle Menneskene*)

7. April: Peter Nielsen: The Literary City: Vienna in Robert Musil's *The Man Without Qualities*

21. April: Henning Goldbæk: Berlin as a state of mind - about Wolfgang Hilbig's Berlin novel *Ich* (1993) with interwar period Berlin in retrospective (Berlin som tilstand - om Wolfgang Hilbigs Berlin-roman *Ich* (1993) og med tilbageblik på mellemkrigstidens Berlin)

These guest lectures were attended by the TSG and they were open and announced to other interested students as well. Each lecture was attended by approx. 40-60 students from the department, only Søren Pold's lecture was announced to the TSG only. The series of lectures proved in a very successful manner to establish a theoretical and literature historical framework for the students, as many of the lectures referred to each other and to the same corpse of theory and literary texts. The discussions following the lectures were very fruitful and they provided an important basis for the demo-seminar

for the Danish students. The students have expressed great contentment with these lectures and felt prepared to the demo seminar.

c.) Introducing the technology

Besides we held a workshop and some introductions to the technology. The Internet was introduced on 28 April. All the students got an Internet account with an email address, they were taught how to log in, they all subscribed to the relevant Humanities mailing lists (Hum-lit-contacts, Hum-lit-content, Hum-lit-general, Hum-chat), they were shown how to interact with the news groups and World Wide Web (WWW) in general. As well as this workshop, which managed to get everybody on-line,² we have (through an extraordinary grant from the faculty) provided the students with computers equipped with the relevant software, as well as lists of useful addresses on WWW.³ As preparation to this workshop all the students were told to make a professional and personal presentation of themselves and prepare abstracts of the above mentioned lectures to post on Internet.⁴ - I have followed and supervised the discussion on the news groups thoroughly, in order to animate discussion and participation both locally and with our European partners.

Beside this workshop and the work on Internet we have shortly discussed the use of technology in connection with each telelecture. For the students more theoretically interested in Internet, information society, and network I referred to a seminar that I've arranged in connection with "Tværfag" called "The Semiotics, Philosophy and Aesthetics of the Information Society" where several students attended.⁵

3. The demo seminar, perceived from Aarhus

After some weeks of hectic activities, providing the necessary technology the demo seminar started. In connection to each telelecture I will give a short summary of how the lecture was perceived and dealt with in Aarhus.

3. a) 27.04 - Antonio Sánchez Trigueros

In the programme we were promised two lectures, but for some unknown reason we only got one ("Introduction to Granada in Spanish and European literature") which lasted the full 55 minutes. The

video, which was beautifully edited with pictures of Granada and Alhambra, was delivered in Spanish. There were no subtitles, only a translation of the manuscript, and seeing the video while reading the manuscript was a remote and unsatisfactory experience. Subtitles would have been a much better solution, maybe even better than an English spoken lecture, because Spanish speaking students would still have the opportunity to understand the original language. Besides, the content of the lecture was very closely connected to Granada, making a sort of guide to Granada in literary history. The lecture lacked explicit reflections of the theoretical approach and only contained few sketchy reflections on the relations to the overall theme of cityscape or the relations between literature and cities.

In the following audio conference the translation from English into Spanish and back again, though brilliantly done by Domingo Sanchez, became a great problem for the debate and communication with professor Trigueros. Besides the rather closed and one dimensional structure of his lecture made it difficult to pose critical questions and get the debate unfolded towards a critical academic level. Especially if you were not specifically working with the specific treatment of Granada in literature.

3. b.) 28.04 - Els Jongeneel

Els Jongeneel held a well prepared satellite lecture,⁶ where she developed a theoretical approach to the theme. Though the Groningen tutor Job van Schaik had emailed a very useful short introduction to the lecture, the perception of the lecture could have been improved by some more introductory reading material.

The following satellite interaction and debate functioned a lot better than the day before thanks to the many theoretical and substantial problems that were explicitly raised through the lecture. Still it seemed difficult to obtain a critical, academic level, probably due to anxiety about the technology etc. But the discussion formed a great departure point for the discussion on the Internet about professor Jongeneel's lecture, which through her availability and serious, well written, collaboration has turned out to be one of the most fruitful Internet discussions of the project.

In general professor Jongeneel's lecture showed both some of the problems and some of the potentials in using new technology

and distant teaching. It is comparably more difficult to establish a common, critical debate than in a close forum. Communication gets more formal and stiff because of the technology. On the other hand the local students and classes gets a chance to develop more individual learning from – and viewpoints on the lecture because of the distance to the teacher authority. In the local classroom we (the students and the local teachers/tutors) could react more freely to the lecture and discuss it during the break and afterwards.⁷ A discussion that was led back into the global discussion via Internet.

Through the experience we gained through this satellite lecture we can conclude that good distant teaching requires quite an effort on the Internet afterwards (as in the case of professor Jongeneel). The short immediate debate via audio conference or satellite conference is not satisfying in itself, but only serves to strike some of the issues for debate. There was not enough time and too many misunderstandings involved in the live debate. Consequently it is a bit frustrating if not combined with Internet discussions afterwards, which we missed with all the other lectures.

3. c.) 02.05 - University of Montpellier

After the satellite lecture the project hit a new crisis with the Montpellier lectures.⁸ In Aarhus we received the tapes less than five hours before the lecture was supposed to take place and several other European universities did not receive the tapes in time. Furthermore, the videotapes were in Secam-format (which among the participating countries is only used in France!), they were both in French without subtitles and only one of the tapes was provided with a translated manuscript, and it was not the one we were supposed to watch on that day (which was "Granada in Le Fou d'Elsa by Louis Aragon").⁹

In Aarhus we decided to watch the tape, which was accompanied with a translated manuscript, i.e. not the lecture scheduled for this session but Michel Collomb's lecture about Paris in the 1920's (and not the promised "Paris and Vienna as Capitals of Modernity in the 20'th Century"). This lecture, like Trigueros' lecture, lacked a theoretical framework and explicit theoretical reflections on the approaches, as well as methodical reflections on the larger theme of cityscape. It consisted mostly of rather entertaining but not very poignant literature historical anecdotes about authors

and bars in Paris in the 1920's. The students consequently were not involved very much and the lecture did not raise any specific questions related to our work or interests.

After the video we connected to the audio conference, but having not seen the proper video due to lack of translation we quickly disconnected again. The spirit among the participating students reached a low point, where they felt that the project turned into being a waste of time, resources and money. Consequently we decided not to participate in the audio conference following the Paris-lecture from Montpellier on May the 10.

3. d.) 09.05 University of Vienna

Vienna sent a video with two lectures in German accompanied with an English manuscript, which raised the usual language problems, though not as poignant in Aarhus because of the larger knowledge of German than French or Spanish. Especially professor Wendelin Schmitt-Dengler's lecture dealt in interesting ways with more thematic subjects in Vienna-related literature that also related to the more overall thematic and theoretical issues of city literature. While professor Monika Seidl's lecture was more specific guiding to a certain literature (English authors in Vienna in the mid-war period) in the same way as professor Trigueros' and professor Colomb's.

Unfortunately the telephone bridging service for the audio conference did not work due to an alleged thunderstorm and we never got connected. An annoying accident, which could have been fixed with some rescheduling, or by making the professors available via Internet. It never was though, and we as well as others were cut off from debating this interesting lecture.

3. e.) 10.05 University of Montpellier

We did not participate (see 3.c.).

3. f.) 12.05 Round-Table Live from Bergen

It was with excitement that we looked forward to the last satellite lecture, where it turned out to be the task of Els Jongeneel and José Lambert to clear the threads and make some sort of conclusion on the project until now. More than 2/3 of the students were present, although the lecture was scheduled on a Danish holiday. Els Jongeneel summoned up on some of the theoretical discussions and

pointed out how some of the issues were central to the perception of modern literature and referentiality in general. José Lambert, who on several occasions has criticised the implementation of the project, came with some critical remarks which we in Aarhus felt was quite to the point. He said that he had missed some more explicit positioning as regards to the overall theme; a positioning that might lead to a discussion about how we can and wish to deal with this subject at all. After all literary studies is not at all only summoning up facts and collecting biographical, topical, and literature historical knowledge. It is just as much a theoretical discussion about what literature is, how we can approach it, which role it plays in the construction of (urban) reality etc.

3. g) Conclusions on the demo seminar

In general the demo seminar did not live up to the expectations of the students, which is not so much to blame on the technology as on the preparation of the demo seminar. The technology proved to be capable and useful in a humanistic, university context. It has advantages as the above mentioned less authoritarian educational situation. The students can more easily form critical and independent approaches towards the lectures, there are less (or at least different) hierarchical power structures when the discussion is not only kept in a class room, but is spread out spatially and temporarily so that everybody has the possibility of writing a well-considered contribution behind a computer. With the implementation of both live discussions and written contributions via both Internet's news groups and personal email the discussion has many channels adjusted to different needs and passions. (See "The Internet" below).

Another great advantage of ODL is of course the possibility of gaining international contacts and learning from different cultural approaches. - Of course the technology has also disadvantages like the more stiff and formal conversations, the uneasiness etc. Things that might get better when we get more used to the technology. Many of the live discussions (via telephone and/or satellite) were not entirely satisfying. As I mentioned above, it proved difficult to establish a critical dialogue. Longer and more complex questions were often misunderstood or not quite given the time to elaborate. One way of raising the critical level could be to let one of the participating universities play the role as opponents. They would

have to prepare better for the lecture and lead the discussion, and then the rest of the universities could interrogate via written messages over Internet (email or Internet Relay Channel). Written questions often worked better than the rather confusing telephone messages, where everybody were allowed to pose one or two questions.

But the central problem was that the professional content related outcome of the demo seminar was not worth all the fussing around with technology, which leads us back to the critique of the content and preparation of the demo seminar.

To succeed with such a project it is absolutely necessary to prepare, analyse and define the contents in a much more explicit and reflective way. It takes time (and it seems as if the lack of time has been a major cause for the problems) to implement such a demo seminar into an academic context in a satisfying way. To be worthwhile we need some careful preparation done at least one year before by a respected researcher familiar with the subject. We need lists of literature and reference works distributed to construct a theoretical framework, both locally at preparatory courses on each university and globally. Then it would be easier for the lecturers to assume something about the level and interests of their receivers, instead of having to 'play safe' with rather uninspiring and factual lectures. And the students would also be able to assume some common ground for discussions on the Internet and live.

To put it in a very short manner: On the part of the technology the project has worked, partly because it seems as if the greatest efforts have been put into testing and applying new technology in the humanities. It is also on the technological level that the outcome has been the greatest for the participating students (and tutors/teachers). On the part of the content there has been more severe problems. One way to 'solve' or at least 'heal' this problem would have been to make the technology part of the content in some sense. It would have been obvious to reflect more on the relations between the city as an informational structure (the cityscape) and the modern media structure (the mediascape) or 'global village'. In this way, with at least one lecture,¹⁰ the content could have been linked with the technology in a way where the two aspects of the project mutually reflected each other. For these reasons, I think that HUMANITIES should move towards projects such as proposed by

Barend Van Heusden and Daniel Apollon.¹¹ – Not because technology can only be applied to brand new literature or because the medium is the *only* message. But while the technology and the use of it is still very new, it will captivate the main part of the interest anyway. And by dealing with technological minded literature or literary technologies we could get this energy back in the literary studies.

Jacques Perriault (CNED, France) places three criteria for a successful participation in distance learning projects (in the *HUMANITIES RESEARCH DELIVERABLE*):

- the relevance of the theme of the conference with the studies program,
- the "image" of the invited personality (moral scientific, etc.;
- the quality of the documents which are sent before to prepare the video conference.

HUMANITIES have had severe problems with all of these criteria, as well as the overall criteria of preparation as mentioned above. I will comment shortly on the criteria one by one:

- The theme though highly relevant was way too broad and loosely defined including almost everything. Especially if one looks at the original, general topic *A Literary Journey across Europe* we were free to deal with as diverse subjects as for example travel literature or the concept of Europe in literature. The original topic was though along the way narrowed to the topic of cityscape and European cities, a topic still too diverse (cf. the above mentioned critique).
- To counterbalance the large technological efforts one could expect receiving lectures done by more prominent and leading professors in the field. Professors that we could not expect to see in our university in other ways. This is of course a difficult and sensitive subject, because who is prominent in literary studies on a European base? Of course this is a discussion that converges with national, cultural and theoretical differences in the approach to literary studies. On the other hand these differences needs to be confronted explicitly in order to be engaged in open discussion, in stead of just acting as hindrances for the global interaction.
- At least one or two literary 'stars' would have helped engage the students and local

environment as did professor Umberto Eco for the Communication TSG.

- We have received lots of papers in this project, but almost nothing about the content. We have missed relevant literature to prepare for the demo lectures, in stead we have received various guides (student's guide, teacher's guide, tutor's guide) which often were all too general to interest anyone in particular.

All in all the demo seminar outlined some of the advantages we can expect of future ODL programmes. But the actual implementation seemed to be most concerned with the technology (which to a large extent succeeded) and care less about the content. And it is after all the content, which is going to make ODL inevitable in a humanistic environment.

To summon up the advances and critical points:

Advances:

- More possibilities for individual learning
- Possibilities of making international contacts and developing international research
- Introduction to using the technology

Problems:

- Problems with using (or not using) English as common language
- Late distribution of material
- Lack of definitions of contents
- Lack of definitions of theoretical approaches
- Lack of common learning material
- Relevance of lectures/lecturers

4. The Internet

In Leuven the tutors received some introduction to both the First Class system and Internet in general. The idea was that we should use First Class for the Internal communication and debates and Internet for the external communication. It was disappointing to discover on coming home that the First Class system did not work,¹² and that there were no facilities to use on Internet yet. But through

the great work of Hannu Markkanen, TechNet Finland, facilities like mailing lists with mirroring newsgroups on WWW¹³ were established a week after Easter (24 April). Though it might have been great to use First Class for more internal communication the Internet facilities provided by TechNet has technically worked very fine, among other things through the active participation and availability of the project co-ordinator Hannu Markkanen.¹⁴

Even though the technology worked (at least globally and in Aarhus) the electronic discussions has also been marked by a lack of content and real communication and contacts on a professional level. This I think is due to at least three things:

- 1) The general problem with lack of definition of the theme did also mark the electronic communication. There was a general disagreement or/and confusion with what we were to discuss and on which level. At some time there was a lively chat on the lists, but it died out again. And the more serious messages like the abstracts of lectures, questions, short essays has had disappointingly little response, maybe because they did not communicate with other student's interests in the theme.

- 2) It takes time to become familiarised with the technology and the appropriate Internet lingo and culture. Internet with email and news groups is *not* just another way to fax or mail a letter. It is a new way of communicating, which has it's own rules for success. For example to get a mailing list or a news group working everybody must be interested in the theme and feel urged to correspond in an open and helpful way whenever possible. The list is a sort of community where everybody must be readily available and urged to contribute to the common research on the list. – At the same time one must learn to quickly filter the incoming messages and delete what is not interesting. Else one gets overwhelmed with the enormous number of messages and consequently drops out or becomes a passive receiver. I have the impression that a lot of students have taken that option either out of resignation (with not having any answers to ones inquiries or with being overwhelmed with useless chat), problems with the availability of the technology or lack of time (because of exams and the short time to get used with Internet).

- 3) Generally one feels a bit cut off on the lists, like shouting out loud without getting any answers. It both comes from the above

mentioned lack of experience with Internet lingo and from the fact that almost none of the organisers of the HUMANITIES project reacted to the discussions on the list. Only two of the lecturers (Els Jongeneel & José Lambert) have followed the discussions and been available for questions and comments. Especially as a tutor it has often been very difficult to get in contact with organizing partners. There are lots and lots of examples from the hum-tutoring list of tutors crying out their urgent problems while nobody reacts.¹⁵ Internet is a powerful tool for an organisation like HUMANITIES, but only if the relevant people bother to be available. Of all the organising organisations only TechNet has been visible and available. Of the Literature Task Force only Daniel Apollon followed the Internet discussions and has been available¹⁶ and the co-ordinators from Coimbra has not either followed the email discussions. It almost seemed like a playful comment on these problems and the problems with language in general, when we after the last satellite lecture received an email from the chairman of the literature Task Force and member of the steering group Manuel Cáceres Sánchez apologising that he had not followed the discussion on the Internet because he did not speak English!¹⁷

Though the technology functioned the conclusion must be that it takes more to making a successful Internet discussion than just the technology. We need a clearer defined theme, more time for getting accustomed with Internet (both students and tutors/teachers), and everybody, both tutors, organisers, and lecturers, *must* be available on the Internet and at least monitor the discussions. We need a well considered strategy of how to animate the students into active participation on Internet. This strategy should contain both a presentation of the net culture, some examples, some exercises and points of beginning for the interaction on the mailing list, and some forthcoming events on the Internet (like different lecturers being available for questions, new substantial material posted etc.).¹⁸ It should be considered what the Internet facilities should be used for, how for example research results could be exchanged and we need a schedule with plans and ideas on how to keep the Internet discussion alive and interesting. As a common goal it would be a good idea to work towards a WWW-publication, which could turn out to

be a really powerful tool for other people working in the same field.¹⁹

To summon up the critical points:

Advances:

- TechNet's server and support
- Gaining knowledge of Internet

Problems:

- First Class was never implemented
- Lack of definitions of the content
- Internet culture
- Availability of organisers, partners, and teachers
- Lack of prepared events on the mailing lists
- Lack of strategy for publishing on the Internet (and elsewhere)

5. Workshop and evaluation

At 16 June we held a final workshop before the exams (10 August) where this paper was discussed thoroughly and agreed upon. Generally the students expressed that they were rather satisfied because of the very successful local lectures and the opportunity to get experienced with the technology, although they supported the critique of the demo seminar. They seemed well prepared for exams and expressed contentment with having been involved in an extremely unorthodox course in spite of all the problems. One interesting aspect of the many problems was that we have spent a lot of time discussing the formal aspects of education and literary studies.

Still after this rather critical evaluation we would not have missed the project and we understand the difficulties with organising such a vast project in a very short time. – The project has given us a great opportunity to introduce new technology and media at the Department of Comparative Literature, and we have gained a lot of valuable experience. We hope that this evaluation will contribute to a better organisation of the next HUMANITIES project, in which we will be enthusiastic to participate.

It is of utmost significance for the success of future projects that this project gets thoroughly evaluated, and that all the evaluations from students, tutors, teachers and other partners is considered and included in a final gathering that will be reported back to all involved partners. A lot of people has put a great effort in the project and deserve to get some feed back on their work. Also it would be a major advantage, or even a necessity, for a future project to be able to draw on the now established European network of tutors familiar with ODL and the technology. Already in the planning processes tutors and organisations should be contacted and heard.

List of abbreviations:

HUMANITIES: Historic Universities Multimedia Network for Innovation in Education System

ODL: open and distant learning

TSG: thematic study group

WWW: World Wide Web

Notes:

¹ Summaries of the guest lectures were made by the students and can be found on Internet at
[news://news.dipoli.hut.fi/hut.dipoli.technet.humanities.lit.content](http://news.dipoli.hut.fi/hut.dipoli.technet.humanities.lit.content)

² Nobody has requested another session, but the students have managed to help each other with the problems, and though they were encouraged to confront the tutors with any technical problems, we have the impression that everybody succeeded quite well and without serious problems.

³ The addresses were in a bookmark file. A bookmark file is a document in the WWW-browser Netscape equipped with addresses of your own choice. The addresses are presented as hypertext links leading directly to the desired WWW-site. The links in the bookmark file includes City.Net, HotWired, Project Runeberg, Humanities, Book Stacks, WebMuseum, Postmodern Culture, CTheory etc.

⁴ The presentations can be found on Internet in the hum-lit-contacts news group.

⁵ Tværfag is a joint-humanistic education centre. The seminar was held on the 5. may with Per Aage Brandt (Semiotics and media), Niels Lyngsø (Michel Serres and network philosophy) and Lars Kiel Bertelsen (Photography after photography - about digital photography).

⁶ Els Jongeneel's paper can be obtained via Internet's WWW on:
<http://www.uib.no/ped/LITCIT.html>

⁷ Michel Serres, who has been in charge of mapping out a how-to report on the organisation of France's projected 'open university', is presenting similar reflections in the interview "Making a Killing" (in *Artforum*, April 1995) done by Laurence A. Rickels. Serres talks about "limits set to teaching on every type of channel-television, radio, etc.-and my thoughts on this are that we cannot teach everything on every channel. Some disciplines beam up better on television, others are diffused best on other channels, still others can only be transmitted via the text." [...] "One of the issues around this question is the idea of the larger-than-life presence of the professor. I discuss this problem in the second part of my last book, *Atlas*, saying, for example, that the presence of the teacher is very useful for teaching but it also sets up blocks. We used to have young people who couldn't learn math because they hated their math professor, or who liked their philosophy professor so much that they became fanatics and lost their freedom of thought. There are limits to the big idea of presence, and they rival those said to beset the new channels of information."

⁸ This crisis is reflected on the news groups, which was floated with messages about the Montpellier tapes. First everybody wondered why they didn't get the tapes and translations (which we still has not got for the lecture on Aragon). Then a lot of people got disappointed and angry with the fact, that we couldn't get translations into the common language and that we didn't get the video in

time to do any translation ourselves. I participated in this discussion with several messages for example the rather dispirited "Montpellier lecture and general feelings" from 2 May.

⁹ The discussion around the problems of language and translation got very heated around the time of the Montpellier lecture. In short there was a general discontent with the fact that it had not been discussed and dealt with thoroughly before the project started. Either there seemed to be no real policy about language issues (which is always a very sensitive issue in a European context). Or the policy of English as common language was not being followed due to lack of resources and/or English speaking professors. In Aarhus the students were rather astonished that while the student was chosen regarding their knowledge of English, there had been no such demands in connection with the professors involved.

¹⁰ Dealing with for example Thomas Pynchon or William Gibson, the thoughts about using the city as a visualising metaphor on the Internet, or to give an example from elder literature the relations between James Joyce and Marshall McLuhan (see Donald F. Theall: "Beyond the orality/literacy dichotomy: James Joyce and the pre-history of cyberspace" in *Postmodern Culture* v.2 n.3 (May 1992).

¹¹ For example the proposals 'Literature in a changing world' and *The departure from locality - Literary production in the new electronic media.* - See "Humanities-Task Force Literature - Abstract of the meeting - Vienna 2 February 1995"

¹² There was no server to connect to. And though I've written several messages to both the list and Noesis/Kenneth Lindquist I received no response what so ever. But on May 6. I received a fax with a telephone number to a BBS somewhere in Belgium (Scoimbra), which promised that "later on" the system would also allow access via Internet. At that time we were halfway through the demo seminar and were not obliged to run out and buy modems in order to connect to a very remote BBS.

¹³ The following text is an introduction to the Internet resources made available by TechNet. The text is cut from TechNet's WWW-server and is located at: <http://www.dipoli.hut.fi/org/TechNet/org/humanities/cmc-intro.html>

"Computer mediated communication

Introduction

Computer mediated communication connects people through computers and telecommunication networks. Internet is the most popular telematic network in the university environment, and it will be used also in the Humanities demo seminars.

Internet provides various telematic services to users. The Humanities demo seminars will utilise e-mail, mailing lists, newsgroups and World-Wide Web. These will be described shortly here.

E-mail

Electronic-mail is the basic form of computer mediated communication where an individual sends a message to another individual or group of people using a computer connected to telecommunication network such as Internet. Every user has an e-mail address that for European university people using Internet looks usually something like "name@dept.univ.co" where

name is the user's name (may be abbreviated)

dept is identification of the department (not always included in the address)

univ is the identification of the university

co is the identification of country in two letters

E-mail is used through an e-mail software. There are great variety of e-mail software available for Internet, and you will be using the one installed on the computer available for the use in the demo seminar. If you are not familiar with using e-mail, you will be trained for it in the preparation module.

Mailing lists

Mailing lists are an Internet service which make it easy to distribute information to a large group of people. Mailing list is basically a list of addresses of people who are interested in discussing a particular topic. The mailing list is maintained on a computer called a list server. Mailing lists can be used through your e-mail software.

Before being able to use a mailing list you have to subscribe to it by sending a subscription message to the list server (you will be explained in the preparation module how to do this in practise). After you have subscribed to the list, you will receive all the message that people send to the list, and will be able to send your messages to the other people on the list.

Newsgroups

Newsgroup is an electronic bulletin boards The difference between mailing lists and newsgroups is that in the mailing lists all the subscribed people get automatically all the messages sent to the list, whereas in the newsgroups the user browses through the messages and selects the ones that (s)he wants to read.

To access newsgroups, the user has to acquire a news reader software and subscribe to the newsgroup. There are several Internet news readers available as public domain or shareware programs, of which the user can select the most appropriate for his/her environment.

World-Wide Web

The most prominent of the advanced information services on Internet is the World-Wide Web. WWW is based on distributed hypertext technology developed at CERN. The technology provides also some support for multi-media data, although this is still under development.

Users can access the service using one of the several public domain (e.g. Mosaic) or (inexpensive) commercial client programs available on the market (e.g. NetScape). The client programs are available in line-oriented or windowing systems running in various platforms (DOS, Windows, Mac, Unix). The Humanities WWW server will be set-up in the premises of one of the partners. The service will be linked to other WWW services around the world in the three discipline areas of Humanities."

¹⁴ Hannu Markkanen has proved to be one of the few people in the project, who has been constantly available and engaged in the project as well as always knowing what he is speaking about and keeping his promises.

¹⁵ For example around the Montpellier lectures (where we still do not have a translation of the Aragon lecture), the problems about the scheduled placements or the idea about making a book.

¹⁶ And he has indeed been available solving a lot of problems and prohibiting a lot of severe crises. Apollon was the only representing the Task Force in Leuven and he has been the only one visible ever after. This must be the place to thank him for his marvellous contribution.

¹⁷ The following is an excerpt from the email that can be read in whole at the newsgroup:
news://news.dipoli.hut.fi/hut.dipoli.technet.humanities.lit.general
under the header GREETINGS from the TASK FORCE-LITERATURE:

"Dear colleagues,

At this very moment when the Demo Seminar is going to end I would like to address all of you who participated in it and at the first place to apologise for not having participated in the audio conferences and also in our communications through the e-mail. Those knowing me personally know also my difficulties in expressing myself in English."

¹⁸ The learning material homepage is still (16 June) not implemented and contains no information. The only learning material available is placed on the Norwegian Humanities WWW-pages. For a nice way and very professional way to keep an on-line community alive check out Hotwired at <http://www.wired.com/>

¹⁹ For an example of such a tool check out the Literature and Medicine Database at <http://mchip00.med.nyu.edu/lit-med/lit-med-db/topview.html> - It is not very substantial but I think it shows some great ideas on how to develop a joint WWW publication.