

# Keywords in



# Remix Studies

Edited by Eduardo Navas, Owen Gallagher and xtine burrough

Eduardo Navas

Remix has become culturally relevant due to its function as a binder for the constant recycling and repurposing of material and immaterial things; it has helped develop an awareness of the constant exchange of ideas across specializations and cultural niches for different purposes. Why this is taking place could certainly be considered from various points of view, which is what makes accepting remix as a vital creative process difficult. Once an awareness of the relation of remixing to culture at large was developed, a critical and historical engagement became encapsulated under the terms "remix culture" and more recently "remix studies." What remix studies itself may be is difficult to define, as many of its participants engage with remixing as a field of research based on different paradigms, which, as part of remix itself, question each other.<sup>1</sup> One could also argue that trying to define remix might be a moot point because, while the most basic meaning of the word appears to remain constant, its connotation changes as it continues to be discussed, reflected upon, and (most importantly) put into practice by those who actually produce material that both challenges and redefines it.<sup>2</sup>

What can be productive, then, is to evaluate how remix has evolved from a creative action to a cultural practice and a field of study. In order to accomplish this, we can evaluate the various stages that remix has gone through as it gained common usage. In what follows, I go over the brief history of the word "remix" with the aim to reflect upon its elusive cultural role. I will not provide variations of its basic definition, because it has remained fairly constant since it became related to the general understanding of creative production. What is outlined is how the concept itself has been repositioned to evolve into a subject of research and practice. I begin with remix's basic definition, moving on to its common understanding in music. The impact of remix on broader cultural studies is then reviewed under the umbrella of remix culture, followed by its own reflective meta-stage of remix

studies. I then consider the current stage of remix and how it could possibly change in the near future.

### Remix Practice

One could actually argue that all things in life, from nature to culture, are remixes. In the cultural realm, this in fact is the argument by Kirby Ferguson who titled his online film series "Everything is a Remix."<sup>3</sup> But one should wonder how, even on a rhetorical level, everything could be considered a remix. And consequently question if remix as a concept, once it is applied to everything, may lead to a type of hegemonic view of the world—particularly if it is mainly defined by Western meta-narratives.

To begin, we must reflect on the basic meaning of remix; the term consists of two syllables, the prefix "re" and the root "mix." According to the New Oxford American Dictionary "mix" can be defined as a verb to "combine or put together to form one substance or mass." It can also be a noun describing something that has been mixed. The prefix "re" means "once more, afresh, anew." It can also mean "return to a previous state, restore, revert."

As a verb, remix is defined as to "mix (something) again. Produce a different version of (a musical recording) by altering the balance of the separate tracks." It is also defined as a noun, "a different version of a musical recording produced in such a way."<sup>4</sup> As we will learn, the fact that remix can be both a verb and a noun may be in part the reason why it is so difficult to define.

It can be noted thus far that the basic definition of remix is directly linked to music, not culture at large. It is remix's expansion as a cultural metonym for creative production as well as a practical means of communication that makes it elusive once it moves beyond the music realm. Note, however, that the term "mix" itself is not directly linked to music. This happens only after the prefix is added. This is in part due to the rise of "the remix" as a proper noun and verb during the time period when late mechanical reproduction took place in the form of digital technology.<sup>5</sup>

The term remix, in effect, is specific to the period in which media increasingly became part of daily life. The musical genres of Jamaican dub, disco, hip hop, trip hop, house, techno, drum 'n' bass, garage, grime, dubstep, and most recently trap, among others have all shaped remix and in turn have been reshaped by remix. This activity in music culture has become extended as a creative cultural form. The relation of music and culture is defined on material terms by the rise of mechanical reproduction, which evolved into electronic reproduction.<sup>6</sup> The foundation of remix, from a technical and technological point of view, starts with an innovation that made it possible to record the world. Photography made this possible in visual culture beginning in the 1820s. Yet, remix as a specific concept of sampling from recordings, became prevalent in music during the 1970s. In turn, it was extended to culture at large once the basic act of remixing became

prevalent across culture and society. Computers made cut/copy and paste a basic principle of communication across networks, as well as a primary element for all types of creativity, from writing texts to creating the most complex multimedia works of art. As remix evolved, new ways of discussing creativity came about to explain what it means to produce things with pre-existing materials. This tendency was encapsulated in the term “remix culture,” which was pivotal for Creative Commons.

### Remix Culture

Lawrence Lessig noticed that established copyright laws were increasingly unfair to the creative practice of remix that was developing across the Internet, as people shared, copied, and uploaded new information. His initial writings, which arguably became popular and influential due to their accessibility for a general non-specialist audience, focused on the exchange of not just creative works, but all types of shared media, under the umbrella of “remix culture.” This term turned out to be the backbone concept of Creative Commons, a non-profit organization whose mission is to promote the open sharing of information.<sup>7</sup> Lessig initially wrote about remix culture in terms of “free culture.” His argument was initially linked to the free software movement. He writes, “we come from a tradition of ‘free culture’—not ‘free’ as in ‘free beer’ (to borrow a phrase from the founder of the free-software movement), but ‘free’ as in ‘free speech,’ ‘free markets,’ ‘free trade,’ ‘free enterprise,’ ‘free will,’ and ‘free elections.’”<sup>8</sup> He claims that any new work that is a result of borrowing from a previous work protected under copyright law should be allowed to be shared based on fair use, and the free exchange of ideas.

Lessig plays an important role in the history of remix. He helped deploy the concept across culture by popularizing it beyond the music realm in order to make a case for the fair and free flow of all types of creative works; albeit, his argument was primarily focused on digital works. Lessig’s first book *Code and Other Laws of Cyberspace* was published in 2000—around the time that the concept of remixing began to move from the music realm to mainstream culture.<sup>9</sup> It is crucial to note that remix culture’s popularity turned the act of remixing into a form of resistance against the implementation of copyright laws that deter creativity. Because of Lessig’s interests, remix became understood as an important tool for critical practice. His contribution informs the assumption that if one is to practice remix, such an act is expected to function under the paradigm he helped establish—as a form of expression often critical of corporate interests; yet, remix does not only function as a form of resistance, but also can be implemented as an effective commercial tool. In other words, remixing can be used to do the opposite of what remix culture envisions. In fact, the first remixes were produced in part because they proved to be potentially profitable.<sup>10</sup> This not so apparent contradiction increases the complexity of the term.

Lessig was not alone in shifting the general understanding of remixing from music to culture at large. There were a number of other scholars who wrote about the potential of repurposing material. These include Lev Manovich, who in his book *The Language of New Media* (2001) considered the DJ, who remixes live for an audience, a key figure for understanding the emerging role of the new media producer. For Manovich it is the act of selecting from a set of information (music recordings) to create a new composition that makes the DJ a good example of a digital media producer.<sup>11</sup> Henry Jenkins, in his book *Convergence Culture* (2006), discusses his own term “participatory culture” to evaluate how content is recycled and transformed by fans across online communities. He discusses the economic and cultural tensions that such acts tend to develop in terms of authorship in relation to corporate interests.<sup>12</sup> Michael Veal, in his book *Dub* (2010), discusses the history of Jamaican versions, and at the end of his book proposes dub in terms of remix, specifically as part of global popular music. Veal’s work is foundational in understanding the complex history of versioning as part of remix.<sup>13</sup> Paul D. Miller (aka DJ Spooky that Subliminal Kid) has been active as a DJ and music producer as well as an author on remixing since the 1990s. In his book *Rhythm Science* (2004), he discusses remix in terms of the flow of patterns across media and culture.<sup>14</sup> Miller also positions the DJ as a key figure for understanding creativity in times of ever-increasing recyclability.

Paul D. Miller aka DJ Spooky is the author of Chapter 24, “Versioning,” in this book.

There are many other major researchers who certainly laid the groundwork for remix studies. Some of them did not necessarily focus on remix specifically as a concept, but rather explored other elements such as sound, sampling, and repetition as foundational creative elements in the development of a global society. Tricia Rose’s *Black Noise* (1994) is certainly one of these important contributions, whose focus on hip hop culture helps us better understand why the recontextualization of previously existing elements would become vital for the creative process once we developed an awareness of constant cultural recyclability.<sup>15</sup> Admittedly, Lawrence Lessig was and remains the most cited writer on remix culture between 2000 and 2010.<sup>16</sup>

### Remix Studies

By 2009, scholars from various disciplines had written about remix from different points of view. Aram Sinnreich published *Mashed Up* in 2010, in which he discusses configurability to re-evaluate how creativity, primarily in music, changed once data exchange became a common activity.<sup>17</sup> In 2011, Kembrew McLeod and Peter DiCola published *Creative License*, in which they examine the act of sampling in music, and how it redefines our views on originals vis-à-vis copies.<sup>18</sup> In 2010, Vito Campanelli published *Web Aesthetics*, a book that reviews digital media in culture at large. Although only the fifth and final part of his book focuses

on remix, there is a clear emphasis on remix principles throughout his argument. Campanelli's publication can be considered a predecessor to the broader interest in remixing that began to take effect around this time.<sup>19</sup> Carolyn Guerra published *Digital Prohibition* in 2012, a book that engages issues discussed by Sinnreich, McLeod and DiCola with a clear focus on creativity across culture.<sup>20</sup> The emphasis in these and similar written works published around this time, including peer-reviewed essays, emphasized the relation of the limitations on creativity by copyright law informed by Lawrence Lessig's arguments for fair use. Remix was broadened to other areas well beyond music in *Mashup Cultures* (2010), edited by Stefan Sonvilla-Weiss.<sup>21</sup> The book comprises essays by different authors on remix's role in media, culture, and pedagogy. My own book, *Remix Theory: The Aesthetics of Sampling* was published in 2012.<sup>22</sup> My goal was to trace the history of remixing as a cultural act that was not primarily related to copyright fairness, but rather as a type of discourse that permeated culture.

These books are the result of research that had been taking place for many years, and they form part of a collective body of work that continues to be produced by a growing number of scholars. There are certainly too many individuals to include here, but some that should be named include Margie Borschke, who questions Lessig's assumptions on the history of remix; Patricia Aufderheide who aims to clarify the misunderstandings that take place in fair use by creative individuals; Janneke Adema, who discusses remix in terms of the future of the book's ever-changing electronic forms; Katharina Freund and Francesca Coppa who research fan culture in relation to vidding and feminism; and Annette Markham, who discusses remix as a discourse for critical practice and ethically conscious production.<sup>23</sup>

Remix and the eventual development of remix studies are also informed by a great number of documentaries that cover the history of major genres, including disco, hip hop and house music, as well as the creative application of music sampling. Media companies in the United Kingdom, in particular, produced films such as *Pump Up the Volume: The History of House* (2001),<sup>24</sup> *Krautrocks: The Rebirth of Germany* (2009),<sup>25</sup> and *The Joy of Disco* (2012).<sup>26</sup> Other documentaries focusing on remix, sampling, and turntablism include *The Hip Hop Years* (1999),<sup>27</sup> *Scratch* (2001),<sup>28</sup> and *Copyright Criminals* (2011).<sup>29</sup> An interest in the history of disco and hip hop has led to the production of fictional stories for Internet and TV viewers such as *The Get Down* (2016)<sup>30</sup> and documentaries such as *Hip Hop Evolution* (2016),<sup>31</sup> which attest to the ongoing interest in the history of music in relation to remix.

This consistent interest in the early days of extended remixes and sampling in disco and hip hop, is part of a reflexive moment in which material is being repurposed based on a growing awareness of recycling as a creative act. This, however, leads to a particularly formulaic approach to deliberately reuse pre-existing material. This is also sensed in social media. Facebook, in particular, at the time of writing, is reminding its members about their previous photo shares

from at least three years ago. In effect, people not only recycle what they find online anew, but also recycle material that they have already shared. Simon Reynolds actually foresaw this moment in his book *Retromania*, in which he discusses an obsession with the recent past found in music during the past 40 years. It appears that such a tendency is now part of culture at large.<sup>32</sup> In effect, we have entered a third stage of remixing in which we are not only aware of how we recycle all things we encounter in one way or another, but how we recycle ourselves for our own amusement.

Remix studies, consequently, emerged as a diverse field of inquiry as researchers and practitioners developed a body of reflective work on the subject. *The Routledge Companion to Remix Studies*, published in 2015, can be considered a body of texts edited with the aim of capturing some of the diverging ideas on the ways remixing has been taking place, going back to the early days of rhetoric in Western history as a proper form of appropriation and repurposing.<sup>33</sup>

### Remix, Remixability, Remixology

If remix studies makes anything evident it is our awareness that principles that have come to shape creativity have been with us since at least the time we developed the concept of culture. Different terms have been used to evaluate this issue. This is evident in the development of remix culture and remix studies outlined above. There are particular terms that have spun out in order to develop an emphasis on aspects relevant to a specific researcher's interests. In this regard, the keywords that comprise *Keywords in Remix Studies* include appropriation, collaborative, bricolage, cut-up, mashup, memes, sampling and versioning, to name just a few.<sup>34</sup> There are certainly many more terms that are also closely related to remix that were not included in this book, which only adds to the point that remix is a common practice that continues to promote and support social awareness of creativity as a collective process.

Some variations on the term remix are worth mentioning. Lev Manovich, for instance, discusses remix in terms of "deep remixability," which he sees informing a structure at play in direct relation to modularity and data.<sup>35</sup> Another term that should be mentioned is "remixology," which has been specifically used by three authors who have published books on the subject. *Remixology* is the title of a book by Paul Sullivan; he traces the influence of Jamaican dub in different music genres around the world.<sup>36</sup> The term is also used by Mark Amerika to describe his approach to remixing creative and theoretical material, which he publishes as hybrid fictional and theoretical works such as *Remixthebook*.<sup>37</sup> David J. Gunkel uses the term to encapsulate his philosophical reflections on remix studies, based on primary and secondary research, produced by many of the scholars previously mentioned. Gunkel makes a point of taking remix all the way back to the early days of the Greeks. He claims in his book, appropriately titled *Of Remixology*, that Plato's *Phaedrus* is a type of remix of the performed word.<sup>38</sup> It is in Gunkel's

book where we can find a moment of meta-reflection, which may well show that remix is developing into a proper, yet sprawling field of study. For this reason, it is worth elaborating a bit more on his argument.

What is unique in Gunkel's argument is his claim that everyone, both those who see remix as a truly creative practice and those who see it as a lazy activity, have been approaching it in a limited fashion:

both sides of the conflict value and endeavor to protect the same things. One side sees remix as providing new modes of original expression that require considerable effort and skill on the part of producers; the other argues that there is not much originality, innovation, or effort in merely sampling and remixing prerecorded material. [...] Consequently, if one wanted to summarize what follows [in the book] in a neat sound-bite package, it could be said that what I will argue is that the copyright gets the remix wrong but does so for the right reasons, while the copyleft gets the remix right but for the wrong reasons.<sup>39</sup>

Gunkel goes on to argue that we need to re-evaluate such normalized positions in order to reconsider Platonic thinking, which, according to him, has been the order that has defined representation of the world, including remixing, since the beginning of culture. Gunkel's answer to the usual approach to remix from both sides of the argument is to flip Platonic thinking. To achieve this, he applies to remix the philosophical ideas of Gilles Deleuze in terms of difference and repetition to propose a Nietzschean approach to representation as defined by Plato.

Gunkel argues that everyone who has written about remix thus far has done so based on what Deleuze sees as a first order of repetition, which presents copies in juxtaposition to originals. This is the Platonic model that, according to him, has defined how we view the world. Gunkel, based on Deleuze, proposes to view the world according to a second order of repetition, one that is defined not by differentiating copies from originals, but by viewing what normally would be called copies or originals as compositions consisting of pre-existing materials and ideas; from this standpoint, everything already is a copy of a copy, or copies. In other words, for Gunkel, following Deleuzian thinking, all things consist of already-existing elements that are brought together through the "difference of repetition."<sup>40</sup> This is quite evident for him in remix: "Remix does not consist in the technological preservation and reproduction of some original and prior live performance. It instead manufactures new originals from copies."<sup>41</sup> His main issue is that repetition in remix, as practiced under Platonism, is turned into a concept, which is not what Deleuze proposes in terms of difference and repetition.<sup>42</sup> In other words, once the relation of difference and repetition is turned into a concept, the terms, in effect, become subjects of representation under Platonism. Deleuze rather sees repetition and difference in relation to a constant *becoming*.

Gunkel's position is arguably polemical, due to the fact that he is calling out major figures in Western thought to be subjected to Platonic thinking. He argues that such individuals are unable to move past a specific type of worldview that is defined by a somewhat narrow type of repetition as a concept that is comfortably re-implemented by each generation as cultures evolve. His criticism sweeps over some of the most respected philosophers in history, such as Kant, Hegel, Adorno, and Heidegger, among many others, as well as just about all of the most relevant remix theorists and practitioners. It is with Deleuze, as noted above, and Žižek (in the last part of his book) that Gunkel finds some innovative approaches to remix that can help us, according to him, move in a different direction from the first form of Platonic repetition.

### Conclusion: [Re]-mix-[ed]-[de]-terminations

Whether or not one agrees with a particular position in remix studies, from its early days, mainly as a practice, to a time of cultural acknowledgment as remix culture according to Lessig, on to remix studies, remixability and remixology as discussed by Manovich, Amerika, and Gunkel among many others, what must be noted is that such contributions to remix do provide much to reconsider. Based on this, after having surveyed the brief history of the word "remix" as a cultural variable, one can notice the complexity that has developed as it continues to play an important role in all aspects of cultural production. If anything, the term has entered an advanced meta-stage, which makes possible critical reflections that not only continue to re-evaluate remix itself, but the actual debate around it.

This brings us back to my previous point on the two syllables that comprise remix, the "re" and the "mix," and their relation to the word functioning as both production and action. To reiterate, remix is both a verb and a noun. This is the case with other words, but what is peculiar about remix is that what it describes and also is, is a specific cultural variable that is vital to just about all areas of cultural production. It describes the repurposing of something by being both action and object. This in itself may well be a constant process of becoming, but one that also is likely to push remix to remain on the margins of the mainstream. Paradoxically, this is what enables it to keep changing, because when a remix is produced, it is a thing that can be named, commodified and repurposed—only to begin that cycle afresh: such a thing is then taken and repurposed to become something different.

To conclude, if there is a possible consensus among the individuals who have written and continue to write about remix, it is that remix is a peculiar form of cultural production that points to constant change, defined by its very own process of constant becoming in terms of practice and criticism. And to this effect, paradoxically, to engage with remix critically also exposes its limitations. This may well be what becomes apparent in remix's meta-stage at the time of this writing. When we reconsider Gunkel's contribution, which, while asking us to

turn Platonism on its head, is also inscribing inadvertently an abstract and open-ended yet “proper” way of both producing and writing about remix by using Deleuze’s reflections on constant becoming as the way to engage with it critically, such a view remains defined by Western thought, unable to acknowledge the fact that remix itself is not solely informed by Western practices. An example of someone who has looked at representation and repetition from another point of view is Tricia Rose, who argues that repetition for hip hop does not function as outlined by Gunkel. Rose explains that repetition as defined by Western thought in the works of Adorno, Attali, and Jameson is presented as a tool of mass production—directly linked to capitalism, in contrast to its musical function in repetitive patterns found in African rhythms.<sup>43</sup> Rose views repetition not in terms of originals versus copies, or copies of copies, but rather as a circular process (a loop) marked by cuts that make possible the actual repetition that allows for something to be left and picked up as one comes around to it, thus falling outside of Western philosophy’s ideological tendency to function in terms of progression towards some greater goal, based on an abstract concept of accumulation (contribution to knowledge, which finds an equivalent drive in mass culture as gain of capital). Considering Rose’s position on repetition, which she directly connects to sampling and hip hop culture in order to discuss originality in rap music, what becomes evident in the critical writings of remix studies is not so much a blanket Platonic interpretation by everyone who participates, but rather a constant and fragmented renegotiation of “repetition” as a form of resistance to emerging forms of marginalization often found in capitalism. Ultimately, in order for remix studies to remain a critical field, it needs to stay alert against becoming a homogenized form itself; because remix, as a practice, by default, thrives on the margins of culture, and burgeons by remaining resistant to the very elements that make it possible.

## Notes

- 1 For different approaches in remix studies see Eduardo Navas, Owen Gallagher, and xtime Burrough, eds., *The Routledge Companion to Remix Studies* (New York: Routledge, 2015).
- 2 In this sense remix is dialogical. See Martin Irvine, “Remix and the Dialogic Engine of Culture,” *Remix Studies*, 15–42.
- 3 Kirby Ferguson, “Everything is a Remix,” available on <http://everythingisaremix.info>.
- 4 For the definitions of mix and remix see *The New Oxford American Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).
- 5 I explain this at length in Eduardo Navas “Remix[ing] Sampling,” in *Remix Theory: The Aesthetics of Sampling* (New York: Springer, 2012), 9–31.
- 6 John Mowitt, “The Sound of Music in the Era of Its Electronic Reproducibility,” *The Sound Studies Reader*, ed. Jonathan Sterne (New York: Routledge, 2012), 213–224.
- 7 Creative Commons remains an important organization in the debates of fair use: <https://creativecommons.org>.
- 8 Lawrence Lessig, *Free Culture: The Nature and Future of Creativity* (New York: Penguin, 2004), xiv.

- 9 For a set of charts that show this development, see Navas, “Remix[ing] Sampling.”
- 10 This can be noted in the early stages of disco, when extended remixes were produced because there was a demand for them by the emergence of DJ pools and nightclubs, initially in NYC. An early and parallel example is the production of dub plates, (versions) in Jamaica because there was a demand by the local dancehalls, closely bound with cultural movements reacting to different types of political repression, the professional production of remixes for the a basic monetary incentive that led to the production of remixes for the gain of capital. These examples expose the complex relation of remix with for-profit interests in forms that cannot be aligned solely with an anti-corporate position.
- 11 Lev Manovich, “From Object to Signal,” in *The Language of New Media* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2001), 134–135.
- 12 Henry Jenkins, *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide* (New York: New York University Press, 2006).
- 13 Michael Veal, “Coda: Electronica, Remix Culture, and Jamaica as a source of Transformative Strategies in Global Popular Music,” in *Dub: Soundscapes and Shattered Songs in Jamaican Reggae* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2007), 220–260.
- 14 Paul D. Miller, *Rhythm Science* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2004).
- 15 Tricia Rose, *Black Noise: Rap Music and Black Culture in Contemporary America* (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1994).
- 16 Lessig’s research, at the time of this writing, deals with the electoral politics in the United States.
- 17 Aram Sinnreich, *Mashed Up: Music, Technology and the Rise of Configurable Culture* (Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2010).
- 18 Kembrew McLeod and Peter DiCola, *Creative License: The Law and Culture of Digital Sampling* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2011).
- 19 Vito Campanelli, *Web Aesthetics: How Digital Media Affect Culture and Society* (Amsterdam: Nai Publishers, 2010).
- 20 Carolyn Guertin, *Digital Prohibition: Piracy and Authorship in New Media* (London: Bloomsbury, 2012).
- 21 Stefan Sonvilla-Weiss, *Mashup Cultures* (New York: Springer, 2010).
- 22 Navas, *Remix Theory*.
- 23 There are many more individuals that cannot be listed. For some of them see other keyword contributions in this publication as well as *The Routledge Companion to Remix Studies*, also see the bibliography of this chapter.
- 24 Karl Hindmarch, director, *Pump Up the Volume: The History of House*, Flame Television, USA, 2001, [www.imdb.com/title/tt0847411/](http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0847411/).
- 25 Benjamin Walley, director, *Krautrock: The Rebirth of Germany*, BBC, UK, 2009, [www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b00nf10k](http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b00nf10k).
- 26 Benjamin Walley, director, *The Joy of Disco*, BBC, UK, 2012, [www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b01cqt72](http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b01cqt72).
- 27 David Upshal, director, *The Hip Hop Years*, Channel 4, UK, 1999, [www.ovguide.com/tv/the\\_hip\\_hop\\_years.htm](http://www.ovguide.com/tv/the_hip_hop_years.htm).
- 28 Doug Pray, director, *Scratch*, Firewalks Film, 2001, [www.imdb.com/title/tt0143861/](http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0143861/).
- 29 Benjamin Franzen and Kembrew McLeod, directors, *Copyright Criminals*, Changing Images, [www.pbs.org/independentlens/copyright-criminals/](http://www.pbs.org/independentlens/copyright-criminals/).
- 30 Stephen Adly Guirgis and Baz Luhrmann, creators, *The Get Down*, Netflix, USA, 2016, [www.netflix.com/title/80025601](http://www.netflix.com/title/80025601).
- 31 Darby Wheeler and Sam Dunn, *Hip Hop Evolution*, Netflix, US (2016), [www.netflix.com/title/80141782](http://www.netflix.com/title/80141782).
- 32 Simon Reynolds, *Retromania: Pop Culture's Addiction to Its Own Past* (New York: Faber & Faber, 2011).
- 33 See the “History” section in *The Routledge Companion to Remix Studies*.
- 34 See the table of contents for other keywords.