Chapter 1

Storytelling for the Twenty-First Century

What is digital storytelling? Simply put, it is telling stories with digital technologies. Digital stories are narratives built from the stuff of cyberculture.

We can also conceive of digital storytelling through examples of it in action, such as:

- A very short story about growing food, made out of remixed archival photographs
- A podcast about medieval history, where each installment takes listeners through the extraordinary lives of Norman rulers
- A blog novel about America in 1968, following two teenagers as they travel through political and personal landscapes
- An account of an alien invasion delivered through multiple Twitter accounts: an updated *War of the Worlds* hoax, tweet by tweet
- A video clip about a mother–daughter relationship over time
- A game of sorts seemingly about *The Matrix*, based on a Web site, but mysteriously extending across multiple platforms including your email inbox
- Novels read on mobile phones—and often written on mobile phones
- Hundreds of Vermont teenagers creating multimedia stories for each other
- A Holocaust victim's life retold by Facebook[1]

Digital stories are currently created using nearly every digital device in an ever-growing toolbox. They are experienced by a large population. Their creators are sometimes professionals, and also amateurs. They can be deeply personal or posthumanly otherwise, fiction and nonfiction, brief or epic, wrought from a single medium or sprawling across dozens. We are living in a time of immense creativity, with new opportunities for creators appearing nearly every day. Several decades of energetic digital

experimentation have borne fruit, and yet, in the larger historical frame, still these are early days of innovation.

The phrase "digital storytelling" has several interesting resonances as this book is being written, and we can break out some assumptions from them. Pairing those two words can still elicit surprise or even shock for some, if the listener expects the two domains to be fundamentally separate. "Storytelling" suggests the old storyteller, connected to a bardic or Homeric tradition, a speaker enrapturing an immediate audience. As Coleridge and Wordsworth imagined it:

> He holds him with his glittering eye—
> The Wedding-Guest stood still,
> And listens like a three years' child:
> The Mariner hath his will.

Stories are spoken and heard, in this classic model. The story is a personal, intimate, analog thing. Therefore cyberspace is a world apart, at its worst a cold domain of data. At best, since many of us now inhabit cyberspace to a degree, this view of story assigns to that vast domain functions which might assist, but not constitute, narrative: communication, database access, entertainment, socialization, document management.

When I teach digital storytelling workshops, as an initial discussion prompt I ask participants to describe what stories are *not*. Inevitably people are surprised, even wrong-footed, as they probably expect to speak to what stories *are* (which is also a fine prompt; see below). Usually the negative answers that emerge identify an item typically associated with the digital world: data, especially data without meaningful patterns. Data are cold, while stories are warm. Data lack intrinsic meaning, while stories are all about meaning.

Other workshop participants see the gap between storytelling and the digital world as based upon a preference for analog media, namely, books, movies, TV, and music. Few will hedge this stance by noting that much seemingly analog content is already being produced and distributed through digital means. Instead they focus on pre-Web devices, like the paperback novel, film stored on reels and projected into a peopled theater, live music, or vinyl records. These objects are more familiar than digital ones to many participants and have an additional aura of ever-increasing historical value. They may be spoken of with love, nostalgia, or pride.

Once brought into conversation, these apparently predigital media help workshop participants describe what makes good storytelling happen.

Thinking of favorite TV shows or novels, workshops quickly summon up examples of appealing characters, solid plots, great scenes, and what makes a particular genre successful. A class can work with such details of either oral or "analog" storytelling and take them into less medium-bound, more generic territory. Conceptually, this abstraction then prepares the ground for reconnecting these concepts with digital platforms. Practically speaking, participants who start thinking about digital storytelling by bearing in mind narrative traditions in which they place value and comfort tend to feel less anxiety about the newer, digital tools.

At a different level, pairing digital storytelling with other narrative traditions brings to mind the sheer scope and persistence of storytelling in the human condition. The historicity of storytelling tempts us to consider the narrative impulse to be a universal one. Every culture tells stories. Each epoch brims with tales, insofar as records make them available.

For our purposes, it's vital to realize that people tell stories with nearly every new piece of communication technology we invent. Portable video recorders led to video art, starting in the 1960s with the Portapak and Nam June Paik's work. Long-playing vinyl records enabled concept albums, from Gordon Jenkins's *Manhattan Towers* (1958) to Jethro Tull's *Thick as a Brick* (1972) and Pink Floyd's *The Wall* (1979): a series of songs thematically unified and interrelated by content and/or formal features.[2] The motion picture camera elicited cinema. Radio spawned the "theater of the mind." The Lascaux caves either represented scenes of daily life or taught viewers hunting and other tasks. Indeed, no sooner do we invent a medium than do we try to tell stories with it.

What, then, are stories? It's often productive to see how people react when asked to answer that question themselves in conversation, in class, or as an audience. As a teacher and presenter, I have seen every single audience energized by the question. Their faces light up with memory of stories and storytellers; their heads tilt in forceful, almost physical recollection. Goofy smiles and critically engaged frowns appear and disappear in succession. Asking the question "What is a story?" is a more positive and productive exercise than asking the opposite, as answers come more quickly, tend to expressive positive emotions, and are often usefully diverse.

Answering this question, some will volunteer versions of the Freytag triangle, usually without naming it. This is the customary sequence of exposition or introduction, rising action, climax, falling action, and a dénouement, first codified by the German writer Gustav Freytag (1816–1895) in the nineteenth century. Nearly every person will recognize this sequence on its own

terms, perhaps rephrased in the ancient trinity of beginning, middle, and end, or through variations like inception through crisis and resolution. A story is simply a thing, any media object, which demonstrates this clear sequence. Some workshop participants will recognize this notion from either Robert McKee's influential screenwriting book *Story* or the 2002 film *Adaptation*, both of which reference that approach explicitly. McKee also (and usefully) expands that three-step sequence to include five stages: inciting incident, progressive complications, crisis, climax, and then resolution.[3]

The linear nature of stories is crucial to many definitions of *story*. Events arranged in time, or an event broken down into a temporal sequence: these make intuitive sense. Given that stories reassemble previously existing materials (language, media, audience, lives), perhaps we can go further and see stories as consisting of some selections from the set of available cultural practices, crafted to represent events chronologically. But focusing on the importance of time to stories risks being too obvious. How can a story exist outside of time, beyond the cliché of being timeless? If we emphasize time's role in the definition of storytelling, Will Eisner's definition of comics as "sequential art" could be translated and applied to any storytelling form or practice at all.[4]

Some story definitions appear to reflect a frustration with other media—hence the argument that stories are objects (books, movies, documents, etc.) with *meaning*. This definition opposes a story to a pile of data, or a document that is difficult to parse, or an experimental work that is challenging to grasp. Related to this sense of story as meaning-vehicle are definitions that place *engagement* in the foreground. In this model, stories are that which pull in the viewer/reader/listener; nonstories (or very bad stories) are things which do not attempt to engage us, or fail miserably at it. As Nick Montfort argues, a story "has a point. There's a reason for introducing it, there's a reason for bringing it up. If it means something to our situation, and to the way we talk to one other, *then* we're doing storytelling."[5] Documentarian Sheila Bernard places engagement at the root of storytelling: "A *story* is the narrative, or telling, of an event or series of events, crafted in a way to interest the audiences, whether they are readers, listeners, or viewers."[6]

The reason for a story—its point, its meaning—can be understood as a theme: "the general underlying subject of a specific story, a recurring idea that often illuminates an aspect of the human condition."[7] The full sweep of emotions and details ground that theme, making it accessible and engaging. Daniel Pink sees these as definitional: "Story exists where high concept and high touch intersect. Story is high concept because it sharpens our

understanding of one thing by showing it in the context of something else. . . . Story is high touch because stories almost always pack an emotional response."[8] Radio artist Ira Glass considers a story's theme or meaning—"why the hell you're listening to this story"—as one of storytelling's two essential "building blocks."[9]

Another way of contrasting data with stories is to classify some short narratives as data points: too small to consider as whole stories, but useful as material out of which to *build* stories. The Cognitive Edge group calls these "microcontent anecdotes" and urges organizations to generate as many of them as possible. They can then be used later on:

> An anecdote is a naturally occurring story, as found in the "wild" of conversational discourse. Anecdotes are usually short and about a single incident or situation. Contrast this with a purposeful story, which is long and complex as well as deliberately constructed and told (usually many times).[10]

Here we see stories distinguished by scale, a kind of quantitative argument: anecdotes are short and focused, while stories are longer and focus on larger or multiple topics. Anecdotes are also concrete, while stories build toward abstract knowledge out of them. Put another way, Cognitive Edge makes a distinction between uncodified knowledge and knowledge codified through narrative. Stories decode and encode.[11] Glass offers a similar view, using the same term, "anecdote," as one of the essential building blocks of stories.[12]

No writer offers a hard-and-fast rule for distinguishing small from large, anecdote from story. No precise measurement of clip length nor word count can be sustained (see the discussion of Hemingway's six-word story in chapter 13). But the scale differential can work as a rule of thumb, if applied to our consideration of small bits of multimedia, such as images, sound effects, or maps. Stories are assemblages, storytelling a kind of scaling up.

A related approach to understanding meaning in a story is to focus on a problem or crisis, especially a personal one. On the face of it, such a model seems obvious; what kind of story is there without some problem or struggle? It is, after all, easy to dislike a story for its lack of significant problem, which leaves an impression of dullness or emotional flatness. Sheila Bernard notes: "If something is easy, there's no tension, and without tension, there's little incentive for an audience to keep watching."[13] We can readily dismiss a story in the mystery genre for having made the killer's identity

too easy to solve, or a romance where the lovers' obstacles are too quickly overcome. Stories seem to require a challenge at their heart, one for characters to work through and for readers or listeners to appreciate.

Problem-based storytelling is a popular model in the literature. For example, Jason Ohler calls his problem-based model the "story core" and breaks it down in three parts. First, a "central challenge" must be evident—"a question, a problem, an obstacle, an opportunity, or a goal." This "creates tension that gives the story its forward momentum, which in turn produces listener involvement." Second, characters change as they wrestle with the problem. "Either life or 'the old you' pushes back as new circumstances or 'a new you' struggles to emerge." Third, the problem receives closure: "solving a mystery, slaying a dragon, reaching a goal, applying new academic knowledge or learning processes, overcoming an obstacle. . . . Closure by no means implies a happy ending, just a resolution of events."[14]

Problems can be escalated in scale to a far greater level than the personal, according to the mythic school of storymaking. This stems from the early twentieth century's anthropological boom, climaxing for storytelling purposes in Joseph Campbell's *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* (1949). Campbell claimed to have identified a monomyth of a hero's journey, an *ur*-tale or Jungian archetype with deep, regular underpinnings. The hero is summoned to extraordinary challenge, faces strenuous and even deadly obstacles, overcomes them, and then returns home victoriously. Campbell saw this pattern embodied in myths and ancient stories with local variations, from the lives of Buddha and Christ to Greek epics.

Campbell's monomyth is a staple of many storytelling approaches, having reached an acme of fame in its association with George Lucas and the (chronologically) first *Star Wars* movie. Some schools broaden the hero's journal into a set of myths, or simply the strategy of crafting a story to draw on popular, radical-appearing myths. This is the basis of James Bonnet's screenwriting work, connecting writers to mythic plots in order to create better scripts.[15] As another screenwriting guru, Robert McKee, argues: "An archetypal story creates settings and characters so rare that our eyes feast on every detail, while the telling illuminates conflicts so true to humankind that it journeys from culture to culture."[16]

The mythic school has garnered criticism over the decades, beginning with Campbell's focus on male characters to the all-too-frequent exclusion of women. The mythopoeic approach is also critiqued for the way it necessarily diminishes the importance of craft and media specificity. Further, it falls in and out of fashion depending on the status of Carl Jung's reputation.

Perhaps the most important objection to the mythic approach for our digital storytelling purposes is the way myth sidesteps the materials of everyday life. Rather than looking for mythic substrata in the quotidian, we can respect the details and stories of our lives, letting them resonate on their own terms. That is part of the genius and appeal of the Center for Digital Storytelling methodology, which is built upon giving voice to every participant, regardless of his or her professional ambition or life experience. Or, as Annette Simmons argues: "Myths and fables are not the only timeless stories. There are stories of your life, from your family, in your work experience that if you told them, would activate a deep recognition in almost any human being in the world."[17]

In my workshop experience, both approaches—mythic and everyday—appeal strongly to participants engaged in the creative process. Both clearly appeal to us as media consumers, as even a casual glance at the media landscape reveals.

Engagement can be also understood as a kind of mystery, a story in whatever medium elicits the audience's curiosity and makes us want to experience more of it. Consider, for example, a famous opening line:

> The last man on Earth sat alone in a room. There was a knock on the door. (Fredric Brown, "Knock," 1948)

The first sentence immediately summons up a sense of vast catastrophe, a crisis already passed. The second then shocks our sense of the first, eliciting a frisson of wonder: who, *what* could it be? An alien? A robot? A woman, if "man" means "male"? A mere seventeen words in and the reader is hooked, driven on toward the lines that follow.

Compare that one with these famous openings:

- "It was a bright cold day in April, and the clocks were striking thirteen" (George Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, 1949).
- "Last night, I dreamt I went to Manderley again" (Daphne du Maurier, *Rebecca*, 1938).
- "The sky above the port was the color of television, tuned to a dead channel" (William Gibson, *Neuromancer*, 1984).
- "As Gregor Samsa awoke one morning from uneasy dreams he found himself transformed in his bed into a gigantic insect" (Franz Kafka, *The Metamorphosis*, 1915).[18]

Each of these presents us with mysteries. How can a clock strike thirteen? (Answer: military time.) What is Manderley, why did the narrator go there

before, and why once more? What does that kind of sky look like, and how did it get that way? How on Earth did this Gregor Samsa person become a bug, and what does it mean? These openers are mysterious enough to engage us, without being so cryptic that we cannot quickly find meaning in them. They are puzzles we want to decode.

For creators, this kind of mysterymaking can seem wrongheaded and perverse, especially in nonfiction contexts. After all, we come to tell stories in order to *share* our material, not to *conceal* it. Yet concealing the matter of a story in a way that pulls in attention can engage the audience enough that they will deliberately pay more attention to the story. As Bernard writes of documentary filmmaking, as a creator "your goal is to create a film that's driven by a story, one that will motivate even general viewers to *want* to know more of those details that thrill you. They'll grow to care because those details will matter to the story unfolding on screen."[19] In chapter 2, we will reference Espen Aarseth's idea of experiencing hypertext fiction and gaming as a "work path," where such stories are predicated on an audience's effort. But a good story wins its audience to efforts on its behalf even without the formal device of hypertext or games, through careful use of mystery. This is the root of interactivity, and of co-creation.

Compare such mysterious story elements to a bad PowerPoint presentation. The latter does not draw us in, failing to summon our willing efforts to see it advance. Instead, the poor PowerPoint depresses us with the prospect of its extension into the future. It is a spectacle of inertia, a kind of audience assassination. We do not want the presenter to advance the slides, unless it is done quickly. We viewers and listeners come to expect that the next slide will appear monotonously through PowerPoint's sequential logic.[20]

A presentation that uses storytelling well, by contrast, makes the audience *want* the next slide to appear. Individual slides might seem incomplete, but in a way that elicits our desire to finish them ourselves. Two or more can seem to be a puzzle for which we can supply an answer. Alternatively, we may come to expect that the next slide, or one further along, will complete the puzzle for us; this is a form of trust won by decent storytelling.[21] We will return to puzzles throughout this book, especially in gaming; for now, consider them another part of the story mystery, of stories.

Another classic sense of story emphasizes representation of life to an audience, or *mimesis*. We find this theme as early as Plato and Aristotle, and mimesis persists as a storytelling theme throughout the subsequent history of aesthetics. Representation does not require a story to occur, as

the non-narrative arts attest. For a story to connect with an audience, however, it must represent something recognizable from life.

Simmons sees the skill of storytelling as "the unique capability to tap into *a complex situation we have all experienced and which we all recognize*."[22] This is a form of connection to the audience, on par with the sense of engagement discussed earlier. But it is in the service of carrying one part of life (a situation) to another (the audience). Simmons recommends that creators develop skills with empathy and sensory detail, in order to better connect with their readers or listeners. This aligns well with this definition from *Wikipedia*: "Storytelling is the conveying of events in words, images and sounds often by improvisation or embellishment." In this sense, stories are events conveyed to an audience through the skillful use of media.

Instead of reproducing events or situations through art, perhaps stories are essentially about representing people. My workshop participants inevitably deem personal content to be part of a story. They value highly stories that feature appealing characters, but generally like those with any characters at all. Charles Baxter, a leading teacher of writing, emphasizes characters as being essential to a story through their desires: "Without a mobilized desire or fear, characters in a story—or life—won't be willing to do much of anything in the service of their great longings."[23] The Center for Digital Storytelling (about which see chapter 2) bases its curriculum upon personal stories, those about the creator's life or concerning the life of someone who deeply affected the creator. Jason Ohler, an educator who teaches with digital stories, argues that stories usually work when

> they have at their heart an effective story core: a central character . . . that undergoes a transformation in order to solve a problem, answer a question, meet a goal, resolve an issue, or realize the potential of an opportunity.[24]

Bernard agrees, referring to "the way or ways in which the events of a story transform your characters" as an *arc*. Sam Pollard, interviewed by Bernard, describes a character arc as "a transformation of a state of being."[25] A story without such an arc will often feel flat, its emotional range blunted. A character who does not change in a story is not a person but a trading card.

Put another way, we deem characters storyworthy through multiple, overlapping validations. Does a character seem convincing, realistic, human? (See a related note on gaming and consistency in chapter 6.) Do we empathize with them, feel an emotional connection? These two

assessments are widespread in the reception of nearly all fictions. A third evaluation reverses the terms and questions the storyteller's character: Is he or she convincing? Do we feel hailed by, or connected to, that voice? Naturally these criteria apply differently across cultures, times, and individual preferences, but the forms remain popular.

So far we have not dealt with the distinction between fiction and nonfiction. The term "storytelling" often implies fiction, or even myth ("That's just a story they tell to explain . . ."). But every aspect of story definition we've discussed so far applies as well to nonfiction narratives: characters (people), extension in time, mystery and engagement, even Freytag's triangle. A good exercise for people who aren't narrative professionals is to think of nonfiction storytelling examples. As Alan Levine and I noted, these include "marketing used to sell a product's story; the mini-stories so essential to any discussion of ethics; the use of storytelling for surfacing implicit information in knowledge-management practice."[26]

In fact, nonfiction storytelling is widespread. Journalists often describe their work as "telling the story" of a present-day event, as "history's first draft." Historians, in turn, want to tell us the story of past events to the highest degree possible. A common therapeutic process has a patient learning to tell his or her own story of a threat, a trauma, or a relationship; Freud's case narratives are fine stories in themselves. Ethical discussions inevitably turn to parables or exemplary stories to illustrate a point or elicit thought. For instance, the classic runaway train problem—"If you had a choice between letting a runaway train kill ten people or murdering one yourself, what would you do?"—requires a short-short story to work.[27] Attorneys before a judge or jury assemble evidence, then knit it together into a performed narrative, in order to persuade the court.

Businesses use storytelling in a variety of levels. Marketing sells products by telling persuasive stories about products. For example, Google accumulates and blogs positive stories about people using its search service. These short-short tales involve Google-based happiness around love, physical health, language learning, and, of course, finding information.[28] Companies like StoryQuest help company staff learn to create and share stories.[29] Public relations tries to tell the most effective story of an enterprise, in the face of sometimes oppositional narratives. Internally, a common knowledge-management practice involves employees narrating an operational process in order to surface tacit or hidden knowledge about how work gets done. Politicians combine all of these in campaigns, which mix current events, history, and persuasion. In fact, our daily lives are permeated by nonfiction

stories, coming at us from all media, competing with and complementing each other.

For our purposes, let us attempt a synthesis of these definitional attempts. For a given audience, a *story* is a sequence of content, anchored on a problem, which engages that audience with emotion and meaning. Breaking this down, *audience* is a crucial definitional component, simply because what makes a story for one group might fail utterly for another.

Being able to determine a *sequence* or significant extension in time lets us distinguish a story from a data point or anecdote. The timeline of a story does not necessarily have to map directly onto the temporal sequence of what it describes. Flashbacks, for instance, or revisiting events can twist a straight timeline into retrograde orbits or curlicues.

Sequence is important for another reason, namely, the importance of stories' extension in time. A single image, object, or musical tone does not usually constitute a story. They are story *pieces*, media fodder awaiting use. Now, an audience can turn a single item into a story through the process of reception. Looking at a portrait of a weeping clown, one might envision reasons for such sadness, or ways of alleviating it—and at that point, the audience member is making a story, indeed beyond the extent of the original. Skillful creators can pause their narratives to facilitate precisely this form of engagement, drawing the audience into co-creation. Some digital tools make this explicit, as we'll see in chapters 2 and 3.

Returning to our previous examples of famous opening lines, note how they get audiences thinking sequentially. For one thing, they put forth mysteries that require explanation. How did the sky get to be that color? What happened to poor Gregor? They therefore push us in two different time directions: back, to understand the reasons preceding the situation; and forward, into a plot which must surely follow (if the clocks ring thirteen, something bad is bound to happen next).

Emotional engagement and meaning, again, are something audiences must at least partially determine. But it's a good rule of thumb to bear in mind that some kind of struggle or problem, some source of friction, is usually required to generate both engagement and meaning. When audiences complain about a story being weak, slow, or uninviting, it's often from a lack of such struggle. Too easy a plot rapidly becomes dull. Think of poor PowerPoint presentations that proceed solely by inertia or, even worse, by the speaker merely describing what's on a slide. These lack a sense of urgency, some problem being wrestled with, a question asked and being replied to. Stories require at least a bit of struggle.

Character can survive a lack of plot, if the character is interesting enough. A fascinating environment can take the place of a crisis in a story: hence the cliché of a city, building, or landscape being part of the dramatis personae. Yet these impersonal objects usually go through changes in stories where they appear significantly enough to merit characterization. The city of Baltimore in TV's *The Wire* (2002–2008) experiences major changes in policy and leadership, while enduring crime waves. Algernon Blackwood characterizes one Danube River location as an entity in "The Willows" (1907), showing its response to a challenge (the arrival of two human visitors). Character grounds meaning for a story, so long as it offers credibility and change.

If we can work with this template definition of *story*, then we can proceed to see how it helps us understand stories in the digital world. First, we can assess a given digital object against our definition to see how it performs. Second, we can explore how the digital story functions in ways emphasizing the unique affordances of cyberculture. How does being digital enable new aspects of storytelling?

One way of answering the second question is to start by recognizing that a greater proportion and number of people than ever before now have access to storytelling media—for both story production and consumption, united by myriad networks of critique, support, examples, and experimentation. This is a profoundly democratic revolution in media usage, and one whose outlines we are just starting to grasp.[30]

Perhaps the greatest example comes from the 2008 U.S. presidential campaign. If elections can be seen as storytelling contests, where candidates battle to promulgate the most effective narratives about their programs, then the Obama campaign conducted the largest digital storytelling exercise to date. The then-candidate's strategy included many social media components, including Facebook and MySpace pages, Twitter feeds, public and password-protected Web sites, and YouTube channels. Fan-made content was published, shared, and spread widely through these networks, along with blog posts and *Wikipedia* entries. Think, for example, of the many remixes of fan videos like the "Yes We Can" series. Mobile devices carried all of this still further, with the additional features of smartphone apps and text messages purportedly from the candidate himself.[31] It is now commonplace to view Obama's successful campaign as a mythopoeic story, where a heroic figure journeys through trials, ultimately arriving at triumph. As this book is being written, the subsequent Obama administration

constitutes another story, also being told through digital media, written into the fabric of our times.

If digital storytelling is so extensive in our culture, we can reverse the question into its negative: What *isn't* digital storytelling? This is, in some ways, a harder question to answer. First, an increasing amount of "analog" storytelling is being delivered and/or experienced in digital form. Television is increasingly experienced through Web browsers (Netflix, YouTube, Hulu) and mobile devices. E-books are finally beginning to be adopted beyond the cutting edge. Movies have followed TV into the home and are even digitally projected in theaters. Radio is played through satellite networks or from laptops. Music is consumed in mp3 format, playable through nearly every digital device we can use. Is watching a TV show on one's iPad a digital storytelling experience?

Second, a large amount of analog storytelling is built in digital formats. How many print books began life as Word documents? How few video productions emerge without digital editing, sometimes in multiple layers? Digital effects are widespread throughout the television world and are growing in the form of computer-generated imagery (CGI) within movies.

Rather than see the digital and storytelling domains overlap each other entirely, we can restrict ourselves to the exploration of digitally native stories. This means stories "born digital" and published in a digital format. Included are blogs, Web video, computer games, and mobile apps. How we tell stories with them, through the cybercultural matrix, is a question we begin answering in the next chapter.