

“Is writing going to continue to be what it largely has been, at least for the last century—the linear arrangement of pure text—or is it going to become something else perhaps, text integrated with graphics, either printed as complex documents (with headlines and other graphical cues serving rhetorical purposes) or displayed as a nonlinear series of artfully designed screens? In other words, are we to consider writing mainly in terms of the internal structure of ideas ... or are we to expand our notion of writing to include pictures, page design and eventually screen presentation...?”

(Tuman, as cited in Snyder, *Hypertext: The Electronic Labyrinth*, 1998, p. 113).

“According to Ulmer (1992), what has emerged from the meeting between print and electronic cultures is a new discursive form: ‘collage’. ... Ulmer explains: ‘One way to construe what is happening as we pass from print apparatus to electronic apparatus would be to say that the dominant forms for organising information in print have been narrative and exposition ... with pattern dominating only in the arts, at the bottom of the hierarchy of knowledge in the relations among science, social science, and the humanities. The dominant form organising the release of information in new apparatus, however, is pattern, whose essential form is collage... Story and document are still operating in collage, but they are subordinated to and manipulated by the operations of pattern, which transform their signifying effects’. ... As hypertext becomes more widely used in the academy, Ulmer’s collage may well assume the status of an accepted discourse and perhaps even rival the essay as the pre-eminent form of written communication and assessment. ... Scholars working in the humanities and social sciences have been slow to consider the potential of hypertext” (Snyder, 1998, pp. 114-116).

Secondary and post-secondary sources are legitimate citations, particularly as *all* knowledge and *all* texts pass through the perceptual filters of others before ever meeting the hearts and minds of users. To cite only ‘primary’ sources is to pretend that knowledge comes from pure origins.