Trying to “Out-Book the Book”: Amazon’s Marketing of the Kindle

Christopher Doody*

Since its debut in 2007, the Kindle has become synonymous with e-book reading devices. Although the Kindle was not the first e-book “reader,” as these devices are commonly called, it quickly became the most successful. Even with competition from other devices such as the Apple iPad or the Indigo-Chapters Kobo, the Amazon Kindle still holds 55 to 60 percent of the e-book market.¹ If Amazon continues to hold a majority of the e-book market, then its biggest competitor as the largest online store of print books will be itself. It is noteworthy then that in advertising the Kindle, Amazon stresses how the technology of its e-book reader is superior to the printed book while at the same time assuring its customers that the content of both objects is the same. This rivalry between a new medium (the e-book reader) and its predecessor (the printed book) is not uncommon. In fact, Jay David Bolter and Richard Grusin argue that this sort of rivalry, as well as its accompanying homage, occurs in all forms of remediation.² Amazon, however, has taken the rhetoric of remediation and has used it explicitly in their advertisement for the Kindle. Instead of hiding the e-book’s close relationship to the earlier medium of books, Amazon celebrates it and highlights both the rivalry *and* the homage involved in this act of remediation. This paper argues that the advertisement of the Kindle explicitly employs the rhetoric and language of remediation in an attempt to forge a stronger connection between the reading of a Kindle and a printed book. Examining the way in which the most successful e-book reader has been marketed is important because the advertising rhetoric

* Christopher Doody is a PhD student in the Department of English Language and Literature at Carleton University. His Master’s thesis focused on the works of Douglas Coupland, and his doctoral dissertation will look at the creation and early development of the Canadian Authors Association.

¹ Amy Martinez and David Turim, “How Amazon is Redefining the Book Market,” *Inside Retail*, 9 April 2012, <http://www.onfood.com.au/it/irHome.aspx>.

² Jay David Bolter and Richard Grusin, *Remediation: Understanding New Media* (Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1999).

employed by Amazon has the potential to influence the way that readers discuss e-books at large.

N. Katherine Hayles explains remediation as a theory in which “media constantly engage in a recursive dynamic of imitating each other, incorporating aspects of competing media into themselves while simultaneously flaunting the advantages that their own forms of mediation offer.”³ Remediation was originally defined by Bolter and Grusin as “the representation of one medium in another” or “the way in which one medium is seen by our culture as reforming and improving upon another.”⁴ In this way video games remediate movies, movies remediate photographs, and photographs remediate paintings: “*all* mediation is remediation.”⁵ Elsewhere, Bolter argues that this appropriation of one medium by another is always executed in a similar fashion: “remediation describes a particular relationship in which homage and rivalry are combined.”⁶ This struggle between rivalry and homage is essential to the understanding of how remediation functions. A new medium emulates an older medium (homage) while also attempting to improve where the old medium failed (rivalry). In this relationship, the new medium must walk a fine line between these two. On the one hand, the new technology strives to replicate the older medium’s ability to be immersive, “which means that it is a medium whose purpose is to disappear,” so “that the user is no longer aware of confronting a medium, but instead stands in an immediate relationship to the contents of that medium.”⁷ The new medium, however, cannot simply reproduce the old medium, or it would be redundant. It must also attempt to “reform” the earlier medium. The new medium must emulate the features of the older medium that were successful while simultaneously improving upon them. This improvement is not an attempt to make “a good thing even better,” but simply an effort to fulfill “the unkept promise of an older medium.”⁸ In other words, the new medium offers its users features that the older one could not. Therefore, in remediating movies, video games allow viewers not only to watch a narrative

³ N. Katherine Hayles, “Print is Flat, Code is Deep: The Importance of Media-Specific Analysis,” *Poetics Today* 25, no. 1 (2004): 69.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 45, 59, 45.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 55.

⁶ Jay David Bolter, “Transference and Transparency: Digital Technology and the Remediation of Cinema,” *Intermédialités* 6 (2005): 14.

⁷ Bolter and Grusin, *Remediation*, 21, 23–24.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 60.

unfold before their eyes (the immersive feature) but also to control that narrative directly. In this rivalry with the older medium, the new medium must not stray too far from the original. As Bolter and Grusin note, "the older medium cannot be entirely effaced," since new media are "still compelled to define themselves by the standards of the media they are trying to erase."⁹ Kindles, for example, will inevitably be compared to books. So it is not surprising that Amazon advertisers have chosen to embrace the comparison, specifically noting the similarities between the two mediums.

This attempt to preserve the connection to an older medium is most evident in remediations that attempt to play up the homage paid to the older medium while downplaying the rivalry, such as the remediation from manuscript to printed books. In *Five Hundred Years of Printing*, S.H. Steinberg describes how early printed books were based on manuscripts. Although he does not phrase it in the rhetoric of remediation, it does demonstrate the struggle between rivalry and homage: "In outward appearance books printed between 1450 and 1480 are almost indistinguishable from contemporary manuscripts ... [E]arly printers printed mainly those texts which were already favourite medieval reading material ... and made their printed products resemble handwritten books as closely as possible ... Neither manuscript nor printed book had a title-page or page numbers ... The same material ... was used for the same sizes which had become fairly settled, with quarto and folio easily leading."¹⁰ While early printed books strived to copy the physical appearance of manuscripts, they still retained the essential benefit of being able to be quickly printed, producing duplicate copies of an "accurate and reliable text."¹¹ Steinberg argues that the reason early printers attempted to replicate the style and form of the manuscript was not that "they wished to deceive the public by making their 'substitute' look as near as possible like the 'real' thing." Instead, "The true explanation ... is to be found in the attitude of the consumer rather than the producer. Extreme conservatism as to the presentation of reading material has always been the outstanding characteristic of the reading public. 'The typography of books requires an obedience to convention which is almost absolute'; and 'for a new fount to be successful, it has to be

⁹ Ibid., 47, 54.

¹⁰ S.H. Steinberg, *Five Hundred Years of Printing*, rev. ed. John Trevitt (London: British Library and Oak Knoll Press, 1996), 9–10.

¹¹ Ibid., 10.

so good that only very few recognize its novelty' – these are among the 'first principles of typography' as abstracted by Stanley Morison from the study of five centuries of printing."¹² Whether or not we agree with Steinberg's "true explanation," his observations support Bolter and Grusin's claims about the work of remediation. More importantly, this example suggests that early printers focused much more on the homage inherent in the remediation relationship and downplayed the rivalry. If Steinberg is correct, then printed books were not then heralded as a new way of reading, but instead simply as a more efficient way to access content. The marketing of the Kindle, then, stands in some contrast to this earlier remediation. While the marketing of the Kindle praises the familiarity of its content (i.e., the words are the same as the words in the printed version) in a similar fashion to the early printers, it also heralds the superiority of the e-book technology over that of print.

When the Kindle was first launched Amazon focused as much attention on its "revolutionary" technological features as it did on comparing it to the printed book. For example, in a promotional video featuring writers like James Patterson and Toni Morrison, the Kindle's features are described with the rhetoric of the fantastical: "It's not backlit, which is kind of magical," "It's magic [to have the ability to buy books anywhere]," and "It was like having a genie, who you say [*sic*] 'Genie, go and get me this book, and they come back in thirty seconds and the book is there.' That, in itself, is amazing."¹³ Along with these comments on Amazon's web page for the Kindle, however, appears a long list of comparisons to the technical features of a book: the Kindle has "electronic paper, a revolutionary new display technology, [which means] reading Kindle's screen is as sharp and natural as reading ink on paper"; it uses "a new kind of display technology called 'electronic ink'"; and it is "Lighter and thinner than a typical paperback."¹⁴ All of these comparisons, taken together, pay homage to the previous media while demonstrating the Kindle's superiority. The "paper" is at once the familiar stuff of printed books

¹² Ibid., 9–10.

¹³ Jeff Bezos et al., "Jeff Bezos and Bestselling Authors Discuss Amazon Kindle," Amazon video, advertisement video from 2007, accessed 15 April 2012, http://www.amazon.com/Kindle-Amazons-Original-Wireless-%20generation/dp/B000FI73MA/ref=cm_cr_pr_product_top.

¹⁴ "Kindle: Amazon's Original Wireless Reading Device," Amazon, accessed 15 April 2012, http://www.amazon.com/Kindle-Amazons-Original-Wireless-generation/dp/B000FI73MA/ref=cm_cr_pr_product_top.

and an electronic support with digital superiority. The Kindle is apparently “a lot easier to read than a lot of books are these days” and “it’s actually clearer, easier on the eye than the printed word.”¹⁵ Even the Kindle’s size and weight are more favourable than a book’s, although Jeff Bezos, Amazon’s chief executive officer, has admitted that the Kindle is “not quite pocket sized.”¹⁶ Of course, the Kindle’s advertisement also praises the technology’s advantages for which there are no adequate comparisons with books. These include the ability to buy a book from anywhere and to begin reading it in under sixty seconds thanks to its free Wi-Fi connection; a built-in dictionary with access to over two hundred thousand words; its simplicity of use: “It is so simple, you could be a moron and it works ... It takes no intelligence at all. Anybody who can read a book can function with this thing;”¹⁷ and “access to the planet’s most exhaustive and up-to-date encyclopedia – Wikipedia.org.”¹⁸ As Bolter and Grusin tell us, this sort of comparison between a new medium and an older one is inevitable and necessary, even if it is usually subtler.

Even more surprising than the explicit nature in which Kindle advertising invokes homage and rivalry in its comparisons to the printed book, is the direct way in which Amazon frames the Kindle’s immersive qualities. As noted earlier, remediation theory suggests that a new medium will strive to be immersive, that the medium aims to disappear, and that the medium allows the reader to be transported into the medium’s content. Jeff Bezos has stated that the Kindle’s immersive nature was Amazon’s “top design requirement:” “When we designed Kindle, the thing that we were really focused on was making sure that Kindle completely disappeared in the reading experience. It needs to get out of the way. It can’t be a flashy device. It needs to be transparent, so that you can be really close to the thing that you are actually reading. That is what you care about.”¹⁹ And: “You can’t out-book the book. You have to accept its key feature and embrace that, which is that it disappears, and get out of the way.”²⁰

As Bolter and Grusin note, “At the end of the twentieth century, we are in a position to understand hypermediacy as immediacy’s

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Bezos et al., “Jeff Bezos and Bestselling Authors Discuss Amazon Kindle.”

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ “Kindle.”

¹⁹ Bezos et al., “Jeff Bezos and Bestselling Authors Discuss Amazon Kindle.”

²⁰ Jeff Bezos, interview by Charlie Rose, *Charlie Rose*, 19 November 2007, <http://www.charlierose.com/view/interview/8784>.

opposite number, an alter ego that has never been suppressed fully or for long periods of time.”²¹ Hypermediacy describes a medium that has “random access with multiple media,”²² and this hypermediacy will always draw attention to the material aspects of the medium.²³ Simply, the greater a medium’s hypermediacy, the less immersive it can be. Following this logic, a printed book will always be the more immersive medium, because it has less hypermediacy than a Kindle, i.e., it does not have the constant option to look up any word from the same device, it does not provide easy access to Wikipedia, and it does not possess a screen that refreshes every time you turn a “page.” As a result, a book’s immediacy is the one feature that the Kindle can never truly replicate. It is why “you can’t out-book the book,” and why a reader will inevitably end up getting lost in the technology and not the reading. Problematically, Bezos has stated that a book’s immersive nature is what makes it so “elegant” and is its “key feature.” To compete against this feature, the marketers of the Kindle need to *tell* the reading public that the Kindle is as immersive as a printed book. Or, in other words, the marketers need to rely on the rhetoric of homage found in remediation to assure readers that the reading experience on a Kindle is as familiar as the reading experience of a book; the technology is new, but the content is the same.

As a theory, remediation aims to explain how a new medium historically relates to an older one; Kindle advertising takes this theory and redeploys it as rhetoric. While Amazon’s description of how the Kindle operates might be accurate, it is important to remember that the marketers of the Kindle are financially motivated to represent the new medium in the best possible way in order to drive sales. It is therefore worthwhile to examine a few claims made of the Kindle more closely in order to determine how accurate the rhetoric of remediation truly is. The Kindle’s display, for example, is often referred to as a “page.” The page in a printed book is defined by the *Oxford English Dictionary* as “one side of a leaf of a book, manuscript, letter, etc.” and as “the material written or printed on one side of a

²¹ Bolter and Grusin, *Remediation*, 34.

²² Ibid., 31.

²³ The ability on a Kindle, for example, to be able to look up any word in a dictionary or to be able instantaneously to download a new book, are part of the medium’s hypermediacy. These features, alongside having to push a button to turn the page, and the flash of light as the new page loads, all remind the reader that they are using a Kindle to read. This reminder decreases the immersive nature of the medium.

leaf of a book, etc.; an amount of text corresponding to this."²⁴ From these two definitions, we are able to extrapolate two key features of a printed page: once printed, it is of a fixed size, and the text that appears on a specific page in every copy of a particular edition will (usually) be (for most purposes) the same. The first of these features allows book designers to utilize the space of a page in very specific ways, by displaying text in a non-traditional manner, for example. The second of these features allows readers to make reliable citations, for themselves as well as for other readers. Neither of these two key features of the printed page is available on the Kindle's version of a page. Since a Kindle reader is able to change the size of the text, as well as the spacing between the lines, the amount of text that appears on a Kindle screen can vary dramatically. It is therefore not fixed, nor will the text appear in the same location for all readers.

The loss of these features has several consequences. First, there are a number of texts that have not been turned into e-books because their design relies too heavily on having a static page.²⁵ Second, the Kindle did not originally have page numbers as understood by readers of printed books. Instead, a text on a Kindle is divided up into blocks of characters with each block assigned a "location" number. Therefore, when a reader looks at the text on his or her Kindle screen, it might represent location 965–966 out of 6242. While these numbers

²⁴ *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "Page."

²⁵ One solution to this problem has been to scan these types of texts in Printed Document Format (PDF) before turning them into e-books. This, of course, means that readers of these texts on the Kindle cannot employ any of the medium's features, such as resizing the font, looking up words in the dictionary, or even annotating the text, as all of these features rely on having a text file to work with, and not an unchangeable PDF file. More problematical are works of poetry. On a Kindle, when a reader is able to change the text size at will, there is the constant problem of not being able to recognize a line or stanza break. Stuart Woods argues that this means that e-book readers cannot, and do not, display poetry accurately. He notes, "it is certainly the case that the design and formatting issues that afflict e-books are more pronounced in verse, often distorting a poem beyond recognition." There has been no apparent solution since Woods wrote his article. Woods quotes "a leading developer of e-reading technology," who argues that for now the most realistic options are either to keep a long line intact by scrolling horizontally across the screen – "a really bad experience" – or to find a way to "better communicate" to readers that a line broken in two was meant to be a single line. "Neither are perfect solutions," he said. "I'm not sure what the perfect solution is." See "How E-books Break Poems," *Quill & Quire*, 15 July 2010, <http://www.quillandquire.com/blog/index.php/2010/07/15/how-e-books-break-poems>.

essentially serve the function of being able to cite a specific passage, readers complained. Amazon eventually added “real” page numbers to most books, allowing readers to locate the text in the corresponding print version. Importantly, however, location numbers on a Kindle are detached from any concept of a static page. This comparison between a page in a printed book and a “page” on a Kindle is reflected in the *Oxford English Dictionary*’s definition of a digital page, which is defined as “the quantity of text that fills a screen *at any one time* when a person views teletext, a computer monitor, etc.” (emphasis added).²⁶ In comparing these two different definitions of a “page,” it becomes obvious that the similarities are minute – essentially, both versions of a page simply display text – while the differences are dramatic. Therefore, one could ask what is to be gained by making a false comparison, by employing the word “page” for digital mediums, as opposed to a more accurate term, such as “display” or “screen?” It would appear that Amazon employs the term for its familiarity as opposed to its accuracy. Similar arguments can be made for the terms “electronic paper” and “electronic ink.” These comparisons suggest that the rhetoric of remediation employed in Kindle advertisements is employed to distract customers from the mediums’ differences.²⁷

As the Kindle advertisement explains, it was designed “to provide an exceptional reading experience.”²⁸ What it obfuscates, however, is that this reading experience will be different from the reading experience of a printed book.²⁹ As discussed earlier, early book printers were concerned with the reading experience of their new medium. They wanted to minimize the technological differences and focus on the familiarity of the content. In this way they downplayed the new medium’s hypermediacy to ensure that the reader did *not* notice a difference in the reading experience. By contrast, it would appear that the marketers of the Kindle want to emphasize the differences between

²⁶ *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. “Page.”

²⁷ I am not suggesting that Amazon invented the terms “digital page,” “electronic paper,” or “electronic ink.” Far from it – these terms were all in use before the Kindle came onto the market. My criticism instead is aimed at how these terms are used, both in their frequency and in their use in contrasting the Kindle with the printed book.

²⁸ “Kindle.”

²⁹ A number of book historians, most notably D.F. McKenzie and Jerome McGann, have made compelling arguments that the reading experience is influenced by the text’s materiality. As a result, the reading experience of the same text on an e-book and in a printed book will necessarily be different, despite the fact that the Kindle’s advertising insists otherwise.

the technology of the new and old medium while ensuring readers that their reading experience will be the same, or even better, than with a printed book. I would argue that we should be suspicious of this reversal of the way in which the remediation of print is presented to the reading public. It is important to analyze the Kindle features that its marketers promote as well as the features that are kept out of sight. It appears that by assuring readers of the familiarity of the content and of the reading experience, the marketing of the Kindle might be obscuring the way in which the "superior" technology of the Kindle is actually changing the reader's ability to access the content.

In a 2007 interview with Charlie Rose, Jeff Bezos explained that one of the Kindle's features is the number of books to which readers had access. He told Rose: "if you look at the current *New York Times* best-seller list, there are 112 books on the current *New York Times* list, and this device [the Kindle], right now, as we speak, has [access to] 101 of those 112." Rose countered by asking: "So what is wrong with the other 11?" Bezos paused and responded: "There are rights issues, there are all other [*sic*] ... there are 101 out of 112 *New York Times* best-sellers [which] shows that we are really getting the books that people want to read."³⁰ There are a number of important factors to consider in this response. Bezos admitted that some best-selling books could not be read on the Kindle because of copyright restrictions or because Amazon had come to an agreement with some publishers but not others. Bezos clearly wanted to discuss the medium's strengths instead of its weaknesses and to control the terms on which the Kindle was discussed. In trying to refocus attention on the Kindle's strengths and its ability to provide access to 101 of 112 *New York Times* best-sellers, Bezos claimed that this "shows that we are really getting the books that people want to read." This statement implies that the eleven books on the *New York Times* best-seller list that were not available on the Kindle are books that people do not want to read, which is both illogical (thousands of people read these books to get them on the best-seller list in the first place) and prescriptive (Amazon knows, and more importantly, Amazon controls, which books people "want to read."). It further demonstrates that Amazon marketers are promoting books for the Kindle that are already well established, popular books (instead of supporting or encouraging readers to discover new or under-appreciated works). By placing their emphasis on primarily

³⁰ Jeff Bezos, interview by Charlie Rose.

acquiring the rights to best-sellers,³¹ Amazon is implicitly suggesting that the Kindle will be a way to read popular books after they have already been made popular by readers of print books.

Although it might be unfair to focus so much attention on one comment, I would argue that it is reflective of Amazon's larger ambitions. In the same interview, Rose asked Bezos if Amazon had plans to partner with libraries. Bezos responded that at the moment (in 2007 when the Kindle was released), Amazon had no plans – he cited potential problems with copyright holders as the main reason – but said that Amazon would consider this feature if enough readers asked for it. Four years later, in April 2011, Amazon announced that it was going to allow readers to borrow books from their local libraries. Kindle Library Lending, which became available in September 2011, allowed Kindle owners to borrow books from “over 11,000 public and school libraries in the United States.”³² A study done by the Pew Internet & American Life Project, however, found that some Kindle users found the process of borrowing a book through the Kindle to be arduous, because “library patrons who choose to download a Kindle e-book [from their library] are redirected to Amazon's website, where they must log in with an Amazon account (as opposed to completing the entire process within their library's system).”³³ Again, this is an example of the Kindle hindering a reader's access to content.

Perhaps the most obvious hindrance to access is the digital lock, incorporating digital rights management (DRM), that is placed on all of Amazon's e-books. Once having purchased a printed book, the reader can keep, resell, trade, loan, or destroy it as his or her sole discretion; by contrast, Amazon retains powerful controls over an e-book even after one has apparently bought it. In the now infamous example, Amazon even proved that it could delete e-books off of its customers' devices without their notification or consent, when in July 2009 it removed all the copies of George Orwell's novels, *1984*

³¹ Bezos also explained to Rose that Amazon has a deal with the “Big Six” American publishers (HarperCollins, Random House, Hachette, Simon & Schuster, Penguin, and MacMillan) to have their books available on the Kindle. When asked about deals with other, smaller, publishers, Bezos explained that they were working on it.

³² Kathryn Zickuhr et al., “Libraries, Patrons, and E-books,” *Pew Internet: Pew Internet & American Life Project*, 22 June 2012, 14. This feature is still limited to United States residents only.

³³ *Ibid.*, 14. The study found a second complaint of this feature, noting that it “has raised questions of privacy, as Amazon is able to track library patrons' borrowing habits in a way that many librarians are uncomfortable with” (14–15).

and *Animal Farm*, that Kindle readers had legitimately purchased, explaining that the creator of the e-book did not have the rights to these works.³⁴ These three restrictions on access to the content of a Kindle – that only certain books are available for download, that borrowing from libraries is not straightforward, and that content is digitally locked – are either brushed aside or ignored completely in the advertising; the marketers of the Kindle seem to dismiss them as the concerns of a small group of readers only. As Tim Carmody notes, "When the Kindle was introduced, there were [some critics] who argued that Amazon was only trying to preserve one kind of reading – direct individual purchase of popular new books – and grind every other model to dust."³⁵ While suggesting that Amazon is attempting to "grind every other model [of reading] to dust" may be extreme, since they are the largest retailer of printed books in the United States, the claim that Amazon is attempting to create a very specific type of reading experience is apt. Amazon, it appears, is marketing the Kindle in an attempt to gather heterogeneous readers into one large homogeneous group – a group of readers who are middle-class and who can thus can afford to purchase the Kindle in the first place as well as purchase books instead of borrowing them from the library,³⁶ and who generally only read books that make established best-seller lists.

This group of readers probably represents a large, if not the largest, section of the reading public. Amazon is a company that is in the business of selling e-books, and marketing its device towards the largest group of readers makes sense. I am not arguing that Amazon

³⁴ Amazon has promised not to do this again. Bezos apologized for the removal of these books, calling the decision "stupid, thoughtless and painfully out of line with our principles." (See Vindu Goel, "Amazon Chief Says Erasing Orwell Books Was 'Stupid,'" *New York Times*, 23 July 2009.) This, however, does not negate the fact that Amazon still has this power.

³⁵ Tim Carmody, "Amazon's Kindle Gets a Library Card," *Wired*, 21 September 2011, <http://www.wired.com/business/2011/09/how-to-check-out-library-books-for-kindle>

³⁶ Recent statistics show that 73 percent of readers who read an e-book in the past year had a household income of \$50,000 or more; 38 percent had a household income of \$75,000 or more (40). This same study states, "Those who read e-books were more likely than other readers to have bought the book – and they are more likely to say they prefer buying books than getting them other ways. Some 64 percent of e-book reading device owners had purchased the book" (47). Lee Rainie et al., "The Rise of E-reading," *Pew Internet: Pew Internet & American Life Project*, 5 April 2012, <http://libraries.pewinternet.org/files/legacy-pdf/The%20rise%20of%20e-reading%204.5.12.pdf>.

should be marketing the Kindle differently; what I am arguing is that when Amazon is close to having a monopoly on the e-book market, the way in which the Kindle is marketed becomes important for another reason: because of its saturation of the e-book market, the rhetoric and mindset found in the marketing of the Kindle has the potential to frame social perceptions of the ideal e-book reading device, as well as what is an acceptable use of that device. Amazon is employing the language of remediation to define their device, combining homage to the printed book (assuring readers of the familiarity of the Kindle's content) with rivalry with it (vaunting the Kindle's technological superiority). E-book reading has thus been framed as a specific mode of reading, but this framing is so pervasive that it threatens to become a naturalized concept. Will a proprietary marketing campaign take over as the commonly accepted ideal of reading? As textual scholars, we need to be aware, and critical, of this influence.

SOMMAIRE

Cet article traite de la publicité d'Amazon concernant le Kindle, sa liseuse de livres électroniques. On allègue que cette publicité suit le discours de la remédiation tel que développé par Bolter et Grusin. La théorie de la remédiation consiste à démontrer comment un nouveau médium est tributaire de ce qui constituait la base du médium antérieur en dépit du fait qu'il est également dans une sorte de compétition avec celui-ci. La remédiation est adoptée par Amazon en vue d'assurer les lecteurs que l'expérience de lecture qu'ils retireront avec le Kindle sera la même qu'avec un livre imprimé (tribut) tout en vantant cependant la technologie avancée de la liseuse (compétition). En examinant le fonctionnement de la stratégie de mise en marché et en prenant en compte les aspects que le Kindle ignore ou minimise dans sa publicité, cet article démontre noir sur blanc que le Kindle cible un type bien défini de lecteur de livres électroniques. Mais le plus important, c'est que cette publicité tend potentiellement à façonner l'opinion du lecteur sur le livre électronique en général.