

Territory(ies) Internet

Deleuzian perspective on ownership and identity on the web

Agnieszka Wenninger

“... the passengers row together, they are not supposed to like one another, they fight with one another, they eat one another. To row together is to share, to share something beyond law, contract, or institution. It is a period of drifting, of ‘deterritorialization’.”
– Gilles Deleuze, *Nomad Thought*

“He’d operated on an almost permanent adrenalin high, a byproduct of youth and proficiency, jacked into a custom cyberspace deck that protected his disembodied consciousness into the consensual hallucination that was the matrix.”
– William Gibson, *Neuromancer*

I. Intro

Since 1990s Internet has penetrated almost all life spheres, starting from everyday information inquiry, online shopping or other forms of numerous electronic business applications with a multibillion-dollar economy behind, online TV and radio broadcasting, advertising, e-government, up to introduction of e-learning in education systems or new forms of conducting science online. Rapid advancement and omnipresence of modern Internet technologies – one of the epitomes of the era of globalisation stressing simultaneity and interconnectivity – have not only changed the communication modes, but also led to access restrictions, new legal regulations and destabilised the traditional notions of ownership and identity. Emergence of such phenomena like ‘Second life’, blogging, chats, YouTube, podcasting, wikis, peer-to-peer file sharing etc. only fortify the difficulties in grasping users’ identities as well as ownership claims. Together with Internet penetration, the euphoria of the initial period of “everything is deeply intertwined” (Ted Nelson), and the utopic visions¹ of the Internet as a space for free knowledge sharing and collaborative knowledge production, more equality and liberty in a global social space, gave way to gradual saturation of the web with commerce and brought about another – this time digital – divide, which in a way reproduces the ‘old’ North-South divide. Present trends towards stifling control over the Internet and its content, particularly in the field of copyright, might in turn exert negative effects on creative potential of cyberspace in the future.

¹ Compare: John Perry Barlow's *A Declaration of the Independence of Cyberspace*

The work of the French philosopher, Gilles Deleuze (1925-1995) – especially such keywords as “nomads of the Internet” floating in the cyberspace or the notion of rhizome – has already been applied for drawing attention to the similarity of hypertext to a rhizomatic structure². Following Deleuze this contribution, however, seeks to reflect on the questions of ownership and identity, which are being constantly under siege. In order to grasp the nature of the Internet the paper will focus on the notions connected with territoriality rather than on an attempt to refer to a structural analogy, i.e., juxtaposing the hierarchical/tree versus network/rhizomatic or investigating the applicability of five rhizome principles developed by Deleuze and Guattari in their book under the same title. Along with Deleuze, one can state that Internet is neither *terra infinita* to be explored, nor an electronic library, but should rather be conceived of as a battlefield of (on) territories/domains as well as deterritorialization and reterritorialization movements.

II. In situ – cyber-territory(ies)

One of the central notions of Deleuze’s oeuvre is the notion of territory, territoriality or plateau. The introduction of the spatial aspect makes us think of topography and brings to mind another reference made by Deleuze, namely the one to the map. Deleuzian maps can be entered at any point and are not cartographed beforehand, but are rather designed while drawing. In this sense, territories can be marked or claimed ours, while we are in movement of traversing the space. The traversing movement takes place without predetermined ways of proceeding. However, the moment territoriality has been entered, a differentiation process is at work, generating relations. The differences, structures, hierarchies or functions mark the space during the process of producing territories via their distribution, just like a mobile inscription of immanent character. If one evokes for example Saussure, for whom language is a system of differences both at the level of signs as well as at the level of corresponding ideas or concepts, the distinction between Deleuze – vividly criticizing structural linguistics – and Saussure’s model in respect to the issue of differentiation might be situated at the level of relationality – the latter being prior in a logical and not genetic sense – to the process of difference attribution. While pointing to an asymptotic and productive character of the linguistic process and putting

² See: Robin B. Hamman (1996). However, for example the paper by Stefan Wray (1998), relating Deleuze and Guattari to the issues concerned with cyberspace and information science, attempts to situate *Thousand Plateaus* in context of communication theories and presents some interesting ideas on the resistance potential of the Internet.

emphasis on the statement generation (immanence versus signifier-signified binarism, move towards pragmatics, “linguistics of flows”), the post-structuralist thinking of Deleuze goes beyond or along the traverse line in relation to the key trait of the structuralist model of the sign system, i.e., the reciprocal difference and referentiality (see Massumi, 1992: 177).

Not only can the territories be entered at any point, but they can be related or connected to one another solely in a “user-defined manner”, as well. This aspect stresses the lack of external plan prior to the process of *becoming*, making or producing the territories. Another characteristic of territories is that they constitute dynamic spaces marked by de- and reterritorialization movements. The movement of deterritorialization is oriented towards production of change³ and entropy. However, it is important to mention that the emphasis here lies not on the arriving at a certain state or stage, but on *becoming*. In other words, deterritorialization “can never be grasped in itself, one can only grasp its indices in relation to the territorial representations.” (Deleuze/Guattari, 1983: 316)

The Internet, a worldwide network connecting computer networks that are also interconnected, provides an infrastructure for the information exchange based on the Internet protocols. This infrastructure makes the earth and information exchange facilitated by this infrastructure constitutes the Internet territoriality, which in turn is formed by the rapid information flows and information transfers. As such, it is a paragon example of a globalising and decentralizing space. Flows of information, freely circulating through electric circuits on the Internet, are deregulated, open and in a way lacking overall external control. The technological development gave way and continuously provides new possibilities for solely internally regulated⁴ content production. Everybody in possession of a personal computer and Internet connection can be part of and contribute to the proliferation of globally accessible content. Liberating information from temporalization and making it independent of space opens up the flow of deterritorialization and has, among other things, also challenged legal systems and nation-states boundaries, i.e., their territorial being untouched. This freeing indicates that information means just so much at a given time. It is nomadic knowledge and its worth is determined by the use, by what a user (a

³ See entry on “Deterritorialization / Reterritorialization” by Adrian Parr, in: Parr, A. (ed.) 2005: 67.

⁴ With Deleuze one can speak of *intensive* regulation versus *extensive* one. This means a rule of regulation and the formatting in reference to and difference of other elements of the territoriality/map *alone* versus a place ruled by an objective and external rule independent of the structured elements.

temporal, regional community of users) can make of it, and *not* by any set of objectives

This dynamics of Internet territoriality (deregulated/intensively regulated flows of information) as well as the omnipresent interconnectivity (any content can be connected to another one creating new informational assemblages and increasing the entropy) both generate changes along the “lines of flight” or lines of deterritorialization. These lines of ruptures may produce metamorphoses or creative, as well as pathological, mutations of the territories. Moreover, the dynamics triggering deterritorialization can also result from engagement or interaction with other assemblages or plateaus such as for instance media discourse or politics. Cyberspace enables anybody to function as a publisher of news. This is additionally facilitated by the fact that news do not underlie copyright regulations (i.e. news are not a territory, or at least not a well guarded one). Internet is also a space for expression of personal opinions to be shared with other users, which is reflected e.g. by the proliferation of the Internet blogging. The case of Russ Kick’s blog with photos from Iraq withheld by the military (see Schwabach, 2006: 225) has challenged the potential of traditional media. Not only do blogs present diary-style stories, but opinions and commentaries on political issues, as well. This, on the other hand, leads to the deterritorialization movement: the territory gets mobile, starting to function as a part of “political space”. It can be observed in recent implementation of blogging e.g. for election campaigns. Another crucial dynamic element producing changes in the territoriality is the tension between the Internet as an open space and Internet as a playground for corporate interests. For instance, the advertising of the commerce itself is fundamental to the free sharing of uprooted, deterritorialized knowledge and informal data flows, as it finances them to a great extent. Advertising means just as much spamming these flows as reterritorializing them by monetary backings.

What is situated as the Internet territoriality is correlative or interconnected, meaning that it always implies one of the two, or both, simultaneously occurring tendencies – either de- or reterritorialization. Alongside with interpretation or exploration of the code, the deterritorializing movement exerts radical power in the strong meaning of decoding, as Deleuze mentions in one of his lectures on *Anti Oedipe et Milles Plateaux*: “to decode in absolute sense, destroy the codes in order to make the flows flow freely.” (webdeleuze, lecture 14/12/1971: 2) Again, free flow does not mean it would be un-coded, and therefore without any reference or any semantics at all, as Internet is rather the opposite – a semantic overflow. It is a

multiplicity of possibilities as well as conditions for coding. Many references to literary texts made by Deleuze in his work might in this context justify pointing for example to Beckett's *Happy Days* in order to visualise the movement of decoding. One may think of the decoded flows of "another happy day" phrases repeatedly uttered by Winnie, a sedentary nomad traversing the plateau, a messenger of deterritorialized streams. Repetition is just as much a deterritorializing force of traversal total connectivity. It produces the same entropy: semantics begins to disappear as far as its traditional objective encodings in textbooks and dictionaries are concerned. Internet is speaking, not any longer about how steadfast the true/false-distinction holds in reference to the signified, as the ontology of the signified is obliterated in the chain of signification. The signified does not exist outside the hermeneutical process – the Internet is both self-supportive and autopoietic. Deterritorialization becomes apparent also in open access efforts and open-source movement. The 'closed territories' of the commerce are being deterritorialized or challenged by initiatives that decide to open the territories through the disclosing of the source code for further collaborative improvement of the software. However, within cyber-territories there are also more radical examples of deterritorialization such as activities carried out by Internet hackers cracking the codes, creating worms or, to put it in other terms, breaking down certain norms of conduct (an activity which especially at the beginning of the Internet era fulfilled an important function of disclosing security flaws: this, on the other hand, means reterritorialization tendencies – a nomad being employed to close the gaps in the fence).

In the same time, the movement of deterritorialization, with the lines of flight immanent to the plateau, evokes reterritorialization of the territories. Deregulated, decoded flows of information trigger the recodification tendencies such as instalment of passwords, codewords, and different forms of regulations. One could also refer to other types or instruments of codification such as law, contracts and institutions (Deleuze, 1977: 142) governing the ways of recodification of the deregulated flows of information. Through the reterritorialization movements new, reterritorialized territories emerge. These "neoterritories" are again driven by their own deterritorializing tendencies and movements. Yet, it is important to stress the fact that the de- and reterritorializing tendencies are not to be conceived as a chronological sequence, wherein the deterritorialization precedes the reterritorialization, although it might occur, but rather as interconnected, interwoven movements or processes. To put it differently, deterritorialization equals increase in entropy, and reterritorialization

equals increase in an-entropy. The more homogeneous the *striatification* of a territory is, the higher the deterritorialization pressure, since the pace of technical development is *eo ipso* ahead of the regulative settings. This can easily be demonstrated by the leaps in the development of information storage and coping machines: their diversity multiplies, and they become small, cheap tools. They connect (plug and play) easily to any hardware, they can be used in an informal, impromptu and self-regulating way – they are nomadic tools. Reterritorialization is also not to be conceived of as a process of coming back to the original territoriality. It can rather be envisaged as an active instalment of a palimpsest like inscription on the former territory in the sense of a metamorphosis of the deterritorialized space through an introduction of new arrangements of its parts or establishment of new relations between them or with other territories.

The reterritorialization tendencies on the Internet are reflected by the attempts to control the web through various kinds of emerging regulations. For instance, the issue of a peer-to-peer file sharing, particularly in the realm of music files exchange, has challenged the content industry immensely and will definitely further contribute to the evolution of the Internet legislation in the next years. Reterritorialization is particularly noticeable in the area of intellectual property protection laws and licensing procedures as well as in stifling the individual expression opportunities. As some researchers have already suggested⁵, this trend might possibly be leading to diminishing creativity in the cyberspace. Reterritorialization movements can also be found in the hacker community, which reterritorializes itself while the divisions within it become visible as a result of anti-hacker activities such as raids (e.g. famous “Sundevil” from the year 1990) and criminal prosecution. The image saving efforts of the hackers introduce the term “white-hat hackers”, who distance themselves from lawbreaking actions of “crackers”.

III. Cyber-inhabitants – identities as multiplicities

Likewise other post-structural thinkers, Deleuze turns against traditional conception of identity⁶ or interiority as best expressed in the notion of the thinking subject (or

⁵ The very titles of some publications concerned with issues of intellectual property rights on the Internet already voice this apprehension, e.g. Laurence Lessing's, one of the initiators of the Creative Commons initiative *Free Culture: How Big Media Uses Technology and the Law to Lock Down* (2004) or Siva Vaidhyanathan's *Copyrights and Copywrongs: The Rise of Intellectual Property and How It Threatens Creativity* (2001).

⁶ As Deleuze writes: „The primacy of identity, however conceived, defines the world of representation. But modern thought is born of the failure of representation, of the loss of identities, and of the

Cartesian *ego cogito*). The primacy of interiority or identity of the subject (speaker, user) results in the world falling apart into system of binary oppositions such as 'I' and the external world, signified and signifier, content and expression etc. The reference to the some kind of 'natural' interior or identity constructed on the basis of the notion of sameness with itself ($a = a$) given in the reflexive introspection and reasoned through the prism of the 'Innerlichkeit' gives way to the post-structural view of the "subject – produced as a residuum alongside the machine, as an appendix, or as a spare part adjacent to the machine – [which] passes through all the degrees of the center, and passes from one circle to another. This subject itself is not at the center, which is occupied by the machine, but on the periphery, with no fix identity, forever decentered, *defined* by the states through which it passes." (Deleuze/Guattari, 1983: 20) This radicalisation movement in turn leads to the grasping of subject's identity as multiplicities produced by disparities or differences and not as the original sameness which is retrogradely restored on the basis of difference understood negatively and reflected in the world as representation of the interior. Another important gesture here is the pointing to life conceived as a state of being connected and being other, as well as the emphasis on becoming, immanence of the production and autopoiesis.

Referring to Internet, one can think of presenting a sort of geology of the cyberspace. In the early stages, Internet was mainly a pure means of communication – if I write an e-mail, I only change the medium and decide to use an electronic way of information transfer instead of a conventional, print postage. Subsequently, together with technological progress and as the change of the hermeneutical situation occurs, the shift towards taking different roles for different modes of communication takes place thanks to continuous development of synchronous computation among multiple users. There is a plenitude of different types of news groups, chat rooms, social networking websites like 'MySpace' or interactive multi-player computer games such as for example 'Second Life'. These numerous spaces can be entered by users after they have logged on or registered via a code or password. Although the users have to identify themselves, the issue of identification is a 'game' intrinsic one, meaning that for the online interaction it is utterly irrelevant whether there is an ontological identity relation, meaning that the user is who he or

discovery of all the forces that act under the representation of the identical. The modern world is one of simulacra (...) All identities are only simulated, produced as and optical 'effect' by the more profound game of the difference and repetition" (1994: xvii)

she claims to be. Notwithstanding the fact that it is vital to apply various forms of certification procedures or ensuring the identities of users – particularly for certain types of security sensitive online activities such as online banking – it, however, does not influence the shift to plural identities. Already at this stage, the role play is inherent in the hermeneutical situation of the communication. This means assuming an identity which is not to be derived from ‘the real one’ – online gender changers could serve as a good example here. The subject, being more of a singularity than an individual, since the latter is always embedded in structures of roles and obligations, chooses what comes handy to him, i.e., a suitable *modus operandi* – which is as easily shed – for the reality of the Internet worlds. It *makes no sense* (literally) to ask who the person behind a nick/handle is. What is solely relevant is whether the user conducts him- or herself according to the given scenario.

Now, at a globalized stage of the interchangeability of possibilities to say ‘I’ and in face of the fact that there is no absolutely sure way of verifying any user’s identity⁷, this what it means to be oneself gives way to deconstructing the question of self itself. The following movement can be traced: from avatars – users going to ‘Second Life’, which is more or less a copy of the ‘first reality’ (especially in the sense of assertion of negativity, i.e., providing space for that type of activities that cannot be performed in the so-called ‘first reality’ such as for example flying, since this is what human beings cannot do) – to entities of speech where the hermeneutical process of exchanging information of any kind produces the speakers/users. What takes place here is a Gibsonesque intercourse of AIs (artificial intelligence) and humans – “the point where the copy ceases to be a copy in order to become the Real as its *artifice*.” (Deleuze/Guattari, 1983: 87)

We are not experiencing the post-modernity as a crisis of subjectivity, end of man or stable identities etc., as there have always already been multiplicities (‘we are many and I is one of them’). What is crucial to the Deleuzian approach is an attempt to conceive of identity *not* from the viewpoint of the “center” or self or similarity, but from the perspective of the difference and disparities – the users are “something only by being something else” (Deleuze/Guattari, 1983: 87). Therefore, if we deal with a crisis, it is solely a crisis of the *notion* of subjectivity and not of subjectivity itself, since users have been living this multiplicity all the way through. To

⁷ In this context various forms of law infringement can be invoked such as for example identity theft or Internet false identifications that stress the difficulties in absolute assuring the identity within the cyberspace. This will most probably still continue to be a concern in case of e.g. credit card transactions or alike.

put it differently, they simply *do* it. This is the way the users *are*, both in their online as well as offline encounters.

Reflective discourse which ignores this radical pragmatization is just being left behind by the ‘lines of flight’ of the users turning to *be-iers*. In this way a tool for communication from the beginning stages of the Internet evolves into a tooled communication, whereas the evolution is marked by the hardware of the interface: punched cards become keyboards become neural sockets⁸. It is important to point out the fact that it is not an attempt to reintroduce an artificial watershed between the so-called ‘real’ and ‘virtual’. For Deleuze there is no categorical difference between the two sides of the binary pair. It is also vital to stress here that the issue is not to even out the differences in a so-called ‘post-modern’ fashion, so often wrongfully attributed to post-structural thinkers, neither is it the question of a simple reversing the primacy of the interior in favour of the exterior or unity in favour of multitude. The movement which is being performed is a more radical one in the sense that “reality has ceased to be a principle.” (Deleuze/Guattari, 1983: 87)

IV. Cyber-territories – property

The development of Internet technologies opened up new possibilities for the production, reproduction and exchange of digital content. Therefore, it is above all the issue of intellectual property within the cyberspace which became particularly explosive. With Deleuze, the question of property posited in the context of the Internet is already a product of de- and reterritorialization tendencies. It is also naturally related to the question of identity as expressed in the notion of authorship, a romantic, creative genius haunting the 21st century. Users deterritorialize restricted intellectual property through for example file sharing and peer-to-peer exchange, coping and making content – which up to now has never been so easily pro- and reproducible and could not be so effortlessly made reusable or duplicated in the electronic medium of the Internet without huge additional costs and quality loss – accessible to other inhabitants of the cyberspace. In doing so, users challenge and subvert the one-to-one relation between the ownership/authorship and the produced intellectual property in the way which is mirrored by exclusive exploitation rights of the author. They also destabilize the property economy behind it, meaning in

⁸ A seminal live experimentation process is conducted by Australian performer, Stelarc (<http://www.stelarc.va.com.au/>), who explores the possibilities of having his physical reality/body invaded and controlled by machines.

particular the content and media industry, which is directly related to the exclusivity of the author's rights that are often being ceded to provider, publisher, label etc. The newest reactions of the music industry are already *in medias res* of the de- and reterritorialization of the territory 'ownership' itself. If the boundless copying of music facilitated by digital technologies smoothes (deterritorializes) the space of the ownership, it also opens up the reterritorialization of the copyright by the corporate actors. This means that 'the big four' of music industry 'striae' the space for example while introducing so-called digital rights management systems. Recent decision of EMI to give up copy protection for the music pieces bought in Apple's iTunes store for an additional fee of 30 cent is a reaction to the deterritorialization movement of the proliferation of illegal music file sharing activity that seems to be inescapable within the cyberspace. EMI reterritorializes the copy protection via saying to the users: now you can copy music files without on-line copyright infringement, you just have to pay slightly more for it.

During the last decade, some new models of intellectual property rights, in particular in the sphere of scientific knowledge and artistic production, but also in the area of software programming, have emerged. One can mention especially such open licensing forms as Creative Commons⁹, copyleft¹⁰ and public domain as well as their precursor – the GNU General Public License. Although they all, on the one hand, deterritorialize the traditional notion of the copyright, in the same time they also reterritorialize the 'ownership' in a transformed way while introducing new relations and bringing about the rearrangement of the elements. However, in the same way as traditional copyright, they also start from the assumption of the 'strong' position of the creator in order to make the property more flexible and accessible. Yet, these new solutions lay emphasis on the creator of the property attributing exclusive rights to her so that she (and not the middle man – the publisher, provider etc. to whom the rights have been ceded) can decide about the ways in which her work/property can be used as long as the authorship credit is given the way the creator wishes, in contrast to the standard copyright procedures, automatically reserving all rights to the author and requiring her permission. The underlying assumption behind the movement is that for many authors/creators the overriding tendency is a wish to make their work or property available for public use respectively for copying,

⁹ An initiative founded in 2001 operating under the principle "some rights reserved" (<http://creativecommons.org/>).

¹⁰ Term also used for open-source movement in context of software development.

especially (but not exclusively) for non-commercial usage, and the threat of plagiarism or theft is a just another risk to be taken. In a way, this can be perceived as a response to the omnipresent capitalistic machine of the commercialization of the creative work of an artist, a writer, a musician or a computer programmer. These new forms of ownership attribution and the ways in which intellectual property can be used, reproduced or distributed by other users reflect a reterritorialization movement of the Internet multiplicities¹¹ emphasizing the ownership claims of the 'I', the subject, the author. The deterritorialization grasped as an escape from the territory triggered by the 'lines of flight' or 'deterritorializing elements' (technological development within the cyberspace largely freeing the content from the reproduction constraints) leads to opening up the copyright to a certain degree. In the same time, it is a process entangled with the reterritorialization mentioned above, which is also present and at work, rearranging the territory for example through the introduction of "some rights reserved" formula.

The open licensing procedures are undeniably more transformative and more process oriented. On the one hand, they allow for more innovation through multi-user/creator cooperation, and on the other hand, they open up opportunities of access to knowledge, art, etc. by a wider group of users. Therefore, it has to be stressed that the new forms of licensing are definitively a step towards a more open system. With their explicit emphasis on collaborative processes, broader access and non-commercial usage of intellectual property, in contrast to restrictive traditional copyright systems, they reflect the need for more innovation and intellectual exchange. While pointing to the idea of the Internet as 'commons' or underlining the importance of the public domain, they also challenge the exclusive notion of intellectual property. What still remains to be seen is the further evolvement of exclusive as well as open forms of licensing. They will undergo new transformation in the future as they are subjected to further deterritorialization conceived as a process of change – the dominant tendency, both in view of Deleuze, as well as applied for the cyberspace. Yet, they make us aware that the question of access to knowledge and information in a knowledge-based society is a crucial for economy, science and culture advancement and needs cautious legislative measures, not necessarily based solely on protectionism, creating new barriers, limiting and trapping deterritorialization in the notion of a society of control.

¹¹ As for Deleuze „'A' (Un) is always the index of a multiplicity: an event, a singularity, a life..." (Deleuze, 1997: 5)

Summarizing, the de- and reterritorialization movements grasp the issue of (intellectual) property as it is posited in the medium of the Internet. This suggests that the Deleuzian perspective can serve as an adequate description of the situation or the object being described. As far as the Internet is concerned, the description of the object and the object itself are one and the same thing, that is to say, exactly the *description-of* can be referred to as a new *object identity*. This means that for example intellectual property rights – which so far have been differentiated from the objects under these rights – coincide or are in the state of *becoming*¹² in the Deleuzian understanding of this word. The classical sentence ‘this is mine’ and the reference object of this sentence start to coagulate. The continuous flux of the de- and reterritorialization originates from this peculiar and conflicting discernability of the description and the described. What you own and the description of the ownership in the medium of the Internet are not to be misunderstood as simply identical, but congruent, i.e., the declaration of the ownership is constituent for the declared object. To put it differently, a declaration of the ownership in the Internet is a further encoded extension of the owned – a software code is just another way of speaking.

V. Coda

This contribution intended to look at the relation between Internet and some philosophical issues of Deleuze (and respectively also Guattari). The main motivation behind was not to apply the concepts in a metaphorical or analogical meaning, but to make them function in a new context, to generate new conjunctions between them and to see where possible connections might be situated, to produce a Heideggerian *Ereignis*. In this spirit, the paper addressed some encounters between Internet, user identities, the issue of ownership or property and one of Deleuze’s key concepts, that is, the notion of territoriality and the de- and reterritorialization movements. In the same time being well conscious of a limited view presented, a final remark has to be made that a further in-depth contextualisation would certainly be productive especially in respect to Deleuze’s and Guattari’s *Thousand Plateaus*. This work was deliberately left out here because of both extensiveness and a compendium character of this text, the analysis of which would require a separate extensive study and would go beyond the scope of this short paper.

¹² In the *Deleuze Dictionary* Cliff Stagoll writes on Deleuze’s term ‘becoming’ the following: “Becoming in the pure movement evident in changes between particular events (...). Rather than a product, final or interim, becoming is the very dynamism of change, situated between heterogeneous terms and tending towards no particular goal or end-state”. (2005: 21)

References

- John Perry Barlow (1996), *A Declaration of the Independence of Cyberspace*, <http://homes.eff.org/~barlow/Declaration-Final.html>, (retrieved on February 19, 2007).
- Deleuze, Gilles (1977), "Nomad Thought", trans. David B. Allison, in: David B. Allison (ed.), *The New Nietzsche: Contemporary Styles of Interpretation*, New York: Dell Pub. Co., pp. 142-149.
- Deleuze, Gilles; Guattari, Félix (1983; first ed. 1977), *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, 12th ed., transl. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem and Helen R. Lane, preface by Michel Foucault, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles (2004; first ed. 1994), *Difference and Repetition*, trans. Paul Patton, London/New York: Continuum.
- Deleuze, Gilles (1997), "Immanence: A life...", in: *Theory, Culture & Society*, 14:2, pp. 3-7.
- Robin B. Hamman (1996), *Rhizome@Internet. using the Internet as an example of Deleuze and Guattari's "Rhizome"*, <http://www.socio.demon.co.uk/rhizome.html> (retrieved on March 8, 2007).
- Gibson, William (1995; first ed. 1984), *Neuromancer*, London: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Massumi, Brian (1992), *A User's Guide to Capitalism and Schizophrenia. Deviations from Deleuze and Guattari*, Cambridge, Ma.: The MIT Press.
- Parr, Adrian (ed.) (2005), *The Deleuze Dictionary*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Schwabach, Aaron (2006), *Internet and the Law: Technology, Society, and Compromises*, Santa Barbara, Calif. et al: ABC-CLIO.
- Webdeleuze. Les Cours de Gilles Deleuze, <http://www.webdeleuze.com/php/texte.php>, (retrieved on March 27, 2007).
- Stefan Wray (1998), *Rhizomes, Nomads, and Resistant Internet Use*, <http://www.thing.net/~rdm/ecd/RhizNom.html>, (retrieved on February 22, 2007).