

Deleuze's Control Society and the "Eye" of the Empire

RANIEL SM. REYES
UNIVERSITY OF SANTO TOMAS
ranielreyes83@yahoo.com

Abstract

In this paper, I will attempt to explore Gilles Deleuze's analysis of post-industrial society using his notion of the "control society." In the first part, I will expound upon Michel Foucault's principle of the disciplinary society, along with its transition into the control society, which is a more complicated structure of surveillance. In the second, I will explain the innovative yet precarious nature of "Empire," which is the primary expression of the control society. I will then discuss the Empire's various socio-political and economic effects upon contemporary life, which is shaped by the convergence of advance capitalism and cyber technology. Finally, I will explain and accentuate the necessity of fashioning potential spaces for revolutionary resistance against today's Empire, one that is faithful to the Deleuzian characterization of philosophy as the creation of new and untimely concepts.

Keywords: Deleuze, control society, Empire, capitalism, revolutionary resistance

Introduction

With the exponential rise of technology, the human condition has become mediated and transformed. On the one hand, this brand of revolution presents an ideal life within calculative grasp. On the other hand, it makes possible various repressions while dominating the whole of life in subtle ways. While contributing to the social fiber of mankind, the rise of technology simultaneously adds to pre-existing intricacies. Consequently, even the supposed "heroes" of the past and present, be they people, systems, or principles, can actually become tools of systematic oppression. Writ

large, the very space that affirmatively grounds our existentiality has turned into a seat of possible totalization. Our world has paradoxically developed a life unaware of its own disability.

The transition from the Foucaultian panoptical apparatus to the Deleuzian control society is not a simple socio-structural change since the question of structure has become problematic in the present, and the disciplinary frames of the previous society have been annihilated as well. We are not anymore dealing with closed spaces, docile individuals, and objectification, but with realities that are simulated; they are also detrimental in very subtle ways not only to the human condition, but to the whole of life itself.

Surveillance, Control, and Hegemony

From Disciplinary to Control Society

Michel Foucault employed the term “discipline and punish” to refer to the practices of surveillance and political policing that happened in the 18th century, when the human sciences were undergoing a radical transformation.¹ Discipline and training could generate new practices and, most especially, new kinds of subjects. In the words of Foucault:

The human body was entering a machinery of power that explores it, breaks it down, and rearranges it. ... it defined how one may have a hold over others' bodies, not only so that they may do what one wishes, but so that they may operate as one wishes, with the techniques, the speed and the efficiency that one determines.²

Disciplinary control augmented the production of new kinds of subjects or epistemological formations. Surveillance was often built into the institutions' physical architecture, which was organized to develop political visibility within them, as “[s]tones can make people docile and knowable.”³ The institution proliferated practices of examination, which created a regulative site of domination by spatially organizing subjects to be

¹ See Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* (New York: Vintage Books, 1975).

² *Ibid.*, 138.

³ *Ibid.*, 172.

presented as objects of observation in the corpus of knowledge. The subject was granted a thing-like existence open to description and analysis. In this manner, disciplinarity became coextensive with society or government; it produced discourses of knowledge. In addition, disciplinarity became subject to the exercise of power meant to enhance governmentality. Disciplinary technologies employed techniques to appropriate subjects into disciplined bodies.

The contemporary era however has seen a shift from the disciplinary society into what Gilles Deleuze calls the "control society."⁴ For this reason, using Foucault's disciplinary apparatus to understand the present has become passé, or at the very least, insufficient. This transition was neither a mere shift in institutional mechanisms nor means the end of all societal spaces. This new phenomenon features the re-definition of the concept of power: power is now processed through interconnected networks of control and is not anymore confined to sovereign spaces. It has instead become integrated into our everyday lives.

Control society⁵ emerged in the post-War years. Previously, the customary discursive practices of individuals happened in enormous, closed, and independent spaces, such as in the hospital and in the school. Foucault analyzed these using the prison model and the notion of the "panopticon." How this panoptical organization of power is done currently has become paradoxical. Under this new mechanism, various social walls have broken down. This ruptures political space. However, instead of promoting human thriving, the new mechanism opens the gate for more occasions of perpetual control. Therefore, the previously open spaces of disciplinary society have been replaced by more fluid open systems of networks. Deleuze writes:

⁴ Gilles Deleuze, *Negotiations*, trans. Martin Joughin (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), 178.

⁵ According to Deleuze, "[c]ontrol is the name proposed by Burroughs to characterize the new monster" (Ibid.). However, he did not fully explain the nature of Burrough's characterization of control thereby eliciting criticism (See Jia-Lu Cheng, "On Control Societies: A Deleuzian Postscript," paper presented at the conference *The Unthinkable—Thinking Beyond the Limits of Culture*, Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica, Taiwan, 13-14 December 2008, <http://www.ioe.sinica.edu.tw>. One of the critics is Mark Poster. In his article, "The Information Empire," *Comparative Literature Studies*, 41.3 (2004): 327-28, Poster argues that the notion of control formulated by Burroughs is incompatible with the development of computer technology, because Deleuze's use of the metaphor of the virus is problematic, and that his philosophy is deficient in elaborating the *control* aspect of control society.)

The various placements or sites of confinement through which individuals pass are independent variables: we're supposed to start all over again each time, and although all these sites have a common language, it's *analogical*. The various forms of control, on the other hand, are inseparable variations, forming a system of varying geometry whose language is *digital*. ... Confinements are *molds*, different moldings, while controls are a *modulation*, like a self-transmuting molding continually changing from one moment to the next, or like a sieve whose mesh varies from one point to another.⁶

Michael Hardt analyzed the control society in his essay "The Withering of Civil Society."⁷ He says that:

[i]t is more adequate ... to understand the collapse of the walls defined by the enclosures not as some sort of social evacuation but rather as generalization of the logics that previously functioned within these limited domains across the entire society, spreading like a virus.⁸

What has happened is a totalization of the logic of capitalist administration and production. From its actualization in the factory, this logic is now located in every form of social production.⁹ In the language of Critical Theory, reification and possible liberation are no longer exclusive to the proletariat in the factory. It has become more culture-based, because capitalist exploitation now operates in every social stratum.¹⁰ In other words, all disciplinary architectures have become universalized, in other words, applicable to the whole of society. Oppression thus has become multi-faceted. In fact, the prison now begins even before you leave your house.

⁶ Deleuze, *Negotiations*, 178-79.

⁷ See Michael Hardt, "The Withering of Civil Society," in *Deleuze and Guattari: New Mappings in Politics, Philosophy, and Culture*, eds. Eleanor Kaufman and Kevin Jon Heller (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998), 27-44.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 31

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ See Max Horkheimer, *Critical Theory: Selected Essays*, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell, et al. (New York: Continuum, 1989).

Control society, normally expressed in the form of surveillance and censorship, has integrated itself into the social corpus. A great number of governments and states currently require national identification or registration, as well as licensing from their citizens via the Internet. Manifestations of control society are currently developing—at an accelerating and increasingly intensive fashion—in proximity, magnitude, and scope, both in authoritarian and in democratic political frameworks. In fact, the line that separates authoritarian from democratic societies has now become vague.

The Philippine government is in the process of promulgating the National I.D. System to organize and control its citizens. This requirement is only one among the many facets of the control society that a Filipino must conform with. However, even this mode of disciplinarity pales in comparison to that of South Korea and of China. In the case of Korea, the institutional I.D. system serves as a macro-surveillance machinery for the identification of each citizen: one is required to obtain and carry in his/her person this I.D. card, and must be able to present it if asked by the police.¹¹ The I.D. is also required for a wide variety of transactions. Of course, the Korean government has tried to justify this seemingly harsh program for the purpose of nationwide protection and organization. China, on the other hand, implements a very stringent panoptical eye upon its populace and its geographical neighbors. China has established a government office that hires a large number of cyber police to control the domestic use of the World Wide Web. "Human search engines" look for the opponents of the regime and arrest them from their homes, so that they can be held liable for what they have expressed in cyberspace.¹² China has, since 1991, funded, developed, acquired, and fielded advanced cyber technology—more and more intensively—in the government, military and civil sectors.¹³ This is indispensable for politico-economic expansion, and for the cultivation of cyber warfare capacity as an asymmetric means to battle other belligerent countries, especially the superpowers. The Chinese now recognize that

¹¹ See Kwang-Suk Lee, "Surveillant Institutional Eyes in South Korea: From Discipline to a Digital Grid of Control," *The Information Society* 23.2 (2007): 119–124.

¹² See Evgeny Morozov, *The Net Delusion: The Dark Side of Internet Freedom* (New York: Public Affairs, 2011), 112.

¹³ Jayson M. Spade, *Information as Power: China's Cyber Power and America's National Security*, ed. Jeffrey L. Caton (Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College, 2012), 4.

cyberspace is a new arena for warfare and that cyber power now ranks with land, sea, and air power in ensuring victory.¹⁴

Deleuze also argues that the control society “no longer operate[s] by confining people but through continuous control and instant communication.”¹⁵ Institutions like the hospital and the workplace are not independent mechanisms anymore, since they already yield to a surreptitious owner—the corporation. Deleuze points out that:

Even the state education system has been looking at the principle of “getting paid for results”: in fact, just as businesses are replacing factories, *school* is being replaced by *continuing education* and exams by continuous assessment. It’s the surest way of turning education into a business.¹⁶

Although the university was previously a source for possible social critique and emancipation, it is now regrettably undergoing various anatomical modifications. Universities are now structured for commodification, and are owned by corporations. Consequently, the university’s intellectual landscape has become patterned after the workplace. In the current state of things, tuition fees are paid on-line, lecture discussions are done via webcast, and academics are subjected to performance-based salary, as well as required to undergo various training seminars. Interpersonal associations and individual dignity are thus reduced to thing-like relations and maneuvered as items of control. Education has currently become a sustainable opportunity for capitalist investment and profit. This is one of the most effective ways to advance the alienating goal of capitalism: here socio-political exploitation assumes an ostensibly human face.

Empire and the Capitalist Machinery

Whereas the disciplinary society shaped the individual’s behavior, the control society modulates interpersonal associations. Control society converts subjected individuals into *dividuals*—into forms of data

¹⁴ Robert Miller and Daniel Kuehl, “Cyberspace and the ‘First Battle’ in 21st Century War,” in *Defense Horizons* 68.1 (September 2009): 2.

¹⁵ Deleuze, *Negotiations*, 174.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 179.

and statistics—and operates by assimilating differences. In the field of marketing, every form of individuated diversity is equated with stimulating opportunity.¹⁷ Simulated exchange rates and corporate stocks serve as the functioning media of the control society's networks of production and relation. In a world under capitalist duress, the forces of anti-production deem the market as the substratum of operation, because "[t]he alliances and filiations no longer pass through people but through money..."¹⁸ Hence, the prevailing relations of anti-production alienate the personal in privileging the economic or the capital.

Global capital, in the contemporary epoch, is administered by what Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri call the *Empire*:

Capital...operates on the plane of *immanence*, through relays and networks of relationships of domination, without reliance on a transcendent center of power. It tends historically to destroy traditional social boundaries, expanding across territories and enveloping always new populations within its processes. Capital functions, according to the terminology of Deleuze and Guattari, through a generalized decoding of fluxes, a massive deterritorialization, and then through conjunctions of these deterritorialized and decoded fluxes.¹⁹

The sovereign and disciplinary spaces of previous times that utilized unilateral forms of control were already ill-fated. The Empire's productive apparatus consists of unified networks that totalize all identities or singularities. Shaped by Karl Marx's *Capital* and Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari's *A Thousand Plateaus*, Hardt and Negri's notion of the Empire is a capitalist war-machine that is geared for universal integration. Within this carceral system, the people (or "multitude," in Hardt and Negri's terms), are separated and turned against each other through simulated cultural differences. This strategy disheartens anyone plotting a large-scale

¹⁷ Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000), 152.

¹⁸ Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1972), 264.

¹⁹ Hardt and Negri, 326

confrontation with the despotic system. One example is the contemporary shopping mall, which is a miniature, yet powerful model of the capitalist regime—it furnishes false needs in order to numb the workers' or consumers' critical consciousness so as to avert resistance. The Empire's oppressive governance is clearly systemic and systematic. After estranging the multitude's consciousness in a spectacular fashion, it continuously modifies itself aesthetically. is the Empire does this by deceiving its prey by providing possible routes for redemption. This is tantamount to a vicious cycle of dominion.

Deleuze and Guattari illustrate this estranging quicksand in their book *Anti-Oedipus* under the heading of "Poor Technicians of Psychoanalysis." In this section, they compare the model of the spin-doctors of desires to public strategists in the professional and corporate fields. These pseudo-leaders strategically generate the illusion of their product's supposedly tremendous importance to our daily life. This line of reasoning is clearly not exempted from social assimilation. Political concepts when expressed in propagandist language, i.e., through media advertisements, become manipulative tools in corrupting revolutionary awareness. In practical terms, when groups of people cry for democracy, the said political ideal actually objectifies the populace's will.²⁰ These public strategists (the ones that Deleuze and Guattari call "popular psychoanalysis practitioners") take human desire for granted when they interpret it as a "lack" within individuals that must be treated clinically. In vindicating desire as an affirmative force, they claim that, "[d]esire does not depend on lack, it's not a lack of something, and it doesn't refer to any Law. Desire produces."²¹ When international economic organizations, and understood as capillary

²⁰ See Theodor Adorno, *Negative Dialectics*, trans. E. B. Ashton (London: Routledge, 1973), 148.

²¹ Gilles Deleuze, *Desert Islands and Other Texts, 1953-1974* (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2004), 233. Other existing intellectualizations which treat desire as a positive force have been overlooked. Nietzsche's principle of the *Will to Power* and Spinoza's concept of the *Conatus* have likewise been victimized by these strategic and systematic marginalizations, for their respective philosophies see desire as productive. Of course, this has been the long-standing practice in the history of western philosophy. For the longest time, the mind or soul had been privileged over the body. There have been radical philosophers, in the guise of thinkers like Baruch Spinoza, David Hume, and Friedrich Nietzsche—whom Deleuze credits as his philosophical forefathers—who went against the grain to show the shortcomings of traditional thought. They opened up possibilities for the body and took philosophy to the level of the immanent.

parts of the Empire, persuade poor countries to become members, they do so ostensibly to promote symmetrical relations and financial freedom. However, the multitude should not forget that the monetary and foreign policies drafted in their political constitutions are actually authored by the Empire to serve as furtive strategies to guarantee economic dependence, that is, through subjugation in the guise of international cooperation.

Another key character of the control society alluded to earlier is the dismantling of the center of power. In the Empire, the ubiquitous capitalist system is indisputably accountable for all of these systemic networks of modulation. However, it is increasingly becoming more difficult to identify the the center of power as well as the definite coordinates of its carceral machinery, since all relations and ideals have now become blurred alongside capitalism's ever-elastic capacity to deterritorialize. The United States is the epitome of Empire. A significant amount of this global machinery's power comes from its imperialistic relations with other countries that are dependent upon this Empire. The panoptical surveillance found in different states imposes itself upon the control society from the smallest scale to the largest. For this reason, the traditional modes of resistance would be seen as terrorist attacks (since the Empire controls global media), or would simply fail.

The Empire is now totalizing Third World countries into simulated categories so as to prevent them from launching socio-political assaults. At the same time, the Empire makes these countries economically dependent upon the First World. It is only when the multitude is convinced that they are deficient in something, for example, economic stability, national security, or military technology or even the latest military technology, that they can be persuaded to produce and consume what the capitalist system requires. According to Eugene Holland,

“[t]he debt owed to the capital remains, like that of despotism, infinite, but the system of anti-production under capitalism has become immanent to the system of production, and has its motive force only further production of surplus-value for its own sake.”²²

²² Eugene Holland, *Deleuze and Guattari's Anti-Oedipus: Introduction to Schizoanalysis* (New York: Routledge, 1999), 79.

In this manner, consumption, as the realization of surplus value, must not be viewed as an end in itself, but only as the means to secure liquid and sustainable capital for reinvestment in the incoming cycle of social production. The American dollar fuels the complex operations of the capitalist system in the level of economics, politics, and culture. Through the dollar, the Empire is able to repress other countries; the dollar sign becomes a symbol of hope for the multitudes and yet the Empire remains impenetrable. Given that the Philippines is one of the American Empire's naïve dependents, the happiness of the Filipino people has become defined by the possession of dollars.

Within the Empire, it is the flow money that influences the policies of both corporations and nations.²³ The Empire marginalizes Third World countries, which leads into this situation: "A man is no longer a man confined but a man in debt."²⁴

Deleuze and Guattari's "schizoanalysis" posits a radical analysis capable of responding to the failure of institutionalized psychoanalysis in infusing itself with reality's material conditions. As a form of philosophizing, schizoanalysis assumes that the libido does not have to be sublimated in order to recognize politico-economic factors:

The truth is that sexuality is everywhere: the way a bureaucrat causes money to circulate; the way the bourgeoisie fucks the fondles his records, a judge administers justice, a businessman the proletariat; and so on... Flags, nations, armies, banks get a lot of people aroused.²⁵

Along this line of explanation, they argue that schizophrenia as a mental condition co-exists with the capitalist system itself. The latter romanticizes psychological maladies and categorizes people as neurotic in order to regulate normativity and intensify structurality. Schizoanalysis, however, views desire as neither good nor bad in itself. Deleuze and Guattari have thus revolutionized psychoanalysis by emphasizing the affirmative aspect

²³ See Iain Munro, "Empire: the Coming of Control Society," *Ephemera: Critical Dialogues on Organization* 2 (2008): 175-185, <http://www.ephemerajournal.org/sites/default/files/2-2munro.pdf>.

²⁴ Deleuze, *Negotiations*, 181.

²⁵ Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 293.

of desire.²⁶ For them, becoming a desiring machine is not categorically bad. Desire enables man to seek greater causes in life and gives him the audacity to struggle with the chaos of existence in order to realize higher values. What capitalism does within the Empire is to decode and recode desire.

The advent of the Internet has seen the development of surveillance techniques. The Internet began as a separate and free space, but has since been reconstructed to become the continuously shifting site for the control society. As Jayson M. Spade says:

Cyber power is the ability of a nation-state to establish control and exert influence within and through cyberspace, in support of and in conjunction with the other domain-elements of national power.²⁷

This is only possible when the state has sufficient resources for this kind of political expansion, as in the case of the United States and China. In addition to its traditional armaments, the state now organizes computer networks and telecommunication systems, develops computer software, and trains "virtual" intellectuals.

Being innovative, this realm can be reformulated into new forms of control that are more subtle and nuanced. The landscape of control society has now extended into the digital realm, and is continuously manifested via communication channels. Hence, cyberspace proliferates different modes of capitalist-imperialist dominion, since communication is now "the form of capitalist production in which capital has succeeded in submitting society entirely and globally to its regime, suppressing all alternative paths."²⁸

The ascendance of cyber culture and media verifies Deleuze's formulations of the control society. The information traffic in the World Wide Web is fueled by the logic of capitalism. The information highway actually becomes a tool for disinformation and estrangement.²⁹ There is an illusion of freedom in this realm. Here, users can access almost anything and traverse virtually any periphery seemingly in absolute freedom, i.e.,

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 29.

²⁷ Spade, 7.

²⁸ Hardt and Negri, 347.

²⁹ See Jean Baudrillard, *Selected Writings*, ed. Mark Poster (St. Louis: Telos, 1973).

without experiencing confinement “while still being perfectly controlled.”³⁰ For instance, when users turn their computers on, they will inevitably access the Internet as well. While working on their computer, they remain connected to social networking sites. Because they remain connected to the Internet, they continue to be subjected to surveillance. New panoptic devices like electronic bugs, global positioning systems (GPS), wireless tracking techniques, and data mining software have provided more avenues for power to operate without being detected. These technologies persuade people to embrace digital trends, but what happens because of this is that hegemonic values dominate society. Another example is the way Internet Service Providers (ISPs) monitor and regulate online activity. China’s ISPs, for instance, impose three kinds of restrictions: surveillance, filtering, and shutdowns.³¹

Control society has even become appealing in some situations because of certain sociopolitical events such as terrorism. For this reason, more and more modes of disciplinarity are built within social space and cyberspace.³² The Empire, through its control of these infrastructures, gains global hegemony.

Presently, the multitude have become both participants and victims at the same time. Spatialization of knowledge is accompanied by information supervision and business procedures, among others, which harmonize with the individual’s systematization via computer technology.³³ Connection through communication is not just similar to a line between the transmitter and the receiver, but is also like a web that traps us within, since connection means plugging into a network.³⁴

The de-centering of power enables the capitalist reified soul to move flexibly in a discontinuous manner. In this vein, the systemic oppression of

³⁰ See Gilles Deleuze, “Having an Idea in Cinema,” in *Deleuze and Guattari: New Mappings*, 14-19.

³¹ See Sanja Kelly and Sarah Cook, eds., *Freedom on the Net 2011: A Global Assessment of Internet and Digital Media* (Washington, D.C.: Freedom House, 2011).

³² For some examples of censorship, see Ronald Deibert, *Access Contested: Towards the Fourth Phase of Cyberspace Controls* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2012), 92.

³³ Hardt and Negri’s book *Empire* can help to further understand the control society. Its formulation of a theory of power is a yardstick to analyze the advanced industrial society’s networks of production circulating in the control society.

³⁴ Cheng, 24.

capitalism becomes all-encompassing. However, if this is the case, then the same possibility can be potentially turned against itself. Hardt and Negri see that its own seeds of annihilation are inherent in the Empire. Are they saying that this omnipotent force is about to reach its destruction? The very possibility of the Empire is derived from catastrophic conditions—to borrow Adorno's words, it is supported by the "wrong state of things." It is true that oppression and degeneration can pose a challenge to the existence of the Empire, they remain as the Empire's integral components. In other words, the Empire's war machine operates through that which threatens it.

In spite of all these, Deleuze and Guattari are not completely pessimistic about capitalism. For them, it can also be positive in the sense that it can create possibilities through its manipulations of desire. In short, they remind us that capitalism can affirm creativity, but also can be exploitative. With this insight about the dual aspect of capitalism, they assert that schizoanalysis, as a form of radical philosophizing, may lead to a different kind of life, one that uses the body and the material conditions of the society as points of departure.

The Possibility of Philosophical Resistance

Given all that has been said so far, what then is the role of philosophy? The malleable networks of control society, which are characterized by the rupture of disciplinary enclosures, can be potentially employed for resistance. Since power is already destabilized by the deterritorializing tendency of capitalism, then the small spaces where domination subtly operates can also be transfigured into loci of resistance and change. In this vein, philosophy should examine itself ceaselessly, and must be continuously reminded regarding its jargon of inauthenticity or its propensity toward conceptual reification. Most importantly, philosophy must fashion new concepts that can penetrate into the abyss of the control society, and must relentlessly expose the internal contradiction within capitalism. These concepts should be able to adapt themselves to the unfolding of the times, specifically to the self-evolving capitalist adversary.

Cyber power can potentially be used to counter not only U.S. biopower, but the entire American Empire as well. China's proto-dictatorial cyber architecture is evidently oppressive, but this may also serve as China's resistance to the American Empire's supremacy, both in cyberspace and in

the political field.³⁵ Although the Chinese firewall is supported by western companies like Cisco and Microsoft, there are still potential spaces in the capillaries of this control society. One example is China's banning of American YouTube and other online services in favor of their local versions. China, with almost 300 million Internet users, has routinely blocked access to websites it considers politically unacceptable, e.g., the *Voice of America* and *The New York Times*. It also censored the coverage of some television broadcasting corporations like BBC and CNN of controversial issues such as China's foreign policy in Tibet and Taiwan.³⁶ Although *prima facie* negative, it offers a possible critique of America's ubiquitous presence in international affairs. Indeed, this activity crafts a revolutionary praxis that is well-suited to the complexities of the current global political situation.

The amorphous attribute of the control society discourages the use of traditional forms of political struggle and conceptual paradigms in dealing with contemporary social contingencies. It is clear that the old ways of political demonstrations have become outdated, thus contemporary "street parliamentarians" are increasingly using the Internet as well as other social media to make their mobilizations more efficient. If this is the case, then current critical theorizing must adopt itself to the temperament of the time. By using Deleuzian rhizomatic eyeglasses, the act of creating open source codes and freeware, providing access to online resources, promoting computer piracy, and propagating computer viruses appears as potentially revolutionary means to confront the control society. The multitude must accept the possibility that the very space where reification and dominion happen can likewise be the space for emancipation.

³⁵ The global village is witness to the conflicts in geopolitics and cyberspace between two of the world's superpowers—China and the U.S. When American aircraft accidentally bombed the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade in 1999, Chinese hackers defaced American government websites. American hackers afterwards responded in kind. This happened again in May 2001 when a U.S. Navy P-3 Orion collided with a People's Liberation Army Navy (PLAN) E-8 fighter. Hacker wars accompanied NATO's intervention in Kosovo, Israel's 2006 incursion into Lebanon, and the Russian conflict in Chechnya. See Charles Billo and Welton Chang, *Cyber Warfare: An Analysis of the Means and Motivations of Selected Nation States* (Hanover, NH: Dartmouth College Press, 2004).

³⁶ See "YouTube Blocked in China" in *CNNInternational.com/technology*, 26 March 2009, http://edition.cnn.com/2009/TECH/ptech/03/25/youtube.china/index.html?_s=PM.

The current role of Deleuzian micropolitics is to generate new desiring machines and to establish deeply parallel relations between them. Philosophy must become revolutionary by rendering a praxiological *ethos* beyond conventional societal principles, and vigilantly warning us about the inevitable possibility of fascism within the macro- and microsphere. This dynamic brand of praxis is a philosophy of life whose thrust is the formation of various social relations while recognizing their differences.

Works Cited

- Adorno, Theodor. *Negative Dialectics*. Translated by E. B. Ashton. London: Routledge, 1973.
- _____. *The Culture Industry*. London: Routledge, 1991.
- Baudrillard, Jean. *Selected Writings*. Edited by Mark Poster. St. Louis: Telos, 1973.
- Billo, Charles, and Welton Chang. *Cyber Warfare: An Analysis of the Means and Motivations of Selected Nation States*. Hanover, NH: Dartmouth College Press, 2004.
- Bogue, Ronald. *Deleuze and Guattari*. New York: Routledge, 1989.
- Boundas, Constantine, ed. *Deleuze and Philosophy*. London: Edinburgh University Press, 2006.
- Burroughs, William. "William S. Burroughs Interview, 1961." Interview by Gregory Corso and Allen Ginsberg. *Journal for the Protection of All Beings* 1, Love-Shot Issue (1961), <http://www.deepleafproductions.com/wilsonlibrary/texts/wsb-inter.html>.
- Cheng, Jia-Lu. "On Control Societies: A Deleuzian Postscript." Paper presented at the conference *The Unthinkable—Thinking Beyond the Limits of Culture*, Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica, Taiwan, 13-14 December 2008, <http://www.ioe.sinica.edu.tw>.
- Colebrook, Claire. *Gilles Deleuze*. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Deleuze, Gilles. *Desert Islands and Other Texts, 1953-1974*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2004.
- _____. "Having an Idea in Cinema." In *Deleuze and Guattari: New Mappings in Politics, Philosophy, and Culture*, eds. Eleanor Kaufman and Kevin Jon Heller, 14-19. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998.
- _____. *Negotiations*. Translated by Martin Joughin. New York:

- Columbia University Press, 1995.
- _____. *Nietzsche and Philosophy*. Translated by Hugh Tomlinson. New York: Columbia University Press, 1983.
- _____. *Spinoza: Practical Philosophy*. Translated by Robert Hurley. San Francisco: City Lights Books, 1988.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Felix Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated by Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983.
- _____. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated by Brian Massumi. London: The Athlone Press, 1988.
- _____. *What is Philosophy?*. Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.
- Diebert, Ronald. *Access Contested: Towards the Fourth Phase of Cyberspace Controls*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2012.
- Featherstone, Mike, and Roger Burrows. *Cyberspace/Cyberbodies/Cyberpunk: Cultures of Technological Embodiment*. London: Sage Publishing, 1995.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish*. New York: Vintage Books, 1975.
- Hardt, Michael. "The Withering of Civil Society." In *Deleuze and Guattari: New Mappings in Politics, Philosophy, and Culture*, eds. Eleanor Kaufman and Kevin Jon Heller, 27-44. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998.
- Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Holland, Eugene. *Deleuze and Guattari's Anti-Oedipus: Introduction to Schizoanalysis*. New York: Routledge, 1999.
- Horkheimer, Max. *Critical Theory: Selected Essays*. Translated by Matthew J. O'Connell, et al. New York: Continuum, 1989.
- Kelly, Sanja, and Sarah Cook, eds. *Freedom on the Net 2011: A Global Assessment of Internet and Digital Media*. Washington, DC: Freedom House, 2011.
- Kwang-Suk Lee. "Surveillant Institutional Eyes in South Korea: From Discipline to a Digital Grid of Control." *The Information Society* 23.2 (2007): 119-124.
- Miller, Robert, and Daniel Kuehl. "Cyberspace and the 'First Battle' in 21st Century War." *Defense Horizons* 68.1 (September 2009): 1-6.
- Morozov, Evgeny. *The Net Delusion: The Dark Side of Internet Freedom*. New York: Public Affairs, 2011.

- Munro, Iain. "Empire: The Coming of Control Society." *Ephemera: Critical Dialogues on Organization* 2 (2008): 175-185, www.ephemeraweb.org.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Human, All Too Human*. Translated by R.J. Hollingdale. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Patton, Paul, ed. *Deleuze: A Critical Reader*. Massachusetts: Blackwell, 1996.
- Poster, Mark. "The Information Empire." *Comparative Literature Studies* 41.3 (2004): 317-334.
- Spade, Jayson M. *Information as Power: China's Cyber Power and America's National Security*. Edited by Jeffrey L. Caton. Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College, 2012.