

Moving “Networks” into the Composition Classroom

Jessica Clements

English 626: Postmodernism, Rhetoric, Composition

March 7, 2010

Commented [OWL1]: Comments made by CWC denote explanations of writing and citing in Chicago's Author-Date References style, while comments made by CMOS denote explanations of Chicago Manual of Style guidelines.

Commented [CWC2]: Margins should be set at no less than 1" and no greater than 1.5".

The recommended typeface is something readable, such as Times New Roman, Calibri, or Arial. Use no less than ten-point type, but the preference is for twelve-point font. Most importantly, be consistent!

Double-space all text in the paper, with the following exceptions:
table titles and figure captions. Single-space notes and reference page entries internally, but leave an extra line space externally between said entries.

Commented [CWC3]: Class papers often include a title page that features your title and any additional information required by the instructor. However, consult with your instructor, as it's also acceptable to include the title on the first page of text.

When creating a title page, the title should be centered a third of the way down the page. When subtitles apply, end the title with a colon and place the subtitle on the line below the title. Your name and any additional information (such as the class name and date) should follow several lines later.

Different practices apply for theses and dissertations (see Appendix 2.1.2 in Kate L. Turabian's *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations* [9th ed.]).

Commented [CWC4]: Chicago's Author-Date References style is recommended for those in the physical, natural, and social sciences and requires using parenthetical citations to identify sources as they show up in the text. Each source that shows up in the text must have a corresponding entry in the References list. This style also requires that you must include a parenthetical citation for each source you use in your paper. Parenthetical citations consist of the author's last name, the publication date, and the page number of the source (when applicable). Keep in mind that when a source is listed on the references page by editor or translator instead of author, you do *not* include abbreviations such as *ed.* or *trans.* in the in-text citation.

In *Democracy and Other Neoliberal Fantasies*, Jodi Dean (2009) argues that “imagining a rhizome might be nice, but rhizomes don’t describe the underlying structure of real networks” (30), rejecting the existence of nonhierarchical interconnectedness that structures our contemporary world and means of communication. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri (2009), on the other hand, argue that the Internet is an exemplar of the rhizome: a nonhierarchical, noncentered network—a democratic network with “an indeterminate and potentially unlimited number of interconnected nodes [that] communicate with no central point of control” (299). What is at stake in settling this dispute? Being. And, knowledge and power in that being. More specifically, this paper explores how a theory of social ontology has evolved to theories of social ontologies and how the modernist notion of global understanding of individuals working toward a common (rationalized and objectively knowable) goal became pluralistic postmodern theories embracing the idea of local networks. Furthermore, what this journey of theoretical evolution allows for is a consideration of why understandings of a world comprising emergent networks should concern composition instructors and their practical activities in the classroom: networks produce knowledge.

Our journey begins with early modernism, which was dominated by a theme of oneness. This focus on oneness or unity (on the whole rather than on individual parts) derived from Enlightenment thinking: “The project [of modernity] amounted to an extraordinary intellectual effort on the part of Enlightenment thinkers to develop objective science, universal morality and law, and autonomous art according to their inner logic.” Science, so the story went, served as inherently objective inquiry that could reveal truth—universal truth at that. Enlightenment thinkers, such as Kant, believed in the “universal, eternal, and . . . immutable qualities of all of humanity” (Harvey 1990, 12); by extension, “equality, liberty, faith in human intelligence . . .

Commented [CWC5]: Although not exemplified in this sample, longer papers may require sections or subheadings. Chicago allows you to devise your own format but privileges consistency. Put an extra line space before and after subheads and avoid ending them with periods.

Commented [CWC6]: Note that Arabic page numbers begin in the header of the first page of text, rather than the title page.

Commented [CMOS7]: Chicago takes a minimalist approach to capitalization; therefore, while terms used to describe a period are usually lowercased except in the case of proper nouns (e.g., “the colonial period” vs. “the Victorian era”), convention dictates that some period names can be capitalized (e.g., the Enlightenment). See the University of Chicago Press’s *The Chicago Manual of Style* (18th ed.).

Commented [CWC8]: Additionally, when the same page(s) of the same source are cited more than once in a single paragraph, you need only cite the source in full after the last reference or at the end of the paragraph. Notice there is no direct citation attached to “The project [of modernity]. . .” on page one of this sample but a full citation appears here at the top of page two.

Commented [CWC9]: There should be no punctuation between the author’s last name and the year, but do place a comma between the year and page numbers when used in parenthetical citation.

Place author-date citations before a mark of punctuation whenever possible. Note that parenthetical citations usually follow direct quotations, but it is acceptable to place them before such a quotation if it allows the date to be placed next to the author’s name.

and universal reason” were widely held beliefs and seen as unifying forces (13). In fact, Kant ([1784] 1983) believed that Enlightenment (freedom from self-imposed immaturity, otherwise known as the ability to use one’s understanding on his or her own toward greater ends) (41) was a *divine right* (44) bestowed upon and meant to be exercised by the masses. Later modernists began to acknowledge the fragmentation, ambiguity, and larger chaos that characterized modern life (Harvey 1990, 22) but, perhaps ironically, only so they might better reconcile their disunified state. This later modernism, labeled “heroic” modernism, was based on the precedent set by romantic thinkers and artists, which accounted for the “unbridled individualism of great thinkers, the great benefactors of humankind, who through their singular efforts and struggles would push reason and civilization willy-nilly to the point of true emancipation” (14). Yet heroic modernists still seemed to ascribe to the overall Enlightenment project that suggested that there exists a “true nature of a unified, though complex, underlying reality” (30). Even the latest “high” modernists believed in “linear progress, absolute truths, and rational planning of ideal social orders under standardized conditions of knowledge and production” (35). Ultimately, modernism was about individuals moving in assembly-line fashion toward a (rational and inherently unified) common goal. This ontological understanding rested on what Lyotard would call a “grand narrative.”

Lyotard (1984) sees “modern” as fit for describing “any science that legitimates itself with reference to a metadiscourse of this kind making an explicit appeal to some grand narrative, such as the dialectic of Spirit, the hermeneutics of meaning, the emancipation of the rational or working subject, or the creation of wealth” (xxiii); in other words, Lyotard characterizes “modernism” as a hegemonic story that defined and guided the ways in which humans lived their lives. Further, Lyotard defines “postmodernism” as “incredulity toward metanarratives” (xxiv). Lyotard is not suggesting that totalizing narratives suddenly stopped existing in our postmodern

Commented [CWC10]: When the same source but *different* page numbers are referenced in the same paragraph, include a full citation upon the first reference and provide only page numbers thereafter. “(35)” here indicates the quotation came from page thirty-five of Harvey’s text.

Commented [CWC11]: When a source has no identifiable author, cite it by its title, both on the references page and in shortened form (up to four keywords from that title) in parenthetical citations throughout the text. Use italic or roman type as needed (see the CMOS comment on page fourteen of this sample).

Additionally, if you cannot name a specific page number, you have other options for helping your readers find your source work. Other specific locators include section (sec.), equation (eq.), volume (vol.), and note (n.). It may be helpful to cite specific chapters or paragraphs. In the case of electronic works in particular, you may have to create your own signposts: e.g., (Lyotard 1984, under “Modernism”).

world but argues that they no longer carry the same currency or usefulness to the people creating and living by and through them. One of the key theoretical understandings driving this change is that, according to Lyotard, knowledge is not “a tool of the authorities” as knowledge (specifically, scientific knowledge) may have been for the moderns; postmodern knowledge allows for a sensitivity to differences and helps us accept those differences rather than proffer a driving urge to eradicate or otherwise unify them (xxv). Lyotard notes that science, then, no longer has the power to legitimate other narratives (40); it can no longer be understood to be the world’s singular metalanguage because it has been “replaced by the principle of a plurality of formal and axiomatic systems capable of arguing the truth of denotative statements” (43). Lyotard is invested in these (deliberately plural) systems, these “little narratives” (61) that operate locally and according to specific rules, and he calls them “language games.” The modern (or, more accurately, postmodern) world is too complex to be understood beneath the aegis of one totalizing system, one goal imposed through one grand narrative: “There is no reason to think that it would be possible to determine metaprescriptives common to all of these language games or that a revisable consensus like the one in force at a given moment in the scientific community could embrace the totality of metaprescription regulating the totality of statements circulating in the social collectivity” (65). Paralogy, learning how to play by and/or to challenge the rules of a specific language game is the means fit for postmodernity, not consensus, according to Lyotard (66). Ultimately, in his invocation of plural systems rather than a singular system, Lyotard’s attitude toward grand narratives invites a way of thinking and a way of understanding the world with inferences of a networked logic. Stephen Toulmin, too, tackles an understanding of contemporary sociality based on (competing) systems rather than a singular hegemonic system.

In *Cosmopolis: The Hidden Agenda of Modernity*, Toulmin (1990) challenges us to consider how such different systems and ways of viewing the world come to hold sway at different points in time. Like Lyotard, he suggests that we cannot simply do away with grand narratives but that we are making progress if we interrogate how and why they came to be while acceding to the fact that there might be multiple ways of interpreting those seemingly domineering capital “S” Systems. Additionally, Toulmin discounts the vocabulary of narratives (grand or not) and games, instead preferring the term “cosmopolis.” “Cosmopolis,” according to Toulmin, invokes notions of nature and society in relationship to one another; more specifically, a cosmopolis is not a thing in and of itself (it is not nature, it is not society, it is not a story, and it is not a game) but a process, an ordering of nature and society (67-68). Unlike the seemingly stable cosmopolis of modernity that Kant and others present, Toulmin suggests that cosmopolises are always in flux because communities continually converse in an effort to shape and reshape their understanding of their ways of being in their universe. Dominant cosmopolises do emerge to characterize a particular state of persons at a particular time, but that should not prevent us, argues Toulmin, from reading *into* the dominant rather than with it. Dissensus, then, has a place in Toulmin’s postmodern understanding, too, just as in Lyotard’s. We might, in fact, suggest that Lyotard and Toulmin both see the world in its interconnected and localized intricacies but use different language to forward their unique interests. While Lyotard critiques Habermas and his insistence on the value of consensus, Toulmin seeks to disrupt the common narrative of modernity as whole by interrogating its structuring features. What we must ultimately note is that Lyotard’s and Toulmin’s ontological commonalities are interrogated by another important thinker: Michel Foucault.

In “What is Enlightenment,” Foucault (1984d) writes, “Thinking back on Kant’s text, I wonder whether we may not envisage modernity rather as an attitude than as a period of history. And by ‘attitude,’ I mean a mode of relating to contemporary reality; a voluntary choice made by certain people; in the end, a way of thinking and feeling; a way, too, of acting and behaving that at one and the same time marks a relation of belonging and presents itself as a task” (39). Foucault (1984a), too, questions that there ever was some objective means to an end of unified truth; rather, Foucault suggests that the moderns *voluntarily* embraced and enacted that vision. Foucault’s unique contribution, however, was to suggest that a “disciplinary” society most accurately described the way contemporaries were relating, acting, thinking, and feeling their world. Rather than a voluntary and even blind acceptance of any such vision, Foucault suggests that a metacognitive understanding (or metawareness) of the way power flowed in our disciplinary society would make room for resistance, despite the bleak picture that he often gets accused of painting. We may say “bleak” as Foucault writes that “discipline ‘makes’ individuals; it is the specific technique of a power that regards individuals both as object and as instruments of its exercise” (188). This is a far cry from Descartes’ nostalgic “I think; therefore, I am” that informed the Enlightenment and most of modernism’s utopian vision of powerful individuals coexisting in a perfectly rationalized, truthful, and unified world.

In his grand splitting from Descartes and other Enlightenment and modernist thinkers, Foucault (1984a) suggests that the instruments of hierarchical observation, normalizing judgment, and examination are what drives our contemporary disciplinary society (188). He asks us to consider how seemingly mundane and beneficent institutions as hospitals and schools (and also asylums and prisons) enact these instruments. Even architecturally, he insists, these institutions are built to “permit an internal, articulated and detailed control . . . to make it

Commented [CWC12]: When you have several sources by the same author written in the same year, list them alphabetically by title on your references page and append the letters *a*, *b*, *c*, etc. to the year of publication.

Commented [CMOS13]: In standard American English, quotations within quotations are enclosed in single quotation marks. When the entire quotation is a quotation within a quotation, only one set of double quotation marks is necessary.

possible to know [individuals], to alter them” (190). Such systems work as networks, according to Foucault: “[disciplinary society’s] functioning is that of a network of relations from top to bottom, but also to a certain extent from bottom to top and laterally; this network ‘holds’ the whole together and traverses it in its entirety with effects of power that derive from one another: supervisors, perpetually supervised.” Yes, this represents a hierarchical network (hospitals and schools have administrators, asylums and prisons have their own care staff and guards, too), but the important thing Foucault wants us to remember is that power is never possessed; it *flows* “like a piece of machinery” through the network (192).

Further, Foucault (1984a) suggests that the threat of penalty lies at the heart of a disciplinary system (193). It is a “perpetual penalty that traverses all points and supervises every instant in the disciplinary institutions”; that penalty “compares, differentiates, hierarchies, homogenizes, excludes. In short, it *normalizes*” (195). In the end, the disciplinary system is interested in creating well-behaved objects (not subjects, per se). It does the work of unification and disunification at the same time: “In a sense, the power of normalization imposes homogeneity; but it individualizes by making it possible to measure gaps, to determine levels, to fix specialties, and to render the differences useful by fitting them one to another” (197). A disciplinary society is interested in producing citizens that will *perform productively*. But, in addition to observation or surveillance and normalizing judgment, such an end can only be accomplished through examination, which goes hand-in-hand with documentation: “It engages them in a whole mass of documents that capture and fix them” (201). This turns us as individuals into “cases”: “It is the individual as he may be described, judged, measured, compared with others, in his very individuality; and it is also the individual who has to be trained or corrected, classified, normalized, excluded, etc.” (203).

Commented [CWC14]: As seen in this quotation and the next, use square brackets to add clarifying words, phrases, or punctuation to direct quotations when necessary. However, before altering a direct quotation, ask yourself if you might just as easily paraphrase or weave one or more shorter quotations into the text.

Additionally, although not seen in this sample, Latin phrase “sic” can be used to indicate misspelled or misused words in quotations. Generally, “sic” should be used in academic settings when acknowledging the flaw is relevant to the discussion. In most other settings, using “sic” may be considered impolite or unnecessary. When used, “sic” should be italicized and placed in square brackets immediately after the misspelled or misused word.

Commented [CMOS15]: Italic type is the preferred method of emphasis in CMOS. However, it should be used infrequently (only when altering sentence structure will not suffice). Writing a word in all capital letters for emphasis should be avoided.

Ultimately for Foucault, “Power was the great network of political relationships among all things,” (Thomas 2008, 153), and Foucault (1984a) represents a powerful figure in postmodern thought because he asserts that power is what produces our reality; a hierarchical network of power is our contemporary ontology: “In fact, power produces; it produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth. The individual and the knowledge that may be gained of him belong to this production” (205).

Foucault undoubtedly has a grand legacy of sorts, but that does not mean his work has not been challenged or, perhaps more accurately, extended. Nikolas Rose (1999), in his *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*, buys into Foucault’s understanding of contemporary society as networked, but he does not believe we have much to gain by understanding it as a disciplinary society. Rather, Rose proposes that we live, work, and breathe as a control society: “Rather than being confined, like its subjects, to a succession of institutional sites, the control of conduct was now immanent to all the places in which deviation could occur, inscribed into the dynamics of the practices into which human beings are connected.” We no longer need hospitals, schools, asylums, or prisons to monitor and correct our activities; instead, our way of being in the world is now personally connected. As a result of the everyday networks in which we partake, we are a society of self-policing risk managers: “Conduct is continually monitored and reshaped by logics immanent within all networks of practice. Surveillance is ‘designed in’ to the flows of everyday existence” (234). Rose challenges Foucault by suggesting that, in a control society, power is more potent and even more dangerous. Rather than an institution using disciplinary intervention to correct deviant individuals, control societies work on the premise of regulation. This makes power more “effective,” according to Rose, “because changing individuals is difficult and ineffective—and it also makes power less obtrusive—thus

Commented [CWC16]: When an author’s name appears in the text, the date of the work cited should follow, even when articulated in the possessive. Also note that Chicago distinguishes between authors and works. While “in Foucault 1984a” is technically permissible, “Foucault’s (1984a) work suggests...” is preferred.

Commented [CWC17]: Some instructors, journals, or disciplines may prefer sentence-style capitalization. This means following the guidelines above but refraining from capitalizing the important words that are not proper nouns. For example, “Powers of freedom: Reframing political thought.”

Commented [CMOS18]: Titles that are mentioned in the text itself, in notes, and on the references page are capitalized “headline-style.” This means capitalizing the first letter of the first word of the title and subtitle as well as any and all important words or proper nouns. Unimportant words (such as “of” or “and”) should remain uncanceled unless they happen to be the first word of the title or subtitle.

diminishing its political and moral fallout. It also makes resistance more difficult . . . [;] actuarial practices . . . minimize the possibilities for resistance in the name of . . . identity.” In a control society, deviants are targeted as a collective, and techniques of control, rather than those of discipline, are meant to preempt crime and risk (236). Foucault did not get it quite right, says Rose, because “. . . the idea of a maximum security society is misleading. Rather than the tentacles of the state spreading across everyday life, the securitization of identity is dispersed and is organized. And rather than totalizing surveillance, it is better seen as conditional access to circuits of consumption and civility, constant scrutiny of the right of individuals to access certain kinds of flows of consumption of goods” (243). We are our own tentacles of surveillance; we grant our own access to being, knowledge, and power.

Rose (1999) eloquently sums up his argument in the following quotation:

In a society of control, a politics of conduct is designed into the fabric of existence itself, into the organization of space, time, visibility, circuits of communication. And these enwrap each individual life decision and action—about labour, purchases, debts, credits, lifestyle, sexual contracts and the like—in a web of incitements, rewards, current sanctions and foreboding of future sanctions which serve to enjoin citizens to maintain particular types of control over their conduct. These assemblages which entail the securitization of identity are not unified, but dispersed, not hierarchical but rhizomatic, not totalized but connected in a web or relays and relations. (246)

In addition to clarifying Rose’s understanding of how individuals instate their own risk management (a new form of “surveillance”) in noncentered, nonhierarchical (non-institutionally-sponsored) networks, this quotation also highlights the significant issue of visibility, or, rather, invisibility of said networks, which is picked up by Giorgio Agamben in *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*.

Agamben (1998) calls for the replacement of Foucault’s prison metaphor with the idea of the “camp” and suggests that “the camp as dislocating localization is the hidden matrix of the politics in which we are still living, and it is this structure of the camp that we must learn to

Commented [CMOS19]: Ellipses, or three spaced periods, indicate the omission of words from a quoted passage. Together on the same line, they should include additional punctuation when applicable, such as a sentence-ending period. Use ellipses carefully as borrowed material should always reflect the meaning of the original source.

Commented [CWC20]: CMOS recommends that particularly long quotations (such as those more than a hundred words) should be “blocked.” The block quotation is single-spaced and takes no quotation marks, but you should leave an extra line of space immediately before and after. Indent the entire quotation .5” (the same as you would the start of a new paragraph).

Other quotations that should be blocked include quotations of two or more paragraphs, quoted correspondence, lists, and quotations that require special formatting. In cases where you are using quotations as entities and comparing them to one another, consider blocking both long and short quotations. Overall, keep in mind that blocking too many quotations may disrupt reading. See the *Chicago Manual of Style* for more information.

Commented [CWC21]: The citations for block quotations begin after the final punctuation of the quotation. No period is required either before or after the opening or closing parentheses of block quotation documentation.

recognize in all its metamorphoses into the *zones d'attentes* of our airports and certain outskirts of our cities" (175). The camp is hidden, more ubiquitous than we recognize, and it is the camp as social construct—the camp as paradigm of contemporary existence—that should capture our attention because “it would be more honest and, above all, more useful to investigate carefully the juridical procedures and deployments of power by which human beings could be so completely deprived of their rights and prerogatives that no act committed against them could appear any longer as a crime” (171). Agamben here argues that power, and the flow of power through networks and its capacity to construct reality, should be discussed in terms of “*homo sacer*.”

“*Homo sacer*” is “sacred man” and is analogous to a bandit, a werewolf, a colossus, and refugee (something that is always already two things in one). It is someone who is stripped of the laws of citizenship and can be killed by anyone for any reason without penalty but, at the same time, that person cannot be sacrificed. It is someone who is removed of all sanctions of the law except the rule that banished that person in the first place. *Homo sacer* represents inbetweenness with possibility. It is to be a Mobius strip, “the very impossibility of distinguishing between outside and inside, nature and exception, *physis* and *nomos*” (Agamben 1998, 37). Perhaps the most significant statement Agamben makes about *homo sacer* is that “if today there is no longer any one clear figure of the sacred man, it is perhaps because we are all virtually *homines sacri*”; we are all *homo sacer* (115). Agamben, here, is deliberately augmenting Foucault by addressing the power of law. If the government denies a place for the refugee in contemporary society, and we are all refugees, where does that leave us (132-33)? We should be alarmed by such a realization, Agamben argues, because “in the camp, the state of exception, which was essentially a temporary suspension of the rule of law on the basis of a factual state of danger, is now given a

Commented [CMOS22]: Use italics to indicate a foreign word that the reader is unlikely to know. If the word is repeated several times (made known to the reader), then it needs to be italicized only upon its first occurrence.

Commented [CWC23]: Notice that when a page range is cited, the hundreds digit need not be repeated if it does not change from the beginning to the end of the range.

permanent spatial arrangement, which as such nevertheless remains outside the normal order” (169; *emphasis added*). Agamben sees permanency in the camp metaphor, and we can see affinities between what Agamben has to say and what Rose has to say when Agamben states that “in this sense, our age is nothing but the implacable and methodical attempt to overcome the division dividing the people, to eliminate radically the people that is excluded” (179). We might bring in Rose to ask, then, whether we are self-destructive in our self-policing: “It was more accurately understood as a blurring of the boundaries between the ‘inside’ and the ‘outside of the system of social control, and a widening of the net of control whose mesh simultaneously became finer and whose boundaries became more invisible as it spread to encompass smaller and smaller violations of the normative order” (238). Rose readily admits that there are “insiders” and “outsiders,” processes of “inclusion” and “exclusion,” in a control society, and “it appears as if outside the communities of inclusion exists an array of microsectors—microcultures of noncitizens, failed citizens, anticitizens—consisting of those who are unable or unwilling to enterprise their lives or manage their own risk, incapable of exercising responsible self-government, attached either to no moral community or to a community of antimorality” (259). What is at stake in heeding Agamben’s ontological call to notice the camps in contemporary society is also about recognizing our precarious status as permanent homo sacri at risk of being (self-) shoved out of a network of privileged “citizens” in our society to a network or counterpublic of delinquent and at risk noncitizens. Yet, to further complicate our understanding of our being in our postmodern world, Manuel DeLanda and Bruno Latour ask us to take our focus away from people, *per se*.

DeLanda (2006), in *A New Philosophy of Society: Assemblage Theory and Social Complexity*, specifically wants to argue that theories of social ontology should not be in the

Commented [CWC24]: When you add italics for emphasis within a quotation, you must inform the reader that the italics were not a part of the original quotation. Phrases such as “emphasis added,” “emphasis mine,” “italics added,” or “italics mine” are acceptable. The phrase should be in the parentheses following the quotation in the text itself. This information can also be presented in a footnote.

Commented [CWC25]: A semicolon is also used to separate a citation and a relevant but short comment (e.g., Agamben 2008, 115-33; political issues are addressed here) in a single parenthetical citation. A semicolon should be used to separate two or more references in a single parenthetical citation as well.

business of arguing for seeing the world through a particular metaphor; the contemporary world is far too complex for that. Rather, his theory of assemblages offers “a sense of the irreducible social complexity characterizing the contemporary world” (6). DeLanda argues that far too many theorists have tried to put forward “organic totalities” based on “relations of interiority” in which “the component parts are constituted by the very relations they have to other parts in the whole” (9). This means fitting parts to predetermined wholes, and this produces a false notion of a “seamless web” (10). DeLanda works from Deleuze to offer a theory based on relations of exteriority in which network parts are autonomous and can be plugged into different networks for different outcomes; and, importantly, “the properties of the component parts can never explain the relations which constitute the whole” (10-11). Another important feature of assemblages (the term DeLanda uses for “networks” to account for their foundational property of being emergent) is that assemblages can be described on two specific axes: parts play material or expressive roles and are involved in processes that can territorialize or deterritorialize (18-19). The important difference between material and expressive roles is that the expressive role cannot be reduced to language and symbols. For example, there may be the material content of a discussion but also the bodily expression of attendant cues. Material and expressive functions can be exercised individually or together and at different places and times by the same “parts” of an assemblage. Similarly, to “territorialize” is a part’s process of stabilizing a network, while to “deterritorialize” is to destabilize a network, and “one and the same assemblage can have components working to stabilize its identity as well as components forcing it to change or even transforming it into a different assemblage” (12). Coding and decoding are also discussed as important variables of assemblages. Coding, which can be performed by genes or words, works to further stabilize the identity of assemblages, while decoding does the opposite and allows for

Commented [CWC26]: “Which” clauses are considered nonrestrictive or nonessential to the meaning of the sentence and should be preceded by a comma. Restrictive clauses, or clauses that are essential to the meaning of the sentence, should begin with a “that” (no comma). For more information, see the OWL resource “Introduction and General Usage in Defining Clauses.”

further expression of personal convictions and styles (15-16). DeLanda emphasizes that all of these processes are recurrent (16), assemblages account for nonlinear results (20), and that an assemblage can affect its parts retroactively (34).

What we gain from DeLanda (2006) is an understanding that it is important to look at the links that (however temporarily) bind the assemblage or network rather than the “parts” themselves. About this concept of examining links over “parts,” he explains that “It is the *pattern of recurring links*, as well as the properties of those links, which forms the subject of study, not the attributes of the persons occupying positions in a network” (56). DeLanda is not interested in essences, and he is not interested in natural kinds. He is interested in possibilities: “The notion of the structure of a space of possibilities is crucial in assemblage theory given that, unlike properties, the capacities of an assemblage are not given, that is, they are merely possible when not exercised. But the set of possible capacities of an assemblage is not amorphous, however open-ended it may be, since different assemblages exhibit different set of capacities” (29). It is not about what humans think of the world but about describing how the world organizes itself at any given (perpetually dynamic) moment.

One might argue that Bruno Latour (2005a) is even more vocal in highlighting the “world” as actor upon itself (regardless of human interpretation of that acting and their part in it). In “*From Realpolitik to Dingpolitik or How to Make Things Public*,” Latour states, “In other words, objects—taken as so many issues—bind all of us in ways that map out a public space profoundly different from what is usually recognized under the label of ‘the political’” (15). Latour is clearly interested in doing away with any notions of a modernist, foundational truth when he says “we don’t assemble because we agree, look alike, feel good, are socially compatible or wish to fuse together but because we are brought by divisive matters of concern

Commented [CWC27]: Both in the text itself as well as on the references page, a title is treated with quotation marks or italics based on the type of work it is. Book and periodical titles (titles of larger works) get italicized while titles of articles, chapters, and shorter works get enclosed in double quotation marks. Notice here how italics are used to indicate foreign words within an article title.

Commented [CWC28]: A colon can be used to introduce a direct quotation, but it usually accompanies “thus” or “as follows” and implies a heightened level of formality. Use it sparingly. If you merely need to introduce the speaker (i.e., “Latour says”), follow with a comma before introducing the quotation.

into some neutral, isolated place in order to come to some sort of provisional makeshift (dis)agreement” (23). Further, in *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory*, Latour (2005b) describes this “coming together” as “concatenations of mediators”: “Action is not done under the full control of consciousness; action should rather be felt as a node, a knot, and a conglomerate of many surprising sets of agencies that have to be slowly disentangled” (59). Under Latour’s view, “action” runs haphazardly among humans and objects in contemporary localized networks (75). Yes, says Latour, “any thing that does modify a state of affairs by making a difference is an actor—or, if it has no figuration yet, an actant” (71). DeLanda and Latour are ultimately after similar things; they seek to challenge any sort of social ontological theory that is not emergent. Both DeLanda and Latour find that “being” in the world is best described in the rise and fall of action, in the links as they are in the processes of linking, and that our ontological understanding must include objects as veritable actors. Put differently, they believe that things impact this network just as much as people do, and that it is the *process* of “impacting” that we should be interested in.

So why, as composition teachers, should we be concerned with how our way of being in the world is differently described from modernism to postmodernism? Because ontological understanding has a direct impact on how knowledge is created and circulated through texts. Such ontological postmodern developments have helped us come to understand the “death” of the singular author. Foucault (1984c) confirms that “criticism and philosophy took note of the disappearance—or death—of the author some time ago. But the consequences of their discovery of it have not been sufficiently examined, nor has its import been accurately measured” (103).

Ijessling (1976) is particularly helpful in briefly but effectively summing up the transformation in thoughts on subjectivity and authorship from modern to postmodern times. The

first and oldest or most modernist understanding of authorship suggested that “the author as subject is the autonomous and irreducible origin and master of his own monological speech.” In other words, the author (in the romantic sense) was the individual genius behind the concrete work he produced. In a second and later sense, authorship was considered the product of dialogue: “Subjectivities come about in one’s being spoken to by others and in speaking to others” (132). This view suggested that since speakers and writers are constantly discoursing, it is difficult if not impossible to locate an irreducible, singular source. The third, most postmodern sense compromises intertextuality and directly connects to the way in which Latour and others’ call for viewing our disposition of being in the world. Intertextuality “conceives all that one says as a fabric woven into a much wider network of interrelated texts with references to each other. The speaker or writer is also woven into this fabric.” In this sense, it is clearly *impossible* to suggest that an “author” originates a work; rather, the author and his or her words are “carried along by the network of words in circulation.” “Authors” are no longer considered to “own” words; instead, the author is considered to be a product of the larger circulation of narratives (133). “Literary output,” according to Ijessling, can be defined “not as the work of an author, but as a *web of meanings*. On the one hand, it results from a network of previous arguments and assertions and, on the other hand, it opens up unlimited possibilities of new arguments and texts” (132). The same networked logic that defines our general ontological sense of being in the world also defines the way in which texts (with implications for knowledge and power) are produced and circulate in the world: “At the pinnacle of contemporary production, information and communication are the very commodities produced; the network itself is the site of both production and circulation” (Hardt and Negri 2009, 298).

Commented [CMOS29]: Direct quotations should be integrated into your text in a grammatically correct way. For example, the first word in a direct quotation should be capitalized if it begins a sentence, even if it was not capitalized in the original quotation (and vice versa). This can be done “silently” (without demarcation) if it does not affect the meaning of the quoted material; otherwise, indicate the change by placing square brackets around the newly capitalized or lowercased letter.

Commented [CWC30]: For multiple authors, use the conjunction “and” (rather than an ampersand) both in the text itself as well as on the references page.

This paper has been an exercise in acknowledging the significant changes that have occurred on a theoretical level in our understanding of how society functions from modern to postmodern times; this paper has also shown how these changes are paralleled in our understanding of what it means to “write” in a contemporary world. So, when Lisa Ede and Andrea Lunsford (2001) among others ask us to pay attention to the fact that said theories do not align with the pedagogies we practice in our contemporary composition classrooms, I think we need to pay attention.¹ If we, as composition teachers, are charged with teaching our students how to effectively communicate in “writing” (which now involves a multitude of modalities beyond the “print” that dominated modernism), we need to get with the “networked” program. As we have seen in this paper, it is, indeed, power that is at stake. We are not just teaching our students how to “write”; we are teaching our students how they might consciously work within these networks and gain some control of whether they will be included or excluded in power-filled and power-constituted postmodern world. Perhaps the “story” of “student empowerment” may be considered cliché, but what seems more apparent than ever is that in a postmodern world full of homo sacri and “camps,” being a “good” writer has greater consequences than ever.

Commented [CWC31]: Footnotes or endnotes can be used to supplement the Author-Date References style to provide additional relevant commentary and/or to cite sources that do not readily lend themselves to the Author-Date References system.

In the text, note numbers are superscripted. In the notes themselves, note numbers are full sized, not raised, and followed by a period. Superscripting numbers in both places is also acceptable.

Note numbers should be placed at the end of the clause or sentence to which they refer and should be placed after any and all punctuation except the dash. Note numbers should also begin with “1” and follow consecutively throughout a given paper, article, or chapter.

The first line of a footnote is indented .5” from the left margin. Subsequent lines within a note should be formatted flush left. Leave an extra line space between notes. Citations within such notes are treated the same as they would be in the text itself.

Commented [CMOS32]: Regarding multiple competing punctuation marks, Chicago prescribes commas and periods inside quotation marks and colons and semicolons outside quotation marks. The placement of quotation marks and exclamation points depends on whether they clarify the meaning of the quotation or the surrounding sentence as a whole.

1. Ede and Lunsford (2001) note that we all agree that writing is inherently social, yet we still rely on individualistic praxis; we still ascribe to pedagogies that encourage the independent author producing concrete (original, honest, and “truthful”) works.

References

- Agamben, Giorgio. 1998. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Translated by Daniel Heller-Roazen. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Dean, Jodi. 2009. *Democracy and Other Neoliberal Fantasies: Communicative Capitalism and Left Politics*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- DeLanda, Manuel. 2006. *A New Philosophy of Society: Assemblage Theory and Social Complexity*. London: Continuum.
- Ede, Lisa, and Andrea A. Lunsford. 2001. "Collaboration and Concepts of Authorship." *PMLA* 116 (March): 354-69. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/463522>.
- Foucault, Michel. 1984a. "The Means of Correct Training." In *The Foucault Reader*, edited by Paul Rabinow, 188-205. New York: Pantheon.
- Foucault, Michel. 1984b. "Panopticism." In *The Foucault Reader*, edited by Paul Rabinow. 206-13. New York: Pantheon.
- Foucault, Michel. 1984c. "What is an Author?" In *The Foucault Reader*, edited by Paul Rabinow, 101-20. New York: Pantheon.
- Foucault, Michel. 1984d. "What is Enlightenment?" In *The Foucault Reader*, edited by Paul Rabinow, 32-50. New York: Pantheon.
- Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. 2000. "Postmodernization, or the Informatization of Production." In *Empire*, 280-303. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Harvey, David. 1990. "Modernity and Modernism." In *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*, 10-38. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Ijessling, Samuel. 1976. "Who is Actually Speaking Whenever Something is Said?" In *Rhetoric and Philosophy in Contact: An Historical Survey*, translated by Paul Dunphy, 127-36. Hague, Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Kant, Immanuel. (1784) 1983. "An Answer to the Question: What is Enlightenment?" In *Perpetual Peace and Other Essays*, translated by Ted Humphrey, 41-48. Reprint, Indianapolis: Hackett.

Commented [CWC33]: Label the first page of your references "References" or "Works Cited." Two blank lines should be left between this title and your first entry. One blank line should be left between remaining entries, which should be listed in letter-by-letter alphabetical order according to the first word in each entry. Sources you consulted but did not directly cite may or may not be included (consult your instructor). Entries are formatted similarly to those in Chicago's Notes-Bibliography style, but the date appears immediately after the author's name.

Commented [CWC34]: For two to three authors or editors, write out all names in the order they appear on the title page of the source. For four to ten authors, write out all names on the references page but use just the first author's name and "et al." (not italicized) in the text itself.

Format the first author of a source in the "Last name, first name" format and all subsequent authors of the same source in "first name last name" format.

Commented [CWC35]: For electronic articles and other web sources, DOIs are preferred to URLs. DOIs are to be prefaced with the letters "doi" and a colon.

If you must use a URL, look for the "stable" version assigned by the journal.

Additionally, note that no access date is required to be reported for electronic sources. Only resort to using access dates when date of publication is unavailable or when referencing a webpage that changes often. If you cannot ascertain the publication date of a *printed* work, use the abbreviation "n.d."

Commented [CWC36]: The 18th edition of the *CMOS* cautions authors against using the 3-em dash (—) to replace the names of authors or editors who hold multiple, successive entries on a references page. Instead, list them normally, as seen here with Foucault's four works. Arrange such entries chronologically, oldest publication to newest publication. Note that multiple entries in the same edited collection can be cross-referenced.

Latour, Bruno. 2005a. "From *Realpolitik* to *Dingpolitik* or How to Make Things Public." In *Making Things Public: Atmospheres of Democracy*, edited by Bruno Latour and Peter Weibel, 14-41. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Latour, Bruno. 2005b. *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lyotard, Jean-François. 1984. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Translated by Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Rose, Nikolas. 1999. "Control." In *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*, 233-73. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thomas, Nicholas. 2008. "Pedagogy and the Work of Michel Foucault." *JAC* 28 (1-2): 151-80.

Toulmin, Stephen. 1990. *Cosmopolis: The Hidden Agenda of Modernity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Commented [CWC37]: Identify editors, translators, and the like (on the references page only) by spelling out the phrases "edited by" or "translated by." Only capitalize these phrases if they follow a period. When the editor's or translator's name takes the place of the author's name, follow the name with a comma and the appropriate abbreviation for the noun form: ed., eds., trans., etc. Standard terms such as volume (vol.) and number (no.) are always abbreviated when used.

Commented [CWC38]: Journal articles are usually cited by volume, issue number, and date of publication. In the event that pagination is consecutive across a volume, the issue number and/or month or season can be omitted.

Commented [OWL39]: For information on Chicago's Author-Date style, please visit the Purdue OWL. You might also consult the University of Chicago Press's *The Chicago Manual of Style* (18th ed.) and/or Kate L. Turabian's *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations* (9th ed.).

Commented [CWC40]: When you do not know the author or editor of a source, begin the entry with the title of the source.

Note that an initial article (such as "a" or "the") is ignored in alphabetization.

Some sources are traditionally left out of bibliographies, such as personal communication. However, it's best to consult your instructor in such cases.