VILNIUS TECH
Vilnius Gediminas Technical University

Creativity studies
ISSN 2345-0479 / eISSN 2345-0487
2023 Volume 16 Issue 1: 108–124
https://doi.org/10.3846/cs.2023.15161

CONCEPT CREATION IN ACTION: INTERNET SPACE AS A METEOROLOGICAL PRESSURE SYSTEM

Gytis DOVYDAITIS *

Department of Theatre Studies, Faculty of Arts, Vytautas Magnus University, Muitinės str. 7, 44280 Kaunas, Lithuania

Received 19 June 2021; accepted 19 November 2021

Abstract. The spatiality of the Internet is a complex phenomenon presupposing a wide range of ideas: that there are different environments which can be characterized, that there are subjects moving within them, that these spaces are being employed for certain ends by their users, and much more. However, various spatial descriptions of the Internet most of the time observe it as a part of a larger spatial architecture, not as a spatial architecture itself. This paper employs radical concept creation machinery conceptualized by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari in *What Is Philosophy?* (first published in 1991), principles of paralogistic thinking proposed by Jean-François Lyotard and divergent thinking methods, finally arriving at a new conceptualization of the Internet space as the meteorological pressure system. This is an invitation to see the Internet and movements occurring within it from a new perspective: where temperatures rise and drop, winds blow and dissipate, fogs come and go; where limits of spatial characteristics are forming different climates; where each part affects the whole, and can potentially bring out various chain reactions. Such a conceptual system opens up the possibility to see the Internet as a coherent spatial structure, filled with becomings and intricate relationships.

Keywords: conceptualization, creativity, Internet space, Gilles Deleuze, Jean-François Lyotard, paralogy, plane of immanence.

Introduction

When we open *Facebook*, we tend to think of and refer to it as an architecture where people move and socialize. As Lefebvre (1991) had noted, space is a social product – an amalgamation of (social) relations expressed through perceived, conceived and lived spaces, which primarily is experienced socially. Our vernacular comprehends the Internet spatially, as a place, and it is largely due to the ability to situate our being in it and experience sociability (Turkle, 1995).

There are various dispersed attempts to conceptualize the space in the age of Internet, each of which grasps a different aspect of both physical and digital faces of our networked

*Corresponding author. E-mail: *gytis.dovydaitis@vdu.lt*

realities. Manuel Castells and Benjamin H. Bratton contributed here the most, yet, they are saying very little about the space of interface and people's movement through the Internet. Castells (2000) is concerned with sociology and urban developments; Bratton (2016) is concerned with the entire planet as a computational megastructure. However, when people refer to Internet space, they are primarily referring to two dimensional spaces conceived through screens, not a global cyber-structure. The primary problem of this research is the lack of systematic conceptualizations of the Internet space, as a networked space with movements happening within it. How the Internet space operates as a system? How it mediates movement? What are the characteristics of different parts of the Internet space? On what basis they could be compared? Inability to answer these questions hinders our possibilities to approach space productively and consciously shape our networked realities. Lefebvre (1991) had showed how innately social reality is connected to spatial constructs and how the influence on space is influence on sociability – the base of human experience, thus it is easy to see how important are such Internet problems as the death of Web, surveillance and platform capitalisms, digital expansion United States jurisdiction and others. Changing space is changing people. It is of utmost importance to understand space. However, it is not that simple – the novelty of our situation posits a need for creativity and concept creation (Lovink, 2011).

Deleuze and Guattari (1994) elaborately explore the process of philosophy, by stating that the main job of it is creating concepts. By separating art, science and philosophy, they describe the latter as a productive process which seeks to create new perspectives on world and open new events through concepts, rather than solving problems with singular solutions (as it is being done in science). They explore this perspective eloquently in their book *What Is Philosophy?* not as a call for arguments or discussions, but as a positive call for creativity. However, they do not regard philosophy being superior. Art and science are equitably important movements of thought, just different in their nature (Schönher, 2013).

Deleuze and Guattari's productive approach goes along the lines with Lyotard's critique of modern science. He calls it homologistic – static and linear, and claims that postmodernity should abolish logical thinking in favor of paralogical thinking (Lyotard, 1984). This habit of thought embraces paradox and turns it into vehicle by requiring one to see the object at hand from multiple perspectives at once. As a call for trans-disciplinarity and productive conceptual process, paralogistic thinking is largely connected to divergent thinking – an unstructured movement of thought to all directions at once. By thinking divergently, we can produce a whole bunch of paralogisms – seemingly paradoxical statements, which then can be tested and developed into concepts.

Within this essay I will employ Deleuzoguattarian approach to concepts, will do my best to think divergently and paralogistically, finally developing a set of concepts. Here I will employ the meteorological pressure system to conceptualize Internet space as a territory of winds, temperatures, pressures, rains, mists and users. This article defends two main theses: 1) Internet is a fluctuating and heterogeneous network of spaces with a variety of characteristics; 2) Deleuzoguattarian approach to concepts combined with paralogy and divergent thinking is a productive creative apparatus allowing to come up with innovative results. The outcome of this process should not be approached as rigid theoretical body, but rather as kind invitation to see the Internet from an unexpected angle. To begin with, I will delve deep into the concept of a concept.

1. Deleuzoguattarian concept creation

Philosophy is a specific movement of thought. Deleuze (1994) strictly criticizes the dogmatic image of thought, which starts off from the idea that thought desires truth and its movement is oriented by it. However, as Deleuze shows, such postulation is limiting since it presupposes a singular solution of a given problem before anyone had even began solving it. It is the peril of convergent thinking – a movement of thought which is concerned with fixed identities and linear progressions. Another route would be to think divergently, to experiment and look for something interesting instead of necessarily truthful. That is what Deleuze and Guattari (1994) propose under the idea of concept creation, which, according to them, should be the main job of the philosopher. Concepts are not singular solutions, but creative outbursts of virtual field, which respond to a problem with virtuality embedded inside. Problems here are approached as learning opportunities with infinite spectrum of potential solutions (Bell, 2016). This is the main normative principle proposed by Deleuze and Guattari: namely that concepts are problem-oriented, not truth-oriented (Penner, 2003, p. 16).

According to Deleuze and Guattari, a philosopher should approach the objectivity of the problem by plunging oneself into the chaos. Prior known rules of solution should be forgotten in the favor of unleashed creative desire (la Licata, 2013). Here navigation is only possible by experimentation. "Concepts are throws of a dice" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 35), and by throwing them, philosopher creates concepts, which shed light on the immanent multiplicities of life. Deleuzean ontology is based on the idea that difference is prior to individuality, and this is encapsulated in the binary opposition of virtual and actual – plane of difference and plane of individualities (Deleuze, 1994). Concepts are unique individuals in a sense that they are actualities which open up virtual potentials and can be applied to particularities (Cook, 1998). That is what Deleuze and Guattari mean by stating that concepts have chaos within them.

Such take on concepts highlights the impossibility of universals. Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p. 7) claim that "the first principle of philosophy is that Universals explain nothing but must themselves be explained". Universals assume the existence of static individualities which can be described in the same way, regardless of time and place. For Deleuze, philosopher of difference, universals are dead tools of signification which say nothing about constant becomings of reality (Bell, 2016). Deleuze and Guattari (1994) oppose that with a concept, which instead of describing knowledge, opens up events, while itself being an event. An example of an event would be the greening of the plant. At first sight, it is tempting to describe it scientifically by employing chemical analysis and uncovering the temporal change in the levels of chlorophyl. However, this would be concerned with the individualities abstracted out of their state of affairs – body of a plant and its' chemical composition. An event is neither in the body, nor outside it – it is a process of relational alterations actualized in a body and mediated through virtual plane (Lundborg, 2009). The greening of the plant can be only described as past and future actualizations of virtual potentials becoming within certain spatiotemporal context.

Deleuze had always encouraged creativity. He claims that fixed solutions are stupid (Deleuze, 1994). What one should seek is the "interesting, remarkable and important", and

creation of concepts is doing just that (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 82). "If one concept is 'better' than an earlier one, it is because it makes us aware of new variations and unknown resonances, it carries out unforeseen cuttings-out, it brings forth an Event that surveys [survole] us" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 28). This is the pedagogy of the concept at work: the power of the concept to provide learning opportunities by opening new ways of thinking about the world. Both creating a concept is a creative endeavor, but also reading, analyzing, internalizing and applying it. Going from greening of plant to greening of a desert (as in an art installation) is a creative movement of thought, uncovering and possibly actualizing new virtual potentials. Concepts are not self-identical idealities which are altered in each and every iteration (Cook, 1998), and even should be altered in order to employ them productively (Schulte, 2018).

Creation of concepts and conceptual machineries is something at what Deleuze and Guattari are very adept, and such works as *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (first published in 1972) and *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (first published in 1980) are brilliant examples of that. Here a whole bunch of concepts get fleshed out: body without organs, rhizome, nomadology, smooth and striated spaces, affective machines, *etc.* (Deleuze & Guattari, 2003, 2009). Their "conceptual ecologies work in a nonhuman, lateral sense" (Cole & Mirzaei Rafe, 2017, p. 850), involve efforts to escape traditional habits and the dogmatic image of thought. It is possible to see a genesis of thought leading to *What Is Philosophy?* in *A Thousand Plateaus*, where Deleuze and Guattari (2003) propose a new way of thinking: not about the world, but with the world. In other words, not by simply describing states of affairs with fixed individualities, but by embracing becomings of the world and taking the world as a method of thinking. This is an encouragement to plant the rhizome in one's brain and to think with it, instead of about it.

Concepts must have both internal and external resonances: they have to bring their elements (plant, color green, time, *etc.*) to singularity, and connect to other concepts (for example, the growth of a plant):

> "Every concept will branch off toward other concepts that are differently composed but that constitute other regions of the same plane, answer to problems that can be connected to each other, and participate in a co-creation" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 18).

Concepts build bridges in the plane of immanence and form a conceptual machinery: the population of concepts within a given problematic field. Each element within this field extracts a different event from a state of affairs, and thus forms a landscape of events, allowing to systematically approach a set of problems. Philosopher creating such a landscape is ought to throw dice – to experiment, reject linear logical movements of thought, and think divergently.

2. Paralogisms and divergent thinking

Computer is acting logically and it can arrive only to one singular solution, while world is innately paralogical: photon is both wave and a particle, you are both free and a captive at your workplace, a table can be both a table and a bed. Anything can be anything else, but

we are forced to think otherwise. While logic endorses "either/or" type of reasoning and linear progressions, paralogism celebrates "both/and", embraces the incommensurability of the world, views it as resources rather than blockages, anticipates becomings, promotes unexpected moves within language games and seeks to uncover insights through rejection of similarities (DeGooyer, 2010).

Paralogisms are looking for "instabilities, generation of new thought and promotion of segregations" (Gedutis, 2002, p. 12) rather than for consensus and agreeableness. This is a productive type of reasoning which is not concerned with arriving to solid, singular solutions. As Degooyer, Jr. (2010, p. 298) puts it, "paralogy emphasizes the unknown through experimentation rather than innovation, privileges dissensus over consensus over transparency, and values antiterrorism". Terrorism for Lyotard is "the efficiency gained by eliminating, or threatening to eliminate, a player from a language game one shares with him" (1984, p. 63). Along with ideology, academic disciplines also tend to operate terroristically by imposing their rules on other participants, and threatening to reject insubmissive ones. Terrorism is a consequence of consensus "For in consensus, a group 'agrees' to be repressed" (Hayati & Hayati, 2012, p. 179). Lyotard's paralogy is a call to get out of rigid conceptual territories and to create new planes of thought.

Such promotion of irregular thought corresponds to Deleuzoguattarian concept creation, what is focusing on new and unexpected, not on truth value of certain facts. Furthermore, both Deleuze and Guattari and Lyotard see problems as "others", which cannot be solved as puzzles, but rather invite the reader to an ongoing learning process. Paralogy is "a power that destabilizes the capacity for explanation, manifested in the promulgation of new norms for understanding" (Lyotard, 1984, p. 61), and it seeks to promote creative output similarly to Deleuzean ontology. Instead of aiming at predictive value (increased performance), paralogy aims at strategic value, which instead of being reactive, is active, constructive, and seeks to anticipate other's moves to strategically position oneself (DeGooyer, 2010). Paralogy promotes creative effort of outsmarting the problem by creating new rules for solving it.

Paralogical thinking encourages such intersectional transitions as speaking about economics through psychological terms (Schumpeter's (2008) "creative destruction") or describing contemporary mediated network society through biological systems (Parikka's (2010) "insect media"). Paralogy emphasizes the "capacity to articulate what used to be separate" (Lyotard, 1984, p. 52). Deleuze and Guattari are adept at this: large portion of their work employs concepts from all over the academic spectrum to create a conceptual apparatus for explaining how chaosmos functions (rhizome, body without organs, nomadology, war machine, *etc.*).

Generating paralogisms is an intense creative effort defined by experimentation (DeGooyer, 2010), thus matching Deleuze and Guattari's (1994, p. 35) view on concepts, which "are not pieces of a jigsaw puzzle but rather the outcome of throws of the dice". This is a requirement to shoot multiple ideas in all directions at once – to think divergently. In opposition to convergent (linear and logical) thinking, "divergent thinking refers to our mental processes and associated structures of thinking in relation to tasks that have more than one possible solution" (Lewis & Lovatt, 2013, p. 46). As observed in multiple studies, divergent thinking tests "provide useful estimates of the potential for creative thinking" (Runco & Acar,

2012, p. 66). Ability to traverse disciplinary territories, to explore the states of affairs creatively and extract unseen potentialities is a necessary ingredient in successful concept creation.

These processes lead to unexpected ideas, which sometimes end up bad or even malevolent. However, that is the inevitability of creative potential brought by the divergent thinking (Runco & Acar, 2012). One should be prepared to occasionally find oneself in such situations where his ideas seem to reject the established ethical or moral codes, but that is the point of thinking divergently and aiming to bring new events to light. Creativity is a venture without clear end and without correct answers, it is a paralogical process of embracing the becomings of life and finding new ways to approach it.

What is more, problem discovery is associated with creative performance and high scores in divergent thinking tests (Runco & Okuda, 1988). Such correlation highlights the importance of finding or redefining problems in your own terms. In Deleuzoguattarian terms this a process of establishing your own plane of immanence: a territory where seeds of concepts get laid out and grow, where conceptual persona moves divergently and generates paralogisms.

3. Plane of immanence

What Is Philosophy? is an ironical title. It refers to the dogmatic image of thought exemplified in Socratic questions "what is x?", from which Deleuze and Guattari try to get away. Such question expects a convergent type of thinking leading to a singular logical solution, while it is clear that Deleuze and Guattari are doing something else. They propose a model of a jealous lover who is not concerned with "what it is?", but is invested in questions such as "how?", "when?", "why?", "where?", *etc.* (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994). These questions allow to specify spatiotemporal coordinates of selected problem and lay out a plane of immanence (Bell, 2016). This is the labor of divergent thinking.

The plane of immanence starts off with the problems and lover's questions, but is much more: "[it's] the image of thought, the image thought gives itself of what it means to think, to make use of thought, to find one's bearings in thought" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 37). Plane of immanence presupposes certain movements of thought and certain events which can and should be grasped or avoided. Concepts populate the plane of immanence just as grass populates the field of soil. It is what structures thought: habits, patterns, movements of it. It is precisely because of the plane of immanence Jean Baudrillard is unable to think together with Plato and assume the reality of ideas. While the plane of immanence can be infinite, its virtual potentials have certain characteristics and cannot actualize into absolutely anything. The plane is like a circle, which can be divided infinitesimally, but never as a square. Plane of immanence is tightly connected to Deleuzean virtual field of difference – it is the plane from which identities actualize. It is through concepts that plane of immanence is expressed (Schönher, 2013).

Each philosopher establishes its own plane of immanence and populates it with its own concepts. That is why "Philosophy is becoming, not history; it is the coexistence of planes, not the succession of systems" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 59). Concepts are simultaneous, and philosophical thought progresses non-linearly. "Truth" for Socrates is eternal and transcendent, for Michel Foucault it is the product of localized power dynamics – these are

two different coexisting concepts, designating different events. Deleuzoguattarian concept creation seeks to disentangle the creation of concepts from their environmental surroundings, and encourage to create a new plane of immanence with new concepts (even if they verbally appear to be the same) each time a problem is faced (Cole & Mirzaei Rafe, 2017).

The concept of "space" is appropriated through entire spectrum of academic disciplines: from physics to sociology, from psychology to philosophy, from art to engineering. Space is everywhere. However, natural sciences had unfairly snatched it from other disciplines (Lefebvre, 1991). As Deleuze and Guattari (1994) had showed, science and philosophy are working by contrasting principles: science establishes a plane of reference and creates functives, which aim to fixate and describe state of affairs, while philosophy looks at state of affairs and extracts events from it, hence the concept of "space" is expressing different meanings within physics and philosophy. Philosophical concepts are never fixed, and instead of providing concrete and universal knowledge, they open and invite one to learn. Space in physics is a universal system of coordinates, while for Lefebvre (1991), it is a constantly fluctuating field of social relations.

Calling Internet a "space" is another example of a trans-planar movement of a concept: it is obvious that Internet does not abide to laws of regular physical space and its spatiality is entangled with our sociability (Cohen, 2007, p. 210). I might try to solve this problem by asking "what is the space of Internet?", but we already know that such question will yield a fixed solution, not a concept. In this essay I aim to conceptualize the Internet space, and for that I have to start off by establishing a plane of immanence. Here the model of a jealous lover will help to pose a dynamic set of questions: how is this space formed? Where does it direct me to? How movement within this space happens? Why I am in it? Will it be the same tomorrow, or will it change?

Creating concepts is a pedagogical venture, where a philosopher has to indicate a set of singularities, sieve them off from the chaos of the real, uncover their relationships and form concepts, which instead of pointing out to a reference (as in science), or to an affect (as in art), point to an event (Bell, 2016). A question "how movement within Internet space happens?" brings forth a multiplicity of singularities: space, movement, vehicle of movement, Internet itself as a technical infrastructure, the subject which moves, the surroundings of the space which move relatively to the mover, *etc.* This could be continued to infinity, and that was the problem which faced Aristotle when categorizing individualities into a hierarchy branching from substances to individuals. Once you select an individual, you can only point to it, but never grasp the entirety of its existence since it is composed out of difference (Deleuze, 1994). Concept does not aim to capture individuals, but is concerned with becomings: greening of the grass, warming of the sun, flying of the wasp, flowering of the orchid, or movement of the Internet.

The mediating power which allows to move from the plane of immanence to the concept is a conceptual persona. It is neither the philosopher itself, nor it is his concept, but rather a motivation and embodiment of the movements of thought (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994). Conceptual persona could be mapped on the intensities in Deleuzean ontology, because it brings actualities to out of virtual plane. It might be tempting to see the conceptual persona as certain mythological creature, such as Zoroaster or Socrates, but Deleuze and Guattari give clear warnings for such mistakes:

> "they only nominally coincide and do not have the same role. The character of a dialogue sets out concepts […] conceptual personae carry out the movements that describe the author's plane of immanence, and they play a part in the very creation of the author's concepts" (1994, p. 63).

Conceptual persona is like hunger which compels you to sieve out chaos of the kitchen (select ingredients and tools) and actualize dinner out of it. In certain sense, it is the creative vehicle through which the philosopher is able to see the world differently. The complicating factor is that a conceptual persona rarely takes shape of a certain character, rather in most cases it is the underlying faculty of imaginative thought, hazy and unidentified, such as the idiot in René Descartes' *cogito*, or investigator in David Hume's belief (Bell, 2016). In my case I will call this persona the user – an endpoint of Bratton's (2016) model of the stack. The user moves through the space of Internet and seeks to know inner workings of this spatial system: why he ends up where he does, how to characterize the space where he ends up, what moves him there and how to get out, *etc.* I, as an author of this essay, am becoming the user. I will assume his sex to be male, corresponding to my own physical body. He is the vehicle moving my thought – my hunger – and I am his spokesperson – his cook.

4. Establishing a plane

Space is always fragmented: our physical environments have rooms, houses, cities; our mental environments have rational thoughts, fantasies, dreams; our mediated attention moves through space of books, movies or Internet. Any region can be divided infinitesimally. The scope of fragmentation is defined by the state of affairs at which we designate our attention in order to solve the problem. In my work I act as a spokesperson of the user, who seeks to characterize the space from phenomenological perspective, and thus is concerned with layers of website, webpage, and various interactive sections of graphical user interface). By employing the divergent thinking, I am able to come up with questions he might ask: "why am I here?"; "where will I get next?"; "what is this space?"; "where's the exit?". By employing a combination of Lyotard's paralogy and divergent thinking, I am able to come up with a wide range of ways to characterize the Internet space: as bodies of water (information and users moving along the streams of rivers, ending up in variously sized oceans and moving in between them); as a mechanism of an internal combustion engine (information coming inside the online platform as a fuel, where users conduct the ignition and generate both productive energies and reductive residues); as human metabolic system (different tissues of the body metabolizing the user-injected glucose differently, setting different rules for interaction and generating different outcomes of it); or as a meteorological system (characterizing the Internet space as a constantly moving atmospheric pressure system with winds, temperatures, humidities, *etc.*). The user sticks to the latter paralogism since it appears to be the most intuitive way for describing the space. Phenomenologically, we first of all refer to physical outdoor spaces as hot or cold, windy or static, rainy or dry. Concepts of temperature, wind and humidity point out to certain phenomenologically relevant events, thus this path is going to be followed here.

Let us look at a random webpage and see what this state of affairs entails. Regardless of a webpage, information particles and condensed or loose composition of them will be

observed. Here we can extract a concept of "pressure", which is indicative of a certain level of molecular concentration. By looking deeper into the elements of this concept we uncover movement: a closed thermodynamic system is always seeking equilibrium, thus differences in pressure levels are being naturally eliminated by molecules moving from higher pressure to lower pressure territories. This in turn, creates wind.

Pressure is a concept: it points to an event happening within state of affairs. In the described case it is the unstable concentration of molecules and the tendency of the system to harmonize itself. Thinking paralogically, we can set free the concept of molecules from the necessity to refer to physical particles, and see them speaking about information or psychic elements. By extracting the concept of pressure out of the state of affairs, I also extract the relationality and reactivity of the meteorological system. This opens up the Internet space as a set of movements and becomings. It also brings forth a collection of concepts, which can be connected to the first one by bridges, thus such concepts as low or high pressure, temperature, humidity or climate appear as a natural outcome of the user traversing through this newly established plane of immanence. Let us explore what concepts populate this plane and how do they operate as a system.

5. Climates of the Internet

To start off, meteorological system presupposes the existence of climates. The concept of a climate opens up an event: fragmentation of regions in space, and certain rules according to which these regions behave. Climate is the rulebook according to which the localized spatiality, or in other words – the territory – is evolving and changing. Climate is composed out of wide variety of elements: it defines how high temperature can rise, how intense the winds should get, when and how much should rain, *etc.* What is more, while a climate is a meta-system, it still can be divided to smaller regions: cities, beaches, forests, houses and rooms, each of which will have a different levels of their climatic characteristics: varieties pressure, wind, temperature, humidity. But it is not to say that the climate has sub-climates – regions vary only in the values of those characteristics, but not in the limits of possible values of those characteristics. Regions are relative to other regions in the same climate, but are not comparable to regions in other climates. Rules, ratios and properties which govern the dynamics of local pressure system are defined by climate, which is embedded in code – the law of the region. Climatic features get embedded into code of the territory. Paralogistic thinking suggests that the code could take shape of anything from the ideological common sense to *JavaScript*. Climate is the plane which defines possible spatial arrangements and movements through spaces. It is a space-concerned fraction of the virtual plane.

As we had just saw, the concept of climate has a lot of bridges to other meteorological concepts, closest of which are low and high pressures. Varied levels of pressure move affects around – winds, temperatures, humidities. The concept of pressure defines territories – fragments in space – and allows us to both see how various processes happening within these territories are connected, and what the user should expect from a given territory.

Low pressure territories – both climates and regions within those climates – attract winds, have higher temperatures, are getting more misty and display a smoother spatial structure.

Here divergent thinking is promoted and paralogisms are praised. Such territories do not have numerical segmentations, thus are much more difficult to follow. Their contents avoid being caught into "beings" because most of the action within these territories are concerned with becomings. Smooth low pressure spaces are not tied to linear time, they allow various forms of simultaneities: anything can juxtapose anything from anytime. Clocks are not concern here. What happened – happened, and it is gone. The focus is on the now.

High pressure territories are clear, calm, steady, cold and usually windy. They are striated, linearly segmented, numbered, homogeneous. The most common movement of thought here is convergent and defined by homologies. These territories expect singular and static solutions to problems, are very much concerned with identities and seek to impose terroristic requirements to submit to rules of the game raised by the governors of the territories. Since humidity is quite low here, these territories tend to be transparent and can be surveyed in great distances. Numeric segmentation allows to know the end point of the journey before it had even began.

Paralogistically thinking we can see how these concepts are able to open various events of the Internet. Archives, like *Internet Archive* (2021), are pressurized – there are huge amounts of molecules fixed in their positions, nothing is moving anywhere. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* is very pressurized, just as government websites are. In territories where you go to make bank transfers every move is predetermined, every step is made on a rigid grid and there is no way to step away from it. There are no mysteries here, no dark and unexpected corners, nothing new and exciting to find, it is all purely functional, goal oriented and heavily governed.

On the other hand, social media is defined by low pressures. It expects its users to experiment with their identities, to manifest becomings and exchange their molecules with each other. *Facebook* timeline never "is", it always "becomes". Posts within the timeline are never constructed in a narrative form, everything is fragmented into tiny time slots. Each post has its own becoming. What is more, such territories allow rapid exchanges of thought. Comment sections perfectly exemplify this: here different particles are bumping into each other and are exchanging their energies. This is friction. This is heat. And it leads us to the analysis of climatic affects: temperatures, winds, mists and rains.

6. Climatic affects

6.1. Temperature

Where multiplicities meet and molecules start bumping, rubbing, multiplying, jumping from one place to another and so on, the heat increases. Heat is defined by the energy contained within the system – the higher the energy, the more internal movement it contains, the higher is the heat. Varying levels of temperature can be mapped out to Deleuzean ontology as levels of intensities, changes in which result in various actualizations: water changes its aggregate state from ice to vapor along with changes in temperature. Temperature stands in the gap between virtual and actual planes and indicates how gooey is the space: how much non-linear movement can occur within it and how easily the aggregate states of inner contents change.

The concept of temperature uncovers various events: people commenting are verbally exchanging psychic molecules and render the territory lukewarm; flame wars are scorching and melt the space around them, inviting new lines of argument and new people to contribute; search engines are cold and static, terroristically imposing their rules of the game over the users. Since temperature is spatial, it is always relative: certain regions within the same platform can present different levels of temperature – one part of *Facebook* can be very hot, while other stays frozen.

Since heat involves the movement of energies and exchange of molecules, it has a social aspect. Individuals coming to interact within a social media platform express their molecules as much, as the law of the climate allows. Once that happens, mediations of their becomings start circulating the platform as comments, images, likes, shares or something else. By coming into contact with other user, they rub to his molecules and increase heat. In short – reciprocal communication moves the gradient of temperature. Exactly this social aspect of heat renders low pressure territories as lively. They seem to be populated, vivid, engaging. They color the subjective symbolic experience of space through collective meaning making process, which renews the folk-like forms of participatory culture, where each individual is allowed to contribute to the worldmaking process on equal basis. In short, warm places feel like home. People dwell in *Facebook*, and this is one of the events opened by the concept of heat.

6.2. Wind

The concept of heat sheds light on a region of other meteorological concepts which are connected to it by bridges. The summary of the map is as follows: heat – low pressure – wind. Increased temperatures lower the local pressure, what in turn results in wind. The inner workings of the concept have external resonances: wind is directional. That describes a subjective experience of being steered into a low-pressure tunnel leading towards a certain region. Wind is a vector with a direction on it, but the end point is never clear. The wind leads somewhere, but then it dissipates or changes its course. It is possible to generate winds artificially by using large fans or various weather modification methods, but the important feature of it remains – you can never be entirely sure where the subject will finally end up. Wind operates in the virtual field and opens a field of potentials, which actualize in each and every moment again and again. Both wind, and the subject moving along with it, are in a state of becoming – like an arrow, which instead of flying on a line, redirects its course every moment by integrating the absolute actuality of the surrounding environment (Deleuze & Guattari, 2003).

Once again, working paralogically, various windy events in Internet can be uncovered: every link on *Facebook* is a small gust, tailoring the user to click on it; certain advertisements are blowing tenaciously towards so called "click to action" items; viral videos generate fierce blasts as a result of positive feedback loop of interaction (more engagement – higher temperature – lower pressure – stronger winds – more engagement).

Furthermore, it appears that different climates have different agents of wind. While in *Facebook* it is the machine learning algorithms which decide where the wind will blow and how strong will it be, the wind in a highly pressurized bank website is always predetermined

by human design. Algorithmic wind is particularly interesting here due to its agentless and reactive nature (corresponding to its wild counterpart). Designed wind originates out of fans and manipulated air currents, while algorithmic wind reacts to environment and is constantly in becoming: argument under an article lowers the local pressure and in turn, the algorithms generate wind towards the post. Sometimes the argument is just sweltering and wind grows into jet streams lasting days (as in the case of a viral video). On the other hand, some posts are boring, get frozen quickly and no wind ever blows towards them.

Another important inner element of wind is relativity – a subject can stand behind a wall and feel nothing, while an exposed individual will fly along like a kite. Algorithmic winds are unpredictable and can get somebody in air without a notice, while designed wind-tunnel architectures (as in bank websites) move the people along the same lines pretty similarly, and only the shape of the sail (intentions of the user) change their course.

6.3. Rain

Wind is always carrying atmospheric contents of various humidity levels. Sometimes humidity reaches a certain threshold level, which then actualizes a change in aggregate state – condensation occurs and rain starts falling along the wind. Rain is composed out of raindrops, each of which are composed out of particularly arranged molecules. Every raindrop can be defined by internal relationships between its molecules. Raindrops are actualities arisen from the virtual plane. What is more, rain is essential for human survival, since it brings water. This is nothing else but information. Employing paralogical and divergent thinking we can see that Internet brings raindrops of various shapes and sizes: comments, pictures, videos, news articles or books, *etc.* They are collectively generated contents of the Internet which enliven our spatial experiences. Rain gets in our way we want it or not, and it follows the direction of wind.

The concept of rain is extremely paralogical in a sense that it is a trinity: rain, a well and a spring. While primarily the molecule is a raindrop, but depending on the perspective, it also takes the shape of a spring or well. For the system, information particles are rain which have to move around; for the user rain is experienced both as rain which gets in his way, and as landscape of wells from which he can drink; while the author of the post establishes a spring – a positive source of hydration directed to other users. However, I select to speak about this trinity as rain, since rain is a primary experience of user once he enters an Internet space (a swarm of fragmented information particles invading his attention).

Rain also can be dangerous once there is too much of it. Such examples as conspiracy theory or radicalization pipelines overwhelm the user in a hot and windy storm. What is more, the vital aspect of rain puts the user in a spiral: the user comes back and back again to that well where he found the water, and the more time he spends there, the more his taste gets adapted to that specific kind of flavor. With time, his gut bacteria start rejecting water from other sources. Rain is largely connected to taste – the user goes to drink where his instincts lead him. Obviously, a wind from other side can come and destabilize the user with new waters, but retroactive algorithms are keeping such incidents to a minimum.

Thinking paralogically we can state: Internet is rainy. As Burnham (2018) said, Internet is an externalized unconscious, and water is the most universal symbol of unconscious (Adler & Hull, 1980). Algorithmically tailored winds are working as an all-seeing eye: they observe every single move of the user (both conscious and not), captures it as data, analyzes it, develops behavioral models, generates winds accordingly, brings rain on the user of one or another flavor, which then finally is being drank through unconscious scrolling and clicking behavior. The concept of the rain opens an event of unconscious communication in Internet.

6.4. Mist

The concept of rain is in proximity to mist as a different form of humidity. A lot of rain inevitably creates mist, which limits the visibility range. Mist is once again concerned with virtual plane in a sense that it regulates movement potentials within the space. Mist disorients, confuses, terrorizes. Mist is extremely territorial – it keeps the user in a certain region by hiding or even effacing various movement potentials.

While humidity gradient is fluctuating everywhere regardless of scale, it is easiest to see mist as a feature of climates, not of internal fragments of them. Since mist goes along the wind to low pressure territories, it mostly engulfs social media. The architecture of these spaces aims at keeping the user stuck (scrolling) as long as possible. Various design decisions are made to reach these goals: elimination of external hyperlinks, promotion of repetitive usage behaviors via dopamine channeling, easing the commenting process, hiding the space from search engines, *etc. Facebook* is rather opaque – it is not only that the user is stuck in a social bubble due to retroactive algorithmic winds, but it also tends to leave external hyperlinks in shadows (a shared *YouTube* video is receiving much less wind than a *Facebook*-native video upload). *Instagram* is impenetrable – the feed shows only the followed pages, and barely a single external hyperlink is allowed in a whole profile.

Continuing to micro scale, certain comment sections can get even gloomier. Especially low pressure – high temperature sections, which stick the attention of the visitor by bringing tasty rain of comments and promoting the molecular exchange through commenting. However, this is entirely different in *Wikipedia* – a relatively highly pressurized territory which praises the hyperlink. This is a transparent and dry territory, where the user is able can see very far and move rather freely.

The concept of mist sheds light on the territoriality and terrorism of the social media, and on the liberation of the archive and a database. It shows how movement within online spaces is regulated, how certain regions disorient the user, and how all of that is connected to levels of pressure and temperature.

7. Integrative presentation

While the described meteorological system has bridges to a lot more concepts (cyclones and anticyclones, Coriolis force, Archimedes' principle, water cycle, butterfly effect, *etc.*), I decide to stop here, both due to limitations of the essay format, and due to a rather elaborate shape this conceptual machinery already gained. Climates, low and high pressures, temperatures,

wind, rain and mist construct a dynamic and detailed landscape of events, allowing us to see the Internet space from a different angle – as an intricate system of chain reactions. Now I will continue with an integrative analysis of the workings of this system.

The user comes to the space (*Facebook* let us say). For the space, he is not a body, but a particular molecular arrangement of his inner psyche manifesting as behaviors: likes, shares, scrolls, views, comments, *etc.* These objects enter the circulation of the system through input boxes. The arrival of a molecule (in this case, a mediated transmission of it) always comes as a bump into other particles (posts and users), what outputs certain heat through friction. In the case of social media, a new post is a new region which increases the local temperature, lowers the pressure, and gets quickly noticed by algorithmic winds. The multimodal mediation of a psychic molecule implanted into the Internet space kicks off a chain reaction. The molecule itself is a molecule of particularly tasting water, which is tasty for somebody and disgusting for somebody else.

Wind is crucial since it transports users, who then increase temperature. If another user within the climate is taking a specific spatial position where the wind moves, the user gets caught by the breeze and follows its lead. If the internal molecular arrangements of the user at hand are of a particular structure, or in other words – express a certain taste for a certain kind of water – the user comes to the spring as a dematerialized body. His psychic molecules get mediated via views, likes or comments, which then rub into the contents of the spatial region and increase temperature. That is where the feedback loop begins: increased temperature lowers the pressure and generates wind, which then starts catching users who have lower affinity (likeability) towards that certain kind of water. The lower the pressure, the more intense is the wind: the looser are the algorithmic selection criteria, and the longer lasting is the wind-blow. Low pressure climates are special in a sense that here the user receives a unique set of gusts and can be regressively defined by them as a networked identity (Castells, 2000), while high pressure climates are predetermined – no personalization means that winds are controlled from above. Then the level at which the wind affects the user depends solely on his taste.

The highly pressurized climate of an archive brings a different image – that of a static architecture. While such spaces are transparent and do not restrict locomotive movements, they are not flexible enough for interesting feedback loops to happen. Of course, archive can show an algorithmically selected article of the day on a homepage, or even have a comment section, but that does very little to make its space resemble the heterogeneous patchwork of social media. The user comes to the archive to drink from the landscape of wells, but that is a temporal, one-way exchange. No mist detains the user, he stays there as long as his affinity lets him to.

Now we can see the Internet as a space in becoming, where simple actions bring sets of reactions. Obviously, low pressure climates are more reactive, but winds blow, humidity rises and drops and temperatures fluctuate everywhere to a higher or lower degree. It would be interesting to employ this perspective to analyze various "in-between" climates (neither low, nor high pressure), such as search engines, cloud storage tools, video conferencing platforms, online shops and others, since each of these spaces have their own unique set of characteristics. For example, news website is close to archive in its pressurization, but constant updates

of the contents and active comment sections are rising temperatures similarly to social media. Search engines are extremely pressurized, yet, algorithmic winds are adaptive and blow towards low pressure regions. Search engines could also allow to evaluate how climates of certain spaces compare in their temperatures. The in-between and fluctuating nature of the Internet space uncovers itself in *Google*.

8. Chain reactions and thought

This plane of immanence is easily traversable by the user, who can conveniently create new concepts by traveling along the bridges. What is more, the concepts discussed here truly work pedagogically: in order to use them, I have to enter an intense learning process by trying to comprehend what are the elements of the concept and what kind of event does it uncover. The Internet has been explored here by throwing a dice multiple times. The results of this game opened a new set of relationships speaking mostly to the space of social media, thus a further analysis is needed. Just as the concepts themselves expose various potentialities, the creation of this conceptual system is an actualization of potentialities embedded in the plane of immanence. But it will never reach total exhaustion. Analytical application of this system to "in-between spaces" would yield a more adequate evaluation of it. In any case, while the novelty of particular events uncovered by the described conceptual apparatus are arguable (such as the fact that algorithms show posts with more engagement), the system as a whole renders a new picture: a lively and highly connected landscape of the Internet. Paralogical and divergent thinking efforts (combined with creative courage) had led me to the point where nothing is static anymore: here the Internet space uncovers itself as a fluctuating and heterogeneous network of spaces with a variety of characteristics, a fragmented system of parallel becomings, intricately dependent on the users of the spaces and their own becomings.

However, the critical importance of this system can be grasped by focusing on the movement of thought, which in the context of Internet is browsing the Internet, or in other words – exploring its spaces. Climates structure the architectural arrangements and becomings of the territory, and in turn – structure user's thought, who is an innate part of the system. At the moment of interaction his multiplicities connect and extend to a whole communicational system of the Internet, thus each spatial restructuring affects the movement of his thought. The meteorological conceptual apparatus along with chain reactions, uncovers the thinking through the Web. User senses a wind, sees some water which affirms his taste, enjoys a certain level of higher temperature, and thus – contemplates through this voyage. Internet is a movement of thought.

Conclusions

I began with theoretical assumptions and methods of thought, then established plane of immanence and its inhabitant – paralogicaly and divergently thinking user, who finally created a landscape of concepts and presented a possible strategy of application. As we saw earlier, Deleuzoguattarian approach to philosophy is extremely creative and mostly is concerned with the "interesting", not "truthful". The same could be said about Lyotard's paralogy, which

emphasizes the need to think without boundaries. By following these principles and thinking divergently, I managed to come up with innovative results, hence proving a productive value of this methodological combination. Even though such approach might yield inapplicable outcomes, I still had managed to show how these concepts work, relate to each other, and what events do they uncover. While a lot more work is needed to polish this system, I had managed to prove that there are valuable potentials in it.

Such a creative praxis is difficult and time consuming since it generates a huge number of insights which with later analysis appear senseless or excessive (the initial draft of this essay was more than twice as long). However, its potential to create something new is indeed great. You have to throw dice a lot of times in order to collect enough sixes for a conceptual landscape to form, but once that is done – new perspectives get opened and new movements of thought become enabled, while by homologically affirming previous work we will eternally remain immobile and ignorant of the becomings of the world. As Deleuze (1983) interpretation of Friedrich Nietzsche entailed, the same eternally returns, but what is that "same", is difference, thus only by embracing chaos and plunging ourselves into it we will be able to ride its wave and create new modes of being. We had enough of the same, let us make something new.

References

Adler, G., & Hull, R. F. C. (Eds.). (1980). *Bollingen series XX*: *Vol. 9. Part 1: C. G. Jung. Archetypes and the collective unconscious. The collected works of C. G. Jung*. H. Read, M. Fordham, & G. Adler (Eds.). Bollingen Paperback Printing.

Bell, J. A. (2016). *Deleuze and Guattari's What is philosophy?: A Critical Introduction and Guide*. Edinburgh University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748692545

Bratton, B. H. (2016). *The stack: On software and sovereignty*. The MIT Press. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262029575.001.0001

Burnham, C. (2018). *Psychoanalytic horizons. Does the internet have an unconscious? Slavoj Žižek and digital culture*. E. Rashkin, M. Ruti, & P. L. Rudnytsky (Eds.). Bloomsbury Academic.

Castells, M. (2000). *The information age: Economy, society and culture. Vol. 1: The rise of the network society*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Cohen, J. E. (2007). Cyberspace as/and space. *Columbia Law Review, 107*, 210–256.

Cole, D. R., & Mirzaei Rafe, M. (2017). Conceptual ecologies for educational research through Deleuze, Guattari and Whitehead. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 30*(9), 849–862. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2017.1336805

Cook, P. (1998). Thinking the concept otherwise: Deleuze and expression. *Symposium, 2*(1), 23–35. https://doi.org/10.5840/symposium19982126

DeGooyer, Jr. D. H. (2010). Supple praxis: A paralogical strategy for problems. *Communication Theory, 20*(3), 296–322. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2010.01364.x

Deleuze, G. (1994). *European perspectives: A series in social thought and cultural criticism*. *Difference and repetition*. L. D. Kritzman (Ed.). Columbia University Press.

Deleuze, G. (1983). *Nietzsche and philosophy*. Columbia University Press.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (2003). *Athlone contemporary European thinkers. A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Continuum.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (2009). *Penguin classics. Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Penguin Books.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1994). *European perspectives: A series in social thought and cultural criticism. What Is Philosophy?* L. D. Kritzman (Ed.). Columbia University Press.

Gedutis, A. (2002). Jeanas François Lyotard'as: mokslo vaidmuo postmodernioje visuomenėje. *Problemos, 61*, 120–131. https://doi.org/10.15388/Problemos.2002.61.6742

Hayati, A. M., & Hayati, M. (2012). The builder inquires the bricks: A study of Roger Waters' *The Wall* from the viewpoint of Jean Francois Lyotard's paralogy. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 1*(2), 177–184. https://doi.org/10.7575/ijalel.v.1n.2p.177

Internet Archive. (2021). *Internet archive is a non-profit library of millions of free books, movies, software, music, websites, and more.* https://archive.org/

Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space*. Blackwell Publishing.

Lewis, C., & Lovatt, P. J. (2013). Breaking away from set patterns of thinking: Improvisation and divergent thinking. *Thinking Skills and Creativity, 9*, 46–58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2013.03.001

Licata, la E. (2013). Desire, negation and creativity: Deleuze and Wittgenstein on the creative act. *Minerva: An Internet Journal of Philosophy, 17*, 102–120.

Lovink, G. (2011). *Networks without a cause: A critique of social media*. Polity Press.

Lundborg, T. (2009). The becoming of the "Event": A Deleuzian approach to understanding the production of social and political "Events". *Theory and Event, 12*(1). https://doi.org/10.1353/tae.0.0042

Lyotard, J.-F. (1984). *Theory and history of literature: Vol. 10. The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. University of Minnesota Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/1772278

Parikka, J. (2010). *Posthumanities: Vol. 11. Insect media: An archaeology of animals and technology*. C. Wolfe (Ed.). University of Minnesota Press. https://doi.org/10.5749/minnesota/9780816667390.001.0001

Penner, M. A. (2003). Normativity in Deleuze and Guattari's concept of philosophy. *Continental Philosophy Review, 36*, 45–59. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1025197102549

Runco, M. A., & Acar, S. (2012). Divergent thinking as an indicator of creative potential. *Creativity Research Journal, 24*(1), 66–75. https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2012.652929

Runco, M. A., & Okuda, Sh. M. (1988). Problem discovery, divergent thinking, and the creative process. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 17*(3), 211–220. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01538162

Schönher, M. (2013). The creation of the concept through the interaction of philosophy with science and art. *Deleuze Studies, 7*(1), 26–52. https://doi.org/10.3366/dls.2013.0093

Schulte, Ch. M. (2018). Deleuze, concept formation, and the habit of shorthand inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry, 24*(3), 194–202. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800416684872

Schumpeter, J. A. (2008). *Capitalism, socialism and democracy*. HarperPerennial/Modern Thought.

Turkle, Sh. (1995). *Life on the screen: Identity in the age of the internet*. Simon & Schuster Paperbacks.