RHETORIC OF FACEBOOK

Asim Mondal
Asstt. Teacher
New Huda Digambarpur Jr. High School,
Nadia, West Bengal

Abstract

Literally every 'face' is a 'book'. Every new 'friend' (face) has many chapters (book) of relation. But considering from the standpoint of theories, the last word becomes a profound *metaphoric condensation* of the multiple forces that are functioning in the formation of networked individuation and community. In other words, it is a play of innumerable signs in bizarre network of *textuality*. In an age which has reached the height of complexity in technology, in economics, and in human sciences, any phenomenon, especially technological one, cannot be seen merely at the level of literary tropes. Facebook is basically and actually a complex *articulation* at the cross-roads of technology, culture and capitalism in their newest heights. The purpose of this essay is to strategically contemplate on the issues of the status of Facebook as *textuality* across www; the question of authorship of the users; and finally, the question of subjectivity and agency along the line of post-structural/post-modern theorization.

Keywords:- Syntagmatic and paradigmatic axis, Dialogism, Heteroglossia, Differance, Studium , Simulacrum, Hypereality, Cyborgism, Logocentrism, Rhizome, Deterritorialization, Commodity, Collective Individuation, Schizophrenia.

> "The simulacrum is never that which conceals the truth
> – it is the truth which conceals that there is none. The simulacrum is
> true."1

Baudrillard cited it from the Borges fable at the beginning of his *Simulations*. The modern world and its representation are increasingly becoming dominated by the images. The nature of information is rapidly changing with these stereotypical images, and the truth about them can never be deduced as they stand for themselves. As the so called 'reality' which has enjoyed its metaphysical status—from Plato to Kant, particularly the traditional dilemma between 'appearance' which may be deduced from the senses, and 'reality' which is a region of the analytics of the Reason -- for so long, now cannot be separated from the simulacrum. The theorization of the last three decades, at least, tends towards the inseparability of these two universal categories debated over the centuries. The image-dominated culture of today's world has influenced the deepest core of our being—in sociability, human affect, or relation-ties between human beings. Facebook being one of the leading social-networking sites today is

silently working towards the formation of *techno-sociality*. Just a tap on 'like' 'unlike' or 'share' talks the status of 'friendship'. By *techno-sociality* I try to mean a mode of social being mediated through technology, which is also a broad vistas in the culture of cyborgism, and Facebook being a small part of it.

As the popularity of Facebook is widening rapidly, cutting across the categories of age, trades, culture and nationality, questions of its social utility, its impact on habits and behaviours, its capacity of mass mobilization as well as its theoretical implications have begun to be discussed in the recent times. The world of the internet has already revolutionized the concept of space and time in the presentation of information of the world in a mouse-click. But the thing Facebook has so singularly revolutionized is relation between people living in separate polls of the world. It allows users to make 'friends' on a cross-cultural, cross-national basis. It carries forward the process of *collective individuation* in which sociability is reconstructed around networked individualism and social community through quest for the like-minded individuals in a process that combines online interaction with offline interaction, cyberspace and the local space. Facebook, in this regard, is a profound *metaphoric condensation* of the process of social and economic rearrangement that is taking place on a large scale. But 'book' often hides or masquerades issues the structure and function of which lie deep in the unconscious of the text. The whole structure dismantles when stray-away threads are pulled up. Precisely, 'book' contains signs and in containing signs it becomes a full-scale operation of signification, of *textuality*.

TOWARDS A SEMIOLOGY OF FACEBOOK

Wittgenstein wrote in *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, "The limits of my language are the limits of my world". Therefore, wherever there is a possibility of social communication, there is a language, and yet again a possibility of *textuality*, a term whose implication carried to a game of *ad indefinitum* in any system of language by Jacques Derrida .Language by no means implies sets of alphabetic letters arranged on a horizontal plane. Much more than that. Even non-letter form of communication owes a linguistic property – such as non-verbal gestures, pictures even the glossolalia, given that they are put in authentic principles of communication. In this way a silent film (even without subtitles), mime or pantomime means just in the way a Hollywood film means to a modern audience. Considering Facebook it may be defined as a series of posts (visual, audio, audio-visual) arranged on a vertical plane to designate particular status updates of its users in a presumed mode of social communication. Analyzing structurally each post belonging to any order of perception functions itself as a sign having a signified to its audience or even to the post-maker himself. The picture, or in case of video clip which may have series of signs dispelling series of referents consequently, with its colour(like black and white signifies nostalgia, sepia trauma or tragedy etc.), composition and setting forms a visual signs which inevitably produce meanings which are its referent. Here the referent is determined by its context. A simple model will serve the purpose taking it granted the habitual experience of a common Face book user:

        Context
        Message
        Addresser (*Post-Maker*) ---------------------------- Addressee (*Post-Viewer*)
        Contact
        Code (*Visual, Audio-Visual*)

On Faceboook the speech communication is replaced by image communication, excepting during chat hours. Every post on Facebook thus can be analyzed through several functions of language. Saussure pointed out that language works through relations of combination and association. Simple sentence like 'the empire writes back' relies on two axis : this sentence works by horizontal spacing of words which follows a grammar(SVO pattern) and a syntax. This is the syntagmatic axis of language. On the other hand, the sentence has been structured through a series of choices. There are , for example , a number of words that could be chosen instead of the word 'empire' (for example 'kingdom', 'colony' etc.): this is the vertical axis or the paradigmatic axis of language.

Now, looking at the posts on Facebook also reveals two distinctive structures— syntagmatic and paradigmatic axis . Though unlike an English sentence, posts are arranged on vertical axis which is programmed to be slid up and down, nonetheless, they obey the principle of combination. The reason behind this is the post-maker's will to invest the posts a meaning, like a sentence. During multiple posts, technically the user is careful enough to arrange them in a way as to construe a narrative out of them. Then each photograph corresponds to another on a relational basis. For example, a tourist post-maker would normally chose to record his time- to-time escapades on his Timeline to construct a story of journey, hence linearity of development, whereas routine-based posts, when taken collectively, develop in the same way narrative of mundane activities through rules of grammar and syntax. In both cases posts are relational, they combine to one another causally to make an agreement like Subject followed by Verb followed by Object. Hence, it is the syntagmatic axis. By the time he posts photographs he consciously ransacks photo-archives to bring out the most suitable ones, given that each photograph is an individual sign carrying unique meaning. This axis of choice is the paradigmatic axis. Besides being like elements in la lang, the *social* character of communication does not lose sight of. Every contact on Facebook is like individual speech act. And every speech is deeply involved in innumerous social contexts. Which is why, as being one of prime reasons, Facebook gets its name *social* networking site. Seeing in this way dialogism becomes a key concept. Bakhtin in *The Dialogic Imagination* argues that language is always 'evaluative', always involved in social ideology. There is no innocent, objective language—a point which can be made clear by picking up a key Facebook word 'friend'. People make friends cutting across categories such as age, trades and profession. In real society friendship follows various social registers like friend in class-room, in football ground, in a job interview and many other ways. But on Facebook it all goes in a umbrella term though not altogether disobeying its varying social situations. In every instance of 'friendship' on Facebook there go different sets of ideologies in varying form of address and treatment. Even the responses to posts show their *social* groundedness. People respond to their friends' posts in ways which precedes the actual situation of the post. Ways in which addresses are respectively manoevoured by the established codes prior to the situation. Thus words are not simply their own, but dialogic, possessing within them what has already been said before them, an 'other'. Even a picture-post which may be 'liked' or 'unliked' defines this *social* character. In *Camera Lucida* Roland Barthes uses two terms—stadium and punctum. ' The *studium* is' Barthes writes, 'the order of *liking*, not of *loving*; it mobilizes a half-desire, a demi-volition; it is the same sort of vague, slippery, irresponsible, interest one takes in the people, the entertainments, the books, the cloths one finds "all right".'2   Barthes farther argues that stadium is intricately linked to the photographer's intention which in term comes from the social myths. According to him stadium is reconciliation between the photography and society. Thus in *liking* a photograph we actually respond to the pre-established codes of choices valorized

by society, since we actively participate 'in the figures, in the faces, in the gestures, in the settings, and in the actions'. Facebook, in this way, becomes a site of heteroglossia or a multi-voiced *text*.

With *heteroglossia* stability of signs becomes increasingly unsettling about their signified. Signs cannot hold in position the meanings. There can be no origin of meaning, since it is always comprised of pre-existing textual elements, like a 'tissue of quotations'. On a parallel scale individual posts being 'multi-voiced' in nature, they begin to break free from their originatory denotation to roam freely on the level of connotation. In this case not only the written message of the post but the post itself with its range of connotations in color, contours, angle , mis-`en-scene and every other technical properties become prior-established norms of photography. Like language where every sign falls back on every other, on Facebook every picture-post refers back to every other picture-post without origin. To be more precise, each post as a discreet sign has a signified --and here the signified comprises of not only a time-spot contact, but also the laws of photographic industry—and that signified becomes a sign to become signified again of another sign---*ad indefinatum.* These norms enter our psychic domain through professional photography, films, magazines, or soap-operas. As institutions of art they train our eyes and their logic works through us in our photography. Which is why, the presumed uniqueness of each picture-post loses into mayhem of already sanctioned laws of photographic technicities. Every post carries with it a deep *contamination* of other posts ever regressingly. This process of infinite regression is the celebrated *differance* of Jacques Derrida.

The term *net-work*, in another way, also comes into play. Written in this way *text* and *net-work* become interchangeable. Traditionally, a *text* is a piece of cloth having intersecting warp and woof. *Net-work* in the like manner is an interwoven mode of communication where persons and posts are intertwined in bizarre way. In his *Theory of the Text* Barthes argues that *signifiance* (the process of signification or meaning making) is an active process of production. Barthes writes:

> 'Once the text is conceived as production (and no longer as product),'signification' is no longer   an adequate concept. As soon as the text is conceived as a polysemic space where the paths of several possible meanings intersect, it is necessary to cast off the monological, legal status of signification and to pluralize it'. 3

Or in *From Work to Text* he writes:

> 'The text is plural. which is not simply to say that it has several meanings, but that it accomplishes the very plural of meaning: an irreducible(and not merely an acceptable)plural…it answers not to an interpretation, even a liberal one, but an explosion, a dissemination'. 4

This is the 'explosion' that blows up meanings to scatter them into unknown fissures and cracks beyond the reaches of a 'work', beyond the solid meaning of Timeline posts. Every post thereon starts encoding and decoding themselves in the game of non-stop production and dissemination.

THE PRESENCE AS GHOSTLINESS

The word 'author' comes from the Latin verb *augere*,' to make to grow, originate, promote, increase ,which later in the medieval period developed into the words *auctor* and *auctoritas*, with their sense of authority. This sense of the word is somehow retained through the Romantics until the publication of Michel Foucault's *What Is an Author*(1969) in which he shows the discursive

production of an author, The author is according to him, 'the ideological figure by which one marks the manner in which we fear the proliferation of meaning'. Coupled with it perhaps the largest blow came from Roland Barthes. In his celebrated essay *Death of the Author (1967)* Barthes theoretically postulates that writing involves 'the destruction of every voice, of every point of origin.'

In our habitual experience we find everything which we come to grip with an immense feeling of authorship, and Facebook is not an exception to it. While using social media like this, a common user very consciously creates his status quo among the 'friends' without knowing his attempt to create an articulate authorial position rests on a faultline. In terms of tags, statements, photo updates he follows an utmost selection so as to drive home 'friends' his imposing style-statements , as if he successfully arranges the signifieds around himself much like an auto-biographer does. While doing this he is completely unaware that his posts, comments , shared pages, or his profile picture -- even more dangerously -- are used , cited , re-cited several times by the other users or authors at the other ends of the network. And each time of citing a post its referents regress according to motive and context accordingly leaving its purpose and meaning under permanent erasure. Therefore, words (or posts) of an author becomes the corollary of the other authors. And if an author is at loss of words, what does, then, qualify him as an author?

Absolutely there is no author. The function of the author , as Barthes points out, is like an 'anchor' who does all to choke the plurality of meaning and multiplicity of voices. The 'myth of the author is particularly convenient one for capitalists or commercialized ideas of reading,' writes Graham Allen, 'since it allows for a model in which works can be deciphered , successfully interpreted , fully understood and thus tamed.'5 This is the *function* of the author located in the discourse of capitalism. But for the time being, I reserve the discourse of capitalism and subjectivity for the next section of this paper. Thus the figure of the author prevails as logocentrism, like God. Logos or image is susceptible to be re-written, cited, interpreted in the absence of an author, unlike the phonic which not being logos remains immediately to the consciousness. Hence, logos for Derrida are always an absent centre which merely purports to be a 'presence'. Logos is an ever-present possibility of 'death'.

The sense of authorship may be noteworthy from another angle. Conventionally the word author stands in good relation to an owner, since signature in any work-- may not be necessarily a literal one-- individualizes it, and surely modern copyright rules of book consolidates the fact that an author is the legal owner of his work. In his seminal book *Camera Lucida* he argues that looking at one's own photograph causes a 'disturbance'. 'This disturbance is ultimately one of ownership', Says Barthes. And this question of ownership hangs around due to a 'disassociation of consciousness' following the cause that --

> 'The portrait-photograph is closed field of forces. Four image repertoires intersect here,   oppose and distort each other. In front of the lens, I am at the same time: the one I think I am, the one I want others to think I am, the one the photographer thinks I am, and the one he makes use of to exhibit his art…each I am (or let myself be) photographed, I inevitably suffer from a sensation of inauthenticity…I am neither subject nor object but a subject who feels he is becoming an object: I then experience a micro-version of death(of parenthesis): I am truly becoming a specter' 6

In this way, user/author on Facebook ends up dispossessed of himself even before uploading his photograph, and becomes an objective, a common property for many other users across the world wide web.

THE SCHIZOPHRENIC SELF AND THE SOCIETY

Facebook could be taken as a profound manifestation of the *techno-social* order fuelled by the complex crossover of the politics of *power*, *capitalism* and *humanitarianism*. It becomes a bit of the last mentioned category since it never forsakes the utopianic principle of non-hierarchical, non-regimented *social* relationships. As the latest technological altruism, it allows us to live in a world of space, and time which runs like a microcosmic society. It is a *simulations*, to use the term Baudrillard used, dissolving the border line of the imaginary and the real, much like a Disneyland or any other units of modern technological artifices.

Primarily, Facebook means to us about sharing, liking, disliking things according individual choices. In other words, Facebook is meaningful as its use confers certain form of selfhood upon us. But things turns completely reverse when questions are asked: What provokes a user to create an identity in addition to having one in living in a society? Then is there a 'lack' of a sort in living a mundane life in a society? And if this is so, then what constitutes that 'lack', and how far does a common user proceed to create an alternative/additional identity in a virtual reality? And finally how far does it help us realizing our agency in an alternate space?

There is no denying that Facebook has engineered an architecture of 'curved reality' constituted by series of photographs, images , videos, and tags which let the users have a sensation of concocted version of 'reality'. This technologized 'reality' has split apart the lived 'reality' along the 'reality' of our 'self'. We now experience of our feeling, thoughts, and sensations as series of disconnected stream of images. And if the world has ended up as bunch of images, it is not without reducing our psyche to the same bundle of images. But again they do not refer to much beyond themselves. So we experience the world and its people as random collections of *flat* meaningless images which have no coherent relation to one another, or at least copies of one another. Along with this we learn to experience ourselves as similarly meaningless collection of disconnected signs. We experience like a schizophrenic. This implies a radical flow of desire to make new connections, to form new dimensions, and to 'deteritorialize' our being. The structural psychoanalysis would come to succour with a lacking subject in the oedipal archetype, perhaps with a theory of repression in the symbolic order and the subject's narcissistic identification with the images in the virtual world. But the emanation of the social media occurred at such a time when theory of the multiplicity is not only a political position of post-modernity, but 'lived experience' of some sort. To trace the roots of an urge to create an 'identity' despite having more empirical one in society is surely to be located as a 'lack'. And this 'lack' may not be the Lacanian binary logic. This is lacking empty-signified which by lacking itself disrupts the process of signification in circular circuit. Baudrillard in *Simulations* accepts the operation of a form of power concealed as 'ideology' to describe the 'attraction' of Disneyland at the level of 'social microcosm'. He continues,'

'But this ('attraction') masks something else. And this "ideological" blanket functions as a cover for a simulation of the third order: Disneyland exists in order to hide that is the "real" country, all of "real" America that is Disneyland.' 7 He describes Disneyland as a 'deterrence machine' which is 'neither true nor false' In other words; the lack is that of consciousness of the real and its simulated copy. Desire find its salvation in the circuitry of empty-referents, since there should be no discontentment when there is hardly anything to refer back to more empirical 'reality' than that to be found in 'virtual reality'. In this context it must be said that Facebook operates at the level of the phenomenological reduction in the purport of presenting only the essence, and in so doing it brushes aside history, context, or the origin ; every Facebook post,

especially the pictographic content, becomes a free-floating signifier. When a signifier is not chained down to particular referents it can encompass or even conceal some redundant signifieds. In case of the majority of Facebook posts, we find this tendency of avoiding the redundant. Because, before uploading, posts normally undergo a filtration process. Ideology functions over here in the filtration of redundancy. In the age of global consumerism nobody wants to fall behind in the process of global citizenship with its set standards of sophistication, technology, utilitarianism etc. To lose steps is to lose the race. Ideology--- always concealed or rather saturated in the cultural production of commodities—works through us to supervise over the selection we make. Each selection and the simultaneous process of rejection nullify the ideologies working behind the Facebook Timeline. In this way Facebook is not majorly different from a TV ; the latter disseminates whereas the former reflects these 'ideological blanket(s)'. Thus both become the 'deterrence machine(s)' of Baudrillard.

Then comes the second question, what dissolves the consciousness of these two frontiers so meticulously. The colossal force that has so revolutionized technology and the face of the planet is capitalism. There is no escape of its insinuating presence into the veins and vessels of our social life. It is pretty tempting over here to juxtapose the theoretical positions of Jean Baudrillard and Fredric Jameson, as they are very close, in fact, in expostulating debates over the production of the simulacrum/ 'commodity culture'. In his most eulogized work *Post-modernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism (1991)*, Jameson argues that the common factor that has hold us together today is TV commercials; again reference to post-modern visual factor. It is through the visuals in the advertisements, which as signs dispense of signifieds which stand for themselves for their truth value. In the introductory section of P*ostmodernism* he describes one of its leading feature as 'a new depthlessness, which finds its prolongation both in contemporary "theory" and in a whole new culture of the image or simulacrum; a consequent weakening of historicity, both in our relationship to public History and in the new form of our private temporality…'8 Jameson locates 'new depthlessness' in a broad spectrum of the loss of historical consciousness and the consequent new individualized time. Engulfed by the constant flux of simulacrum, we lose sense of the difference between 'new' and 'old' which is a prime constituent category of mutating times and is cultures. The concept of 'newness' disappears, since there is nothing 'old' to contrast with it. And the resultant sense is the liquidated consciousness of 'public History'. The catalyst which organizes these is the postmodern commodity culture. He describes it as '… an immense dilation of its sphere (the space of commodities), an immense and historically original acculturation of the Real…', a quantum leap in 'reality' which is a 'commodity rush'*,* or ' our "representation" of things tending to arouse an enthusiasm and a mood swing not necessarily inspired by the things themselves.' 9 The key phrase Jameson uses here is 'our "representation" of things'. '(R)epresentation' is always a function of the symbolic order. Therefore, it is not our need but a refraction of it is manipulating our choices. And Jameson is using 'the Real' in the Lacanian sense which is a need (like hunger) that enters the symbolic, but itself remains on the outer limits of signification, that is a non-signifiable category in language. Again, in an era which is dominated by stream of simulacrums in which we find our desires, our cordial being *represented,* 'devours' the cardinal quality of 'reality' or the 'things themselves', like the Real which is always there but unlocatably. Thus 'reality' becomes what we *re-present* it both in the Baudrillardian and Jamesonian sense. Facebook being self-referential, as I have discussed earlier, is a 'lack' (or a 'need'?) which reflects our 'representation' of that which (our desire of a unified ontological being) we impose

on it. As 'subjects' we see our being glowing in the 'reality' in the electronic space of the Facebook Timeline, almost narcissistically.

The last issue that is to be meditated on is the question of 'agency'. Agency is a philosophical term which implies realization of will force or can be taken as capacity towards actions which a subject aspires to. This critical term has been used by the Feminists and the Postcolonialist as subject's political liberty which he/she acquires in the process of dislocating the discourses – the discourses which have signified them in particular ways such as a *fe-male* or *slave*. These terms are out-and-out outcome of discursive practices. Hence, they are saturated with unequal power. The agency is enacted or recuperated, according to Bhabha, until subjects imitate and displace the discourses through performance of beliefs, culture, or genealogy. And the identities thus emerge is called 'hybridity'. But theorization of later times (Postmodernism or Poststructural Marxism) takes the notion of agency to another degree. Latest development in this field is schizophrenia of Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari *in A thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, where they conceive 'subjectivities' in terms of 'intensities, 'new connections', 'deterritorialization', 'lines of flights', 'flows' etc. Subjectivities or social identities are formed like rhizome which takes in all the mentioned terms. According to Delueze and Guattari, a rhizome is:

> '… unlike trees or their roots, the rhizome connects any point to any other point, and its traits are not necessarily linked to the traits of the same nature; it brings into play very different regimes of signs of signs, and even nonsign states. The rhizome is reducible neither to the One nor the multiple. It is not the One that becomes Two or even directly three, four, five, etc. It is not a multiple derived from the One, or to which One is added (n + 1).' 10

Or they say a little later:

> 'In contrast to the centered (even polycentric) systems with hierarchal modes of communication and preestablished paths, the rhizome is an accentered, nonhierarchical, nonsygnifying system without a General and without organizing memory or central automation, defined solely by a circulation of states.' 11

Rhizome is a unnervingly complex structure of 'connection', 'abandonment' and 'new connections'. It connects to other structures through 'lines of flight'. Thus it shifts to 'deterritorialize' and forms new plateaus. Facebook is a good example of rhizomatic constructions. It connects 'friends' to 'friends'. The process of connection is never of a binary nature, or merely a mode of communication between persons of two people's friend lists. Very often friends from other territory intrude upon the territories of these two friends lists. The intruder – when 'request' accepted – always composes a 'line of flight'. And then 'new connections' are made to proliferate into unknown areas of many other new 'friendships'; it is an outlet of inception to many other friend lists. Facebook 'friendship' status is always in the *'milieu'*. It neither begins nor ends. It flows. It is a dynamic of becoming, and always new regimes of signification. Thus like rhizome Facebook is a becoming of relations counted as (n – 1). Friendship on Facebook is 'linear multiplicities with n dimensions having neither subject nor object', where every addition of new friend is amount to subtraction on the plane of multiplicities. In this form agency could no longer be accepted as a concrete site of self-articulation. In drawing out the full implications of Deleuze and Guattari's work, Brian Massumi claims that:

'… there is no [longer any] self-sufficient agency that can qualify as intentional. There are varying degrees of choice at successive threshold states. The 'will' to change or stay the same is not an act of determination or the part of a unified subject in simple response to self reflection or an internal impulse. It is a state of self-organized indeterminacy in response to complex causal constraints. It constitutes a real degree of freedom, but the choice belongs to the person; it is objectively co-caused at the cross-roads of chance and determinacy.'12

Basically, on the other hand, there is no contradiction to the latest development of capitalism, as Slavoj Zizek claims in *Organs without Bodies: Deleuze and Consequences* while reviewing Deleuze and Guattari's works. Zizek points out contemporary neo-liberal economics is far from being centralizing, consolidating or homogenizing tendency. On the contrary, contemporary global capitalism thrives on the very deterritorializing dynamics that Deleuze and Guattari theorized to show that micropolitics could be a good resistance to the global capitalist system. Contemporary global capitalism thrives on the surplus-value production, as Massumi points out. In its target of intensified profitability it *hijacks our* affects. Contemporary consumerist culture captures libidinal energies and in doing actually diversifies them. Bernard Stiegler has also argued that globalized capitalism now aims to capture and control the *collective individuation*, largely through cultural-technological networks and virtual imaginaries that process and manipulate consumer's desires. He terms this process as 'synchronization' of subjective experience. The technologically mediated selection of stereotypical images and affective responses serve to bind the libidinal energies for the purposes of enhanced consumption.

Then, again it must be said that in the age of global capitalism, Facebook is not outside of the trajectories of economics. Like other media it is also part and parcel of large-scale consumerist culture. All those elements that go to constitute Facebook page are direct emanation from the culture of consumerism. The Timeline posts, especially those photographs, bear heavy inscriptions of the 'culture industry'. The affects thereon immanent in each in ever new form or modulation as choices are diversified by the capital. The modern capital, along the line of Zizek and Massumi, as already a decoded flow multiplies the choices in terms of consumption by the Facebook users in their orientation towards a *Face-less individuation* (the notion of differance and author's death also merge here). The status of Facebook, in the final words, in our day-to-day life, during recreation, or in the time informational necessity is that it binds us into the circular traffic of consumption and reproduction. And it is this economy of cultural consumption that our 'nomadic' identities merge with the dynamics of capitalist power.

Works Cited:
1.Baudrillard, Jean. *Simulations*. New York, Semiotext(e), 1983, pp. 1
2. Barthes, Roland. *Camera Lucida*. Trans. Richard Howard, New York, Hill and Wang,1981,pp. 27 ,print.
3. *Barthes, Roland*. Ed. Graham Allen. Routledge Critical Thinkers, London/New York, 2003, pp.84, Print.
4. Barthes, Roland. *The Rustle of Language*. Trans. Richard Howard, New York, Hill and Wang, 1986, pp.59, print.
5. *Barthes, Roland*. Ed. Graham Allen. Routledge Critical Thinkers, London/New York, 2003, pp.74, Print.

6. Barthes, Roland. *Camera Lucida*. Trans. Richard Howard, New York, Hill and Wang,1981,pp.13-14,print.

7. Baudrillard, Jean. *Simulations*. New York, Semiotext(e), 1983, pp. 14

8. Jameson, Fredric. *Postmodernism,or The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, Durham, Durham University Press, 1991, pp.5, print.

9. ibid. pp. ix.

10. Deleuze, Gilles, Guattari, Felix. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Trans. Brian Massumi, Mineapolis/ London, University of Minnesota Press, 1987, pp. 21, print.

11. ibid.

12. E. Hall, Donald. *Subjectivity*, Routledge, New York/ London, 2004, pp. 120, print.