

multiple on the basis of a centered or segmented higher unity" (Deleuze & Guattari 1987: 16). The authors sum up the imaginary of a rhizomatic structure as follows:

„In contrast to centered (even polycentric) systems with hierarchical modes of communication and preestablished paths, the rhizome is an acentered, nonhierarchical, nonsignifying system without a General and without an organizing memory or central automaton, defined solely by a circulation of states. What is at question in the rhizome is a relation to sexuality—but also to the animal, the vegetal, the world, politics, the book, things natural and artificial—that is totally different from the arborescent relation: all manner of „becomings"" (Deleuze & Guattari 1987: 21).

One can now trace this metaphor to the cyberspace and its virtual communities. The internet being a network that consists of nodes and connections between these nodes has evolved in a non-hierarchical rhizomatic sense. There is no single entry and exit points to the internet, no tree structure. This was the early spirit of the internet and throughout this writing it will be explored how various groups were and are active defending the rhizomatic character of the internet. In his essay on Cryptoanarchy, Timothy C. May, specifies that anarchy – in a cryptoanarchist perspective – does not necessarily mean that there are no local hierarchies, indicating that on a local level various forms (also hierarchical) of organization might be existent that still operate outside of governmental control (May 1994). The problematic implications of this perspective shall be discussed at a later point. Stemming from the mid-90s' cybercommunity, a time of intense contestation about the course of cyberspace, John Perry Barlow published a „Declaration of the Independence of Cyberspace" as a response to the Telecommunications Act of 1996, which inclusively illustrates the refusal of integration into state structures: