

PAPER DETAILS

TITLE: Post-hümanizm ve posthümanizm söylemlerinin yersizyurtsuzlasma kavramı üzerinden yeniden incelenmesi

AUTHORS: Muhsin Yanar

PAGES: 1347-1361

ORIGINAL PDF URL: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/3447313>

80. Post-hümanizm ve posthümanizm söylemlerinin yersizyurtsuzlaşma kavramı üzerinden yeniden incelenmesi

Muhsin YANAR¹

APA: Yanar, M. (2023). Post-hümanizm ve posthümanizm söylemlerinin yersizyurtsuzlaşma kavramı üzerinden yeniden incelenmesi. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (36), 1347-1361. DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.1369587.

Öz

Dört sanayi devrimi boyunca bilim ve teknoloji, insanlığı, kültürleri ve günlük pratikleri değiştirme, geliştirme ve dönüştürme arzusuyla hareket etmiştir. Bir toplum mühendisliği türü olarak nano-, biyo-, bilgi- ve bilişsel teknolojiler gibi modern teknolojiler, yaşam alanları ve bedeni kontrol ederek bu değişim ve dönüşüme katkıda bulunmuştur. Bu teknolojiler toplumu ve bedeni ele geçirme, kontrol ve disipline etme hususlarında gelecekteki olasılıkları keşfetmekle kalmamakla beraber bunların sömürülmesine de katkıda bulunmuştur. Yani, ‘tek boyutlu’ insanlar, teknolojinin egemen olduğu (ilkel) bir ortamda yaşamaya zorlanmış ve çevreleri ve bedenlerinden yersizyurtsuzlaştırılıp yeniden yurtlandırılmışlardır. Post-hümanizm ve post-hümanizmin kapsamı dikkate alındığında, bu diskurlar fiziksel ve kavramsal olarak insana ait yerleşik sınırlar, yapılar ve hiyerarşiler, akışkanlık ve melezlik geliştirmekte; yeni/alternatif sınırlar oluşturmakta; çeşitli kültürlerin, alternatiflerin bol olduğu yeni veya alternatif sistemler oluşturmaktadır. Bu bağlamda, bu makale post-hümanist ve posthümanist diyaloglarda yersizyurtsuzlaşma ve yeniden-yerliyurtlulaşma kavramlarını irdelemektedir. LaGrandeur’un post-hüman/izm ve posthüman/izm tanımlarına dayanan bu makale, post-hümanist ve posthümanist tartışmaların insan/insan olmayanlar kavramını hem yersiz yurtsuzlaştıran hem de yeniden yurtlandıran olarak nasıl görülebileceğini inceleyecektir.

Anahtar kelimeler: post-hümanizm, posthümanizm, yersizyurtsuzluk, yeniden yurtlaştırma, Deleuze

Revisiting post-humanism and posthumanism as deterritorialization

Abstract

Throughout the four industrial revolutions, science and technology have been driven by the desire to modify, improve, and transform humankind, cultures, and everyday practices. Additionally, as a type of social engineering, modern technologies such as nano-, bio-, information-, and cognitive technologies have contributed to these alterations and transformations by controlling living environments and bodies. Not only have these technologies discovered future possibilities in conquering, controlling, and disciplining society and the body but they also have also contributed to their exploitation. That is, ‘one-dimensional’ humans live in a primitive environment dominated by technology, and they have become deterritorialized from their surroundings and bodies and re-territorialized to the new. Given the breadth of post-humanism and posthumanism, one could argue that post-humanism and posthumanism consider how the human, both as a concept and as a body, become deterritorialized and reterritorialized, as the former break down established boundaries, structure, hierarchies, and develop fluidity and hybridity, and the latter creates new or alternative

¹ Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Ağrı İbrahim Çeçen Üniversitesi, Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu, Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu (Ağrı, Türkiye), myanar@agri.edu.tr, ORCID ID:0000-0003-2523-608X [Araştırma makalesi, Makale kayıt tarihi: 16.08.2023-kabul tarihi: 20.10.2023; DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.1369587]

boundaries and set new or alternative systems in which various cultures, alternatives abound. In this sense, this paper delves into the concepts of deterritorialization and reterritorialization in post-humanist and posthumanist dialogues. Based on LaGrandeur's definitions of post-human/ism and posthuman/ism, the paper aims to explore how post-humanist and posthumanist discussions might be viewed as both deterritorializing and reterritorializing the concept of humans and non-humans.

Keywords: Post-humanism, posthumanism, deterritorialization, reterritorialization, Deleuze

“Yes. In this environment, the human spirit will be fundamentally changed. People will become—”
 “You mean that in this new environment, people will become new people?”
 “New people? No, Lieutenant Colonel. People will become... non-people.”
 — Cixin Liu, *The Dark Forest*

1. Introduction

In her preface titled “İkili Olmayan Benlik” (translated as “Personhood Without Boundaries”) in the book *Edebiyatta Posthümanizm* (translated as “Posthumanism in Literature 2020”), Sherryl Vint provides a definition of posthumanism as a disciplinary field that has emerged in response to various societal and academic shifts in the late twentieth century. This field aims to address the erosion and rejection of the assumed centrality of certain human conceptions, while acknowledging the existence of multiple ways to define human identity that have been developed through scientific and technological advancements. These advancements include the observation of animal life to bridge the perceived gap between humans and nonhumans, the creation of novel entities through synthetic biology, and research into artificial intelligence and artificial life (2020, p. 9). In his article “Can Posthumanism Save Us?” Kevin LaGrandeur argues that posthumanism, as a significant emerging philosophical and scientific idea, has the potential to bring about a fundamental transformation in our understanding of the universe, our own existence, and our interconnectedness with it (2022, p. 1). The milieu in which our life is entirely techno-saturated is what has led to this paradigm shift. The environment in which we exist, combined with the technology that surrounds us, has a significant role in shaping our understanding of human existence, both in isolation and in relation to other non-human entities. The interwoven relationship between humans and non-human entities challenges and redefines conventional human boundaries by examining the ways in which people interact with and impact many species outside their own.

In the realm of post-humanist and posthumanist literature, it is common to encounter instances of entanglement whereby several entities, including humans, non-humans, human-nature, human-machine, and human-animal, engage in “intra-active” relationships involving numerous links (2003, 815). Neil Badmington posits that within this literary context, individuals may see a gradual decline in established humanistic convictions, alongside the emergence of novel reinterpretations pertaining to physical forms, cognitive processes, personal aspirations, limitations, and epistemological frameworks (2010, p. 375-6). LaGrandeur provides a conceptual elucidation of posthumanism by distinguishing between the concepts of post-humanism and posthumanism. Post-humanism, as a critical and philosophical perspective, involves the examination and evaluation of the tendency to prioritize the human species as the ultimate reference point for evaluating and understanding the world. It also encompasses the questioning of the indispensability of the human category itself, as well as the identification and scrutiny of the prejudices that are based on factors such as skin color, gender, ethnicity, and many others. This perspective examines the changes and consequences associated with

the concept of the human that goes beyond conventional understandings of humanity, such as those found in classical and enlightenment humanism. These traditional conceptions, exemplified by Da Vinci's Vitruvian Man, have historically excluded certain groups, including black individuals, indigenous peoples, women, and nonhuman entities such as plants, animals, and other life forms, from being considered fully human (Braidotti, 2010). The perspective also challenges the notion that people are distinct from or superior to the natural world, instead advocating for a comprehensive perspective that recognizes the interconnectedness and interdependence between humans and nonhumans. The change of viewpoint has the potential to serve as a catalyst for prompting substantial efforts toward mitigating the rapid decline of animal populations and the consequential degradation of ecosystems (Theresa, 2023).

As explained by LaGrandeur, posthumanism pertains to the potential alterations that individuals, including humans, may experience because of adopting transhumanist strategies and procedures that include the integration and assimilation of technology, ultimately leading to the development of augmented cyborgs and extraordinary beings (2022, p. 2). The concept of posthumanism delves into the implications for the human body, human nature, human agency, and subjectivity, as well as the bodies of non-human entities and technological advancements when various technologies such as cybernetics, informatics, nano-, bio-, information, and cognitive technologies are used (Dobrin, 2022). The current situation might be compared to a critical juncture in the evolution of life when human intervention enables life to assume self-control and shape its own future (Simon, 2013, p. 2). As stated by Simon, the novel stage is characterized by the emergence of new social entities, such as cyborgs, artificial intelligence, and virtual communities. These entities are produced via identities that are inherently fluid, flexible, and subject to change, beyond the limitations imposed by biological boundaries. As a result, a new social order is established (2013, p. 2). With this description, posthumanism recalls the breadth of transhumanism in the sense that it transcends traditional human restrictions, including both physical and mental capabilities, because of the effect of digital, biological, and chemical technology. This is akin to the way transhumanism conceptualizes the potential for humans to transcend their current limitations. This transformation results in an individual who transcends the boundaries of humanity and becomes something more than a mere human. This makes a reference to the ongoing state of human existence as an incessant progression toward becoming the everlasting manifestation of technological advancements (Deleuze and Guattari, 2009). The previous discourse pertaining to post-humanism and posthumanism emphasizes its extensive breadth. It can be argued that these theoretical frameworks analyze the ways in which individuals, both conceptually and physically, undergo processes of deterritorialization and reterritorialization. This occurs as post-humanism challenges and deconstructs established boundaries, institutions, and hierarchies, ultimately fostering a state of fluidity and hybridity. On the other hand, posthumanism introduces new or alternative limitations and develops alternative frameworks that can accommodate a wide range of cultures and possibilities. The objective of this paper is to investigate the concepts of deterritorialization and reterritorialization in the framework of post-humanist and posthumanist discourses. This study aims to analyze the viewpoints of post-humanist and posthumanist discourse, as conceptualized by LaGrandeur, in relation to their capacity to disrupt and reconstruct the prevailing comprehension of humans and non-humans.

2. Post-humanism and posthumanism: the deterritorialization of rigid spaces and concepts

In his seminal work "Prometheus as Performer: Toward a Posthumanist Culture?" Ihab Hassan asserts that it is imperative to comprehend the potential conclusion of five centuries of humanism, as humanism

undergoes a transformative process that can only be described as posthumanism (Hassan, 1977, p. 843). In this discourse, Hassan puts out a proposition to alter the existing framework that encompasses the enduring perspectives of humanism on many aspects such as color, race, gender, sex, ability, disability, European identity, non-European identity, as well as the distinction between human and non-human entities, which have historically had significant influence over Western societies. The present transition towards posthumanism aims to investigate the inquiry of the essence of being human and the process of being human considering technological advancements. Hassan's position might be seen as pushing for the destruction of existing boundaries, institutions, hierarchies, and norms, while perhaps neglecting to fully acknowledge the significance of diversity, hybridity, and flexibility. I contend that Hassan calls for the reterritorialization of worldviews that are Eurocentric and suggests deterritorializing them. This entails the establishment of new or alternative boundaries and the creation of new or alternative systems that allow for the proliferation of diverse cultures and alternatives through technological advancements. Hassan raises the question of whether artificial intelligences will surpass, enhance, or merely extend the capabilities of the human brain.

Artificial intelligences, ranging from basic calculators to advanced computers, have been instrumental in reshaping the perception of humanity and the human condition. According to Hassan, they might be regarded as representatives of a novel kind of posthumanism (1977, p. 846). Hassan's inquiries aim to challenge the conventional perception of humanity within traditional humanism by examining the implications of contemporary technologies such as cybernetics, genetics, nanotechnology, pharmacology, and artificial intelligence. These technologies serve as sources of inspiration, prompting an exploration into the potential transformation of the established image and concept of the human. According to Yaszek and W. Ellis, it is proposed that humans contain an extraordinary capacity for mutability and plurality, and that posthumans have the potential to enhance or alter different characteristics beyond mere physicality (2017, p. 71). The proposition I put out is that the possible alteration and enhancement of the human physicality might potentially lead to the deterritorialization and reterritorialization of individuals. This proposition introduces a distinctive framework whereby humans undergo technical and technological enhancements and augmentations, resulting in a profound alteration of the human. Consequently, there is a possibility for humans to undergo a transformation that renders them as "non-people" (Liu, 2015, p. 477) or as whole new entities. Several current proponents of posthumanism, such as Yaszek and W. Ellis, Julien de la Mettrie, and the Marquis de Condorcet, hold the belief that humans in the modern era are a fundamental asset that can engender an entirely new species. There is a collective vision that considers individuals in the modern age as being capable of engendering a whole new species. As explained by Clarke and Rossini, modern technologies have the potential to both de/re/territorialize human beings, meaning that they may separate individuals from the physical regions in which they were raised or the cultural frameworks in which they were raised (Clarke and Rossini, 2016, p. 72). Deterritorialization is referred to as "the movement by which 'one' leaves the territory" by Deleuze and Guattari (1998, p. 508). As stated by Deleuze and Guattari, the concept cannot be fully comprehended in isolation; rather, one can only apprehend its manifestations via territorial representations (1983, p. 316). It does not denote the physical act of an individual or group physically departing from a certain geographic location. The movement is concerned with the process of territorial transformation, characterized by its tendency to spread, mutate, split, and conquer (Kilgore, 2016, p. 261). For Guattari, the territory is characterized by the interconnectedness of landscapes, rather than being only determined by the presence of animals and people. The phenomenon under discussion serves as the origin for both organic and inorganic collections and organisms. Scholars have labeled this phenomenon as "chaosmosis," (1995, p. 130). which denotes an ongoing sequence of expressive activities, trajectories of escape, and transformations into alternative states that consistently

generate new domains and areas. Territorialization, in a larger context, comprises both existential and evaluative elements in relation to the establishment of new values and importance. It pertains to the interconnection of spaces within biological and inorganic assemblages and species, including a continuous sequence of activities, the possibility of novel connections, and the process of transformation across spaces that continuously generate fresh territories and locations. As a catalyst for change, it involves the creation of values and interpretations within specific contexts. As noted by Schroeder, the processes have a universal nature in their abstract growth and selection procedures, which however, demonstrate resistance to the coercive and tangible globalization of commercial interests that exploit technology and people for economic benefits (2012, p. 256). In the present framework, the concept of de/re-territorialization, as conceptualized by John Tomlinson, pertains to the process of both “de/re-localization” or “displacement” (1999, pp. 119-121) of rigid spatial boundaries, leading to the blurring of distinctions between urban areas, suburbs, and rural regions. Additionally, it encompasses the colonial imperialist practices that involve the eradication of symbols, beliefs, and rituals of a conquered population, subsequently replaced, or reterritorialized with the conquerors’ own cultural elements, serving as a means of subjugation (Schroeder, 2012, p. 255). This process involves the examination and alteration of values and meanings within fixed boundaries that exist between the realm of nature and the realm of society, which is shaped by human design and production. This encompasses the elimination of cultural topics and objects, as well as alterations in social, political, economic, and political processes, together with individuals, materials, languages, traditions, and beliefs associated with their respective original entities.

Anthony Giddens’ definition of modernity as an experience of “distanciation” and/or “estrangement” (1990; 2007) from the territory, and such concepts of mediatization, migration, and commodification contribute to the scope of deterritorialization. Deterritorialization, for Arjun Appadurai, is an influential force in the modern world as it draws workers into lower-class sectors and places them in comparatively wealthy civilizations. Simultaneously, it offers new markets for film companies, art exhibitions, and tourism companies, which benefit from the deterritorialized population’s desire to reconnect with their birthplace (Appadurai, 1990). In addition to these conceptualizations, it is linked to “infinite movement or the movement of the infinite” (Deleuze and Guattari, 1994, p. 37), conveying a work-in-progress, namely becoming. It depicts the immanence of life and its movement, dynamism, fluidity, openness, and infinity. Immanence here refers to the continual variety and mutation that cannot be reduced to negative differences yet is connected to the deterritorialization that removes any solid reference point that one can rely on, destination to arrive at, and roots to refer to (Nebioglu, 2020, p. 13). In one of his 1975-1976 seminars, Deleuze stated: “Everything that pertained to territoriality, that is to say, the animal body or human corporeality which has never ceased to be deterritorialized, more and more, and to be reterritorialized by artifice and which, having lost the codes of corporeality, must be over-coded, thus so many that we have lost corporeality with maintenance of territorialities...” (Lecture 5, 16 December 1975). Deleuze adds: “The body is endowed with movement. It shouldn’t be thought of in terms of objects but in terms of their movement... What interests us are the movements of a more secret nature... compared to the animal body, the human body is animated by movements of deterritorialization. The human body is a deterritorialized animal body” (Lecture 5, 16 December 1975). In his argument, Deleuze illustrates “the hand” to conceptualize the term deterritorialization. The hand, not in terms of partial-object integration, but rather in terms of the composition of relative deterritorialization movements. The hand as a partial object is described as “a butcher’s idea. It’s a pure Frankenstein” (Lecture 5, 16 December 1975). It is for anatomists, those individuals who cut people up. According to Deleuze, the hand might be conceptualized as a paw, specifically a forepaw that has undergone deterritorialization. This deterritorialized hand is characterized by its separation from the soil, devoid of its original

materiality. When examining the hand as an illustrative case, it can be argued that movements of deterritorialization traverse both human and non-human entities universally. Deleuze perceives this concept as an abstract machine, which characterizes a system, whether natural or otherwise, that exhibits a perpetual process of generation, development, and transformation. It “is directly related to the thought of the machine. Because a machine has no subjectivity or organizing center it is nothing more than the connections and productions it makes; it is what it does. It, therefore, has no home or ground; it is a constant process of deterritorialization or becoming other than itself” (Colebrook, 2001, p. 56). I contend that the constant process of decentralism of things (the machine), de/re-localization of places, de/re-territorialization movements of humans and non-humans through boundary-blurring, as well as the de/re-construction of rigid values and meanings within those territories, not excluding eradication of people’s symbols, beliefs, and rituals, are integral to posthumanism and the post-human imagination. One imagination follows from critical posthumanist discourse projects that attempt to undermine humans’ hegemonic position by entirely upending humanist narratives that “disrupts, fragments, escapes, overflows, and deterritorializes old modes of thinking” (Daigle and H. McDonald, 2022, p. 1). These narratives categorize humans into subhuman, inhuman, and superhuman categories, which might include beastly, demonic, or divine traits (Clarke, 2016, p. 142). It is critical that our imagination extends to nonhuman species and recognizes the undeniable fact that humans and nonhumans coexist and coevolve together. As outlined by Clarke, any posthuman era that involves the removal or replacement of exclusive humans must also encompass nonhuman entities without exception (2016, p. 147). Clarke’s statement asserts that the integration of humans into the ever-evolving realm of advanced technology ultimately leads to their transformation into posthuman, removing them from traditional humanist elusive ideals; the human ontologically cannot continue under the false assumption that it is superior to the nonhuman. That was the grandiose ideal and story of high humanism. Rather, the human needs the nonhuman to get into the process of existence (Clarke, 2016. P. 150). New research into animal cognition calls into question the notion that humans are unique considering the near potential of super-intelligent and sentient robots. For example, tissue and organ exchanges between humans and beyond species boundaries undermine what appear to be stable boundaries between self and others. One could argue that the unrelenting pursuit of technology and science, along with studies on animal cognition, tissue, and organ exchange, discloses a deterritorialization pattern that poses significant threats to humans’ attachment to their traditionally stable and self-determined settings. This pattern results in humans becoming enmeshed in flexible and fluid technological ecosystems that facilitate interaction and entanglement with non-human entities.

According to Rossini, the contemporary transformations in the concept of human existence and identity are attributed to both the epistemological and ontological changes in anti-humanist and poststructuralist philosophy, as well as the continuous advancements in technology that enable modifications to the human body (2016, p. 155). The ongoing process of deterritorialization in the realms of epistemology, ontology, and technoscience is influencing our perception of the human body. The hierarchical mechanisms of control that have persisted over an extended period, together with the categorization of entities into human, nonhuman, or inhuman, might potentially be subject to questioning and critique. Stacy Alaimo, Donna Haraway, and Karen Barad boldly challenge, namely deterritorialize traditional power dynamics that are based on divisive categories such as class, race, ethnicity, sexuality, gender, and ability from their solid grounds through their revolutionary concepts of “trans-corporeality,” (Alaimo, 1990) “companion species,” (Haraway, 1994) and “intra-action,” (Barad, 2007). These concepts underscore the interdependence and connectivity of humans and non-humans (Rossini, 2016, p. 156), implying a perpetual reterritorialization of humans and non-humans. Reterritorialization, in this sense, pertains to the recognition of novel grounds and physical and

conceptual territories concerning humans and non-humans. Alaimo's term "trans-corporeality" (1990, p. 2) built on Barad's conception of "intra-action" deals with the "mutual connections and interactions" (1990, p. 2) of bodies, whether human, animal, or technological in the posthuman world, which cannot be separated from the larger network of material world and agency (1990, p. 115). Alaimo contends that humans and non-humans are mingled (1990, p. 17), in material agency, flows, and processes that connect human bodies, animal bodies, technology, and the larger environment. Her concept of "trans-body permeability," which pertains to the de/re-territorialization of bodies, addresses that these bodies are interrelated/connected and contribute to the "more-than-human world" (1990, p. 12). The concept of entanglement, "spaces of enclosure" (Deleuze and Guattari, 2017, p. 3-4), a constant act of de/re-territorialization between human bodies and non-human ecologies, such as animals, plants, and technology, fundamentally challenges the idea of an independent and individual human body. My argument posits that post-humanism and posthumanism serve to destroy and reconfigure systems of domination and hierarchical dualisms, hence promoting variety and inclusion. The progress made in nano-, bio-, information, and cognitive technologies goes beyond the limitations imposed by human biology, eventually beyond the established limits of human existence and transformation. The de/re/territorialization of the concept of the human, along with the embrace of post-human and posthuman conceptualizations, are interconnected with the dismantling of human primacy and dominance structures. This is facilitated by the utilization of advanced technologies, which facilitate the ongoing and expedited evolution of the human form and its limitations through scientific and technological means (More, 2013, p. 3). The ongoing process of de/re/territorialization pertaining to the notion of the human, which involves the emergence of post-humans and posthumans, is continuously evolving within the realms of time, science, and technology. Specifically, disciplines such as information technology, computer science and engineering, cognitive science and the neurosciences, material science, artificial intelligence, pharmaceuticals, life extension, genetic engineering, among others, have the potential to facilitate the reconstruction of our physical and mental capacities, enabling individuals to possess unparalleled levels of physical, intellectual, and psychological abilities (More, 2006). As stated by Ferrando, science and technology are perceived as significant elements in the process of human reconfiguration and hierarchical pursuit, achieved through the integration of humans with technological advancements and matter. However, it is important to acknowledge the potential risks associated with techno-reductionism, as it tends to prioritize logical reasoning and material advancement (2013, p. 28). I argue that science and technology have the potential to redefine and transform the fundamental nature of human life. This innovative procedure entails liberating oneself from conventional humanist concepts. Despite concerns about the possible negative outcomes associated with the integration of technology into human life, namely in the form of a carbon-to-silicon-based existence, I contend that the continuing process of posthumanization, facilitated via the use of matter and technology, has the capacity to unveil novel possibilities and favorable outcomes. The advancements achieved in the field of science and technology provide a unique prospect to expand our understanding and reevaluate the idea of post-human and posthuman. Technology should not be seen as an external entity to be feared and resisted, but rather as an inherent characteristic of human existence. Ferrando's characterization of technology as the "human outfit" (2013, p. 28) aligns with the notion of technogenesis, a term that encompasses the mutual development of people and technologies. These include not only the neurophysiological alterations in human cerebral structures but also the intricate interplay between sophisticated human and advanced technology networks (Hayles, 2012). I argue that Hayles' idea of technogenesis encompasses the ongoing process of deterritorialization, which involves the displacement of entities, and reterritorialization, which involves their subsequent transfer. This process applies to both human and non-human entities. The integration of technology with the human experience is

inseparable. On the contrary, it may be argued that humans undergo a continuous process of transformation and evolution facilitated by technological advancements. The process entails a continual emancipation of the physical form from its intrinsic limitations. The concept of emancipation from the physical form may also be seen as a process of detachment, specifically referred to as deterritorialization from the corporeal being (Gardels, 2023). Building upon Gardels' analysis, I contend that human beings inhabit a dynamic nexus of perpetual interactions with both the natural cosmos and the constructed realm created by technological advancements. The concept of being or becoming human entails an ongoing process of engagement with a fluid and evolving environment, resulting in continuous production, reformulation, and transformation. This might be characterized as human demystification rather than erasure, and it is now undergoing a process of auto-deconstruction. The conventional Humanist conception of the human undergoes dissolution and deterritorialization when the underlying scientific understanding of the human is unveiled through contemporary biosciences, the epistemological consequences of artificial intelligence, and the technologization of both living and non-living elements that shape and reshape the human.

Haraway's theoretical framework about cyborgs elucidates the co-evolutionary dynamics of biological beings, machines, physical and non-physical surroundings, as well as human and non-human entities, which together experience concurrent territorial transformations. Posthumanism may be characterized as a rejection of centralization since it acknowledges the existence of several centers of interest. However, these centers are not fixed, but rather fluid, migratory, and transient in nature (Ferrando, 2013, p. 30). Drawing upon the debates of Hayles and Haraway, Ferrando acknowledges that posthumanism encompasses a range of perspectives that are characterized by their multiplicity, fluidity, nomadic nature, and focus on transience. These perspectives co-evolve and undergo transformation, as they simultaneously displace and reestablish boundaries, impacting both human and non-human entities within the intricate web of technological systems. It might be argued that the rejection of human uniqueness by post-humanism extends beyond mere post-anthropocentrism. Additionally, it involves dismantling the limitations imposed by conventional humanism, which establish rigid standards and hierarchies predicated on characteristics like as race, ethnicity, and sexuality, as well as the differentiation between human and non-human entities. Therefore, the inclusion of both post-humanism and post-anthropocentrism is crucial for dismantling these limits. Both critical and philosophical post-humanism have a common emphasis on the deconstruction of narratives associated with the Eurocentric White Man. The task at hand necessitates a comprehensive reorganization of their rigid systems of power, societal standards, and hierarchical structures. Post-humanists engage in a transformative process whereby they generate new ecologies that are hybrid, fluid, and encompassing, so reconfiguring the narratives traditionally associated with the White Man. Moreover, it is worth acknowledging the substantial influence that progress in biotechnology, particularly in the pharmaceutical sector, may exert on providing a useful understanding of the intricacies of human nature and the processes involved in human existence and development. When combined with cutting-edge technologies like nanotechnology and cybernetics, these medications have the capacity to boost a wide range of human attributes, including physical, psychological, cognitive, and creative talents, as well as augment our inherent strengths and characteristics. The convergence of biotechnology and other technological advancements has led to the emergence of new types of hybridity, including both human and non-human entities. As a result, the conventional distinction between the natural and the artificial is progressively diminishing. When people ingest pharmaceutical compounds, there is a prompt interaction between these chemicals and their physiological and psychological processes, potentially resulting in alterations to their cognitive, emotional, or physiological patterns. The integration of cybernetics and organisms, which form the basis of the principles, methodologies, and information

systems of power, is a key element in the first conceptualizations of the cyborg. The concept of ‘cyborg’ was introduced to signify the merging of different entities, thereby challenging the dichotomies between nature and culture, human and animal, and living organisms and machines (Bess & Walsh Pasulka, 2018, p. 68). This convergence is facilitated by advanced technologies that seek to transform our understanding of human existence by creating entities that defy categorization, extending lifespans, creating hybrid cyborgs, and integrating human and non-human elements. The argument put forth is that advanced technologies aim to redefine the notion of humanity by fragmenting it into a variety of incompatible entities, extending lifespans, altering bodies to become cyborgian hybrids, and blurring the boundaries between humans and non-human entities.

Donna Haraway, N. Katherine Hayles, and Rosi Braidotti use a critical perspective while examining the relationships between humans, non-humans, and their respective ecologies. They, in conjunction with scholars such as Karen Barad, Stacy Alaimo, Graham Harman, Nick Bostrom, Ray Kurzweil, Max, and Natasha Vita-More, espouse innovative methodologies for engaging with the realms inhabited by both humans and non-humans. According to Nayar, the notion of posthumanism necessitates a reevaluation of subjectivity, since it posits that human subjectivity is intricately intertwined with the development of machines and animals, becoming a collective entity (2018, p. 8). These perspectives propose that post-humans are inherently connected to their natural environments, existing alongside both animal and non-animal entities, and undergoing co-evolution with both humans and non-humans within their newly established territories. As to Pramod K. Nayar, critical posthumanism entails a fundamental displacement, referred to as decentering or de/re-territorialization, of the conventional notion of the human as a sovereign being that is unified and autonomous. This statement elucidates the way human beings consistently engage in the processes of territorialization and deterritorialization, thus undergoing evolutionary transformations that are influenced by, intertwined with, and instrumental in the development of various forms of life and technology. As stated by Nayar, the human is seen as being shaped by and engaged in dynamic connections, representing a continuous process of human development rather than a static state of being human (2018, p. 22). Based on Wolfe, the process of integrating with technology, augmenting human capabilities, and surpassing physical constraints may be seen as manifestations of heightened humanism (2010, p. xv). These acts aim to address and mitigate prejudices and dichotomies, including but not limited to those related to gender, the dichotomy between nature and culture, the difference between ability and handicap, the contrast between consciousness and non-consciousness, and the differentiation between non-human creatures and robots, among several others. In addition to Wolfe’s perspective, the integration and use of technology in the definition of the human as a representation and idea aligns more closely with transhumanism rather than post-humanism. In contrast, Braidotti puts out a comprehensive and integrated viewpoint that embraces a post-anthropocentric stance in relation to post-humanism. It may be argued that there exists a complex interconnection between humans and non-humans. As stated by Braidotti, the concept of posthuman subjectivity encompasses a kind of responsibility that is grounded in embodiment, implying a limited perspective. This accountability is rooted in a significant emphasis on collectivity, relationality, and the subsequent formation of communities (2013, p. 49). In contrast, Haraway’s concept of comprehensive inclusion, connection, and inter/relationality encompasses the convergence of machine and organism. She posits that humanity might be understood as chimeras, constructed amalgamations of both machine and organism (Haraway, 1994, p. 8). In essence, she argues that humans are cyborgs. Haraway’s discussion can be further enriched by examining several theoretical frameworks, including Niklas Luhmann’s systems theory, Maturana and Varela’s neo-cybernetic concept of autopoiesis in 1980, Bruno Latour’s actor-network-theory (ANT), and Andy Clark and David Chalmer’s notion of the “extended mind” (Menary, 2010). These theories offer valuable insights into the complex nature of human

existence and provide a deeper comprehension of the process of human becoming. These theories also include non-human components, systems, and structures, so illustrating that the human experience is situated within intricate and interconnected ecological systems. The occurrence of change and mutation is contingent upon the relationships established with broader networks of ecologies. Luhmann's systems theory, which encompasses the concept of autopoiesis, operates as a self-referential system that perpetually produces and renews itself. The system encompasses several subsystems, including people, organizations, and societies, which engage in interactions through communication channels (Maturana & Varela, 1980). Latour's theory of Actor-Network Theory (ANT) posits that the social milieu is influenced by the dynamic interplay between human actors and non-human entities. This implies that agency and transformative contributions are not limited to people alone, but also extend to non-human entities such as individuals, institutions, technology, and things. Furthermore, the notion of the "extended mind" as proposed by Clark and Chalmers delves into the exploration of how the human mind surpasses its conventional limitations and engages with external apparatus, technological advancements, and the surrounding milieu. This implies that external tools and the environment have the potential to have a significant effect on cognitive processes, therefore extending the conventional understanding of the mind. In general, these theories assert that the notion of "human" surpasses the conventional dichotomy of body and intellect, and instead integrates with a wider assemblage of human and non-human entities. This concept encompasses the notion of "trans-corporeal assemblages" (DeLanda, 2016) and "trans-corporeality" (Alaimo, 1990), which argue for the interconnectedness and interdependence of human and non-human entities in the construction and transformation of the world. It discusses the significance of acknowledging the intricate network of people, animals, plants, objects, and other environmental components when defining the idea of human conception, which pertains to the notion of 'becoming' in Deleuzian philosophy. This notion underscores the perpetual dynamic and inherent fragility of existence. If one accepts the premise that life is inherently characterized by open systems, then follows that all facets of existence will constantly undergo renewal, differentiation, and alteration. The Deleuzian theory of becoming elucidates the process via which organisms, systems, and environments (referred to as ecologies) persistently undergo alterations and metamorphoses, hence engaging in deterritorialization and reterritorialization. As stated by Colebrook, the Deleuzian understanding of deterritorialization is closely associated with the notion of the machine, characterized by the absence of subjectivity or a central organizing entity, which primarily manifests its capacity to establish connections and generate products. It lacks fixed boundaries and exhibits a perpetual process of deterritorialization, whereby it undergoes transformations and assumes forms distinct from its original state (2001, p. 56). Plants, animals, human beings, and atoms have distinct capacities for undergoing developmental processes. Deterritorialization is a phenomenon characterized by the departure or separation of a becoming event from its initial region (Colebrook, 2001, p. 59). Colebrook contends that the concepts of post-humanization and posthumanization pertain to the process through which both humans and non-humans undergo a departure from their initial domains, both in a physical and intellectual sense. With this the deterritorialization or re-territorialization of entities, with the incorporation of novel ideas and visual representations derived from the domains of post-humanism and posthumanism. Through this action, there is the potential to reevaluate and revise our comprehension of the concept of humanity or non-humanity, which might encompass the concept of transferring human consciousness onto computational systems, which is seen as the pinnacle objective by some scholars such as Neil Badmington and Hayles. However, there exist critics who provide counterarguments to this proposition, asserting that it sustains the contradiction between materialism and immateriality inside individuals, hence leading to an excessive focus on human-centric viewpoints that may not be ideal. The critical posthumanist perspective advocates for the deconstruction of

humanism through an analysis of its inherent contradictions and conceptual inconsistencies (Roden, 2014, p. 9). It encompasses the enhancement of human nature, the development of individual autonomy, and the augmentation of human capabilities through technological methods. This eventually supports and preserves conventional concepts of humanism.

Both forms of posthumanism, post-humanism, and posthumanism, have the same goal of critically analyzing and suggesting alternate viewpoints about these topics. For Roden, several varieties of posthumanism challenge anthropocentric perspectives in comprehending life and reality (2014, p. 10). That is, post-humanism and posthumanism challenge the fundamental humanist philosophical premise that humans possess a privileged status that is lacking in most if not all, nonhuman entities and that humans are fundamentally separate from nonhumans. The former approach involves a critical examination and reconstruction of humanist discourse, which emphasizes the recognition of human-specific value, dignity, rationality, autonomy, and agency. This entails the development of a comprehensive worldview that encompasses both humans and nonhumans. On the other hand, the latter approach relies on the utilization of technology, specifically the convergence of nanotechnology, biotechnology, information technology, and cognitive science (NBIC), to achieve tangible outcomes such as the modification of fundamental human traits, ranging from physical attributes to cognitive abilities, as well as emotional and intellectual capacities (Bess and Walsh Pasulka, 2018, p. xiii). This technological advancement aims to address issues such as hunger and scarcity through innovative agricultural and manufacturing processes, the eradication of diseases, and the enhancement of social policies (Anders and Bostrom, p. 201). Posthuman futurism, or posthumanism, is just enhanced humanism in the eyes of many critical post-humanists, which is both a philosophical misunderstanding and a betrayal of the anti-anthropocentrism objective. The argument posits that futurists who express concerns regarding potential robo-apocalypses or indulge in fantasies of achieving immortality as a soul engine are overlooking the fact that these fantasies of transcendence or annihilation inadvertently perpetuate humanist beliefs regarding the inherent universality of human reason, the expendability of physical bodies, and the enduring nature of the human essence. The argument fails to acknowledge that the concept of the “human” to which these hypothetical beings are considered “post” is already a result of historical variability influenced by cultural and technological factors. The existence of a posthuman successor species is deemed implausible due to the assertion made by Hayles in her work “How We Became Posthuman” (1999), which suggests that humanity has already transitioned into a posthuman era. This era is characterized by scientific, political, and philosophical advancements that have raised doubts regarding the inherent worth and status of the human species (Roden, 2014, p. 35). Posthumanism, contrary to the assertions made by critical posthumanists, does not represent a radical departure from the fundamental aspects of the human experience. It does not indicate the conclusion of a certain understanding of the human but rather signifies the termination of a particular conceptualization.

3. Conclusion

In the framework of post-humanism and posthumanism, this paper investigates the usage of the terms “de-territorialization” and “re-territorialization.” The meaning of the phrase “constant act of deterritorialization” and the many facets and applications of this concept are going to be the primary focuses of discussion in this article. To be more specific, it refers to the process of dislodging established viewpoints and liberating both humans and non-humans from dualistic divides, created frameworks, and individual organisms. It applies to both humans and non-humans. This makes it possible for a desire to correspond with fluid motions and promotes the formation of configurations that are mutually

developing with one another. In its capacity to promote border crossings and the manufacture of new modes of existence and possibilities, deterritorialization engenders a diversity of life forms, both physical and intellectual, that are defined by continual becoming and transformative processes. This is because deterritorialization could produce new modes of existence and possibilities. This paper also demonstrates that post-humanism and posthumanism, with their diverse interpretations, provide a challenge to the historically dominant position and essential function of the human concept and reframe them in a different light. A new perspective on the essence of human life, the physical appearance of humans, and the underlying premise that people are essentially complete, innate, or preset may be gained by analyzing the concept via critical, philosophical, and emerging technical perspectives. The process of revisiting, utilizing modes of thinking that modify the emphasis and viewpoint, draws attention to the intrinsic changeability of things – both human and non-human within the natural world. This involves the interconnection of them as well as the acknowledgment of their existence as creatures that are linked inside networks. Several mythical myths from various cultures include an examination of the yearning to achieve enlightenment and rise beyond the limitations of human existence. For instance, in *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, some characters express a want to surpass their mortal existence and achieve immortality. For LaGrandeur, the characters in William Shakespeare's *The Tempest* (1610) and Christopher Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* (1604) serve to amplify and disseminate the creative abilities of their authors. These characters can be interpreted as representations of artificial magical entities that act as substitutes for their human creators. Moreover, they should not be viewed solely as supplementary tools, but rather as complex systems that expand the identity of their creators. Consequently, these characters can be regarded as early modern precursors to the contemporary posthuman subject (LaGrandeur, 2022, p. 16). An additional illustration may be found in Mary Shelley's novel, *Victor Frankenstein* (1818), when the main character endeavors to fabricate a posthuman being by amalgamating physical components of both humans and animals, with the aim of eliminating the inherent afflictions of pain, suffering, and mortality that are intrinsic to human existence. Posthumanists designate Victor's invention as a catalyst for the demise of a certain conception of humanity. Moreover, Dante Alighieri's literary work, *The Divine Comedy* (1321) serves as a significant touchstone for posthumanists, contributing to the deconstruction of established human conceptions. This perspective proposes the potential transition of humans into posthumans, both in terms of spirituality and physicality.

According to Bess and Walsh Pasulka, posthumanists explore a process known as posthumanization or transhumanization. This process entails a progression through the celestial bodies such as the moon and planets, with the goal of reaching the empyrean, a divine realm situated far beyond the solar system of Earth (2018, p. 52). Dante's exposition of the concept of posthumanization, sometimes referred to as transhumanization, has had a substantial influence on the debate around the endorsement of biological enhancements and the consequent transition towards a condition of existence beyond the confines of biology for human beings. It highlights Elon Musk's objective, as shown by his Mars project, to integrate humans and robots as a strategy for ensuring survival in the face of an environmental catastrophe that would render Earth uninhabitable for humans, which might align with Teilhard de Chardin's concept of the "omega point" (Bess and Walsh Pasulka, 2018, p. 54). The time in an individual's existence when they experience a significant level of oneness with the divine is referred to as their "omega point." Teilhard de Chardin is the one who came up with the concept of an "omega point," which describes a possible scenario in the far future in which the union of humanity and technology would have resulted in a profound oneness, which may have made it simpler to receive divine revelation. The anticipated occurrence symbolizes the elimination of the duality that exists between the material and spiritual

realms, which would, in the end, lead to the inclusion of posthuman beings into the cosmic domain (ibid).

It is clear, after considering the arguments relevant to the conceptualization of the human as both an image and a conception, that humans go through a series of changes as essential components of the processes of post-humanization and posthumanization. These transitions are caused by the processes of post-humanization. Because of their interaction and embodiment with media and current technology, humans go through these processes in a constant cycle of deterritorialization and reterritorialization. Because of our continuing involvement and integration with a wide range of forms of media and cutting-edge technology, such as NBIC, it is conceivable to make the case that “we are cyborgs” (Haraway, 1994) and that “we have always been posthuman” (1999, page 291). Both claims are supported by the fact that ‘we have always been posthuman.’ This is because we are continuously involved with and integrated into these many types of media and technology. The fact that the continual process of deterritorialization and reterritorialization of places has, as a direct consequence, become the defining attribute of the whole of human life lends credence to both views.

References

- A Thousand Plateaus I - Deleuze at Paris 8 (Video Links), Lecture 05, 16 December 1975 | the Deleuze Seminars.* deleuze.cla.purdue.edu/seminars/thousand-plateaus-i-deleuze-paris-8-video-links/lecture-05.
- Agnes, T. (2023). “Posthumanism: A Philosophy for the 21st Century?” *TheCollector*, 10 May. www.thecollector.com/posthumanism-philosophy-of-the-21st-century/.
- Alaimo, S. (1990). *Bodily natures: Science, environment, and the material self*. Indiana University Press, 2010.
- Appadurai, A. (1990). Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. *Theory, culture & society*, 7(2-3), 295-310.
- Ardoin, P., Gontarski, S. E., & Mattison, L. (Eds.). (2014). *Understanding Deleuze, Understanding Modernism*. Bloomsbury Publishing USA.
- Badmington, N. (2010). Posthumanism. *The Routledge companion to literature and Science*. Routledge, 374-384.
- Barad, K. (2003). Posthumanist performativity: Toward an understanding of how matter comes to matter. *Signs: Journal of women in culture and society* 28.3, 801-831.
- Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*. Duke University Press.
- Bess, M., & Pasulka, D. W. (2018). Posthumanism: The Future of Homo Sapiens.
- Bostrom, N. and Anders, S. (2009). “Cognitive enhancement: methods, ethics, regulatory challenges.” *Science and engineering ethics* 15, 311-341.
- Braidotti, R. (2013). *The posthuman*. John Wiley and Sons.
- Clarke, B. and Rossini, M. eds. (2017). *The Cambridge companion to literature and the posthuman*. Cambridge University Press.
- Clarke, B. and Rossini, M. eds. (2016). The nonhuman. *The Cambridge Companion to Literature and The Posthuman*. Cambridge University Press, 141-152.
- Colebrook, C. (2001). *Gilles Deleuze*. Routledge.
- Daigle, C., & McDonald, T. H. (Eds.). (2022). *From Deleuze and Guattari to posthumanism: Philosophies of immanence*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

- Deleuze, G. *What Is Philosophy?* (1991; 1994). Trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell, New York: Columbia UP.
- Deleuze, G. (2017). Postscript on the Societies of Control. In *Surveillance, crime and social control* (pp. 35-39). Routledge.
- Deleuze, G. (1998). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (2009). *Anti-Oedipus: capitalism and schizophrenia*. Penguin.
- DeLanda, M. (2016). *Assemblage theory*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Foucault, M., Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1983). Preface. *Anti-oedipus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane. Minneapolis, MN: U of Minnesota P.
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (2009). *Anti-Oedipus: capitalism and schizophrenia*. Penguin.
- Dobrin, S. I. (2022). Foreword: Posthuman/s/ism/s. *Çokdisiplinli Çalışmalarda Posthümanizm* 5, 23.
- Ferrando, F. (2013). Posthumanism, Transhumanism, Antihumanism, Metahumanism, and New Materialisms: Differences and Relations." *Existenz*, vol. 8, no. 2, 26-32.
- Gardels, N. (2023). Post-Anthropocene Humanism - NOEMA. *NOEMA*, 30 June, www.noemamag.com/post-anthropocene-humanism.
- Gardels, N. (2023). The Evolution of What It Means to Be Human. *NOEMA*, 17 July, www.noemamag.com/the-evolution-of-what-it-means-to-be-human.
- Giddens, A. (1990; 2007). *The consequences of modernity*.
- Guattari, F. (1995). *Chaosmosis: An ethico-aesthetic paradigm*. Indiana University Press.
- Haraway, D. (1994). A Manifesto for Cyborgs: Science, Technology, And Socialist-Feminism in the 1980s. *The postmodern turn: new perspectives on social theory*, 82-115.
- Hassan, I. (1977). Prometheus as Performer: Toward a Posthumanist Culture? *The Georgia Review*, Vol. 31, No 4.
- Hayles, N. K. (1999). *How we became posthuman: virtual bodies in cybernetics, literature, and informatics*. University of Chicago Press.
- Hayles, N. K. (2012). *How we think: Digital media and contemporary technogenesis*. University of Chicago Press, 2012.
- LaGrandeur, K. (2022). Posthümanizm Bizi Kurtarabilir mi? *Çokdisiplinli Çalışmalarda Posthümanizm*. Transnational Press London 479-489.
- Liu, C. (2015). *The Dark Forest*. Vol. 2. Macmillan.
- Maturana, H. R., et al. (1980). Problems in the neurophysiology of cognition. *Autopoiesis and Cognition: The Realization of the Living*, 41-47.
- Menary, R. (2010). Introduction: The extended mind in focus.
- More, M. (2006). The Extropian Principles, Version 3.0: A Transhumanist Declaration.
- More, M. (2013). The philosophy of transhumanism." *The transhumanist reader: Classical and contemporary essays on the science, technology, and philosophy of the human future*, 3-17
- Nayar, P. K. (2018). *Posthumanism*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Nebioğlu, R. Ç. (2020). *Deleuze and the Schizoanalysis of Dystopia*. Springer International Publishing.
- Roden, D. (2014). *Posthuman life: Philosophy at the edge of the human*. Routledge.
- Simon, B. (2003). Introduction: Toward a critique of posthuman futures. *Cultural Critique*, 53(1), 1-9.
- Schroeder, B. (2012). Reterritorializing subjectivity. *Research in Phenomenology* 42.2, 251-266.
- Tomlinson, J. (1999). *Globalization and culture*. University of Chicago Press.

- Vint, S. (2020). İkili Olmayan Benlik. *Edebiyatta Posthumanizm*, edited by Sümeyra Buran, Translated by Muhsin Yanar, Transnational Press London, 9-18.
- Wolfe, C. (2010). *What is posthumanism?* Vol. 8. U of Minnesota Press.
- Yaszek, L. and Ellis, J. W. (2017). Science Fiction. *The Cambridge Companion to Literature and the Posthuman*. eds. Bruce Clarke and Manuela Rossini, 71-83.