Apparatus of Absence: Anonymity from Print to Algorithms
Balakrishnan, Sreepriya

Apparatus of Absence: Anonymity from Print to Algorithms

SREEPRIYA BALAKRISHNAN
Government Victoria College (Kerala), India

The paper tries to problematize the concept and contexts of digital anonymity by placing it along with literary modernity. The biopower that digital text generates has created and complicated an industry of data and surveillance of user profiles and throws the processes of textual subjectification to more visibility. Anonymity in print has been a phenomenon that was consequential of and integral to the institution of authorship. Even if authorship has been an important terrain of interest in digital studies, print authorship in all its socio-cultural specificities as a Eurocentric patriarchal construct within the field of artistic production has rarely been studied in relation to the evolving digital existence. The paper attempts to present an overview of contexts of anonymity in print and a review of existing approaches toward it in the web and to address a theoretical gap found therein. Away from the prevalent moral perceptions about anonymity, the paper presents anonymity as a larger apparatus rooted in the publishing practices in literary modernity where authorship and anonymity remained as mutually augmenting mechanisms of absence and presence. In algorithmic cultures, the materializing of absence as presence endures in more rigid forms necessitating continuous struggles over the question of anonymity. The paper is concluded by referring to gendered anonymity in the digital space as one terrain that reflects the nature of this continuous struggle.

Keywords: Anonymity, algorithmic cultures, literary modernity, authorship, gender

The possibilities of reorganization of systems like publishing and authorship that happened in the wake of internet have been a strong concern in internet research. Authorship in Internet was evaluated in the realms of textuality (Landow 1992; Lanham, 1993), in scientific knowledge (Longo & Mognolo 2009), in fiction (Joyce, 2008; Chiappe, 2007), games (Sarikakis, Krug, & Rodriguez-Amat, 2016), in Wikipedia (Bryant, Forte, & Bruckman, 2005; Garon, 2012), and scholarly publishing (Fitzpatrick, 2011) and the changes were found to rightly enact the 'decentred' position of the author in the discourse. An established difference between analogue and digital authorship (Poster, 2001) is mostly presumed and digital authorship is often evaluated in terms of a displacement from the text, an ease in publishing, republishing, reach and facilitation through multimedia and a threatening complication of copyright issues. An ease in 'amateur authorship', an actively engaged readership and a renewed audience/producer relationship promoted by social media platforms is marked as a challenge to traditional publishing forms (Mandiberg, 2012; Bold, 2016).

Corresponding Author: Sreepriya Balakrishnan, Research Department of English, Government Victoria College, Palakkad, Kerala-678 001, India

Wherever it was noted that such views about a decentred author with its focus on dematerialized technology is a fallacy that emerged from a technological determinism of early hypertext theories (Rasmussen, 2002), an emphasis on the socio-political institutions of discursive networks founded on a neo-Foucauldian, historicist approach was put forward (Grusin, 1994; Bolter & Grusin, 1999). Even as the concerns about 'digital' authorship remain important, print authorship in all its socio-cultural specificities as a Eurocentric patriarchal construct has rarely been studied in relation to the evolving digital existence. Authorship in Internet is not a publishing exercise but an identification practice, which nevertheless is deeply linked to authorship in print. By putting forward the understanding of authorship as a strategy of textual identification, this paper argues that anonymity, far from being a moral discourse or material possibility, is a larger apparatus that underlies the biopolitics of textual subjectification. Anonymity is looked at as a grounding principle of authorship in both print and internet and the implications of algorithms in reconstituting anonymity is explored. Rather than using any empirical data, the research involves a critical understanding of digital practices of authoring and anonymity and an overviewing of the theoretical approaches about the same.

Literary authorship and anonymity of modernity was integral to the individualizing and generalizing biopolitics when authorial name became a 'property' (Foucault, 1994; During, 1992, p. 121) and a property relation was established between the text and its generator that was further sealed with copyright laws. However, in hypertext, the property relation was established symbolically and materially through rituals involving a username, password and an integrated profile data that sets a framework for self-authentication and sets a contact point between the technologies of self and power and governmentality of the subject (Crampton, 2003; pp. 73-82). Contemporary 'infopolitics' (Koopman, 2014) involve not just the data surveillance but several mechanisms like data analytics, digital rights movements, cashless digitized economy, algorithmic finance and digital property rights disputes that constitutes the everyday of digital identities (Solove, 2004; Cheney-Lippold, 2011). The digital or informational persona (a form of what Deleuze (1992) perceived as 'dvidual') is one whose bodies are the aggregated material data that serve as extensions to the body and are compiled by computer programs and come up in any database query. (Cheney-Leopold, 2011). In the web, logging practices insists a sense of authorship and property relation to the text (Elwell, 2014) a myth of self and a sense of possession of space (Cohen, 2007) that is kept alive in the drives both symbolically and materially. Personal data from several platforms get aggregated to create a digital biography of an individual who then becomes 'reducible to the sum of their transactions, genetic markers, and other measurable attributes' (Cohen, 2000). Digital browsing had taken traceability to the next level where, as Cohen (1996) observed, even the freedom to read anonymously is curtailed as the extensive surfing records are being archived. In effect, every browsing act also becomes an authoring act for the browsing subject. The history of this politics of identification has been analysed as a culmination of developments stretching back to the late 19th century through the tools of Foucaldian genealogy of biopolitics (Koopman, 2014).

The print informed relations between individual, text and capitalist structures (Anderson, 1991) found its contemporary ramifications in our understanding and usage of the digital, and were successively critiqued as an emerging form of capitalism based on immaterial labor (Lazzarato, 1996; Hardt & Negri, 2004; Dyer-Witherford, 2005), as digital capitalism, the establishment of a communication infrastructure network that is shaped in the neo-liberal logic (Schiller, 2000, Dean, 2011) and as a strengthening of the new forms of capitalist exploitations and corporate surveillance (Morozov, 2012; Lovink, 2011).

The image of cyborg as a new form of self that is post-gender and beyond the essentialist notions of naturalized gender categories (Haraway, 1991) had also been contested later by theorists who argued that the structured inequalities offline form the material base of online existence too (Hayles, 1999; Nakamura, 2002; Knight, 2014). Equally challenging to cyborg subjectivities that imply any transhumanism are those regional and material inequalities that the history of modernity itself incurred, especially in the colonially structured Asian experiences (Sreekumar, 2016, p. 187). Approaches toward digital anonymity that are currently in focus have to delve into the understandings about conceptual continuities between print capitalism and the digital that emerge from the techno scientific milieu rather than look at anonymity as a mere technology induced moral question. If today's web is part of the 'informatics of domination' (Haraway, 1991), a massive 'surveillance assemblage' (Haggerty, & Ericson, 2000), it is also because, the regulatory strategies of governing it are those that had already begun with print and are becoming more visible and consolidated in digital forms (Epstein, 2016; Ball, Domenico & Nunan 2016).

One reliable understanding of anonymity in the digital world is that of 'algorithmic anonymity' (Rossiter & Zehle, 2014) that involve not only the anonymity of individual actors but that of objects and their relations too. Algorithms are technically the meta-language that translate the abstract data of user behaviors into usable content thereby intermediating the moral and technical realm of textuality. It is the search for more entrenched means to remain anonymous in the web that necessitated continuous reshaping of algorithms that would allow new digital patterns to emerge, better use of encryption and encrypted services that should have led to better transparency of processes. But on the contrary what we came to require were new age martyrs and whistle blowers who move into the no-man's lands in the aggressive wars fought over data and vouch for both privacy and transparency. Algorithmic anonymity, has shaped both the financial capitalist system of web as well as political organizations and social movements in the digital era like hacker cultures, Arab spring, Occupy movements and many local and regional protests against majoritarian politics. The intersection of 'algorithmic cultures' (Galloway, 2006; Striphas, 2015; Dourish, 2016) now control our lives in immensely intricate ways, effect our privacies and while the algorithms remain inscrutable to the end-users, their massive significance necessitates continuous interventions to scrutinize and make them more accountable (Neyland, 2015). Essentially understood and experienced as obscure and anonymous in themselves (Dourish, 2016), the impact of algorithms have been widely studied across technocultural contexts including finance, labor politics, governance, public policy, and organizational strategy (Barocas, 2014; Gillespie, 2014 ; Glaser 2014; Manovich, 2013; Pasquale, 2015; Seaver, 2015; and Ziewitz, 2015).

The relative autonomy and invisibility of algorithmic actors, both data miners and the users, have made algorithmic anonymity a central issue within the questions of technology and human subjectivity. Frameworks like that of 'rights' and 'user-agreements' that depend on an assumed transparent user-agency and a moral contract do not sufficiently foreground the roles that algorithmic actors play in the circulation of data. Beyond the categories like identity or representation, it looks very likely, that anonymity has become a term of critical theoretical value in the age of data. (Rossiter & Zehle, 2014). Constitutionalising social networking or even expecting social network platforms to be democratic venues, as Morozov (2012) warns, will not help us in understanding the relationship between internet corporations and users which constitutes the larger apparatus of subjectification through algorithms. While anonymity in internet is extensively researched as a behavioural and socio-psychological phenomenon, leading to theories

about disinhibition, deindividuation, disembodiment and other implications of social interactions, the cultural and material history of institutions and apparatuses of anonymity are rarely found relevant to digital authorship.

Methodology

Grounded in Foucault's understanding of authorship as a part of the intricate micro-politics of individuation and Kittler's (1990) link between the material, technological and discursive systems, the paper uses Agamben's (2009) interpretation of Foucault's (1977) use of 'dispositif' or 'apparatus' in the context of authorship and anonymity. Apparatus, according to Agamben is an ensemble of discourses and non-discourses and the complex relationships between these heterogeneous elements. Foucault holds that the dynamics of apparatuses are structured in two phases: the appearance of the device and its stabilization. (Dumez & Juenemaitre, 2010). The incorporation of material machinic complexities across the terrain of culture, economics and politics has been a major issue for debate in the field of communication and media studies. Agamben's summarising of these material complexities as 'apparatus' has an edge over 'actor-network theory' (Latour) or 'assemblage (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987) because it integrates discourses and materials into one heterogeneity. (Frost, 2015; Legg, 2011) According to Agamben, 'apparatus' is a heterogeneous set of practices and mechanisms that includes institutions, laws, police measures, philosophical propositions and everything linguistic and non-linguistic and locates itself and appears at the intersections of power and knowledge (p. 14).

Apparatus captures and subjects a desire which then form the nexus in which the subjectification is furthered. Agamben's idea of states of exception has been previously used in studying pervasive tracking, data-mining and algorithmic regulation and have been found to be useful to understand digital dissent as well as more than human digital acts that comprises of algorithms (McQuillan, 2015; Dixon-Roman, 2016). Referring to the proliferation of the architectures of code, ubiquitous computing, data-mining, surveillance, GIS Mapping and several other contexts of algorithmic anonymity, Rossiter and Zehle (2014) proposes that rather than the analytical categories of openness, transparency, privacy and the like, 'anonymity' should be understood as "an affect capable of sustaining new modes of relation and collaborative constitution as well as an operating principle at the infrastructural core of algorithmic cultures and its institutions." The present paper connects the histories of anonymity in print to this understanding of anonymity as the core of algorithmic cultures by positing that anonymity is an apparatus of absence rooted in the systems of identification and authorship.

Anonymity of Print Culture

The rigid structures of commercial book publishing and the institution of literature necessitated not only the desire and contexts to be anonymous, but mechanisms to sustain anonymous presence in text as well. Anonymity appeared in literary modernity as not authorial absence, but as an apparatus to be 'present' through 'absence'. Anonymity in the centuries from 17th to the 20th in the literary history of European modernity has been a concurrent publication practice that accentuated with the commercialised authorship nexus of publishing industry (Griffin, 1999, 2003; Rose, 1993).The 'apparatus' of anonymity could be well-located in the idea of authorship that shows immense historical and cultural mutation before and during the print-era. What determined the author, who attributed her

authority and how the authority was constituted, all this always remained multiform and multiphase. (Donavan, Fjellestad, & Lunden, 2008; Pease, 1990; Krieger, 1977; Love, 2002). Literature of modernity also points to a domain that records the constitution of the subjectivity of author-selfs, how authors inscribed their self-knowledge as writers, as part of the commercial and ideological nexus that involved the introduction of copyright into the realm of symbolic capital (Rose, 1993, p. 2; Jaszi, 1991, p. 459; Woodmanse, 1984). The authors of modernity understood themselves as 'authors' by self-assertions in tune with the textual market and also by performing for or shying away from the commodification of literature and art and the large circle that sustained the industries, what Bourdieu (1994) called 'the field of artistic production'. Be it the 'age of personality' (Coleridge, 1812, p. 150) or that of 'impersonalization' (Eliot, 1917), be it the neo-classicists like Pope or the Romantics like Wordsworth, authors were desperate to authorize themselves into the print market by being obliged to show, conceal or hide as well as to tell, to give the illusion that they did not exist, to consciously avoid the accusation that they were "playing god" (Hees, 2005, pp. 4-6; Booth, 1983, p. 51; Trilling, 1971, p. 7; Bennett, 2005, p. 21). Literature, both fiction and poetry of modernity rebounds with self-scrutinizing statements of authors about the necessity of transcending personal selves and the norms and the burden and the opportunities of authorship established the poet and the writer as not a person but a persona. Like a professional role, a paternal or maternal role, masculine or feminine role, an artistic role also came to the purview of the self as a mode of subjection. Artists/ authors began to swear their allegiance to art, strove for the political import of their activity and ventured to perform their role to utmost perfection, both in and out of the text. The practices of self-mythification and objectification of oneself within the text (as in Nabokov's *Pale Fire*, Kierkegaard's pseudonym adventures and much of postmodern meta-fiction), death and resurrection in the text, all became active ways in which writers tried to counter their new found author-identity (Woodmanse, 1994; Burke, 1995). In this textual market of authorial performance, anonymity was not an aspiration to be nameless, but a mechanism that allowed another form of 'presence'.

As Foucault explicates, functional-author is one category that necessarily normalized and legalized the significance of the author, whether actual or fictitious, real or fake, as a discursive entity. As Jorge Luis Borges (1962) elucidates in his intensely dramatic piece about self-conception, the role-playing of being the author is one in which, 'the other one, the one called Borges is the one things happen to'. Author, even his textual absence, became one of the internal rules, a contrivance through which control and dissemination of discourse is achieved and thus anonymous and pseudonymous writings also implied an individual whose action of hiding in the text marked her 'presence'. Every aesthetic criterion that the writing subject invented, including his attempts to erase himself from the text, became a mode of subjecting, an obligation for the individual. This singularity of 'the mark of self as absence' becomes a theme with modernist writers predominantly because the writers had to 'assume the role of the dead man in the game of writing' (Foucault, 1994). Agamben (2007, pp. 64-65) explains: "The author subject does exist and yet he is attested to only through the traces of his absence." The pinnacle of the self-constitution of author as absence was perhaps Beckett's question 'what does it matter who is speaking', which was reiterated by Foucault (1994). The question was deeply ethical in the sense that its inherent indifference to self was also something that was part of the history of the self-constitution of the authors in modernity.

As and how the name of the author became a brand name and cultural commodity (Rose, 1993), in a wide variety of contexts of marginality like gender, race, nationalism, ghost-writing, hoaxes and several such attempts to challenge the status-quo, anonymity

became a powerful strategy of publication. In European literature anonymity happens to be one important practice that sometimes the most vulnerable and the most conflicted writers took up to access the power of a textual subject. As generally assumed, it did not disappear with printing press or copyright as well but rather was most widely used due to the restrictions imposed by them (Griffin, 2003). Anonymity took up more intense shapes with copyright, like in the case of Scott who famously signed his poetry but did not sign Waverly as he believed it would be against the dignity of an officer in Edinburgh court to write popular fiction. Anonymity also became a choice over and above legal rights that sometimes let authors publish with no legal claim over their work as in the case of many women writers of 17th and 18th century. Jane Austen published all her works herself without her name and until 1870's Married Woman's Property Law was not entitled for copyright. In sentimental novels that came up as a reaction to the Augustan rationalism this practice was taken to its heights and many women anonymously published through their editors and literary mentors (who were mostly their lovers or husbands too as in the case of La Van Roshe and Martin Weiland).

Anonymity, pseudonymity and heteronymity have been used by writers for political pamphleteering that sometimes amounted to character defamation. Spectator and Tatler and the coffeehouse gossip genre from which writers like Swift and Addison gained their literary footing is an early example. We may consider Plato's dialogues and his use of eidolon as a pre-print example of political anonymity, whereas Kafka's wish to burn down his writings after his death also represents another political choice to remain anonymous. Another distinctly political use of anonymity was in the publishing practice called samizdat, a typical dissident publishing that came up from post revolution Soviet-bloc that brought out the works of Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn and Mikhail Bulgakov. Samizdat was a kind of anonymity that stressed on the manner of circulation rather than the onymity and identity of the writer. A similar publishing practice had also brought into existence the 'literary underground', what Susan Sontag (1993) famously called the 'Pornographic imagination' and Marquis De Sade could be considered a pioneer in this anonymous publishing strategy that worked stealthily, away from mainstream publishing networks. The intricate linkages of anonymity to the oppressive regimes of the print modernity become all the more palpable in the case of colonial archives where anonymity becomes an oppressive strategy by the dominant classes. Ghosh (2004) explores the native Indian women narratives in colonial archives to find how most often illegal partners or concubines of white men were recorded invariably as anonymous. However in the case of political poetry or pornography for which the writer faces legal censure, anonymity was not a loss of information, but it allowed the material to be archived in the first place. (Ross, 2013; Griffin, 2007). Thus as oppressive anonymity and defensive anonymity went hand in hand, identity and anonymity began to whither and anonymity emerges as a subject position, yet another 'presence', never a namelessness or absence, but positively another form of self that could be materialized and archived. We may safely summarize that anonymity, together with authorial name, pseudonymity and anonymous publication practices evolved and sustained as an apparatus to capture the matrix of desires that constituted the print author.

Anonymity of Algorithmic Cultures

The argument about digital authorship and anonymity as 'absence' and 'hiding in bytes' (Poster 2001, p. 69) is problematic firstly because, as we have noted in the previous section, hiding and self-erasure from the text is not an internet specific development but had been a part of the subjectivation of the performing author-selves in much of modernity.

And secondly and more importantly, anonymity in the web points toward a stronger consolidation of the apparatuses of identification, like race, gender, class and other attributes that are effectively getting coded through algorithms as digital presence. The digital, with its more sophisticated modes of recording these attributes, archives every anonymous/'absence' as a material 'presence' in bytes. Presently, even as web disallows anonymity- as hypertext demands that the user may associate with the text only by way of a trace that is asserted through a confessional statement with a profile and password- this act of confession literally also creates a perpetual context of textual chase open for every web user, a space where new cultural anxieties and ethical dilemmas are being formed and performed.

In the earliest theories about digital authorship, electronic text with its multiple reflections and responses 'was understood to constitute itself in anonymity' and thus destabilize language (Poster, 1990, p. 114). Electronic language was assumed to facilitate anonymity and the earliest manifestos of cyber liberation (Barlow, 1996; Mentor, 1986) reasserted this notion of anonymity through writing in web as an escape from conventional self-constitution categories like gender, race or color. Resembling early speech right movements at the dawn of print like that of John Milton who in his Aereopagitica, interpreted freedom of speech in terms of the 'right to print' (Eisenstein, 1980; Deazley, Kretschmer, & Bentley, 2010), these manifestos asserted a right to the evolving cyberspace. Time and again, anonymity was held up as liberating and it was reiterated that textual anonymity is a constitutionally protected right for speech in the wake of information revolution, and recommended that it be treated as morally neutral (Teich, Frankel, Kling, & Ya-Ching, 1999). Approaches toward anonymity in the web were formulated widely from the point of view of social psychology, behavioral sciences and phenomenology, as a possibility of the technology of computer mediated communication (CMC) that was famously clichéd by Steiner's (1993) cartoon in New Yorker, "On the Internet Nobody Knows you're a Dog" (Joinson, 1999; Hayne & Rice, 1997; Herring, 1993; Christopherson, 2007).

There has been observations that online identity research that looked at identity as performance failed to look at web as a socio-cultural production that include offline selfs as well (Hine, 2001; Kennedy, 2006). Generalized earlier views about 'virtual identities' as anonymous and 'faked up' (Turkle, 2005), and the phenomenological and psychoanalytical interpretations about role-playing as possibilities of alternate self(s) (Bullingham & Vasconcelos, 2013), or bloggers as 'whatever beings' (Dean, 2010) and other approaches toward online performance of self are often contested from spheres were gender and politics intersect. For instance, from the sociological side, it has been shown how online identities of women ethnic minorities are continuations of their offline lives, that there are 'degrees of anonymities' in their online presentations, to analyze which the present directions of identity research based on 'real' and 'virtual' look insufficient (Kennedy, 2006). In another direction, the anonymous communication research landscape has been very voluminous and fertile in computer engineering and has come to look at the many nuanced ways in which the web technically facilitate anonymity (Chen & Li, 2013; Fanti & Viswanath, 2016). These approaches detail out anonymity in the web in terms of both the adversaries involved, (local or global) and the possible stages and levels of being anonymous from the sending of the message to its encryption. Anonymity in Internet has been a very rich area of research both as a collective phenomenon and individually in platforms like in early usenet forums like Internet Oracle (Sewell, 1997), peer-to-peer networks (Svensson & Banister, 2004), in games and forums like Warcraft (Albrechtslund, 2011), Wikipedia (Ashton, 2011) and in e-petitions (Berg, 2017). Also pertinent are

researches about the models of ephemerality and anonymity that springs from communities like 4chan, against the identity and archival continuums of community design strategies of corporate social media (Bernstein et al., 2011).

Thus we see that, anonymity in the web was understood in mainly four directions: (i) As a feature of electronic text in itself. (ii) As a right, to be asserted or denied (iii) As a moral and psychosocial issue, and (iv) As a technical mastery. Though these understandings often overlap each other, the aspects of anonymity raised in them have not been addressed cumulatively as part of a historical mechanism that is both discursive and materialistic. Either anonymity is restricted to the technical milieu of the platform in question or is encountered as a moral parameter, as a right to be claimed. There is no overarching theory of anonymity that can embrace it as a principle contributing to the links forged between human subjectivation and new technologies. Researches into anonymity at the intersections of technology and politics has not yet conceptualized it as something that unite fields as varied as health and infertility (like in sperm and egg donation (Konrad, 2005) or blood donation (Copeman, 2009) and organ transplantation (Lock, 2001) to that of data rights and privacy like Coleman's (2013) study of anonymity in WikiLeaks. A theory of anonymity should necessarily be able to look at the technological processes of identification like UIDAI in India and similar biometric programs of liberal governmentality for not just their anonymous exclusions (Thomas, 2014), but for the mechanisms that claim to eliminate anonymity altogether as well.In the following sections, gendered anonymity is explored as a context where all the four directions converge and hence prove insightful to see the larger apparatus in work.

Gendered anonymity is not merely a question of common gender swapping which led earlier researchers to deem internet as egalitarian (Rellstab, 2007; Herring & Stoerger, 2013). Even from the early periods of web, arguments that women tend to be more anonymous in Internet have also been disproved through studies that confirm a conspicuous dearth of female voice and a persistence of male linguistic rituals in the web discourses(Cushing, 1996) and alarmingly sexualized apps and games (Downs & Smith, 2010; Sundén, 2003; Salter, 2014). In fact, from the original Turing test that initiated the debate between gender and technology, as Katherine Hayles (1999) shows, this technology had registered woman as an 'error' or a mismatch that stands apart in the system. As much as anonymity has been a political weapon with women, it has been used as a weapon against them too.

The contexts of digital misogyny and gender-based anonymous trolling in social media continues to serve to explain the linkage between the moral and technical realms of anonymity in the digital context. It is through the question of gender and gender based abuse that anonymity in internet came to be treated as an aberration of speech that had to be regulated. The first recorded case of 'cyber-rape' in a multiplayer dungeon called LambdaMOO (Dibbel, 1993) marked the moral and ethical question of verbal offence, threat and malice in the hyperextual medium and evoked the need for censor of speech within web. In contexts where women's everyday politics in cyberlife almost always blur the duality between online and offline worlds (Mitra-Khan, 2012), when the very appearance of women in online spaces is identified as 'slutty' invoking derision, interest and mockery and is thus symptomatic of a larger practice of technological control of body (boyd, 2004, Shah, 2015), there are intensely complicated ways in which anonymity is being used against women in gaming, trolling and social media policies. Anonymity promotes the web-specific forms of inflammatory speech and covert censoring through trolling that impede the free use of web spaces by women and the marginalized groups. The irony that anonymity as a category supports both the trolls and the trolled has often led to a scenario that demanded

'authentic anonymity' (O'Reilly, 2007) that attempted to transpose common moral tropes about 'authentic' selfs over to the realm of textual subjectivity. To protect anonymity in the realm of data, means to have full rights to the constellation of data around an individual and the metadata that are generated to manipulate this data which is a moving target that would increasingly be impossible to achieve. (Nissenbaum, 1999). As Agamben (2009, p. 21) notes, our everyday struggles with apparatuses cannot be confronted as good or bad, that there is no way to destroy them as much as there is no 'right way' of using them.

The emerging practices of digital resistance against verbal offences in web consists of new strategies of mobilization through technical means like reporting a profile, reporting faulty community standards of platforms, finding the array of algorithmic techniques that are deployed by the platforms to tackle sexual, racial and other forms of verbal violence and then attempting to alter their patterns through massive online mobilization (Gillespie, 2014). Facebook's technical policy of insisting on 'real' profiles had been subjected to severe criticisms ever since it was proclaimed as a policy. During Arab Spring, Egypt's biggest dissident Facebook page 'We are all Khaled Said' was stalled during a crucial period of the revolution owing to a controversy over an anonymous admin (Giglio, 2011; Alaimo, 2015). Once reported or stalled, according to Facebook's policies, a page cannot be opened unless the real identity (with approved supporting documents) is provided. The irony of this policy lies not in the contradictions between the corporate company's proclaimed liberal progressive politics and its actual technical standards. It lies in the fact that reporting of a profile is an entirely new form of censoring based on algorithms that can eventually lead to more scrutinizing algorithms. Facebook considers pseudonyms and multiple identities as showing a lack of integrity (Kirkpatrik, 2010). But its community standards do not come handy to stop fake profiles that are created exclusively to practice misogyny, parochialism, narrow nationalism, racism and state supported censor. But by the same standards, pages like 'We are all Khaled Said' in Egypt or 'Kiss of Love' in India (Praveen, 2015; Outlook, 2014) come to be reported and admin profiles get rummaged and ransacked for 'real' identity details. The 'Nymwars', the massive online movement that came up demanding the right to be anonymous, especially after Google insisted on real name for profiles in its social networking platform, was one of the major trend that influenced policy decisions over digital rights to be anonymous (boyd, 2012).

Google had to revoke its decision following the movement, but the war over names have not ended as accounts are being suspended, especially those of Non-western, 'suspicious looking' names (Galperin, 2011). Following a recent controversy over continuous blocking of the profiles of women who spoke against online abuse in the Malayalam Facebook community in Kerala, a south-western state in India, there were active calls from either ends of the debate, to seek the right to be anonymous in Facebook itself that was taken up as a campaign called #For a better FB (Devika, 2015; Inji, 2015; Balakrishnan, 2018). The fact that converging questions about anonymity arise from diverse platforms in social media and that it generates new forms of struggles confirm that the question of anonymity may not be limited within the policy shifts of individual web corporates like Facebook or Google. The contexts reveal how the apparatus of anonymity has complicated our textual existence and carried over the structural inequalities within systems.

Conclusion

There is a vital link that connects textual identity and anonymity, or in fact it is the historical contingency of the former that necessitated the latter. The authoring act for the digital

person is the numerical label assigned to each individual hit that marks a presence and what is aggregated as the cumulative presence of such data in the network. Approaches toward anonymity in the web as behavioral pattern of individuals cannot address such contexts of anonymity that are infused by the material technology. The long tradition of anonymity in literary authorship should be related to the theoretical enquiries about algorithmic anonymity in internet. In contemporary World Wide Web, anonymity as 'hiding' is disproved because web has made anonymity more readily traceable than in print. Rather than for 'hiding', web has evolved to be a space for leaving traces and for being traced, for self-exposure and for monitoring. The sophisticated data tools both facilitate and entrench the politics of being anonymous in the web.

An individual who is anonymous in internet is more traceable than an anonymous writer in print, especially when a profile is reported, thus making it dangerous for the most vulnerable people. This threat was countered in web by the standardization of tools and technical solutions to stay anonymous, thus perpetrating an entire algorithmic structure that sustains and circles around concerns about concealment, transparency and privacy. To disentangle it from the prevalent moral perceptions, the paper presented an understanding of anonymity as a larger apparatus rooted in the publishing practices in literary modernity where authorship and anonymity remained as mutually augmenting mechanisms of absence and presence. The problematization of anonymity in internet should therefore begin by observing the conceptual continuity of the politics of authorship and anonymity from print to internet and secondly by understanding the apparatus of algorithmic anonymity.

References

Agamben, G. (2007). *Profanations*. Trans. Jeff Fort. New York. Zone Books.

Agamben, G. (2009).*What is an Apparatus and Other Essays*. Trans. David Kishik and Stephen Pedatella. California. Stanford University Press.

Alaimo, K. (2015). How the Facebook Arabic Page "We Are All Khaled Said" Helped Promote the Egyptian Revolution. *Social Media and Society*. 1(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305115604854

Albrechtslund, A. (2011). Online identity crisis: Real ID on the world of Warcraft forums. *First Monday.* 16(7). http://firstmonday.org/article/view/3624/3006

Anderson, Benedict. (1991) *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. New York: Verso.

Ashton, D. (2011). Awarding the self in Wikipedia: Identity work and the disclosure of knowledge. *First Monday*. 16. (1-3). http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/3156

Baehr, C. and Lang, S.M. (2012). Hypertext Theory: Rethinking and Reformulating What We Know, Web 2.0. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*. 42(1), 39-56.

Barnet, B. (2013). *Memory machines: The evolution of hypertext*. London: Anthem Press.

Balakrishnan, S. (2018). Vulnerable Speech: Algorithmic materiality and the regulation of language in the Web. In *Asian Journal of English Studies.* 7(1), 79-100.

Ball, K., Domenico, M. and Nunan, D. (2016). Big Data Surveillance and the Body-subject. *Body Society.* doi: 10.1177/1357034X15624973

Barlow, J. P (1996). A Declaration of the Independence of Cyberspace. Retrieved from https://www.eff.org/cyberspace-independence

Barocas S (2014) Panic Inducing: Data Mining, Fairness, and Privacy. (Doctoral Dissertation) New York University, NY.

Bennett, A. (2005). *The Author.* New York: Routledge.

Berg. J. (2017). The dark side of e-petitions. Exploring Anonymous signatures. *First Monday*. 22(2-6) http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/6001/5910

Bernstein, S. M, Monroy-Hernandez, A. Harry, D., Andre, P.,Panovich, K., and Vargas, G. (2011). 4chan and /b/: An Analysis of anonymity and ephemerality in Large Online Community. Proceedings of the 5th International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media. Retrieved from http://www.aaai.org/ocs/index.php/ICWSM/ICWSM11/paper/download/2873/4398/

Booth, Wayne. C. (1983). *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bold, M. R. (2016). The return of the social author. Negotiating authority and influence on Wattpad. *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies*. doi. 10.1177/1354856516654459.

Bolter, J. D and Grusin, R. (1999). *Remediation: Understanding New Media*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT.

Borges, J. L. (1962). *Labyrinths: Selected Stories and Other Writings.* New York: New Directions.

boyd, danah (2004). Friendster and Publicly Articulated Social Networks. Conference on Human Factors and Computing Systems, Vienna, Austria. April 24-29. *Communications of the ACM*. doi>10.1145/985921.986043

boyd, danah (2012). The politics of "real names". *Communications of the ACM*. 55 (8), 29–31. doi>10.1145/2240236.2240247

Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The Field of Cultural Production*. Randall Johnson (Ed). Columbia: Columbia University Press.

Bryant, S. Forte, A and Bruckman, A. (2005). Becoming Wikipedian: Transformation of participation in a collaborative encyclopedia. *GROUP '05 Proceedings of the 2005 international ACM SIGGROUP conference on Supporting group work. New York: ACM.* doi:10.1145/1099203.1099205

Bullingham,L and Vasconcelos, A.C.(2013). "The presentation of self in the online world: Goffman and the study of online identities". *Journal of Information Science,* 39(1), 101-112.

Burke, Sean. (1995). Ethics of Signature. *Authorship. From Plato to the Postmodern. A Reader.* 285-291. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Cohen, J. (1996). The Right to Read Anonymously: A Closer Look at 'Copyright

Management' in Cyberspace*. Conn. L. Rev. 28.*981-1039

Cohen (2000). Examined Lives: Informational Privacy and the Subject as Object. *Stan. L. Rev.* 52. 1373-1398.

Cohen (2007). Cyberspace As/And Space.*Columbia Law Review*, 107.1, 210-256.

Coleman, E. G. (2013) Anonymous and the politics of leaking. In B. Brevini*et.al.* (Eds.) *Beyond WikiLeaks: Implications for the future of communications, journalism & society*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Coleridge, S. T. (1812). The Friend: A Series of Essays. London: Gale and Curtis.

Copeman, J. (2009) Introduction: Blood donation, bioeconomy, culture.*Body & Society*, 15 (2), 1-28.

Cheney-Lippold, J. (2011). A New Algorithmic Identity: Soft Biopolitics and the Modulation of Control.*Theory, Culture and Society*. 28(6), 164-181.

Chiappe D. (2007). Creative Processes in Hypermedia Literature: Single Purpose, Multiple Authors. Claire Taylor and Thia Pitman (Eds) *Latin American Cyberculture and Cyberliterature.*Liverpool. Liverpool University Press.

Christopherson, K. M. (2007). The positive and negative implications of anonymity in Internet social interactions: "On the Internet, Nobody Knows You're a Dog". *Computers in Human Behavior* 23.6, 3038-3056.

Chen X and Li. G (2013). Evaluation Indicators and Model of Network Technical Anonymity. *International Journal of Future Generation Communication and Networking.* 6(4).

Crampton, J. W. (2003). *The Political Mapping of Cyberspace*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Cushing. P. J. (1996). Gendered Conversational Rituals on the Internet: An Effective Voice Is Based on More than Simply What One Is Saying. *Anthropologica*. 38(1), 47-80.

Davie, D. (1968) "On Sincerity: From Wordsworth to Ginsberg." *Encounter*. 31(4), 61-66.

Dean, J. (2010). *Blog Theory: Feedback and capture in the Circuits of Drive.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Dean, J. (2011). Communicative Capitalism: Circulation and the Foreclosure of Politics.*Cultural Politics.* 1(1), 51-74.

Deazley, R., M. Kretschmer and L.Bentley (2010). Introduction. The History of Copyright History: Notes from an Emerging Discipline. In Ronan Deazley et al. (Eds) *Privilege and Property: Essays on the History of Copyright.*1-21. Cambridge: Open Book Publishers.

Deleuze, G. (1992). Postscript on the Societies of Control. *October.* 59, 3-7.

Deleuze, G and Guatari, F. (1987). *A Thousand Plateaus : Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Trans. Brian Massumi. London : University of Minnesota Press.

Devika, J (2015)For a Better FB: Women in Campaign's Press Release. *Kafila.org*. 8 Aug 2015. Retrieved from http://kafila.org/2015/08/26/for-a-better-fb-womenincampaigns-press-release-2/

Dibbel, J. (1993). A Rape in Cyberspace.*juliandibbel.com*. Retrieved from http://www.juliandibbell.com/articles/a-rape-in-cyberspace/

Donald. E. (1990). Author. *Critical Terms for Literary Study.*Frank Lentricchia and Thomas McLaughlin. (Eds.) 105-117. London: University of Chicago Press.

Donavan, S. Fjellestad, D. and Lunden, R. (2008) Introduction: Author, Authorship, Authority and Other Matters. In Donavan, S. Fjellestad, D. and Lunden, R(Eds.). *Authority Matters: Rethinking Theory and Practice of Authorship.* 1-23. New York: Rodopi.

Doring, N. (2002). Personal homepages on the web: A review of research. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication.* 7(3).

Dourish, P. (2016). Algorithms and their others: Algorithmic culture in context. *Big Data and Society.* 3(2).

Downs, Edward, and Stacy L. Smith. (2010). Keeping Abreast of Hypersexuality: A Video Game

Character Content Analysis.*Sex Roles* 62, 721– 33.

Dixon-Roman, E. (2016). Algo-Ritmo: More-Than-Human Performative Acts and the Racializing Assemblages of Algorithmic Architectures. *Cultural Studies "! Critical Methodologies*, 16(5), 482-490.

During, S. (1992). *Foucault and Literature: Towards a Genealogy of Writing*. London: Routledge.

Dumez, H and Juenemaitre, A. (2010). Michel Callon, Michel Foucault and the " dispositif: When economics fails to be performative: A case study." *Le Libelliod'Aegis*. 6 (4), 27-37.

Dyer-Witheford, N. (2005). Cyber-Negri: General Intellect and Immaterial Labour. in T. S. Murphey and A-K. Mustapha (Ed) *The Philosophy of Antonio Negri: Resistance in Practice.* 136-162. London and Ann Arbor, MI: Pluto Press.

Eisenstein, E. L. (1980). *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change.* Cambridge, UK.

Eliot, T. S. (1917). Tradition and Individual Talent. *Selected Essays*. London: Faber&Faber.

Elwell, S. J. (2014). The transmediated self: Life between the digital and the analog. *Convergence, 20(2), 233-249.*

Epstein, C. (2016). Surveillance, Privacy and the Making of the Modern Subject: *Habeas* what kind of *Corpus*? *Body Society.* doi:10.1177/1357034X15625339

Fanti, G., &Viswanath, P. (2016). Algorithmic advances in anonymous communication over networks. In the proceedings of *2016 Annual Conference onInformation Science and Systems (CISS).* 133-138. DOI: 10.1109/CISS.2016.7460490

Fitzpatrick, K. (2011). *Planned Obsolescence: Publishing, Technology and the Future of the Academy.* New York: New York University Press.

Foucault, M. (1977- 1980). The Confession of the Flesh. In Colin Gordon(Ed). *Power/Knowledge Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*. 194–228. New York. Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1994). "What is an Author?" In James D Faubion(Ed).*Aesthetics, Method and Epistemology: Essential Works of Foucault 1954-84, Vol 2*. 205-223.New York: New Press

Frost, Tom (2015). The *Dispositif* between Foucault and Agamben. *Law, Culture and the Humanities*. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/1743872115571697

Galloway AR (2006) *Gaming: Essays on Algorithmic Culture*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Galperin, E. (2011). 2011 in Review. Electronic Media Foundation. Retrieved from https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2011/12/2011-review-nymwars

Garon (2010). Wiki Authorship, Social Media, and the Curatorial Audience. *Harvard Journal of Sports and Entertainment Law*. Vol. 1

Ghosh, D. (2004). Decoding the Nameless: Gender, subjectivity, and historical methodologies in

reading the archives of colonial India. In Kathleen Wilson (Ed). *A new imperial history; culture, identity, and modernity in Britain and the Empire 1660-1840.*297-316.Edinburgh. Cambridge University Press.

Giese, Mark (1998). Self without Body: Textual Self-Representation in an Electronic Community.

First Monday. 3 (4 – 6)

Giglio, M. (2011). Middle East Uprising: Facebook's Secret Role in Egypt.*Daily Beast.* 24 Feb 2011.

Gillespie, T. (2014). The Relevance of Algorithms. In Gillespie Tarleton, Boczkowski, Pablo. J and Foot. Kristen, A (Eds.) *Media Technologies: Essays on Communication, Materiality and Society*. Massachusetts, MIT Press.

Glaser, V. (2014). Enchanted algorithms: How organizations use algorithms to automate decision-making routines. In *Academy of Management Proceedings* 2014 (1).

Griffin, R J. (1999)Anonymity and Authorship.*New Literary History: A Journal of Theory and Interpretation* 30.4, 877–95.

Griffin, R. J. (2003). Introduction. *Faces of Anonymity: Anonymous and pseudonymous Publications from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth century.*1-18.New York: Palgrave Macmillan,

Griffin, R. J. (2007). Working with Anonymity: A theory of theory vs Archive. *Literature Compass* 4/2, 463–469.

Grusin, Richard. (1994). What is an Electronic Author? Theory and the Technological Fallacy. *Configurations*. 2.3 469–83.

Haggerty K.D and Ericson, R.V. (2000). The surveillant assemblage. *British Journal of Sociology*. 51(4). 605-622.

Haraway, D J. (1991). A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century.*Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature.* 149-181. New York; Routledge,

Hardt, M. and A. Negri (2004). *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. New York: Penguin Press.

Hauben, M and Hauben R. (1997). Netizens: On the History and Impact of Usenet and the Internet. Wiley-IEEE Computer Society Press.

Hayles, K. (1999). *How we became posthuman:Virtual Bodies in Cybernetics, Literature and Informatics.* Chicago: University of Chicago.

Hayne, S. C., & Rice, R. E. (1997). Attribution accuracy when using anonymity in group support systems. International Journal of Human Computer Studies, 47. 429-452.

Hees, S. (2005). *Authoring the Self: Self Representation, Authorship and the Print Market in British Poetry from Pope through Wordsworth.* New York: Routledge.

Herring, S. C. (1993). Gender and Democracy in Computer-mediated Communication. *Electronic Journal of Communication.* 3(2).

Herring, S.C and Stoerger, S. (2013). Gender and (A)nonymity in Computer-Mediated Communication. In J. Holmes, M. Meyerhoff& S. Ehrlich (Eds.), *Handbook of Language and Gender*. 2nd edition. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing.

Himmer, S. (2004). The Labyrinth Unbound: Weblog as Literature. *Into the Blogosphere: Rhetoric, Community and Culture of Weblogs.* University of Minnesota Digital Conservancy. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/11299/172823.

Hine, C. (2001). Web Pages, Authors and Audiences: the Meaning of a Mouse Click. *Information, Communication and Society.* 4(2), 182–98.

Hogan, B. (2010). The Presentation of Self in the Age of Social Media: Distinguishing Performances and Exhibitions Online. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society.* 30(6) 377–386.

InjiPennu. (2015). Indians Blast Facebook Over Broken Community Standards. *Global Voices.* 2 Aug 2015. Retrieved from https://globalvoices.org/2015/08/02/indians-blast-facebook-over-broken-community-standards/

Jaszi, P. (1991). Toward a Theory of Copyright: The Metamorphoses of "Authorship". *Duke Law Journal.* 2, 455-502.

Joinson, A. (1999). Social desirability, anonymity, and Internet-based questionnaires.*Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers* 31(3), 433-438.

Joyce, M. (2008). Authorship as Replacement. *Authority Matters: Rethinking Theory and Practice of Authorship.* Ed. Donavan, Stephen, Danuta,Fjellestad and Rolf Lunden. 259-269. New York: Rodopi..

Kennedy, Helen (2006). Beyond anonymity, or future directions for internet identity research *New Media & Society.* 8 (6), 859-876.

Kirkpatrick, D. (2010).*The Facebook Effect.* New York. Simon & Schuster.

Kittler, F. (1990). *Discourse Networks 1800/1900s.* Trans. Michele Metteer and Chris Cullens. California: Stanford University Press.

Knight, K. (2014). Gender Representations. In Marie-Laure Ryan, Lori Emerson, Benjamin J. Robertson (Eds) *The Johns Hopkins Guide to Digital Media.* Maryland. JHU Press.

Konrad, M. (2005) *Nameless relations. Anonymity, melanesia, and reproductive gift exchange between British ova donors and recipients.* New York: Berghahn.

Koopman, C. "The Age of Infopolitics". The Newyork Times. Jan 26, 2014. Retrieved from https://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2014/01/26/the-age-of-infopolitics/?_r=1

Krieger, L (1977). The Idea of Authority in the West. *The American Historical Review.* 82(2), 249-270.

Landow, G P. (1992) *Hypertext: The Convergence of Contemporary Critical Theory and Technology.* Maryland: John Hopkins University Press.

Lanham (1993). *The Electronic Word: Democracy, Technology, and the Arts.* Chicago. University of Chicago Press.

Latour, B. (2005). Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network-theory. Oxford university press,

Lazzarato, M. (1996) Immaterial Labor. Trans. P. Colilli and E. Emery, in M. Hardt and P. Virno (eds.) *Radical Thought in Italy: A Potential Politics.* 133-147. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press,

Legg, S. (2011). Assemblage/Apparatus: Using Deleuze and Foucault. *Area.* Royal Geographical Society. 43 (2). 128-133.

Lock, M. (2001) *Twice dead. Organ transplants and the reinvention of death.* Oakland: University of California Press.

Longo Mariano and Stefano Magnolo. (2009) The Author and Authorship in the Internet Society
New Perspectives for Scientific Communication. 57(6).

Love, Harold. (2002). *Attributing Authorship: An Introduction.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Lovink, G. (2008). *Zero Comments: Blogging and Critical Internet Culture.* New York: Routledge.

Mandiberg. M. (2012) Introduction. *The Social Media Reader.* New York: New York U Press.

Manovich L (2013) *Software Takes Command.* London, UK: Bloomsbury

Marx, G. T. (1999). What's in a name? Some reflections on the sociology of anonymity. *The Information Society,* 15 (2), 99-112.

McQuillan, D. (2015). Algorithmic states of Exception. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*. 18, (4-5), 564-576.

Miller, C R and Shepherd D. (2004). Blogging as Social Action: A genre analysis of the weblog. *Into the Blogosphere: Rhetoric, Community and Culture of Weblogs.* University of MinnesotaDigital Conservancy. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/11299/172818.

Mitra-Khan, T. (2012). Offline Issues, Online Lives? The emerging cyberlife of feminist politics in Urban India. In Srila Roy (Ed). *New South Asian Feminisms: Paradoxes and Possibilities*. 108-130. London. Zed Books.

Morozov, E. (2012). *The Net Delusion: The Dark Side of Internet Freedom*. New York: Public Affairs.

Mullan, J. (2008). *Anonymity: A Secret History of English Literature.* London: Faber&Faber.

Nakamura, L. (2002). *Cybertypes: Race, Ethnicity, and Identity on the Internet.* New York: Routledge.

Neyland, D. (2015). Bearing Account-able Witness to the Ethical Algorithmic System. *Science, Technology and Human Values*. 41 (1), 50-76.

Nissenbaum, H. (1999). The meaning of anonymity in an information age.*The Information Society*, 15(2), 141-144.

North, M. (2003). *Anonymous Renaissance: Cultures of Discretion in Tudor-Stuart England.* Chicago: U of Chicago P.

Outlook (2014, November 3). Kiss of Love's FB page, Organizers Account Allegedly Hacked. Retrieved from http://www.outlookindia.com/news/article/Kiss-of-Love-FB-Page-Organisers-Accounts-Allegedly-Hacked/866400ssenbaum

O'Reilly, T. (2007). Call for a Blogger's Code of Conduct.*O'Reilly radar*.

Pasquale F (2015) *The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms that Control Money and Information*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pease, D. E. (1990). Author.In Lentricchia, F and McLaughlin, T. (Eds). *Critical Terms for Literary Study.* 105-117. London: University of Chicago Press.

Ponesse, J. (2013) Navigating the unknown: Towards a positive conception of anonymity. *The Southern Journal of Philosophy*. 51 (3), 320-344.

Poster, M. (1990). *The Mode of Information: Poststructuralism and Social Context.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Poster, M. (2001). *Whats the Matter with Internet?*Minnepolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Praveen, S.R. (2015 August 27). A push from Kerala, 'For a better FB'. *The Hindu*.

Rasmussen, Eric (2002). From Lexias to Remediation: Theories of Hypertext Authorship in the 1990s. *eliterature.org*. Retrieved from http://eliterature.org/state/papers/paper-RasmussenE.pdf

Rellstab, D.H. (2007). Staging gender online: gender plays in Swiss internet relay chats. *Discourse & Society*. 18(6), 765-787.

Rose, M. (1993). *Authors and Owners: The Invention of Copyright.* Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Ross, E. (2013). The problem of anonymity in archives: A literature review. *BilgiDunyasi*. 14 (2) 240-250.

Rossiter, N and Zehle. S (2014). Toward a Politics of Anonymity: Algorithmic Actors in the Constitution of Collective Agency and the implications for the global economic justice movements. In Parker, M., Cheney, G., Fournier, V. and Land, C. (Eds) *The Routledge Companion to Alternative Organization*. 151-162. London: Routledge.

Salter, A. (2014). Mobile GamesIn Marie-Laure Ryan, Lori Emerson, Benjamin J. Robertson (Eds.) *The Johns Hopkins Guide to Digital Media*. Maryland. JHU Press.

Sarikakis, K, Krug, C. and Rodriguez-Amat, J.R. (2016). Defining authorship in user-generated content: Copyright struggles in The Game of Thrones. *New Media & Society*. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444815612446

Seaver N. (2015). Working with algorithms: Plans and mess. In: Kai Franz (Ed) *Serial Nature*. Stuttgart: Edition Solitude.

Sewell, D. R. (1997). The Internet Oracle: Virtual Authors and the Networked Community. *First Monday*. 2.(6)

Schiller, D. (2000). *Digital Capitalism: Networking the Global Market System*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Shah, N. (2015). The Selfie and the Slut Bodies, Technology and Public Shame.*Economic and Political Weekly*. L(17), 86-93.

Solove, D. (2004). *The Digital Person: Technology and Privacy in the Information Age.* New York. NYU Press.

Sontag, S. (1993). The Pornographic Imagination.*Styles of Radical Will.* 35-74. New York: Picador.

Sreekumar, T. T. (2016). Asian modernity and the posthuman future: Some reflections. In Sun Sun Lim and Cheryll Ruth R Soriano (Eds.), *Asian perspectives on digital culture: Emerging phenomena, enduring concepts*. 171-191. New York: Routledge.

Striphas, T. (2015). "Algorithmic Culture." European Journal of Cultural Studies. 18 (4-5), 395-412.

Sundén,J. (2003). *Material Virtualities: Approaching Online Textual Embodiment*. NewYork: Peter Lang Publishing.

Svensson, J. S. and Bannister, F. (2004). Pirates, Sharks and moral crusaders: Social Control in Peer-to-peer networks. *First Monday*. 9(6). http://uncommonculture.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/1154/1074

Teich, A., Frankel, M.S., Kling, R., and Ya-ching, L. (1999). Anonymous communication policies for the Internet: Results and recommendations of the AAAS conference. *The Information Society* 15(2).

The Mentor (1986). The Hacker Manifesto. Retrieved from http://www.phrack.org/archives/issues/7/3.txt

Thomas, O.D (2014). FoucaultianDispositifs as Methodology: The Case of Anonymous Exclusions by Unique Identification in India. *International Political Sociology* 8 (2), 164–181.

Trilling, L. (1971). *Sincerity and Authenticity*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Turkle, S (2005). *The Second Self: Computers and the Human Spirit.* 1984. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Woodmanse, M. (1984). The Genius and the Copyright: Economic and the Legal conditions of the Emergence of the 'Author'. *The Printed Word in the Eighteenth Century.* Spec. issue of *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 17(4). 425-48.

Woodmanse (1994). On the Author Effect: Recovering Collectivity.*The Construction of Authorship: Textual Appropriation in Law and Literature*. 15-28. North Carolina: Duke University Press.

Ziewitz M (2015). Governing algorithms: Myth, mess, and methods. *Science, Technology & Human Values* 41(4), 3–16.

Sreepriya Balakrishnan holds a doctorate in English literature from Mahatma Gandhi University, Kottayam (India) and has been into teaching and research for more than ten years. Her area of research crisscrosses literature studies and digital humanities.