

Cyberculture: Redefining Culture and Literature in Cyberspace

Luís Miguel Cardoso

Abstract—Cyberculture is now an established and profoundly solid scientific domain. The beginning of debates on the concept of Cyberculture starts with the emergence and consolidation of the internet and its impacts on contemporary society and the different manifestations of culture. Since the first researches on Post-Modernism, Cyberculture has gained more and more theoretical importance, namely with the contribution of researcher Pierre Lévy. Currently, cyberculture and cyberspace are part of the main theoretical researches and are subjects taught in numerous universities.

Keywords— Cyberculture, Cyberspace, Culture, Internet.

I. INTRODUCTION

The appearance of the internet has created a new space for expression, knowledge and even for communication between people, but it is not a space that exists physically, but virtually: cyberspace. This technological revolution has come to affect many aspects of daily life, making the present ever closer to the idea of a global village. But only in the last half of the twentieth century, with the emergence of the digital network and cyberspace, the virtual became an unquestionable point in social practices. Still, in addition to the unlimited amount of information published online, which anyone can access, entertainment is one of the most popular reasons why many people immigrated to cyberspace. Existing space in the world of communication in which the physical presence of man is not necessary to constitute communication as a source of relationship. It is "a physical and multidimensional representation of the abstract universe of 'information. A place to go with the mind, catapulted by technology, while the body is left behind. (Gibson, 2008: 5-6).

The notion of culture is related to the actions, ideas and artefacts learned, shared and perpetuated by a given society, more than a tradition, it is changing, as it moves according to the development of society. According to Santaella (2003): "Human culture exists in a continuum, it is cumulative, not in a linear sense, but in the sense of incessant interaction of tradition and change, persistence and transformation" (p.57), as well as "Human culture it exists in a continuum, it is cumulative, not in a linear sense, but the sense of incessant interaction of tradition and change, persistence and transformation" (Santaella, 2003). The digital culture or cyberculture comes from the indication of technology 2.0, in this context, the connection of thousands of users generates other forms of symbolic productions, if before

the content was made available on the network, today there is the culture of access to the content and its ways of online production. Combining cybernetics and culture, it originated the word cyberculture, which thus relates technology, the virtual and culture.

The concept of cyberculture has several meanings, however, it can be understood as the sociocultural form that results from an exchange relationship between society, culture and the new microelectronic based technologies that emerged in the 70s, due to the junction of telecommunications with informatics. Cyberculture is used in the definition of social agencies of communities in the virtual electronic space. These communities are increasing and popularizing the use of the Internet and other communication technologies, thus giving a greater possibility of getting closer among people from all over the world.

For Lemos, "Cyberculture is contemporary culture marked by digital technologies and represents a contemporary culture and is a direct consequence of the evolution of modern technological culture." (Lemos, 2003) and presents 3 laws for Cyberculture:

To try to systematize the questions quickly posed in this essay, we would like to draw your attention to what appears to be some cyberculture laws. These laws can be useful for the various analyzes under the varied aspects of contemporary society. A first law would be the law of Reconfiguration. We must avoid the logic of substitution or annihilation. In various expressions of cyberculture, it is a question of reconfiguring practices, media modalities, spaces, without replacing their respective antecedents.

The second law would be the Release of the emission pole. The various contemporary socio-cultural manifestations show that what is at stake, such as the excess of information, is nothing more than the emergence of voices and discourses previously repressed by the mass media's edition of information. The release of the broadcasting pole is present in the new forms of social relationship, in the provision of information and the opinion and social movement of the network. Thus chats, weblogs, websites, lists, new media modes, e-mails, virtual communities, among other social forms, can be understood by this second law. The third law is the law of generalized connectivity that begins with the transformation of the PC into a CC, and

then into a mobile CC. The various contemporary socio-technical networks show that it is possible to be alone without being isolated. Widespread connectivity puts men and men, men and machines in direct contact, but also machines and machines that exchange information autonomously and independently. In this era of connection, time is reduced to real-time and space becomes non-space, even if for this reason the importance of real space, as we have seen, and of time chronological, passing, have their importance renewed. (2003).

For Lèvy (1999), cyberculture presents a set of techniques, practices, attitudes, ways of thinking and values that were determined with cyberspace:

Cyberculture will be characterized by the formation of a structured society through widespread telematic connectivity, expanding the communicative potential, providing the exchange of information in the most diverse forms, fostering social aggregations. Cyberspace creates a working world, interconnected to icons, portals, websites and homepages, allowing the power of broadcasting to be placed in the hands of a young, tribal, gregarious culture, which will produce information, add noise and collages, throw excess to the system. Perhaps we are looking for technologies for a new form of social aggregation (electronic, ephemeral and planetary. ” (Lemos 2004: 87).

In the virtual space generated in cyberspace, all the products of human action and the culture of a community are projected: knowledge, art, emotions, different groups or individuals. It is in this dimension that the vast set of images, sounds, ideas, human history or its product becomes potentially accessible. That is, everything that belongs to the real world can belong to the virtual world. Furthermore, what we call the virtual world uses the material and symbolic universe of the real world, for Lévy:

Cyberculture expresses a fundamental change in the very essence of culture. According to the thesis I developed in this study, the key to the culture of the future is the concept of universal without totality. In this proposition, "the universal" means the virtual presence of humanity for itself. The universal houses the here and now of the species, its meeting point, a paradoxical here and now, with no definable place or time. The horizon of cyberspace that we have as a universalist is to interconnect all the bipedal speakers and make them participate in the collective intelligence of the species within a ubiquitous environment. ” (1999: 78)

Lévy defines cyberculture as the third era of communication that would follow oral communication and writing, characterized by digitalization, and the immediate transportability of all types of data. Kerkchove (1999) proposes to understand cyberculture from its three main characteristics: interactivity, hypertextuality and connectivity. For its part, Sherry Turkle (1997) speaks of the new subjectivities that arise before the extension of the new digital technologies and reflects on the identity in cyberspace. Pierre Lévy unites technique, society, culture, art, education, citizenship in a single space: the virtual, which for the author, is just a starting point for getting to know and better plan the real territory. We can divide his main book into three parts: - the author makes a relationship between technique, culture and society, emphasizing that the technique is the product of a culture, and society is conditioned to its technique. Although not decisive, the technique opens up possibilities in all aspects of social life.

Therefore, without it, some social and cultural options could not be thought of. - cultural implications brought about by the new space of communication, sociability and inclusion, which Lévy calls Cyberspace, and says that this is the only way through which people can share “collective intelligence” and discuss numerous themes simultaneously, without submitting to any kind of ideological control; - Lévy defends that one of the main characteristics of cyberspace is to be independent and communal, so it should not be used only in a commercial way. Another issue is that with the emergence of cyberspace, the State fears losing its sovereignty over culture and territory. The network is deterritorializing, through it, you can visit the world without having to go through customs.

The growth of cyberspace is guided by three fundamental principles: interconnection, the creation of virtual communities and collective intelligence. Interconnection is a basic principle of cyberspace, since its dynamics is a dialogue between people, for cyberculture the connection is always preferable to isolation. Christian Huitema said that “the technical horizon of the cyberculture movement is universal communication: every computer on the planet, every device, every machine, from the automobile to the toaster, must have an internet address. This is the categorical imperative of cyberculture. If this program materializes, the smallest of the artefacts will be able to receive information from all the others and respond to them, preferably wirelessly. ” (Lévy, 2010, p.127)

Virtual communities “are built on affinities of interests, of knowledge, on projects, in a mutual process of cooperation and exchange” (LÉVY, 1999, p.127). Finally, collective intelligence refers to the knowledge shared by several individuals. “It is an intelligence distributed everywhere, in which all knowledge is in humanity, since, nobody knows everything, but everyone knows something ”(Lévy, 2007, p. 212).

Cyberculture is the transposition of human cultures into an expanding connected space, which allows more people and connected groups to share information, knowledge and knowledge, thus creating conditions for the introduction of new knowledge that can be developed through the creation of applications, websites and programs.

As it is explicit in its name, the word "cyber" is linked to new technologies, post-modernity and society's networked communication:

Cyberculture can be understood as a field of experience through which this instituting factor of modern times begins to become every day for the conscience. The formation that underlies him refers to a set of practices and representations, through which he begins to be routinized to the common man. (Rüdiger, 2008: 11)

The cyberculture movement appears associated with the evolution and massification of computers as well as the network communication made by society. Cyberculture appears associated with the Internet and all its main characteristics:

The cyberculture movement is a relatively recent movement, which is largely a consequence of the massification of digital computers, their network connection accompanied by the popularization of the Internet, and also certain scientific and technological developments that have also become known to the general public. in the last decade. (...) However, and as with any other movement of ideas, its origins are much older. They go back to the moment when technological innovation arose that would mark the fundamental characteristics of cyberculture: the design and implementation of the digital computer. They also date back to a scientific movement, cybernetics, within which many of the modern characteristics of so-called information technologies began to take shape. As in part with the cybernetic movement, cyberculture is an absolutely distinctive feature of its intimate association with this specific technology, which is the digital computer. " (António Machuco Rosa).

At the origin of Cyberculture and Cyberspace, we find the work *Neuromancer*, by the American writer William Gibson, linked to postmodernism and the concept of the post-human. This search for the improvement of human capacity, the increasing hybridization of the body by machines and this new look at human nature, received, by parts of theorists and scholars in this area, the denomination of Post-human. One can apprehend in the Gibsonian work the coexistence of two paradigms: a humanist who reinforces the transcendence of the soul, the elevation of the being, the detachment of the mind/soul of the human body. As well as the post-human paradigm that reinforces the embodiment, the communion of the body, as a machine, whether prosthetic or not, with the mind. As Kim writes:

The effective vulgarization of cybernetics began in the 1980s under the influence of a type of science fiction literature that became known as

cyberpunk.³ The influence of this literary genre in cinema was decisive for the dissemination of the contours and connotations that "cybernetics" have today. Cyberpunk brought together the dystopian vision of the punk movement and the stereotypes of its lifestyle to the futuristic imaginary in which the "cyber" gadgets (gadgets and gadgets) and cyborgs were widely used. One of the main legacies of cyberpunk is the image of the gadget-man (man-object that is not much more than a gadget coupled to a system or network of gadgets) whose body is banal support of bionics and whose mind only finds its totality when connected to "cyberspace". In his nonfiction book, *The Hacker Crackdown - Law and Disorder on the Electronic Frontier*, Bruce Sterling comments that the term cyberspace appeared in 1982 in cyberpunk literature (Sterling, 1992, p. XI). That year, William Gibson launched *Neuromancer*, considered a classic of cyberpunk literature, which in addition to the term cyberspace, also introduced the term matrix to refer to cyberspace as a global simulation network. Sterling adds that "cyberspace" is not a science fiction fantasy, but a "place" where we have genuine experiences and that has existed for more than a century (2004, p. 212-213).

Regarding this relationship, which is increasingly noticeable, between man and machines, Santaella writes:

In the passage from the 20th to the 21st century, the reconfiguration of the human body in its technological fusion and biomaterial extensions is creating the hybrid nature of a prosthetic organism, cyber that is establishing a new form of relationship or electromagnetic continuity between the human being and space through the machines. This paradigmatic reversal of perspective on our horizon made it essential to overcome the opposition between the mechanical universe of technology in favour of a logic of complexity capable of recognizing that the life of the body and its external and even internal environments are inextricably mediated by machines. (2003, p. 66)

In this regard, the American theorist Katherine Hayles (1999, p. 3) considers that: "In the posthuman, there are no essential differences or absolute demarcations between bodily existence and computer simulation, cybernetic mechanism and biological organism, robot technology and human goals".

On this issue, we recall Elias:

In my view, cyberspace is considered a "machine-place", because it is in fact (sic) a space that reconciles two extremely important elements; one is technology, the other

rationalism. They look the same, but in reality, they are not. What makes cyberspace so passionate is the fact (sic) that it is a space of technique that allows rationalism and, at the same time, hallucination. Cyberspace is thus the meeting point for something that was fragmented and left to chance in modernity (technology). In this sense, cyberspace is a new universe, a single world that contains everything that includes and is in uncontrollable expansion, like the cosmos. (2007, p.23)

Therefore, in conclusion, as Lemos writes:

We must therefore be open to the potential of cyberculture technologies and be attentive to their negativities. We must try to understand life as it is and seek to understand and seize the socio-technical means of cyberculture. This will guarantee our cultural, aesthetic, social and political survival beyond mere mechanical control over the world. For those who know and want to look, in the different socio-cultural manifestations of contemporary cyberculture we can see that there is still life beyond the total artificialization of the world. The phenomenon is still in its prehistory and this dynamic object will change with certainty. We claim that today, our present is immune to aseptic and generalized controls. (2004, p. 23).

REFERENCES

- [1] Elias, H. (2008). *Néon Digital: um discurso sobre os ciberespaço*. Universidade da Beira Interior: LabCom, 2008. http://www.livroslabcom.ubi.pt/pdfs/20110824-elias_herlander_neon_digital.pdf.
- [2] Gibson, W. (2008) *Neuromancer*. São Paulo: Aleph, 2008.
- [3] Hayles, K. (1999). *How we became posthumans?*. Chicago: Chicago University Press

- <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226321394.001.0001>
- [4] Kim, J. (2004) *Cibernética, ciborgues e ciberespaço: notas sobre as origens da cibernética e sua reinvenção cultural*, *Horizontes Antropológicos*, Porto Alegre, ano 10, n. 21, p. 199-219, jan./jun. 2004 <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0104-71832004000100009>
- [5] Lemos, A. (2004) "Cibercultura, tecnologia e vida social na cultura contemporânea", Porto Alegre: Sulina.
- [6] Lévy, P. (1999) *Cibercultura*. Rio de Janeiro: Ed.: 34
- [7] Machuco Rosa, A. (2003) *Internet - Uma História*, Lisboa, Edições Universitárias Lusófonas
- [8] Rüdiger, F. (2008). *Cibercultura e pós-humanismo*. Edipucrs.
- [9] Santaella, L. (2003). "Da cultura das mídias à cibercultura: o advento do pós-humano", in *Revista FAMECOS*. Url: <http://www.revistas.univerciencia.org/index.php/famecos/article/viewFile/229/174>



L. Cardoso was born in Viseu (Portugal) in 1969. After concluding the Humanities degree at the Catholic University in 1991, he concluded a Master in Classic Literatures at Coimbra University, in 1996. In 2007 he concluded his PhD in Modern Languages and Literatures at Coimbra University (Portugal). After teaching for four years in secondary schools, he began teaching at the Polytechnic Institute of Viseu in 1995 until 2008, when he moved to the Polytechnic Institute of Portalegre as Adjunct Professor. He was elected Dean of the School of Education and Social Sciences in 2010 until february 2018, completing the two mandates permitted by law. Since 2015 until May, 2018, he was also President of ARIPESSE – the Association for Reflexion and Intervention in Higher Schools Polytics. Main interests in teaching and investigation include Science and Communication Languages, Literature and Cinema, and Management of Higher Education Universities. In 2016, he published *Literature and Cinema: the look of Janus. Vergílio Ferreira and the space of the unspeakable*. Prof. Dr. Cardoso was the national coordinator for the Bologna Process in Polytechnics in Media and Communication Sciences. He is a member of several international organizations concerning Education, Communication, Comparative Literature, Narratology, Film Studies and Higher Education Management and reviewer of several international journals. He has published several papers in national and international journals with peer review and is a member of C3i - *Polytechnic Institute of Portalegre* and of the *Center for Comparative Studies* of the University of Lisbon.