

This article was downloaded by: [New York University]

On: 12 February 2009

Access details: Access Details: [subscription number 784375604]

Publisher Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



Third Text

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title-content=t713448411>

Electronic Civil Disobedience Post-9/11

Ricardo Dominguez

Online Publication Date: 01 September 2008

To cite this Article Dominguez, Ricardo(2008)'Electronic Civil Disobedience Post-9/11',Third Text,22:5,661 — 670

To link to this Article: DOI: 10.1080/09528820802442454

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09528820802442454>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: <http://www.informaworld.com/terms-and-conditions-of-access.pdf>

This article may be used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, re-distribution, re-selling, loan or sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

Electronic Civil Disobedience Post-9/11

Forget Cyber-Terrorism and Swarm the Future Now!

Ricardo Dominguez

Protest action of all kinds has been muted, first by an environment of shock and mourning, next by the rising tide of nationalism multiplied by the mass media organs, and then by the passage of legislation curtailing civil liberties in the name of the 'War on Terrorism'.¹

While it is true that contestation and protest after 9/11 felt much more dangerous than before, it did not stop Electronic Disturbance Theater (EDT) and many others from staging or participating in mass non-violent virtual sit-ins. In fact the theory and practice of ECD (Electronic Civil Disobedience) post-9/11 has now become part of the basic repertoire of possible activist gestures around the world and part of university research, training and implementation at Calit2,² at the University of California, San Diego, where Electronic Disturbance Theater is now based. EDT's institutional interpellation has allowed the practice of ECD to continue routing around the post-9/11 Patriot Act's attempt to place ECD under the umbrella of 'cyberterrorism' and once more to re-anchor the gesture as an act of radical poetics, of 'utopian performativity'.³ This utopian performativity carries the shapes of past historical embodiments and discursive conventions of civil disobedience (CD) as a practice, while at the same time creating a 'gestic insistence', in a Brechtian sense, that provokes a constant re-consideration of the performativity of ECD in the 'no-place' and the 'every-place' of post-contemporary digital environments. This gap between the shores of CD and seas of ECD has opened a series of re-mappings of the material relations between both event zones, which in the end are embedded within each other. Both CD and ECD meet at the contact point of the mass body of the multitude moving back and forth between 'being-there' and 'being-digitally-there'.

(We now interrupt this article with an e-terview)

1 Sasha Costanza-Chock, 'Mapping the Repertoire of Electronic Contention', 2001, Annenberg School for Communication, University of Pennsylvania, autumn 2001, http://www-scf.usc.edu/~costanza/electronic_rep_draft.pdf

2 Calit2, bang.calit2.net

3 Jill Dolan, *Utopia in Performance: Finding Hope At the Theater*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 2005

A TRANSPARENT AND CIVIL ACT OF DISOBEDIENCE AN INTERVIEW WITH RICARDO DOMINGUEZ BY HANS PETER KARTENBERG

Ricardo Dominguez speaks about virtual sit-ins and the upcoming trial against online Lufthansa Deportation Class activists in Germany. Hans Peter Kartenberg emailed the co-founder of The Electronic Disturbance Theater (EDT) on 12 June 2005.⁴

Hans Peter Kartenberg On your website at thing.net there was a call for a virtual sit-in on the website minutemanproject.com from 27 to 29 May 2005. Who are the Minutemen and what was the idea of that action?

Ricardo Dominguez Swarm The Minutemen was an e-action developed by a group of activists in the San Diego, California and Tijuana, Mexico border along with Electronic Disturbance Theater (EDT), in order to call attention to The Minutemen. The Minutemen are a non-governmental group of people vowing to patrol the US/Mexico border with guns in order to stop migrant people from crossing the border. They represent an intensification of the trend of violence towards migrant people and people of colour that has increased since 9/11. They have received right-wing state-government support from Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger and from anti-immigrant media. EDT called for a three-day virtual sit-in in solidarity with SWARM who had called for a number of e-actions to take place: a 24/7 telephone call campaign, a fax action, an email action and sound pollution actions on the border. Since the Minutemen say they love the silence of the desert – because they can hear the dirty rats (the people trying to cross the border) making noise – by creating lots of loud sounds it would keep the Minutemen from finding, stopping and harassing these people. These on/offline actions took place on the same days the Minutemen were holding a convention in Las Vegas.

HPK What were the effects of the campaign?

RD More than 78,500 people from around the world joined the non-violent mass virtual sit-in on sites hosted around the world against the Minutemen. It seems that in a time when almost all the space in the United States has been privatised and free speech zones have been reduced to cages topped with barbed wire, the internet can still serve as a commons where people can gather together to create positive social change. There were reports that at times the MinuteMenProject.com server was not responding, and at times the WakeUpAmericaFoundation.com server was unresponsive as well. Apparently the swarm had an effect. Within the Minutemen circles the action was discussed as well.

HPK In 2001, you were visiting the activists who organised the first virtual sit-in in Germany – they had been inspired by the Electronic Disturbance Theater. 13,000 people took part in the sit-in at the Lufthansa website to protest against the business the company was doing with the German state, transporting people who are deported from Germany.

4 <http://post.thing.net/node/304>, 12 June 2005

RD I was invited by No one is Illegal and Libertad! to speak in different cities in Germany in June 2001 about the history of Electronic Civil Disobedience (ECD) and Electronic Disturbance Theater's (EDT) use of mass non-violent direct action online since 1998. I helped to spread the word about the Virtual Sit-In on Lufthansa during the yearly shareholder meeting on 20 June 2001. I spoke to small and large groups of activists, media, artists and hacktivists.

HPK Was the Lufthansa action any different from the sit-ins organised in the US?

RD This action functioned exactly like our recent SWARM action. The 'Deportation class' action followed all the protocols of transparency that had been established for ECD since the first 'netstrikes' by the Italian activist communities in the mid-1990s. All the activists and artists announced the dates and reasons for the actions online, in the streets and inside the shareholders' meeting – nothing was hidden. This is important because ECD is about bringing together real bodies and digital bodies in a transparent manner that follows the tradition of Civil Disobedience – that people are willing to break a law (like blocking the street) to uphold a higher law.

HPK On 14 June Andreas-Thomas Vogel, who registered the domain libertad.de, where in 2001 a call for the Lufthansa action had been published, will be prosecuted in a high-security courtroom in Frankfurt, where on other occasions terrorist trials are held.

ECD should be judged by local, national and international courts as a civil act of disobedience and not as a crime. As Dr Dorothy E Denning of Georgetown University stated in her testimony before the Special Oversight Panel on Terrorism Committee on Armed Services in the US House of Representatives on 23 May 2000:

EDT and the Electrohippies view their operations as acts of civil disobedience, analogous to street protests and physical sit-ins, not as acts of violence or terrorism. This is an important distinction. Most activists, whether participating in the Million Mom March or a Web sit-in, are not terrorists.

Lufthansa and the German government knew who, what, when, why and how these actions were going to happen; it was not a secret attack. ECD is not a secret and anonymous 'cracking' into servers and enslaving in order to set off Distributed Denial of Service-attacks (DDoS). These actions only represent one or two hidden people. ECD is the unbearable weight of human beings online in a civil and transparent protest – whose main goal is to question and spread information about what they feel is a social condition that must be corrected to create a better society for all. This act of transparency is important for civil society and the courts to understand. ECD is and should be treated as another digital condition intimately tied to the long and deep Western tradition of Civil Disobedience – nothing more and nothing less.⁵

(We now return to the interrupted article.)

⁵ <http://www.libertad.de/inhalt/projekte/depclass/verfahren/index.shtml>, Dr Dorothy Denning on Cyberterrorism: Special Oversight Panel on Terrorism Committee on Armed Services in the US House of Representatives on 23 May 2000, <http://www.cs.georgetown.edu/~denning/infosec/cyberterror.html>

The inculcation of the politics of fear post-9/11 via the ‘War on Terror’ policies has not shifted the practice of ECD, or non-violent mass action online, as a number of critics thought would be the case:

Increased vigilance against the prospect of cyberterrorism has had its most tangible impact in the increased penalties for all forms of computer hacking – potentially including much hacktivist activity. The U.S.A. PATRIOT Act amended the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act (CFAA) to ‘lower jurisdictional hurdles relating to protected computers and damages, and increase penalties for violations’ (Milone 2002). The scope of the CFAA was expanded to specifically include computers outside the U.S., where they affect U.S. commerce or communications. The threshold of financial damage required for prosecution of computer hacking was revised to allow for aggregating damage caused to multiple computers, and to remove any minimum threshold in the case of damage to systems related to justice, defense, or security. Most significant, the maximum penalty for first-time offenders was raised from five years to ten, and for repeat offenders, from ten years to twenty.⁶ (Milone 2002)

Instead what has occurred has been a growing acceptance of ECD post-9/11 as an action-space that continues to function as a mirroring of the juridical kernel at the centre of CD and that EDT has consistently participated in identifying those links: one, it is a public action; two, it is non-violent; three, it willingly accepts the condition of ‘deliberate unlawfulness and accepting of responsibility’; four, it is always conscientious concerning its civil nature. According to John Rawls:

... civil disobedience expresses disobedience to the law within the limits of fidelity to law, and this feature helps to establish in the eyes of the majority that it is indeed conscientious and sincere, that it really is meant to address their sense of justice.⁷

For a number of legal scholars ECD is completely outside of the frame of cyberwar, cyberterrorism and cybercrime and even the softer trajectory of social net war. Instead legal scholars, such as William Karam, view ECD as not only connected to the ‘modern theoretical roots of the late 1800s, the jurisprudence of civil disobedience involves a global narrative stretching from Aeschylus... to nomadic protestors opposing globalisation...’⁸ For him ECD is a continuation of this global narrative; ECD is CD by other means. This mantra has been at the heart of creating a space of implementation and reflection that other forms of non-violent direct action online (such as cracktivism and some types of hacktivism, like web defacement) have not. ECD gestures continue to offer a form of social embodiment that allows everyday communities online and off the possibility of creating a space for civil society that is not directly tied to the dominant digital modes available, that is ‘communication and documentation’ or high-end code politics, as the only political options available to the non-specialist to connect with civil society in a state of contestation. ECD networks have become decisive zones for mass social expression that still carry the strong auras of human bodies gathering before and on the sites of governmentality under the historical signs of CD.

(News Flash)

6 Alexandra Whitney Samuel, ‘Hacktivism and Future of Political Participation’, doctoral thesis, 2004, <http://www.thing.net/~rdom/ucsd/Samuel-Hacktivism.pdf>

7 J Rawls, ‘Civil Disobedience and the Social Contract’, in *Morality and Moral Controversies*, ed J Arthur, 4th edition, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1996, p 356

8 William Karam, ‘Hacktivism: Is Hacktivism Civil Disobedience?’, Faculty of Law, University of Ottawa, 2003

HIGHER REGIONAL COURT SAYS ONLINE DEMONSTRATION IS NOT FORCE

Almost a year after the first-instance court of Frankfurt sentenced the initiator of an online demonstration against Lufthansa to pay a fine, the Higher Regional Court has overruled the lower court's verdict in its ruling of May 22 published yesterday and found the accused not guilty. The judges mainly questioned the definition of the use of force on which the lower court had based its ruling.

The proceedings concerning the online demonstration lasted almost five years. On 20 June 2001, the Groups Libertad and Kein Mensch ist illegal (No one is illegal) called for an online demonstration against Lufthansa. With special software they developed, demonstrators were able to automatically call various Lufthansa web sites in an attempt to overload the servers. The activists did so to protest the airline's participation in deportations.

It is not clear whether the campaign was a success. The publicity effect was tremendous, with even Germany's Ministry of Justice publicly expressing its doubt as to whether the planned event was legal. There were charges that the campaign constituted coercion and computer sabotage. Nonetheless, the human rights activists say that some 13,000 Internet users took part in the protest. On the other hand, the technical effect on Lufthansa was not great: the airline had prepared for the attack and rented additional line capacity to accommodate the traffic. Even today, it remains unclear how long the web site was actually slowed down and whether it ever went offline completely.

But the legal aftermath had greater effects. The human rights activists saw their online protest as a modern kind of non-violent sit-in and claimed they were acting within their basic constitutional right of freedom of assembly. Lufthansa and the state prosecutor saw things differently: they claimed that the campaign constituted coercion and that the activists were inciting others to break the law. The offices of the Frankfurt group Libertad were searched and computers confiscated – the beginning of several years of investigations.

In the summer of 2005, the first-instance court of Frankfurt found initiator Andreas-Thomas Vogel guilty and sentenced him to a fine of 90 days' pay. The court found the demonstration to be a use of force against Lufthansa as a web site operator as well as against other Internet users; specifically, the airline had suffered economic losses from the campaign, while other Internet users had been prevented from using Lufthansa's web site. The online demonstration was found to be a threat of an appreciable harm as defined by German Penal Code Section 240; Vogel was therefore found to be inciting people to commit coercion.

In its ruling (1 Ss 319/05), the First Penal Senate of the Higher Regional Court of Frankfurt has now overruled the initial verdict. The Higher Court found that the online demonstration did not constitute a show of force but was intended to influence public opinion. This new interpretation left no space for charges of coercion, and the accused was found not guilty. The initiators of the campaign see this new ruling as a 'slap in the lower court's face'. Although the online demonstration has not been repeated, the initiators expressly repeated their conviction that

the protest was legitimate. As Libertad spokesperson Hans-Peter Kartenberg put it, 'Although it is virtual in nature, the Internet is still a real public space. Wherever dirty deals go down, protests also have to be possible.' He also called on everyone not to forget the actual goal of the online protest in light of all the legal turmoil. According to Libertad, some 20,000 people are forcefully deported each year. Kartenberg reminds everyone that this 'inhumane policy' causes hundreds of deaths each year.

Torsten Kleins, Craig Morris, jk/c⁹

(We are Back to the Future)

The German court's decision very clearly frames the utopian performative of ECD as an event that re-zones 'the real' of the virtual public. The contact point is the human core that emerges in the untimely manner in a circuit that is both all too normal and still all too deviant. For some critics, like Dr Samuel, ECD has become all 'too common' to meet the demand of the dominant media's incessant need for new attractors and for others it fails to break the machine of digital capitalism beyond a limited form of pedagogic resistance. Yet it is this very lack that has created a new staging arena for the practice of ECD and its continuation as an area for long-term research. In 2004 EDT was invited to become part of Calit2 (a new-edge technology institute at UCSD), and the conditions that were established were based on ECD as an important critical diagramming of political practice in the present and the future, as well as a recognition that the type of ECD that the Electronic Disturbance Theater has established emerged from a long history of radical social interventionist aesthetics. While the institution as a whole accepted the conditions of ECD, the specifics of the internal dialogues about how and what would happen once the gestures started was another question.

EDT, in conjunction with our researchers at Borderhacklab, have staged two actions against the Minutemen, two actions against the Mexican government in response to its abuse of power in both Antenco and in Oaxaca, one against the French government (see above) and most recently an action in support of children and families fighting healthcare cutbacks in the state of Michigan (a situation that is occurring all across the US). In each case the process of internal dialogue within Calit2 has become clearer and has produced a higher state of support with each action. This unexpected support for ECD from Calit2 functions as a form of 'interhacktivity', to use new media theorist Jon McKenzie's term for digital activism/artivism that targets institutional infrastructures and dominant social groups, and seeks to shift the new onto-historical formations of power/knowledge that have emerged under the sign of 'high performance'.

The structural entanglement of this mass gesture of ECD and an edge technology institution will definitely play itself out as a constant process of deterritorialisation to counter the rapid process of re-territorialisation and back again – the question becomes one of diagramming the shifts that have occurred and are occurring. The diagram will have to give weight to each act of destratification and resistance in order to understand the effects or mutations of ECD as an institutionalised practice.

⁹ <http://www.heise.de/english/newsticker/news/73827>

But, it is too soon to have any clear or definite view of the power dynamics at play or a sense of the futural patterns that will be established.

(Interruption from Out of the Past)

**‘WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?’ JENNY MARKETOU
INTERVIEWS RICARDO DOMINGUEZ, 16 OCTOBER 2002**

*Artists, theorists, activists, hacktivists and artists’ collectives prior to all this have long been exploring through their works and actions various critical and crucial questions which pose the above proclaims. The artists in the exhibition *Open_Source_Art_Hack* which I organised with Steve Diets at the New Museum of Contemporary Art in New York, from 3 May to 30 June, 2002 are creatively pointing into the above debates about ‘public domain’, ‘hacking’ and ‘open source’.*

I feel compelled to mention that at the beginning of the exhibition ‘Knowbotic Research’, the artists’ collective from Zurich, had become the target of the disturbing and constantly expanding forces of private parties which can exert control of the public domain. Their project ‘Minds of Concern’ was forced to ‘pull the plug’ on their website under pressure from the museum’s ISP who in turn depend upon higher-up ISPs to preserve their connections to the Internet and who threatened to shut down the whole exhibition if KR did not stop the scanning of security systems (port scanning) to evaluate the vulnerability of a particular server to hacking attacks.

*Ironically ‘Minds of Concern’ was not the only project in the exhibition which ran into legal problems. The acclaimed artists’ collective Critical Art Ensemble and their performance *GenTerra* was postponed after the decision made by the director and staff of the New Museum. They did not feel comfortable with the project, on the grounds that it was illegal, or with the release of a ‘transgenic organism’ during the performance. CAE could only perform *GenTerra* in the museum once they jumped through a number of legal hoops. The tragedy is that both incidents address the political, sociological and creative sequences of a culture which is marked by the recent globalisation, privatisation and legal control which has resulted in the loss of a free public domain. Both incidents suggest that cultural institutions have not been able yet to balance artistic freedom of action with a dialogue between artists and museums which can actively engage internal critique from within the museum space.*

Jenny Marketou Do you think ‘creative hacking’ can intertwine with mainstream visual culture successfully? And what could be the role of the institution vis-à-vis the hacktivist artist? My argument here is what happens when the forces of the institution are confronted with radical, hacktivist net art aesthetics, when the emphasis is on direct action, transparency and agency? Or do you think that the museums and the commercial galleries are no longer interesting places for radical art practice? What are our options?

Ricardo Dominguez As you have pointed out, another larger social dynamic occurring around the institutional encounter, even with a digitally

correct network_art_activist project like the ‘Minds of Concern’, are the pre- and post-9/11 rhetoric of cyber-terrorism and cyber-crime that they are unable to see beyond. They fall easily before the digital hysteria of Empire and Terrorism just because they are using an ISP that did not support them – rather than spending time seeking out an ISP like thing.net that might have an understanding of the aesthetic and political questions involved in a work of this nature.

While many years of active education of the cultural institutions by artists working between art and politics during the twentieth century have taken place around the critique and disruption of the architecture of the museum/gallery and its policies of presentation, they fail to grasp its function within network architecture. These same institutions have not been able to leap into the networks and transfer over that history of encounters. For instance, a performance artist might receive more aesthetic and institutional support for chaining themselves to the outside doors of a museum or gallery to block access to them as a political performance than a project like the Electronic Disturbance Theater’s ‘Zapatistas Tribal Port Scan’ (2000). Not that one is a better performance than the other, but that the somatic architecture of networks is not as well understood by these cultural institutions.

One can also say much the same thing about CAE’s bio-political performances and institutional response to GenTerra as a legal question rather than a political aesthetic question: something that the museum/gallery would not do in the case of bio-formalist art along the line of Kac’s work. Formalism has been the main containment filter during the last half of the twentieth century – it will probably continue to do the same during the next half of this century (if we all live that long) – it is a very handy ideological tool. The nature of a radical transparency and direct action aesthetics as hacktivist gestures will not receive support from these older traditional spaces – until more projects like the one you have just done are done. Pedagogy is the primary event space right now for network_art_activism, rather than aesthetic or critical reflection within the institution.

But, even then, are these the spaces that we should seek support from? Most network_art_activism carried out during the 1990s existed outside the cultural institution and can continue to do so. But, if we do not pursue the artist’s right to present political art via code in the museum/gallery, we would lose one of the few spaces left that allows the possibility of presenting an important form of knowledge (art) that is not bound to science and technology to develop important social questions and ruptures.

JM As Lawrence Lessig puts it: ‘Free content is crucial to building and supporting new content. The raw material of Culture is Culture.’ Recently contemporary policies and practices towards the digital commons have changed. How do you see the future? Could the creative ‘hack’ with the ethics of ‘open source’ intermixed with the superfluity economy of the internet possibly attempt to maintain the richness and diversity of the public domain?

RD I am not sure only one way or one method can suture all of these elements together as a full-spectrum response. A swarm response will

probably offer us a better way to keep the public domain ‘rich and diverse’ online and offline. At one end of the spectrum we should have legal activism on a local, national and international level; and on the other end continue to push ‘creative’ hack crews to open more spaces, like ‘Freenet’ or the ‘Peek-a-booty’ browser by Cult of the Dead Cow. Tactical media projects should continue forward at pre-9/11 levels and at full speed, since they are not all dependent on the ‘superfluity’ of digital economies and can continue to distribute free/shareable content. At the same time the digital Agora must be pushed deeper into materiality of the social across the arcs of the world. The digital commons must become more aware of what is happening beyond code as it relates to globalisation and code’s relationship to its own expansion.

Those artists who crisscross between these spaces must bring to the foreground issues that are supposed to have been erased by the digital delirium: race, gender and class. No matter how much we hear the virtual mantra about race, gender and class no longer existing or being important it is simply not true. We now face a ‘War On Terrorism’ that is part of a global race war that is also being used to dismantle whatever small gains have been made towards democratic values around gender and class. The ‘Open Source’ movement and related digital issues, while interesting, are not going to develop solutions to these more complex issues and create the links between the global south and north that are needed to construct the alter-globalisation that will be necessary.

JM Taking into account your past involvement with Critical Art Ensemble (CAE) how do you describe electronic civil disobedience as ‘disturbance’ in the rhizomatic networks of power, as CAE describe it in their book, *The Electronic Disturbance*, as the only viable avenue for oppositional artistic practice in our time of globalisation? How has this altered your artistic production?

RD My artistic production has always been focused on developing ‘disturbance’ spaces as material/immaterial gestures within the ‘social imaginary’ that can be amplified by ubiquitous technologies – be it in traditional theatre productions, performance art, net art, or network_art_activism – even the pre-digital work functioned as contestational trajectories. I do not sense a deep alteration in my work between my collaborations with CAE and EDT, but a continuation of the same work under different signs.

The function of ‘disturbance’ for me is a hybrid between Augusto Boal’s Invisible Theatre and the Situationist gesture. It allows for visceral and political poetics to carve out social spaces for mass and intimate protest that can now be polyspatial. As for the ‘disturbance’ of rhizomatic power flows – this can be done if one understands that the flows of Virtual Capital are still uni-directional, that it has always been a one-way flow: steal from the bottom and keep it all on top; take from the South and keep it in the North, IMF growing and Argentina dying, Chiapas asking for Democracy and NAFTA deleting Democracy. So rhizomatic power does not lurk in Virtual Capital as a rhizome but as naked neo-imperialism. Rhizomatic power does flow from groups like the Zapatistas who have developed distributed abilities that are not uni-directional. The goal of EDT’s ‘disturbance’ is to block Virtual

Capitalism's race towards weightlessness and the social consequences of a totalised immaterial ethics.

JM Critical Art Ensemble advocates the practice of what they call 'Recombinant Theater'. How does this practice intermix with the powerful theatre of resistance that Zapatismo has created in Mexico and around the world that has been expanded in the performative Electronic Disturbance Theater's direct actions online?

RD EDT's performance involves a type of Electronic Civil Disobedience; we do not say that it is the only form of Electronic Civil Disobedience. Our gestures staged a simulation of Distributed Denial of Service as the outcome of mass agency and digital liminality. We move among net hacking, net activism, net performance, net art, and those who have no net link at all. To me this intermixing of social Zones is what CAE meant by 'recombinant theater'. Remember that according to part of CAE's analysis, Virtual Power was a counter-mapping of Fractal Politics that could be used by resistance groups to leverage the inertia and speed within each of the iterations or spaces of Virtual Power – the military/entertainment complex, the CNN effect, NGOs, the streets and jungles – to invent new dynamics for social interventions from the bottom up. The 'Zapatista FloodNet' and the 'Zapatista Tribal Port Scan' are radical aesthetic data gestures that disturb the ontology of the networks without being bound to the networks – because these gestures play on multiple social spaces in the same instant, or as after effects, or word of mouth (the most important form recombinant theatre as an aspect of Fractal Politics). We also did not ask any cultural institution if we could perform these gestures.

Digital Zapatismo understood within a few minutes of ripping into the electronic fabric in 1994 that the Fractal Politics of the web was different to that of the networks. Networks were about flawless code for command and control; the web was built in abandoned spaces and symbolic efficacy between data trash and discarded groups. Networks are about utilitarian rationality, the web is about an ontology of empathy; networks function under the teleology of robust infrastructure, the web creates a strong social imaginary that can re-route around lack of access. EDT's performative matrix has come to understand Digital Zapatismo as a type of theatrical empathy that the web can offer network_art_activism.

(Swarm the Future Now)

Now Calit2 is giving unlimited support for the performative utopianism of EDT's version of ECD that can at its best inject a critical humanism into the edges of high technology. As Fredric Jameson suggests, one possible outcome of a utopian gesture:

... is not to bring into focus the future to coming to be, but rather to make us conscious precisely of the horizons or outer limits of what can be thought and imagined in our present.¹⁰

10 Phillip E Wegner, 'Horizons, Figures and Machines: The Dialectic of Utopia in the Work of Fredric Jameson', *Utopian Studies*, 9:2, 1988, p 61

We must mind the gaps that are circulating around ECD now by swarming on the delays, discontinuities and retrenchments that are more than likely to be haunting this institutional setting. As the Zapatistas like to say, sometimes 'the apple falls up!'