

*The ZaMir (for peace) Network: from transnational social
movement to Croatian NGO*

Paul Stubbs (The Institute of Economics, Zagreb)

Introduction

This article is a work in progress, part of an ongoing study of the *ZaMir* network which I first wrote about in an article published in Sociological Research On-line on 30 September 1998. (Stubbs, 1998) Essentially, this text is an historical case study, a kind of ‘*ZaMir* revisited’, utilizing a methodology based on ‘netnography’ and respondents’ accounts, the latter gathered through semi-structured taped interviews. It seeks to explore diverse understandings of the social and political role of *ZaMir* and its internal structuring and organization. In particular, the study concentrates on *ZaMir*’s shift from a transnational social movement based on a bulletin board system (BBS), to being a Croatian NGO linked to a new commercial Internet service provider (ISP), and involved in supporting ‘civil society’ and ‘community development’ in war-affected areas of Croatia.

Two quotes from respondents help frame the analysis in the text, and underpin the exploration of diverse accounts of these shifts, their broader meaning, and any possible analytical explanations. Both quotes are from Croatian anti-war activists with an involvement in, or knowledge of, *ZaMir* from its earliest origins.

We were different from each other before the war. Our opposition to the war brought us together. After the war, we were able to be different again. (Respondent 1, female)

I really don’t believe that, it’s like, the early times of *ZaMir* were wonderful, and now these technocrats came and they have destroyed everything, and they have turned it into some mainstream, quasi NGO type of thing. It is not true. (Respondent 2, female)

The importance of historical case studies of on-line and off-line social and political movements is stressed in David Silver’s excellent epilogue to the edited volume

‘Cyberactivism’. He notes the importance of time which ‘inevitably brings with it new dilemmas, new directions, new problems, and new solutions.’ (Silver, 2003: 287) He goes further to suggest that ‘by historically situating cyberactivism, we better understand it as a set of fluid, changing and *changeable* ebbs and flows.’ (Silver, 2003: 288, emphasis in original)

There are no zombie methods

Ulrich Beck has systematically in the last five years launched an attack on what he terms the ‘zombie categories’ of sociology, which ‘are dead, but somehow go on living, making us blind to the realities of our lives.’ (Beck, 1999) Whilst his targets, concepts of ‘the family’, ‘household’, ‘class’ and such like, are well chosen and in themselves not particularly relevant to this text, the mode of thinking behind the phrase is relevant and perhaps more problematic. Namely, in this ‘new’ age of a postnational risk society, with a leading role played by ‘new’ information technologies, it is extraordinarily tempting to state that sociology needs ‘new’ concepts, ‘new’ categories’, ‘new’ methodologies.

The last, the notion of ‘new’ methodologies, is particularly seductive – who could possibly resist the idea of using the computer to understand computer-mediated communication. Indeed, I am myself increasingly involved in multi-disciplinary work on social network analysis utilizing the advances of computer-based mathematical modelling which allow for the gathering and analysing of data ‘on a scale far larger than previously possible.’ (Newman, 2003: 167) Yet, as Newman and others associated with this ‘new’ movement recognize, there is a long tradition of the study of networks within sociology which needs to be built on and developed, not ignored.

Taking as axiomatic Adamic and Adar’s notion that ‘you are what you link’, subsequent work on *ZaMir* may well benefit from studying out- and in-links to its web pages. Such a study would, no doubt, reveal ‘a complex network of ... links’ and provide ‘a rich mining ground for studying social phenomena’, (Adamic and Adar, n.d.) much as Garrido and Halavais were able to tease out the embeddedness of the Zapatistas’ web sites in a wider network utilizing a customized web-crawler. (Garrido and Havelais, 2003)

Thus far, however, the study has relied upon combining the relatively new concept of ‘netnography’ with the tried and trusted method of the semi-structured interview with key participants in the *ZaMir* story. At the time of my own first use of the term

‘netnography’, (Stubbs, 1999) I was not aware of Robert Kozinets’s earlier usage of it, to refer to a process and a written account based on ‘observing the general guidelines and traditions of ethnography whilst adapting them to the unique circumstances of cyberspace.’ (Kozinets, 1998) In this sense, insofar as the Internet is a form of social interaction, it renders itself, in Christine Hine’s terms, as ‘in some sense ethnographically available’. (Hine, 2000: 50)

Hine goes on to suggest that alternatively cyberspace can be viewed as composed of texts. She sees no inherent incompatibility between these two approaches, and suggests that studying interaction can actually be complemented by studying texts which are ‘available outside the circumstances in which they are produced.’ (Hine, 2000: 50) My own semi-structured interviews, with so far only seven respondents out of hopefully a final group of between fifteen and twenty, represent a key source of information, and can also be seen as both ‘texts’ and as ‘interactions’. The latter is important given Hine’s concern, also, with reflexivity, hopefully going beyond the old cultural anthropological joke of the interviewer who says to her/his respondents: ‘Enough about you, let’s talk about me some more’¹. For Hine, virtual ethnography involves ‘intensive engagement’, suggesting that it ‘can usefully draw on ethnographer as informant and embrace the reflexive dimension’, (Hine, 2000: 65) such that ‘reflexivity is applied not just to the work of individual ethnographers, but to the methodology as a whole.’ (Hine, 2000: 55)

Here, the need for reflexivity is, in part at least, related to my own position as a user of *ZaMir* since 1994, and the realization, in the course of interviews with people most of whom are known to me personally, some of whom are close collaborators and/or close personal friends, that over time *ZaMir* has changed so that I am no longer considered a *member* (of a community, a movement, a group), but a *beneficiary* (of an NGO, a project, a service). My own activist-scholarly work, over the same period, has focused, some would say obsessively so, on the shifts from ‘authentic’ social movements to ‘projectized’ NGOs, and from politicized commitment to technocratic routinization, (cf. inter alia Stubbs, 2001) so that there are real dangers in simply uncovering ‘facts’ which prove the thesis. Hence, whilst broadly charting the shift in *ZaMir* in these terms, this text is also profoundly interested in the diverse understandings, underpinned by a commitment to a ‘multi-voiced’ netnography, (cf Jambresic Kirin, 1999) in which not all pieces fit easily into a neat ‘before’ and ‘after’ jigsaw story.

Time moves on: between ‘amnesia’ and ‘nostalgia’

If we return to Silver’s point of the importance of time within historical case studies, we can note four broad sets of complex interrelated changes in the period between *ZaMir*’s establishment in 1992 and today. The first is, of course, the realization that the contemporary age is a globalized one which, in terms of an explosion of literature at least, did not really begin until at least the mid- to late-1990s. From its earliest days, linked to GreenNet in the UK and, more widely, to the Association for Progressive Communications (APC), *ZaMir* was innovative in global terms, unique in the region, and certainly ahead of its time, in linking CMC and social movement activism.

Secondly, *ZaMir* developed explicitly as a part of the anti-war movement in Croatia and in other parts of the former Yugoslavia. The historical pattern of the wars, and wider political transformations, are relevant to the particular path taken by *ZaMir* in this period. The war in Bosnia effectively ended with the Dayton peace agreement of 1995 and, by this time, most of the territory of Croatia was under Government control following military actions in May and August of that year. One region, Eastern Slavonia, was at the same time placed under UN administration and then, over time, peacefully reintegrated into Croatia. Efforts in Croatia, subsequently, turned to questions of post-authoritarian normalization, not achieved to any extent until the election of a new government in January 2000. In Serbia, of course, the Milošević regime continued to exist, even after NATO bombing and the establishment of Kosovo as a UN-administered protectorate, until its overthrow following disputed elections in October 2000.

Thirdly, whilst not wanting to be trapped within a technologically determinist paradigm, the period of the last twelve years has seen enormous changes in both the capacities and constraints of ‘normal technology’ and its social significance. Originally *ZaMir* in Zagreb was run from a Dutch activist’s laptop until a grant from the Government of Switzerland allowed for the purchase of the first ‘server’, a 386 40 MHz computer with a ‘massive’ 400 MB hard-disk. For many years it was a bulletin board system (BBS), using Cross-Point software as an off-line reader, a program running on DOS, and only available in the German language. Over time, more choices became available given the dramatic increase in potential and decrease in costs in

state of the art technology and indeed many of the key changes in *Zamir*, and disagreements about them, were facilitated by precisely this trend.

Fourthly, I share Salter's concern that 'much of the most insightful and original writing about the Internet took place in the mid-1990s, prior to the expansion of the Web.' (Salter, 2003: 119) My own earlier work on *ZaMir* was heavily influenced by the concerns of Rheingold, Watson and others regarding whether CMC users are a 'community' and how CMC changes identity. (Stubbs, 1998: part 2; Rheingold, 1993: Watson, 1997) Now, in retrospect, those questions seem far too broad and not particularistic enough.

In this context of changing times, two tendencies are extremely difficult to avoid, which in shorthand and, unavoidably if problematically, medicalized, terms, we can call 'amnesia' and 'nostalgia'. In some senses, they are opposite tendencies, since the former forgets, or is ignorant of the past, and the latter remembers the past fondly, albeit often distorted. Both have problematic effects on acting in the present, since the former forgets the path already travelled, and the latter wants to go back down it.

The notion of 'amnesia international' was coined by the curator Darko Fritz for the retrospective exhibition 'I am still alive' held in Zagreb, the capital of Croatia, in 2000. (Fritz, 2000) He is referring in part to the 'almost forgotten' fact that, from 3 to 4 August 1968, Zagreb played host to an international colloquy on 'Computers and Visual Research' as part of the fourth 'New Tendencies' exhibition which can be seen as a major event in the promotion of computer art. (cf. Klütsch 2004; Mestrovic, 2004) The fact that such a movement was rediscovered in 2000, and had no connection with *ZaMir* is, perhaps, not as profoundly disturbing as the fact that much of *ZaMir* today is ignorant, or plain wrong, about its own past. To quote one respondent:

Recently, maybe a year and a half ago, I looked on *ZaMirNET* and I looked at the history. And I really had to dig, dig, dig, to find the history of *ZaMir*. And I found that *ZaMir* was established in 1989! And then I wrote them saying this is wrong.'
(Respondent 1, female)

Interestingly, at the time of writing (October 2004) whilst the Croatian language version has been changed on the web site, so that *ZaMir* is correctly stated as being founded in 1992 and the Anti-war Campaign, ARK network, correctly stated as

having being founded in 1991 (<http://www.zamirnet.hr/sadrzaj/zamir/zamir.html>), the English language version remains incorrect in part, with ARK recorded as having been established in 1989, which would have been an act of considerable historical foresight (<http://www.zamirnet.hr/eng/page/zamir/zamir.html>). Indeed, something of the problem is acknowledged by those involved with *ZaMir* today:

When I started to work with *ZaMir*, we somehow researched a little bit *ZaMir*'s past, and I was talking to different people, listening to different stories, looking on Internet to find German sources, because the server was in Germany. I found some things there but nothing really in *ZaMir* itself, there was no written history, nothing really available. (Respondent 3, female)

Other amnesias will be noted throughout this text, notably the way in which the commercial Internet service provider *Iskon* tends to forget its own origins in *ZaMir*. Whilst amnesia is perhaps a sin of others, the dangers of social movement nostalgia are ever present in this text, a nostalgia somewhat too utopian and not ironic enough in Svetlana Boym's sense. (Boym, 1994: 284-5)ⁱⁱ In part, nostalgia can be traced to participation in a social movement underpinned by a 'new' technology which represented, or seemed to represent at the time, the cutting edge of engagement and activism. Yang has usefully suggested that the notion of liminality, 'characterized by freedom, egalitarianism, communion, and creativity', (Yang, 2000: 383) helps to explain the nostalgia which participants have for experiences which were identity transforming. Nonetheless, such a nostalgia, which one respondent described as 'some kind of fetishism (which) was almost fatal at some point', (Respondent 4, male) takes elements from this liminality and projects that, if only things had not changed in the way they did, then 'authenticity' would have been maintained.

Revisiting early *ZaMir*

The story of the early years of *ZaMir*, let us say from 1992 until 1996, has been told often, sometimes in the words of those directly involved. One of the most interesting accounts can be found in *Wired Magazine* of November 1995:

The idea behind ZaMir was to connect groups fighting against war in a country that was being ripped apart by it. The first two ZaMir centers began in June 1992 in Zagreb, the capital of Croatia, and Belgrade, the capital of Serbia and the rump Yugoslavia. In early 1994, centers in Sarajevo, the besieged capital of Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Ljubljana, the peaceful capital of Slovenia, were Wired. Recent additions include in November 1994 Pristina, the capital of Kosovo, the majority-Albanian region under Serbian control within the borders of the rump Yugoslavia; and this past spring the Bosnian city of Tuzla. (Gessen, 1995)

Gessen's portraits of some of the key figures in the early days of *ZaMir* are particularly evocative, describing Eric Bachman as 'a Vietnam-era conscientious objector who has been living in Germany since 1969', Dutch activist Wam Kat as 'a 40-year-old globetrotting troublemaker whose personal mythology is nearly rich enough to rival the convoluted history of his latest adopted land ... (who) has worked in the peace and environmental movements in Europe for the last 20 years', Ognjen Tus as a forty-five year old 'techno-hippie who maintains he drives one of the last Volkswagen Bugs made in Yugoslavia', and Srdjan Dvornik as 'a weary 42-year-old intellectual political activist'. Perhaps most interesting is her observation that 'some ZaMirites are geeks, some are intensely political, and the Zagreb ZaMirites are notably cool and generally pleased with themselves for running such a nifty project.' (Gessen, 1995)

Other accounts, including those of Bachman himself, (Bachman, 1996a and 1996b) are more formalistic in tone. By the end of 1994, he informs us, *ZaMir* had more than 1700 users on five different servers in five cities, and, having become full members of the Association for Progressive Communications, the email domain name became ztn.apc.org, with ZTN being the 'ZaMir Transnational network.'

My own account of *ZaMir*, published in 1998, described it as part of 'an experimental social movement', (Stubbs, 1998: 3.2) noting the lively debates, humour and internally meaningful discourse, particularly, of the Zagreb 'scene' of peace, human rights and women's group activists. In addition, *ZaMir's* role in passing messages into and out of Sarajevo, in facilitating work on both sides of Pakrac, a divided town in Croatia, and in 'witnessing' events such as the shelling of Tuzla in Bosnia-Herzegovina, all indicated the connection between on-line and off-line realities. (cf Stubbs, 1998)

One activist, centrally involved in the anti-war campaign in Croatia at the time, describes this relationship clearly:

Different groups used *ZaMir* differently and some really made the best out of using it, and some had not been able. There was a certain level of planning and networking needed. ... So it was most useful for groups which already had a common agenda ... and clear common goals, and then they can nicely use it for actually achieving their goals and agreeing about directions. So you have a physical space, a context, and then you can build on that. (Respondent 5, female).

Another activist describes different aspects of this relationship:

For me, what is more important was the way we involved the people as users. ... For some of our users, we would bring them computers, because we had a contact and sometimes we would get old computers. We would put the programme in and put a modem in. And we would find interesting users, you know, people who want to communicate (and) who have something to say. We built this social structure. (Respondent 6, male)

A third comments:

For us here (in Zagreb), *ZaMir* really was a fantastic tool. Through newsgroups or conferences and individually, we made an exchange, it was really great. I know some people who fell in love over e-mail. And all kinds of personal relationships were established, or sometimes broken. (Respondent, 4, male)

A fourth expresses *ZaMir*'s contribution to liminality even more clearly:

It was a feeling, like it was an internal public space. ... It was run by activists. There were people who were really good with technology but also their main characteristics were that they were activists ... and that's why it worked. (Respondent 1, female)

Changing ZaMir: Internet, NGOization and the Iskon connection

In seeking to address the meaning, form and content of *ZaMir* today, it is necessary to untangle three inter-related, but perhaps separable, changes: from the bulletin board system to Internet; from being part of the anti-war campaign to being an independent NGO, and, in terms of the Internet connection, becoming a kind of sub-provider within the private commercial company *Iskon*. Of course, many other changes are also relevant: notably, the end of the wars, the decline and finally disappearance of all the other *ZaMir* nodes outside of Zagreb, and the diversification of computer-mediated activism in the post-Yugoslav space.

The shift from the BBS to Internet is one which, interestingly, many of the older generation of activists see as problematic in and of itself:

For me, I still haven't got over the end of the BBS. Because the quality of communication which we had then was incomparable to what we have now. Internet, of course it's useful, but it has an enormous capacity towards the world and a small capacity towards your neighbours. (Respondent 5, female)

A different perspective is given by one of those centrally involved in *ZaMir* today:

I am a very visual type and I did not like how the BBS looked, it was not attractive at all. ... And then suddenly there were some web pages that looked attractive and I was interested. ... Suddenly, I realized there was something interesting, and I loved the web design stuff. It's nice. I would like to learn, but I don't have time. Luckily now we have content management systems so I can upload any information without any difficulties. I use that, it's really user friendly and I love it. (Respondent 3, female)

What does appear to have occurred is that, within *ZaMir* and the wider anti-war campaign 'a ... consensus that we wanted to provide full Internet access to our users' (Respondent 4, male) actually broke down in the context of wider debates about how to keep 'the local touch', (Respondent 6, male) in changed circumstances in which there was some kind of dissipation of 'social energy'.

More fundamentally, the technological shift was overdetermined by a wider process of 'NGOization', or a process through which, in Aida Bagic's terms, borrowing from

the work of Sabine Lang, (1997) ‘well-run NGOs become seen as the equivalent of social change activism’. (Bagic, 2004: 222) Aspects of this, the attention to ‘issue-specific interventions’ and ‘pragmatic strategies’, ‘a strong employment focus’, and emphasis on professional organization building, within a hierarchical structure, can be found in today’s *ZaMir*. One respondent sees the shift as both incremental and accidental, on the one hand, but also fundamental on the other:

When the finances were kind of clear, then they said – OK, let’s register *ZaMir* as a separate NGO, as this was the trend with all different kinds of projects. ... (The new co-ordinator) had ideas to form *ZaMir* as an NGO portal which changed the identity of *ZaMir*. ... It started to be an NGO and to support, what is it, civil society or NGOs’ growth. ... It’s important to have it, but it’s not *ZaMir* anymore. (Respondent 1, female)

The same respondent also referred to a ‘different way of entering the organization’ and ‘a different way of behaving in the organization’, (Respondent 1, female) in which salary, job description and finding people to fit positions began to dominate over an emphasis on activism. Indeed, the iconography of *ZaMir* changed, with the new *ZaMir* now in a neat office, with every piece of office equipment, including framed posters on the wall, marked with a number.

The third, and most contentious issue, a subject the intricacies and diverse understandings of which reach the status of a movement myth, is the relationship between *ZaMir* and *Iskon*, a company established by a *ZaMir* employee as the first commercial Internet provider in Croatia. The precise details of this are impossible to retell in the short space afforded here, involving, as it does, the complex relationship between *Iskon*, *ZaMir*, the Open Society Institute and, crucially, key persons involved. Interestingly, different views about the relationship between *Iskon* and *ZaMir* appear not to be about the problems of commercialization *per se*, but rather about what are seen as betrayals and duplicity, or at least the lack of safeguards for *ZaMir* on the one hand, and those who see the same ‘facts’ as revealing basically reasonable behaviour on all sides, on the other hand.

As can be seen from *ZaMir*’s web pages, most of *ZaMir*’s funding, which has grown considerably in recent years, is focused on new technology and community development in war-affected areas. In some ways, this was the issue which divided

respondents most with some seeing it as precisely a return to some of the original aims of *ZaMir*, and others decrying the fact that ‘these people that they educate ... don’t become part of our network’ (Respondent 5, female) or that ‘they are now a development project, you know, they are developing local communities because they were given money for that.’ (Respondent 7, male)

Today, *ZaMir* operates two main web sites, the organizational web site (www.zamirnet.hr) ‘which shows that we are very transparent, listing donors, budgets, calls, activities, reports, everything’ (Respondent 3, female) but which others criticize as ‘very passive’ with ‘information put out by the staff, who have to earn some salary’ (Respondent 7, male) and *ZaMirZine* (<http://www.zamirzine.net>) which is described as an on-line newspaper for civil society and urban culture and which, under a new editor, has become far more active in recent weeks, and maintains a critical stance on many issues. In addition, *ZaMir* is involved in projects focusing on independent media, on Open Source, and has rejoined APC.

Instead of conclusions: understanding disagreements

Notwithstanding whether *ZaMir* has ‘managed to reintegrate some of the original aspects ... and adapt them to the new era, so to say’ (Respondent 2, female) or whether it has ‘become more like an American NGO structure ... not at all a civic initiative’, (Respondent 1, female) what is in need of understanding is the remarkable polarization of views and disagreements between respondents. In thinking through these issues, two broad strands of social theory appear relevant although, without more triangulation of evidence, and more interviews, these can only be put forward tentatively here.

The first relates to the distinction made recently by Arturo Escobar between what he terms two ‘alternative philosophies of life’. The first are hierarchies which ‘entail a degree of centralized control, ranks, overt planning, homogenization, and particular goals and rules of behaviour conducive to those goals.’ The second, which he terms ‘meshworks’ ‘are based on decentralized decision making, ... self-organization, and heterogeneity and diversity.’ (Escobar, 2003: 4) As Escobar recognizes, the two principles ‘are found mixed in operation in most real life examples.’ (Escobar, 2003: 5) Nevertheless, seeing *ZaMir* as shifting from largely meshwork to largely hierarchy does offer some clue to the disagreements voiced by respondents, whilst not ruling out a shift back to meshworking, albeit of a different kind, as dominant in the future.

Alternatively, or perhaps complementarily, a generational effect may be in place, if the concept of ‘generation’ is used very loosely to refer to three different groups. In some ways, as ‘activists’, all are untypical of the population as a whole. The first generation, now the ‘over 45s’, many of whom were active in social movements in the late 1980s, were influenced by a mixture of non-violence, deep ecology, and self-actualization, perhaps akin to Gessen’s notion of ‘techno-hippies’. The second generation, today’s ‘thirty somethings’ came of age in the context of international development assistance, NGOs, strategic planning, advocacy and campaigning. In some senses, they are the ‘techno-technocrats’. A third generation, the ‘twenty somethings’ appear to fuse net.art, a critical stance on globalization and various kinds of anarchistic theory, and are today’s ‘hacktivists’. *ZaMir* has never been the exclusive property of any one of these groups but, certainly, early *ZaMir* bore more the fingerprints of the first generation and later *ZaMir* more of the second. The emerging role of the third generation will be fascinating to observe in the next period.

To illustrate, at least, the divergent constructions of two key, linked themes, those of ‘time’ and ‘money’, also very much the concerns of hacktivists (see Himanen, 2001: Ch. 2), I conclude with two quotes from respondents who, perhaps, best represent each of the first two generations:

I don’t know, there’s something in paying. When we first got some money from Soros, then after that people assume it was Soros’ system. The system should be kept by itself and by the people who care about it, not by those who are paid. When you have a paid person, then you don’t run in the night to restart the system because someone is paid to do that. (Respondent 6, male)

We can have a vision, but if there is no money then we are on the street and there is no vision at all. You can’t provide Internet access from a park. So, to achieve the vision, you have to have means, you have to have resources... We are exploring whether we can do something in different geographical regions, the ex-Soviet republics, they do not have well developed internal resources to deal with some issues, if maybe we can transfer our experience from early *ZaMir* days. (Respondent 3, female)

Returning to Silver’s plea for historical case studies of cyberactivism, this essay, hopefully, has shown the value of exploring ‘what happened’ in *ZaMir*. It has shown

the enormous difficulty in explaining this, much less venturing into the terrain of ‘what could have happened’. Above all, it has shown the folly of venturing into the terrain of ‘what should have happened’. (Silver, 2003: 288)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adamic, Lada and Eytan Adar (eds), ‘You Are What You Link’, <http://www10.org/program/society/yawyl/YouAreWhatYouLink.htm> (accessed 7 October 2004).
- Bachman, Eric ‘Communications Aid in the post Yugoslavian countries: The origin and development of the ZAMIR transnational net (ZTN)’, Posted as part of the balkans.net ‘History of ZTN’ (1996), <http://balkansnet.org/MF-draft/MFF/eric-3~1.htm#technical> (accessed 7 October 2004)
- Bachman, Eric, ‘Digital Communication via the Internet in a War Zone: Conflict Resolution and the Internet?’, Paper to Inet Conference (1996), http://www.isoc.org/isoc/whatis/conferences/inet/96/proceedings/h2/h2_2.htm (accessed 19 October 2004)
- Bagic, Aida, ‘Talking about ‘donors’: women’s organizing in post-Yugoslav countries’, in Gould, J and H. Secher Marcussen (eds), *Ethnographies of Aid: exploring development texts and encounters*, (Roskilde University, International Development Studies Occasional Paper 24, 2004) pp. 199–226.
- Beck, Ulrich ‘Goodbye to all that wage slavery – full employment’. In *The New Statesman* March 5, 1999.
- Boym, Svetlana (1994) *Common Places: mythologies of everyday life in Russia* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1994)
- Escobar, Arturo, ‘Other Worlds Are (already) Possible: cyber-internationalism and post-capitalist cultures’, (Draft Notes for World Social Forum, January 2003) <http://www.zmag.org/escobarcyner.htm> (accessed 18 October 2004)
- Fritz, Darko ‘Amnesia International’. Notes for Exhibition ‘I am still alive’, PM Gallery, Zagreb (14–28 May 2000), <http://www.mi2.hr/alive/eng/amnesia.htm>
- Garrido, Maria and Alexander Halavais, ‘Mapping Networks of Support for the Zapatista Movement’, in McCaughey, M. and M. Ayers (eds) *Cyberactivism: on-line activism in theory and practice* (London: Routledge, 2003), pp. 165–84.

- Gessen, Masha, 'Balkans On-line – in the trenches with the warriors fighting one of the nastiest information wars of the late 20th century' in *Wired* 3.11 (1995); http://www.wired.com/wired/archive/3.11/zamir.html?pg=1&topic=&topic_set=
et seq.
- Himanen, Pekka, *The Hacker Ethic and the Spirit of the Information Age*. (London: Secker and Warburg, 2001).
- Hine, Christine, *Virtual Ethnography*, (London: Sage, 2000).
- Jambresic Kirin, Renata, 'Personal Narratives on War: a challenge to women's essays and ethnography in Croatia', in *Estudos de literatura oral* 5 (1999); pp. 73–98.
- Klüttsch, Christoph 'The summer 1968 in London and Zagreb: starting or end point for computer art?', unpublished manuscript (2004).
- Kozinets, Robert, 'On Netnography: Initial Reflections on Consumer Research Investigations of Cyberculture', in Alba, J. and Hutchinson, W. (eds.) *Advances in Consumer Research*, 25 (1998), pp. 366–371.
- Lang, Sabine, 'The NGOization of Feminism', in C. Kaplan *et al* (eds.) *Transitions, Environments, Translations: feminisms in international politics* (London: Routledge, 1997), pp. 101–20.
- Mestrovic, Matko 'Computer and Visual Reassert – Ways of thinking and scope of acting', unpublished manuscript (2004).
- Newman, M. E. J., 'The Structure and Function of Complex Networks', in *SIAM Review* 45 (2003), pp. 167–256.
- Rheingold, Howard, *The Virtual Community: homesteading on the electronic frontier* (Reading, USA: Addison Wesley, 1993)
- Salter, Lee, 'Democracy, New Social Movements and the Internet: a Habermasian analysis', in McCaughey, M. and M. Ayers, (eds), *Cyberactivism: on-line activism in theory and practice*. (London: Routledge, 2003), pp. 117–44.
- Silver, David, 'Epilogue: current directions and future questions', in McCaughey, M. and M. Ayers (eds), *Cyberactivism: on-line activism in theory and practice*. (London: Routledge, 2003), pp. 279–92.
- Stubbs, Paul 'Conflict and Co-Operation in the Virtual Community: email and the wars of the Yugoslav succession' in *Sociological Research On-line*, 3 (3) (1998). <http://socreson-line.org.uk/socreson-line/3/3/7.html> (accessed 7 October 2004)
- Stubbs, Paul, 'New Times?: towards a political economy of 'civil society' in contemporary Croatia', in *Narodna Umjetnost (Croatian Journal of Ethnology*

and Folklore Research), 38 (1) (2001), pp. 89–103.
<http://www.gaspp.org/people/pstubbs/paper%209.doc>

Watson, Nessim, ‘Why we argue about virtual community: a case study of the phish.net fan community’. In Jones, S. (ed.), *Virtual Culture: Identity and Community in Cyberspace*, (London: Sage, 1997), pp. 102–32

Yang, Guobin, ‘The liminal effects of social movements: red guards and the transformation of identity’ in *Sociological Forum* 15 (3) (2000), pp. 379–406

ⁱ I am grateful to Pamela Ballinger who first told the joke in discussion of a brief presentation I made at Brown University’s Watson Institute for International Studies in date, at the seminar, organized by Ana Devic.

ⁱⁱ For Boym, utopian nostalgia is ‘reconstructive and totalizing’ whereas ironic nostalgia is ‘inconclusive and fragmentary’.