along paths: lines connecting place A and place B. Most intriguingly, when a 'person moves he becomes a line' and as 'the wayfarer is constantly on the move […] he is the movement' (2011: 149, 150).

Ingold's insights have helped me to appreciate this state of wayfaring within the meshwork of lines. The communities/collectives/networks I worked with were constantly on the move, along paths that I had also just begun to follow. As I was partaking in the making of the rhizome, we were all lines and movement. Our movement was fluid, haphazard, nomadic, taking us from London to Cava de' Tirreni, from there to Turin, and later, (after my fieldwork had officially ended while the rhizome continued to grow), to Rome and Berlin.

Online Communities

As I was journeying along these nomadic itineraries, I was also tracing lines in virtual space: visiting websites, online forums, social networks, to follow and communicate with the communities of my study. During the year of my fieldwork I passed a great amount of time travelling in NetBehaviour, a "networked artists' community for networked distributed creativity" (www.netbehaviour.org). Netbehaviour describes itself as

an open email list community for sharing ideas, posting events & opportunities in the area of networked distributed creativity and facilitating collaborations between artists, academics, soft groups, writers, code geeks, curators, independent thinkers, relationalists, activists, networkers, net mutualists, new media types, new media performers, net sufis, non nationalists (www.netbehaviour.org).

NetBehaviour is the online place where the wider digital community of Furtherfield comes together. From January 2011 to February 2012, I archived 8,317 messages on NetBehaviour. Many of these were to/from key people from the other interlinked lines of my research, AOS (Salvatore Iaconesi) and Make-Shift (Helen Varley Jamieson). These messages were, therefore, intersecting connectors and trails positioned, juxtaposed and interwoven with those in physical space.

Then, during my fieldwork with *Make-Shift* community, I worked both in the physical locations where the cyberformances (network performances) were taking place and in the online spaces where these performances were streamed. This streaming, and the interaction with audiences it enables, is a critical practice for *Make-Shift* : 'everything that happens in the houses is streamed to online audiences who can also contribute text chat visible on the interface to everyone throughout the event' (www.make-shift. net). In addition to following Helen Varley Jamieson at various physical locations of her cyberformance, I also attended many of her performances online, as a member of the online audience. This online attendance permitted me to follow Helen's nomadic journey to locations, cities and houses around the world (Turkey, Germany, France, Italy, New Zealand, India, the US). When I asked Helen how the *Make-Shift* community is constituted between (and across) online and offline spaces, she replied:

We're building a *Make-Shift* community […]. So we have regularly people who come online and watch the show, to participate in the show and the people in the houses are participants making the show with us. And then we have a mailing list so you've been already on it (referring to my membership in the mailing list). So, we add people to the mailing list after the shows and hope that they would keep being involved and get feedback from.

To get a better grasp of the dynamic, constantly expanding community Make-Shift was becoming, online fieldwork was, therefore, indispensable.

For AOS, on the other hand, forming a community with people they involved in their projects, although appreciated, was not prioritised as one of their objectives. When I asked them how they felt about the Facebook group that was created by the participants of READ/WRITE REALITY, an intensive workshop on Ubiquitous Publishing organised in Cava de' Tirreni, Oriana Percico replied that:

The community of Cava de' Tirreni is a good example of temporary community. […] Well I don't have any problem with this, but focusing on an objective, a goal, we have shared time very precisely, we didn't force people. For example, they did autonomously this group on Facebook, but we didn't ask them to do this because our goals were and is still always to give them tools. In this time, we were sharing a big experience, we really wanted it. We were there for five days. We chose to live together 24 hours. In that time, it was my family, it was not my community. It was my house, it was my time. And we did all together, we did everything together with them. So I have no problem, it was very clear… I mean in that moment we were assembling and no problem in disassembling.

[…] I don't want to build something which is out of my force… my energy, my goal, I mean something bigger than me you know (she laughs). Not a problem at all. The real point was that we wanted to give them a tool, our goal is that they use this for their own things. It was a community based on time, a specific time, a specific goal.

What was interesting to observe during the fieldwork, both online and offline, was that AOS were simultaneously members of various communities, as artists, educators, academics and activists. They were moving along numerous lines, meeting, collaborating, sharing knowledge and tools and, at the same time, making connections between disparate communities. Salvatore's and Oriana's activity, thus, was instrumental to the emergence of new communities (and networks), even if their intention was not the formation of those communities.

Furtherfield was the nodal place, where all lines of this journey meet, assemble, perhaps, in due course even disassemble. It was in Furtherfield Gallery where I met Salvatore and Oriana from AOS – an event that signaled the beginning of my nomadic journey.

Postscript

The text finishes with an introduction. I would like to introduce the three main lines (knots) of my fieldwork. For this matter, I would let the three 'case studies' introduce themselves:

Furtherfield

'The collaborative work of artists, programmers, writers, activists, musicians and thinkers who explore beyond traditional remits; dedicated to the creation, promotion, and criticism of adventurous digital/networked media art work for public viewing, experience and interaction. Developing imaginative strategies in a range of digital and terrestrial media contexts, Furtherfield develops global, contributory projects that facilitate art activity simultaneously on the Internet, the streets and public venues.' www.furtherfield.org

Art is Open Source (AOS)

Art is Open Source, an informal network promoting artistic, creative and critical practices in different parts of the world. www.artisopensource.net

Make-Shift

Make-Shift is a unique and intimate networked performance that speaks about the fragile connectivity of human and ecological relationships. Make-Shift is an ecologically aware house party with a difference. As well as experiencing the intimacy, viscerality and shared experience of a live performance event; local and online audiences participate in a call-and-response between people, landscape and culture to discuss the theme of 'disposability' in its broadest sense. www.make-shift.net

References

Amit, V. (2000) 'Introduction: constructing the field' in Amit, V. (ed.) *Constructing the field: ethnographic fieldwork in the contemporary world*. London: Routledge.

Beaulieu, A. (2004) 'Mediating ethnography: Objectivity and the making of ethnographies of the Internet' in *Social Epistemology*, 18 (2-3).

Biggs, S. & Travlou, P. (2012) 'Distributed Authorship and Creative Communities' *Dichtung Digital*, vol. 41 http://dichtung-digital.mewi.unibas.ch/

Davis, D. (2007) 'Science and Serendipity: Reflections on an Anthropological Career' *The 55th Annual Harrington Lecture*, 2 October 2007, The University of South Dakota.

Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1993) *A Thousand Plateaus*. Minnesota: The University of Minnesota Press.

Guimarães, M. J. (2005) 'Doing Anthropology in Cyberspace: Fieldwork Boundaries and Social Environments' in C. Hine (ed.) V*irtual Methods. Issues in Social Research on the Internet*. London: Berg.

Hazan, H. & Hertzog, E. (2012) *Serendipity in Anthropological Research: The Nomadic Turn*. London: Ashgate.

Ingold, T. (2007) *Lines: A Brief History*. London: Routledge.

Ingold, T. (2008) 'Bringing Things to Life: Creative Entanglements in a World of Materials.' http://www.reallifemethods.ac.uk/events/vitalsigns/programme/documents/vital-signs-ingold-bringing-things-to-life.pdf

Ingold, T. (2010) 'Footprints through the weather-world: walking, breathing, knowing' J*ournal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 2010 Special Issue: S121-S139.

Ingold, T. (2011) *Being Alive: Essays on Movement, Knowledge and Description*. London: Routledge.

Leach, J. (2003) *Creative Land: Place and Procreation on the Rai Coast of Papua New Guinea*. London: Berg.

Marcus, G. E. (1995) 'Ethnography in/of the world system: the emergence of multi-sited ethnography' in *Annual Review of Anthropology*, vol. 24:95-117.

Miller, D. (2000) *The Internet: an ethnographic approach*. London: Berg.

Turkle, S. (1995) *Life on the Screen*. New York: Touchstone.

Urry, J. (2007) *Mobilities*. London: Polity.

DIWO: DO IT WITH OTHERS – NO ECOLOGY WITHOUT SOCIAL ECOLOGY

Ruth Catlow & Marc Garrett

The acceleration of technological development in contemporary society has a direct impact on our everyday lives as our behaviours and relationships are modified via our interactions with digital technology. As artists, we have adapted to the complexities of contemporary information and communication systems, initiating different forms of creative, network production. At the same time we live with and respond to concerns about anthropogenic climate change and the economic crisis. As we explore the possibilities of creative agency that digital networks and social media offer, we need to ask ourselves about the role of artists in the larger conversation. What part do we play in the evolving techno-consumerist landscape which is shown to play on our desire for intimacy and community while actually isolating us from each other (Turkle 2011). Commercial interests control our channels of communication through their interfaces, infrastructures and contracts. As Geert Lovink says 'We see social media further accelerating the McLifestyle, while at the same time presenting itself as a channel to relieve the tension piling up in our comfort prisons.' (2012: 44).

Many contemporary artists who take the networks of the digital information age as their medium, work directly with the hardware, algorithms and databases of digital networks themselves and the systems of power that engage them. Inspired by network metaphors and processes, they also craft new forms of intervention, collaboration, participation and interaction (between human and other living beings, systems and machines) in the development of the meaning and aesthetics of their work. This develops in them a sensitivity or alertness to the diverse, world-forming properties of the art-tech imaginary: material, social and political. By sharing their processes and tools with artists, and audiences alike they hack and reclaim the contexts in which culture is created.

This essay draws on programmes initiated by Furtherfield, an online community, co-founded by the authors in 1997. Furtherfield also runs a public gallery and social space in the heart of Finsbury Park, North London. The authors are both artists and curators who have worked with others in networks since the mid 90s, as the Internet developed as a public space you could publish to; a platform for creation, distribution, remix, critique and resistance.

Here we outline two Furtherfield programmes in order to reflect on the ways in which collaborative networked practices are especially suited to engage these questions. Firstly the *DIWO (Do It With Others)* series (since 2007) of Email Art and co-curation projects that explored how de-centralised, co-creation processes in digital networks could (at once) facilitate artistic collaboration and disrupt dominant and constricting art-world systems. Secondly the *Media Art Ecologies* programme (since 2009) which, in the context of economic and environmental collapse, sets out to contribute to the construction of alternative infrastructures and visions of prosperity. We aim to show how collaboration and the distribution of creative capital was modeled through *DIWO* and underpinned the development of a series of projects, exhibitions and interventions that explore what form an ecological art might take in the network age.

In common with many other network-aware artists the authors are both originators and participants in experimental platforms

and infrastructures through processes of collaboration, participation, remix and context hacking. As artists working in network culture we work between individual, coordinated, collaborative and collective practices of expression, transmission and reception. These resonate with political and ethical questions about how people can best organise themselves now and in the future in the context of contemporary economic and environmental crisis.

Though this essay draws primarily on artistic and curatorial practices it also makes connections with the histories and theories that have informed its development: attending to the nature of co-evolving, interdependent entities (human and non-human) and conditions, for the healthy evolution and survival of our species (Bateson 1972); producing diverse (hierarchy dissolving) social ecologies that disarm systems of dominance (Bookchin 1991, 2004); and seeking new forms of prosperity, building social and community capital and resilience as an alternative to unsustainable economic growth (Bauwens 2005, Jackson 2009).

Contemporary critical practices in art, technology and social change

Furtherfield's mission is to explore, through creative and critical engagement, practices in art and technology where people are inspired and enabled to become active co-creators of their cultures and societies. We aim to co-create critical art contexts which connect with contemporary audiences providing innovative, engaging and inclusive digital and physical spaces for appreciating and participating in practices in art, technology and social change.

The following artworks, researched, commissioned and exhibited by Furtherfield this year, offer a range of practices exemplifying this approach. *A Crowded Apocalypse*[1] by IOCOSE deploys crowd-sourced workers in the production of staged, one-person protests (around the world) against collectively produced, but fictional, conspiracies. This is a net art project that exploits crowd sourcing tools to simulate a global conspiracy. The work exploits the fertility of network culture as a ground for conspiracy theories which, in common with many advertisements, are persuasive but are neither ultimately provable or irrefutable (Garrett 2012).

A series of distributed performances called *Make-Shift*, by Helen Varley Jamieson and Paula Crutchlow, is a collective narrative about the human role in environmental stresses, developed with participants who build props for the 'show' using all the plastic waste they have produced that day. Makeshift is an 'intimate networked performance that speaks about the fragile connectivity of human and ecological relationships. The performance takes place simultaneously in two separate houses that are connected through a specially designed online interface.'[2]

Moving Forest London 2012[3], initiated by AKA the Castle (coordinated by Shu Lea Cheang), employs the city of London as it prepares for the grand spectacle of the 2012 Olympic Games, expanding the last 12 minutes of Kurosawa's adaptation of Shakespeare's Macbeth 'Throne of Blood' (1957), with a prelude of 12 days, and durational performance of 6 acts in 12 hours. The Hexists (artists Rachel Baker and Kayle Brandon) perform Act 0 of this sonic performance saga, with *3 Keys – The River Oracle*, a game of chance and divination[4].

Other notable works in this vein include *Embroidered Digital Commons*[5] by Ele Carpenter; *Invisible Airs* and *Data Entry*[6] by Yoha; *Web2.0 Suicide Machine*[7] by _moddr_ and Fresco

Gamba; *The Status Project*[8] by Heath Bunting; and *Tate a Tate*[9], an interventionist sound work by Platform, infiltrating one of the largest art brands of the nation using a series of audio artworks distributed to passengers on Thames River boats, to protest the ongoing sponsorship of Tate Modern exhibitions by British Petroleum. Also relevant is the realm of ludic digital art practices that facilitate new socially engaged aesthetics and values such as *Germination X*[10] by FO.AM and *Naked on Pluto*[11] by Dave Griffiths, Marloes de Valk, Aymeric Mansoux.

DIWO as an emancipatory collaborative art project

The term 'DIWO (Do It With Others)' was first defined in 2006 on Furtherfield's collaborative project *Rosalind – Upstart New Media Art Lexicon* (since 2004)[12]. It extended the DIY (Do It Yourself) ethos of early (self-proclaimed) 'net art heroes', who taught themselves to navigate the web and develop tactics that intervened in its developing cultures.

The word 'art' can conjure up a vision of objects in an art gallery, showroom or museum, that can be perceived as reinforcing the values and machinations of the victors of history as leisure objects for elite entertainment, distraction and/or decoration – or the narcissistic expression of an isolated self-regarding individual. *DIWO* was proposed as a contemporary way of collaborating and exploiting the advantages of living in the Internet age that connected with the many art worlds that diverge from the market of commoditised objects - a network enabled art practice, drawing on everyday experience of many connected, open and distributed creative beings.

DIWO formed as an Email Art project with an open-call to the email list Netbehaviour, on the 1st of February 2007. In an art world largely dominated by elite, closed networks and gatekeeping curators and gallerists, Mail Art has long been used by artists to bypass curatorial restrictions for an imaginative exchange on their own terms.

> Peers connect, communicate and collaborate, creating controversies, structures and a shared grass roots culture, through both digital online networks and physical environments. Strongly influenced by Mail Art projects of the 60s, 70s and 80s demonstrated by Fluxus artists' with a common disregard for the distinctions of 'high' and 'low' art and a disdain for what they saw as the elitist gate-keeping of the 'high' art world...[13]

The co-curated exhibition of every contribution opened at the beginning of March at HTTP Gallery[14] and every post to the list, until 1st April, was considered an artwork - or part of a larger, collective artwork - for the *DIWO* project. Participants worked 'across time zones and geographic and cultural distances with digital images, audio, text, code and software. They worked to create streams of art-data, art-surveillance, instructions and proposals in relay, producing multiple threads and mash-ups.' (Catlow & Garrett 2008).

> The purpose of mail art, an activity shared by many artists throughout the world, is to establish an aesthetical communication between artists and common people in every corner of the globe, to divulge their work outside the structures of the art market and outside the traditional venues and institutions: a free communication in which words and signs, texts and colours act like instruments for a direct and immediate interaction (Parmesani 1977).

So it made sense that the first *DIWO* project should be a mail art project that utilised email, enabled by the Internet; a public space

with which anyone with access to a computer and a telephone line could use to publish. Because an email could be distributed (with attachments or links) to the inboxes of anyone subscribed to the Netbehaviour email list, subscribers' inboxes became a distributed site of exhibition and collaborative art activity: such as correspondence, instruction, code poetry, software experiments, remote choreography, remixing and tool sharing.

This and later *DIWO* projects used both email and snail-mail and (in line with the Mail Art tradition) undertook the challenge of exhibiting every contribution in a gallery setting.

The *DIWO Email* art project was liberally interspersed with off-topic discussions, tangents and conversational splurges, so one challenge for the co-curators was to reveal the currents of meaning and the emerging themes within the torrents of different kinds of data, processes and behaviour. Another challenge was to find a way to convey the insider's – that is the sender's and the recipient's – experience of the work. These works were made with a collective recipient in mind; subscribers to the Netbehaviour mailing list. This is a diverse group of people; artists, musicians, poets, thinkers and programmers (ranging from new-comers to old-hands) with varying familiarity with and interest in different aspects of netiquette and the rules of exchange and collaboration. This is reflected in the range of approaches, interactions and content produced.

In a number of important ways the email inbox guarantees a particular kind of freedom for the *DIWO* art context, as distinct from the exchange facilitated by the ubiquitous sociability, 'sharing' and 'friendship' offered by contemporary social media. Facebook, Myspace, Google+, etc, provide interfaces that are designed to elicit commercially valuable meta-data from their users. They are centrally controlled, designed to attract and gather the attention of its users in one place in order to monitor, process and interpret social behaviour and feed it to advertisers. As demonstrated during the disturbances of the Summer of 2011, these social media are an extension of the Panoptican and can also become tools of state surveillance and punishment as Terry Balson discovered on being detained for two years after being found guilty of setting up a Facebook page in order to encourage people to riot (BBC News 2012).

The *DIWO Email* Art and co-curation project is fully described and documented elsewhere[15] but it is outlined here as it gives an example of how our networked communities may intersect with everyday experience and with mainstream art worlds while also creating their own art contexts. We may be playful, critical, political and may work as possible co-creators with all the materials (stuff, ideas, processes, entities – beings and institutions – and environments) of life. This *DIWO* approach provides the fundamental ethos for the Furtherfield Media Art Ecologies programme.

Media Art Ecologies

Furtherfield's Media Art Ecologies programme (since 2009) brings together artists and activists, thinkers and doers from a wider community, whose practices address the interrelation of technological and natural processes: beings and things, individuals and multitudes, matter and patterns. These people take an ecological approach that challenges growth economics and techno-consumerism and attends to the nature of co-evolving, interdependent entities and conditions. They activate networks (digital, social, physical) to work with ecological themes and free and open processes.

The programme has included exhibitions such as *Feral Trade Café* by Kate Rich and *If Not You Not Me* by Annie Abrahams,

an art world intervention by the authors *We Won't Fly For Art* and workshop programmes such as *Zero Dollar Laptop* workshops (in partnership with Access Space in Sheffield). It has supported research projects such as *Telematic Dining* by Pollie Barden and developmental artist residencies, such as *Make-Shift* by Helen Varley Jamieson and Paula Crutchlow. These projects and practices have a number of things in common:

• They work with the metaphors, tools, cultures and processes of networked culture in the context of environmental collapse;

• They are led by artistic sensibilities (incorporating but not governed by utilitarian or theoretical concerns);

• They generate unruly and provocative relationships between symbolic meanings and material effects;

• They are metalogues – their content and their structures are in a conversation with each other, expounding and resonating with their subjects. Their ends and means are well aligned.[16] (Bateson 1972, Catlow 2012).

Why Media Art Ecologies now?

Through the Internet we all now have access to data about historic and contemporary carbon emissions. We also find visualisations of this data that provide concise and accessible graphical arguments for thinking, feeling and acting in a coordinated way at this historical moment [17][18].

Data shows an exponential rise in global carbon emissions since the 1850s, starting with the UK. UK carbon emissions have dropped as a percentage of global emissions by region (CDIAC 2010). At the same time the quantity of carbon dioxide emitted by the UK has steadily increased since the start of the industrial revolution to annual levels now higher than 500 million tonnes (Marland, Boden & Andres 2008). This data shows how successful the UK was, during the industrial revolution, at spreading the production methods that would turn out to promote a model of sole reliance on economic growth and fossil fuels. The logic and infrastructures of capitalism are now collapsing in tandem with the environment (Jackson 2009). At the same time networked technologies and behaviours are proliferating. Social and economic transactions take place at increased speed but our existing economic and social models are unsustainable and the consequences of continuing along the current path appear catastrophic for the human species (Jackson 2009). This is a critical moment to reflect on how the technologies we invent and distribute will form our future world.

Michel Bauwens, of the Foundation for Peer to Peer Alternatives, works with a network of theorists, activists, scientists and philosophers to develop ideas and processes to move beyond the pure logic of economic growth[19]. He observes that by transposing what has been learned from sharing the production and use of immaterial goods, such as software, with strategies for developing sharing in other productive modes, the community comes to own its own innovations, rather than corporations. This puts peer production at the core of civil society. The fabrication laboratory or 'fab lab' system, developed at MIT in collaboration with the Grassroots Invention Group and the Center for Bits and Atoms, offers an example; a small-scale workshop that facilitates personal fabrication of objects including technology-enabled products normally associated with mass production. The lab comprises a collection of computer controlled tools that can work at different scales with various materials. Early work on

the Open Source car shows how open, distributed design and manufacturing points to a possible end of patenting and built in obsolescence; constituent principles of our unsustainable consumer-based society (Bauwens 2012).

[Bauwens] recognises that peer to peer production is currently dependent on capitalism (companies such as IBM invest huge percentages of their budgets into the development of Free and Open Source Software) but observes that history suggests a process whereby it might be possible to break free from this embrace. He suggests that by breaking the Free Software orthodoxy it would be possible to build a system of guild communities to support the expansion of mission oriented, benefit-driven co-ops whose innovations are only shared freely with people contributing to the commons. In the transition to intrinsically motivated, mass production of the commons, for-profit companies would pay to benefit from these innovations (Catlow 2011).

A peer to peer infrastructure requires the following set of political, practical, social, ethical and cultural qualities: distribution of governance and access to the productive tools that comprise the 'fixed' capital of the age (e.g. computing devices); information and communication systems which allow for autonomous communication in many media (text, image, sound) between cooperating agents; software for autonomous global cooperation (wikis, blogs etc); legal infrastructure that enables the creation and protection of use value and, crucially to Bauwens's P2P alternatives project, protects it from private appropriation; and, finally, the mass diffusion of human intellect through interaction with different ways of feeling, being, knowing and exposure to different value constellations (Bauwens 2005).

These developments in peer to peer culture provide a backdrop to the projects presented as part of the Media Art Ecologies programme which, in turn, proposes that a focus on the networked cultures in which the work is produced, supports ecological ways of thinking, privileging attention to complex and dynamic interaction, connectedness and interplay between artist viewer/participant and distributed materials. Its projects have been developed within independent communities of artists, technologists and activists, theorists and practitioners centered around Furtherfield in London (and internationally, online), Cube Microplex in Bristol and Access Space in Sheffield. They identify the simultaneous collapse of the financial markets and the natural environment as intrinsically linked with human uses of, and relationships with, technology. They take contemporary cultural infrastructures (institutional and technical), their systems and protocols, as the materials and context for artistic production in the form of critical play, investigation and manipulation. This work, at the intersection of artistic and technical cultures, generates alternative spaces and new perspectives; alternative to those produced by (on the one hand) established 'high' art-world markets and institutions and (on the other) the network of ubiquitous user owned devices and social apps. These practices play within and across contemporary networks (digital, social and physical), disrupting business as usual and the embedded habits and attitudes of techno-consumerism.

An exhibition that was also a working café

We will end this essay by describing an early project developed as part of this programme, *Feral Trade Café*[20] by Kate Rich, an exhibition that was also a working café. Feral Trade Café served food and drink traded over social networks for 8 weeks in the Summer of 2009 and exhibited a retrospective display of Feral Trade goods alongside ingredient transit maps, video, bespoke food packaging and other artifacts from the Feral Trade network.

Since 2003 participants in the project (usually travelling artists and curators) have acted as couriers, carrying edible produce around the world with them on trips they are taking anyway and delivering them to depots (friends' and colleagues' flats or work places), mostly independent art venues in Europe and North America. Rich has crafted a database through which couriers can log their journeys, tracking the details of sources, shipping and handling for all groceries in the network 'with a micro-attention usually paid to ingredient listings.' (Catlow 2009). This database[21] is at the heart of the artwork, with special attention given to the day to day challenges and obstacles met in its distribution – tracking the on-the-fly street level tactics employed, out of necessity, by a distribution network with no staff, vehicles, storage facilities or business plan.

Courier Report FER-1491 DISPATCHED: 13/05/09 DELIVERED: 15/05/09 - ali jones spent a few hours trying to start a car using various techniques. eventually got it moving with a push start with the help of a stranger who was leaving behind a night of print-making.convoyed to cube where friend took parcel in her van while i parked dubious car at garage for fixing.[22] (Feral Trade Courier 2009).

The café stocked and served a selection of Feral Trade products from a menu including coffee from El Salvador, hot chocolate from Mexico and sweets from Montenegro, as well as locally sourced bread, cake, vegetables and herbs. Diverse diners – local residents and long-distance lorry drivers (from Poland and Germany) – were served their food along with waybills (drawing information from the database) documenting the socially facilitated transit of goods to their plate.

The invitation to the exhibition promised visitors a convivial setting from which to 'contemplate broader changes to our climate and economies, where conventional supply chains (for food delivery and cultural funding) could go belly up.' The café provided a local trading station and depot for the Feral Trade network, and a meeting place for local community food activists for research and discussion. It's worth noting that a year later a Government Spending Review announced a cut of nearly 30% to the Arts Council of England's budget (BBC News 2010). Two years later global food prices were up by over 40% and set to rise another 30% in the next 10 years (Neate 2011). A number of small new projects continue to develop from meetings between the gallery community and local community activist groups working on sustainability issues.

The materials and methods employed by this artwork, that is also a functioning café, are diverse and non-standard. The café is not scaleable and generates no jobs or surplus, let alone profit. It may build 'social capital', what Bordieu defines as a form of capital 'made up of social obligations ('connections') which is convertible in certain conditions into economic capital and may be institutionalised in the form of a title of nobility.' (Bordieu 1986). However, it is uncertain whether this will apply to Rich as any 'nobility' she might acquire is undermined by her purposeful maintenance of the project's ambiguous status as an artistic project.

For this essay we present *Feral Trade Café* alongside Bauwens' proposal for alternative P2P infrastructures. We propose that while the work is not a design, formula or practical, alternative business model (either for an artwork or a café) for mass adoption, it can be considered an ecological system for 'mass diffusion of intellect' (Bauwens 2005). Interaction with the project engages participants in different ways of sensing, operating and valuing the world. It is a most inefficient way of trading.

The work poses strange questions as it oscillates between artwork (sensual, expressive, rhetorical) and catering (utilitarian, literally nourishing) and to consider the meaning of our lives and vocations in local communities and a functional future society. 'Understanding that prosperity consists in part in our capabilities to participate in the life of society demands that attention is paid to the underlying human and social resources required for this task.' (Jackson 2009: 182). Feral Trade focuses our attention on the truly pleasurable aspects of social exchange that are lost in our quest for affluence. 'Creating resilient social communities is particularly important in the face of economic shocks.[...] The strength of a community can make the difference between disaster and triumph in the face of economic collapse.' (Jackson 2009: 182).

Feral Trade is both art and a lived, alternative co-created system for trading and serving food that refuses commercial exploitation, contributes meaning and strengthens bonds across an existing community. A distinctive, memorable and sensual way for people to interact, to socialise and savour the socio-political ingredients of a meal eaten while discussing strategies for avoiding ethical discomfort. Most powerfully, it is a lived critique and reinvention of a fundamental aspect of everyday life (feeding ourselves) through the subtle tactics of manipulation and play (by its many participants).

It is our contention that by engaging with these kinds of projects, the artists, viewers and participants involved become less efficient users and consumers of given informational and material domains as they turn their efforts to new playful forms of exchange. These projects make real decentralised, growth-resistant infrastructures in which alternative worlds start to be articulated and produced as participants share and exchange new knowledge and subjective experiences provoked by the work.

Conclusion – Ecological Media Art promotes participation in social ecology

Social scientist Tim Jackson has shown that the establishment of ever more efficient and productive systems of control and growth, owned by fewer, more centralised agents, is both unjust and environmentally unsustainable (2009). The reverse also applies; that the distribution of freedoms and access to sustenance, knowledge, tools, diverse experience and values improves the resilience of both our social and environmental ecologies (Bateson 1972, Bookchin 1991, Jackson 2009).

Ecological media artworks turn our attention as creators, viewers and participants to connectedness and free interplay between (human and non-human) entities and conditions. It builds on the *DIWO* ethos. On the one hand we resist the elitist values and infrastructures of the mainstream art world and develop our own art context, on our own terms, according to the priorities of a collaborating community of creative producers (which may include diverse participants and audiences). On the other, we deal critically with the monitored and centrally deployed and controlled interfaces of corporate owned social media; wherever possible working with Free and Open Source Software to privilege commons-based peer produced artworks, tools, media and infrastructure.

Humanity needs new strategies for social and material renewal and to develop more diverse and lively ecologies of ideas, occupations and values. For this to happen more of us need to be able to freely participate more deeply in diverse artistic or poetic and technical world-forming processes and to exchange what we create and learn.

Those who share our 'analysis of the contemporary political moment may also perceive a possible role for themselves in the generation of mutual commons-based interfaces for engagement that go beyond solely textual formats to arrays of performance, narrative (fact and fiction), image, sound, database, algorithm, music, theory, sculpture – to explicitly re-conceive inalienable social relations (Catlow 2011)[23].

Notes

1. *A Crowded Apocalypse*, net art work by IOCOSE, 2012. Commissioned by the Abandon Normal Devices Festival and Furtherfield. Artwork available [online] at <http://www.acrowdedapocalypse.com/> [Accessed 26th June 2012]. Exhibited as part of a group show called Invisible Forces, Furtherfield Gallery, June - August 2012.

2. *Make-Shift*, networked performance by Paula Crutchlow and Helen Varley Jamieson, 2010 - 12. Stage and documentation available [online] at <http://www.make-shift.net/> [Accessed 26th June 2012].

3. *Moving Forest*, networked performance series by AKA The Castle, co-ordinated by Shulea Cheang, 2009 - 12. Documentation of networked performance available [online] at <http://mf2012.anorg.net/london2012/> [Accessed 26th June 2012].

4. *3 Keys – The River Oracle* by the Hexists. Part of Invisible Forces exhibition at Furtherfield Gallery, 2012. This event 'attempts to invoke the relationship between the divinatory functions of our contemporary 'influencing machines' (cybernetic systems and game theory using data-mining, data profiling and data protection) and traditional magical ones, creating new machines in the process. Using tools such as cards, dowsing, stick throwing to interpret phenomena in the landscape, historical and current, 'readings' can be cast, allowing associative action, language and thought to determine what might happen in the future, to create a path, an artwork. 'Documentation available [online] at <http://www.furtherfield.org/programmes/events/moving-forest-act-0-3-keys-river-oracle/> [Accessed 26th June 2012].

5. *Embroidered Digital Commons*, participatory socially engaged project by Ele Carpenter, 2009 - 13. Documentation available [online] at <http://www.open-source-embroidery.org.uk/EDC.htm> [Accessed 26th June 2012].

6. *Invisible Airs* by YoHa, 2011. Documentation available [online] at <http://yoha.co.uk/invisible> [Accessed 26th June 2012].

7. *Web 2.0 Suicide Machine* by moddr_ & Fresco Gamba, 2010 Artwork available [online] at <http://suicidemachine.org> [Accessed 26th June 2012].

8. *The Status Project* by Heath Bunting, 2005 – ongoing Artwork available [online] at <http://status.irational.org/> [Accessed 26th June 2012].

9. *Tate à Tate* by Platform, 2012. Artwork available [online] at <http://tateatate.org/> [Accessed 26th June 2012].

10. *Germination X – a game about permaculture* by FoAM, 2005 - ongoing. Artwork available[online] at <http://www.germinationx.com/> [Accessed 26th June 2012].

11. *Naked on Pluto* by Dave Griffiths, Marloes de Valk, Aymeric Mansoux, 2010 - ongoing. Artwork available [online] at <http://naked-on-pluto.net/> [Accessed 26th June 2012].

12. *Rosalind, an Upstart New Media Lexicon* by Furtherfield, 2004 – ongoing. This project was initiated to encourage artists working in the field of new media art at the time to coin the terms and build the vocabulary to describe their own practice, to resist premature colonisation of the practice by academics and curators. Artwork available [online] at <http://www.furtherfield.org/get-involved/lexicon> [Accessed 26th June 2012].

13. *Do It With Others* (*DIWO*) call out, 2007. Netbehaviour email list. Available at <http://www.furtherfield.org/blog/furtherfield/do-it-others-diwo-e-mail-art-netbehaviour> [Accessed 28th June 2012].

14. HTTP Gallery was run by Furtherfield 2004 – 2010 from their warehouse space on Ashfield Road, Haringey. HTTP became *Furtherfield Gallery* in 2010 and in February 2012 opened as a gallery and social space in the heart of Finsbury Park, North London.

15. The background to the 2007 *Do It With Others* (*DIWO*) – E-Mail Art exhibition – the open call, co-curation process and a selection of works in the exhibition are described in full here. Catlow and Garrett (2008).

16. 'Notably, the history of evolutionary theory is inevitably a metalogue between man and nature in which the creation and interaction of ideas must necessarily exemplify evolutionary process.' (Bateson 1972: 1)

17. Graphical representations of data concerning historic and contemporary Fossil Fuel CO2. In particular see 2010 figure showing emissions by source region 1751-2010. Available [online] at <http://www.columbia.edu/~mhs119/Emissions/Emis_moreFigs/Efrac_byRegion.pdf/> [Accessed 28th June 2012]. This shows UK carbon emissions dropping as a percentage of global emissions by region (CDIAC 2010).

18. UK CO2 emissions since before the industrial revolution (Marland, Boden & Andres 2008). The image shows UK Carbon emissions rising sharply. Available [online] at <http://www.nef.org.uk/climatechange/images/co2emits.gif> [Accessed 28th June 2012].

19. Wiki for the Foundation for Peer to Peer Alternatives is available [online] at <http://p2pfoundation.net/> [Accessed 26th June 2012].

20. Documentation of Feral Trade Café – an exhibition that is also a working café, by Kate Rich. 13 June - 2 Aug 2009, HTTP Gallery. Available [online] at <http://www.furtherfield.org/exhibitions/feral-trade-cafe> [Accessed 26th June 2012].

21. Feral Trade Courier is the import export database that provides the infrastructure for organising the flow of goods between the network of couriers. Traders can track their goods and print waybills that document the stories associated with the produce. Available [online] at <http://www.feraltrade.org/cgi-bin/courier/courier.pl> [Accessed 26th June 2012].

22. An example of a Feral Trade waybill. In this instance, tracking coffee from San Pedro Nonualco-San Salvador to HTTP. Available [online] at < Gallery http://www.feraltrade.org/cgi-bin/package/2package.pl?action=format_waybill&edit_id=1507> [Accessed 26th June 2012].

23. From an open letter from Michel Bauwens (Catlow 2011).

Bibliography

Bateson, G., (1972) Steps to an Ecology of Mind. University of Chicago and London: Chicago Press

Bauwens (2005) The political economy of peer production. Available [online] at<http://www.informatik.uni-leipzig.de/~graebe/Texte/Bauwens-06.pdf> [Accessed 28th June 2012].

Bauwens (2012) Blueprint for P2P Society: The Partner State & Ethical Economy. Shareable. Available [online] at <http://www.shareable.net/blog/a-blueprint-for-p2p-institutions-the-partner-state-and-the-ethical-economy-0> [Accessed 28th June 2012].

BBC News (2010) Arts Council's budget cut by 30%. 20 October 2010. Last updated at 17:40. Available [online] at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/entertainment-arts-11582070> [Accessed 20th December 2011].

BBC News (2012) Facebook riots page man Terry Balson detained. 8 May 2012. Last updated at 19:57. Available [online] at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/entertainment-arts-11582070> [Accessed 28th June 2012].

Bookchin, M. (1991) The Ecology of Freedom. The emergence and dissolution of hierarchy. Montreal, New York: Black Rose Books.

Bookchin, M. (2004) Post-Scarcity Anarchism. Edinburgh, Oakland, West Virginia: AK Press.

Bordieu, P. (1986) 'The Forms of Capital'. English version first published in Richardson J.G., (1986) Handbook for Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education, pp. 241–258. Available [online] at <http://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/fr/bourdieu-forms-capital.htm> [Accessed 29th June 2012].

Catlow, R., & Garrett, G., 2008. Do It With Others (DIWO) – E-Mail Art in Context. Vague Terrain. Available [online] at <http://vagueterrain.net/journal11/furtherfield/01> [Accessed 26th June 2011].

Catlow, R. (2009) Ecologies of Sustenance Catalogue essay for Feral Trade Café – an exhibition that was also a working café by Kate Rich. 13 June - 2 Aug 2009, HTTP Gallery. Furtherfield, London.

Catlow, R. (2011) Re-rooting digital culture at ISEA 2011. Available [online] at http://www.furtherfield.org/blog/ruth-catlow/re-rooting-digital-culture-isea-2011 [Accessed 28th June 2012].

Catlow, R. (2012) We Won't Fly For Art: Media Art Ecologies. Culture Machine, Paying Attention, July 2012.

CDIAC, Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center (2010) Fossil Fuel CO2 Emissions. Columbia University. Available [online] at <http://www.columbia.edu/~mhs119/Emissions/Emis_moreFigs/> [Accessed 26th June 2012].

Feral Trade Courier (2009) Import, export database created by artist Kate Rich. Available [online] at <http://www.feraltrade.org> [Accessed 26th June 2012]

Garrett, M. (2012) CROWDSOURCING A CONSPIRACY an Interview with IO-

COSE. Available [online] at <http://www.andfestival.org.uk/blog/iocose-garrett-interview-furtherfield> [Accessed 28th June 2012].

Garrett, M. (2012) Heath Bunting. The Status Project & The Netopticon. Available [online] at <http://www.furtherfield.org/features/articles/heath-bunting-status-project-netopticon> [Accessed 28th June 2012].

Jackson, T. (2009) Prosperity Without Growth. Economics for a Finite Planet. London: Earthscan.

Lovink, G., (2012) Networks Without a Cause. A Critique of Social Media. University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Marland, G., Boden, T.A. & Andres, R.J. (2008) 'Global, Regional, and National Fossil Fuel CO2 Emissions' in Trends: A Compendium of Data on Global Change. Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, U.S. Department of Energy, Oak Ridge, Tenn., U.S.A.

Neate, R. (2011) 'Food price explosion "will devastate the world's poor'. The Guardian. Friday 17 June 2011 18.42 BST. Available [online] at: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2011/jun/17/global-food-prices-increase-united-nations> [Accessed 20th December 2011].

Parmesani, L. (1997) Poesia visiva, in L'arte del secolo - Movimenti, teorie, scuole e tendenze 1900-2000 . Giò Marconi: Skira, Milan.

Turkle, S. (2011) Alone Together: Why We Expect More from Technology and Less from Each Other. Basic Books.

EMERGENT FRAMEWORKS

THE NEW GAMIFIED SOCIAL

Athanasia Daphne Dragona

Introduction

How many friends do you have? How many followers? How many people have liked your recent post or video? How many shares or how many re-tweets did that post have? And then ultimately what is the total score? How influential are you?

These are questions that might not be openly asked but are always on social media users' minds. Constantly looking after their 'scores' and checking on the popularity of others', users today clearly show that in the social networking world numbers matter. Numbers reveal how sociable users are, how popular their sayings are, how interesting their everyday life appears to be. High scores depend on the content, or rather the virtuosity of the user behind the content; on the way moments, actions and thoughts are captured, expressed and uploaded, in proper timing with a readiness for timely interaction.

In the era of the attention economy, the social media world looks more and more like a game-space prompting players for their next decisions and moves. Following scores, newsfeed boards and status announcements, users compete for their online presence and peer recognition. Daily mediated interaction is charged by a degree of performativity, a degree of repetitiveness and addiction; a need to keep coming back to provide new feedback. But what drives these new modes of interaction? What is the broader context they can be studied in? Which are the forms of power and counter-power being developed?

In his Grammar of the Multitude, Paolo Virno notes that there is something childish in today's multitude, which at the same time is utterly serious (2004). He argues that repetitiveness persists today, just like it happens in the games of childhood, as a response to the need to protect one's self against the unexpected. Do social networking sites take advantage of such features of human behavior when they embrace game-like elements? This paper will aim to discuss these questions in an attempt to examine the emerging phenomenon of gamification, analysing its origin, consequences and counter-forces.

The emergence of gamification

Social networking sites were competitive right from the start. One can recall the early years of YouTube when people could rate videos using stars, or the period that MySpace and Facebook had a top friends rank. Although friends' or channels' numbers were hitting much lower scores than today, the first signs for the intensification and gamification of sociability were already there. The social web had appeared as a space where one could belong but also stand out, where one could collaborate but also compete, where one could express oneself but could act only within constraints. The new vivid and antagonistic participatory spaces were based on rules set by the social networking sites and on the progressive integration of dynamics and mechanics coming from another field, the field of games.

Gamification, as a term, appeared in 2010, some years after the social web boom, in order to specifically describe this process

of integrating game elements into non game environments and drive participation. Not surprisingly, the term was 'invented' by a technology company BunchBall.com that wished to promote marketing as a game strategy (Ionifides 2011). However, gamification was not limited to cyberspace; its application expanded to different areas such as those of health, education, labour and advertising, aiming to affect human behaviour in ways desirable for the market. Using game mechanics and dynamics, such as points, levels and leaderboards on the one hand and awards, affirmations and achievements on the other, a broad spectrum of game like experiences appeared that succeeded in motivating and engaging the targeted audience.

Gamification at first seems fascinating. As game designer Jane McGonigal suggests, even society itself can be restructured better through such processes. Paying special attention to the emotional activation that only games can bring, she sees a future in which games will build stronger social bonds and lead to more active social networks. 'The more time we spend interacting within our social networks, the more likely we are to generate a subset of positive emotions…' she argues (2011). Thus, according to McGonigal, a new gamified social condition seems to arise driven through games and collective, pleasurable activities. While such optimism is yet to be confirmed, this paper will aim to examine the emergence of gamification following three basic axes related to a. the self, b. social relationships and c. urban space.

The gamified social condition

The gamified self

The avatar is a constructed identity that appears in the form of uploaded pictures, comments, and other forms of sharing, and every update to the site mediates and reforms this identity in view of others (Butera 2010).

The online self is formed by data. It is fed by posts, likes, shares, tags and status updates, and it is measured and quantified by sums of numbers. Like an avatar, it needs to be actively cared for, in order to be kept 'alive'. Similar to Sims characters or Tamagotchi toys, it relies on its owner's responsibility to survive but, at the same time, it is not really an avatar. The online self is a data body which has been gamified, as most information related to it is real, reflecting a real person in their everyday life.

What drives the construction of this new self? Scholars discussing the formation of online identities tend to agree on the desire to control the impression of the image of one's self in the presence of others. They turn to Erving Goffman's theory about the performance of the self (1956) and to Judith Butler's perception of a self in a permanent process of becoming (1990). Rob Cover for example, who mostly bases his research on Butler's work, argues that profile management is actually a form of identity performance (2012) while Pearson, referring to Goffman, examines how the controllable and mediated spaces of social networking sites allow users not only to create their online selves but also to create their own staging and the setting in which they will perform themselves. 'The online performative space is a deliberately playful space' she says but she also adds that in these new spaces there is not much risk involved. There is always a safe distance (2009). Pearson's thought can be connected to Zizek's notion of interpassivity; the state where one postpones being affected and being active (1999). Instead of the user, it is his/her profile that 'enjoys, laughs, believes in the right political causes and suffers…, thus relieving [one's] own real bodily self of all these sometimes unbearable duties and injunctions of being a decent human being.' (Muhr & Pedersten 2010).