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Abstract
This paper discusses empirical findings from Firefund.net. Based in Denmark, the organisation is a crowdfunding website that provides resources for direct action movements. The organisation deliberately positions itself within a political struggle to provide resources for activists and to create a global solidarity network. This paper sheds light on contemporary non-mainstream activism and activists’ motivations to change social arenas. We highlight Firefund.net’s challenges and possibilities in relation to juridical issues and issues of control and sharing responsibility in a supposedly self-organised organisation. Two main dilemmas are discussed. Firstly, how to build both an effective and self-organising website: the internal organising of Firefund.net is a key challenge, not least when it comes to including communities of activists. Secondly, how to support radical initiatives without breaking the law: some activists sympathise with movements in a juridical grey zone. Both issues are relevant to dissident movements and activism in general.
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Introduction

Imagine the common cartoon narrative that we saw as children, where you have a group of nice people all living happily together until a wicked villain shows up. In our supposedly democratic society, these people would be assigned an area from where they could yell, and the villain would then decide whether or not to listen. Who considers that a happy ending?

With this anecdote Mikkel, one of the two co-founders of Firefund.net, expresses his view on current civil rights as being make-believe. Firefund.net is a crowdfunding website (established in 2015) directed at political movements and activists, created from a desire to apply direct action to address what the founders perceive as an acute lack of constructive solutions.

The activists and founders of Firefund.net share the view that global inequality

---

1 All quotes are translated from Danish to English.
is on the rise with an exclusive elite becoming richer and more powerful. A central problem with this is the way we as citizens show our support for the underprivileged. Activists of Firefund.net believe that instead of supporting struggles directly, we merely support mainstream organisations and collectively ignore conditions of the underprivileged. In their view, the consequence is that social imagination is reduced to something unrealistic or utopian.

The real problem is relying on representation, which means putting your lives in the hands of people in power and expecting that they will make things better for you. The claim is that nothing will change for the people if they do not take matters into their own hands. Thus, direct action is essential.

Direct action is here distinguished from political action or civil disobedience. Political action is defined as strategies using the system already in place to try and influence the people in power to make changes (Walt and Schmidt 2009, 138). Civil disobedience is defined similarly, as a method questioning specific unjust laws, but not the legal order itself (Graeber 2013, 234). This supposed discrepancy is captured in the argument that it would be impossible to constructively create social change by keeping relations to the current seat of power or their institutions (Drabble 2013, Holloway 2005).

With Firefund.net the two founders want to make it possible to transform symbolic solidarity into direct action. Instead of waiting for likes and re-tweets to pressure politicians to change their minds, movements should have the possibility of earning the necessary funds themselves and create the needed networks for change.

The research was conducted during the first year of Firefund.net’s online life. Our observations started shortly before the beta version of the website was launched in June 2015 and continued until a few months before the launch of the final website in October 2016. Since then the development has been followed from afar. Thus, we are able to include some reflections on the organisation’s development and changes.

The paper begins by presenting the fieldwork, followed by an overview of the organisation and of the ideals behind the initiative. The discussion sections take a closer look at challenges of organising a global network of activists supposedly without hierarchies. Here we discuss issues of control, delegating, and sharing responsibility in a self-organised organisation. We argue that internal organising is an extremely important, and often contested, element when it comes to this project championing equal participation. The final section shines a light on Firefund.net’s challenges and possibilities concerning legal issues when facilitating dissident activism.

Research design

Fieldwork on Firefund.net was initiated in June 2015 at a time of rapid change for the organisation. Research ended in June 2016, however we have since
followed the development of Firefund.net, and are thus able to include details of how Firefund.net have worked with the challenges defined in our analysis.

Data-source triangulation was applied based on observation, participation, interviews and document analysis. The primary data source is field notes obtained through observation and participation in the daily work at Firefund.net’s office (including weekly scrum meetings with the founders), at activist meetings (once a week for four months) and 10 training and development workshops. These sources are supplemented by 1) two interviews with the founders, and two interviews with two different activists. 2) Internal documents developed during the year of research, where Firefund.net was still defining itself and its raison d’être: manifestos, communication strategies, market analyses and website development papers. 3) External communication about Firefund.net: an article written about Firefund.net (Ruggaard 2015) and a radio program (Radio24Syv 2015) with one of the founders.

Using several methodological approaches serves as a tool to address inconsistency in the data (Hammersley and Atkinson 2007). By using different sources of information and having access to all internal documents including internal communication, it has been possible to follow the development of discussions and ideas. Because of the novelty of the organisation, the fieldwork makes use of the principle that absence of knowledge can contribute to significant insights into a field (Hammersley and Atkinson 2007). This has an explorative quality where the analysis process inductively is guided by the findings in the field (Geertz 1973).

Insights were at times challenging to capture. However, it has been an interesting platform for exploring initial stages in this kind of organisation since it has gone through a significant process of learning by doing (Turner and Bruner 1986) while developing the website and activist networks.

Throughout fieldwork, fieldnotes were continuously scrutinised to make sense of empirical data. This was a process where the analytical notes gradually became more advanced and where the research themes became more specific. The iterative process of going back and forth between findings and theory was important in order to carry out an informed analysis (Hammersley and Atkinson 2007).

Except for the two founders, Karl and Mikkel, the informants are anonymised and given pseudonyms because of the often precarious and controversial issues involved.

**Introducing Firefund.net**

Initially a beta version of the website contained two campaigns for public display. The founders began involving more people both online and face-to-face, and gradually work continued to finalise the website. Since the launch of the website in October 2016, 13 different movements have run 15 campaigns
through Firefund.net. In total, they represent nine different countries on three continents. The campaigns vary from support to a festival for QTIBPoC [Queer, Trans, Inter Black People and People of Colour] to legal aid for activists in Uganda, Germany, Palestine, Ukraine, and an autonomous centre in Macedonia. Eight of the campaigns reached their campaign goal, and five campaigns are still running as we write. Thus, Firefund.net has indeed succeeded in creating a crowdfunding platform. However, building a platform that can facilitate a global network still needs work.

Firefund.net is a crowdfunding site aimed specifically at social and political movements. The problem with most present-day crowdfunding sites, according to Mikkel and Karl, is that they leave little room for non-mainstream political projects. However, as Karl says, crowdfunding is basically ‘people equals power’ because if a lot of people donate small amounts it will accumulate to one big donation.

From the very beginning Mikkel and Karl have envisioned the organisation as being able to facilitate a global network of movements, helping each other to seize power through sheer volume of supporters. In Mikkel’s opinion, in order to counteract a global unjust development, Firefund.net should contribute to a tradition where local struggles strengthen global alliances: “Firefund.net will enable global alliances even when it comes down to smaller local struggles, because basically we are all fighting for the same cause”.

For the two founders direct action is key to doing this work. Even though symbolic solidarity such as mental support, likes on Facebook and re-tweets are able to strengthen belief in your cause, it does not actually change anything, they say. Instead people need to act on their solidary feelings, e.g. by donating money to or by contributing to the mobilisation of movements that are essentially doing something to fight the system (Radio24Syv 2015).

It has been important for the two founders from the beginning to create structures in the organisation that make room for everyone everywhere to participate on their own terms. Thus, openness on all levels from source coding to internal and external communication is a priority. This effort is seen on three organisational levels:

The community level is open to anyone with a computer and an interest for the project. At this level, there are several possibilities of engagement taking place primarily via the Internet. Through Open Source and a Reddit community, people can engage in discussions and in development of the website. The community is growing slowly, as more and more activists are learning to code the website. Approximately 15 activists are affiliated to Firefund.net today. Most of them are Danish and close to the founders, and the founders and current activists are still learning how to open up this level.

The second level is the solidarity network [Solinet]. The point of this level is to have groups that sympathise with Firefund.net’s goals. These groups should all be loosely connected to the organisation and not committed to any specific
promises or tasks. The role of the solidarity network is spreading word globally of every new campaign launch. It is still an ambition to build up and increase this level.

The third level is an activist level consisting of a more stable group of people with a steady workflow in the organisation. On this level, there are several tasks like assisting movements using Firefund.net, preparing crowdfunding campaigns or helping the day-to-day management. The aim is to establish these activist groups globally. The activist level is still most active in Denmark, but with the potential to start up in Germany soon.

In the beginning a fourth organisational level consisted of day-to-day management with two programmers and the two founders. However, this level has been taken over by the activist level, which is a big step in terms of overcoming challenges of internal organising and lack of inclusion of activists.

**Imagining another world and dissidence**

When posing the question to Mikkel and Karl “what is wrong with the world?”, they agree that the way current society is organised is a pressing issue. In Mikkel’s view, mainstream economic systems make “logical” solutions impossible, because these solutions are not always profitable: “It is logical that devastating Mother Earth is a really bad idea; however, the system has not yet found a solution to this problem.” Karl’s view is that we are not seeing the bigger picture, and therefore we have a system that is failing the majority of the population as well as the earth we inhabit together.

Because of their view that political activity behind societal change is essential Mikkel and Karl maintain there is a need for dissident movements. They wish for a society where social change is created collectively from the bottom up. Karl points out that anything growing on its own will usually not develop in a very pleasant way, so there is a need for movements that dare propose alternatives.

People are affected by reproduction of structures and systems, even when they seem unjust or illogical. It may be possible for people to have power through more public participation and organisation, but this train of thought is contested by the argument that change cannot happen from within the system (Drabble 2013, Freeman 1970, Graeber 2013). Classical critical theorists such as Horkheimer (2002 [1972]) perceive systems where economic interests are put before human interests to be unwise, and he does not believe that the realisation of a fair society is a matter of historical development. On the contrary, it requires imagination, clear visions, and collective action to realise a different society.

Firefund.net’s aim in this regard is a noble one, but changing systems and organisations is difficult, because illegitimate power often does not exist formally and therefore power systems are difficult to identify for the organisation itself. A critique of neoliberalist economy is evident in this
discussion. According to Susan George, individuals and corporations “with a turnover much greater than the Gross Domestic Product of many of the countries where they operate (...)” (2015, 1) exercise power through lobbyists or directly through government. She views this as illegitimate power, because it is neither accountable nor loyal to the citizens or to the countries in which they operate. This makes power structures extremely difficult to identify.

David Graeber (2013) points out that most radical change happens through social movements willing to break the law, because governments do not of their own account grant new freedoms or even rights for radical groups. The problem is that even if a constitution grants its people the right to resist unjust governments, how then is exercising this right distinguished from mere troublemaking? According to Graeber, the issue is that governments do not make this distinction and object to signs of insurrection. This complicates life for movements working with dissident projects, because it leaves no options for systemic change within the legal system (van der Walt and Schmidt 2009).

These issues are also current for Firefund.net, which legitimises labelling the organisation as dissident.

Ideally, research contributes to the realisation of more just societies by looking at the dialectic relationship between macro and micro levels (Mills (2000[1959]), Wright 2010). With this aspiration, Graeber analyses dissident organising, direct action and consensus, and uses real world examples to illustrate how maintaining a free market has turned out to require a system heavy on regulations and policy. He sees several examples of the ability to imagine another world like the Occupy movement, the Arab Spring and the Global Justice movement (2015). These sort of activities challenge power structures, and Graeber reminds us that if humans have built something, we can just as easily generate new knowledge, initiatives and movements.

**Facilitating dissidence**

Susan George frames unequal development in neoliberalist systems like this: “It [neo-liberalism] has steadily gained ground despite overwhelming proof that it is harmful to nearly everyone, except for the extremely wealthy, the topmost people on the corporate ladder and those who enrich themselves by manipulating money in the international casino economy.” (2015, 10).

We are often not capable of imagining doing things differently: “(...) the world doesn’t just happen. It isn’t a natural fact, even though we tend to treat it as if it is – it exists because we all collectively produce it.” (Graeber 2015, 89). The challenge of this is to be able to imagine something radically different and not to be caught in systems. Consequently, we find ourselves living in a society dominated by elites, resulting in exploitation of human and natural resources, inequality, climate changes, and undemocratic practices (George 2015).

The problem is not just one of inequality in wealth, but also inability in the
power to control one’s own life (Noys 2013). A solution to this development could be more influence among citizens and organisations (Dearden 2015). This subscribes to a view that change can only happen outside dominating systems, because if one attempts to overthrow the system using the system’s methods nothing will change, and a new oppressive system will take its place (Graeber 2015). A way toward change may be achieved through dissident activities around the world (Drabble 2013) as we may be seeing in the example of Firefund.net.

Organisational emancipation often comes from movements opening up small cracks in existing systems where it is possible to do things differently to create lasting change (Davies et al. 2013, Fernández-Savata 2014). In this sense Firefund.net can expand the cracks by facilitating a platform for activists using the possibilities of the Internet. This, however, requires a conscious approach to Firefund.net’s organisation. In the following, we will take a closer look at these challenges and possible solutions.

**Delegation or control**

One of the first things Mikkel said when fieldwork began was: “If you find anything interesting about how to facilitate rallies without putting people to sleep, or how to make consensus effective, please let me know”. Karl added that the organisation has succeeded when “people embrace the project and develop it as they go along, ensuring that this tool always matches the needs of the movements and the struggle.”

Both Mikkel and Karl have previous experience organising political action, and they have often experienced the ineffectiveness caused by the arduous process of consensus. Thus, it has been important for them to seem professional, effective, and in control. However, they are aware that they do not wish to appear “business-like”, which they feel would alienate their target group and the activists. This dilemma balances between wishing to be efficient while still showing contempt for unjust systems and keeping the project open for activists.

From the very beginning they have put a lot of thought and effort into this specific challenge. In spite of their aspirations Firefund.net has often been viewed as Mikkel and Karl’s project.

In November 2015 an evaluation meeting was held to find out how the activists were doing and if they liked being part of the organisation. At this meeting several activists mentioned that they lacked information and understanding of what is going on in Firefund.net.

One activist phrased her comments like this:

> It is good that we are introduced to what we are supposed to do. However, it is difficult imagining how we can become self-organised, because you [Karl and
Mikkel] know everything. It is hard to imagine how we are supposed to work alone without your instructions. We need more information and updates between meetings in order to be able to meet without you. I am fine with being told what to do, but this is more a question of how it will work in the future.

She captures the essence of the problem: if the aim is to decentralise as much as possible, it is imperative to share information and delegate tasks.

The more time one puts into a project the better access to information one will have. Information is power, and the more one knows about how an organisation works, the more effective one can be, which will automatically increase influence (Freeman 1970). Even in egalitarian-based organisations like this one it is not possible to avoid that some people spend more time on a project than others and thus increase their access to information, so it is important to acknowledge that “The best democratic process depends on the nature of the community involved” (Graeber 2013, 208).

As initiators of the organisation, Mikkel and Karl have more invested in the project than the other activists, and it has been difficult for them to delegate and share their knowledge, which creates difficulties in terms of involving others.

Mikkel used this analogy to describe his and Karl’s relationship to Firefund.net:

> At some point it becomes old enough to make its own decisions, and we just have to believe that the upbringing we have given it is good enough to drive it in an acceptable direction. Overprotection can hurt a child and its development. Everyone should have the opportunity to learn – and sometimes kids themselves know what is best for them.

This somewhat paternalistic position may be a practical way to view the situation, but there is a danger that the founders will remain overprotecting parents unable to let go, because they are afraid the organisation will get hurt or will make non-reversible mistakes if they are not involved in every aspect of its development.

A specific example is from a lengthy period of press strategy preparations. Karl was in Norway working on the website with one of the programmers and said that he would work on the strategy while the programmer was busy with other tasks. Mikkel and an activist therefore worked together on producing a draft for a press release, but when Karl was asked to give his comments, he ended up rewriting the whole draft. If they are not diligent, Firefund.net may fall into the trap of over-organising because the two founders themselves want to participate and be involved in every activity, which does not leave much room for others to learn.

However, Jo Freeman (1970) argues that the worst possible method is not to
organise at all, because there is no such thing as groups without some sort of structure, and pretending there is will only result in informal elites that no one is able to control. Organising is in this sense important to avoid informal elites emerging caused by the lack of formal structures to prevent them.

At one point there was a danger of the two founders establishing themselves as a small centralised elite, not necessarily because they wanted to, but because they were putting so much work into the project, being the only ones working full time despite the fact that they constructed the levels of organisation to avoid this development.

Engaging the community of activists

Organising is particularly interesting when it comes to dissident initiatives because how to organise defines possibilities for development as well as who is included or excluded. Much effort has been put into training and involving the activists on the three levels of involvement and in the extensive communication system. Crowdsourcing, Reddit communities, GitHub, Slack, and Trello are tools the Internet provides for non-established organisations to organise. Firefund.net aims to use these to be transparent and to allow broad involvement in campaign consulting as well as website development and coding.

Mikkel and Karl worked full time for a year to get the website up and running and getting word out that they were ready to host campaigns, but they ended up burning out because the hard work did not pay off as they had hoped. They decided to take a break and only do the minimum amount of work required to keep the website running. This did not mean that things slowed down. On the contrary, campaign proposals kept coming in, more campaigns were successful and more activists claimed responsibility. This confirms the hypothesis that more room for the activists will lead to wider participation.

It is unclear which came first. If Mikkel and Karl had not put so much effort into the project initially, it might not have run so smoothly when they began letting go. Maybe they could have let go much earlier; maybe they were just lucky. Their own view is that when more people get involved on the three levels of participation, then the need for day-to-day management becomes smaller.

This has proven correct; however, it still seems to be a challenge to involve activists as much as the founders would like in terms of skills as well as geography. Training activists with the necessary skills and knowledge to get involved is difficult in a global network. However, it is a challenge that the founders and the other activists are currently working to solve.

Firefund.net has the potential to become a de-centralised global network. The biggest challenge in this regard might be the issue of who will take responsibility for keeping Firefund.net within legal boundaries, and who steps in if it slips. In the following section, we will take a closer look at this theme.
Balancing on the edge of the law

Dissident organisational theory argues that it is impossible to create constructive social change by maintaining relations to seats of power and their institutions (Drabble 2013), or as Holloway argues: “(...) any engagement with the state pushes us in the direction of reconciliation with capital.” (2005, 40). Graeber (2015) mentions this as a dilemma that all social movements run into as soon as they begin to own something, because ownership absorbs them into the maelstrom of insurance, levies, and legal forms. The problem with this is that only individuals, corporations, or other organisational forms recognised by the state can own things, but networks cannot.

Mikkel began a workshop by presenting the rules restraining Firefund.net to keep out unwanted actors and projects. The three written rules for projects funded through the website are: 1) Target the oppressors, not the oppressed, 2) Do not fundraise on behalf of others – you fundraise your own struggles, and 3) Be honest. Additionally, two unwritten rules are: 1) No funding for weapons. 2) No funding for organisations listed as terrorist, as these will result in the website being shut down.

With this in mind Firefund.net are aware of the fine balance between building a website that does not break the law, but at the same time does not necessarily discourage the individual activists to do the same. Karl stresses that abiding by the law is a crucial element. On the one hand, it is necessary for Firefund.net to abide by regulations to survive. On the other hand, some of the activists using the platform sympathise with organisations that are considered illegal. This balance between being a legal platform and making room for potentially illegal projects is difficult and presents a recurring discussion among the activists.

A specific example is from a workshop where the purpose was to get feedback and ideas on what information to include in different sections of the website. Four activists joined the workshop. Three of them knew each other in advance and all four of them knew Mikkel, which created a pleasant atmosphere where everyone participated actively.

The unwritten rules generated the most debate about how Firefund.net is be able to ensure that money raised will not end up being used for weapons, and whether or not there is any room for groups known to use weapons. During the discussion Tommy, an activist, asked, “what if ISIS wants to do a campaign? Which of course they can’t.” Another activist, Susan, immediately commented: “A pitfall about having general rules is that we have to state that supporting PKK [a Kurdish labour party, listed as terrorist] is not allowed, which would be a shame, because we could support them through blogs or whatever without funding them.” The dilemma here being that some activists sympathise with movements that are listed as terrorist, or at least could be involved in illegal activities.

Everyone present at the workshop pragmatically agreed that raising money for “non-illegal” activities is fine no matter how the funds are used afterwards.
Susan gave an example of this by mentioning a crowdfunding campaign raising money for masks and scarfs, which on their own are not illegal objects. However, they could be used in demonstrations where the protesters are masked, which is illegal in some countries.

The question is how Firefund.net is able to facilitate change while not directly challenging the law. An important point here is that they do not see themselves as creators of change, but merely as facilitators of change. According to Karl, they have not actually invented anything new. Instead, they wish to take already existing elements to facilitate dissident action. This, however, requires a conscious stance on how to deal with legal issues and who assumes responsibility.

**Legal responsibility**

The Internet provides vast possibilities for communication, involvement and exposure, which more than ever enables a global platform for activism. However, the Internet also presents Firefund.net with the challenges of surveillance and who assumes responsibility in the organisation. Thus, a core focus in the development of Firefund.net is how the website is built.

In order to make use of the possibilities presented by the Internet, Firefund.net have several considerations to avoid problems pertaining to surveillance: “It is important to provide a high level of digital protection for our users. It is a matter of principle for us to make our cashflow difficult to track to make our users safe, because not all governments are great fans of political movements, even if they are legal,” says Karl (Ruggaard 2015, 22).

Even though the Internet presents security issues, the use of Bitcoins and other measures provides some protection. According to Karl, certain payment systems like PayPal shut down accounts or money flows if they pick up a political vibe. Bitcoins, however, has proven to be a system that resists these shutdowns.

Using tools like Bitcoins, however, does not address the issue of how to keep the platform within legal boundaries among a global community of actors with extremely diverse perceptions of right and wrong. Karl expresses this dilemma in an interview in Danish radio:

> We are not supposed to be judges deciding who is okay and who is not, but somehow we are. We have to be, seen from a juridical legal perspective, because we do have some limitations. A nazi project will never appear on our site, so in some ways we have a political delimitation. Luckily, it is not just me and my mates who have to decide. We are a whole community, so I think it will solve itself (Radio24syv 2015).

Karl’s point is that Firefund.net is able to avoid fraudulent organisations on the
platform because someone in the network will always have the ability to stop them. However, there is a recurring dilemma of who decides which projects adhere to the organisation’s own rules and which do not, and who should assume responsibility for making these decisions.

The current arrangement is designed to work across international borders, so when activists contact Firefund.net with a project proposal, any activist in the community can in theory assume responsibility for each project and approve it for the website. However, in legal terms, the final juridical responsibility cannot lie with each individual activist, and the question is whether the people with the legal responsibility will allow others to have a say in these decisions.

In practice, having the juridical responsibility may in the end mean that only a few people have the right to decide or to veto. This is only an issue for projects outside the legal area, but it is already a principal challenge and discussion in terms of how to engage a decentralised community of activists supposedly sharing responsibility.

The activists see a profound need to clarify how to handle potentially illegal methods. Here Karl points out his attitude to the Danish government’s legislation on terror: “It is important to stress that we are trying to build a pragmatic tool that can strengthen the left wing and living movements. Our purpose is not to challenge the law by supporting organisations listed as terrorist, or to make a quibbling political point of the fact that the legislation on terrorism is really random” (Ruggaard 2015, 22). Even though he does not want to break the law, it is evident that he thinks it might be necessary for some movements. His opinion is that each movement must do what they have to do. However, Firefund.net needs to put up some boundaries because if blame falls on Firefund.net there will no longer be any platform to use for future projects.

Conclusion

The crowdfunding platform Firefund.net aims to facilitate network and resources for activists fighting against social oppression and inequality. The root problem with most political systems, according to activists involved in the platform, is that they rely on representation, which means putting your lives in the hands of people in power and expecting them to make things better. As an alternative, the wish is to create a platform that facilitates activists globally in order to strengthen a worldwide struggle against perceived neo-liberalist systems.

Our findings show that Firefund.net may indeed be on the way to actively opposing non-egalitarian structures, but the organisation does have some issues to be aware of.

A main dilemma, if the founders want to engage the community of activists, is that they need to delegate and share knowledge and responsibilities. If this does not happen, the activists become passive users or disappear altogether, which
will defeat the self-organising intentions.

Firefund.net balances on a fine line between a legal framework and facilitating potentially law-breaking movements. By being a platform for dissident movements, the organisation may find itself in a dilemma between following the law to avoid sanction vs. breaking the law to create change. The platform attempts to balance this out by applying different tools, primarily by utilising security measures on the website, having regulations against organisations listed as terrorist and through continuous communication with the activists. In this way, Firefund.net wishes to remain a legal platform that activists can use to raise funds for projects that they would not be able to raise through existing mainstream channels.

The aim of Firefund.net is to create an open platform to facilitate and strengthen social and political movements, and how they organise is crucial to the change they wish to see. Organising can be constructive or counterproductive, and it is important consistently to reconsider ideas and plans. This is as important for established organisations and businesses as it is for organisations with participatory, self-organisational aspirations.

Constant reinvention keeps a dissident movement like this alive, but at the same time it is not possible to define a singular form of resistance applicable to every dissident organisation. Thus, leaving the Firefund.net platform open to the activists seems a serviceable way to ensure that it keeps on fulfilling its goal of being an initiative for the users by the users. If Firefund.net can manage to balance these challenges and possibilities, there is a genuine potential for facilitating the envisioned dissident action.
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