

DIGITIZABLE ART

CHAPTERS

CHAPTERS.....	1
THEFTS.....	3
CANNIBALISM.....	4
CHAOS.....	5
I CALL UPON YOU, THE WHOLE OF YOU.....	7
One system.....	7
Diluted frontiers.....	7
Digital 'legal' offer.....	7
Free havens.....	8
Transparency.....	8
Universality.....	8
CONCLUSIONS.....	10

INTRODUCTION

_ Internet, peer-to-peer, music, a worldwide tsunami ? The Atlantis is believed to have vanished out of a self-made weapon. For decades, we have been fearing a nuclear holocaust, now we do fear an ecological cataclysm, both believed to be man made disasters. What if, long before these, we ended up clearing the globe from all civilization through the downfall of art and culture, self-cannibalised in the digital age ?

_ For years, I deliberately refrained from expressing myself on the subject, as from the start, I felt I needed time to study what was at stake, both in great and evil ways. I needed time to enrich my thoughts with the outcome of the many law projects and contradictory regulation attempts that the world, Europe and France in particular have put forward throughout the years; and I came out with what I believe is a revolution we will all have to undergo, sooner or later: a revolution of the minds, that can do more than help us survive - but actually transcend - the digital revolution, a never-ending phenomenon. A revolution that could turn the cultural black hole that potentially lays before us, into a formidable propeller for genuine creation, yet in orderly manner. It is feasible, therefore quite urgent.

_ The following is a dense yet concise analysis of a crisis that starts with a account of my personal experience in the dawn of digital music, then draws ties with the advent of the internet, and finally lands a proposal in the way of multiple calls. Some of these opinions may appear either too mild, or outright radical, sometimes shocking; they come out of long years observing, and I'll have no trouble defending them. I am still working on this, and your feedback, any comment sent to wally@wallybadarou.com, is more than welcome.

THEFTS

_ Back in the 80s, I have been privileged to be labelled one of the most 'pirated' African artist, among other nicknames, due to the huge success a piece of mine ("Hi-Life") had enjoyed over the continent; success happened without generating any income for me, not a single penny. For none of the copies sold in Africa were ever legal, since in those days, my record label did not have a distribution deal over there.

_ In all fairness, I could never blame my fellow people who, by the myriads, had acquired what they thought was a legitimate copy, since they payed for it. Little did they know that their acquisition being legitimate, the copy itself wasn't. But the overwhelming ovation I've constantly been granted ever since could not oblivate the fact that, somewhere in Africa or abroad, somebody actually made money, in substantial figures, that should have come to my producer, my publisher and myself. I was fortunate enough to enjoy many other successes and keep myself busy during my career, that I wasn't just left moping around. Yet, I never could elude the issue: should I ever seek justice ? How ? Shouldn't I simply give up ? Wasn't it too late anyway ?

_ With that difficult experience still fresh in my mind, I feel I am in adequate position to defend the idea that I'm about the present here. The facts ? With the internet came peer-to-peer exchange, that allowed direct transfer of digitized work between users, depriving legitimate beneficiaries from the income that such transaction, in the physical world, would have generated. I will not attempt to evaluate how much the record industry crisis owes to that spoliation. I will just set the record straight in making loud and clear my conclusion that, in regard to national and international laws, enforceable everywhere to this date, spoliation there has been and still is, regardless of the the scope of it, regardless of its entrenchment in time, and whatever denegation might be put forward under so-called "modernism" and "darwinism" flags.

_ Without making it too technical, I name it spoliation, when the intellectual property rights pertaining to the creations of the mind, regardless of the way they are to be protected, under either 'copyright' or '*droit d'auteur*' regime, get nullified in essence, whenever the beneficiary does not get legitimate income from both the enjoyment and the transaction set upon his property; whenever, in other words, he does not get *fructus* from the *usus* and the *abusus* set upon it, let alone does not even monitor it. The minute the work gets digitized, entire loss of control is bound to occur, sooner or later. In regard to the law, wherever we are, it is a theft that looks for legitimacy, justified by the worldwide scale of the phenomenon and its soon-to-be multi-decade duration. It is a theft nevertheless. But a theft with characteristics so distinct, compared to a physical theft, that none of the actual legislation attempts can efficiently and durably solve, no matter how clever they try to be in combining deterrence and repression. So, what to do ?

_ Without making it too 'legal', I believe the law still remains the solution. But what law, that's the question. No more than ultra-capitalism ever could, as we can all witness nowadays, ultra-technologism will never succeed in regulating itself. As unstoppable as it is (and might always be), progress does not care about people, it simply can't; but moreover, it doesn't have to. That thousands of people may lose their job, it is not its concern. The world will adapt, and may the strong survive and the weak die. Only the law is justified in containing, protecting and favouring. It remains the only shield against progress 'ill-effects'. But the law is historically proven to always run far behind. Even more so with the digital age, that made us lose the race before it even took place. What I am about to suggest, is for the law to stop chasing progress, stop trying to adapt to progress; to make it stand and reign way above the paths of progress, to reach a level that can ignore all of the forthcoming turns of progress, expectable and un-expectable. It can do so, without ever attempting to stop it. For that to happen, it will require all of us to undergo a revolution of the mind.

CANNIBALISM

_ I had long been among those who saw, in dismay, the great invention that digital sampling was, for the realm of sounds unheard before it was to offer and promote, turn instead into a 'godsend' tool for some, to 'create' by 'using' music written, arranged, rehearsed, performed, produced, recorded, mixed and mastered by others beforehand. Vinyl records became 'raw' materials, 'interesting' pieces of primitive art only retrieved from the dust to finally meet the genius who was to make them blossom, totally oblivious of the army of creators who were involved in their production at the first place, totally oblivious of what those works meant to the people who initially received them. As inventive as it ever was and still remains, hip-hop music was born in the ashes of a dream I used to share with others, pioneers of the technology. Little did I understand that, from the days of its invention, digital sampling bore the germs of its own fate within.

_ Who in the world did I really think I was, in criticizing those new creators, when I could - and I did - use string, horn, vocal, drum, percussion samples, not seeking to invent sounds unheard before, but simply to emulate them ? Sure enough, these sounds were simple 'abstract' recordings, that did not articulate in a melody or a rhythm. I never ever used drum loops in any of my personal creations. But, in using pre-recorded sounds, as 'elementary' as they were, yet not specifically performed in the goal of being sampled one day, I was initiating the very act of appropriating someone else's performance, diverting from the primary goal of its initial recording; I was appropriating the capture of someone else's sensitivity, someone else's art. An act that was to turn into outright cannibalism - I mean it - pure cannibalism, each and every time full bars of orchestrated and mixed music was to be used in another music afterwards.

_ No one ever thought some extract of a Hitchcock movie could ever be 'used' as the backbone of a David Lynch movie. But in music, that was not only feasible, but it became the norm and, moreover, the only way one could be perceived as 'current' and survive. We, as 'sampled' musicians, could even make extra income out of it: one could judge the value of a recording studio, large or small, by its CD-Rom library. This deeply changed music production ever since, making any other use of digital sampling (other than within keyboard factories) quite marginal. Yet, as 'legal' as the transaction ever was in acquiring those 'sounds', from elementary to full bar loads, one thing remained constant: there was predation on a creation by another creation, 'physical' feeding of the latter onto the former, as opposed to the act of covering (which 'only' predates on an 'idea'). This was true yesterday, and remains true each time it is performed, regardless of the legality, the talent and inventiveness been applied in the process.

_ At times, I was under the impression that the quest for the perfect melody, inventive harmonies, crafted development and orchestration had become cliché; and I felt sad that a song once revered for the treasures within could get outrageous success only when a cover was to reduce it to just the chorus line repeated over and over.

_ But why in the world complain, when the original work was given a second life and, moreover, tribute was being paid, for the cover did only demonstrate the value, the performance and the inventiveness of the original work, compared to the cut and paste process that became ubiquitous. My initial mixed feelings regarding the transaction that allowed Massive Attack to use music I wrote, performed and produced, "Mambo", as the backbone of their "Daydreaming", soon turned into selfish pride somehow, when I realised, as years went by, that I had been one of the key influences over a band of undisputable mythical status today. To sum it up, the original creators could be keen on giving up on their moral rights, when tribute was paid to their creation via what could be, to their view, the annihilation and the perversion of its very essence. Additional income, added to de facto acknowledging of their pioneering status, could easily make the decision. Not to say that this never happened before the days of hip-hop and sampling. But to stress that they made it all the more blatant, regular and acceptable, all at the same time.

_ And I could easily go on and on over the recycling of recorded music, wherever I look at:
> The gigantic income the recorded industry made in re-releasing its catalog with the advent of CD, that it was eager to renew with the advent of unfolding digital enhancements such as SACD, Audio-DVD and others, with a tag price never on the decline;
> Or the "remix" phenomenon that took the world like a storm, to promote, in its own terms, the re-ingurgitating of the same, only with different spices.

_ But then again, who are we to be looking down on such phenomenon, that granted us extra income and rewards ?

_ I am not just indulging in self-criticism for the sake of it, nor performing some kind of coming out on how reactionary I could be proved, with aging. My point is, long before the internet caught us by surprise, artists, producers, publishers, we all contributed to the shaping of today's internet user's mentality, based on how we looked at each other's creations, at our own creations, and how we adamantly treated them, for decades the world over. My goal is to assert that 'free' internet art never was an ex-nihilo self-generated movement. It is to find the source of such phenomenon at the crossroads of an ethical and a technological events; the former, deriving from our own behaviour in regard to our own art; the latter, from the click of the almighty mouse, which could instantly trigger an exact 'copy' without actually moving the 'original', leading to the whole of our vocabulary to be redefined. To those who already had trouble understanding the ethical difference between a cover and a sample, how could we ever explain that free downloading could amount to genuine stealing ? My aim is to have us confess that, through the cultural cannibalism we've seemed to be not just approving, but defending and promoting even, we contributed, one way or another, conciously or unconsciously, to the devaluation of our own art.

CHAOS

_ Along with mobility and portability, the internet generated exciting disturbances at first, which then turned into major havoc before anyone could understand what was - and still is - happening; and ever since, it has been fostering the most contradictory speeches, the most extravagant stances and unexpected antagonisms, the most simplistic arguments and outright populist politics, in regard to the so-called 'record industry crisis', paralleled to the advent of massive peer-to-peer exchange, but never fully proved to be triggered by the latter. All of a sudden, the unthinkable became reality: one could be deemed artist-friendly or ennemy of the arts, depending on which side one was to defend, officially or not. War had been declared, in all paradoxical terms, between artists and internet users, between artists and major labels, between major labels and the collecting right societies, within the artist community, the internet user community, often making use of the adversary rethoric ! Artists, once irrevocably deemed 'freedom fighters' in this world, could suddenly be perceived as repressive totalitarianists ! And the world of internet users had just turned into a massive bunch of thieves overnight !

_ It is high time we learn, from what we can't ignore any longer, from the lessons the digital age has brought in redefining - if not abolishing - the frontiers between genres, between 'original' and 'copy', between 'creators' and 'users', between 'demos' and 'masters', between 'raw' and 'polished', between the nations, between the eras, hence, in a more specific way, between public storing, hosting and broadcasting. Cybertime and cyberspace are not just transpositions of their counterpart in cyberworld. They mean new dimensions in their own right, forever blurring the limits between the 'inside' and the 'outside', the 'before' and the 'after', the 'real' and the 'virtual'. Nothing valuable nor durable can be achieved as long as the specifics of digital exchange and their inherent consequences are ignored. The only frontiers that digital might never manage to alter are those set between the rich and the poor, between the fair and the unfair.

_ It is high time we remember that, both radio and TV broadcast (ironically reincarnated in streaming) did looked like offering free access to art and culture; but remember that this was never free in reality: beneficiaries were to get their fair part systematically, generated by the wealth of subscriptions, advertising and/or grants the broadcaster was to receive. This remains true today, even with the advent of digital TV and radio. It just means that there is nothing like free lunch in this world, and someone down the line has to pay the cost. Beneficiary income has always been generated even when the broadcast turned out to be promotional: music and broadcast economics found balance in the system; and no one felt like, radio and TV broadcast just going digital, the logic behind it was to vanish: freedom came and still comes with a cost.

_ Hence the questions I've been asking myself:

> What mysterious rationale makes the internet, by rejecting anything close to a regulation, justified in abolishing that logic ?

> What authority makes some to place on death row those creators who happen not to adapt to the so-called 'new' economy, which they claim is inherent to the digital revolution, without ever demonstrating it other than simply bowing before the almighty '*fait accompli*' ?

> What authority enables some to decide that there shall be no salvation outside the realm of live performance, as noble an activity as it can be, without ever representing the whole of an art, without ever compensating for the loss thousands of creators have suffered so far, without ever benefiting to any but the only few who could, by their established fame, engage in worldwide tours of gigantic scale ?

> Who said that there shall be no salvation unless full and integral downloading or streaming of work in progress is granted free of charge, with nothing but the buzz this might eventually trigger among fans, based on 'smart' and ubiquitous hype permanently nurtured over the myspace, facebook, twitter and the likes, sort of a narcissic "me, my photos, my videos, my music and I" cyber-hyper-activity ?

> What culture are we to promote in a system that places the artist in permanent spotlight, to discuss his or her every move on every network, to deliver the 'goods' at a pace dictated by the hype and the frenzy, to deprive him-or-herself from due time to put his or her work to rest, to think things over and reconsider his or her decisions ? Would only the 'real-time artists' be eligible for survival ?

> What kind of cynicism makes some seek through this quagmire the perfect opportunity to be questioning the duration of rights, if not their very existence ?

> How can anyone finally conclude that creators are nothing less than rich and simple annuitants, whose 'lazyness' just got to be put to an end ?

> How can any of these self-entitled art and freedom fighters celebrate the jungle law, the domination of the talented by the 'smart' ?

_ With all the lies purposely spread upon it, the digital confusion we find ourselves immersed in does not help asking ourselves those simple questions, before we can ever start answering them. It is time, high time we wake up.

_ In an attempt to focus on some of the issues that seemed to enjoy consensus, I ended up realising that, how much the 'record industry crisis' actually owes to the free internet downloading still remains unevaluated. Many other facts can be blamed for the crisis, and I don't intend to list and evaluate them neither. I'll just concentrate on the undeniable fact that, out of that deliberate chaos, out of the wars and incredible waste of time, talent and energy it generated, out of the ashes of many a creator's dreams, out of the duly orchestrated cacophony, some with a big name in cyber-industry made gigantic profits, still make gigantic profits today, and are bound to make greater profits tomorrow, silently but surely, with the world's appraisal, still seemingly abiding to the law. The ISPs, the Apples, the Googles, today sexiest icons of unconventional modernism. And yet, you will hardly find ultra-broadband internet users, or 160 Giga iPod owners, planning to use them or fill them up with 'legally acquired' music and video exclusively ...

_ I am no Victor Hugo, I am no Emile Zola, and I'll never pretend I could ever match their genius. But I can only get inspired by Zola's "*J'accuse*" to present, with maximum clarity, the revolution of the minds that all those thoughts have led me to call for. May I ever be excused for 'stealing' from the literature legend he was and, moreover, from the political figure whom that historic act propelled, for having so brilliantly defended Justice, to the supreme status of one of our most revered pillars in western civilization.

I CALL UPON YOU, THE WHOLE OF YOU

_ I call upon all of you, politics, economists, jurists, media, artists and your representatives, all internet users, to stop all those wars we've been waging in vain and that lead us to nowhere; to finally look at the ruins and ashes some of us - ISPs, multimedia player makers, unavoidable 'free' search engines, 'free' multimedia servers, 'free' social networks, 'free' etc - have built formidable empires upon, without fear nor substantial sharing. I call upon all of us to unite our forces and our talents for a project that leads us to a positive future rather than close on the attempted repression of those of us, music lovers by the millions around the globe, who unknowingly made themselves the best allies of the new masters of the world, even less culture minded than the major labels they legitimately criticized for their greed and their arrogance.

_ I call upon you all to realise that, what the media used the call a war between the artists and the internet users was in fact a wargame waged between the major labels and the new masters of the world, using the artists and the internet community as swords and shields, making them the ultimate victims. The game must stop, or the war, real war, might prevail, with no winner at the end.

_ I call upon us all to proceed to a revolution within, a revolution of the minds, that might make us look at the fact that, what could legitimately be perceived and condemned as a theft, could only be so because the beneficiary did not get fair income from the use of his or her creation; if ever there can be a way to compensate, compensation there must be, even though the final 'user' might not be the direct 'payer', as it is often the case in the 'real' world, upon cultural and non-cultural goods.

_ I call upon you all to cease wasting time and energy attempting to 'combat' so-called 'illegal' downloading: it is an endless race which can only fail in the long term, technologically and judicially, without ever solving the main issue: the fair revenue that any exploitation of digitized art should (and still can) generate.

One system

_ I call upon all the greats of this world, all sovereigns and governments, all the people in power and influence, all national and international bodies, to create, promote and defend a simple legislation, transparent and universal, designed to make any enterprise deemed bound to make commercial benefit, one way or another, from the direct or indirect digital exploitation that it allows for or incite to, of the works of the mind that it is storing or allows to store, hosting or allows to host, putting online or allows to put online, streaming or allows to stream, broadcasting or allows to broadcast, pay substantial percentage of net profit before tax, determined by the type of enterprise and the nature of profit, to the benefit of creation, through transparent, harmonized and reliable collecting societies, on national and supranational level, existing and yet to be created, in fully acknowledged public interest.

Diluted frontiers

_ I call upon us all to finally realise that, in the free world, the digital age knows no frontier between storing, hosting and broadcasting, three words which hardly bear any kind of similarity with their analog counterparts, three activities that don't just stop at their initial boundaries, in a physical manner. Even though digital storing, hosting and putting online can't amount to broadcasting, individually and literally said, they do much more as a whole since, put together,

they allow for (or amount to) public exposure and offer, potentially unlimited in space and time, identical to the 'original' and rather instantaneous, easily automatable at both ends of the line, equal if not superior to any conventional broadcast, quantitatively and qualitatively. An end must be put to the legal vacuum the so-called non-broadcasting status has created, in regard to the massive profits those lucrative activities clearly generated, for having directly or indirectly promoted or made the creations lay free in public consumption all these years, which should therefore subject them all to proper return towards the creators, just as would any conventional broadcasting activity do.

Digital 'legal' offer

_ I call upon you all to understand that, as respectful of today's law as it may look, the so-called digital 'legal offer' - as it is structured today - is just a lure in the long term. Competition in domination, multiplicity, complexity in nested deals 'offered' as package-deals, opacity in the fare policies as well as in the conditions been imposed to the producers and the artists, they just aim at adding to the general confusion, just to enrich the richest and reinforce their diktat upon us all, all the while leaving the creators with a dismal royalty. One must face the facts: there can be no future in a system that pretends to sell what can be acquired for free, one way or another, legally or illegally. Digital 'legal offer' as it exists today, for a given quality standard, is alas a dead-end in the long run.

Free havens

_ I call upon you all to make the ISPs do much better than act as auxiliary police, wasting their resources in endless anti-piracy chase. This new legislation must, in the contrary, require them to create a 'free uploading, downloading, hosting and streaming' haven within, allowing all digital activity present and future to be freely and legally engaged in, upon all works of the mind, past, present and future, regardless of the genre, freely and legally posted as expressly agreed by the beneficiaries, in return of the said substantial royalty, by way of adjusting their subscription rates accordingly. The benefits would be multifold:

> We would get precise and unobtrusive counting of user-end activity upon the works, in lieu of vague polling.

> We would get effective peer-to-peer marginalization rather than criminalization, so that it can eventually get reduced to what it was precisely designed for: a godsend tool for professionals and specialists to freely exchange data, whatever the domain.

> We would re-channel all existing digital 'legal offer' systems in transparent and accountable structures.

_ I call upon all beneficiaries, artists, producers and publishers, to fully understand that this won't work unless they upload or allow anybody to upload the whole of their catalog to those ISP 'free havens'. I call upon all those digital 'legal offer' entrepreneurs, who really seek to defend the arts, to work within the frames of the ISP 'free havens', by offering them their licensed catalogs and their know-how, in exchange of a negotiated slice of the ISPs profits. This would make them 'real contributors to the arts', an award equal to the green label most entrepreneurs are running after in our eco-conscious times.

Transparency

_ I call upon all of you, national and supranational institutions included, to stop advocating for competition between established collecting societies but, in the contrary, to seek for transparency and harmony between them, so they can work within the frames of that global legislation and beat the confusion that the exploding number of offers, channels, formats and standards the digital revolution is just starting to foster, condemning countless talented creators and creations

to oblivion for not having been smart in their trying to adapt. I call upon us all to put an end to the plethora of uni/bi/tri-lateral deals and package deals between phone companies and major labels, collecting societies and streaming web-radios and the likes, which leave the creators with virtually nothing on the base that "little is better than nothing"; to put an end to the deregulation dogma, that wants us to seek digital freedom through digital chaos, which neither the artist, nor the end-user, nor even a single person will benefit from, in the long run.

Universality

_ I call upon us all to make this legislation a universal rule to be applied to each and any digitized form of art, from photography to cinema, from software to literature, even though at start, their slice of generated revenue would be of symbolic importance, compared to this of the recorded music: they haven't gone through the catastrophe the music industry has suffered yet. The new legislation should provide for periodic re-evaluation of sharing ratios between domains of creation present and future. It is mandatory that they all benefit from the system nevertheless, one way or another, from the start of its implementation, for the following reasons:

> We will need each and everyone's support in this effort, if it is to ever succeed. No '*digitizable art*' creator should be left aside.

> By having everybody in, we add to the universality of our quest: we are talking about digitizable art, whatever and wherever it was, it is today, and is bound to be in foreseeable future.

_ I call upon all companies and organisms that might end up contributing on their profit, to see the validation of their own future in doing so: creation, whether digitizable or not, never was, is not, will never ever come without a cost, unless the creator can be granted studios, instruments, tools and studio time, free rent and zero income tax, and allowed to pay for none of the things any human being can acquire only by paying. I call upon us all to ask not who did actually commit the spoliation of the artist resources, but who did actually make money in letting the spoliation occur; ask who, in silently inciting, smartly calling for - or advocating for - free lunch, made himself the spoliation best tool. Ask not who must pay, for allegedly having committed the act, but who can, who for and what for, for undeniably having inspired and gained from that act; ask who should pay in a simple and transparent manner so that, all together, we can freely enjoy art and still make a living out of it tomorrow.

_ I call upon you all to see, in this suggestion, far from bowing before the spoliation that occurs whenever 'free downloading' does not produce creator's income, just the opposite: the only income mechanism that might ever work today and tomorrow. To understand that, far from advocating for the artistic devaluation of the works that their 'free disposal' by the ISPs might induce, I am in the contrary looking at the only viable system the digital age allows us to develop durably and efficiently, regardless of technological upheavals present and future, never to believe that direct purchase can ever be hurt by this system: in the physical world, direct purchasing of works of the mind is and will remain pertinent in generating proper income to the beneficiaries. It never was so - and never will be so - in the digital world, in a coherent and durable way, over products of equal quality, despite all that can be praised about today's digital 'legal offer'. Again, I see no future in a system that pretends to sell what can be acquired for free, one way or another, legally or illegally.

_ I call upon those of us, 'free-downloaders', to see in this manifesto no resignation, no acquittal nor green light: their doing will still amount to genuine spoliation, making them the new empires' best friends, supporters of a system far worse than the major labels they felt justified in criticizing: and so, as long as the universal legislation I am calling for, or a legislation of similar effects, is not implemented. Then, and only then, free downloading can be viewed as proper and legitimate free access to culture and art, because both *usus* and *abusus* subsequently granted to them, do generate *fructus* to the beneficiaries, even though they might not be the direct

generators. In the absence of which, digitizable art could simply die. The whole of our civilization might be at stake.

CONCLUSIONS

_ I am fully aware that most of those thoughts and suggestions might have been already put forward, debated, discussed, adopted, abandoned, re-adopted here and there, by such and such. What makes them different though is, they simultaneously voice out:

> My clear condemnation of all repressive politics of all kinds against the internet-user, just as this of all demonization of artists and their representatives.

> My clear condemnation of those fratricide antagonisms, waged in blatant simplism. Those wars make no winner, only losers. Culture is the only ultimate victim.

> My dearest wish that, ISPs and other contributors included, everybody can understand the need for a global basic system that might carry and promote diversity, rather than surrender to the *'fait accompli'* of diverse local and national systems that contradict and annihilate each other.

_ The 'highly pirated artist' that I've been knows too well what spoliation means; yet I'll never blame it on the fans, whether they acted legally or illegally, unless they make money out of it. I'll rather blame it on the system, when it fails to properly channelize what is due to me, by letting the fans choose between legal and illegal acquisition, most purposely.

_ What matters to me is the coherence of a vision and a project, that does not work within the boundaries of just one country or one continent, even though we might probably start somewhere on the globe, and hope it can win everywhere, over chaos and lawlessness, just as the internet managed to win over geographical frontiers.

_ I am fully aware of how late I am in expressing those views, in regard to the juridical cacophony which prevails today, possibly making those views obsolete before they can ever be read. But 'fait accompli' never legitimated an offence. Designating the responsible entities does not simply amount to condemning them: it might foster an awareness, the start of a revolution. It is not too late.

_ The task before us is grand, of utopian magnitude most probably. Which makes it the more urgent and inevitable. Let's wake up.

Wally Badarou - 18.06.2009

Revision 26.09.2009

All rights reserved