Jonas Andersson, submitted January 2011.

The origins and impacts of the Swedish file-sharing movement: A case study

Introduction

This article serves to both summarize the recent history of peer-to-peer-based file-sharing in Sweden, and to contextualize it in interesting ways. What are the principal factors shaping the file-sharing movement in Sweden? How do they overlap, reinforce and conflict with one another? I do not believe that file-sharing is a phenomenon which is *a priori* opposed to the current, neo-liberal, capitalist world order. Instead, it is borne out of it – not least, since it hinges upon the individual end-user's desire to acquire entertainment, and to maximise both pleasure and efficiency. In allowing for this consumer agency to come about – in aggregated, not entirely foreseeable ways – it has dislodged certain established industries (such as the sales of audio CDs), while creating potentials for entirely new ones. At the same time, file-sharing is being harnessed in ways that act as opposition to various centres of established, institutional order, while potentially reinforcing other forms of power and domination. This article will give examples of how the systemic nature of file-sharing resonates with the particular, late-modern collective ethic that we can see in Sweden. I will begin by contextualising file-sharing in Sweden, in an attempt to marry factual understanding with theoretical insights. Towards the end I will connect the observation that file-sharing allows for great latitude when it comes to the end-user, however requiring both knowledge and directed action on the side of the user, and an overarching ubiquity and standardization in terms of infrastructure. This reverberates with how subjects in late modernity are increasingly governed by means of an odd marriage of standardization and voluntary self-regulation, where the relative freedom of consumption entails a constant, reflexive management of the self.

Why has file-sharing become so popular in Sweden, and how does this country make for an interesting case study? The idea of a truly flat, de-territorialized panacea of globalization is largely a myth (Hafez 2007). In fact, an allegedly 'global' media system like the internet is both locally produced and sequestered, in terms of language and infrastructure.[1] By taking concrete examples, and making particular case studies, we can reveal the complexity of an otherwise idealized image of this global network. My own research has focused on Swedish file-sharing; how it takes place, as well as how it is invoked and justified by the actors involved. In this article, I will outline how p2p-based file-sharing has seen a particularly strong development in Sweden, while having been referred to in various forms of public debate, to varying results. To begin with, I would argue that p2p-based file-sharing has been particularly prolific in Sweden, due to a range of factors.

(a) Sweden has had a very early establishment of fibre-based broadband, where upload as well as download speeds are high, compared to for example ADSL (which is more common in Britain). Especially for the younger generations, access to computers, smart phones and broadband are part of the quotidian.

(b) The general population sees high degrees of technical competence, and the secular belief in

---

[1] The internet can be said to be sequestered "vertically," in terms of access to its various applications: Think of the internet as layered according to the 'network stack,' with the physical layer at the bottom, followed by various protocol layers, some of which *literally* comprising applications, requiring specific means of access. Without access to the Skype software, one cannot for example use that particular voice-over-IP application. It is also sequestered "horizontally" in terms of linguistic and geographical borders.

rationality and self-fulfilment – typical for the Western world – is more extreme in Sweden than in any other country (Inglehart & Welzel 2005, Zuckerman 2009). This, in turn, is indicative of a wider shift in social relations, as our societies tend to become more aligned to the type of social order that theorists such as Ulrich Beck, Zygmunt Bauman, Manuel Castells, and Anthony Giddens have outlined: namely, more complex societies, where everyday relations seem to be characterised more and more by *gesellschaft*-like arrangements and personal "management" of one's own identity and social relations – in line with the process of individualization, outlined by Beck and others.

(c) Meanwhile, Sweden has also seen a significantly lively debate around file-sharing, also in the mainstream media. Consequently, the debate has arguably been relatively sophisticated compared to other countries, not least given the wide popularity and controversy of sites like The Pirate Bay (TPB) and the relative success of the Swedish Pirate Party in recent years.

Further, in my own research, I have found some really interesting parallels between p2p-based file-sharing and what I would see as a typically Swedish form of social structuration. This can be outlined in a similarly ground-up, schematic fashion:

(I) Sweden is characterised by strong secularism, and a reflexive self-image of efficiency, engineering and optimization of societal functionality. This helps to explain the currency that the argument of *technological inevitability* appears to have had in the Swedish file-sharing debate. Of all the modes of justification that file-sharers use to defend the phenomenon, the notion that it is (at least on a global level) 'unstoppable' appears as the most principal one in Sweden.

(II) The Swedish welfare model is not partial to the family unit (as a recipient of social benefits) to the same extent as Germany or USA. Neither are semi-private institutions (like charities) as important as they are in Anglo-American societies, nor is there any particularly strong emphasis on local communities, as in for example the UK (Berggren & Trägårdh 2006; Economist 2007). Rather, individual freedom is made possible by a strong, efficient overall universal collectivity on the state level, where individuals are determined to maximise personal gratification/convenience as well as (societal and personal) efficiency, without doing so at anyone else's expense. Interestingly, these tendencies are not only found in Swedish sociality and political organisation, but also in the technically mediated collectivity of p2p. In a typical p2p system, the scope of choice for the individual node is reliant on the size of the aggregated totality. In a file-sharing network, the more nodes connected, the wider the availability, durability and reliance for everyone involved. It strikes a uniquely neat balance between the smallest unit and the largest collectivity; the individual and the state.

(III) Further, as the legal systems lays claims to be as totalizing as possible, engraining social control in the souls of its citizens, there is also a rich tradition of *evading* the system among cunning individuals; private import of goods, home-brewing, and tax evasion are all common pastimes (see Andersson 2011 on file-sharing and the concept of *la perruque*). The concept of 'people's movements' (or, as was also noted among my interviewees, 'folk sports') appears to be a particularly Swedish way of establishing the notion of an intermediaries against both anarchy and the potential totalitarianism of a strong state apparatus (Berggren & Trägårdh 2006: 104). However, in Sweden, the latter role of such intermediaries has been obscured and subsumed by the strong historical impetus of national progress and the state as a benevolent entity. According to Berggren & Trägårdh, the Swedish labour movement bred a romanticised image of its 'people's movements,' probably as such images also play on the patriotic notion of "a small country performing well" in sports, industry, technology and the like. Hence, phenomena like TPB can also be read in terms of nationalistic pride.

Defining the inescapably non-overseeable, largely nebulous phenomenon of file-sharing in terms of constituting a 'people's movement' or 'folk sport' is also to formulate it as a valid collective, and to give it a rhetorically powerful, organised form (albeit perhaps only appropriated in the abstract). It allows the phenomenon to be *invoked* alongside the already formulated macro entities or established institutional actors of the copyright lobby, thus serving a justificatory purpose. It lends an otherwise invisible, nebulous phenomenon a legitimizing thrust; in some way sanctioning it, for example by pointing to its documented popularity and adoption among wider layers of the population, something which further asserts its supposedly 'unstoppable' nature. It is also a way of "branding" one's own movement in market terms. This serves as another explanation for the momentous public interest that TPB has garnered.

Consequently, in Sweden, the topic has not only been discussed on web-based forums affiliated to TPB, and supporting clusters like the Pirate Party and Piratbyrån. Many blog-based commentators have commented on the controversies, where blogs like for example Copyriot (Rasmus Fleischer) have proved helpful also for my own coverage of the argumentation regarding the topic of p2p, file-sharing and 'piracy'. Both national newspapers and public service broadcasters have covered the topic rather extensively since 2005. Alongside the 2009 Pirate Bay trial, two different books on file-sharing were published in Sweden: Rydell & Sundberg (2009) is the journalistic, dramatised story of TPB, while Ernst (2009) contains a series of interviews of various members of the Swedish political and cultural establishment, on unauthorised file-sharing and digitization. These were preceded by Söderberg's critique of the Swedish file-sharing debate (2008), and succeeded by the *After The Pirate Bay* reader edited by myself and Pelle Snickars (2010).

On Sweden and file-sharing

The file-sharing demographic is one characterised by an already widespread access to internet technologies, both in terms of knowledge/skill and wealth. Sweden is a rich country characterised by relatively small gaps in income distribution, making access to technologies like broadband very commonplace. In recognizing this, one should not presume class or gender affiliations *per se*, but instead highlight the question of what kinds of subjectivities the activity of file-sharing engenders. The defining feature seems to be one of inclination and reflexive choice; a typically post-Fordist, 'late modern' attitude, made possible by reliance on those greater collectives and infrastructures facilitating that choice – something which is not unique to Sweden but to the increasingly pseudo-rational, reflexive individualization of Western societies, a tendency outlined by many contemporary sociologists (see below). Strandh (2009) notes how the Swedish case is unique in its combination of rapid infrastructural development with uniquely strong secularism. This secularism has fostered strong individualism and a reflexive questioning of normative ideologies, Strandh argues. He also adds the particularly strong libertarian ethos among the "geeks" who have had a key role in establishing online companies and services.

My own fieldwork consisted of a general overview of the mediated discourse on internet forums, blogs, and comment boards, as well as interviews with Swedish file-sharers by way of continual email exchange, with the intention of assessing the discursive tropes. The main fieldwork was conducted in 2006, prefigured by a pilot study. In the main study, both interviewer and interviewees were practically anonymous to one another, as I was mainly interested in the modes – and by which invocations – experiences, interpretations and justifications were expressed. One of the things I saw was that active file-sharers seem to share a propensity for exploration – not exclusive to youth or

gender but, rather, personal inclination. Despite a language of 'sharing,' various internet-activist commentators, as well as my own interviewees, have tended to use decidedly individualist explanation models, emphasizing individual *ability* above any particular other demographic factor. This ability is facilitated by high levels of computer literacy and access to broadband. In addition, what is required is a strong personal inclination to govern one's own media consumption, to discover new media texts and explore new technologies – in short, to *manage* a media consumption which is personally experienced as autonomous.

The paradox is that this autonomy relies on aggregated, technical infrastructures which ultimately come to constitute collective formations or even institutions in their own right (albeit in novel forms). This appears to be an intrinsic feature of autonomy. It inevitably relies on collective structures. Collective, or structural macro-agency begets individual agency. What is particular to Swedish reflexive modernity is the degree to which the nation state has come to serve as the single most primary such structure. The aggregated character of such huge collectives seems to be instrumental for individual autonomy in that they become large enough to do away with personal (friendly or familial) bonds. The collectivity becomes impersonal, semi-anonymous, bureaucratic, ultimately *gesellschaft*-like.

The networks of the internet, and p2p in particular, are similarly non-familial; they are essentially stranger-to-stranger, non-overseeable (at least beyond a set horizon; see also Lundemo 2009) and strictly governed by protocol (Galloway 2004). Hence, the parallel between an autonomy facilitated by (national and increasingly transnational) collective institutions and a technologically facilitated autonomy like the one inherent in p2p networking is an analytically useful one.

The singular most helpful book that this argument rests upon would be Berggren & Trägårdh (2006). This book examines the historical continuity of what is defined as a typically Swedish notion of personal independence; that true love can only flourish between people who are economically independent of each other, and that this personal autonomy is – seemingly paradoxically – granted by means of a uniform, all-encompassing state-dependence. This insight ties back to the never-ending sociological conundrum of individual agency *vis-à-vis* structural/collective agency, something that should be expected to apply also within our contemporary techno-cultural spheres, extending not only to the politics of the welfare state but to digitally mediated, networked formations as well. This article can be seen as a starting point of such an elaboration, and the case study approach will constitute a lens through which we can read the file-sharers' own arguments and the material references that these arguments invoke.

Regarding p2p-based file-sharing *per se*, an extensive quantitative study of p2p-based file-sharing in Sweden, MusicLessons*,* ran chronologically parallel to my own research. The explicit focus of this research program was 'to deepen the understanding of how p2p technology will support new business models and to evaluate and compare threats and opportunities, providing a better basis for policy-making' (Findahl & Selg 2005); an approach somewhat different to mine. However, the insights gained from my own qualitative approach are intended to complement quantitative data such as that generated by Findahl et al. Similarly, my research has gained from some of the insights provided both from MusicLessons, and from the more recent Lund University research program Cybernormer.

In the more recent surveys, it is noted that the harshened legislative framework that was implemented on the 1st of April 2009 (named IPRED), alongside the Pirate Bay ruling the same month 'generally did not affect the Swedes' attitudes about illegal downloading of motion pictures' (MMS 2009). The percentage who equalled downloading copyrighted material from the internet

with 'theft' had even decreased in that particular study. Similar findings have been made within the Cybernormer project, which suggests that the IPRED law has not significantly changed the fact of illegal file-sharing – and certainly not the social norms that it rests upon (de Kaminski 2010). Another report (Findahl 2009) showed that file-sharing only marginally declined in 2009 (with just a single percentage point, later to be continually resumed to levels higher than previous years).

The critique from the side of the copyright industry, where "the creation of a legal internet" is of primary concern, thus appears to rest on empirically unsound grounds, at least in Sweden. Ostensibly, the commonly invoked image remains: The standpoints regarding internet regulation and copyright in general – and file-sharing in particular – appear to be as oppositional as ever.

Still, the Swedish case indicates that there has been a growing cultural acceptance of unregulated file-sharing also in the mainstream press. Between 2005 and 2008, a general acknowledgement began to emerge, also in the British press, that the entertainment industry was thought to have weathered the economic crisis purportedly instigated by unauthorized file-sharing, and that certain sectors of this industry were in fact doing well (Gibson 2005; 2008b; Keegan 2008; Wallis 2008). More importantly, a realization about the commonness of unregulated file-sharing is (especially among younger people) seems to have led many cultural commentators to have accepted unauthorized file-sharing as a part of the contemporary cultural landscape. Arguably, this was realized sooner in Swedish newspapers like *Svenska Dagbladet*, compared to British and US American ones. Already in 2005, British consumer research agency The Leading Question[2] found that those who admittedly downloaded or shared unlicensed music on a regular basis also spent significantly more money on legal services.[3] Paul Brindley, the agency's director, commented:

There's a myth that all illegal downloaders are mercenaries hell-bent on breaking the law in pursuit of free music. In reality they are often hardcore fans who are extremely enthusiastic about adopting paid-for services as long as they are suitably compelling. (Gibson 2005)

During this period it became more common even among representatives of the music industry to acknowledge this. Glen Merrill (formerly Google's chief information officer, later digital strategist for EMI) said: 'There is academic research that shows file sharing is a good thing for artists and not necessarily bad. […] We should do a bunch of experiments to find out what the business model is' (Gibson 2008b). Similarly, the ubiquity of unregulated copying led Disney co-chair Anne Sweeney to state that piracy 'is just a business model' to be competed with (Wistreich 2006), signalling a different attitude towards unregulated file-sharing where Disney regards itself as the mainstay for putting out content in the first place, lending them primacy in the life-cycle of products.

It appears that a generational divide runs through the file-sharing debate. Söderberg (2008: 208) notes how Swedish centre-right politicians who defend 'intellectual property' argue that a whole generation has become fostered to disregard the principle of property rights and how this is problematic for a rights-based liberal market economy. The argument that this normative acceptance for certain forms of property becomes undermined is hardly diminished by the new business models that prosper from the file-sharing services, nor by the potential profits that the entertainment industry makes thanks to illegal distribution channels, Söderberg holds. Moreover, when a Swedish 31-year old was sentenced in May 2008 for making available music and films, he recounted his experiences on a personal blog, and soon sympathisers voluntarily donated money to him in order to cover fines and legal expenses. Söderberg (p. 35) notes how this reflects a public attitude to

---

2 http://www.musically.com/theleadingquestion/
3 The average spending on legal downloads among these was £5.52 a month, compared to the average monthly expenditure on digital music among those who were not illegally file-sharing, which was only £1.27 (Gibson 2005).

perpetrators that differs significantly from other types of crimes. Yar (2008: 609) mentions 'the apparent inverse relationship between age and propensity to commit copyright offences […] Historically, youth have been the subject of successive waves of social anxiety or moral panics, which focus upon the threat that young people supposedly represent to morality, body and property'. Cultural studies have a long history of accounting for this generational dilemma (Cohen 1972; Pearson 1983; Wimsatt 1994; Springhall 1998). As with my own approach, Yar turns to Luc Boltanski & Laurent Thevenot's concept (2006) of discursive resources and strategies that actors mobilize to justify their normative claims, where rhetorical performances are seen as attempts to establish the legitimacy of a given point of view and its affiliated arguments. 'However, given the inherent plurality of such repertoires, there are always alternative justifications available which favour alternative norms and claims' (Yar 2008: 610). As noted above, the propensity for file-sharing need not be attributable to age *per se*, but rather to ability and a general identification with the respective *roles* that the technological assemblage of p2p-based file-sharing assigns to the actors involved.

After the introduction of IPRED and the conviction of the men behind TPB – events that occurred almost simultaneously – the positions in some ways appear more landlocked than ever. The copyright industry seeks to benefit from a media image that portrays unregulated file-sharing as being on the decline, while the concern that file-sharers and internet activists have expressed – regarding the potential violations of privacy that the law would enable – have to some extent proved unfounded in Sweden. Copyright has for the last decade become a politicized and highly contended issue; something which the Pirate Bay trial made even more obvious, despite the wish from trade organizations like Antipiratbyrån to see it as a mere police case. The Swedish Pirate Party has tried to push the issue in the other direction, pitching themselves as a kind of citizens' movement of the information society, heralding file-sharing as an essentially voluntary phenomenon with little or no profit motive.

Still, to depict p2p-based file-sharing in such a blue-eyed way might be equally misleading, as I would argue that file-sharing has economic repercussions, and that the operation of hubs, indexes and websites which facilitate the sharing can be made economically profitable (albeit not at all to the same extreme extent that the Swedish court rulings would have it in the Pirate Bay case). The Pirate Bay trial illustrates this: It shows that agency always "spills over"; that it is hard to maintain a pure identity in a phenomenon that is as agentially complex as file-sharing. When running a torrent index, for example, one is simultaneously an activist and an entrepreneur. See Andersson (2011) for a further explication of this.

Many of the institutions that oppose copyright have been rhetorically united under the provocative 'pirate' heading, although some Swedish activists seem to have shunned the 'pirate' heading in later years, in web campaigns like the deliberately faceless 'Kopimi' movement, and grassroots campaigns against increased governmental supervision and data retention (Kullenberg 2010). As the situation at hand is characterised by conflict, one way of seeing these formations would be to define them as partisan and countercultural. However, as they come to represent such large populations of internet users, they can equally be seen as expressions of popular opinion – hence the tendency to label file-sharing a 'people's movement' or 'consumer rebellion'. In Sweden, the interest has been big enough to see the foundation of a national Pirate Party, in January 2006. Consequently, European organisations representing the entertainment industry have warned of 'the danger that Sweden, normally considered to be a strong upholder of EU standards and a promoter of culture, should instead be seen as the haven for a cult of copyright infringement that has achieved global

reach' (IFPI 2008: 22).

Especially Piratbyrån and TPB can be defined as being motivated by a countercultural, yet highly decentralised and spontaneous 'hacktivist' agenda – arguably so informal that it is hard to consider an agenda at all. This is exemplified by the hazy, provocative stance of their publication *Powr, Broccoli and Kopimi* [sic] (2009). Merely by existing, they perform a rhetorical function of asserting the justification for p2p-based file-sharing and the obsolescence of copyright in its current form – as their mere existence is, according to some critics, controversial. What is more, their impact confirms that despite being demographically more established here than in most other parts of the world, p2p-based file-sharing remains a discursively contested activity in Sweden. Both TPB and Piratbyrån characterise a typically Swedish approach to collectivism – while in some ways being highly antithetical to it.

The strong presence of these semi-institutional actors has also entailed a practical dimension, regarding increased ease of access. The web forums of TPB and, more notably, Piratbyrån simplified the process not only of gathering initial, rudimentary data, but of approaching the respondents in the main, interview-based study. One of my interviewees noted that it was precisely because of Piratbyrån that I had interviewed him:

They stirred up the interest and started getting people to call stuff into question. Before Piratbyrån was founded, in 2002, no-one spoke of file-sharing in the open; it was something you did secretly.

The significance of these entities cannot be explained by market logics or the communitarianism of the hacker ethos alone. As is shown below, it falls logically within a pattern historically specific to Sweden, and arguably to Western welfare states in general, where the individual compulsion towards self-fulfilment and self-expression has been effectively harnessed by a historical continuity of 'people's movements' ultimately seen to be serving not only the individual but the public good. The potential of forming separate, closed, perhaps even semi-private communes (as part of civil society, in the continental and Anglo-American sense) has in Scandinavia been subsumed by an ethos of transforming such associations to become more *gesellschaft*-like, more open to public access and scrutiny. This transubstantiating drive has had wide appeal in Scandinavian countries since it, when resulting in accountable, de-personalised institutions, serves to minimise corruption, capriciousness as well as personal commitment and liability (Berggren & Trägårdh 2006: 333—364). The modest size of the Nordic countries also means that such formations tend to enter into the national debate more easily. This drive towards more all-encompassing formations can be thought of as (molecular) grassroots formations reaching towards more coherent (molar) forms (Andersson 2009). Boltanski & Thévenot (2006) show that many of the arguments (or even whole groups of reciprocally related arguments) used by actors in these types of public controversies become incommensurable when compared to those of the opponent, simply since they derive from analytical standpoints that are poles apart.

For example, one position sees its mission as safeguarding the global molar structure of a "healthy" (carrier-neutral, scalable, flexible) internet at large, something which they mean can only be done by retaining high degrees of molecular freedom on the level of the individual machine or user. Another position sees its mission as safeguarding the much more local, molar structures of various trade associations or business interests. While the former position adheres to a normative ontology of the internet that accentuates the *inevitability of unrestricted file exchange*, the latter can be said to argue for a normative ontology of the internet where *exchange is regulated, safe and sanctioned by designated, institutionalised providers*.

Both of these positions can be seen to give rise to discursive microcosms which might be internally cohesive and sensible, as they appear isolated on their own. When reciprocally compared, however, they become incommensurable. Hence the seemingly endless lack of consensus.

Brief information on the Swedish piratical organisations and the Pirate Bay trial

The Pirate Bay (TPB) labels itself 'the world's largest BitTorrent tracker' – and its primary function, as this label indicates, is to track and index torrent files. Due to the ability of the BitTorrent protocol to handle extremely large files, torrent files are widely used for sharing films, software packages and large music sets (often entire discographies). The site was started in November 2003 by Gottfrid Svartholm Warg and Fredrik Neij; later, also Peter Sunde joined. They all had links to Piratbyrån (see below), and it is a helpful reminder that TPB was originally branded as Piratbyrån's own torrent tracker. Nevertheless, in October 2004 it became a separate organization.

Piratbyrån (literal translation: 'The Pirate Bureau') was a loose collective which served as a propaganda institute, think-tank and alternative news agency for the pro-file-sharing movement in Sweden. Its website served both as a practical 'how to'-guide and web reference to file-sharing, and as a portal (similar to Zeropaid in the US). The Piratbyrån activities were however somewhat unique in that they tended to formulate a more academically informed critique, not least thanks to its leading spokesmen Rasmus Fleischer and Magnus Eriksson. For example, in April 2007, Piratbyrån organised alternative Walpurgis festivities on a hilltop in Stockholm, burning their own book (Kaarto & Fleischer 2005) as a symbolic event marking a new, non-dualistic conception of the issues pertaining to file-sharing, conceptually erasing old dichotomies that they held as no longer applicable to file-sharing: legal—illegal; private—public; free—pay; art—technology—life [sic] (Piratbyrån 2007).

Piratbyrån was small in terms of active membership (its operation was restricted to the Swedish language, and they had no offices or money). It was led by a handful of spokespersons, formulating an intellectual critique of issues pertaining to copyright and file-sharing, drawing strongly on concepts of media materialism and contemporary critical philosophy. In an interview, they defined themselves thus:

Piratbyran […] is best described as an ad hoc pro-piracy think tank, but Fleischer's partner in the effort, Marcus Kaarto, won't even go that far. "We're like a gas," Kaarto says, laughing. "You can't get a hold on us."
(Quinn 2006b)

The organization was founded in 2003 as a reaction to Antipiratbyrån ('The Anti-Piracy Bureau'), a similarly *ad hoc*, non-governmental anti-piracy organization that still exists and is sponsored by the entertainment industry.

Linde (2005) observes how Piratbyrån deliberately chose not to be *anti* anything, but emphasised instead how the file-sharing movement was *for* all forms of digital copying. This was a strategic decision. Despite being founded in opposition to an alleged Other, Piratbyrån was based on positive affirmation; they intended to anticipate rather than react to the copyright industry, avoiding a defensive position. They continuously had to prove their seriousness in order not to appear as a consumer revolt by teenagers wanting everything for free (Linde 2005: 36—37). By forestalling the copyright-industry representatives by forceful strategy, one can focus on building a strong,

autonomous image for oneself, focusing on issues of one's own choosing. They sought to avoid a reactive tendency where the enemy is construed as a monolithic, catch-all nemesis (as in the leftist movements of the past, invoking "the man" or "the system"). This, however, meant that Piratbyrån were perhaps seen as more ambivalent in their standing than traditional political movements: They would have been seen as leftist in their anti-corporate mode, yet more right-leaning in their libertarian one (Linde 2005: 29). Piratbyrån seized operations in 2010.

Piratpartiet (the Pirate Party) is a Swedish political party, founded in 2006, claiming to stand outside of the left-right scale, focusing exclusively on issues of internet privacy and reform of Swedish laws pertaining to intellectual property. Early on, the party garnered a lot of publicity, but only managed to assemble 0.63 % of the overall votes in the September 2006 election for parliament. In the 2009 European Parliament elections, however, they assembled 7.13 % of the votes, and gained one seat in the European Parliament.

The commonness of broadband and file-sharing in Sweden, and the presence of the above strategic, politicised entities has meant that the file-sharing debate has been particularly lively in Sweden. The leading exponent of the Piratbyrån line is Fleischer, whose blog Copyriot presents an erudite critique of copyright and digitization. Several other bloggers contribute with variably politicised and often well-informed writings. Some of the anonymous bloggers and online commentators tend to formulate rather libertarian, acerbic critiques, while TPB's Peter Sunde, as well as many Pirate Party representatives, activists and journalists tend to formulate critiques that are more socially acute than many of their US American counterparts. This all contributes to a relatively sophisticated debate, where derogatory tropes such as likening record company executives to robber barons or, conversely, likening 'pirates' to terrorists have been relatively absent from the debate. As noted above for example, the notion that *frequent file-sharers tend to be frequent media consumers as well* was picked up on in Sweden before it started to become widely noted also by key representatives of the European copyright industry; Findahl's report (2006) preceding the EMI representatives' arguments in early 2008 (Gibson 2008b).

The history of the rise – and possible fall – of TPB is well known. As the site was based on BitTorrent technology, it quickly became a popular index that hosted links to the copyrighted material that millions of users exchanged between one another. A few years into the new millennium, file-sharing stood for around eighty percent of the total Swedish network traffic. With 25 million regular users, and more than a million listed torrents, TPB was one of the main exponents of a development, where Napster and Gnutella can be seen as a "first wave," eMule and FastTrack (Kazaa) a "second one," and BitTorrent a "third wave" of p2p-based file-sharing. The site was also made infamous by publishing the so-called 'legal correspondence' submitted to it from various media companies and collecting societies who threatened TPB with legal action, only to be met by a deliberately provocative stance from the site's administrators. TPB became known for prankster-like exploits and die-hard dedication to hosting all sorts of material, even in the face of controversy. However, international legal pressure led up to the famous raid against the service in May 2006, when fifty police officers confiscated not only TPB's and Piratbyrån's computer servers, but also a hundred other servers belonging to the hosting company PRQ's customers, leading some commentators to label the operation a politically charged and arguably constitutionally illegal one. Three days later, TPB was back up while the legal machinery had begun to grind, alongside rising interest in the mainstream media. Paradoxically, the clampdown had generated even more publicity and traffic to the site.

Throughout the last decade, mainstream media has tended to portray file-sharing in reference to

similar legal cases in various countries, alongside brief explanations of the phenomenon that often relied on assumptions and a polarised framing of the debate in terms of 'industry versus pirates'. Arguably, this added to a high media visibility of politicised agents rather than everyday, less politicised users without explicit alignment to either of these sides. The presence of entities like TPB and Piratbyrån was vital to how mainstream media framed the phenomenon. In the months following the highly publicised police raid on TPB and its affiliated hosting servers, not only did Swedish media interview the representatives of TPB, but overseas publications like *Vanity Fair* and *Wired* gave coverage to what was rendered a phenomenon of global interest (Daly 2007; Quinn 2006a; 2006b). Swedish public service television covered the phenomenon in several news reports, alleging that the raid was executed due to US American coercion, while the largest national newspaper *Aftonbladet* interviewed key managers of TPB, alleging that 'the [Swedish] people stood behind them' (Nilsson 2006). Various national newspaper ran mini-sites entirely dedicated to the topic.

In May 2007, prosecutor Håkan Roswall announced the prosecution of the founders of TPB, also including web entrepreneur Carl Lundström. In January 2008 they were charged for preparing and abetting copyright infringement. The trial against TPB in February 2009 was extensively covered by Swedish and international media. It is noteworthy that similar cases of abetting copyright infringement had never previously been tried by Swedish courts (Ebadi & Johansson 2009). TPB's representatives repeatedly asserted that they had not breached any Swedish law, as they merely provided *access* to works on their website and were not *hosting* any of the actual works on their servers. The prosecutors argued that the database of torrent links that they provided – placed in categories and directly searchable – thus constituted a more dedicated service than the general ones that companies like Google provide. More interestingly for this article, the founders of TPB were not only accused of financing and maintaining the website (thereby abetting copyright infringements) but of actively supporting and encouraging a dismissal of copyright and, in effect, a boycott against the entertainment industry. This arguably made the trial a political one, as it transpired in its aftermath that the judge and several of the prosecutors were members of pro-copyright organisations.

After several weeks of trial at the Stockholm district court, all four defendants were convicted for aiding copyright infringement. They were each sentenced to one year in prison, and a total of €3 million in damages. The verdict was however instantly appealed to the Swedish crown court, leading the case to be revisited in the autumn of 2010, where the sentence was partially sustained. At the moment, it is unclear as to whether the Swedish supreme court will revise the case.

The trial was depicted by internet activists as a kind of spectacle – a 'spectrial' – but an even weirder turn of events followed. During the summer of 2009 it was suddenly announced that TPB would be sold. By being purchased by software company Global Gaming Factory X, TPB would become a subscription service. The price was set to €6 million, of which half would be paid in shares and the remaining €3 million in cash – that is, the same amount as the damages incurred in court. However, what was sold was in fact only the TPB brand, and the deal was seen as suspect by many commentators: 'There is something fishy about the Pirate Bay affair from the beginning [...] The fog of lies, empty words, debt, questionable business ethics, and defecting companions lies thick.' (Sundberg 2009). The owner of Global Gaming Factory X, Hans Pandeya, turned out to have high levels of tax debt – and soon the deal failed. Still, this affair had cast a shadow of a doubt on TPB as a 'non-commercial' social networking site, and on the possible intentions of its founders. Intensive discussions took place in the blogosphere, as the potential business deal seemed to greatly

undermine the devoted support the site had long enjoyed.

Moreover, in the following year, as part of the national election campaign in Sweden, another institutional actor made a bid to take over another element of the complex Pirate Bay assemblage – namely, the servers. As the abovementioned founders were banned, by court order, from running the site in any way whatsoever, the Swedish Pirate Party took on themselves to give bandwidth to the site. Soon, the Pirate Bay front page was plastered with Pirate Party campaign material; something that would have been alien to the originators of the service, as they have never affiliated themselves with said party.

This shows that a service like TPB is "sticky"; the abundance of connections and interrelating actions acts like glue, and ties both venture capitalism, party politics, partisanship and even the idea of *stewardship of a sensible cultural ecology* into its vortex. TPB was never simply one thing; it outwitted the idea of purity and disinterestedness already at its birth.

Self-reflexive opportunism and hedonism: tracing a post-Fordist subject

They just want stuff for free.
(sign. 'Mark,' commenting Bode 2009)

If the mainstream 'copyleft' literature (Lessig 2004; Liang 2004; Vaidhyanathan 2001) sees online gift economies as primarily beneficial, and instrumental for a 'digital commons,' there is a post-Marxist strand of critique which attempts to problematize this notion and reconnect it to labour relations, as significant *work* is being done by the active media consumer every time he or she acquires, decodes and appropriates a media text. Hence, I will now turn to the Swedish context as an example of 'reflexive modernity'. Here, also the notion of 'socialization of labour' needs to be considered, as the economically productive and inherently reflexive forces of individual consumption are vital to the concept of file-sharing.

Scott Lash (2002: 32—33) argues that culture itself is increasingly consigned to the instrumental rationale of enframing (*gestell*). That is to say, he argues, that the principle of accumulation is seeping into every sphere of human life, including the cultural. Earlier meaningful, symbolically loaded forms of life become 'mere "lifestyles" and strategies for accumulating the various forms of [symbolic, cultural, social, bodily] capital, themselves all valorizable external goods' (p. 33). Robins & Webster (1999: 234—236) similarly describe a conquering of the life-world by order and rationalization, exacerbated by technocultural developments in the 1990s; a surrender to the 19th century concept of 'the factory-like mind'; a concept which can be related to Mario Tronti's notion of 'the social factory,' where 'the whole society becomes an articulation of production. In short, all of society lives as a function of the factory and the factory extends its exclusive domination over all of society' (Bonefeld et al. 1992: 137). This view of the life-world as being increasingly appropriated by forces of accumulation is common to critical theories of contemporary society and culture, echoing some of the elements in Italian autonomist thinking, without necessarily taking on board the arguments for social revolution and the dichotomy of 'multitude' versus 'empire' (see Dyer-Witheford 1999; Terranova 2000; May 2002; Galloway 2004; and Söderberg 2004). In the Swedish context, it would arguably be more productive to focus on notion of how individual gratification and egoism can be harnessed to benefit the greater collective. Paolo Virno has recently written about capitalism's reliance on individual opportunism, while American sociologist Daniel Bell noted, in the 1970s, the centrality of hedonism and egoism to post-Fordist modes of labour organisation.

The concept of 'post-industrial society,' outlined by Bell, outlines a technocratic society where techno-scientific logic precedes politics (Bell 1976a). Post-industrial society can be defined as a society where the majority of those employed are not involved in the production of tangible goods, and where knowledge (in addition to property, and political criteria) is increasingly becoming the base of power. This can be paralleled by Scott Lash's argument (in Beck 1994: 119) that contemporary Western societies are facilitated by 'flexible specialization' of industrial production and – more centrally to my argument – *increasingly specialized, individualised consumption patterns*.

Considering the observations of Swedish late modernity established above, one could define this country as one where the tendencies of individualization and reflexive modernity have excelled, despite the country's documented historical concerns with solidarity and collectivism (noted, for example, in the centrality of 'people's movements'). These tendencies, typical for 'late modernity,' are of course notable throughout the Western world but tellingly, the societal patterns and individual attitudes can, in this thesis, serve to illustrate the particular strength in Sweden of several of them.

An early observation in my fieldwork was that on behalf of the end-user, file-sharing hinges on both knowledge and directed action. Due to the barriers of access involved (in terms of skills as well as material setup) it is an arguably even more active medium than television, radio or newspapers. This added layer of directed, purposeful action resonates with the notion of the management of the individual self, as an increasingly reflexive *project* (Rose 1999; Bauman, in Beck & Beck-Gernsheim 2001) while older, more rigid, pre-given categories such as class, profession, or gender are thought of as becoming less determining for what identities individuals form. Dean (1994) speaks of 'a culture of the self and self-improvement,' while Rose (1999) elaborates how the 'entrepreneurial self' in fact partly grew out of a corporatist, humanist Scandinavian rationale where work was increasingly seen as an essential component of self-fulfilment, prompting people to scrutinize their own life-world and aim to maximize both pleasure and efficiency, treating all areas of life as "projects" to be managed. Individual specialization thus involves a plethora of categories; some of them miniscule, perhaps even banal (especially in a chronological sense, as subjects might often only adhere to them at very short intervals); others more long-lasting, even comprising entire life-projects. Some are more fundamental to one's personal identity than others. Thus, my own heuristic is to avoid the assumption that certain categories would define identity in an *a priori* way. A person may be a computer user, a sci-fi fan, a girlfriend, a tourist, a car driver, a parent, a file-sharer or 'pirate' (the list can be virtually endless) but it would be methodologically unsound to decide *in advance* which category would have more bearing than others in determining this person's identity in relation to certain contexts. We all jump in and out of such roles continually. (This is central to the concept of 'actant' in Bruno Latour's theory.) The various subjective valuations people make of such constitutive roles can be accessed by way of empirical analysis. However, this is not necessarily only done by means of ethnography. The example of file-sharing shows how vital the material, infrastructural settings and the discursive framing are for even beginning to define the abovementioned categories.

The legal context of file-sharing appears to have prompted a high degree of reflexivity among the file-sharers. As most of the file-sharing in question is illegal, individual actors are forced to invoke principles of justification, either by way of outspoken demands for justice or of underlying rationalizations for their habits, given the present controversy. This discursive invocation appears to be charged with attempts to objectify it, to bequeath it with validity, by way of referring to other factors: not only the ontological stability and prescriptive agency offered by the evident popularity

and ubiquity of the infrastructures. By invoking the history and perceived 'nature' of the internet, a generality is offered which lends weight, and provides stable and coherent coordinates for the justification, 'subject to general assessment' (Boltanski & Thévenot 2006: 12). But the prescriptive material framework alone does not fully justify the sharing. More universalizing regimes of justification were invoked, like the idea of progressive adoption of the functionally most 'optimal' technologies, and the primacy of individual latitude over authoritarian order. The respondents primarily justified their sharing by holding that it would have, on the whole, a positive impact on society. The impact of file-sharing was only seen as negative for certain industries.

Further, systems that allow for strong personal autonomy paradoxically do so by relying on set standards and protocols (as Alexander Galloway has beautifully showed). Rigid standards allow for infrastructure, which in turn beget collective formations. The aggregated character of such huge collectives seems to be instrumental for individual autonomy in that they become large enough to do away with personal (friendly or familial) bonds. They become rational and effective, characterised by stranger-to-stranger exchange. They are governed by a protocol logic, which makes them predictable – but only in the short term, to a limited extent, as they involve a high degree of non-overseeability, especially beyond the set horizon of the local network or infrastructure. According to Beck (1992; 1994), contemporary societies are increasingly being affected by prescriptive structures of this kind, having global reach. Often these defining, universalizing structures are products of phenomena that are emergent in their own right, and have no single point of causal agency. This transgresses the 'copyfight' dichotomy, as these prescriptive structures emerge despite the conflictual opinions of the actors involved. The principles of material accumulation and maximization of both personal gratification and of functional efficacy are, for example, shared by both sides of this alleged dichotomy.

Many of these formations take on a strongly universalizing, globalised character. This often acts as a normative, prescriptive force for society at large, in that its effects appear unavoidable and ubiquitous. There is a peculiar *standardization* that goes hand in hand with individualization. Many of the defining structures of our era appear to have this emergent, aggregated, ubiquitous and prescriptive character at their roots: transnational communication and global media; the global financial economy; the global environment; and so on. Similarly, the internet can be understood as a heterogeneous, global, 'network of networks' which is based on unrestricted file-sharing – yet hugely standardizing in that it begets the common use of certain protocols and techniques.

Wendy Brown (1995) argues that brandishing contemporary Western societies' capacity for free choice, resistance and empowerment would be to over-emphasise individual agency in the face of aggregated macro-agencies (be they institutional or hegemonic). She holds that the systematization of freedom through instrumental rationality (the prime narrative of Berggren & Trägårdh's account of Sweden above) actually negates and hinders freedom as much as it facilitates it. Moreover, she argues that individual freedom entails extraordinary personal responsibility, for in order to be beneficial to the individual in the long run, his or her freedom 'requires inventive and careful use of power rather than rebellion against authority; it is sober, exhausting, and without parents' (Brown 1995: 25).

In the context of unrestricted file-sharing, the quick decisions and relative 'freeing of agency from structure' (Beck 1994: 119) should not be understood as propagating indifference and carelessness. On the contrary, the individual's own awareness of repercussions fosters increased calculation and shrewdness on her behalf. Bell (1976b) observed this tendency in Western capitalism already in the 1970s. There appears to be a commonly agreed, pan-societal agreement on the personal right to

'engorge any and every style' (p. 13). Hedonism is officially sanctioned; the entire logic of consumer society relies on it. Capitalism mainly becomes a system for harnessing this individual lust in collectively useful ways:

Here are some of them: the ability to react in a timely manner to the continual innovations in techniques and organizational models, a remarkable "opportunism" in negotiating among the different possibilities offered by the job market, familiarity with what is possible and unforeseeable, that minimal entrepreneurial attitude that makes it possible to decide what is the "right thing" to do within a nonlinear productive fluctuation, a certain familiarity with the web of communications and information. As one can see, these are generically human gifts, not the result of "specialization." (Virno, in Joseph 2005)

This involves an unprecedented degree of reflexivity on behalf of each individual subject, an awareness akin to a modern-day 'social contract'. According to Virno, this awareness allows a nihilistic mentality (of instability, disenchantment and anonymity) to become one of the defining characteristics of society. The transparency of extensive digital communications thus risks allowing individuals to extensively scrutinize their own life-world; 'to know the price of everything but the value of nothing,' as the famous aphorism goes. Unrestricted file-sharing's immediacy, superabundance, choice, minimization of monetary cost and reliance on active intellectual labour should be understood within this framework, especially if we seriously want to question the larger ecological context that our digital ecology is contained within.

In summary: The increased positive liberties of the individual in late modernity can be seen to be centred on hedonism, self-fulfilment, convenience, gratification – but they simultaneously entail a reflexive sensibility. Without taking the route that many online activists take, defending personal liberty against authoritarian measures and regulations of communication, one can take the route outlined in the above, recognizing that there is a need – even perhaps an impossibility – that leads us to consider *self-regulation* as the primary mode of regulation in the context of digital media. The impossibility could either be attributed to what many of my interviewees referred to, the 'unstoppable' nature of file-sharing in technical terms[4] or it could be attributed to the inherent individual freedom of citizens and consumers to engage with the technologies and media we have at our disposal. Effective and complete curbing of file-sharing would entail an effective and complete curbing of private communication over the internet. At the same time, in the management of our own cultural consumption we are given enormous possibilities to act in highly opportunist ways; the crucible for a responsible media use lies in our own hands, as yet another area lending itself to discretionary morality. It is a political choice whether solidarity is best imposed by collective intermediaries, or as an entirely private means of personal charity.

REFERENCES

Andersson, Jonas (2009) "To speak for one's own network" in *The Liquidculture Notebook*, 4/3 2009 http://liquidculture.wordpress.com/2009/03/04/to-speak-for-ones-own-network/ [last checked 18/1 2011]

Andersson, Jonas (2011) "It takes (at least) two to tango" in *Re-Public* journal, Greece

Andersson, Jonas and Snickars, Pelle (2010; eds.) *Efter The Pirate Bay*. Stockholm: Mediehistoriskt arkiv

---

4   That is, when approaching it on a general level – not in the local instantiations, which are often, as we have seen, subject to regulation and censorship.

Jonas Andersson, submitted January 2011.

Beck, Ulrich (1992 [1986], translated by Mark Ritter) *Risk Society – Towards a New Modernity*. London, Thousand Oaks, CA, and New Delhi: Sage Publications

Beck, Ulrich (1994; ed.) *Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order*. Cambridge: Polity Press

Beck, Ulrich and Beck-Gernsheim, Elisabeth (2002) *Individualization: Institutionalized Individualism and its Social and Political Consequences*. London, Thousand Oaks, CA, and New Delhi: Sage Publications

Bell, Daniel (1976a) *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting*. New York, NY: Basic Books

Bell, Daniel (1976b) *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism*. London: Heinemann

Berggren, Henrik and Trägårdh, Lars (2006) *Är svensken människa? Gemenskap och oberoende i det moderna Sverige*. Stockholm: Norstedts

Bode, Karl (2009) "113,000 Have Signed Up For Pirate Bay VPN" in *DSLReports.com*, 9/4 2009. http://www.dslreports.com/shownews/113000-Have-Signed-Up-For-Pirate-Bay-VPN-101820 [last checked 18/1 2011]

Boltanski, Luc and Thévenot, Laurent (2006, trans. by Catherine Porter) *On Justification: Economies of Worth*. Princeton, NJ and Oxford: Princeton University Press

Bonefeld, Werner; Gunn, Richard; and Psychopedis, Kosmas (1992; eds.) *Open Marxism, vol. 2: Theory and Practice*. London and Boulder, CO: Pluto Press

Brown, Wendy (1995) *States of Injury: Power and Freedom in Late Modernity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

Cohen, Stanley (1972) *Folk Devils and Moral Panics*. London: MacGibb and Kee

Daly, Steven (2007) "Pirates of the Multiplex" in *Vanity Fair*, March 2007. http://www.vanityfair.com/ontheweb/features/2007/03/piratebay200703 [last checked 18/1 2011]

Dean, Mitchell (1994) *Critical and Effective Histories: Foucault's Methods and Historical Sociology*. New York, NY and London: Routledge

de Kaminski, Marcin (2010) "Ett år med Ipred" in *cybernormer.se*, 31/3 2010. http://cybernormer.se/2010/03/31/ett-ar-med-ipred/ [last checked 18/1 2011]

Dyer-Witheford, Nick (1999) *Cyber-Marx: Cycles and Circuits of Struggle in High-Technology Capitalism*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press

Ebadi, Solmaz and Johansson, Mirja (2009) "Music File Sharing: Genius Technology or Copyright Infringement?", MA dissertation, Jönköping International Business School, Jönköping University, January 2009

Economist (2007) "The state of Britain", editorial, 1/2 2007 http://www.economist.com/opinion/displayStory.cfm?story_id=8629539&fsrc=nwlehfree [last checked 18/1 2011]

Ernst, Tony (2009) *6 miljoner sätt att skjuta en älg på – En berättelse om musikindustrins uppgång och eventuella fall*. Gothenburg: Reverb

Findahl, Olle (2006). "Thieves or Customers? File-sharing in the Digital World." in P. Cunningham & M. Cunningham (eds.) *Exploiting the Knowledge Economy: Issues, Applications, Case Studies*. Amsterdam: IOS Press

Findahl, Olle (2009) "Unga svenskar och internet 2009", World Internet Institute. http://www.wii.se/publicerat/rapporter/doc_download/81-unga-svenskar-och-internet-2009.html [last checked 18/1 2011]

Findahl, Olle and Selg, Håkan (2005) "The Downloaders – Who They Are and What They Are Doing?", eChallenges Conference Paper / MusicLessons, October 2005

Galloway, Alexander (2004) *Protocol: How Control Exists After Decentralization*. London and Cambridge, MA: MIT Press

Gibson, Owen (2005) "Online file sharers 'buy more music'" in *The Guardian*, 27/7 2005. http://www.guardian.co.uk/technology/2005/jul/27/media.business [last checked 18/1 2011]

Gibson, Owen (2008b) "File sharing 'may be good', says EMI executive" in *The Guardian*, 3/4 2008.

http://www.guardian.co.uk/technology/2008/apr/03/internet.intellectualproperty [last checked 18/1 2011]

Hafez, Kai (2007 [2005]; trans. Alex Skinner) *The Myth of Media Globalization*. Cambridge, and Malden, MA: Polity Press

IFPI (2008) "IFPI Digital Music Report", January 2008 http://www.ifpi.org/content/library/DMR2008.pdf [last checked 18/1 2011]

Inglehart, Ronald and Welzel, Christian (2005) *Modernization, Cultural Change and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence*. New York, NY and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Joseph, Branden W. (2005, trans. Alessia Ricciardi) "Interview with Paolo Virno" in *Grey Room*, no. 21, fall 2005, pp. 26—37. London and Cambridge, MA: MIT Press

Kaarto, Marcus and Fleischer, Rasmus (2005; eds.) *Copy Me: Samlade texter från Piratbyrån*. Stockholm: Roh-Nin Förlag

Keegan, Victor (2008) "The sound of (free) music" in *The Guardian*, 12/2 2008. http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/feb/12/thesoundoffreemusic [last checked 18/1 2011]

Kullenberg, Christopher (2010) *Det nätpolitiska manifestet*. Stockholm: Ink förlag

Lash, Scott (2002) *Critique of Information*. London, Thousand Oaks, CA, and New Delhi: Sage Publications

Lessig, Lawrence (2004) *Free Culture: How Big Media Uses Technology and the Law to Lock down Culture and Control Creativity*. New York, NY: Penguin Press.

Liang, Lawrence (2004) *A Guide to Open Content Licenses*. Rotterdam: Piet Zwart Institute

Linde, Jessica (2005) "'Sharing is caring' – Om Piratbyrån och kognitiv praxis i en ny social rörelse" ["'Sharing is caring' – On Piratbyrån and cognitive praxis in a new social movement"], Sociology dissertation, Växjö universitet, Samhällsvetenskapliga institutionen

Lundemo, Trond (2009) "In the Kingdom of Shadows: Cinematic Movement and its Digital Ghost" in Pelle Snickars & Patrick Vonderau (eds.) *The YouTube Reader*. Stockholm: Mediehistoriskt arkiv

May, Christopher (2002) *The Information Society: A Sceptical View*. Cambridge: Polity Press

MMS (2009) "Hårdare lagstiftning rubbar inte attityder till illegal nedladdning", MMS press release, 16/10 2009. http://www.mms.se/nyheter/pressmeddelanden.asp?pr=8 [last checked: 18/1 2011]

Nilsson, Kerstin (2006) "-Folket är på vår sida" ["-The people are on our side"] in *Aftonbladet*, 3/6 2006. http://www.aftonbladet.se/nyheter/article383250.ab [last checked 18/1 2011]

Pearson, Geoffrey (1983) *Hooligan: A History of Respectable Fears*. London: Macmillan

Piratbyrån (2007) "Fyra bokbål och en begravning – En valborgsritual på vårbergstoppen", Piratbyrån Valborg 2007 website. http://piratbyran.org/valborg/ [last checked 18/1 2011]

Pirate Bay, The (2009) *Powr, Broccoli and Kopimi.* e-book available as a torrent link at http://thepiratebay.org/torrent/4741944/powr.broccoli-kopimi [last checked 18/1 2011]

Quinn, Norton (2006a) "Secrets of the Pirate Bay" in *Wired* magazine, 16/8 2006. http://www.wired.com/science/discoveries/news/2006/08/71543 [last checked 18/1 2011]

Quinn, Norton (2006b) "A Nation Divided Over Piracy" in *Wired* magazine, 17/8 2006. http://www.wired.com/science/discoveries/news/2006/08/71544 [last checked 18/1 2011]

Robins, Kevin and Webster, Frank (1999) *Times of the Technoculture: From the Information Society to the Virtual Life*. London and New York, NY: Routledge

Rose, Nikolas (1999 [1989]) *Governing the Soul: The Shaping of the Private Self*. London: Free Association Books

Rydell, Anders and Sundberg, Sam (2009) *Piraterna: de svenska fildelarna som plundrade Hollywood*. Stockholm: Ordfront

Springhall, John (1998) *Youth, Culture and Moral Panics: Penny Gaffs to Gangsta Rap, 1830–1996*. London: Macmillan

Strandh, Niclas (2009) "Därför uppstod Pirate Bay just i Sverige" ["Why The Pirate Bay appeared in Sweden of all

places"] in *Newsmill*, 20/2 2009. http://www.newsmill.se/artikel/2009/02/20/nagra-teser-om-varfor-pirate-bay-blev-sa-stort [last checked 18/1 2011]

Sundberg, Sam (2009) "Tomma ord och ett urholkat varumärke", Svenska Dagbladet 22/8 2009. http://www.svd.se/naringsliv/it/tomma-ord-och-ett-urholkat-varumarke_3395385.svd [last checked 18/1 2011]

Söderberg, Johan (2004) "Reluctant revolutionaries – the false modesty of reformist critics of copyright" in *Journal of Hyperdrome.Manifestation*, vol. 1 (1), September 2004. http://journal.hyperdrome.net/issues/issue1/soderberg.html [last checked 18/1 2011]

Söderberg, Johan (2008) *Allt mitt är ditt: Fildelning, upphovsrätt och försörjning*. Stockholm: Atlas

Terranova, Tiziana (2000) "Free Labor: Producing Culture for the Digital Economy" in *Social Text*, vol. 18 (2; summer 2000), pp. 33—57

Vaidhyanathan, Siva (2001) *Copyrights and Copywrongs: The Rise of Intellectual Property and How It Threatens Creativity*. New York, NY: New York University Press

Wallis, Roger (2008) "Mer konsumentmakt hotar inte mångfalden" in *Svenska Dagbladet*, 31/1 2008. http://www.svd.se/kulturnoje/mer/kulturdebatt/mer-konsumentmakt-hotar-inte-mangfalden_825453.svd [last checked 18/1 2011]

Wimsatt, William Upski (1994) *Bomb the Suburbs*. Chicago, IL: Subway and Elevated Press

Wistreich, Nicol (2006) "Disney Co-Chair recognises 'piracy is a business model'" in *Netribution*, 10/10 2006. http://www.netribution.co.uk/stories/26/972-disney-co-chair-recognises-piracy-is-a-business-model [last checked 18/1 2011]

Yar, Majid (2008) "The rhetorics and myths of anti-piracy campaigns: criminalization, moral pedagogy and capitalist property relations in the classroom" in *New Media & Society*, vol. 10 (4), pp. 605—623

Zuckerman, Phil (2009) *Society Without God: What The Least Religious Nations Can Tell Us About Contentment*. New York, NY: New York University Press.