CYBERFEMINISM AND THE BELARUSIAN UPRISING: DIGITAL INFRASTRUCTURES, AFFECTIVE SOLIDARITY, AND POLITICAL IMAGINATION

Volha Davydzik

DOI: https://doi.org/10.61095/815-0047-2025-1-226-243

© Volha Davydzik
Research Fellow, PhD Student
DFG Cultures of Critique, Leuphana University, Germany
E-mail: volha.davydzik@leuphana.de
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2903-8558

Abstract: The following article explores how information technologies can function as infrastructures of resistance and collective world-making in the face of socio-political catastrophe, authoritarian suppression, and covert control systems. Focusing on the 2020–2021 Belarusian protests, it examines how digital environments became critical for reconfiguring political agency and collective solidarity. While often associated with surveillance and extraction, digital infrastructures also serve as platforms for alternative, decentralized modes of resistance. Revisited through a cyberfeminist lens, the Belarusian case reveals how feminist strategies intersect with digital tools to generate subversive forms of care, visibility, and political engagement. The entry point to the reimagining of digital technologies as a space for producing solidarity is Donna Haraway's framing of agency as sympoetic and open-ended, thus revealing itself in bundles of networks and entanglements. Agency appears to be distributed amongst human and non-human (or more-than-human) participants in assemblies who co-constitute each other in the process of world-making or world-becoming. Hence, emerging infrastructures are never neutral and merely instrumental, but relational and affective as they are a product of daily interaction (or intra-action) and become a site of intersection of acts, desires, emotions, histories, bodies and technologies. In the course of Belarusian uprisings, digital space became one of those sites of distributed collective agency in-becoming through experimentation, creativity, openness, thinking and telling stories together. This analysis foregrounds the

hybrid entanglements of technology, gender, and resistance, mapping how cyberfeminism offers theoretical and practical pathways for technopolitical transformation and emancipation.

Keywords: cyberfeminism, Belarus, digital resistance, hybrid infrastructures, protest, affective solidarity.

Introduction

In 2020, the presidential elections in Belarus resulted in significant socio-political upheaval. The pandemic crisis acted as a catalyst for growing protest sentiments within society, which gained momentum during the election campaign, especially with the rise of alternative political candidates. The spring and summer of 2020 became pivotal for Belarusian society, giving rise to mass peaceful protests almost daily, the formation of a "political collective subject" and a redefined understanding of political action and activism. In this context, information technologies played a critical role in intensifying protest actions, functioning as tools for communication and information dissemination and as platforms for alternative management and decentralized problem-solving based on the principles of solidarity among citizens affected by the political climate[1].

During the Belarusian protests, a variety of initiatives emerged that leveraged digital technologies. These included smart voting platforms and solidarity networks for different communities, such as doctors, activists, students, women, etc. Tools for mutual assistance were developed, including systems to locate arrested individuals, deliver food and hygiene products to prisons, and provide psychological and legal support to prisoners and their families. In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, mutual aid networks were established[2] to support patients and medical workers. Additionally, digital platforms facilitated the formation of neighbor chat groups in residential areas, traditionally disconnected from political activity, that fostered communication, organized joint events, lectures, concerts, and activism[3]. These

1 The Path to the Square: The Role of Digital Technologies in Belarusian Protests. https://www.opendemocracy.net/ru/put-k-ploschadi-rol-it-technologiy-v-belorusskom-proteste/ (accessed on 01.06.2025). — In Rus.

2 How IT technologies help Belarusians resist Lukashenko. https://www.dw.com/ru/it-protest-kak-tehnologii-pomogajut-belorusam-protivostojat-lukashenko/a-55700780 (accessed on 01.06.2025). — In Rus.

3 Vasily Gatov on the protests: The IT environment has created something like Hong Kong inside Belarus. https://ductus.cz/interviews/vasilij-gatov-o-protestah-it-sreda-sozd/ (accessed on 02.06.2025). — In Rus.

initiatives contributed to horizontal cooperation, non-hierarchical communication, and inclusivity, thereby creating new avenues for political participation where values like care, love, respect, and solidarity became as crucial as procedural elements.

However, following the protests of 2020–2021, political repression and persecution led Belarus into a profound crisis. As the stability of societal structures crumbled, what was once concealed beneath the surface of daily life became exposed and tangible. Paul Edwards, in his work *Infrastructure and Modernity: Power, Time, and Social Organization in the History of Sociotechnical Systems*, highlights the invisibility of most technologies until disruptions expose them. He notes, "Thus, infrastructure is the invisible background, substrate, or support, the technocultural/natural environment of modernity… They create both opportunities and limits…" (Edwards 2003: 191). This shift in visibility reveals not only the fragility of systems but also their potential for change.

The Belarusian protests serve as an example of how ruptures in political and social order make infrastructures visible, both in their oppressive functions and in their subversive potential. The internet shutdowns orchestrated by the state during mass demonstrations[4] exposed the critical role of digital infrastructures in both control and resistance. The very networks that facilitated state surveillance also became sites of counteraction, as protesters rapidly adapted by using VPNs, mesh networks, and encrypted messaging apps. Similarly, urban spaces (streets, squares, and even residential courtyards) were transformed from passive elements of the built environment into arenas of political contestation[5], where the spatial logic of state control was momentarily overturned through collective presence and action. This infrastructural visibility, however, was not just a revelation of power but also a call to reimagine the possibilities of public space beyond authoritarian constraints.

At the same time, the exposure of infrastructures also highlights their plasticity (Malabou 2022) their ability to be reshaped in response to shifting conditions and to resist becoming static instruments of control. Catherine Malabou's concept of plasticity, understood as the capacity to receive form and to break it, captures this dual potential. In Belarus, the failure of state institutions to provide adequate healthcare, legal aid, and basic security during the protests led to the rise

4 Belarus: Internet shutdown, online censorship. https://www.hrw.org/ru/news/2020/09/01/376244 (accessed on 11.06.2025). — In Russ.

5 Belarus: Yard protests in Minsk and other cities. https://www.dw.com/ru/voskresnye-protesty-v-belarusi/a-56183670 (accessed on 11.06.2025). — In Rus.

of alternative infrastructures of care. Volunteer medical teams, mutual aid networks, and underground educational initiatives[6] filled the void left by official neglect, not merely compensating for absence but creating new forms of collective resilience. As Edwards notes, infrastructures both enable and limit; moments of rupture expose this contingency, showing how systems once taken for granted can become unstable and open to reinvention (cf. Edwards 2003). In Belarus, while state infrastructures aimed to suppress dissent, other forms, grounded in solidarity, emerged, revealing the outlines of a society beyond authoritarian constraint.

In this article, I engage cyberfeminism not as a prescriptive frame, but as a way to trace the nuanced and often invisible dynamics through which resistance materializes in acts of care, infrastructural creativity, and relational agency. Feminist theory, with its attention to embodiment, interdependence, and the politics of reproduction, offers critical tools for understanding revolutions that prioritize world-making over regime change — revolutions that build rather than merely overturn. As a micro-optic, cyberfeminism reveals the affective textures, distributed networks, and fragile solidarities that define 21st-century uprisings, especially those that emerge not from centralized commands, but from the entangled practices of everyday resistance.

Cyberfeminism, in Donna Haraway's formulation, manifests a subjectivity that is is not fixed, ultimate, or complete, but always in a state of becoming-with others — networked and entangled with both human and non-human agents (Haraway 1991). It is understood here not as a monolithic theory but as a mobile, adaptive strategy that offers a framework for interpreting these developments. Unlike broader terms such as "networked feminism" or "Feminist Internet theory," cyberfeminism emphasizes the subversive potential of digital technologies and their embeddedness within power relations. It interrogates both the constraints and possibilities of technological environments, foregrounding how gendered bodies and identities are mediated, surveilled, and reconfigured. As Haraway writes:

> "The cyborg is resolutely committed to partiality, irony, intimacy, and perversity. It is oppositional, utopian, and completely without innocence. No longer structured by the polarity of public and private, the cyborg defines a technological polis based partly on a revolution of social relations in the oikos, the household… Cyborgs

6 Study: How Belarusians Resist Authorities Online. https://www.dw.com/ru/issledovanie-kak-belorusy-soprotivlautsa-vlasti-lukasenko-onlajn/a-67290603 (accessed on 11.06.2025). — In Rus.

are not reverent; they do not re-member the cosmos. They are wary of holism, but needy for connection- they seem to have a natural feel for united front politics, but without the vanguard party." (Haraway 1991: 151).

Applying this framework to the Belarusian case of digitalized protests does not imply that the protest movement was inherently cyberfeminist. This reveals how particular moments — such as the use of digital city maps showing riot police dislocations, neighborhood chats for spreading information, protest symbols appearing in unexpected locations, people taking to the streets, women in white, chains of solidarity along the avenues, drivers honking in support, and two young men playing badminton on the steps of the KGB building — collectively form strategies of reappropriation and visibility rooted in a cyberfeminist digital praxis.

Feminist scholars have long interrogated how the built environment, digital systems, and state-controlled infrastructures reinforce gendered and political hierarchies, determining who has access, who is visible, and who is excluded (Haraway 1991; Wajcman 2004). And cyberfeminists such as Sadie Plant and Donna Haraway argue that digital infrastructures, though embedded in patriarchal and capitalist systems, also provide sites of resistance, where marginalized groups can challenge dominant power structures and create autonomous spaces of knowledge production and activism.

Above all, it insists on the practice of becoming-with, of composing the world alongside machines, codes, bodies, and other-than-human agents, in networks of situated, partial, and contingent alliances. This means that resistance is not solely enacted by individual subjects, parties, or movements, but emerges through dense entanglements of people, digital platforms, encrypted tools, emotional bonds, and improvised infrastructures none of which act alone. The biases embedded within digital and technological systems, infrastructural ruptures, whether in digital spaces, urban geographies, or state institutions, offer moments of feminist and political reconfiguration. In Belarus, as in other recent movements, the exposure of authoritarian infrastructural violence was met with a feminist politics of care, resistance, and technological insurgency, demonstrating how infrastructure is never neutral but always contested, and how its failures can become opportunities for radical reinvention.

In her work *The Revolution Face is Female: Case of Belarus*, Olga Shparaga offers a perspective on the role of feminist ideas within the resistance. Shparaga argues that the Belarusian protests, while primarily driven by political demands for democracy and justice, also

intersected with feminist ideologies and values. She defines the protest movement as inherently feminist, emphasizing its opposition to patriarchy and traditional power structures. The protests, she asserts, are not merely a fight for political rights but also a struggle to redefine power, care, and solidarity in ways that subvert the normalization of infrastructural violence imposed by the state on all levels. By promoting a collective, egalitarian ethos, the protests resist the patriarchal control perpetuated by both the state and the wider societal structures. The Belarusian protest movement, in its essence, was a deconstruction of patriarchy, positioning itself not only as a political movement but also as a feminist endeavor that demands a transformation of both the political and social order, as well as overcoming the agential oppression (Shparaga 2021).

Soft tactics of resistance, such as non-violent protest, decentralized organizing, and digital activism, play a significant role in the ways cyberfeminism contributes to understanding contemporary revolutionary movements. It focuses on subverting traditional power structures and insisting on inclusivity, utilizing technology to create decentralized platforms for collective action. In the context of revolution, these tactics focused on horizontal cooperation, shared knowledge, thinking together and solidarity pushing the boundaries of "traditional" activism.

This raises important questions about the role of technology and feminist approaches in analyzing the ongoing socio-political transformations. How can digital technologies and feminist perspectives together reshape our understanding of power, agency, and collective action? The late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries vividly illustrate how digital tools and mechanisms have enabled the development of fundamentally new forms of social institutions.

Several critical questions remain: How do soft resistance tactics contribute to the gradual dismantling of patriarchy? What role do information technologies play in this process, and how can we frame a positive, shared future amidst times of tragedy and turmoil? Finally, why is the convergence of technological and feminist strategies essential for driving transformative changes? These questions guide the inquiry into the intersection of technology and feminism in the shaping of future societal transformations.

This article thus argues that cyberfeminist vision can help elucidate the hybrid forms of resistance that characterized the Belarusian uprising. By examining how technological infrastructures intersect with feminist ethics, it becomes possible to understand protest not as a singular event, but as a complex ecology of practices — emergent, fragile, and yet profoundly transformative.

Digital Infrastructures, Horizontal Mobilization, and the Transformation of Protest in the Belarusian Uprising

The Belarusian protests brought to the fore the critical role of digital infrastructures in shaping the form and ethos of political participation. Infrastructures here are not merely technical systems; they constitute the relational fabric through which protest movements unfold, connect, and act. The development of decentralized communication tools allowed citizens to circumvent state-controlled institutions, transforming how political subjects organized, imagined, and inhabited resistance.

In their article "Can You Hear Me Now? How Does Communication Technology Affect Protests and Repressions?" (Christensen & Garfias 2018), the authors analyze how digital tools transform protest activity and repressive responses. They argue that mobile phones and media contribute significantly to the activation of collective action. Digital technologies, they contend, serve three primary functions: first, they reduce the cost of resources needed for coordination, thus, simplifying the building of infrastructural connections; second, they accelerate the process of disseminating information about the suppression of protests and instances of violence; and third, they make protests global and visible, which is of particular significance.

The visibility and rapid dissemination of information about violence, scenes of police brutality, and arbitrary actions make it difficult for many to remain neutral. As the authors emphasize: "The visibility of repression forces many observers to take a stance, aligning them with the victims and activists" (Christensen & Garfias 2018). Two key factors are crucial for solidarity in protests: proper and effective dissemination of information, and the transformation of this information into common knowledge in the sense of general awareness. Additionally, this awareness is inherently communicative: potential participants must be informed but and engage in feedback, creating a state of mutual awareness across sources and participants. Fragile, temporary connections are established to support the event, providing participants with the opportunity to solidify and communicate, exchange ideas, and be present in diverse ways. Technology facilitates the growth of horizontal connections and broadens the factors contributing to the willingness of individuals to unite in networks and chains of interaction. These networks include communities that existed before the events bridging different spaces and temporalities in the moment of revolution.

Platforms such as Holas (Voice)[7], Chestnyje Liudi (Honest people)[8], BySOL[9], ByMEDSol[10] (which are all now considered to be extremists in Belarus[11]) and others promoted the opportunity for safe participation, different modes of inclusion in the protest movement (both online and offline); the possibility of alternative vote counting against the backdrop of total distrust in government officials, local election commissions and the Central Election Commission.

These digital initiatives have demonstrated their effectiveness in building up solidarity, shaping new modes of political participation, and uniting diverse actors in collective action. By using these platforms, individuals and groups that were previously disconnected have found common ground, mobilizing around shared objectives and fostered inclusive political engagement, overcoming the traditional barriers against inertia in society and sustained, collaborative activism (Davydzik & Stebur 2021).

As the country approached the elections and entered the active protest phase from mid-August 2020 through 2021, both the digitalization and dispersal of protest activities accelerated significantly. This growth in intensity was fueled by the establishment of numerous Telegram[12] channels, which enabled people to organize around specific tasks and shared interests.

Telegram's functionality played a decisive role in this transformation. It combined immediacy with anonymity and adaptability, became a logistical and affective space for coordination. People received alerts, mapped danger zones, and found community — all within an interface tailored to encrypted, rapid response. These functionalities facilitated resistance and reshaped the temporality of protest: actions could be spontaneous, adaptive, and quickly reoriented in the moment of danger and tension.

Almira Ousmanova in her article "Digital Multitude: The Multiple That Takes Over The One" (Ousmanova 2023) notes a very important

7 https://belarus2020.org/home.

8 https://honestby.org/.

9 https://www.bysol.org/ru/.

10 https://bymedsol.org/.

11 Understanding "extremist" lists: a list of organizations and individuals involved in terrorist activities. 20 March, 2023. https://humanconstanta.org/razbiraemsya-s-ekstremistskimi-spiskami-perechen-organizacij-i-fizicheskix-lic-prichastnyx-k-terroristicheskoj-deyatelnosti/ (accessed on 03.02.2025).

12 Telegram messenger as a means of communication and self-organization in the situation of political crisis in Belarus. https://cet.eurobelarus.info/files/userfiles/5/CET/2020_TG_Belarus-I.pdf.

trend that was set by the broad and non-superficial inclusion of digital tools in the political field. With the growth of IT clusters and businesses in the country, a new generation has emerged with access to alternative sources of information and communication. This generational divide has created a significant gap, highlighting the contrast between an analog-style dictatorship reliant on traditional methods of control and communication (such as television and radio) and a digitally empowered populace asking, "What are we capable of?" This digital multitude, equipped with decentralized and real-time communication tools, challenges the old regime's attempts at control and opens up new possibilities for collective action and social transformation: "The peaceful Belarusian Evolution is the protest of the multitude which every day invents politics, constantly changing places and forms of protest using a grassroots form of organization". And further: "This is a molecular revolution (F.Guattari, J.Deleuze, G.Raunig), the composition of which "does not need unification or the representation of a unified (class), subject for leaders, party and vanguard" (Ousmanova 2023).

The concept of the digital multitude, which characterizes the aggregation of actors engaged in shaping the political sphere, represents an alternative perspective on collectivity and solidarity. Unlike traditional modernist nation, this concept emphasizes inclusivity, allowing for the participation of diverse agents and communities while embracing a multiplicity of experiences. Instead of relying on representative political structures, the digital multitude envisions non-representational, fluid modes of engagement, where participation and collective action emerge organically from shared interests and values rather than being dictated by imposed identities, parties or hierarchical frameworks (Virno 2004).

The digital multitude challenges conventional understandings of sovereignty and governance by redistributing agency across decentralized networks, bringing to emergence new forms of political organization and redefines the boundaries of political subjectivity Experimental modes of resistance, where digital tools and cyberfeminist strategies intersect function as a force of disruption and as a generative space for political imagination: a capacity long suppressed or forgotten.

The digital environment has thus emerged as a medium for political participation, offering a suite of tools to create prototypes of non-representative democratic institutions and platforms for engagement, as well as archiving unfolding events, memories and practices. It has expanded the concept of protest beyond physical demonstrations, enabling participation through diverse ways and redefining protest in terms of flow, circulation, flickering, and networking. Within the reality

of protest, the digital sphere introduces new layers of participation with mobility, inclusivity, non-human and technical participants, such as bots in Telegram channels, allowing individuals to select tools and methods of engagement.

The recent transition of protest marches from traditional city centers to more symbolic locations and residential areas marks a significant evolution in protest dynamics. This shift reflects a growing intent to engage directly with communities. Local Telegram chats have emerged as vital platforms for discussion, serving to address political agendas and facilitate interpersonal connections among participants, coordinate actions, share resources and information, thus enhancing grassroots organizing efforts. The chat groups were instrumental in redefining how communities mobilize, connect, and respond to sociopolitical challenges and unlocking the ability to "get to know each other"[13]. Local initiatives implemented in residential neighborhoods and remote areas were of great importance for protest activity. People organized courtyard tea gatherings, hosted lectures and theatrical performances, listened to concerts and read poetry, and held children's events.

In the article "Belarusian Protest: Regimes of Engagement and Coordination" (Gabovich 2021), Misha Gabovich notes a very important trend that set a special tone for the Belarusian revolution. Firstly, the establishment of diverse opportunities and methods for connecting to the protest movement has emerged as a critical factor in mobilizing a large number of participants and brought the feeling of personal investment in the movement, as individuals could engage in ways that resonate with their own experiences and capacities. Secondly, this evolution has led to a significant shift in the locus of political activity and decision-making; the focus has transitioned from abstract politics "up there" to a more personal and relatable form of political engagement. By emphasizing personal connections and local contexts, the protest movement cultivates a deeper sense of agency among participants, reinforcing the idea that political change begins at the community level. The personalization of political and protest participation has been facilitated, in part, by the establishment of a network of local initiatives that address specific local issues while simultaneously contributing to a collective resistance against regimes of control and

13 "We didn't know each other until this summer" is a lyric line from the song of the group "Splin" (Russian Federation), which became one of the slogans of the protest, as well as the title of a documentary film about the revolutionary events in Belarus during the elections and the first week after 9 August 2020. "We didn't know each other until that summer," a documentary by Volha Abramchyk. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6vU9GtE75ZA.

violence. This dual approach allows communities to engage with their immediate concerns while also participating in a broader struggle for justice and accountability. Gabovich further emphasizes a distinctive characteristic of the Belarusian protests: the appropriation of agency by the leaders of the democratic association, who invoke this sense of agency during election campaign rallies.

By framing their messaging around empowerment and collective action, Tsikhanouskaya, Kalesnikava and Tsepkalo addressed political agency and action differently, resonated with the grassroots motivations of participants, thereby enhancing the movement's legitimacy and appeal. This strategy grounded the idea that political engagement is rooted in personal experiences and local realities, appealing for resilient and engaged citizenry capable of challenging systemic injustices and advocating for democratic principles.

Beyond Recognition: Cyberfeminism, Technopolitical Resistance, and Affective Solidarities

During the course of the Belarusian revolution, it became evident how technological infrastructures, once largely invisible, opened new channels of exchange, enabling the generation of utopian horizons for the future, where alternative forms of cooperation and co-existence could be imagined and enacted (Tolstov & Stebur 2020). This utopian potential of technology aligns it with strategic interventions, where digital tools are not merely commercial commodities but instruments of solidarity, care, and activism—means of articulating freedom, emancipation, and the right to visibility in spaces otherwise marked by exclusion and violence.

To fully grasp this subversive capacity of technology, we require a theoretical framework that is fluid, diffuse, and capable of infiltrating structures, exposing contradictions, and revealing the hidden dislocations within systems. As Alla Mitrofanova describes it, cyberfeminism functions as "a browser for viewing and navigating modern cultural shifts and historical heritage" (Mitrofanova 2010), offering a methodological lens and tactics for engaging with technological infrastructures, power, and resistance in moments of upheaval.

Through the lens of technologies embedded within social and political bodies, the world becomes perceptible in new ways — not as a fixed entity but as something constantly reassembled through shifting chains of interaction between human and non-human agents. Technologies reveal a reality where human actors, technical objects, and even other non-human entities exist on equal ontological footing,

engaging in complex configurations of agency. Information technologies, in particular, serve as interfaces that mediate between these environments, enabling interactions between established and emergent objects — a term Helga Nowotny (2006) uses to describe entities that arise at the intersection of different fields, reshaping both scientific and socio-political landscapes. Nowotny emphasizes that emergent objects are not simply pre-existing entities brought into new contexts; rather, they materialize through interactions, producing unforeseen forms of agency and meaning. In this sense, technologies do not merely mediate reality but actively participate in its co-construction, blurring the boundaries between what is considered natural, artificial, or socially determined.

However, in the spirit of Giorgio Agamben, these same technologies also hold the potential to produce new, even more invasive forms of institutional control. Agamben conceptualizes "bare life" as the condition of being reduced to mere biological existence, stripped of political agency, and subjected to pervasive mechanisms of regulation as imposed technic of power (Agamben 1998). In contemporary bio-political regimes, individual subjectivity is no longer determined by social status, reputation, or public identity, but rather by the fixation of bio-anthropometric data, which renders bodies legible for bureaucratic and surveillance systems — whether through medical records, biometric passports, or security checkpoints. As a result, autonomy and freedom of action become dependent variables, constrained by the logic of hierarchical institutions seeking universal control. Within this bio-political framework, subjectivity is a contested field for multiple discourses and socio-political practices of subjugation, where state-administered care operates as life management and discipline.

One of the key strategies employed by activists is the manifestation and production of new subjectivities and feminist cultural representations in cyberspace, contributing to utopian imaginaries and alternative modes of political agency. Online interactions enable the formation of fluid, hybrid selves, decoupled from traditional markers of gender, race, and class, yet at the same time, these identities remain embedded within the algorithmic, economic, and ideological constraints of digital infrastructures. While cyberspace holds the potential to disrupt dominant paradigms, it also reproduces the bio-political mechanisms of surveillance, categorization, and control, shaping digital subjectivities in ways that often reflect existing hierarchies rather than dismantling them.

As cyberfeminist theorists themselves acknowledge, a lack of interaction between theory and critical analysis can lead to unintended consequences, including the reproduction of sexism and mass cultural

stereotypes. So, what is at stake is the production of new epistemologies that do not align with the algorithms of productive economy and rigid hierarchies. From this perspective, the interweaving of socio-political theory and criticism could generate more nuanced and effective strategies for what Sadie Plant terms cyber utopianism — a vision of digital networks as spaces of emancipation and subversion (Plant 1997).

Cyber utopianism — a subcategory of technological utopianism — posits that online communication facilitates decentralized, democratic, and libertarian structures. However, it is clear that the digital environment does not inherently guarantee these idealized outcomes, nor does it automatically dismantle patriarchy or colonial structures. Similarly, cyber utopia does not inherently serve as a space of identity liberation, as it remains embedded within the logic of social production, shaped by pre-existing power dynamics. Digital infrastructures do not exist outside of systems of war, violence, and hierarchical control; they emerge from and within these systems. As Pauline Wilding argues, the integration of cyber environments into hierarchical machines does not negate oppression but instead reinforces new normative constraints on digital subjectivity (Wilding 1998). In this context, cyberfeminism does not merely celebrate the liberatory potential of technology but functions as a radical strategy of hybridization, disrupting and reconfiguring the patriarchal order from within.

The way fem-strategies are defined is, among other things, through the modification of the Other — the search for an alternative subjectivity, even and especially within those toward whom the telescopes of feminist emancipation are directed. This process is not merely about recognition and inclusion but about discovery, differentiation, and distance—a political task that is central to both fem-strategies and networked structures (Hayles, 1993). Feminist interventions in digital environments thus function not only as acts of resistance but as processes of ontological reconfiguration, where subjectivity is reimagined as fluid, relational, and co-constituted through technological entanglements.

The development of fragile ontologies, spontaneous agglomerations, sporadic associations, and an attentiveness to microprocesses and micropolitics defines the utopian horizon made possible by technology and feminist strategies for transforming reality. These alternative modes of being make a shift from politics of recognition and differentiation to politics of immersive-ness and being-with, where identity is not simply acknowledged but actively co-produced within dynamic assemblages, the perspective that was developed by Karen Barad within the conceptual apparatus of intra-action (Barad 2007).

Cyberfeminism, as a theoretical framework, seeks to act as a catalyst for critical social analysis and the emergence of new perceptual paradigms that facilitate political transformation. This transformative discourse is inherently tied to the principle of inclusivity, extending beyond the human to encompass a multiplicity of agents, organic and non-organic, animate and inanimate. As Donna Haraway argues, this ontological shift is rooted in co-thinking and thinking-for in relation to "strange" others — a form of epistemological openness that embraces hybridity, alterity, and non-anthropocentric modes of existence. Cyberfeminism thus proposes a radical ontological gap, one that allows for the intrusion of the extra- or non-social into political and technological discourses. Haraway conceptualizes this co-existential and communicative process as "interspecies fellowship", a mode of relationality that includes objects, technologies, and entities capable of alternative becomings (Haraway 2004).

These interactions among diverse participants are not merely structured by procedural or algorithmic rules; rather, they are suffused with affective intensities, including sensory, emotional, and erotic dimensions (Behar 2016). The erotic, in this context, functions not merely as a sexualized force but as a transformative energy that disrupts established boundaries between bodies, technologies, and systems of knowledge. Drawing from Audre Lorde's conceptualization of the erotic as a mode of radical empowerment (Lorde 1984), cyberfeminist engagements with the erotic emphasize its capacity to generate pleasure, intimacy, and embodied knowledge beyond normative frameworks. In digital environments, the erotic materializes as a force that challenges mechanistic and extractive modes of interaction, instead fostering affective solidarities and alternative ways of knowing and being-with.

Furthermore, the erotic complicates the traditional hierarchies between subject and object, self and other, human and non-human, creating spaces where desire, agency, and materiality are entangled. Within cyberfeminist practices, the erotic is not confined to the realm of sexuality. Still, it extends into the realm of technology and interspecies communication, serving as a medium for co-creation, resistance, and political imagination. It invites us to consider how technologies, bodies, and affective intensities coalesce in digital spaces, forging networks of relationality that are neither fully controlled nor entirely autonomous.

This intersection of political resistance, infrastructure, relationality and the reconfiguration of collective life is further explored in the work of the art group eeefff, comprised of Dzina Zhuk and Nicolay Spesivtsev. Their practice engages with the interplay between

material and digital environments, offering an artistic lens to examine the power structures that shape contemporary social and political conditions. By focusing on themes such as invisible labor, the precariat, control tactics, and the redefinition of care and solidarity, eeefff's projects interrogate how digital and physical spheres mutually reinforce or destabilize forms of governance.

In their contribution to the Ecology of Attention project, the artist collective eeefff presents the work All You Need Now Is in Pinned Messages[14], critically examining digital engagement's structures. Their project interrogates how algorithmic curation fosters a self-reinforcing consumption of content that confines users within their existing preferences, thereby limiting exposure to alternative perspectives and diminishing the potential for shared, collective experiences. By tailoring information streams to individual behaviors, digital infrastructures create a seemingly frictionless environment in which exploration is subtly discouraged. In response, eeefff proposes strategies that redistribute attention beyond isolated digital consumption, advocating instead for practices that foreground communal interaction and shared cognitive engagement.

A central feature of their work is the facilitation of virtual "drifting" sessions through algorithmically reconstructed 3D spaces, including museums, burnt-out apartments, and casinos. These navigational experiments, conducted via platforms such as Discord, highlight the fragmented and often disorienting nature of digital representations. Participants traverse landscapes assembled from algorithmic predictions and incomplete data, encountering blurred images and disrupted spatial coherence. Such experiences problematize conventional notions of digital immersion, revealing how interfaces not only mediate but actively shape perceptual and cognitive processes. By guiding users through predetermined pathways, digital infrastructures exert a subtle form of control, directing attention while simultaneously obscuring aspects of the represented environment.

Beyond their critique of digital consumption, eeefff's work also engages with broader questions of common living and collective space-making within contemporary networked conditions. Their interventions suggest that attention, both as an individual cognitive resource and as a shared social practice, plays a fundamental role in shaping the conditions of collective life. In this sense, the act of navigating digital environments is not merely an interaction with an

14 EEEFFF art-group project All You Need Is Now In A Pinned Messages. https://www.ecology-attention.mmpraxis.com/contributions/eeefff/ (accessed on 11.06.2025).

interface but a form of engagement with the infrastructures that define communal existence. The group's work implicitly raises questions about the possibilities of reclaiming and reconfiguring these infrastructures, challenging the dominance of algorithmic governance by fostering modes of commoning that emphasize relationality, co-presence, and shared affect.

By juxtaposing algorithmic determinism with open-ended, exploratory engagements, eeefff invites a reconsideration of how digital technologies mediate both personal and collective existence. Their work suggests that resisting the passive consumption of pre-curated content is not merely an aesthetic or conceptual choice but a political act — one that seeks to reimagine digital environments as spaces of encounter, negotiation, and common world-making. In this way, their practice contributes to a broader discourse on attention, digital infrastructures, and the conditions of sociality in an era increasingly shaped by networked technologies.

Conclusion

This article has argued that the Belarusian protest movement, while not cyberfeminist in itself, provides fertile ground for cyberfeminist analysis. By focusing on the hybrid entanglements of digital technologies, political infrastructures, and feminist ethics, we can better understand how agency is redistributed, solidarity enacted, and resistance articulated in contemporary techno-political contexts.

Rather than treating infrastructure as neutral or merely instrumental, a cyberfeminist approach highlights its political plasticity — its capacity to be co-opted, reconfigured, and reinvented. This reconfiguration occurs at the level of software or hardware, and through embodied, relational, and affective practices that shape how technologies are lived and felt. Cyberfeminism, as mobilized here, challenges dominant models of political engagement centered on visibility, centralization, and individual sovereignty. It proposes instead a politics of multiplicity, care, and distributed action — one that takes seriously the emotional, the local, and the experimental.

The Belarusian revolution reminds us that transformation does not always arrive through rupture. It could emerge through fragile networks, everyday encounters, and small acts of reappropriation. Digital infrastructures, when inhabited otherwise, can become platforms for collective imagination and resilient hope. In this sense, cyberfeminist thinking does not merely interpret the world — it offers tools for inhabiting and altering it.

References

Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Meridian: Crossing Aesthetics, 228 pp.

Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Duke University Press.

Behar, C. (2016). An Introduction to OOF. In *Object-Oriented Feminism*, University of Minnesota Press, 280 pp.

Bryant, L. R. (2019). *The Democracy of Objects* [Demokratiia ob"ektov]. Perm': Hyle Press.

Christensen, D., Garfias, F. (2018). Can You Hear Me Now? How Communication Technology Affects Protest and Repression. *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*, 13(1), 89–117. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6461378/.

Davydzik, V., Stebur, A. (2021). Features and Effects of the Digital Technologies in the Belarusian Protest. *Digital Icons*, No. 22 (2023): 23–44.

Edwards, P. N. (2003). Infrastructure and Modernity: Force, Time, and Social Organization in the History of Sociotechnical Systems. In *Modernity and Technology*: 185–226.

Gabowitsch, M. (2021). Belarusian Protest: Regimes of Engagement and Coordination. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/351951818_Belarusian_Protest_Regimes_of_Engagement_and_Coordination (accessed on 03.02.2025).

Haraway, D. (1991). *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. Routledge, 309 pp.

Haraway, D. (2004). Cyborgs to Companion Species: Reconfiguring Kinship in Technoscience. In *The Haraway Reader*. New York: Routledge: 295–320.

Hayles, K. N. (1993). Virtual Bodies and Flickering Signifiers. *Cultural Critique*, Vol. 66: 69–91.

Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*. Crossing Press, 190 pp.

Malabou, C. (2022). *Plasticity: The Promise of Explosion*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 344 pp.

Mitrofanova, A. (2010). *Cyberfeminism in History, Practice, and Theory*. In *Cyberfeminism: Theory and Practice*: 67–76. — In Russ.
[Mitrofanova, A. (2010). Kiberfeminizm v istorii, praktike i teorii. In *Kiberfeminizm: Teoriia i praktika*: 67–76.]

Ousmanova, A. (2023). Digital Multitude: The Multiple That Takes Over The One. *Digital Icons*, 22: 1–22. Retrieved from https://digitalicons.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/DI22_01_Ousmanova.pdf (accessed on 03.02.2025).

Nowotny, H. (2005). The Increase of Complexity and Its Reduction: Emergent Interfaces between the Natural Sciences, Humanities and Social Sciences. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 22(5): 15–31.

Nowotny, H. (2006). *Cultures of Technology and the Quest for Innovation*. Oxford/New York: Berghahn Books.

Plant, S. (1997). *Zeroes and Ones: Digital Women and the New Technoculture*. Doubleday.

Shparaga, O. (2021). *The Revolution Face is Female: Case of Belarus*, 234 pp.

Telegram messenger as a means of communication and self-organization in the situation of political crisis in Belarus. (2020). Retrieved from https://

cet.eurobelarus.info/files/userfiles/5/CET/2020_TG_Belarus-I.pdf (accessed on 03.02.2025). — In Russ.
[Telegram messenger kak sredstvo kommunikatsii i samoorganizatsii v usloviiakh politicheskogo krizisa v Belarusi.]

Tolstov, A., Stebur, A. (2020). Like Water. Dynamics of Belarusian Protest: From the Existing Technical Basis to the Utopian Horizons of the Future. Retrieved from https://syg.ma/ (accessed on 04.08.2023).

Understanding "extremist" lists: A list of organizations and individuals involved in terrorist activities. (20 March, 2023). Retrieved from https://human-constanta.org/razbiraemsya-s-ekstremistskimi-spiskami-perechen-organizacij-i-fizicheskix-lic-prichastnyx-k-terroristicheskoj-deyatelnosti/ (accessed on 03.02.2025). — In Russ.
[Ponimanie "ekstremistskikh" spiskov: perechen' organizatsii i fizicheskikh lits, prichastnykh k terroristicheskoi deiatel'nosti]

Virno, P. (2004). A *Grammar of the Multitude: For an Analysis of Contemporary Forms of Life*. Semiotext(e), 160 pp.

Wajcman, J. (2004). *TechnoFeminism*. Polity Press, 158 pp.

Wilding, F. (1998). Where is Feminism inside Cyberfeminism? *n.paradoxa*, Vol. 2: 6–13.