

Culture Jam

THE UNCOOLING OF AMERICA™

Kalle Lasn



EAGLE BROOK

WILLIAM MORROW AND COMPANY, INC.

NEW YORK



Paris, May 1968

THE REVOLUTIONARY IMPULSE

Most people in the world have never heard of culture jamming. Yet it is not a new movement. We place ourselves on a revolutionary continuum that includes, moving backward in time, early punk rockers, the '60s hippie movement, a group of European intellectuals and conceptual artists called the Situationist International (born of the Lettrist International), the surrealists, Dadaists, anarchists, and a host of other social agitators down through the ages whose chief aim was to challenge the prevailing ethos in a way that was so primal and heartfelt it could only be true.

What we all have in common—besides a belligerent attitude toward authority—is a willingness to take big risks, and a commitment to pursue small, spontaneous moments of truth. Opportunities to act boldly (which often means *not* the way you would normally, reflexively act) present themselves every day and maybe even every hour. Authentic acts tend to get noticed amid the fakery and correctness on which postmodern culture thrives. “In a small room where people unanimously maintain a conspiracy of silence,” said Nobel laureate Czeslaw Milosz, “one word of truth sounds like a pistol shot.”

In his book *Lipstick Traces*, American cultural critic Greil Marcus fixes The Sex Pistols' Johnny Rotten squarely in the tradition of the rebel seer. Rotten was a gleeful anarchist who used the word "fuck" on television and sang like he meant to change the world—or at least explode the dreamy, Beatles-fueled optimism of the day, and stick a fork into classic rock. He somehow rose above the obvious joke of The Pistols—the naked commercialism and hype of a band without much talent—and created something vital.

It's not clear whether Rotten knew anything about the Situationist International. But The Sex Pistols and the SI were most definitely on the same page, philosophically. Their song "Anarchy in the U.K." espoused, in crudely poetic form, the philosophy of the movement. The Pistols wanted to live "not as an object but as a subject of the story," as Marcus puts it. That's about as good a working definition of the culture jammers' ethos as you'll ever find.

Marcus recalls watching Johnny Rotten shouting madly over the band's guitars in front of the Berlin Wall and understanding that "his aim . . . was to take in all the rage, intelligence and strength in his being and then fling them back at the world; to make the world notice; to make the world doubt its most cherished and unexamined beliefs." I think culture jammers can learn a lot from the original punks. They were one of the first to feel the nihilism and to rail against a world that offered no future—and for a few years their rage shook the world.

The punks, like the hippies, yippies, beats, anarchists, Dadaists, surrealists, automatistes, fluxists and any number of other disaffected visionaries, represented an age-old spirit of spontaneous defiance toward the established order. But it was the Situationists who first applied that spirit of anarchy to modern media culture. They were the first to understand how the media spectacle slowly corrodes the human psyche. They were, in a sense, the first postmodern revolutionaries.

The Situationists were originally just eight artists and writers, most of them European, who sat down one July day in 1957 in the little town of Cosio d'Arroscia, Italy, to have a little fun together over Gauloises and absinthe. Though a reasonably short-lived group (by the '70s, most

everyone had forgotten about them), they generated an anarchic drive that a generation of students, artists and radicals recognized as the real thing.

The Situationists declared a commitment to "a life of permanent novelty." They were interested only in freedom, and just about any means to it were justified. The creativity of everyday people, which consumer capitalism and communism had weakened but not killed, desperately needed to find expression. Down with the bureaucracies and hierarchies and ideologies that stifled spontaneity and free will. To the Situationists, you are—everyone is—a creator of situations, a performance artist, and the performance, of course, is your life, lived in your own way. Various stunts were concocted to foster spontaneous living. Situationist members suggested knocking down churches to make space for children to play, and putting switches on the street lamps so lighting would be under public control.

The Situationists believed that many times a day, each of us comes to a little fork in the path. We can then do one of two things: act the way we normally, reflexively act, or do something a little risky and wild, but genuine. We can choose to live our life as "a moral, poetic, erotic, and almost spiritual refusal" to cooperate with the demands of consumer culture.

The Situationists spoke often of the "spectacle" of modern life. The term encompassed everything from billboards to art exhibitions to soccer matches to radio and TV. Broadly speaking, it meant modern society's "spectacular" level of commodity consumption and hype. Everything human beings once experienced directly had been turned into a show put on by someone else. Real living had been replaced by prepackaged experiences and media-created events. Immediacy was gone. Now there was only "mediacy"—life as mediated through other instruments, life as a media creation. The Situationists used the term "kidnapped": The spectacle had "kidnapped" our real lives, co-opting whatever authenticity we once had.

I think this helps explain the strong visceral reaction so many people had to Nike's use of the Beatles tune "Revolution," and, later, to

Apple's appropriation of Bob Dylan and The Gap's (posthumous) mugging of Jack Kerouac. Nostalgic, griping yuppies may not have been able to articulate it perfectly, but they understood that some fundamental part of their lives had been stolen.

In the Richard Linklater film *Before Sunrise*, the young hero, played by Ethan Hawke, has an existential crisis: He suddenly grows sick to death of his own company. Every party he goes to, there he is. Every bus he rides, every class he attends, he runs into . . . himself. For him, even his own identity had somehow become a spectacle. Here Linklater is staring into the Situationist abyss, and finding it a little terrifying. To paraphrase Situationist leader Guy Debord: Where the self is by proxy, it is not. This may also explain why one of the juiciest consumer target groups is the man or woman known as the "emulator." Emulators look for products that make them feel like somebody else—someone more important. Since no product can help you fully escape your old identity, frustration mounts, a credit card is produced and the cycle of alienation deepens. (Situationists might point to emulators as proof of a devolution in the state of living: from "being" to "having," and then from "having" to "appearing to have.")

Debord remains a largely unheralded visionary. Derided in his later years, nearly canonized in France immediately following his suicide in 1967 and then gradually forgotten, Debord is only now enjoying a little posthumous fame—especially in France, where a group calling themselves the "Perpendiculaires" have positioned themselves as spiritual progeny of the Situationists. They maintain that culture ought to be spread laterally (through salon-type discussions) rather than vertically (through TV and the Internet).

In some ways, Debord was even more of a pioneer of the mental environment than his high-profile coeval, Marshall McLuhan. Where McLuhan only described the mass-culture trance, Debord developed some effective ways to break out of it. One way was the *dérive*. Literally "the drift," the *dérive* was an idea borrowed from the Dadaists. The Situationists defined it as "locomotion without a goal." As a *dériviste*, you float through the city, open to whatever you come in contact with, thus

exposing yourself to the whole spectrum of feelings you encounter by chance in everyday life. Openness is key. You embrace whatever you love, and in the process, you discover what it is you hate.

The Situationists believed the *dérive* could largely replace the old twin occupations of work and entertainment, and become a model for the "playful creation" of a new way of life. The *dériviste* is a drifter in the best possible sense, not someone down and out but up and beyond, living outside the stifling roles society prescribes for us. Living well, Debord said, involves the "systematic questioning of all the diversions and works of a society, a total critique of its idea of happiness."

Another of the Situationists' favorite tropes was *détournement*, which Debord proposed as a way for people to take back the spectacle that had kidnapped their lives. Literally a "turning around," *détournement* involved rerouting spectacular images, environments, ambiances and events to reverse or subvert their meaning, thus reclaiming them. With its limitless supply of ideas, ranging from rewriting the speech balloons of comic-strip characters, to altering the width of streets and the heights of buildings and the colors and shapes of doors and windows, to radically reinterpreting world events such as the 1965 Watts riots in Los Angeles, the *Internationale Situationniste*—the journal the Situationists published between 1958 and 1969—was a sometimes profound, sometimes absurd laboratory of provocation and *détournement*. Once, Debord altered a famous drawing of Lenin by placing a barebreasted woman on his forehead with the caption "The Universe Turns on the Tips of Breasts." Debord had his book *Mémoires* bound in heavy sandpaper so that when it was placed on the shelves of libraries, it would destroy other books. One famous *détournement* happened in the Notre Dame cathedral on Easter Sunday in 1950. With thousands of people watching, a Lettrist provocateur dressed as a Dominican monk slipped onto the altar and delivered a sermon accusing the Catholic Church of "the deadly diversion of the force of life in favor of an empty heaven," and then solemnly proclaimed that "God is dead." It was with this spirit of *détournement* that the Situationists invaded enemy territory and tried to "devalue the currency of the spectacle." And it was with this

defiance that they intended to pull off a cultural revolution, “a gigantic turning around of the existing social world.”

The Situationists had some fairly radical notions that, when you consider them deeply, make sense. They believed that vacations, so cherished by the masses as a kind of sanity-saver, instead just enforce “the loop of alienation and domination” and symbolize “the false promises of modern life.” (If you’re living a full life, why would you want to “get away” from it?) A memorable neo-Situationist slogan reads: “Club Med, a Cheap Holiday in Other People’s Misery.”

In *The Revolution of Everyday Life*, which apart from Debord’s *The Society of Spectacle* is the seminal book to emerge from the Situationist movement, Raul Vaneigem argued that everyday life is ultimately the measure of all things, and the ground on which all revolutions must unfold. But, he argued, an unfortunate, alienating self-consciousness has crept into our lives. “Even the tiniest of gestures—opening a door, holding a teacup, a facial expression—and the most private and individual actions—coming home, making tea, arguing with a lover—have always already been represented and shown to us within the spectacle.” Thus, our most intimate gestures have become stereotypes, and our lives clichéd. But Vaneigem passionately believed that the spectacle was fast approaching a saturation point, a crisis out of which “a new poetry of real experience and a reinvention of life are bound to spring.”

Today, the stultifying passivity and alienation of the spectacle in our lives has increased to proportions Vaneigem and Debord could hardly have imagined. The great, insidious power of the spectacle lies in the fact that it is actually a form of mental slavery that we are free to resist, *only it never occurs to us to do so*. Our media-saturated postmodern world, where all communication flows in one direction, from the powerful to the powerless, produces a population of lumpen spectators “modern men and women, the citizens of the most advanced societies on earth, thrilled to watch whatever it is they’re given to watch.”

Greil Marcus calls this the “democracy of false desire.” The spectacle is an instrument of social control, offering the illusion of unlimited choice, but in fact reducing the field of play to a choice of preselected

experiences: adventure movies, nature shows, celebrity romances, political scandals, ball games, net surfing. . . .

Boredom emerges in the Situationist literature as one of the Big Enemies. The Situationists saw a world crushed by wasted potential. Mass mechanization, for example, was supposed to create vast stretches of leisure time in which people could create free-flowing, imaginative lives for themselves. Instead, people were allowing their leisure hours to be gobbled up by programmed entertainments. Increasingly, they weren’t in control of their own fun anymore. The Situationist solution: *Take back the show*. Create your own atmospheres, ambiances and situations. Build something “provisional and lived.” One might, to cite one example, take the predictable city and redesign it as a bunch of emotive neighborhoods—the “bizarre” quarter, the “sinister” quarter, the “tragic” quarter, the “happy” quarter, and the “useful” quarter—that people can drift in and out of.

Whatever else you might think of Guy Debord—that he was wildly idealistic and extreme in his views—he did walk the walk. He created a life free of spectacle (except right at the end when, sick and in pain, he carefully orchestrated his own spectacular suicide by a gunshot through the heart). He never had a job; he spent his time in taverns, arguing philosophy, drinking and writing. He consistently refused interviews with the press and wrote only six slim volumes. “I wrote much less than most people who write, but drank much more than most people who drink,” he once remarked. For him life really *was* an eternal festival. He believed passionately in his own destiny and that of his friends. “Our kind will be the first to blaze a trail into a new life,” he boasted.

The heroes of the Situationists’ era were unbridled and anarchical, pure vessels of poetic expression, living somehow out of time. They were the polar opposite of the people often held up as examples in our own age of workaholism—competitive, ambitious folks who, as Welsh historian L.T.C. Rolt put it in his classic book *High Horse Riderless*, “believe in faster trains and more traffic, who ravage the landscape while claiming to protect it, who disintegrate the family while assuring us it is their priority, who sanctify work while increasing unemploy-

ment. All this because they have jettisoned faith in the true spiritual nature of the human being and have not the courage to risk being real, but must always be striving to become superior to their competitors.”

The cognitive psychologist Abraham Maslow spoke of the importance of peak experiences in the life of a fully functioning, or “self-actualized,” human being. These experiences are so engrossing to the senses—in this instant, this act—that people actually feel they are living out of time. Other disciplines have other names for it. Zen Buddhists call peak experiences *satori*. “Generations of poets, prophets, and revolutionaries, not to mention lovers, drug-takers, and all those who have somehow found the time to stand and stare” have craved this ecstatic feeling of oneness with the world. This is also why many culture jammers take daily leaps of faith, or of courage—acts that take them outside market-structured consciousness long enough to get a taste of real living. Living in the moment, pursuing the authentic gesture, living close to the edge—call it what you will—when it’s genuine, it’s the force that makes life worth living. It is also what consumer capitalism takes away from you every time it sells you brand-name “cool” or this month’s rebel attitude.

When I was shooting a film in Japan called *Satori in the Right Cortex*, I asked the head monk of a Zen monastery in Kamakura if I could take footage of his disciples meditating. Yes, he said, but first *you* must meditate. He wasn’t talking about a quick *namaste* and a couple of mumbled koans. He meant sitting for two full days. So I took him up on his challenge. I sat on the floor meditating until my back stiffened, joints ached and muscles cramped. It was physical and psychological torture—a hell I will never forget. But by the end of the second day something really had changed. The monk had forced a painful interruption in my soft routine, and I emerged humbled, thankful and, for a few hours, euphoric. Maybe only when you’re shoved into a new pattern of behavior and make the commitment not to back out—when your hand is held to the fire or you hold your own hand to the fire—do the real gains come. When the trance is interrupted, you catch a brief, tantalizing glimpse of the way life could be.

What does this have to do with revolution and culture jamming? Everything. Interrupting the stupefyingly comfortable patterns we’ve fallen into isn’t pleasant or easy. It’s like crawling out of your warm bed in your dark room one December morning at five A.M. and plunging into a tub of ice water. It shocks the system. But sometimes shock is what a system needs. It’s certainly what our bloated, self-absorbed consumer culture needs.

Culture jamming is, at root, just a metaphor for stopping the flow of spectacle long enough to adjust your set. Stopping the flow relies on an element of surprise. That’s why a Zen master may suddenly throw you a wildly cryptic, inappropriate, even obscene answer to your harmless query. He might answer your question by removing his shoe and placing it on top of his head, or throwing it at you, or telling you that if you meet Buddha on the road you must kill him. The Zen master is trying to break your trance. He’s showing you a new path to the waterfall. Debord called this kind of thing “breaking the old syntax,” and replacing it with a new one. The new syntax carries the instructions for “a whole new way of being in the world.”

What does the perceptual shift feel like when it comes? Imagine a desperately down-and-out soul who suddenly finds God. Now try to imagine the *opposite* of that process. This moment of reckoning is not so much like suddenly seeing heaven in a world you thought was hell as it is suddenly seeing hell in a world you thought was heaven. That world is the world of summer blockbusters and \$5 lattes and Super Bowls in which a thirty-second ad slot sells for \$1.5 million—the spectacular world of the American dream, a world you were raised to believe was the best of all worlds, but a world that collapses under scrutiny. If you stare at your reflection in the mirror long enough, your face becomes a monster’s face, with enormous sunken gargoyle eyes.

In the 1998 film *The Truman Show*, a corporation adopts Truman Burbank at birth, then carefully scripts a whirl of product placement and impression management into his life, which is televised live, twenty-four hours a day. The only time Truman upsets that managed order, when he catches a glimpse of the real world behind his scripted

life, is when he does something spontaneous. Slowly, he comes to realize that only a chain of spontaneous acts will lead to salvation. The culture jammer is seized by a similar sense of urgency to do something, anything, to escape the consumerist script.

Buddhist mythology tells the tale of Buddha's enlightenment. In the beginning Buddha is a plump, rich fellow living in an opulent palace. Occasionally, on his walks around the grounds, he spies, through fissures in the palace walls, the world of suffering, pain and disease. He is repulsed, but also mesmerized. Eventually, he decides to leave the palace and live in that real world. There's a lesson here for jammers about how to snap the First World out of its media-consumer trance. Each time the flow of images and information is interrupted—by any spontaneous, individual act, or any act of mass-media *détournement*—it's like the Buddha catching a glimpse through the palace wall. Over time—say five or ten years—the glimpses add up to a fairly detailed picture of life outside the palace.

If enough people saw the light and undertook spontaneous acts at once, the Situationists believed, the result would be a mass awakening that would suddenly devalue the currency of the spectacle. "The *détournement* of the right sign, in the right place at the right time, could spark a mass reversal of perspective," Greil Marcus said. Suddenly, the spectacle would be exposed in all its emptiness. Everyone would see through it.

This is how the spell is broken. This is how the revolution begins: A few people start slipping out of old patterns, daydreaming, questioning, rebelling. What happens naturally then, the Situationists believed, is a groundswell of support for this new way of being, with more and more people empowered to perform new gestures "unencumbered by history." The new generation, the Situationists believed, "would leave nothing to chance."

Those words still haunt us. The society of spectacle has triumphed. The American dream has devolved into exactly the vacant obliviousness they talked about—a have-a-nice-day kind of happiness that close examination tends to disturb. If you keep up appearances, keep yourself

diverted with new acquisitions and constant entertainments, keep yourself pharmacologized and recoil the moment you feel real life seeping in between the cracks, you'll be all right.

Some dream.

If the old American dream was about prosperity, maybe the new one will be about spontaneity.

The Situationists maintained that ordinary people have all the tools they need for revolution. The only thing missing is a perceptual shift—a tantalizing glimpse of a new way of being—that suddenly brings everything into focus.

Spring

- 99 "The Revolutionary Impulse" The primary inspiration for this chapter and the Situationist strain throughout this book came from: Greil Marcus, *Lipstick Traces—A Secret History of the Twentieth Century* (Harvard University Press, 1989); Len Bracken, *Guy Debord—Revolutionary* (Feral House, 1997); Guy Debord, *Comments on the Society of Spectacle* (Verso, 1990); *Situationist International Anthology*, edited and translated by Ken Knabb (Bureau of Public Secrets, 1981); Raul Vaneigem, *The Revolution of Everyday Life* (Rebel Press/Left Bank Books, 1994); Guy Debord, *The Society of Spectacle* (Zone Books, 1994), Simon Sadler, *The Situationist City* (The MIT Press, 1998) and Sadie Plant, *The Most Radical Gesture* (Routledge, 1992). Start your journey with Marcus or Plant and then move on to some of the original Situationist texts in Knabb's anthology. See Ken Knabb's website: <www.slip.net/~knabb> for a few Situationist texts.
- 99 "one word of truth sounds like a pistol shot." Czeslaw Milosz, in his acceptance speech for the 1980 Nobel Prize for literature.
- 101 "putting switches on the street lamps . . ." the Lettrist International, quoted by Greil Marcus, *Lipstick Traces—A Secret History of the Twentieth Century* (Harvard University Press, 1989), page 411.
- 101 "a moral, poetic, erotic, and almost spiritual refusal' to cooperate with the demands of commodity exchange." Sadie Plant, *The Most Radical Gesture* (Routledge, 1992), page 8.
- 101 "the 'spectacle' of modern life." Guy Debord, *The Society of Spectacle* (Zone Books, 1994). Originally published in France as *La société du spectacle* (Buchet-Chastel, 1967).
- 102 On "dérive," see Guy Debord, "Theory of the Derive," Knabb, page 50. See also Bracken, page 66; Marcus, pages 168, 170; and Plant, pages 58–59.
- 102 For one of the most striking Situationist texts on the subject of cities and *dérive*, see Ivan Chtcheglov, "Formulary for a New Urbanism," 1953, in *Situationist International Anthology*, edited and translated by Ken Knabb (Bureau of Public Secrets, 1981). I first read "Formulary for a New Urbanism" at: <www.slip.net/~knabb>.
- 102 "locomotion without a goal." Plant, page 58.
- 103 On "playful creation" of "situations," see Guy Debord, "Report on the Construction of Situations and on the International Situationist Tendency's Conditions of Organization and Action," Knabb, pages 17–25.

- 103 On "détournement" see Guy Debord and Gil J. Wolman, "Methods of Détournement," Knabb, page 8; "Détournement as Negation and Prelude," Knabb, page 55; Plant, pages 86–89; and Marcus, pages 168, 170, 179, 372.
- 103 "radically reinterpreting world events such as the 1965 riots in Los Angeles . . ." See "The Decline and Fall of the Spectacle-Commodity Economy," *Internationale Situationniste* #10, March 1966, Knabb, pages 153–160.
- 103 "a famous drawing of Lenin . . ." See a picture of this drawing in Bracken, page 64.
- 103 "the deadly diversion of the force of life in favor of an empty heaven . . ."; "God is dead . . ." For a full translation of this sermon, see Bracken, pages 10–11.
- 103 "devalue the currency of the spectacle." Marcus, page 179.
- 104 "a gigantic turning around of the existing social world." Plant, page 89.
- 104 "Even the tiniest of gestures . . ." Plant, page 67.
- 104 "a new poetry of real experience and a reinvention of life are bound to spring." Raul Vaneigem, *The Revolution of Everyday Life* (Rebel Press/Left Bank Books, 1994), quoted by Plant, page 67.
- 104 "the citizens of the most advanced societies on earth, thrilled to watch whatever it is they're given to watch." Marcus, page 99.
- 105 "provisional and lived." The Situationists, quoted by Marcus, page 175.
- 105 "the "bizarre" quarter, the "sinister" quarter, the "tragic" quarter . . ." Ivan Chtcheglov, in Knabb, page 1.
- 105 "I wrote much less than most people who write, but drank much more than most people who drink." See Bracken, page viii.
- 105 "our kind will be the first to blaze a trail into a new life." Karl Marx, adopted by Guy Debord, and quoted by Marcus, page 185.
- 105 "believe in faster trains and more traffic . . ." L.T.C. Rolt, *High Horse Riderless* (G. Allen & Unwin, 1947).
- 106 "Generations of poets, prophets, and revolutionaries, not to mention lovers, drug-takers . . ." Plant, page 39.

- 108 "The détournement of the right sign, in the right place at the right time . . ." Marcus, page 179.
- 108 "would leave nothing to chance." Gil Wolman, quoted by Marcus, page 358.
- 112 "*fin de millénium* atmosphere of postmodernity." Plant, page 5.
- 114 "Establishment and Resistance in one convenient package." Tom Frank, *Commodify Your Dissent: Salvoes from the Baffler* (Norton, 1977), page 35.
- 114 Juliet B. Schor, *The Overspent American—Upscaling, Downshifting, and the New Consumer* (Basic Books, 1998).
- 114 Hal Niedzviecki, "Are We Really Depressed?—Introducing Malaise Culture," *Broken Pencil*, Issue 5, November 1997, page 14.
- 118 "Allen Ginsberg, who found that . . ." Rick Salutin, *The Globe and Mail*, May 16, 1997, page C1.
- 119 "Project Censored." Sonoma State University, <http://censored.sonoma.edu/ProjectCensored/>.
- 119 "Lewis Lapham . . . steadfastly refused to be drawn into the debate." The invitation to debate "the ethical and moral ramifications of running tobacco ads" came in an open letter to Lewis H. Lapham in *Adbusters*, Summer 1994, page 79. Lapham's first "response" appeared in *Adbusters*, Winter 1995, page 91. Then, "The Ball's in Your Court Now Lewis," *Adbusters*, Summer 1995, page 62. Lapham's second "response" appeared in *Adbusters*, Fall 1995, page 5, and his comments to *The Globe and Mail*, in *Adbusters*, Winter 1995, page 5. Further thrusts and parries in *Adbusters*, Spring 1996.
- 121 "a ruthless criticism of all that exists." Karl Marx, 1843, adopted by the Situationists, and quoted by Marcus, page 175.
- 121 "We will wreck this world." *Internationale Situationniste* #1, June 1958, quoted by Marcus, page 175.
- 123 "The Meme Wars." The title of this chapter is taken from Kalle Lasn, "The Meme Wars," *Adbusters*, Autumn 1998, pages 6 and 7.
- 123 The word "meme" was coined by evolutionary biologist Richard Dawkins in *The Selfish Gene* (Oxford University Press, 1976). Derived from a Greek root meaning "to imitate," the word describes how memes mimic the

behavior of genes, propagating not body to body but "by leaping from brain to brain."

- 123 The term "meme warfare" was coined by Paul Spinrad in *Adbusters*, Winter 1995, page 40.
- 123 "a guerrilla information war." Marshall McLuhan, *Culture Is Our Business* (Ballantine Books, 1970), page 66.
- 130 *Limits to Growth*, Donella Meadows, Dennis L. Meadows, Jorgen Randers, William W. Behrens III et al. (Universe Books, 1972).
- 130 "The manager of a housing co-op was . . ." I first read this story in an article titled "Places to Intervene in a System," by Donella Meadows, in *Whole Earth*, Winter 1997, page 82.

Summer

Many of the activist strategies in this part were originally published in *Adbusters*, *Blueprint for a Revolution* issue, Autumn 1998, and subsequent issues.

- 139 "Whadd'ya got?" Marlon Brando in *The Wild One*, 1954, directed by László Benedek.
- 140 "slave component." Sadie Plant, *zeroes + ones: digital women + the new technoculture* (Fourth Estate, 1997), page 4.
- 143 "Lying is the major form of human stress . . ." Brad Blanton, *Radical Honesty* (Dell, 1996), page xxv (preface).
- 145 "Sovereign people do not beg of, or negotiate with subordinate entities . . ." "When a subordinate entity violates . . ." Richard Grossman, "The Relationship of Humans to Corporations," an article he submitted to *Adbusters* in February 1997.
- 149 "Marshall McLuhan's World War III . . ." See Marshall McLuhan, *Culture Is Our Business* (Ballantine Books, 1970), page 66.
- 150 "Reframe Debates." This section was inspired by a story that Paul Cienfuegos, founding director, Democracy Unlimited of Humboldt County, told me circa May 1997.