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In this special issue of Third Text, ‘Whither Tactical Media?’, Gene Ray and Gregory Sholette extend a series of questions concerning the historical obsolescence, future survival or revolutionary sublation of tactical media, refracting it through the distinction drawn by Michel De Certeau between the ephemeral, contingent and opportunistic temporality of tactics – ‘the art of the weak’ – and the long-term vision, large-scale planning and cognitive security associated with the realm of strategies. While Ray and Sholette appreciate tactical media for having kept some spark of resistance alive during the dark days prior to the aurora of Seattle, they also warn that at present the tactical orientation – clearly the privileged term for De Certeau – is dangerously close to a post-1968 ‘liberalism’ which would concern itself with either easily assailable intra-systemic shocks and subversions, or what Ray dismissively calls in his own article ‘begging those in power for reforms and accountability’.

Eviscerated of the authentically ‘anti-systemic’ project of the Situationists from which De Certeau loosely derives his post-1968 theory of tactics, this weak – if not farcical – liberalism is especially dangerous, according to Ray and Sholette, at a world-historical moment in which ‘we are witnessing the return of the strategic with a vengeance’. For the editors, the latter is exemplified by ‘the long-term planning by institutionally entrenched conservative movements’, provoking them to ask whether ‘it is necessary for anti-capitalists to move in the direction of sustainability and confederacy, even if that demands a degree of institutionalisation abhorred by adherents of tactical media?’.

Among other things, my response to this question will aim to complicate, if not displace altogether, the putative cultural-political agenda of ‘anti-capitalism’ the authors presume to be shared by theorists and practitioners of tactical media, especially if such an agenda is possessed by fantasies of revolutionary violence such as that conjured by Ray at the conclusion of his recent Third Text essay ‘Avant-Gardes as Anti-Capitalist Vector’:
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De-reification hovers in the daily images of global governance: robocops with riot sticks and shields, streets filled to bursting, cars in flames. The message circulating, whispering behind the chatter of talking heads: perpetual war and ‘common ruin’ are not immovable fate, encore un effort. After the dissolvent of the negative, after the rupture, would begin the time of free creation.³

Yet while I take a distance from both the monumental iconography and the eschatological rhetoric of such a neo-Situationist position, I am nevertheless sympathetic to certain of the problems laid out by Ray and Sholette in their editorial prospectus, especially those concerned with the terms ‘long-term planning’ and ‘sustainability’. Exposing the editor’s terms to a certain tactical détournement, I will argue that they are most productively considered by those interested in the fate of tactical media not only in relation to the neo-conservative idealists who advocated the invasion of Iraq, nor even the orthodox market-fundamentalism established during the Clinton era, both of which have been ideologically discredited to various degrees by moderates and liberals in the US public sphere from Jimmy Carter to George Soros to Joseph Stiglitz; Rather, I want to consider the editors’ question ‘whither tactical media?’ in relation to an urgent historical development of the past three years that goes unremarked by Ray and Sholette: the unprecedented ascendancy and legitimisation of certain environmentalist discourses among key factions of the global elite, with the issue of climate change as the centrepiece of what Wired magazine recently celebrated – with a certain terminological amnesia – as the ‘New Green Revolution’ crystallising around Al Gore and his high-profile Hollywood film An Inconvenient Truth (2006).⁴

The imperative precariously shared by this emergent coalition of celebrities, policy-makers, executives, intellectuals, designers, technologists and non-governmental activists in their bids to legitimise their various and often conflicting agendas is ‘sustainability’, a concept derived from the UNDP’s definition in the Our Common Future report for ‘development that meets the needs of present generations without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own’ and subsequently adopted by the 1992 UN Earth Summit in Rio De Janeiro.⁵

Etymologically, sustainability suggests the creation of regular conditions for holding up or holding onto the long-term viability or health of an entity that would be precarious or impossible on its own; translated into ethical terms, this sense of a life-support system opens onto an economy of intergenerational responsibility that links bio-ecological survival on the one hand with socioeconomic durability on the other. The political question, of course, is who or what is to be sustained, and on whose or what’s terms.⁶ As I will argue, it is through engaging the contested discursive terrain of sustainability, understood as a long-term intergenerational imperative concerned programatically with ‘environment, economy, equity, and education’, that I believe theorists and practitioners of tactical media will find the conditions for the survival, if not flourishing, of tactical media itself.⁷

Despite this apparent opposition between the strong, strategic claims increasingly made by the various advocates of sustainability and the weak, provisional and ephemeral nature of tactical media, I will argue that these two terms constitute not a binary opposition but an aporetic couple in which each term requires the other for its own precarious
survival. To put it another way, any project of long-term sustainability worthy of the name is unsustainable without a certain exposure to the disruptive temporality and unauthorised demands of tactical media. Without a certain encounter with the long-term imperative of sustainability, tactical media risks either (a) relishing its own small-scale ‘molecular shocks’ for their own sake, a crucial concern sounded by Ray and Sholette or (b) reducing itself to a mere way-station to a messianic anti-capitalist event that, from what I can tell from the discourse of its advocates in the cultural-artistic sphere, remains relatively alien to the techniques, claims and sensibilities of non-governmental activists actually working to challenge or mitigate contemporary modes of governmental and corporate power under the umbrella of ‘Another World is Possible’ (a group that I think should be respectfully distinguished from – which is not to say set against – para-academic cultural critics such as Ray, Sholette, and myself). My contention is that if tactical media can be carefully re-articulated as a critical supplement to the discourses of sustainability, then the terms, techniques and temporalities of tactical media can be affirmed in their own right without having to be judged in relation to an eventual, mythic telos of anti-capitalist cultural revolution. Further, tactical media might thus be re-imagined as a term not only for complicating anachronistic forms of leftist cultural politics but also, more importantly, for challenging and if possible re-directing the self-consciously ‘revolutionary’ aspirations of neo-green elites. Articulating a credible and productive challenge to the latter is a task that requires us to rethink the ‘anti-systemic’ ideology that has been relatively easy for many left-oriented cultural producers to assume vis-à-vis the increasingly vulnerable hegemony of neocorporativism, as well as the neoliberal market-fundamentalism enshrined under the Clinton administration.

A first point to make in considering how theorists and practitioners of tactical media might approach the emergent ‘neo-green’ horizon is that it is clearly dangerous to uncritically accept the premise of novelty and renewal implied by the prefix ‘Neo’, as if environmentalist discourse in general had somehow become stagnant or obsolete prior to the messianic arrival of citizen Gore, his high-profile film, and the elaborate media architecture surrounding it, including the star-studded globally coordinated Live Earth concerts of 2007. Indeed, quite the opposite is the case if one considers the proliferation of non-governmental ecological activism in the north and south alike since the 1992 Rio summit at which the empty philosophical principle of sustainability was simultaneously formalised and exposed to new forms of biopolitical conflict. However, it is true that this proliferation has occurred at a relatively low level of visibility in the public sphere and electoral politics, at least in the United States; as Ted Nordhaus and Michael Shellenberger charged in their influential 2005 report ‘The Death of Environmentalism’ this lack of general visibility arguably falls on the shoulders of the large, well-financed environmental NGOs that have devoted the majority of their resources to technical policy prescriptions and legislative consultation without developing the cultural and mediatic means to capture the hearts and minds of a broad-based public for whom environmental issues could become a principle of passionate political identification. In a way that Ray and Sholette might appreciate, albeit from a more ‘mainstream’ ideological orientation, Nordhaus called for environmentalists to

construct what he called a ‘strategic vision’ that would ‘tap into the creative worlds of myth-making... not to better sell technical policy proposals but to figure out who we are and who we need to be’.9

In its mythopoetic thematisation of what Gore calls ‘the survival of our civilisation and the habitability of the planet’, An Inconvenient Truth in many ways fits the bill of what Nordhaus called for in his report – but it also speaks to a certain weakness in the latter’s hegemonic project. While in the report Nordhaus specifies the general social-democratic programme with which he argues environmentalism needs to link itself for its own survival, he also failed to maintain a space for politico-ideological dispute surrounding the identity of the mythic ‘we’ to which a newly energetic left-liberal eco-populism might address its aesthetic or cultural repertoire. Nordhaus himself cannot be blamed for the relative political emptiness of the sustainability imperative as articulated by An Inconvenient Truth; but his failure to account for intra-environmentalist antagonism leaves the door open for a major cultural event such as the Gore film to be claimed by an emergent strand of techno-utopian environmentalist tendencies such as that of Wired magazine, which is in fact where the catchphrase ‘neo-green’ was first coined in a special issue devoted to Gore; the same issue also happens to feature a fluff-piece on Nordhaus himself that reduces his agenda to wind farms and hybrid cars.

Indeed, whatever its potential interest for tactical media, it is immediately important to recognise that the dominant iterations of the neo-green agenda self-consciously distance themselves from anything that would smack of leftist, anti-capitalism or any kind of outmoded ideological extremism whatsoever, especially as embodied by the insidiously reductive stereotype of the technophobic, misanthropic, scarcity-obsessed, fashion-challenged doomsayer of the ‘old’ environmentalism:

You don’t change the world by hiding in the woods, wearing a hair shirt, or buying indulgences in the form of Save the Earth bumper stickers. You do it by articulating a vision for the future and pursuing it with all the ingenuity humanity can muster. Indeed, being green at the start of the twenty-first century requires a wholehearted commitment to upgrading civilisation.10

As the verb ‘upgrade’ suggests, the Wired iteration of the neo-Green agenda looks to technological design for the prime solutions to environmental crisis, belying its indebtedness to 1960s techno-utopians such as Marshall McLuhan, Buckminster Fuller and eventual Wired contributor Stewart Brand, who saw ecology and technology as complimentary rather than opposing forces in the evolutionary achievement of what was ultimately a post-political self-regulating planetary equilibrium.11 Combining elements of this earlier eco-futurism with the mid-1990s market-populist digital euphoria for which the magazine would become infamous among net.culture critics, the special neo-green issue of Wired declares ‘technology is leading environmentalism out of the anti-business, anti-consumer wilderness’, and breathlessly announces that:

... a new green movement is taking shape, one that embraces environmentalism’s concerns but rejects its worn-out answers. Technology can be a font of endlessly creative solutions. Business can be a vehicle for change. Prosperity can help build the kind of world we want. Scientific exploration, innovative design, and cultural evolution are the most
powerful tools we have. Entrepreneurial zeal and market forces, guided by sustainable policies, can propel the world into a bright green future.  

*Wired* neglects to elaborate on the million-dollar question of what ‘sustainable policies’ would actually entail in relation to the generically market-oriented account of eco-capitalism underpinning the magazine’s version of the neo-green project, and is eager to elaborate on the role played by ‘innovative design’ and ‘cultural evolution’ in the overall process of civilisational ‘upgrading’. For *Wired*, the ‘bright green future’ now on the horizon is populated by self-described ‘eco-chic’ and ‘ecoradical urban hipsters’, as opposed to hippies, who, with ‘solar panels on the roof, hybrid car in the garage, organic-cotton clothes in the closet’ are ‘voting with their dollars’ in the form of both consumption and investment in an emergent green–industrial complex informed by eco-economic paradigms such as ‘natural capital’, ‘carbon footprint analysis’, ‘cradle-to-cradle manufacturing’ and ‘sustainable design’.  

As suggested by the inclusion of sections such as a self-administered ‘Carbon Quiz’ and a ‘12-Step Program to Kick the Carbon Habit at Home’, a key factor in this emergent movement, according to *Wired*, is thus interpellation of a consumer-base that is simultaneously morally conscious about topics such as the global impact of their personal carbon emissions and aesthetically, practically and stylistically invested in the products and technologies made available to suit their morally affected desires.  

Thus, *fashion, media* and *marketing* are among the crucial ‘cultural’ elements of the version of the neo-green project put forward not only by *Wired*, but also, significantly, *Vanity Fair*, which ran a simultaneous cover story on ‘Al Gore and the New American Revolution’. Accordingly, these sectors provide one important place for members of the ‘creative class’ addressed by *Wired* and the Hollywood liberal elite addressed by *Vanity Fair* to contribute their respective forms of expertise in synergising the technologies, initiatives, ideas and images pertaining to the neo-green agenda for a broader, less elite and less specialised mass audience of potential consumer-citizens: a veritable cultural front for a post- *Inconvenient Truth* ‘ecology of affluence’, to use Ramachandra Guha’s term.  

Here it is worth mentioning *WorldChanging: A User’s Guide for the 21st Century*, a dynamically designed six-hundred-page encyclopaedic ‘directory’ of contemporary ecological technologies, concepts, business models, movements and resources addressed to fashion-conscious consumer-citizens in the global north. With prefaces by Al Gore and the ‘green design’ impresario Bruce Sterling, who first introduced the neo-green agenda to readers of *Artforum* in 2006, *WorldChanging* embodies a kind of hybrid genre located somewhere between the eco-voluntarist imperatives of *The Whole Earth Catalogue* of the early 1970s and the politicised tactics outlined in Nato Thompson and Gregory Sholette’s *The Interventionists: Users’ Manual for the Creative Disruption of Everyday Life*. Modelled on the open-source and multi-authorial ethos program of the worldchanging.org website on which it is based, this anthology uneasily constellates everything from carbon-footprint analysis to green building techniques, to green venture capital, to sustainable urban planning, organic farming, and eco-tourism programmes in the global south. A highly significant feature of the anthology for the present is the seventy-page section entitled ‘Politics’, which provides an impressively documented and annotated survey of concepts such as

---


movement-building, network organising, corporate monitoring, media campaigning, and even the typically left-wing discourse of ‘direct action’, including an entry on the civil disobedience techniques of the Ruckus Society and the Yes Men’s 2002 Bhopal project.

Yet in cautiously engaging a phenomenon such as WorldChanging, it is more important than ever to remain vigilant about the potential subsumption of groups such as the Yes Men into an indifferently pluralistic landscape of lifestyle options for what Wired celebrates as ‘eco-chic hipsters’. This is a serious risk given that, despite its many promising entries on politics, culture and activism, the overall programme of the massive WorldChanging volume remains by and large informed by the premises of Wired, whose model of environmentalism ultimately looks to technological innovation, consumer desire and corporate voluntarism – rather than political mobilisation, public planning and governmental regulation – as the primary solution to ecological degradation.

A familiar response to a project such as WorldChanging on the part of Marxists – especially those working in cultural fields marked by a neo-Situationist renaissance – would be to echo Heather Rogers’s critique of the ways in which ‘green commerce’ ‘reinforces the long-standing tendency of mainstream environmentalism to treat the ecological crisis as something separate from the economic system from which it arises’, and ‘draws energy away from the struggle required to secure real political solutions’. In this scenario:

... people are induced to accept individual, personal responsibility for cleaning up the environment and are lulled into a sense of complacency by the idea that they are actually doing something effective.15

While Rogers’s call for a ‘systemic’ critique of neo-green phenomena is ultimately indispensable, the impulse to demystify so-called mainstream environmentalism can prove counter-productive if it paints us into a corner of fundamentally opposing the consumers, corporations or governments involved therein as such, rather than using all available means to challenge, mitigate or hold them accountable for the specific practices regarded by activists as intolerable from the perspective of social justice, ecological sustainability and human rights.

As a concluding example that speaks to the possibilities and limitations of an environmentalism in which neo-green consumer subjectivity plays a key role, let us consider Green My Apple, a tactical media initiative by Greenpeace which happens to concern itself with Rogers’s own area of expertise: the transnational political economy of garbage.16 Green My Apple was launched in 2006 as a multi-sited and multi-faceted campaign that targets the Apple corporation’s use of several highly toxic chemicals in its computer hardware.17 After their often short lives as consumer objects, many used computer products make their way into the unevenly regulated circuits of global waste-management, and ultimately into massive dumps of e-waste in Asia and Africa. Such dumps are the sites of informal work for e-scavengers, often children, who strip exhausted electronics of their valuable metal components for resale on the black market. In addition to exposing local populations to water and soil contamination, these e-dumps expose those who work there to direct manual contact with the hazardous substances in question, resulting in often deadly physiological effects across entire communities that are already underserved by healthcare infrastructures and formal employment systems.


16 Heather Rogers, Gone Tomorrow: The Hidden Life of Garbage, New Press, New York, 2005

17 http://www.greenmyapple.org/
The Green My Apple campaign seeks to bring into visibility the chain of accountability involved in the generation of such ‘effluents of affluence’ and demands that the corporation eliminate the use of the toxic chemicals in its production process as a first step in making Apple the exemplary spearhead of a ‘sustainable electronics industry’. This industry has hitherto been relatively successful in framing itself as ‘clean’ when compared with, say, the non-renewable energy sector. As Soenke Zehle has noted, this is an ideological accomplishment related in no small part to the imaginary of digital dematerialisation shared by both dot-com capitalists and many net.culture participants over the past decade and a half – a charge that contaminates the latter’s enthusiastic calls for ‘an environmentalism of the net’ with what Sehle calls ‘the ecopolitical implications of the very infrastructures that facilitate and sustain the net.cultural dynamic of collaborative creation’. Indeed, as the possessive first-person pronoun of the campaign suggests, Green My Apple is addressed primarily to a public of Apple users composed largely of what the market-populist booster Richard Florida celebrates as the ‘creative class’ – a figure of creative, flexible work exemplified by the urban, hip and scruffy spokesman who appears in Apple commercials as the polar opposite of the pathetic and uptight corporate number-cruncher made to stand in for PC users.

In this regard, the campaign unabashedly makes tactical use of an affectively potent consumerist brand-identification with the entity whose mode of governing it aims to pressure, rather than opposing or denouncing that entity \textit{tout court} in the way that many liberal-left Apple users themselves are probably wont to do with regard to a near-universally reviled corporation such as Halliburton. The specificity of the public addressed by the campaign is indicated by the conceptual and formal organisation of the campaign’s website, www.greenmyapple.com, which self-consciously mimics the layout, icons and typography of the Apple site itself – an ‘adbusting’ technique clearly indebted to the innovations made by the Yes Men and others in the late 1990s. More specifically, an important feature of the site is the ProCreation interface; marked by the iconic bodily silhouettes of the IPod advertisements, this interface calls upon ‘Apple fans’ to personally design their own counter-publicity materials for the campaign including T-shirts, desktop wallpaper, videos, letters to CEO Steve Job and, significantly, a set of photographs of children working in Asian e-dumps that are offered up for what is called in a classic post-Debordian phrase ‘repurposing’ by concerned consumer-citizens.

Another facet of the campaign that also indicates a certain link to the genealogy of tactical media is the site-specific architectural intervention made by Greenpeace activists at the Apple flagship store in New York City. A street-level glass cube leads to an underground emporium, which has been celebrated for the way in which its crystalline transparency mediates between its public urban surroundings and the virtual spaces enabled by the computer products on sale within the store. The intervention consisted of a nocturnal projection onto the building’s vitreous façade of two alternating images. The first was a close-up shot of electronic detritus, implicating the seductively immaterial structure within a global network of material waste-products and ecologically harmful pollution-flows. A Wodiczko-style imageric-architectural collage speaking to the disavowed conflicts and exclusions haunting the spectacular spaces of the city that resonates with De Certeau’s remark that ‘a tactic

boldly juxtaposes diverse elements in order to suddenly produce a flash shedding different light on the language of a place and to strike the hearer. Yet such an antagonistic remarking of the structure was not treated as an interruptive end in and of itself; the second image projected was the green-collared iteration of the Apple logo framing the campaign’s website, a future-oriented dream-image addressed mediatically to executives, shareholders and consumers alike demanding that Apple become an exemplar of the ‘sustainable’ practices advocated in principle by the corporation’s most famous board member, Al Gore himself.

On 2 May 2007, the campaign appeared to have accomplished a provisional victory: the official Apple website actually adopted the Green My Apple icon as a link to a ‘Greener Apple’ page featuring an open letter by Jobs announcing the corporation’s aspiration to become ‘an environmental leader’ in the electronics industry, and making a very specific pledge to eliminate the toxic chemicals in question from its products, as well as to revamp its global take-back programme. Greenpeace framed the news of the Jobs announcement for campaign participants in the following way:

You’re the consumers of Apple’s products and you’ve proven you can make a real difference. You convinced one of the world’s most cutting edge companies to cut the toxic ingredients out of the products they sell… We’ve seen the enthusiasm with which Apple fans have greeted our campaign to make Apple a green leader. They’ve made clear what they want – an Apple that isn’t just skin-deep green, but green to the core. One that creates products free from the most hazardous chemicals, that they can buy and return with a clear conscience, secure in the knowledge that Apple will re-use or recycle them responsibly and that won’t end up in scrap yards or add to the mountains of e-waste that the electronics industry has created. Apple must begin to address these growing problems to ensure that the workers and children of Asia and many developing
nations no longer face the unnecessary environmental and health dangers posed by the hi-tech industry’s waste. Our work isn’t over till Apple users get that. We look forward to working with the new, greener Apple in the future – toward greening the entire electronics industry… Now let’s take it to the next level! An Apple green to the core!

In order to understand the Green My Apple as something more than a limited if not complicitous instance of what Ray dismissively called, in his critique of tactical media, ‘begging those in power for reforms and accountability’, the temporary campaign must be understood as one node in a long-term, worldwide network of activists working on ‘human rights and the politics of pollution’, especially the anti-toxics movement that has shadowed the global electronics industry over the past decade. While the aesthetically dynamic tactics used in this campaign are relatively innovative in terms of their highly visible appeal to consumer-citizens, the demands made upon Apple by Greenpeace are drawn from the discourse of the organisation’s less well-publicised partners such as the Basel Action Network (http://www.ban.org). BAN is a non-governmental advocacy group named for the 1992 Basel Convention which set up a framework governing the transboundary shipment of toxic waste. In 1995, BAN successfully lobbied to have an amendment added to the treaty that specifically prohibits the export of toxic waste by OECD countries to non-OECD countries and obliges northern states to assume responsibility for the waste generated within their borders. While the amendment has not been officially ratified and thus lacks enforceability at a global scale, it was adopted voluntarily by the EU and incorporated into the Waste Shipment Regulations to which all member states and their domestic corporations are subject.
BAN frames its advocacy in terms of combating ‘toxic trade’, which it sees as intrinsically related to globally uneven dynamics of market deregulation. While it often consults with southern governmental agencies about the necessity of maintaining barriers to the import of waste, the organisation uses the 1995 amendment as a point of reference with which to articulate technical policy issues with a call for a more expansive systemic transformation against which to judge the activities of corporations, states and inter-governmental bodies alike:

We promote the development of production systems and consumption patterns that are environmentally sustainable and socially just. We advocate an equitable distribution of the costs and benefits of change in our struggle for a healthy environment of the planet.24

Given that the neo-green agenda is still in a phase of emergence, it is imperative that practitioners and advocates of tactical media take advantage of this uncertain moment to mark any appeal to the lives of ‘future generations’ with an attention to inherited patterns of exclusion and inequality. In other words, as a project concerned with the rights of the unborn, sustainability is itself unsustainable without also addressing itself to the traces of death, suffering and loss inscribed in the history of capitalism itself.

As De Certeau wrote in The Practice of Everyday Life, ‘The space of a tactic is the space of the other. Thus it must play on and with a terrain imposed on it and organized by the law of a foreign power ... it is a maneuver ... within enemy territory’.25 Bereft of a transcendental autonomy, tactical media practitioners must navigate between the constraints and resistances presented by the governing agencies whose practices they aim to transform, while also remaining vigilant about the capacity of these agencies to internalise non-governmental claims in such a way as to foreclose the potential extension and deepening of the latter into realms hitherto protected from pressure and contestation. Permitting such a foreclosure with either a naive celebration, a new-found corporate social responsibility or a self-satisfied denunciation of corporate villainy still runs the risk of depoliticisation. If left unchecked, the first identifies with the agency in question, taking for granted that the internal ethical conscience of a profit-making machine will lead it to do the right thing for its various stakeholders voluntarily. The second, which I would argue is more pertinent to the discourse of many left-oriented cultural producers, privileges its own supposed exteriority to power, enabling them to assume stances of revolutionary militancy without getting their hands dirty. Tactical media should thus be understood as an endless unsettling of the cherished oppositions between interior cooptation and external resistance, liberal reformists and radical leftists, short-term pragmatism and world-historical vision. In the words of Michel Foucault:

A reform is never anything but the outcome of a process in which there is conflict, confrontation, struggle, resistance... It is a matter of making conflicts more visible, of making them more essential than mere clashes of interest or mere institutional blockages. From these reforms and clashes a new relation of forces must emerge whose temporary profile will be a reform.26

24 ‘About the Basel Action Network’, http:// www.ban.org/main/about_BAN.html#mission
25 De Certeau, The Practice of Everyday Life, op cit, p 37. In a remark that is especially germane to my critique of neo-situationist positions such as that of Gene Ray, Garcia and Lovink echo De Certeau when they write in ABC of Tactical Media that ‘Of course it is much safer to stick to the classic rituals of the underground and alternative scene. But tactical media are based on a principle of flexible response, of working with different coalitions, being able to move between the different entities in the vast media landscape without betraying their original motivations’.