



each other. Guerrillamarketing.it was born as a cultural jamming collective acting as an advertising agency, because it wanted to avoid the reassuring mainstream representation where any radical action is made by a group of radicals. Our actions focused on advertising and brand communication. Showing ourselves as an advertising agency was our way to be disturbing. One of our claims was "Fuck the market to enter into it". We had an accelerationist logic, with the goal to develop capitalist contradictions. Our clear goal was to get paid by Mc Donalds to burn its own restaurants. But the absurd thing was that McDonalds called us for real. First small Italian companies, then big multinationals like MTV began to ask for our partnership. The more we were subversive, the more job offers we were getting. When we were working for the companies, we tried to keep the same approach, we were guaranteeing us an income and we reinvested the profits in cultural jamming actions. Obviously it wasn't easy and the project ended. In the meanwhile we got some real skills in the advertising field. Kook Artgency is a result of this. Despite being a more traditional agency, I was able to engage the people I work with on alternative projects.

**Advertising and its most effective mechanisms were also part of a few other works of yours. From the clamorous 'pornomarketing' or 'esproprioletari.com', to the Ballardian 'Crashvertise' and 'Telepathy Advertising', you embodied the classic**

**marketing campaign schemes in taboo or scientifically questionable territories, conceptually mining its own credibility. In your opinion, will these taboos start to vanish over the years as predicted in some dystopic science fiction novels? Or they will just be replaced by other taboos?**

I think the line has moved on. Let's take the case of pornomarketing.com. It's a website where we collected a lot of porno images where some brands of commercial products casually appear. The precondition is paying the amateur porno-exhibitionists to make product placements. On the site the images are archived according to product categories of the products being advertised: beverages, motors, cosmetics, there are brands like CocaCola, Honda, Starbucks too. We had the idea to highlight the mechanism of the extractive capitalism on a borderline ground such as pornography. We showed that the spontaneous behaviours become commodities and we suggested the need to empower through brand renegotiation: from consumers to workers. We had already done something like that some while before, more simply and directly with a t-shirt with the tag "Available Space", like it was an unsold billboard, where we invited the consumers to be paid to wear the clothes. Pornomarketing was also a tool to mean that the multinationals might not have any ethical scruple when they need to advertise a product. At the Brandcameo 2006 Award the project got a special mention. At that time we got this mention as a joke from the organizers, but if you look at the site now it's hard not to think that behind there wouldn't be any start up idea. The projects you mention shared the same goal to take to extremes the logic of capitalist communication to reveal the contradictions, but capitalism is able to go beyond many contradictions. Well, it's true we still don't see the CocaCola ads on the porno sites and CBS refused to broadcast a Pornhub spot during the SuperBowl, but this distance is gradually getting smaller. Small companies start to sell non-porn products and, sooner or later, they may influence the bigger ones to do the same. We don't know if this scenario is compatible with neoliberalism logics, but we

have to accept the result, no matter what it might be.

**The very controversial 'Where-Next?' (developed together with Molleindustria) stirred up a lot of reaction in 2005, inviting people to bet on the next terrorist attack, after the ones in London and Madrid and the consequent marketing of fear by media. After more than a decade, do you think that the articulation of propaganda in the media has changed, or that after 9/11 it has essentially remained stable and of the same kind?**

Where-next had an enormous and special impact too. We released it on September 11th 2005, and immediately articles about it were published all over the world, except the United States, despite a main part of the website traffic originating from there. Ebay immediately stopped the auction where we put on sale the banner on the website (a skyscraper format with the image of the twin towers), the offers in few minutes had got to one thousand Euros. The online betting Bwin warned us to change the logo, very similar to their own one. We also had some problems with Google maps, but this soon got fixed. Well, we immediately got the feeling we touched an uncovered nerve. All the media attacked the cynicism of the action, the only one who tried to deepen the reasons with an interview was the Jerusalem Post. We wanted to communicate the disconnection between the historical-political reasons of terrorist attacks and the media hype the attacks generated. The welcome page stated: "Are you sick of betting only on Nasdaq, on the oil price, or on football games? How about betting on where the next terrorist attack is gonna take place? From now on, you'll be able to do so! Just like capitalism bets on your own life". Where-next rode the boom of the new economy and the commercial explosion of the on-line betting, even if the prize was only a t-shirt with just the tag "I predicted". Actually what Where-next did was creating a real map of the terror perceived. This map in the end was not too different from the one the Ministry of Defence of the United States wanted to make with the Policy Analysis Market, a terror map based on the analysis of