



Cinema as Control 玻璃作為比喻：電影與監控

監控的英文「surveillance」源自法文，字面的意思是「從上看」，帶有控制和有系統的監察的含意。雖然監控的字意與視覺有關，但現代的監控還包括很多其他不同的形式，如電話竊聽、電腦資料採集、生物識別等等。

雖然監控的技術形式眾多，但監控最終主要都是涉及兩方面：偵察與威懾。偵察就是收集有關的情報作不同用途，通常是秘密進行，而威懾就是預先以恐嚇方式阻止某人做某些事情。

威懾之成效往往源於其「可見性」，其中最明顯的例子莫過於閉路電視攝影機。閉路電視攝影機一般都是裝在難以被馬上發現、但也不完全隱閉的地方，讓人們可隱約察覺到它公開的存在。這樣的安排是要提醒公眾，攝影機（或準確點說，攝影機背後的人）無時無刻都在觀察你，無論事實是否如此。簡單而言，攝影機的作用就是要成為威懾的符號，去提醒被觀察的人，你正被觀察。

這一種安排使人無時無刻都自覺有人在看着自己、觀察自己，從而使這一外在的視點成為無處不在的監察力，令監控更有效率又無遠弗屆。攝影機——即監察的技術工具——因而變成一種更廣泛、更強大和更具侵略性的東西。鏡頭的眼睛化成一種凝視，就像沙特（Jean-Paul Sartre）在其著作《存在與虛無》所描繪的「目光」一般。這種內化又強大的凝視與其執行的模式使我們對監察的了解不能單止於當成秘密偷看，還要從更大的社會網絡分析入手。而法國哲學家福柯（Michel Foucault）早在他的著作《規訓與懲罰：監獄的誕生》就通過「全景監獄」這建築比喻，為這種凝視與監控文化提供了詳盡的論述¹。

* * *

監控與電影之間的關係乍看可能並不明顯，尤其是一般的看法就是把前者當作社會控制的工具，而後者則是一種娛樂或藝術形式。實際上，兩者的界線是流動和模糊的。比如在最膚淺的層面，兩者都使用許多類似的技術，如攝影機、電腦視覺程式等等。而且自1990年代開始，監控亦越來越融入不同的大眾娛樂之中。當中MTV的《The Real World》、《Survivor》和《Big Brother》都是一些成功把監控包裝成真人秀節目出現的例子。但監控與電影

兩者之間最深刻和根本的聯繫卻是建基於一種更廣義和無形的凝視之中。這凝視正正是一種關於如何去處理和呈現世界的方法，一種源於現代性的副產品。

與愛迪生和盧米爾兄弟齊名的法國人馬雷（Étienne-Jules Marey），同時亦被視為電影的始祖。馬雷於1880年代發明和不斷改進的時計攝影機是當時原電影攝影機系統（proto-cinematic systems）之中最複雜和最可行的，比愛迪生和盧米爾兄弟的攝影機還要早面世。

馬雷並不如愛迪生和盧米爾般是工業家和企業家，他是一位科學和生理學家。馬雷的專業範疇主要是研究生理功能，尤其是人體運動功能的研究。馬雷對動態的呈現和量度尤其感興趣。換句話說，他的目標是要把一瞬即逝的動作表現和量化出來。為了捕捉這些動作，馬雷需要發明嶄新的方法，因為當時並沒有任何現成的器材可以把時間和動作量化成為數據資料。在這種研究需求和背景下，馬雷發明了一個可以從單一角度快速地連環拍攝照片的時計攝影機，從而可以讓他有系統地用鏡頭凝結一閃即逝的東西。

馬雷的攝影機很大程度上被公認為最早的電影攝影機之一，亦是電影史上的一個里程碑。馬雷創新之處不僅在於他發明了一個實用的工具，而是他採用了一種以電影的方式去探索和理解這世界這一重點上。馬雷的研究是分析性和科學性的。他拍攝的目的是為了客觀的研究和分析，而不是像期後的電影以創意表達和娛樂作主軸。

馬雷所代表的電影傳統，是以電影作為科學探索，而他只是眾多例子的其中一個。這傳統讓我們不只著眼於電影常見的身份，即電影作為一種表達形式，從而幫助我們整理出一個更全面的景象，好讓我們能更認清電影與現代性發展的關係。正如文化理論家卡維特（Lisa Cartwright）在她的著作《掃視身體：尋溯醫學的視覺文化》所言：「電影拍攝工具可以被視作是一種文化技術對人體的紀律和管理……醫學和科學上對身體的分析，與電影作為一種流行文化的制度和技術設備的發展息息相關。」²

馬雷的方法，讓我們知道電影不單只是與觀賞有關，控制亦同樣是其中重要的一環。事實上，我們可以把馬雷的

視野看成為現代凝視（modern gaze）的許多原始實例之一。現代凝視以理性、有組織和客觀的視野取代個人、主觀和短暫的目光，好使我們能夠通過影像產生知識與權力從而掌握並改變這世界。電影的器材把以前只是一瞬的體驗，變成能夠客觀呈現和管理的資料。電影讓我們能捕捉世界、研究世界和控制世界。

電影媒體開拓了新的方式認識世界，這是單靠肉眼所無法達到的方式。這種新媒體的潛質，令許多早期的電影工作者感到無比興奮，如蘇俄著名導演維爾托夫（Dziga Vertov）就在他的「電影眼睛宣言」中，與高采烈地把電影比喻作現代的顯微鏡，一種能展示現實和捕捉生命真諦的科學工具。

這一切都表明電影不僅是單純的技術創新，它同時亦是一種以客觀方法和數據去觀看、組織和呈現世界的嶄新態度。這是一種有組織的凝視，與現代世界其他發展並行。電影在十九世紀發明並不是偶然的巧合。那時代最緊迫的問題正是把所有的東西規範化（如時間、人口、土地、國家）以便交易（資本主義）和控制（殖民主義）。電影把世界變成客觀而物化的片段，以便審查和控制。

若我們把馬雷的電影實驗視為一種處理與世界接軌的特定界面，那就不難整理出我們之前提到與福柯的全景監獄之間的關係。電影和監視的相似之處，正正是通過把視覺理性化和組織化而成為中介，從而規範這世界。

不管我們願意與否，監視已經成為日常生活的一部分，是現代社會中每個公民都要面對的事實。監控已經擴展到各行各業，而且不少人都樂於接受和參與其中。從全球定位系統到智能身份證、生物識別、監控攝像機等，監控系統給予我們一個促進安全、令生活更美好的承諾，實在令人難以抗拒。除了政府之外，市值數十億計的大公司如亞馬遜、谷歌、Facebook等也有興趣了解你、和你的生活方式。監控已經逐漸被接受成為管理的有效和現代方法，用於規範我們的生產、消費和安全。

面對監控這一課題，我們正正被困在方便和控制之間的兩難抉擇。一方面，我們享受現代監控技術所帶來的便利（如車上的全球定位、iPhone上的指紋識別、亞馬遜和谷歌的即時建議等等），同時我們亦越來越擔心因此而損失私隱和自由。

也許相對福柯全景監獄中的囚犯，當今的人對監控可能更有經驗、認知和流動的關係。如果我們要找一個現代建築的比喻來補充福柯的理論，也許我們可以指向俄羅斯科幻作家薩米爾欽（Yevgeny Zamyatin）的《我們》中所描述的玻璃結構。

玻璃的特點是高透明度，內部和外部皆可彼此互見。這也許是我們現代監控社會一個恰當的比喻，因為我們不停地被告誡需要無時無刻地觀察/監察自己（如健康、體重、財政）和與他人的關係。玻璃房子的烏托邦想像正正是無處不在的透明度。但這所玻璃房子的問題，是能見度並非完全對稱。如果我們認真把這比喻放在當今的社會，那麼可以說這玻璃房子的照明控制各有不同。有權力的人操控燈的電源掣。有時他們可關燈，隱藏在黑暗中。更多的時候，他們創造一個背光的情況，讓沒權力的人只看到鬼魅般的黑影，同時為對外能宣稱提供高透明度而沾沾自喜。

在這種背景下，本展覽旨在通過擅於處理這題材的三位國際級藝術家的作品探討監控這議題。Julian Oliver的作品製造介入性的物品和表演，揭露電子通訊的脆弱。Björn Schülke製作奇形怪狀的機械雕塑，玩味監視和介入之間的張力。Adam Harvey設計的「私隱禮品店」，賣時尚而實用的物品作防止監控之用，嘗試把控制權奪回自己手中以回應監控社會。這個題為「玻璃之城」的展覽通過上述這幾個藝術家的作品，探索不同的思考模式和策略，質疑和抗衡我們所處的、日益普及地使用各式監控技術的科技社會。

1 在《規訓與懲罰：監獄的誕生》裡，福柯通過利用英國功利主義哲學家 Jeremy Bentham 於 1787 年設計的有名建築藍圖「全景監獄」，對監控作為普遍和理想化的原則作出了深刻的論述。「全景監獄」——所最終沒有被建成的監獄，設計是一所圓柱形樓宇，監房圍繞着中間的一個崗樓。通過每所監房窗門和燈光的特別安排，讓處於建築中心的獄警可以很容易看到每間監房。這設計的目的，是要把囚犯置於於一種虛無、無所不在和自動的監管之下，就算他們不是真的無時無刻地被監察着。福柯認為這種「全景監獄」，包含了一種「不對稱的可見性」和「凝視的力量」，令監控變成一種普及的原則，為他書內所描述的社會管制作了一個示範性的體現。

2 Lisa Cartwright, *Screening The Body: Tracing Medicine's Visual Culture* (University of Minnesota Press, 1995) 3.

Surveillance, with the word root derived from French meaning to *over watch*, is effectively about control via systematic monitoring. Despite the association with the sense of sight in the original meaning of the word, contemporary practices of surveillance come in many different forms such as telephone tapping, computer data interception, biometrics identification and more.

The technical implementation of surveillance might assume multiple forms but the objectives of surveillance usually come down to two things, namely *detection* and *deterrence*. To detect is to collect and identify intelligence for relevant purpose. Detection usually operates under secrecy whereas to deter is to forestall someone from doing something by injecting fear beforehand.

The effectiveness of deterrence lies in its very "visibility". The most obvious use of deterrence in surveillance can be found in the deployment of CCTV cameras. CCTV cameras are often installed in places that are not immediately noticeable but are never completely hidden, with a hint of their visibility and public presence. The public is being reminded that the cameras (or more precisely, someone behind the cameras) are constantly watching you, be it real or fictitious. In short, the camera functions as a sign of deterrence, i.e. to remind the watched that you are being watched.

By instilling this sense of awareness of the possibility of being watched, it makes the watched internalised a sense of omnipresent watchful-ness, an all-powerful scrutiny from without, thus making surveillance ubiquitous in a more economical manner. The camera, i.e. the specific technical instrument of surveillance, thus becomes something much more general, powerful and invasive. It turns the eyes that are the cameras into a gaze, not unlike the Sartrean Look outlined in Jean-Paul Sartre's *Being and Nothingness*. This internalised all-powerful gaze and its operative modalities also take the understanding of surveillance beyond mere acts of secretive snooping and alleviates it to be a feature of a general framework that can only be viewed through the prism of a much larger social network in which the French philosopher Michel Foucault has written extensively about with reference to Panopticon in *Discipline and Punish: the birth of a prison*.¹

* * *

The relationship between surveillance and cinema might not seem obvious on the very first glance, especially when everyday views tend to regard one as a tool for social control and the other as an entertainment or artistic form. In practice, the line between the two is much more fluid and blurred. For instance, on the most superficial level, both use many similar techniques in their technical deployment such as cameras, computer vision algorithms, etc. Meanwhile surveillance has also increasingly been transformed and accepted as a mass entertainment form since the 1990's with the flood of successful popular reality TV shows such as *The Real World* on MTV, *Survivor*, *Big Brother* as examples. What perhaps is the most profound and fundamental linkage between two, however, is something more general and amorphous that can be reduced into the form of a gaze: a specific way of seeing,

representing and dealing with the world that comes along with modernity.

Together with Thomas Edison and the Lumiere Brothers, the Frenchman Étienne-Jules Marey is often credited as one of the crowning pioneers of cinema. The chronographic camera, a device that Marey invented and improved since the 1880's, is one of the most technically sophisticated and feasible proto-cinematic systems that existed in its time, pre-dating Edison's Vitascope and Lumiere's Cinematographe.

Unlike Edison and the Lumiere who are industrialists and entrepreneurs, Marey is a scientist and physiologist whose professional interest lies primarily in the study of the functions of living organism, particularly human motion. Marey is interested in representing and measuring movement scientifically. In other words he aims to turn motion, something transient, into "quantifiable" and "representable" objects. In order to capture life in motion and transience, Marey needs to devise innovative ways of documentation since no equipment is readily available at the time that can turn subjective perception of time and motion into quantifiable data. Out of this need and background, Marey pioneered a chronographic camera that can capture quick succession of images consecutively from a single vantage point, thus allowing him to systematically freeze and study things that are otherwise in passing.

Marey's camera is largely considered to be one of the first workable motion picture camera solutions and a milestone in the history of cinema. What makes Marey pioneering however is not only the invention of a practical instrument but also the hindsight of employing a cinematic method in understanding and exploring the world, in Marey's case, the study of motion and the human body via the visual form. Marey's deployment of the cinematic method grew out of the analytical and the scientific. It is a kind of cinema that aims for objective study, analysis and research, which stands in contrast to creative expression and entertainment that came to be associated with the later history of cinema.

The scientific root of cinema, with Marey as one example among many, offers an important lesson by allowing us to see beyond the commonly perceived identity of cinema as solely an expressive form, hence helping us to draw up a fuller picture and understanding of the cinematic medium and its relationship with the developments of modernity. As cultural theorist Lisa Cartwright in her book *Screening the Body: Tracing Medicine's Visual Culture* observed,

[T]he cinematic apparatus can be considered as a cultural technology for the discipline and management of the human body, and[...] the long history of bodily analysis in medicine and science is critically tied to the history of the development of the cinema as a popular cultural institution and a technological apparatus.²

Marey's method showed us cinema is as much about spectacles as of control. In fact we can see Marey's vision as one of the many primordial embodiments of the modern gaze. The modern gaze is about succeeding the personal sight: individual, subjective

and transient, with a rational, organised and objective vision that enable us to gain mastery (i.e. knowledge and power) over the external world. The cinematic apparatus turns what used to be an ephemeral experience into something objectively representable, measurable and manageable. Cinema allows us to capture the world, to study the world and to control the world.

The cinematic medium opens up new ways of seeing the world in which the naked eyes fall short. The excitement associated with this new modality of understanding the world as promised by the new medium can be found in many early cinema practitioners, notably in Dziga Vertov's Kino-Eye manifestos in which he excitingly compared the film camera to a microscope of time, a scientific instrument that allows us to see truth and fact out of the flux of life.

All this showed that cinema is more than a mere technical innovation; it is a specific way of perceiving, organising and representing the world rationally via objective means and data. It is a form of organised gaze that stands in parallel with other modern developments. It is no coincident that cinema was invented in the 19th century when the most pressing question is to standardise all things (e.g. time, people, land, nation) for transaction (capitalism) and control (colonialism). Cinema turns the world into objectified fragments for scrutiny and control.

If we see the cinematic method as employed in Marey's experiments as a regulatory practice of interfacing with the world in a specific way, then it is not hard for us to draw some relationships between Foucault's Panopticon that we have mentioned previously. To regulate the world via rational organisation of mediated visualities is what links cinema and the practice of surveillance together.

Whether we desire it or not, surveillance has become a fact of the everyday, a feature of contemporary life that confronts every global citizen. Surveillance has extended and become a general social practice that has infused all walks of life, not without the active participation and acceptance of its members. From GPS, smart ID, biometrics, to CCTV cameras, the promise of surveillance to promote a safer and better life is not unwelcome. In addition to the preying eyes of governments, multi-billion corporations like Amazon, Google, Facebook are also interested to know more about you, and your way of life. Surveillance has come to be accepted as an effective modern form of governance and management that are used to regulate our production, consumption and security.

We are trapped between the dilemma of ease and control. On the one hand, we enjoy the convenience brought by modern surveillance technology (e.g. GPS on a car, biometric identification on the iPhone, instant recommendations from Amazon and Google, etc.). At the same time we are increasingly worried about the loss of privacy and freedom that might come to be associated with it.

Contemporary subjects are also likely to have a more experienced and fluid relationship with surveillance and are (hopefully) better informed than the imagined prisoners of the Panopticon. If we have to identify a contemporary architectonic metaphor to complement Foucault's, maybe we can look for it in a glass structure, perhaps not unlike the ones outlined in the story of *We* by the Russian sci-fi writer Yevgeny Zamiatin.

Transparency is the promise of glass, where the interior and the exterior remain visible to each other. It is perhaps an apt analogy in our current state of a control society in which we are constantly being told to be watchful / mindful to ourselves (e.g. health, weight, finance etc.) as well as our relationships with others. The utopian promise of the glass house is a sense of ubiquitous transparency. The problem with this glass structure, however, is that the visibility is not always exactly symmetrical. If we are serious about our metaphor in practical usage, then it will be more like a glass house with different lighting control. Those who are in power control the lights. Sometimes they turn off the light and hide in the dark; more often, they create a backlit situation, leaving themselves as ghostly silhouettes when seen from the other end with lesser means, while celebrating the (false) promise of transparency in a self-congratulating manner.

Out of this background, the present exhibition aims to explore this pressing issue of surveillance via the works by three international artists who have worked extensively in the area. Julian Oliver creates interventionist objects and performance that question and expose the vulnerability of electronic communication. Björn Schülke creates absurd-looking machine sculptures using solar panels, infrared surveillance and air propulsion to trigger movement or sound, making the surroundings of sculptures sites of observation and intervention. Adam Harvey designs *The Privacy Gift Shop* that sells fashionable but practical items to deter surveillance, answering back to the call of control society by taking back control into our own hands. With the works of the aforementioned artists, "Surviving the Glass System" intends to explore possible models and tactics in thinking, questioning and confronting our present technocratic state of a control society as exemplified by widespread systematic adoption of surveillance in our everyday life.

1 In *Discipline and Punish: the birth of a prison*, Foucault provided illuminating thoughts on surveillance as a general and ideal principle by drawing to the Panopticon, the infamous architectural blueprint designed by the English utilitarian philosopher Jeremy Bentham in 1787. The Panopticon, a plan for a penitentiary that was never materialised, is designed as a cylindrical building consisting of large number of cells arranged circularly around a central watchtower. The windows in each cell together with special lighting arrangement allow the inmates under constant and easy monitoring by the guards stationed in the centre. The design is intended such that the inmates are not necessarily under real physical monitoring but rather subsumed under an imaginary gaze that makes the inmates internalised surveillance as a virtual, pervasive and automated form. This exercise of 'asymmetrical visibility' and 'the power of the gaze' as found in Bentham's conception of the Panopticon is in Foucault's view what makes surveillance a general principle, an exemplary embodiment of social control as outlined in his book.

2 Lisa Cartwright, *Screening The Body: Tracing Medicine's Visual Culture* (University of Minnesota Press, 1995) 3.