Surveillance & Society

A Trialogue on Interventions in Surveillance Space: Seda Gürses in conversation with Michelle Teran and Manu Luksch

Seda Gürses
De-center, K.U. Leuven
Seda.Guerses@cs.kuleuven.be

Manu Luksch
Ambient tv
mL@ambienttv.net

Michelle Teran
ubermatic.org
misha@ubermatic.org

In December 2008 an exhibition under the title *Surveillance and Discipline in Public Space* was curated by D.N.K. FILOART and was exhibited at The Kosova Art Gallery in Prishtina, Kosova. It was during this event that Manu Luksch, Michelle Teran and myself came together and started discussing our approaches to exploring the affects of surveillance space; the subjectivities it enables; and, possible strategies for encountering the discomfort, instabilities and potentialities it produces. Shortly after our meeting we decided to do a three-way conversation that now has become this trialogue. The trialogue started off as a skype conversation, which we then later transcribed and finally edited to its current form.

Neither the event in Prishtina nor our thoughts documented here exist in and of themselves. Our thoughts and our interventions result from constructions of surveillance and privacy, as well as from a set of activities with different communities in which we participated and which also have given us the opportunity to come together. So, in the next few paragraphs I will shortly map out some of the events through which I first met Michelle and later Manu. I hope through this I am able to provide our trialogue with some context.

My interest in surveillance studies actually came about when I stalled with my research on privacy preserving mechanisms for information systems, where privacy preservation was defined to be data minimality, confidentiality and anonymity. Expecting individual users to be responsible for and to control their data in order to avoid possible forms of discrimination and authoritarian control seemed paradoxical. Hence, I had to find narratives other than the "technology driven privacy nightmare" to configure my research.

I was also interested in collective strategies for dealing with surveillance instead of individualized ones. The emphasis of privacy preserving technologies are so far limited to the protection of individuals from discrimination by hiding certain attributes that are linked to them ("personal data" in the EU Directive), which would include their association with a specific group. But most debates around privacy technology and data protection are not concerned with the protection of those groups per se. Nor are they concerned with the protection of individuals from discrimination based on social sorting, given that anonymized data can be utilized to realize such systems.

Around this time, I participated in *Prologue-BLN: New Feminism/New Europe* where Diana McCarty introduced me to Michelle Teran. Shortly afterwards, Michelle and I prepared a talk together for another

exhibition called *I.-R.A.S.C. Schutz vor dem Schutz* (trans. *Protection from Protection*). The focus of the talk was on ubiquitous computing and RFID technologies and a dismantling of the discourse around these technologies with respect to privacy. We first asked questions like: Who is actually being observed? Who is the technology built by and under which social and technical assumptions? Who are the likely observers? Who gets to keep the data? And, who gets to give meaning to the data? We followed this with a list of strategies from practice and theory, the latter being mostly inspired by John McGrath's book *Loving Big Brother: Surveillance Culture and Performance Space* (McGrath 2004) and Brian Massumi's book *Parables of the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation (Post Contemporary Interventions)* (Massumi 2002).

The following year Michelle and I did a series of interventions. These were mostly in different contexts but we kept in touch. I started working on a series of talks called a *A failed coup attempt with folks songs Part I, II and III* in which I looked at how anonymous folk songs could be studied to think of strategies for establishing collective anonymity in information systems. I studied chain mails, urban legends, conspiracy theories and video mash-ups for their potential of enabling collective distribution of data without singling out individuals who are part of its distribution, or actually as it turned out, how they fail to do so.

In later discussions with Michelle, I discovered that folk songs are very comparable to our data bodies/doubles in surveillance space. They both have unidentifiable origins and trajectories of their own that lose and gain meaning in every instance depending on the local power relationships. I expanded my talks to include excerpts of a film called *Whose is this song?* by Adela Peeva in which the filmmaker physically searches for the origin of a folk song in the Balkans. During her journey through many countries and even more communities she finds different versions of the same song. In some contexts it appears as a love song, in others as a political song, in yet others as a religious song. Every place Adela visits, she encounters joyous performances of the local versions of the song as well as tension, animosity and confusion when she questions the song's locally stabilized meanings. The film produces a nice analogy upon which it is possible to discuss relationships to data bodies often around the topics of authenticity, meaning and origins.

While my interventions remained theoretical, in the mean time Michelle completed several projects that intervened in surveillance space. One project was *Friluftskino: Experiments in Open Air Surveillance Cinema* and another, *Parasitic Video Network*, both of which she talks about in the trialogue. In both of these works she used the idea of the uncanny in surveillance space as well as the principle of going against the rules without breaking them. She magnifies the residues of surveillance mechanisms, allowing us to pat our leaking data-selves.

At the end of that year Michelle and I went to Prishtina and had the pleasure of meeting Manu Luksch. The interventions that Manu presented in Prishtina complimented the trajectories that Michelle and I had been following. If we can say privacy research and data protection enforcement can be seen as one plane of activity and the engagement in surveillance space as another, then I would argue that Manu's work under the *Manifesto for CCTV Filmmakers*, which was the basis of her interventions in surveillance space using data protection law, concatenates those two planes. She shows mechanisms for making the traversal from one plane of activity to the other a playful possibility. *Faceless*, in that sense, is a film that shows how surveillance and privacy discourses are constitutive of each other and are not just in opposition.

It is this set of encounters, and many that are not listed, that led us to the trialogue that follows. By way of mapping out this subjective history I hope that I have managed to show that this trialogue is a snap shot of a process that is only likely to evolve as we further engage with surveillance space collectively.

Manu: Michelle, maybe we can already go into how you explore these different experiences in surveillance space and give some examples.

Michelle: Two weeks ago I attended a three-day conference on the uncanny, entitled *Phantasmata: Techniques of the Uncanny*, which took place at the ICI (Institute for Cultural Inquiry) in Berlin. Uncanny, or 'unheimlich', is used to describe a set of characteristics where a sense of unfamiliarity is inserted into a familiar situation, creating a feeling of strangeness or unease. This sense of unfamiliarity can emerge when there is a de-stabilization or shifting of positions. The feeling of being disoriented brought on by the uneasy relationship of the dynamics of movement to a fixed place or seeing the otherness within ourselves through disembodiment and doubling are some examples.

I attended this conference to hear other academic perspectives. However, I myself have been quite interested in the uncanny, which I apply to my own investigations into the relationship of the body to contemporary architecture, of which surveillance is a part. Included within my investigations is the unsteady interaction between informational spaces brought on by different technological and communication systems and their physical city space counterparts. The uncanny affects of contemporary and surveillant architecture can be characterized by such things as disorientation, alienation, absence, transparency, fragmentation, and dislocation of space and body. For example, by observing yourself via a surveillance camera, your image becomes a kind of uncanny double whose body is observed from a distance and from other angles such as from above, from the side and from behind. In literary fiction and mythology, to encounter one's double, or doppelgänger, is generally regarded as a bad omen of impending death. Therefore encountering your body double is related to the possibility of experiencing your own death. Our everyday spaces, such as the home, are awash with transmissions (television, radio, wireless CCTV, WLAN, RFID, Bluetooth, etc) which become a type of invasion, a common metaphor within the horror film genre. The porosity and subsequent de-stabilization of these conventional borders, between the inside/outside, public/private, creates an uncanny situation. My interest in studying, exploring, mapping, activating and performing surveillance is therefore based less on issues of privacy and more about this sense of de-familiarization and de-stabilization brought on by the implementation of it.

Examples of the ways I have worked with this can be found in two recent works that bring together surveillance space, architectural place and the body. In 2007 I created a work entitled *Friluftskino: Experiments in Open Air Surveillance Cinema*. Using a video scanner and a high-powered projector, live video surveillance of various interior spaces was intercepted and re-projected back onto city walls, transforming that location into an open-air cinema. To further enhance the cinematic experience, chairs were laid out and popcorn was served. I created seven different screenings throughout the city of Oslo over a period of seven days. One evening the open-air cinema took place in an outdoor parking lot where live video of the inside of a car wash was projected onto the exterior wall of the building. Along with the strange experience of having the wall suddenly become transparent, allowing us to see inside, there was the uncertain role of the cab drivers using the car wash. They would take turns watching the cinema and then becoming the performers inside.

In 2008 I created *Parasitic Video Network*, a roaming video network consisting of 25 wireless video surveillance cameras installed within various architectural sites, such as an office building, shopping mall or park. The idea of the project was to use these simple, readily available consumer technologies to temporarily transform an everyday space into a media space, a kind of gaming environment or live film set, which could be explored by moving through it. People were brought into a familiar environment and invited to explore its strangeness via the surveillance cameras, where each person became somewhere between explorer, filmmaker and voyeur. Visitors would carry a portable device enabling them to capture and record live feeds from surveillance cameras, which were then augmented with a soundscape generated by the visitor's movement through the architectural space. There was no designated itinerary. The exploration of the space was directed by each visitor who would engage with the cameras and the site in

remarkably distinct ways. The video network was set up to observe different architectural spaces that populate cities in order to highlight their characteristics and affects on the body. The set up of the cameras also enabled self-observation from different perspectives, such as watching oneself from behind and in motion, as well as watching others within the environment. Each *Parasitic Video Network* therefore inserted a video surveillance system to highlight the different ways that body and space interact, by creating a situation where these interactions were experienced in a non-conventional manner and simultaneously through physical and media layers.

Seda: Can I just ask, what are you looking for and why do you do what you do? What fascinates you about making people immerse themselves in surveillance space as such?

Michelle: I'll relate to my original point about technology and the uncanny. There is an inherent potential for de-stabilization and subsequent strangeness through the introduction of technological systems. This I refer to as a 'breakdown in narrative' or having other things taking place that are the unintended by-products of technological use and are outside the official descriptions of the designers of these platforms and products. I find excitement in this subversion.

I have become incredibly intrigued by the recent stream of articles in the Guardian concerning the launch of Google Street View within the UK and outrage depicted within its media reports. The Guardian has chosen to highlight some of the more titillating images found on the map which they frame within a privacy debate, predicated on the right to be left alone and free of intrusion. A man caught vomiting on the sidewalk outside a pub, a guy exiting a sex shop, a small child running around naked during a picnic are some examples of images they have chosen to highlight. The Information Commissioner's Office, in response to a formal complaint lodged by Privacy International, UK's leading privacy protection campaign group, announced that Google was not breaking any privacy laws. It dismissed Privacy International's statement that Google should require consent to photograph saying that "If consent were required by the law, then the producers of, say, Match of the Day, would have to gain the consent of all people attending televised football matches who might be caught on camera" (Doward 2009). But beyond the privacy debate I think part of this outrage and unease over these images (or at least how the Guardian chooses to describe this) could be related to seeing the otherness within ourselves where these images start to take on a life of their own, becoming disobedient shadows or data doppelgängers. The question then is how does one relate to, manage and even co-exist with these different data-selves, created both within and out of your control?

Manu: and, what is your new line of investigation?

Michelle: Currently I am involved in developing a series of urban surveys that look at the connections between YouTube videos and their geographical location. YouTube allows geo-tagging of the uploaded videos, which then appear on Google Earth. This process creates a relationship between media and place. I am using this feature as a method for investigating the types and locations of videos produced in different cities, taking into account the social and cultural conditions influencing their production. I started this process with a project called *Buscando al Sr. Goodbar* which took place throughout the city of Murcia, Spain. I created a bus tour using a playlist of videos that I had assembled while virtually exploring the city. During the performance we travelled through the city on a bus and visited several sites and people where the videos had been produced. The movements through the city were mirrored on Google Earth, which could be seen on a large monitor installed at the front of the bus. Videos were played as we reached a place on the map where an action had taken place, such as somebody doing Tai Chi. Sometimes we got off the bus and went into people's homes. For example, there was a young guy playing piano. First we watched his video on the bus, then met him at the entrance of the building and were led into the room where the piano was situated. Once we were all seated, he treated us to a live piano concert. Therefore a video was first made in a private space and then broadcasted on YouTube for an anonymous public who

then re-entered the private space. In this sense the video's creator started to experience certain consequences of the media that he or she had produced and made public.

So, I would like to tie this to a question to Manu. I have been thinking recently about how much of my time and energy is devoted to the management of data. If our future desires are to become ever more active agents with regard to access, distribution, categorization and interpretation of data, as well as in the development of its policies, how will these direct the type of activities we end up devoting most of our hours to? When you described to me the process in the making of *Faceless* it seems that you came face-to-face (so to speak) with these very time-intensive administrative issues. Is our future about intensive times spent managing our data?

Manu: For *Faceless*, the premise was to get hold of my data, which security professionals were managing "on my behalf". Under the Data Protection Act (DPA) 1998, I requested a copy of my image from operators of video surveillance in London's public and commercial spaces, by sending a letter, to which response was due within 40 days. The written communication with the data controllers would often stretch over many months. Their first response would usually express ignorance about their obligation or they would inform me that their system wasn't working at the time. Then I would receive forms or more excuses. Finally, the images would arrive, but only in one out of ten cases. Negative outcomes included the whole range from technical and human error, refusal, to occasionally my own failure to reply within a deadline. I documented this close-up encounter with the Data Protection Act 1998 in the essay 'Faceless: Chasing the Data Shadow' (Luksch and Patel, 2007). I came to notice that this process of negotiation over your data is actually generating much more data than one is trying to collect!

Seda: Yes, and that is the irony of it. How long did it take you to make *Faceless*?

Manu: I started in 2002, soon after the Data Protection Act 1998 had been implemented in UK law, following the EU directive. A couple of successful requests turned me so rollicking, that I declared and analyzed in my *Manifesto for CCTV Filmmakers* the DPA 1998 as a suitable production tool for films in a country like the UK, where we live underneath a dense network of constantly recording cameras. One of the rules of the Manifesto states that the filmmakers must not bring any additional recording equipment into a location, but use the cameras already in place. Relevant paragraphs from current legislation are analyzed in order to turn them into film production tools. Of course, this sort of 'dogma' was meant to lure people into making use of their rights and to deal with a legal text through a humorous approach.

Practically spoken, even though this idea got headlines like "An Austrian filmmaker has come up with a novel way of avoiding the costs of creating a movie..." (BBC 2007), it was a rather tedious production method, requiring lots of stamina to survive the multiple paper wars and not that "cheap" after all. Having set out to produce an entire science fiction fairy tale this way, I tried to collect as much footage as possible over a period of four years. Of course, I was working on other productions at the same time.

Soon I felt that the process generated more intriguing data than the final catch that the CCTV images constituted. I was searching for a way to accommodate this experience within the film. However, I didn't want to create a didactic piece or a documentary.

Seda: How did you resolve this conflict?

Manu: I emphasized the legal properties of the images by letting them write the plot as much as possible. The title, for example, derives from the fact that data controllers need to comply to the privacy regulations expressed in the Article 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998 which require that third parties in the image are unidentifiable. This is usually achieved by erasing people's faces. Therefore, the story unfolds in a world, where everyone is faceless. People don't remember they ever had faces. Another example is the time code,

which is stamped on all images and therefore qualifies them as 'systematically filed' information, which has to be made accessible under the Data Protection Act 1998. The film uses the time stamps to illustrate the new calendar introduced by the regime, under which absolute time control is exerted.

Seda: You mentioned earlier that you did not receive a response to most of your requests. Can you elaborate on some of those reasons?

Manu: Under Common Law, judgments set precedents. The decision in the case Durant vs. Financial Service Authority (2003) redefined personal data; since then, simply featuring in raw video data does not give a data subject the right to obtain copies of the recording. Only if something of a biographical nature is revealed does the subject retain the right.

According to the judgment of the controllers, hardly any recording counted as personal data. The Code of Practice simply translated the definition into technical specifications: only if a camera panned and zoomed onto you, you were sufficiently focus of attention to generate personal data. But you might feel differently about it. If, for example, I am one person in a crowd going from point A to point B, then this recording may be defined as one that does not contain any personal data, at least according to the Data Protection Act 1998. But, if in those images, I am going from my house to the cemetery and I am undergoing certain feelings, to me this is all in the recording. To others it just might not be.

To me the process of collecting my images was an encounter with the power of language. Whoever holds the power defines the notions. This definition which determines if a recording needs to be made accessible or not, is arbitrary. It is not well defined (Willkür). This is one aspect which the fictive layer in the film project (*Faceless*) reflects and explores. The same image can feed different interpretations and generate conflicting information. The irony is that these images only exist because they may be used as visual evidence in a court case.

Michelle: Yes, there are so many possibilities for interpretation and misinterpretation, within a single image. The intervention of the camera creates such a filter between subject and observer that, even when you watch the images, you don't actually see. There is a discrepancy between what one sees on the surface with what takes place inside, related to thoughts, memories, emotions and moods. One can also generate so many different meanings and uses based on the same source material. There is a very interesting project called *PUBlicIMAGenING* by Zeljko Blace, researcher at Jan van Eyck Academie in Maastricht. Still in its early stages, his project looks at the refactoring of surveillance systems, using them for the collective production and ownership of images which, by entering into the public commons, can then be used by different people (artists, urban planners, activists, academics, researchers, designers, etc) and for different purposes.

Manu: Let me mention one idea here, an extension of *The Faceless Project*, which I have not realized yet. I would like to make all the recordings I collected in the process of making Faceless available online and invite people to create their own fiction from them, like a remix of image and meaning. The footage could be quite interesting material for others, since it is so difficult to get hold of. People could use it to tell new stories or use them for their own line of investigation.

Seda: I have a question to both of you focusing on meaning and power. There was this article in the BBC about the inflation of cameras at demonstrations (Rohrer 2009) and how they are being used and how different people are claiming some rights to the image.

Manu: ... sousveillance against surveillance ...

Seda: Yes. But then, towards the end of the article, there is an important detail where the policeman states:

"I could be giving you a kiss on the cheek but if seen the wrong way it could look like I was headbutting you. It doesn't show the whole series of events - what happened minutes before, what happened around the corner" (Rohrer 2009).

You both show in your work that there is not a single meaning to the data and it is difficult to make data subject to a tyranny of meaning. You both explore and show how many meanings can be generated from surveillance data but even this exploration is subject to power relationships. These power relationships were also very present in Adela Peeva's film when it came to the interpretation of folk songs and how every community tries to claim the song for their causes and identity. I would claim that as we become more competent in understanding how surveillance technology works and as a society we increasingly participate in it by proliferating our data bodies, then surveillance is less about who has the data but more about who has the power to give it meaning and manipulate it to fit their needs.

So, if we accept all of that, I was wondering, if while constructing and disseminating your work, you saw people developing strategies to deal with this constellation of data, meaning and power? What are the strategies, for example, when there is footage of a person being beaten up by the police and the proliferation of meaning given to that footage starts working against that person? What else can you do than snapping back to: but THIS is the meaning of the data. Maybe you have encountered some other strategies?

Manu: For a long time I thought we could keep our autonomy by trying to stay synchronized with our data alter ego. Initially, the conscious dialogue with my data persona in projects like *Faceless* or *Myriorama* rendered data traces visible into an environment for performance. Since we are not only questioning the future of personal identity within a 'surveillance society', but within a 'database nation', this performative relationship cannot provide a sufficient mapping tool any longer.

So I am wondering myself what the strategies are, especially for (very) young people. I find it problematic, to say the least, that childhood is harvested for data by public and commercial organizations, to predict a person's potentials as an adult. While our works are stimulating a critical debate, more resources than ever are being invested into the tendencies we question.

Michelle: I think a powerful strategy is that of democratic journalism where videos produced by citizens and broadcasted on public channels are used to subvert the tyranny of meaning by counteracting 'official' stories such as those narrated by the police. The death of Ian Tomlinson at the recent G20 summit is one example. Something that I personally experienced took place in 2007 at the PPP summit protest in Montebello, Canada where three police were outed as agents provocateurs while attempting to incite a riot. This incident was filmed by several of the protesters who put these videos on YouTube. The videos became so popular that the mainstream press picked it up, resulting in a public repudiation of the original statement by the police. Therefore it was the contribution of several videos, and from different angles, that provided the damning evidence.

By working with surveillance, and media practices in general, I sometimes find myself hovering between the roles of artist and activist. This seems to be unavoidable. But actually I don't think that you can be two things at once. I think that activists and artists have different requirements for what constitutes a successful end result. Working with urban interventions involving media, I am more concerned with temporary de-stabilization than permanent transformation. This is not to say that art does not contain the possibility for transformation. By engaging in different actions, as in the kinds of projects I am doing, I create opportunities for critical engagement, however I am not trying to control a particular outcome. What I do is predicated on the idea that there is no fixed meaning to a piece of data or even to an urban place where I choose to work. Several interpretations can exist of what is actually going on. Of course there are always different power structures that fix meaning. I like to de-stabilize this meaning to allow

other things to come into play. Perhaps I'm a little naive, but I don't think that what I do is so confrontational as to merit a good punch up by the police. There is more an element of disorientation to what I do, where everything suddenly gets a bit off balance, and people have to try to reorient themselves and figure out what is going on.

Manu: Just like Michelle, I see my practice somewhere between art and activism. Art has the potential to provide new vocabulary or even symbols, as gestures, as processes, or single images, which inspire people to rethink positions and to come up with their own strategy. Just as there is not one meaning of life, everyone has to find his or her own answer.

Some reactions to *Faceless* gave to consider that if one organization was targeted and flooded by requests under the DPA, it could be put under significant pressure because it would simply become very costly to comply. I never attempted to flood companies with requests. But someone might learn about *The Faceless Project* and this person, who let's say is questioning the use of CCTV systems in schools, might initiate collective action.

Michelle: Manu, after spending four years collecting these images, navigating through legal and other barriers, why was it important for you to use this footage to develop a piece of fiction? It seems that the laborious process of acquiring these images is such a strong element of the work that the images themselves become almost incidental.

Manu: There are a few reasons. The idea of producing a fiction film entirely through the existing network of cameras served as a starting point. At the time it was not predictable that the process would become so central, to the point that I had doubts if I could complete the movie aspect of the project.

The pairing of fiction and fact is a deliberate choice, as they influence each other constantly in real life. Mythology is always part of history. I am also interested in exploring the role of the anti/hero/ine as a key or emotional access to an issue, rather than statistics (how much fiction do they contain anyway?). I have used protagonists before, to introduce users or audiences to a scenario. In *Virtual Borders*, we enter a (real) discourse about identity of the Akha people through (staged) participation of village elderly Abaw Buseu. In *Myriorama*, we are entangled in an empire rendered from (real) mobile phone location data through the story of Italo Calvino's (fictive) figure of the king in 'A King Listens' (Calvino 1993). In Faceless, we experience doubts about our (real) database-controlled environment through the journey of a (fictive) woman, 'She'.

The imagined meaning provides distance from the too familiar looking recording; the genre lures audiences into confronting their own surveilled existence.

Precursor to Faceless was the self-generative online road movie, *Broadbandit Highway*. It consists of images from hijacked online traffic surveillance cameras, which I had researched online. A Java script loads one stream after the other from a database of about hundred streams in an interval of 40 seconds. It was basically a database-driven non-narrative film. The characters (bandits) Ilze Black and myself, stayed outside the frame by mingling with visitors while wearing blue stetsons during the exhibition. It was in response to this piece, which exploited the incidental with attributes of netculture, that I started working on the introduction of a strong fictive element as additional layer.

Seda: I would like to understand a bit more your relationship to your work. Is there a sense of frustration or fear when you are doing your work partially because you are dealing with this lurking surveillance nightmare? Your work could be interpreted as embracing surveillance when "we should all be resisting it". You may also run into legal limits to your work, since technology is, especially due to privacy and intellectual property laws, being extremely regulated. There is this whole idea of stabilizing meaning of

data through law. Are there conditions like these that may block your work? Or, is there a fear when you do your work, since as we discussed, there is no stability of meaning and therefore no way of knowing where your interventions may go? Most important, who are you in relationship to your work in surveillance space and what kind of relationship is it that you have to your work?

Michelle: I think the only fear that I experience, more like a tingling nervousness rather than heart-stopping terror, is when I'm creating a site-specific work or intervention where I don't know what is going to happen. If I didn't have this sensation, then I wouldn't feel like I'm making honest work. So fear is actually something that I desire. I think that I'm neither embracing nor resisting surveillance, or other media platforms for that matter but trying to explore other narratives concerning the use of these systems and the production of media. What is this experience of mediality or reality created by media?

Manu: Everyone is the guinea pig at the same time as the observer, the one that surveils. We can switch simply by decision; there is no need for special equipment or training. I am interested in alternative architecture of society than pyramid-like, totalitarian, panoptic structures. Equally relevant are non-technological situations: Like in a village, where there is a sense that information is constantly collected about you; or, tactics of sousveillance, like we experienced during the G20 protest, when the role of riot police in the tragic death of Ian Tomlinson became public thanks to a video recorded by a member of the crowd using a mobile phone. (Strangely the CCTV footage of this incident, to which only police had access, had been lost.)

In my work, I am exploring how I ("the citizen") can shake off the guinea pig status and maintain a sense of dignity. To my frustration, I observe this "version" of dehumanizing technology-driven progress, which my work is questioning, being embraced and exported by the industrialized world. Seda, you are asking about our fears - my only fears in this respect are the effects on the future of my child.

Seda: Michelle, I love the bit in your presentation of the surveillance cinema, when you talk about the owner of the car wash. He comes in and asks you what you are doing on his parking lot while you are distributing popcorn to your cinema-guests. It is you going against the rules but not exactly breaking them a la Massumi. You are picking up the signal form the unencrypted transmission from the surveillance camera's in this car wash, you are projecting it to the wall of the car-wash, the car-wash, in a sense, gets magnified and cracks open, and whoever comes by can take a seat and enjoys some popcorn. It is probably the middle of the night, and the owner of the car wash gets a call, something along the lines of "There are some odd people gathering at your parking lot. They are watching your car-wash." And then you recount this dialogue between you and the owner of the car wash. The owner says, "this is my car wash" and you say, "yes". And he says, "this is my parking lot" and you agree. And then he says it is his wall that you are projecting to, his camera etc. All of these things have a somewhat clear answer. And then he says, this is my image and everything falls apart.

Michelle: That is the moment of destabilization.

Acknowledgements

References

BBCNews. 2007. 'Movie makes director star of CCTV'. *BBC Online*, May 15.
    http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/technology/6654971.stm

Calvino, Italo. 1993. *Under the Jaguar Sun*. Translated by William Weaver. London: Vintage.

Doward, Jamie. 2009. 'Google Street View does not breach privacy laws'. *The Guardian*, April 12.
    http://www.guardian.co.uk/technology/2009/apr/12/google-street-view-privacy

Luksch, Manu and Mukul Patel. 2007. *Faceless: chasing the data shadow*. In Ars Electronica: Goodbye Privacy. Stocker &
    Schöpf (eds), Hatje Cantz Verlag. http://www.ambienttv.net/content/?q=faceless_resources

Massumi, Brian. 2002. *Parables of the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation (Post Contemporary Interventions)*. Durham, NC:
    Duke University Press.

McGrath, John E. 2004. *Loving Big Brother: Surveillance Culture and Performance Space*. New York: Routledge.

Rohrer, Finlo. 2009. 'When all video all'. *BBC Online*, April 21. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/magazine/8010098.stm

The exhibition catalogue can be found here:
http://www.kosovaart.com/muslim%20mulliqi/foto/MM_Catalogue_10_Dhjetor.pdf
http://www.kosovaart.com/muslim%20mulliqi/hapja.html
http://www.faces-L.net/prologue/about/
http://www.ubermatic.lftk.org/blog/?p=223
http://www.ubermatic.lftk.org/blog/?p=217
http://www.ubermatic.lftk.org/blog/?p=225
http://www.ambienttv.net/content/?q=faceless
http://www.ambienttv.net/content/?q=dpamanifesto
http://www.ambienttv.net/4/myriorama/
http://www.ambienttv.net/2001/broadbandit/broadbandit