Artistic Strategies against Surveillance

In the past years surveillance, especially visual surveillance systems, have entered our cities and streets on a large scale. In my hometown Frankfurt/Main, the city centre and traffic-hubs have become zones under intensive surveillance. Over 120 cameras are installed at the central station, over 2,000 at the airport. In such highly surveilled places it is impossible to remain unobserved. The extent of surveillance in the United Kingdom and the USA offers a glance into the future. In these countries visual surveillance systems have spread into the farthest corners of cities and villages and into the privacy of their inhabitants.

This development calls for artistic endeavours which examine the phenomenon and raise people’s awareness of CCTV. Subversive strategies have to be developed which counter the inherent power relations of surveillance systems and foster self-confident, active behaviour towards the instruments of control.

The ongoing artistic project, Contemporary Closed Circuits – Subversive Dialogues, examines practices of contemporary visual surveillance. The works explore possibilities of interaction with and subversion of systems of observation. Most of the works were produced during the past three years as an artistic final thesis at Goethe University Frankfurt, Germany.
The exhibition develops continuously, reacts to the place where it is shown and tries to establish local relations. Every city has its specificities concerning history and contemporary state of visual surveillance. The works are adapted to the local contexts, and new works are added which cast light on different aspects of the phenomenon. The exhibition does not stay confined to the gallery or exhibition venue, it extends onto the streets and walls of the city. Interventions and performances in public space enter the everyday life of passers-by and address them in a direct and personal way. For each city where the exhibition is shown, a composite mask of the “typical inhabitant” is produced which can be worn to prevent successful biometric recognition and make a statement about increasing surveillance activities. The different local varieties of composite masks add up to an archive which can be accessed on a website.¹

Works of the series were shown among others at: Interdependenzen (Offenburg, Freiburg, Heidelberg, 2007/08), Galerie der Stadt Sindelfingen (2007), Basementizid Gallery Heilbronn (2006), Visionale (Frankfurt, 2006/2008), and Luminale (Frankfurt, 2008). The pictures and films which are part of this paper² were taken in the exhibition venue of Goethe University Frankfurt (2008). In 2009 the exhibition will be shown in Potsdam (Phantomgesichter - conference on biometric pictures), Mainz (all eyes on you – Kultursommer Rheinland-Pfalz), Offenbach/Main, and Hamburg. Further shows of the exhibition in other European cities are in preparation.

¹ [http://www.pro-these.com/cctv](http://www.pro-these.com/cctv)
² Documentation of the exhibition in Frankfurt can be accessed on the website above.
Points of Departure
My artistic work on the topic of surveillance started in 2004 with documentary photography and short videos that deal with the ambivalent relation of individuals and groups to surveillance: Do existing cameras provide a feeling of security or are they perceived as uninvited observation? Is there really somebody watching? Are the pictures recorded and what are they used for?

Initiated by these questions I developed closed circuit video installations that enable the viewer to negotiate the usual distance between camera and monitor. The audience is simultaneously in the position of the observer and of the observed and can – via visual closed circuit – enter into a communication with other spectators. These interactive spaces of encounter take advantage of the spectators’ fascination with their own representation and their inclination to enter into communicative situations.

My increasing interest in the ‘invisible other’, on the other end of the video connection, led to a quest for authentic stories and interviews with professional observers. How do they perceive their role as watchers? What are their possibilities to react and when would they interfere? These questions were taken up again in performative works in public space which provoke a reaction from uninformed security staff.
The possibility to view live video footage of traffic surveillance cameras on the internet formed the background for performative projects. The camera offers a stage on which people can change roles: from passive observed persons to self-empowered individuals who actively take part in an interaction. The persuasion that I had to take the projects back to the zones under surveillance – into public space – forms the basis of further works in which the awareness of surveillance is raised and people are encouraged to behave actively and self-consciously towards the techniques.

While I was researching the topic and gaining greater knowledge on the possibilities and extent of modern surveillance technologies, my desire to raise consciousness concerning this matter grew. Possibilities of subverting and discrediting the technologies were explored. This quest for subversive strategies, as well as the closed circuit technique are reoccurring reference points in the artistic works. Individual works will be presented in the following part of the text.

**ffmap**

Web based mapping of the city of Frankfurt, 2005-2008. [http://www.pro-these.com/ffmap](http://www.pro-these.com/ffmap)

ffmap is a personal mapping of the city of Frankfurt/Main. It includes references to the projects that were carried out in public space. Traffic surveillance cameras offer real-time views into the cityscape. The map is an alternative, intuitive navigation to the project *Contemporary Closed Circuits – Subversive Dialogues.*
SEE

Three big metal letters, remains of an advertisement sign, form the word SEE. It directly addresses the spectator and can be understood as a request, but also as a warning. The letters were placed in front of surveillance cameras in the city. In the exhibition the letters are suspended from the ceiling, close to the entrance and form a visual barrier that has to be transgressed by the visitors.
With ‘SEE’ he [Raul Gschrey] turns the tables. The three metal letters which are temporarily placed at different places in public space, seem to call out to the passers-by and the cameras: ‘Look! Look what you are doing!’ […] Raul Gschrey’s work is a call, to the observers and those who are under observation, to consciously keep an eye on their surroundings. It is a call not to carelessly accept their position as victims and culprits but to use their potential for active participation and to go along with his words when he demands: ‘Open your eyes!’ (Hünig 2008).

Composite, colour, 0,7x1,0m & do-it-yourself composite mask, 20x30cm, 2008.

“The Typical Frankfurter” is a composite photograph that was composed from twenty portraits of people that move regularly in the city of Frankfurt. The mask that was manufactured from the composite can be worn in public space to prevent successful biometric recognition. The number of automated face recognition systems increases internationally and has become a threat to our privacy. Face recognition systems use characteristics that differ from the norm to match individuals with their biometric image. The composite technique in contrast emphasises similarities, average characteristics predominate in the superimpositions. Masks for other cities of Europe are in preparation. Masks for Berlin, Frankfurt/Main, and Munich are already available on the website³.

³ See Note 1.
Raul Gschrey: “Der typische Frankfurter” oder “Automatisierte Erkennung erfordert individuelle Charakteristika – sei durchschnittlich.” Composite photograph, colour, 0.7x1.0m. Exhibition view, 2008.
**closed circuit conversation**
Interactive closed circuit video installation, 2006.

Two screens are placed on pedestals at the centre of a room. The screens stand back to back, the picture-tube facing the room. A surveillance camera is fixed on top of each screen. Both screens show a superimposition of the pictures of both cameras. The focus of the cameras guides the viewers to a certain point in front of the screens where they can see themselves in focus. The installation offers the possibility of non-verbal communication between spectators. The visual interactions produce superimpositions of bodies and faces. Composites are created that last only for the precise moment of interaction – breaking the boundaries between individuals and genders. The material is not recorded, the ‘game’ has no serious consequences. However the work implicitly refers to face recognition systems that allow the identification of individuals through the comparison of biometric differences.

![Image of closed circuit conversation installation](image_url)

The ‘closed circuit’ links the persons who stand close to each other but are separated through monitors. Both sides can actively take part in a visual ‘conversation’. However they are unable to change the basic set-up or to resist the alienating effect that results from the overlay of the representation of self and other. […] On stepping closer, their own picture and that of the other person dissolve into each other in fluctuating superimpositions. The spectators find themselves in a dialogue, with the person on the other side but also with themselves, without being able to draw a clear line between ‘here’ and ‘there’. Only by leaving the area of visual perception of the camera, people can retreat from this electronically mediated interaction (Perner 2008).
monitoring network

Six monitors are placed on a shelf, fixed to the wall at eye level. Three monitors show recorded surveillance camera pictures of different public locations. The other three monitors show transcriptions of interviews conducted with security staff and observers. The focal point of this research is the view into the lens of surveillance cameras and the possible communicative situation that arises. Views from the perspective of the camera are related to interviews with surveillers about their work. The installation is a quest for the unknown other, demystifies and personalises the technical ‘eye’ of the camera.
CCTV operators are eye witnesses of a different sort as their ‘witnessing’ is mediated by cameras and screens. Psychoanalytic film theory draws attention to the similarity of the cinema experience and hypnosis. A cinema is usually darkened and other sensory
experience minimised [...] CCTV operators in control rooms are usually confronted with a multitude of monitors which play simultaneously but do not provide any sound (Cameron 2004).

immer wenn eine kamera auf mich gerichtet ist, fühle ich mich wie ein schauspieler. / always when a camera is focussed on me i feel like an actor.


A video projection shows a website which offers regularly updated pictures from surveillance cameras. The installation allows a real-time view into the cityscape of Frankfurt. On a monitor which is placed on a pedestal below, a video-loop can be watched that explores possibilities of interaction with the public surveillance cameras. The viewer is indirectly invited to use the ‘stage’ to interact with the camera and its viewers. This is a call upon people to switch roles: from passive observed objects to active self-empowered subjects.

A monitor shows a group of people in the cityscape of Frankfurt. The actors gather on a small piece of street in the middle of a crossroads, surrounded by cars and trams. We see a negotiation of the existing circumstances; a play with the rules of the societal interaction within the limits of potential action in public spaces. Moving a step forward, a step back. The red lights offer the possibility to extend space onto the street, the green
lights the possibility to cross the tram rails and move to a secure place. The structure of the rules is simple. Gschrey, however is not interested to move within the legal framework. He sends his actors over the limits of the sidewalk, to extend the playing field, to experience and widen the boundaries. What is presented to the viewer in a playful and organised manner is – transferred to the concrete action in public space – a subversive questioning of societal regimes of behaviour. The action does not follow the regulations, it is a play with these regulations and legal constraints (Metz 2008).

(re)aktionsflächen / (re)action spaces
Tape-graffiti, 2008.

Yellow and black adhesive tape is used to demarcate rectangular shapes on the floor in surveilled places in the cityscape. The occupied spaces are supposed to raise attention and provoke reactions of passers-by. The interventions as well as the reactions of the spectators were documented photographically. The omnipresence of visual surveillance and the reason for the interventions were discussed with interested spectators.

In the installation “(re)action spaces” he [Gschrey] uses the demarcation of spaces to activate our looking. Not the cameras are in the centre of attention but the places and spaces on which the cameras execute their view. This shows where unsusurveilled public
space still exists. The more cameras are installed at a certain place, the more difficult it becomes to traverse it unobserved. Through Gschrey’s strategy of demarcation and visualisation, the silent view of the cameras is transformed into an obstacle (Zurawski 2008).

bewegungsspielraum / space constraint
Performance, 3-channel video installation, colour, sound, 3x ca. 3’30, 2008.

A person moves in front of a camera and starts to wrap himself, from head to toe, with black and yellow adhesive tape until there is no more space to move. Then the person looks into the lens of the camera and waits for a reaction. The performances constitute attempts to direct interaction with institutions via their surveillance cameras. For the performances places were chosen in which it was likely that there would be a reaction: a subway station, the police headquarters and the Central Station of Frankfurt. In exhibitions the work is presented as a video installation on three big monitors placed next to each other on the floor. Through the different length of the individual clips continuously new combinations occur. The three sound layers overlap and form a mixture which can be heard in the whole exhibition and from which, from time to time, individual elements surface.
At the first glance, Gschrey describes the constraint of people’s movements through surveillance. At a closer look, he provokes the surveillance regime through a legally conform breaking of norms. He directs the view of the cameras on himself, on his own, strangled body and deliberately provokes a reaction. The camera does not only watch, it is turned into a spectator and confidant that has to react to his actions (Zurawski 2008).

The performance of Gschrey is a disintegration of the binary pattern of the surveillance logic. Through the process of wrapping the tape around his body he restructures this pattern. The constraint of movement stays perfunctory: the captivated person empowers himself and is able to evoke a reaction from the invisible observer. At this point the closed circuit opens, a face comes to the fore – a face that has to categorise Gschrey’s actions into either “affirmative” or “negating” but has to realise that neither of these poles work (Perraudin 2008).

**trophäen / trophies**

Surveillance cameras, trophy-boards, dimensions variable, 2008.

Surveillance cameras that were formerly installed in public space are fixed on wooden trophy-boards as they are used in the display of hunting successes. The surveillance camera that was once used as an instrument of control and was itself ‘looking’ at people has lost its function and is displayed like an empty case, in the fashion of a trophy. The power regime of the gaze between observer and observed is subverted. It is now the spectator who looks at the camera which is fixed to the wall like a picture.
hollywood revisited

The closed circuit installation makes inner processes visible. Two surveillance cameras record details from the interior of a video recorder and transmit the recorded section onto two TV screens. A third TV screen shows the whole installation. This picture, that is also taken by a surveillance camera, is recorded simultaneously on the video tape that is filmed in the video recorder. There is a simultaneity of showing and recording, of inner and outer processes. It also is an inquiry into the possibilities and modus operandi of the medium video.
[Gschrey’s] works do not simply deal with the process of seeing, a doubling of the things which can be seen anyway but with the examination of apparatively mediated visual perception. This becomes obvious in ‘closed circuit conversation’ and its overlaying pictures of people who face each other, as well as in the work ‘hollywood revisited’. Here the medium video is used to film and record itself and to expose its interior to external visibility (Hillgärtner 2008).

**Opening the Closed Circuit**

CCTV systems establish closed circuits, they bridge the distance between camera and monitor and accumulate various views from different places in one (control)room. Even though the pictures may be recorded and transmitted, in most cases, the circuit remains closed. The information does not leave the circuit and is mainly used by the institution which runs the system. Even when the sources are opened up for other institutions, the material is not intended for a wider public. The systems work in one direction only, they are not intended to be used for communication. This establishes a power relation between the seemingly omniscient, intangible observer and the uninformed, voiceless, observed object, which has been laid out to perfection in Bentham’s panopticon.

To counter these established power relations the closed circuits have to be opened to public eyes. This development can be initiated through “open” closed circuit installations which allow the visitors to negotiate the distance between camera and monitor and to enter into a communication with other
spectators. These interactive spaces of encounter can be realized in the context of an exhibition or via the internet, where web cams and traffic surveillance cams offer stages for performances.

The strategy to use existing CCTV systems takes the projects back to the zones under surveillance, into public space. Each camera offers a stage, every sequence of pictures offers the possibility to narrate a story. Performances in public space address different kinds of audiences: a primary audience, the professional observers behind the camera and a secondary audience, the passers-by. They perceive the performances and interventions in an entirely different way: Their awareness of surveillance is raised and they are encouraged to behave actively and self-consciously towards the techniques.

Exhibitions which address the topic have different advantages. In the presentation of artistic works and the documentation of performances, a third audience is addressed. The visitors are directly confronted with the topic and are encouraged to form their own opinion and adopt attitudes and strategies towards the systems of control. Artistic works which challenge and subvert the logic of surveillance can also be distributed via the internet. The mask of “The Typical Frankfurter/Berliner/…” is a viable example. It can be downloaded and worn to counter biometric recognition systems and demonstrate one’s opposition to and one’s unwillingness to cooperate with surveillance systems. The archive of composite masks relies on the collaboration with people who assist me in the production of local masks of their hometowns.

**Experiences of an Artistic Research**

During the research and artistic work on the topic I had to face a variety of difficulties. My requests to public and semi-public institutions to do research on the everyday work of security personnel were met with incomprehension and unwillingness to cooperate. After long months of negotiations with public relations offices, requests were denied without reference to possible reasons. I had to adopt a different strategy. Since the top-down approach had not worked, I tried to establish direct contact with the employed personnel and finally succeeded in doing some interviews with individual persons without the knowledge of their superiors. Obviously I had to secure that the people who agreed to talk to me would not have to face any disadvantages. The interviews were presented in an anonymised form, excerpts were displayed as plain text. Due to the circumstances, the original idea of presentation had to be adapted. I could not show the faces behind the cameras, so I decided to provide views into the monitors and show the trivial pictures at which these people were forced to look day in, day out.

The experiences I had gathered concerning formal requests, which were often denied at the last minute, forced me to develop different techniques. I stopped to ask before I made my moves and adopted methods which were developed by street and graffiti artists. During performances and interventions in public space, I began to disguise myself. What could be more inconspicuous if you want to do strange things in public than to wear the most eye-catching clothes. During the interventions for (re)aktionsflächen/(re)action spaces I wore a neon-orange vest normally used by construction workers. This worked incredibly well. Passers-by asked me what I was doing and whom I was working for. This links in with observations of Steve Mann in his sousveillance activities: The actions were more likely to be accepted if the responsibility was transferred to some higher authority, for example an employer (Mann et al. 2003)

I made out different kinds of audiences while I was doing performative works in public space. First of all the actions addressed the primary audience of the security staff behind the camera whose reactions remained invisible to me. I was never sure whether somebody was really watching the footage. During the sometimes long performances and interventions I never received any direct reaction, no private security or police was sent. In a later series of performances I went to places in which there was a high possibility to

---

4 The New York based Surveillance Camera Players have shown in the past decade that surveillance cameras can be used to stage plays, narrate little stories or do performances. See: Surveillance Camera Players: “Surveillance Camera Players: 10-Year Report.” [http://www.notbored.org/scp/](http://www.notbored.org/scp/) 10.11.2008
receive a reaction, the police headquarters and the central station. At these places responses were swift, and I managed to get a glimpse at the faces behind the cameras.

My secondary audience on the streets were the spectators and passers-by. The majority seemed to notice me but made no moves to acknowledge my presence. They kept on walking and cycling but stole a glance. I had the feeling that they did not want to get involved with what I was doing. There were also people who stopped to look, some even asked me questions. When I was explaining my reasons, most of them sympathised and seemed to share my concern about increasing surveillance.

**Between Art and Activism**

Artistic work is per se influenced by the surroundings and experiences of the artists. In some cases the connections become clearly visible. In my opinion artists do have the responsibility to be sensitive towards and react to changes in our environment. These artistic responses can, depending on the context, sometimes be more or less explicit and sometimes move between art and political activism.

While I was working on the topic, my desire grew to raise consciousness towards the extent and possibilities of surveillance. This led to moves away from the established places of artistic production, into the spaces under surveillance, the streets and squares of our city. Working with my own body was a new experience for me; I found myself in the role of an actor. I had always been behind the camera and suddenly I was in the focus of attention, not only of cameras documenting my moves but also of the security personnel who were trying to categorise what I was doing and to decide on a suitable reaction. I was moving within the legal framework, not actually breaking any laws but extending my personal space in public. In a text on my works Bernd Metz perceives this strategy as a ‘game’ which is negotiating social norms (Metz 2008).

Concerning the topic of surveillance artistic works can, as the works of many artists show, raise people’s awareness towards the phenomenon and construct environments which make surveillance perceptible. Artistic works have some advantages in comparison with political activism. They do not need to clearly discriminate between right and wrong and they do not need to provide any final solutions. Artistic works can be understood and experienced in a variety of different ways. However, artists should in my opinion address crucial points in the development of our society and should be held responsible for their actions. I go along with the Nigerian writer Chinua Achebe who lets one of the main characters of one of his novels say: “Writers don’t give prescriptions […] they give headaches.” (Achebe 1988)

**A New Ethics in the Age of Digitalised Surveillance**

The spread of visual surveillance has turned European cities into zones of high security. Technical developments allow for an increasing automatisation of surveillance activities. Electronic communication and interlinked computer systems extend the local nature of CCTV to an international availability. The computerisation turns visual information into data, for example in biometric recognition systems, license plate recognition or data collections through RFID chips. Some scholars see the rise of a new phenomenon which they call “dataveillance”. In this context CCTV is only one means in the collection of relevant data.

Since the advent of visual data collection for surveillance activities, we can see a development, from the observation of individual persons to the surveillance of groups and flows. Recent developments show a re-individualisation of surveillance, but this time drawing from a much greater reservoir of data. Automated

---


6 Roger Clarke has coined the term in the mid 1980’s. [http://www.rogerclarke.com/DV] 20.03.09
systems will soon be able to manage the identification of individual movements and actions from the visual archive of interlinked CCTV systems and therewith zoom in again on individual behaviour.

This development calls for a wide-ranging discussion about the benefits of privacy and the our responsibility towards a liberal society. This duty has to be taken up by scholars and scientists, by software developers and artists alike. An ethics for the information society has to be established, in which researchers\(^7\) and the developers of the surveillance systems of the future define their responsibilities towards personal data. This ethics would have to include a self-obligation not to collect data which might be used for surveillance purposes and to deal in a responsible way with data which is entrusted to them. Frank Rieger, software designer and member of the *Chaos Computer Club* sees endeavours in the development of systems of anonymisation and the decentralisation of data transfer as the core elements to counter the development of a surveillance society (Rieger 2005)

Subversive strategies have to be developed which make use of weaknesses of the technologies, discredit the surveillance logic and raise people’s awareness towards negative effects and possible dangers of the instruments of control. These goals can be most effectively achieved through interdisciplinary collaborations between software designers, scholars, political activists, and artists.

“We need to develop a ‘let’s have fun confusing their systems’- culture that plays with the inherent imperfections, loopholes, systematic problems, and interpretation errors that are inevitable with large scale surveillance. Artists are the right company for this kind of approach. We need a subculture of ‘In your face, peeping tom’. Exposing surveillance in the most humiliating and degrading manner, giving people something to laugh about must be the goal.” (Rieger 2005)
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