



**Dissident Interfaces:
Shu Lea Cheang's *3x3x6* and
the Digital Avant-Garde'**

Paul B. Preciado



Palazzo delle Prigioni, the central prison of Venice from the Renaissance until 1922, is the site of the exhibition for the Taiwan representation at the 58th Venice Biennale in 2019. Located inside the Doge Palace, the city's cells were expanded on and moved to a building across from the Palace in 1614, and yet remained connected by the Bridge of Sighs. The Piombi (the name the Venetians gave to the old prison due to its roof made of "lead") is most renowned today for being the site of incarceration of Italian writer and mythical lover Giacomo Casanova in 1755; he was detained for several months before finding a way to escape.

The series of works that constitute the exhibition 3x3x6 is based on artist Shu Lea Cheang's decision to respond to the architectural and political history of the building, both as a material and as a conceptual element of the project. Investing the building in the crossings of histories and fictions, memory and imagination, Cheang has created an immersive installation with multiple interfaces to reflect on the construction of sexual subjectivity by technologies of confinement and control, from physical incarceration to the omnipresent surveillance systems of contemporary society.

In the development of the project, Cheang has collaborated with international academics, activists, and researchers (including Dean Spade, Josephine Ho, Jackie Wang, and Hans Huang) to study different historical and contemporary cases of imprisonment due to gender, sexual, and racial nonconformity. For this project Cheang has examined numerous prison architectures and visited several prisoners in different parts of the world.² Her research process has led to the selection of ten cases that have become the critical material for a series of ten 4K films, each reflecting on how legal and visual regimes shape sexual, gender, and race norms over time.

Surveillance and the Panopticon in the Digital Age

Exploring the relationship between the prison regime and societal norms, Cheang's work traces the transformation of confinement

and surveillance technologies within digital culture. Her work brings the Prigioni into the contemporary context of global Internet and artificial intelligence (AI), warfare robotic technologies, and genetic engineering, as well as bio and chemical technologies applied to the modification of reproductive, cognitive, and psychological processes. These technologies are inducing a paradigm shift that is comparable only to what took place with the invention of the printing press and colonization in the fifteenth century. We are transitioning from a society where surplus value was extracted mostly from labor (human and nonhuman) to a society where machines will undertake not only most work tasks but will control and decide when, how, and what will be produced: We are passing from the Gutenberg times of writing and reading into a society of flickering signs; from an analogical and text-based culture into a digital electronic landscape of algorithms. This is a transformation of relations between power, knowledge, and pleasure, which in turn is determining new forms of subjectivity and defining new forms of subjection and resistance.

In the early 1990s, and following Foucault, Deleuze used the term "control society" to describe this configuration of knowledge-power.³ Yet, both philosophers did not reflect on the impact of technologies on the production and control of gendered, sexualized, and racialized subjects. Whereas the differences between the sexes, racial categories, as well as between homosexuality and heterosexuality were modern inventions of Western, colonial, anatomopolitical discourse, new technologies of vision and surveillance, communication and reproduction are now constructing and creating new subject positions. I have used the term "pharmacopornographic capitalism" to speak of the specific form of the production of the sexual body and of subjectivity within this new power regime dominated by bio, chemical, and Internet communication technologies, where the traditional frontiers between natural and artificial, between inside and outside, between present and absent, between producer and receiver are blurring.

For Deleuze, one of the main signs of the displacement from the nineteenth-century disciplinary societies to the new societies of control was the move from the “vast spaces of enclosure” (of which the prison is the paradigmatic model) to “ultrarapid forms of free-floating control that replaced the old disciplines operating in the time frame of a closed system.”⁴ As Deleuze pointed out, time and space of the prison within the disciplinary regime were analogical, while within the societies of control “the different control mechanisms are inseparable variations, forming a system of variable geometry the language of which is numerical (which doesn’t necessarily mean binary).” Traditional prison enclosures were “molds, distinct castings,” whereas the techniques of control are “a modulation, like a self-deforming cast that will continuously change from one moment to the other, or like a sieve mesh will transmute from point to point.”⁵

What characterizes the contemporary political condition is the coiling of surveillance and control mechanisms of the disciplinary regime toward the space that was once traditionally considered the most intimate and private, and the most natural: the individual body. In disciplinary societies, the body was subjected by inhabiting a physical architecture of power: the subject’s identity (normal or deviant, sick or healthy, child or adult, free citizen or criminal, worker or owner, male or female, heterosexual or homosexual) was constructed by the state of being inside or outside certain public architectures of power (hospital, school, factory, domestic space, psychiatric institution, prison, etc.). In the pharmacopornographic regime, architectures of power are electrified, miniaturized, and turned into personal digital communication devices and biotechnological prostheses: the individual body becomes the organic architecture to which the devices of power are hooked. The modern subject inhabited the architectures of discipline; the contemporary subject is inhabited by the apparatuses of control.

While Foucault, Deleuze and his collaborator Guattari predicted an end to the spaces of enclosure and the fall of analogical walls,

what they could not foresee was the advent of a new hybrid configuration: Developed over the last thirty years a regime of mass incarceration now coexists with new forms of digital and biotechnological control; the arrival of the control society didn’t erase the architectural technologies of the disciplinary regime but rather established an unexpected alliance. New apparatuses of control are made of a juxtaposition of multiple (and often confronting) technologies of production of subjectivity, which come from diverse historical regimes. We are no longer analogical subjects of discipline but we are not yet fully modular digital beings of control. We are transitioning.

The political and poetic potentiality of this moment is as big as the risks of constructing new forms of oppression and exclusion. Cheang crafts experimental tools to navigate this transition. Her work operates between the real and the imaginary, inventing new countermyths and misusing control technologies to derail power relationships. Reflecting upon the transformation of surveillance and confinement techniques since the nineteenth century to include contemporary 3-D facial recognition and Internet surveillance technologies, Cheang restages the four rooms of the Prigioni as a high-tech surveillance space, dedicated to questioning the ways different visual and legal regimes construct and normalize gender, sexuality, race, and health.

The Inverted Electronic Panopticon

An architecture developed as an industrial inspection house to optimize the production of workers in the state of Krichev, the panopticon was invented by brothers Jeremy and Samuel Bentham in 1786 and soon became a method of prison surveillance in Europe, and extended to the US and Japan during the nineteenth century.⁶ Its architecture consists of two concentric rings of cells and a centralized observation tower, from where a single eye can surveil the great number of cells radiating out from it and without the inmates knowing if they were being watched or not. Each of the cells had two

windows: a window to let light in and another that faced the surveillance tower, which periodically illuminated the cell by its rotating lamp. Constantly subjected to scrutiny, each cell was the object of total institutional voyeurism. For Foucault the panopticon was not simply architectural design: it was the paradigmatic model of the disciplinary regime of power and knowledge.

Cheang uses the architecture of the panopticon to construct the central hall of the *3x3x6* exhibition in Room A. But instead of simply reenacting the workings of the architectural form she hacks the panopticon—she twists the camera, swaps the cables, exchanges locations, and covers her tracks. Her tower projects images rather than watches. In Cheang’s panopticon, the exhibition visitor discovers ten portraits of incarcerated subjects—they become the object of fictional exploration within the artwork. By transforming the panopticon’s main act to that of projecting, Cheang reflects on the performative dimension of the apparatus. Her prison’s aim is not to “watch” the so-called the sexual criminal but to project an already constructed image onto her/him/*. Indeed, subject positions (“normal” or “pathological”) are projections of the collective apparatus of power. (For instance, in Europe during the transition from aristocratic to republican times, Casanova and Marquis de Sade embodied two liminal sexual subject positions: the libertine threatening the Catholic control over female reproduction and the atheist and blasphemer threatening the theological order of moral limitation to sexual pleasure. In the twentieth century, the castrating woman, the black rapist, the HIV-positive homosexual, the transgender subject, and the luscious e-girl become the new “projections” of the apparatus of power.) Thus, Cheang’s interpretation of the panopticon as a multichannel projector speaks of the ambivalence of watching and producing, of the fine line between observing and constructing the subject, who in turn we are meant to monitor and control.

Rooms B and C of the exhibition contain a multitude of monitors showing the ten 4K films dedicated to the ten cases of

incarcerated subjects; the space becomes a maze of narratives and chronologies from eighteenth-century Venice to contemporary Taiwan. Involving legal documents, fake news, historical reports, myths and fantasies, the 4K films tell the history of sexual normalization and imprisonment by using trans-punk-science fiction, queer, and anti-colonial imaginations as visual and critical frameworks to think through subjection and resistance. Further, the use of trans-chronological narrative—a technique to activate dissident readings of history and the critical proliferation of poetic and political action in the present—allows the characters of the ten films to travel across time, to change gender, race, sex and sexuality. By walking between the films and establishing narrative connections, the visitors are invited to construct a queer counter-history of sexuality for digital times.

Finally, the visitors are brought to Room D, which they may choose to enter as though it may be possible to unlock the “black box.” Room D is inspired by the Playboy Mansion control room where Hugh Hefner watched and recorded all actions taking place within the mansion’s more than twenty rooms, including the private bedrooms of playmates. This is no analogical control room however, but a digital control apparatus.⁷ By bringing together “the prison palace” and the “pleasure palace” (as Hefner called the Playboy Mansion), Cheang takes the visitors into a space that interrogates the political relationship between punishment and pleasure, recognition and lust, between the system that is apparently watching us and the surveillance we are actively participating in and enjoying.

The title of Cheang’s project *3x3x6* comes from what is today the standardized architecture of industrial imprisonment for “sexual criminals” and “terrorists” in the West: 3 x 3 meters, with no windows, monitored by 6 cameras 24 hours a day. Thus, the contemporary cell is itself a pharmacopornographic container, a totally closed yet electronically transparent space, inhabited by a chemically managed body, and surveilled by a CCTV closed-circuit system twenty-four hours a day.

Casanova in Pharmacopornographic Times

In the 4K film series we meet CASANOVA X, the fictional Giacomo Casanova, who was in fact arrested by the Messer Grande (the chief archers of the Council of Ten) in 1755 and jailed in the Piombi for almost a year until he escaped—still not knowing what he was accused of. Most probably he was charged for reading and diffusing hermetic, cabalistic, and pornographic books, or, if not that, belonging to the Freemasons. Or his arrest could have been related to his liaison with Marina Morosini, and since Casanova had many debts and was not part of the narrow circle of less than forty aristocratic families of the Republic of Venice he was left unprotected. It is not, however, the Western myth of Casanova the womanizer who interests artist Cheang. She rather pays attention to an often forgotten anecdote in the life of the libertine: Casanova, who engaged in multiple sexual encounters yet tried to avoid both syphilis and pregnancies, was the main promoter of the use of the condom at the end of the eighteenth century (together with Jeremy Bentham)—a view very much against that of the church and of the state.⁸ Cheang, against the Western representation of Asian masculinity as castrated,⁹ creates a hypersexual, gender-fluid, Asian CASANOVA X, embodied by Taiwanese performer Enrico Wey. She depicts not the Western icon of male heterosexuality but an image for the first sexual educator: a pioneer of sex safe, who went beyond the stereotypical differences between straight and queer sexuality.

This is how in the film CASANOVA X travels across time and cultures and meets the protagonist 00 X: a HIV-positive young man accused of spreading AIDS, soliciting sex with gay men via social networks, and having chemsex; he has been jailed in a Taiwanese prison for ten years. Eleven men with whom 00 X had sex with were summoned as witnesses of the court; some were accused afterwards of the same crimes. In 2017, the case of 00 X was made public in Taiwan to openly debate the use of chemsex in working- and middle-class Taiwanese gay communities.

“Chemsex” was coined in 2001 to name the collective practice of taking drugs (mostly methamphetamine, GHB or Gamma Hydroxybutyrate, and Mephedrone, also known as miaow miaow) to enhance sexual experience. Yet it is more the connection between drugs and smartphone applications that defines chemsex, between chemically stimulated sexuality and the Internet hookup, between the pathologization of HIV bodies as potential contaminants (even if they are on tri-therapies where the risk of transmission is none) and state Internet surveillance. Adopted firstly by gay communities as tools, online cruising apps invented a world of photo-shopped avatars, coded encounters, and evaluated sexual partners. Simultaneously, the state was using Internet surveillance to conduct their e-hygienist persecution: the obligation to be blood tested and officially declare one’s own HIV status and the surveillance of one’s activities by apps has led to an unprecedented form of sexual control.

Cheang creates a fictional tale in which 00 X together with his eleven sexual partners and legal witnesses, all dressed in the traditional pink outfit of the Taiwanese prisoner during the years of martial law, dance under a rain of pills like an army of lovers. We come to see that 00 X is in fact the doppelgänger of CASANOVA X, another contemporary pharmacopornographic version of the Italian libertine trapped in the net of digital surveillance and homophobic hygienic laws. Establishing links across the chronologies of syphilis and AIDS, the film scenario that they share ends with a romantic (and political) encounter where CASANOVA X not only passes his condoms onto 00 X but passionately kisses him to deliberately conjure and confront the fear and stigma around HIV transmission.

Sade and the Social Contract in the Age of Sexual Cyborgs

It is impossible to think about the relationships between the prison regime and sexuality in Western modernity without thinking about

Marquis de Sade. Accused with charges of blasphemy and sexual deviancy, Sade spent more than thirty-two years in different prisons of the ancien régime and later the Republic in France at the end of the eighteenth century. As Georges Bataille said, nobody better understood the moral perversion of the Western Enlightenment than Sade himself. Filled with scenes of death punishment, extreme confinement, and total voyeurism, Sade's descriptions of the limitless enjoyment of sexuality as a condition of full sovereignty—notably written at the same time that Bentham designed the panopticon—serves as a way to understand the relationship of the state and its prison institution with the criminalized, sexualized, and racialized bodies from which it extracts labor, knowledge, and pleasure.

In contrast to most cinematic and literary representations of Sade as a slender male, the real historical Sade weighed more than 180 kilograms, and his most consistent sexual practice was not heterosexual but rather anal self-penetration. Embodied by contemporary performer Liz Rosenfeld, SADE X in Cheang's rendition is given back both his materiality and femininity. A queer ode to resistance via writing and expressing sexuality in prison, the film portrays the salvation of the manuscript *120 Days of Sodom*; thanks to Sade's idea of hiding the twelve-meter-long manuscript in a hollow dildo he used for anal penetration while in his cell at the Bastille in 1785; after the Bastille was looted on July 14th, Sade thought the work had been lost, yet it was eventually found and finally published in 1904.

In another 4K film, SADE X encounters MW X, a man sentenced to life imprisonment for having killed a man he met in an Internet cannibal café; he had signed a contract accepting to eat the man after a slaughtering sexual ritual. Stressing the key role that Internet technologies play in this form of sexual relationship, Cheang has transformed the sexual partner of MW X into a computer and the act of killing and eating into a process of disassembly and cyber digestion. MW X's obsession with giving death by contract shows up the limits of social democratic contractualism and conventional notions of consent, and speaks of the complex

unconscious relations between ingestion and sexuality, appropriation and incorporation, pleasure and the disappearance of the other.

Foucault X in Warsaw

Between the historical and the contemporary, 3x3x6 inserts the case of the young Michel Foucault accused of homosexuality while in Poland during the Cold War. Foucault was appointed director of the Centre Français at the University of Warsaw in 1958, during the aftermath of the Polish October revolution when students revolted against the governing communist party and the Soviet Union. As cultural attaché of the French cultural ministry, Foucault was a closeted homosexual: homosexuality was not yet fully legal in France, and homosexual practices were highly surveilled in communist countries. In Poland, particularly, the communist government used traditionally negative attitudes toward homosexuality as a way to blackmail homosexuals. Thousands of files against homosexuals were collected around the country, culminating in the 1985 "Operation Hyacinth," which led to the arrest of many gay men.¹⁰

Back in 1959, Foucault was seduced by a Polish agent with the intention to disclose his sexuality and put the French Embassy in trouble. As a result, he was investigated by the police for homosexuality, officially denounced and detained—we don't know exactly for how long, but probably a brief period of time before the French embassy intervened. Trapped in diplomatic scandal, Foucault was forced to leave Warsaw for Hamburg. The French Embassy never revealed the official documents of the accusation. Although hardly commented on, this event likely marked the life and work of Foucault: He finished writing his doctorate in Poland, published later as *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason* (1961), in which he developed his notorious thesis about disciplinary institutions and the modern displacement of society from public punishment to disciplinary incarceration;¹¹ the key historian

of sexuality and the prison in the West, Foucault, determined to erase his face from the archive of power “like a face drawn in sand at the edge of the sea,”¹² never referred publicly to his own passage in the prison system of Poland.

Foucault’s eviction is a paradigmatic story of sexuality and politics, cultural history and espionage, sex and betrayal, private humiliation and public silence. It speaks of having first-hand knowledge regarding surveillance techniques and the incarceration of sexual minorities, which Foucault went on to historicize. But it also speaks about the philosopher’s own silence and self-denial: Why didn’t Foucault mention this event when speaking about the “history of sexuality”? Was it even possible for him as attaché of the French Embassy and later professor of the Collège de France to speak about sexuality in the first person? Cheang’s *FOUCAULT X* is a portrait of a young, still-with-hair Foucault exposed. He is seen in a prison cell lit by the needle-shaped shadow of the Palace of Culture and Science in Warsaw, wearing the kimono with which Hervé Guibert photographed him in at the end of his life. A series of visitors (a Polish military agent, a diplomat, a doctor) shave Foucault’s head and dress him up, transforming him into the icon of the public intellectual that we have come to know: an austere bald figure with white turtle neck and glasses. The *FOUCAULT X* film fictionalizes the encounters between the Polish agent and Foucault in a gay back room (similar to the Catacombs fisting club that Foucault frequented in San Francisco in the 1970s¹³), where persecutor/seducer and persecuted/seduced discuss what freedom means and how it can be exercised. It is only after his transformation, however, that Foucault starts to speak, becoming the narrator of the history of sexuality, traveling across time and places and encountering the other characters of the films.

The Myth of the Nonwhite Rapist

Two characters who *FOUCAULT X* encounters on his travels across

time and space are the female protagonist of the case B X, sentenced to life in prison in 2013 for severing her husband’s penis and throwing it into a garbage disposal unit, and R X, a Muslim scholar arrested for alleged sexual assault and rape in 2018 and held in solitary confinement in a French prison for ten months without trial. They represent the two political bodies most severely punished for alleged sexual offenses: unruly women and the racialized subject.

Throughout our research for this project, we have learnt some politically loaded lessons. The modern legal regime of the West often defines women as victims of sexual violence, yet very rarely contemplates the possibility of women enacting violence upon men. This may explain why most instances of female perpetrated sexual violence are castigated with extreme condemnation or considered cases of mental illness, which leads to institutionalizing women for life. Women’s violence is always sentenced with longer imprisonment lengths than men, unless men are not white. We also learnt from studying the results of multiple legal complaints of rape, sexual assault, and harassment since the #MeToo movement that it is mostly nonwhite men who have been the object of punishment and imprisonment. White men were often ostracized by women in the media, but they managed to come out of most legal processes without prison sentences. And although the #MeToo movement brought down more than two hundred men from high responsibility public positions, only a few faced criminal charges, and even less (again, mostly nonwhite) were incarcerated as a result of the accusations. Thus, as a side effect, contemporary criminalization of sexual violence has facilitated what we could call, along with political activist and author Angela Y. Davis, the resurrection of the “myth of the black rapist.”¹⁴

For Davis, this myth returns when white supremacy is again in question. A political invention constructed after the abolition of slavery in the US—extended to other colonial and postcolonial contexts—the myth of the black rapist ensures the reassertion of white power in the face of legal freedom of nonwhite populations.

The differences between the contemporary #MeToo and the South American Ni Una Menos movements reside precisely on how racism is considered within these feminist struggles. The Ni Una Menos movement constituted itself around and against the cases of “femicidio” in South America, which extended later to the US in connection to the Black Lives Matter movement. Whereas the #MeToo movement has often used racist arguments to focus on sexual violence against women (such as the accusations of rape by migrants in Cologne in 2016), Ni Una Menos rightfully stresses the interlaced relationship between class oppression, racism, and sexual violence.

The New E-Witch Hunt

Two other films within the 3x3x6 installation focus on the female political companion of the black rapist: the myth of the loose woman. As Davis argues,

The fictional image of the Black man as rapist has always strengthened its inseparable companion: the image of the Black woman as chronically promiscuous. For once the notion is accepted that Black men harbor irresistible and animal-like sexual urges, the entire race is invested with bestiality. If Black men have their eyes on white woman as sexual objects, then Black women must certainly welcome the sexual attentions of white men. Viewed as “loose women” and whores, Black women’s cries of rape would necessarily lack legitimacy.¹⁵

In July 2018, eighteen-year-old Maedeh Hojabri was arrested in Iran accused of posting videos of herself dancing on her Instagram account. Hojabri used a smartphone camera to film herself in her bedroom while she danced to pop and rap music without wearing a hijab. Touraj Kazemi, head of Tehran’s cyber police, declared on identifying the posts that his forces were surveying all popular accounts on Instagram “promoting female indecent dancing” and would take action against such activity.¹⁶ In following statements,

the cyber police clarified the digital nature of the sexual crime: what was punished by the law was not the act of dancing itself but rather the posting of the videos online. Meanwhile, several women in China have been arrested for posting videos of themselves that are considered pornographic or indecent by the authorities. Cheang fictionalizes one such case of L X, who has been condemned to four years of prison for simulating fellatio on the Internet.

As scholar and activist Silvia Federici has argued, sexually and economically independent women have historically been represented as a social danger to the patriarchal regime and have become the object of a systematic witch hunt. For Federici, there is a new witch hunt taking place alongside the expansion and transformation of global capitalism.¹⁷ This hunt is happening mostly, and above all, within the digital space of the Internet and on apps such as Instagram, Twitter, and Facebook, where images and discourses are created and new forms of value produced. Against the image of the Internet as a free, genderless space, such accusations against women define the emergence of a new form of technopatriarchy regulated by a digital authoritarianism, where women’s bodies and actions are harshly surveilled and monitored.

A few days after the arrest of Hojabri, dozens of Iranian and non-Iranian women flooded the Internet with videos of themselves dancing in solidarity, with the hashtag #dancingisnotacrime. In one post, a woman argued that “she would rather go to jail than be ‘imprisoned’ in her bedroom,” acknowledging the continuity between the prison regime, the gender norms that enclose women within the domestic sphere, and the Internet. The violence created by this regulation of the digital space demands the construction of an e-transfeminist collective subject, who is able to invent visual discourse in response to these forms of control. 3x3x6 works as a dissident interface to channel part of this fight, welcoming and remastering images posted on the Internet in solidarity.

The myth of the loose woman and the witch appear again in the case referred to in the film FSB X. In December 2011, three

women from Gweru were held at Harare's Chikurubi Maximum Security Prison for raping and harvesting men's semen for profit. Since then, several cases of female sperm bandits were reported in Zimbabwe and South Africa. The women were said to have sold the sperm on the black magic market. Leaving aside the fact that men were cheated into having sex, it is the expropriation of sperm by women that seems to trigger the severest condemnation. Unlike women's bodies, organs, and fluids, male bodies and fluids remain a site of sovereign property and ownership—sperm has been historically considered a theological fluid carrying the power and the attribution to procreate solely to men. Trafficking with such male power and sovereignty, the so-called female sperm bandits were considered terrorists of the patriarchal regime. As Federici has argued, in Tanzania and in other countries of central Africa, “prisons are full of accused witches, and only in 2016 more than a hundred were executed, burned at the stake by rebel soldiers, who, following in the footsteps of sixteenth-century witch finders, have made a business of the accusations, using the threat of a pending execution to force people to pay.”¹⁸ Closer to sperm banks and fertility clinics than to witches, the female sperm bandits depicted by Cheang act like a gang of mercantile women, traveling from Casanova X's fantasies into pharmacopornographic capitalism conscious of historically being in the position of “sperm vessels,” they revolt and decide to use sperm for its exchange value.

Binary by Default

Like the nonwhite body, the HIV positive, and the alleged e-witches, trans bodies are the objects of a new institutional violence as well as the pathologization and criminalization within pharmacopornographic capitalism. The 4K film *D X* tells the story of a transgender man accused of having sex with a woman without revealing his gender status. Known as “rape by deception,” these legal cases are the inscriptions of transphobic ideology within the law. Accused of

using objects or dildos instead of penises, such trans men are forced to fight with the metaphysics of the cis-body: What does it mean to have sex with an imaginary body? Where are the limits between reality and fiction in sexuality? What counts as a sexual organ in modern sex-gender epistemology? If the cases of rape by deception underline an epistemology that is binary by default, *D X* uses the oversexualized icon of a black male cis-sexuality—exoticized and erotized by Robert Mapplethorpe to imagine somatic drag and bio-transvestism—and exchanges the penis with an array of organic and inorganic elements. Finally, like in traditional Chinese tales, the trans man himself transforms into a snake. In this loss of a human form, *D X* questions what it means to be legally recognized as trans when anatomical and political discourses do not accept the trans body as human reality.

***Sousveillance* Inside (and Outside) the Exhibition Room**

But Cheang's panopticon is not just inverted. It projects the ten fictional cases developed in the 4K video installation and it is decentralized, open to images from the outside. Cheang has connected the projection tower to a 3-D camera surveillance system that scans the body of the visitor on arrival, registers their image, mixes and morphs it with hundreds of others to later project it as a hybrid on the same surface as the alleged sexual prisoners—a disclaimer warns the visitors that by entering the exhibition they are accepting to become part of the surveillance system. This contract exposes the historical relationship between colonial and patriarchal epistemology present in the visual devices of the prison and of the museum, leaving us to question the neutrality of the exhibition space. But in showing up the subject position of the exhibition visitor as data and sample of the bank (and of the market), Cheang also offers hints to awaken collective consciousness and the means to act. The exhibition consciously uses gender and racial morphing as queer digital

strategies to disrupt the tradition of colonial and anthropometric identification techniques that extend from nineteenth-century Alphonse Bertillon's criminological photography to contemporary AI facial recognition.

For example, in 2017, Stanford University created a computer algorithm that claimed to be able to distinguish between gay and straight men 93 percent of the time, and 81 percent for women. In order to create the algorithm researchers Michal Kosinski and Yilun Wang used what they call "deep neural networks," a mathematical system that learns to analyze visuals based on a large data set.¹⁹ Unlike Bertillon who could only count on police, hospital, or colonial detention records to construct his visual archive, this new AI sexual recognition device was created using more than 35,000 facial images posted by users of a US dating website, voluntarily and publicly.

But if machine vision can guess sexual orientation it is not because sexual identity is a natural feature to be read. It is because the machine works with the same visual and epistemological regime that constructs the differences between heterosexuality and homosexuality: We are neither homosexual nor heterosexual but our visual epistemologies are; we are neither white nor black but we are teaching our machines the language of technopatriarchal binarism and racism. *3x3x6* shows this by allowing physical and virtual visitors to send selfies to the online exhibition system. The uploaded images are added to the bank of surveillance images, and then converted into 3-D digital avatars, transformed by a computational system designed to trans-gender and trans-racialize facial data. Further, the surveillance system is hacked by an anti-colonial, transfeminist, and decentralized guerrilla: the faces and bodies of those criminalized by sexopolitical regimes are mixed in and combined with the image of the visitor to create a single visual universe, where one is both reflected and transformed collectively.

By connecting the exhibition to an internal network of 3-D surveillance cameras but also to the open flow of exterior online data,

Cheang transforms the panopticon into a tower of *sousveillance*. This is the term that Canadian critic Steve Mann has given to the radical change in surveillance apparatuses through the use of wearable and portable personal technologies.²⁰ If the French term "surveillance" refers to the "from above" location of the physical or technical eye in the panopticon system, "sousveillance" speaks of the shift from the vertical and radial architecture of the prison to the horizontality and vulnerability of the personal computer device. Although the miniaturization and digitalization of surveillance technologies creates a dispersed, decentralized, and limitless watching regime, which densifies the network of control, it also opens the door to the possibility of an inverted surveillance move, one in which the users become agents watching the regime's eye. Within the contemporary complex of interlocking panopticons and billions of personal smartphones, there is political leverage not only in the position of the watching device but in the collective capacity of users to trigger a strategic movement of dissent, resistance, even rebellion. First, this requires being able to unveil the technologies we use as apparatuses of control and resistance (instead of mere means of communication or entertainment), and second, to understand the way they function and then dare to intervene into their operative system.

By opening up the possibility for the visitor to use personal smartphones and apps differently, by constantly uploading data from the visitors and entering it into the image flow of the exhibition, Cheang extends *3x3x6* outside of its physical location, blurring the limits between the museum and the Internet, but also between artist and visitor, between producer and receiver. She is also questioning individual freedom and intimacy, collective agency and participation. *3x3x6* shows us that computers and smartphones are miniature portable prisons, and museums that confine, constitute, and exhibit our sexual selves only give us the impression of independence and privacy. At the same time, the exhibition invites us to use both sites for possible action and resistance in times of cybernetic sur(sous)veillance.

Digital Avant-Garde: Creating Dissident Interfaces

Hacking digital surveillance technologies and social media, Cheang uses the historical site of the Venetian Renaissance prison to create a real-time dissident interface that the visitor is invited to enter. But this “entering” is no longer just a physical act. The visitor’s facial image is tracked and transformed into data; manipulated to modify parameters associated with cultural codes of gender, sexuality, and race; and reloaded into the biopolitical bank of historical and fictional faces of “sexual offenders” and gender revolters. The visitor can also access the system digitally and introduce elements that translate into exhibited images, such as reuploading the dancing videos of the women arrested and jailed for online posting in solidarity.

If the early twentieth-century avant-garde protested against the cultural conventions of art representation in the nineteenth century and denounced such conventions as political instruments of control, today we are seeing the emergence of a new digital avant-garde working to transform the frameworks of vision, sound, and meaning production to reflect on the change from an analogical society to a digital totality: as reflections on the transformation between gender norms and the legal and illegal cultures of sharing digital materials online, *Brandon* (1998–99) and the *Kingdom of Piracy* (developed with Yukiko Shikata and Armin Medosch in 2002) were respectively two pioneer projects by Cheang within this movement. Whereas modernism negotiated the tension between craft and the emergent technologies of its era, the digital avant-garde develops out of the reassessment, critique, and collapse of modern aesthetics by post-Internet technologies, including data mining, mass surveillance, and AI. This digital avant-garde movement undertakes two oppositional moves, as seen in *3x3x6*. First, instead of working for the Internet as mere content provider, Cheang uses and misuses the possibilities of producing and distributing art specific to the Internet. Second, the artist practices what we could call fictional disobedience: Her ways of coding and narrating oppose

the hegemonic narrative that criminalizes sexual, gender, and racial minorities; she questions the norms that have established the difference between the normal and the pathological, the real and the virtual, the socially recognized and the invisible. Cheang does with Internet technologies what Pasolini did with film, Kathy Acker with literature: turn a medium against itself only to reconnect it with political history and social agency. In doing so, the post-Internet digital avant-garde, to which Shu Lea Cheang belongs, challenges the aesthetics of Internet global capitalism and the politics of identity construction fueled by social media and exploited by marketing and political control alike.

-
1. Dedicated to all sexual and gender prisoners in real or in epistemological prisons.
 2. For legal and political reasons, names of contemporary prisoners visited and fictionalized in the exhibition *3x3x6* are kept silent or modified.
 3. Gilles Deleuze, “Postscript on the Societies of Control,” *October* 59 (Winter 1992): 3.
 4. *Ibid.*, 4.
 5. *Ibid.*
 6. As part of the research project to produce *3x3x6*, we visited several panoptic prisons, including the Chiayi Prison Museum in Taiwan, which was built during the Japanese occupation and still functioned as a prison until the beginning of the 2000s.
 7. For the control room in the Playboy Mansion, see Paul B. Preciado, *Porno-topia: An Essay on Playboy’s Architecture and Biopolitics* (New York: Zone Books, 2014).
 8. See Aine Collier, *The Humble Little Condom: A History* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2007).
 9. About the racist myth of emasculated Asian masculinity, see David L. Eng, *Racial Castration: Managing Masculinity in Asian America* (Durham NC: Duke University Press, 2001).
 10. See Ewa Majewska, “Public against Our Will? The Caring Gaze of Leviathan. ‘Pink Files’ from the 1980s Poland and the Issue of Privacy,” *InterAlia: A Journal for Queer Studies* (2017), http://www.interalia.org.pl/en/artykuly/on_a_rolling_basis/public_against_our_will_the_caring_gaze_of_leviathan_pink_files_from_the_1980s.htm.
 11. See the different accounts of this event in the biographies by David Macey and Didier Eribon, and specially in Remigiusz Rzyziński, *Foucault w Warszawie* (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Dłowy na Istnienie, 2017).
 12. Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archeology of the Human Sciences* (London: Routledge, 1989), 422.

13. See Gayle Rubin's description of the club, "The Catacombs: A Temple of the Butthole," in *Leatherfolk—Radical Sex, People, Politics, and Practice*, ed. Mark Thompson (Boston: Alyson Publications, 1991), 119–41.
14. See Angela Y. Davis, "Rape, Racism and the Myth of the Black Rapist," in *Women, Race, & Class* (New York: Vintage Books, 1983).
15. *Ibid.*, 106.
16. Iranian police had already been publicly criticized after the blogger Sattar Beheshti died in custody in 2012.
17. See Silvia Federici, *Witches, Witch-Hunting, and Women* (Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2018).
18. *Ibid.*, 3–4.
19. Michal Kosinski and Yilun Wang, "Deep Neural Networks Are More Accurate Than Humans at Detecting Sexual Orientation from Facial Images," *Open Science Framework*, February 15, 2017, last accessed February 11, 2019, <https://osf.io/zn79k>.
20. See Steve Mann, "Sousveillance: Inverse Surveillance in Multimedia Imaging," in *Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual International Conference on Multimedia* (New York: ACM, 2004), 620–27.

異議界面 鄭淑麗的《3X3X6》及 數位先鋒¹

保羅·普雷西亞多



自文藝復興時代至1922年，「普里奇歐尼宮」(Palazzo delle Prigioni) 一直都是威尼斯的中央監獄。這裡是2019年第五十八屆威尼斯雙年展台灣館的展出地點。威尼斯的監獄一開始設在總督宮裡，1641年擴遷到宮殿對面的建築中，中間由嘆息橋相連。今天，皮歐比 (Piombi) 監獄(威尼斯人因其屋頂的建築材料，用「鉛」(Piombi) 來命名這座老監獄) 因為1755年曾囚禁義大利作家、深具傳奇色彩的情聖賈科莫·卡薩諾瓦 (Giacomo Casanova) 而出名——他被關幾個月後就成功越獄了。

藝術家鄭淑麗創作了《3x3x6》系列，來回應這座監獄的建築和政治歷史。這個歷史既作為材料，又作為創作中的概念元素。她把這座建築當作跨越歷史與虛構、記憶與想像的場域，創造了一個具有多重界面的沉浸式裝置，來反思性的主體性 (sexual subjectivity) 是如何透過不同的監禁和控制技術——從身體囚禁到當今社會無所不在的監控系統——而被製造出來的。

為了這個作品的創作，鄭淑麗與國際學者、社運分子及研究者合作，包括迪恩·斯佩德 (Dean Spade)、何春蕤 (Josephine Ho)、黃道明 (Hans Huang) 等人，研究歷史上及當代由於性別、性以及種族上不同主流而導致監禁的案例。針對這個計畫，鄭淑麗考察了很多監獄建築，訪問了世界上不同地方的獄中人。² 這個研究過程促使她選了十個案例，以它們為關鍵材料，創作出十部一系列的4K影片，思考法律和視覺體系如何影響性、性別以及種族規範。

數位時代的監控與全景監獄

在這個作品中，鄭淑麗探索監獄體系與社會規範之間的關係，在數位文化內尋覓囚禁和監控技術的變化軌跡。她的作品把普宮帶進了當代語境，這個語境的元素包括全球網際網路和人工智慧、軍用機器人技術和基因工程，以及用於干預生殖、認知和心理過程的生物、化學技術。這些技術催生的典範轉移，可以與印刷機發明和十五世紀展開的殖民活動帶來的典範轉移相比。我們正在從一個從勞力 (人或非人) 中榨取剩餘價值的

社會轉化成一個新型社會，機器不僅會接手大部分的工作，還將會控制並決定什麼東西在何時以什麼方式製造出來：我們正在從古騰堡的讀、寫時代進入一個符號閃爍的社會，正在從一個類比的、以文本為基礎的文化進入一個由演算法構成的數位電子風景。這也是權力、知識和快感之間關係的變化。這種變化導致新型的主體性以及新式的征服和抵抗。

1990年代初，德勒茲 (Deleuze) 追隨傅柯 (Foucault)，用「控制社會」(control society) 一詞來描述知識—權力關係的呈現。³ 然而，德勒茲和傅柯都沒有反思過技術會對性別化、性化、種族化的主體帶來怎樣的影響。儘管性別 (sexes) 之間、種族範疇之間以及同性、異性戀之間的區別是西方殖民及解剖政治話語的創造。然而，新的視覺及監控技術以及通訊和生殖技術正在建構、創造出新的主體位置。我曾經用過「藥學色情資本主義」(pharmacopornographic capitalism) 一詞來描述在由生化及網路通訊技術主導的新型權力格局特定的性身體和主體性的製造——在這個新權力中，自然與人工、內與外、在場與缺席、製造者和接收者之間的傳統界線變得模糊。

對德勒茲而言，從十九世紀那種規訓式 (disciplinary) 的社會轉換到新的控制型社會的主要指標之一，就是從「諸多圈圍空間」(監獄正是這種空間的典範) 轉換到「超高速自由遊走的控制形式，而這種新的形式取代了在封閉系統的時間框架中運作的舊有規訓形式」。⁴ 正如德勒茲指出的，在規訓體系下，監獄的時、空之間具有類比關係，而在控制社會中，「不同的控制機制是彼此無法分開的變化形式，它們形成了一個可變的幾何系統，而數字 (不一定是二元的) 是這個系統的語言」。傳統監獄的圈圍 (enclosures) 是「模子、各不相同的鑄件」，而控制的技巧則是「一種調制，就像一個自我塑形的鑄模一樣，會時刻變化，或是像篩網一樣，從一點到另一點不斷地變形」。⁵

當代政治情勢的特點就在於，規訓體系下的監控機制和控制機制侵入了傳統上認為最私密、最自然的空間：個人的身體。在規訓型社會中，身體因為居於充斥權力的物理空間而被臣服：主體的身分 (正常或異常、有病或健康、兒童或成人、自由公民或罪犯、工人或業主、男或

女、異性戀或同性戀)是透過身處權力充斥的公共建築(醫院、學校、工廠、家庭空間、精神病院、監獄等)之內或外而被建構。在藥學色情的體制下，權力建築被充電、被微縮、被變成私人數位通訊設備及生物技術假體：個人的身體成了有機建築，上面附著著權力設備。現代主體棲息於規訓建築內；當代主體則成了控制儀器的棲息地。

當傅柯、德勒茲以及德勒茲的合作者瓜塔利(Guattari)預料到圈圍空間的終結以及寓意上的牆的坍塌，他們沒有預見到的，是一種新的混雜呈現的誕生：與過去三十年發展出來的大規模囚禁體系共存的，是各種新型的數位及生技控制手段。控制社會的到來並沒有抹去規訓體系的建築學技術，而是建立起了一個意想不到的聯盟。新的控制方式透過把多種(且常是相互對抗的)主體生產技術並置而出現，這些技術來自多種歷史體系：我們不再是規訓體系下的類比主體，但也尚未完全成為控制體系下的模組化數位生物。我們處於轉化中。

這個時刻的政治潛力和詩學潛力與建立新的壓迫和排斥形式帶來的風險一樣大。鄭淑麗創造了實驗工具，來度過這個轉化。她的作品在真實與想像之間運作，它發明了新的「反神話」，刻意誤用控制技術，從而摧毀權力關係。鄭淑麗思考十九世紀以來，監控和監禁的技術是如何轉化成今天的3D人臉辨識及網路監控技術的。她將普宮的四個展覽室打造成高科技監控空間，以詰問不同的視覺體系和法律體系如何建構性別、性、種族和健康，並使之常態化。

倒置的電子全景監獄

全景監獄(panopticon)為傑瑞米·邊沁(Jeremy Bentham)和塞謬·邊沁(Samuel Bentham)兄弟於1786年發明：他們把克里切夫(Krichev)一座工業檢查建築進行改造，用來優化工人的產量。其後，全景監獄快速成了監獄監控的方法，在歐洲廣為採用，並在十九世紀被推廣到了美國和日本。⁶其建築包含兩個同心圓的環形牢房以及中心的觀察塔，從塔上任何一個視點都可以監控從圓心發散出去的大量小牢房，而囚徒不知道

他們是否正在被監視。每間牢房有兩個窗戶：一個窗戶讓光線進入，另一個則面對監控塔，而塔樓定時用循環轉向的探照燈照亮牢房。每個牢房不斷受到監視，成了機構窺探的對象。對傅柯而言，全景監獄不僅只是個單純的建築設計：它還是權力與知識構成的規訓體系的典範模式。

鄭淑麗利用全景監獄的建築模式來打造《3x3x6》A展覽室。然而，她並沒有單純重新呈現全景監獄建築模式的運作機制，而是扭轉相機、替換接線、交換位置，並掩蓋軌跡。她的塔樓投射影像，而不去監視。在鄭淑麗的全景監獄中，觀眾會看到十位囚徒的肖像——他們成了這件藝術作品虛構探索的對象。透過把全景監獄的主要功能由監視變成投射，鄭淑麗反思這個裝置的「述行」(performative)維度。她這座監獄的目的不是要「監視」所謂的性罪犯，而是把已經建構好的形象投射到她／他／*的身上。實際上，(「常態」或「病態」的)主體位置正是權力的集體運作的投射。(例如，當歐洲從貴族時代進入共和時代之時，卡薩諾瓦和薩德處於兩個性主體位置的邊緣：一位是威脅天主教對女性生殖控制的浪子，另一位是無神論者和褻瀆者，威脅神學秩序對性快感的道德限制。在二十世紀，閹夫者、黑人性侵犯、患有愛滋病的同性戀者、跨性別人士，以及性感的網路E女郎，都成了權力展現的「投射」。)因此，鄭淑麗把全景監獄詮釋為多頻道的投影機，強調了監視和製造的矛盾之處，以及在觀察與建構主體(我們也監視、控制這個主體)間的細微差異。

B展室和C展室有很多螢幕，放映著十位囚徒個案的十部4K影片。這個空間成了一個迷宮，充斥著來自十八世紀威尼斯至當代臺灣的敘事和年表。這些4K影片把法律文件、虛假新聞、歷史報導、迷思和幻想揉合在一起，把跨龐克(trans punk)科幻、酷兒及反殖民想像作為視覺和批判的框架，來講述性常態化和監禁的歷史，並思考征服和抵抗的問題。此外，作品使用了跨時間敘事——這個技法旨在激發對歷史進行異議解讀、激發當下的詩意和政治行動的批判性擴散。這個技法讓十部影片中的角色跨越時間，改變性別、種族、生理性(sex)和社會性(sexuality)。透過讓觀眾在影片之間漫步並做出敘事連結，作品邀請他們建構數位時代對性的酷兒反歷史。

最後，觀眾被帶往D展室，他們可以選擇進入，就好像有可能打開「黑盒子」一樣。假如他們進去了，將會看到一個受休·海夫納（Hugh Hefner）花花公子豪宅控制室影響的控制中心。在他的控制室裡，海夫納監視並記錄豪宅二十多個房間（包括花花公子玩伴的私人臥室）裡所有發生的事情。⁷透過結合「獄宮」和「歡樂宮」（海夫納把花花公子豪宅稱為「歡樂宮」（pleasure palace），鄭淑麗質詢懲罰與快感、監控與欲望，以及監視我們的體系與我們主動樂於參與的監控系統之間，具有什麼政治關係。

《3x3x6》這個標題的來源是今日西方監禁「性罪犯」和「恐怖分子」監獄體系的標準化建築結構：每個標準牢房有3x3平方公尺，沒有窗戶，被六個攝影機每天二十四小時監控。也就是說，當代牢房本身就是個藥學色情（pharmacopornographic）容器，一個全面封閉但具有電子透明度的空間。裡面住著一具用化學手段管理的身體，一天二十四小時處於閉路電視監控之下。

藥學色情時代的卡薩諾瓦

在4K影片系列中我們遇見了卡薩諾瓦X——他是虛構的賈科莫·卡薩諾瓦，而真實的卡薩諾瓦1755年被主政的十人議會大長官逮捕，在皮歐比監獄囚禁了幾乎一年，直到成功越獄。他一直不知道自己的罪名是什麼——很有可能是閱讀並傳播神祕、玄妙和淫穢書籍；如果不是這個罪名，就很可能因為他是共濟會成員。他的被捕或許也與他和瑪麗娜·莫洛西尼（Marina Morosini）的祕情有關。由於卡薩諾瓦債臺高築，且不是當時威尼斯共和國由不到四十個貴族家族構成的小圈子的一員，他沒有受到任何庇護。然而，讓藝術家鄭淑麗感興趣的，並不是在西方被神話的風流浪子卡薩諾瓦。相反地，她關注的是這位浪子生平中的一個常常被人忘記的細節：卡薩諾瓦性關係眾多，卻又不想染上梅毒、不想讓女人懷孕。所以他和傑瑞米·邊沁一樣，是十八世紀末保險套使用的主要倡導者——這與教堂和國家的觀點背道而馳。⁸反對西方表述把亞洲男

性特質與閹割畫上等號的做法，⁹鄭淑麗創作了一位縱慾的、性別不定的亞洲卡薩諾瓦X，由臺灣表演者魏道揚（Enrico Wey）扮演。鄭淑麗呈現的不是在西方被奉為偶像的男異性戀者卡薩諾瓦，而是身為最早性教育家的卡薩諾瓦：作為倡導安全性行為的先驅，他超越了直男與酷兒之間的刻板差異。

卡薩諾瓦X就是這樣在影片中穿越了時間和文化，與00 X這位人物相遇的：00 X是位愛滋病帶原的年輕人，他被控的罪名包括散布愛滋病，透過社交網路尋找男同志發生性關係，以及嗑藥做愛（chemsex）；他在臺灣被判入獄十年。十一位與00 X發生過性行為的男性被傳喚到庭作證；其中一些人之後也以同樣罪名被控。00 X一案於2017年在臺灣被公之於眾，激起了關於勞工階層和中產階層的臺灣同志圈中嗑藥做愛的討論。

「嗑藥做愛」（Chemsex）一詞出現於2001年，指的是集體服用藥物（主要是甲基苯丙胺、GHB或γ-羥基丁酸，以及俗稱「喵喵」（miaow miaow）的甲氧麻黃酮），來增強性體驗。嗑藥做愛主要是藥物與智慧型手機APP、化學刺激的性行為與網路交友，以及把愛滋病帶原身體視為潛在汙染者（儘管他們可能已在接受雞尾酒療法，因此傳播的機率為零）的病態化做法和國家網路監控之間的關聯。網路釣人（cruising）的各種APP最早為同志圈使用，它們的出現催生了一個由依賴修圖的各色虛擬化身、祕而不宣的交往，以及對性伴侶的評估所組成的世界。但同時，國家也在利用網路監控來執行他們的電子衛生學迫害：驗血的義務、正式宣告自己的愛滋病毒帶原情況，以及用APP監控個人活動，這已然催生了前所未有的性控制形式。

在鄭淑麗創作的虛構故事中，00 X和他的十一位性伴侶及法律證人都穿上了臺灣戒嚴時代傳統的粉色囚服，在藥片雨中起舞，就像是情人組成的隊伍。我們看到00 X實際上是卡薩諾瓦X的分身，是這位義大利浪子的另一個當代藥學色情版，他淪陷在數位監控和恐同衛生法律構成的網中。這部影片在梅毒和愛滋病的年表之間建立了聯繫，結尾的場景是兩個人既浪漫（又帶有政治意味）的相遇：卡薩諾瓦X不僅把他的保險

套給了OO X，還熱情地親吻他，有意喚起並正視圍繞愛滋傳播的恐懼和汙名。

性生化人時代的薩德和社會契約

只要想到西方現代性裡的監獄體系與性之間的關係，就一定會想到薩德侯爵。薩德因褻瀆和性偏差的罪名，從法國舊制度時期到十八世紀末的共和時代，在不同的監獄總共被關了三十二年。正如喬治·巴代伊（Georges Bataille）所說，沒有人比薩德更了解西方啟蒙時代的道德變態。薩德的作品充斥著死亡懲罰、極度監禁，以及徹底窺探。他把無限的性享受描繪成絕對主權的前提——值得注意的是，他的創作時間與邊沁設計出全景監獄的時間吻合。薩德的這些描寫可以用來幫助理解國家及其監獄制度與被有罪化、性化和種族化的身體之間的關係——從這些身體上，國家及其監獄系統汲取了勞力、知識和愉悅。

大多數電影和文學作品把薩德塑造成一位苗條的男性。其實薩德有一百八十多公斤重，且他最常採用的不是異性戀性行為，而是自我肛插。鄭淑麗作品中的薩德X由當代表演者利茲·羅森菲爾德（Liz Rosenfeld）扮演，這位薩德X恢復了他的物質性和女性特質。這部影片是一首用寫作和獄中性行為譜成的酷兒頌歌，它歌頌抵抗，描述了《索多瑪一百二十天》（*120 Days of Sodom*）手稿是如何被搶救下來的。1785年，囚於巴士底監獄的薩德把這個十二公尺長的手稿藏到了他在獄中用於肛交的中空假陰莖中。7月14日巴士底監獄被洗劫後，薩德以為手稿丟失了，但它最終被找到，並於1904年被出版。

在另外一部4K影片中，薩德X遇到了MW X——此人在殺死他在網路食人主題論壇認識的男子後，被判終身監禁。被殺的男子事前簽過協議，同意在殺死自己的性儀式之後被吃。鄭淑麗強調了網路技術在這種形式的性關係中扮演的關鍵角色，並把MW X的性伴侶轉化成了一臺電腦，把殺人和吃人轉化成了分解和電子消化的過程。MW X對簽約殺死同伴的癡迷，體現出社會民主契約主義和傳統同意觀念的侷限，指出了

攝食和性之間、挪用與合併之間、快感和他者的消失之間，具有複雜的潛意識關係。

傅柯X在華沙

在歷史案例和當代案例之中，《3x3x6》塞進了冷戰時期年輕的傅柯在波蘭被控同性戀的案例。1958年，傅柯被聘為華沙大學法國中心主任；當時波蘭正處於1956年學生反抗主政的共產黨和蘇聯的十月事件之後。身為法國文化部文化專員的傅柯當時是未出櫃的同志；同性戀在法國尚未完全合法，而在共產國家，同性戀行為受到高度監控。特別是在波蘭，共產黨政府利用人們傳統上對同性戀所持的負面態度來挾制同性戀者。全國各地收集了成千上萬反同性戀者的文件，最終發生了1985年的「風信子行動」（Operation Hyacinth），逮捕了很多男同志。¹⁰

1959年，波蘭一名特務誘惑了傅柯，希望透過把他的性向公之于眾來給法國大使館製造麻煩。傅柯因此受到了警察的同性戀調查，被正式指控和拘留——我們不知道究竟被拘留了多久，但可能沒多久法國大使館就干預了。傅柯身陷這齣外交醜聞，被迫離開華沙，前往漢堡。法國大使館從來沒有公佈過這次指控的官方文件。儘管幾乎沒有受到任何評論，但這次事件很可能在傅柯的生活和著作上都打下了烙印。他在波蘭寫完了博士論文，這個論文於1961年以題為《瘋癲與文明：理性時代的瘋狂史》（*Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*）的專書出版，在書中他提出了一個「惡名昭彰」的觀點，討論各項規訓制度以及現代社會如何用規訓性囚禁來取代公開懲罰。¹¹作為西方重要的性史和監獄史學者，傅柯希望把自己的臉從權力檔案中抹去，就像抹去「畫在海邊沙灘上的臉一樣」，¹²希望在公開場合永遠不被提及他在波蘭監獄的事情。

傅柯遭受驅逐的事件是個典範故事，裡面包含了性與政治、文化史與間諜活動、性與背叛、私人屈辱與公共沉默等諸多成分。它說明傅柯對監控技法和對性少數群體的監禁有著第一手知識，且他日後對此做

了歷史論述。但同時，它也讓傅柯的沉默和自我否定顯得意味深長：為什麼傅柯在講述「性史」的時候不提及此事？身為法國大使館專員以及之後身為法蘭西學院教授的他，是否有可能以第一人稱來談性？鄭淑麗的傅柯X暴露了頭髮尚在的年輕傅柯的祕密。他身處的監獄牢房籠罩在華沙文化科學宮的針形陰影中，他身著和服——這正是埃爾維·居貝爾（Hervé Guibert）在傅柯生命接近終點時所拍照片中傅柯穿的那件。一系列訪客——一名波蘭軍事特務、一位外交官、一位醫生——來給傅柯剃頭、穿衣，把他變成我們熟知的那位公共知識分子偶像：簡樸、光頭、身著白色高領衣、戴著眼鏡。傅柯X的影片把傅柯和波蘭間諜的相會，虛構地放到一個祕密同志聚會場所（類似1970年代傅柯在舊金山常常光顧的地下墓穴俱樂部¹³），在這裡，迫害者／引誘者和被迫害者／被引誘者討論自由的意義是什麼，以及如何使用自由。但只有在變身之後，傅柯才開始說話，作為性史的敘述者，穿越時空，和其他影片中的人物相遇。

非白人強暴犯之迷思

傅柯X在他的跨時空遨遊中遇到了兩個人，一位是B X案的女主角——她因割下丈夫的陰莖、把它丟進垃圾處理機而於2013年被判終身監禁；另一位是穆斯林學者R X，他在2018年被控性侵害和強姦，未經審判在法國一所監獄裡被單獨關押了十個月。他們代表著因被控與性相關的罪行而受到最嚴厲懲罰的兩種政治身體：桀驁不馴的婦女和被種族化的主體。

在為這個作品進行研究的整個過程中，我們學到了一些頗具政治性的教訓。西方現代法律體系通常把女性定義為性暴力的受害者，但很少會思考女性對男性施暴的可能性。這或許可以解釋為什麼大多數女性實施的性暴力會受到最嚴厲的譴責或是會被認為是精神疾病案例——這往往會讓女性因此被終身禁錮。女性暴力總是比男性獲得的刑期長，除非男性是非白人。透過研究#MeToo運動以來若干有關強姦、性侵害和性騷擾的法律案例，我們也認識到，大多數被懲罰、被監禁的是非白人男性。白人男性常常在媒體上被女性排斥，但他們往往能從法律程序中脫

身而不會獲得任何刑期。儘管#MeToo運動已經讓兩百多個男人從位高權重的公共地位跌落下來，但只有少數人面臨刑事訴訟，甚至更少的人因這些指控而被關（且被關的幾乎都是非白人）。因此，當代對性暴力的刑事處罰促進了政治運動家、作家安吉拉·戴維斯（Angela Y. Davis）所說的「黑人強暴犯迷思」的再度出現。¹⁴

對戴維斯而言，這個迷思再度出現是因為白人至上主義又一次成了問題。這個所謂「黑人強暴犯」的迷思是美國在廢奴之後建構的政治發明，之後又被延伸到其他殖民和後殖民的語境中去。它是用來針對非白人群體獲得的法律自由、強化白人權力的工具。當代#MeToo運動和南美的「一個都不能少」（Ni Una Menos）運動的差別正好在於種族歧視在這兩個女性主義抗爭中扮演何種角色。一個都不能少運動是圍繞著南美婦女被殺害的案件展開的，後來延伸到了美國。與「黑人的命也是命」（Black Lives Matter）運動接軌。#MeToo運動常用種族歧視論點來討論施予女性的性暴力（例如2016年指控移民捲入科隆的強暴案），而一個都不能少運動很正確地強調了階級壓迫、種族主義和性暴力之間的相互聯繫。

電子新時代獵巫

《3x3x6》中的其他兩部影片聚焦於黑人強暴犯的女性政治同伴：「隨便女人」的迷思。正如戴維斯指出的：

把黑人男子作為強暴犯的虛構形象一直在強化它不可分割的同伴：黑人婦女放蕩隨便的形象。這是因為，一旦大家接受黑人男子身上有壓制不住的動物性衝動，那麼整個種族都會被與獸性相聯繫。如果黑人男子把白人婦女當作性對象來看，那麼黑人婦女就肯定歡迎白人男子的性關注。由於被當成了「隨便的女人」及蕩婦，黑人婦女被強暴而呼救時，就會被覺得一定不是真的。¹⁵

2018年7月，十八歲的梅德·霍加布里 (Maedeh Hojabri) 因為在IG (Instagram) 上傳了自己跳舞的影片而被捕了。霍加布里用手機錄下自己沒有戴頭巾，在臥室裡隨著流行和饒舌音樂跳舞。德黑蘭網路警察的首長圖拉甲·卡則米 (Touraj Kazemi) 宣告，他的隊伍正在偵查IG上所有推女性不雅舞蹈的網紅頻道，並會對這種行為採取行動。¹⁶ 在隨後的聲明中，網路警察說明了性犯罪的數位性質：法律懲治的不是跳舞本身，而是在網路上傳影片。同時，中國也有幾名婦女因上傳被有關部門認定是淫穢或不雅的自拍影片而被捕。鄭淑麗把其中的L X案例做了虛構處理：這位女子因在網路上模仿口交而被判入獄四年。

正如學者兼社會運動家西爾維亞·費德里奇 (Silvia Federici) 提出的。歷史上，在性和經濟上都很獨立的婦女常被描繪成對父權體系的社會威脅，並成了體制下的獵巫對象。對費德里奇而言，在全球資本擴大、轉化的今天，新的獵巫行動正在進行。¹⁷ 這種獵巫主要發生在網際網路的數位空間中，常常牽涉到IG、推特和臉書——在這些地方，圖像和話語不斷生成，新的價值形式不斷被製造。網際網路被認為是自由的、無性別的空間；在這樣的背景下，針對女性的指控說明，新型技術父權出現了。它受數位獨裁控制，在這裡婦女的身體被嚴厲監控、控制。

在霍加布里被捕後幾天，很多伊朗或非伊朗婦女湧上網，上傳她們跳舞的影片，以示團結，並使用了#dancingisnotacrime (#跳舞無罪) 的標籤。在一則貼文中，一位女性辯稱，她「寧可蹲監獄也不願被『囚禁』在自己的臥室中」——這個說法承認了監獄體系和在家裡及網路上圈禁婦女的性別規範之間具有連續性。面對這種對數位空間進行制約的暴力，需要建構出電子跨女性主義 (e-transfeminist) 的集體主體。這個主體能夠創造出視覺語彙，來應對各種形式的控制。作為一個異議界面，《3x3x6》要引導部分鬥爭，歡迎並重新利用網路上貼出的圖像，以示團結。

關於隨便的女人和女巫的迷思在有關FSB X的影片中再次出現。2011年12月，辛巴威圭洛的三名婦女因強姦並採集男子精子圖利而被關進哈拉雷最高安全級別的奇庫魯比監獄。此後，若干婦女盜取精子的案

例在辛巴威和南非都有報導。據稱這些婦女把精子賣給黑魔法市場。如果把男人被騙發生關係的事實先放在一邊不談，讓這些婦女獲得如此嚴厲懲處的，是她們對精子的採用。與女性的身體、器官和體液不同，男人的身體和體液一直是主權財產和所有權的場域。精子在歷史上被認為是一種神學液體，與男性繁衍的權力和特點緊密相關。由於對男性權力和主權進行了非法交易，這些所謂的精子女盜匪被當成了對抗父權體系的恐怖分子。正如費德里奇所說，在坦尚尼亞和其他中非國家，「監獄裡充斥著被控的女巫，僅僅在2016年，就有一百多人被處死，被叛軍燒死。這些叛軍沿襲了十六世紀獵巫者的做法，以判處死刑威脅，迫使人們付錢。」¹⁸ 鄭淑麗呈現的精子女盜匪集團更像是精子銀行和生育診所。其成員從卡薩諾瓦X的幻想漫遊到藥學色情資本主義。她們很清楚自己在歷史上被當作「精子容器」。她們以體現精子的交換價值來反抗。

默認的二元

就像非白人身體一樣，愛滋帶原身體、被控為E-女巫的身體、跨性別人士的身體成了新的體制化霸凌對象，以及藥學色情資本主義下病態化和刑事化的對象。4K影片D X 講述了一位跨性別男子的故事。這位男子被控與一名女子發生性關係，但沒有告知對方自己的性別狀態。這類法律案件被稱為「詐欺強姦」，體現了深植於法律內部的恐跨意識形態。這些跨性別男性被控用物體或假陽具來代替陰莖，被迫對抗「順性別身體」(cis-body) 的形而上：與幻想的身體發生性關係代表什麼？性的真實與虛構之間的界線是什麼？在現代性與性別知識論中，什麼才是真正的性器官？如果說詐欺強姦的案例突顯了默認二元論的那種知識論，那麼D X則是用羅伯特·梅普爾索普 (Robert Mapplethorpe) 那些被異國情調化、情色化的黑人男性「順性向」(cis-sexuality) 的過度性化軀體，來想像肉體易裝 (somatic drag) 和生物異裝 (bio-transvestism)，把陰莖與種種有機、無機的元素做交換。最後，就像在傳統中國故事中那樣，跨性別男子自己變成了蛇。在失去人的形體之後，D X質疑，如果解剖話

語和政治話語都不把跨性別身體作為人的事實來看，那麼在法律上獲得跨性別身分的認可有何意義？

展覽室內(外)的下監控 (Sousveillance)

鄭淑麗的全景監獄並不只是倒置的：它把4K影片裝置創作的十個虛擬案件投影出來，但同時也保持去中心化、保持對外面影像的開放。鄭淑麗把投影塔與一個3D攝影監控系統相連，這個系統在觀眾到來的時候對他們的身體進行掃描。記錄他們的影像，並把這幾百個影像混在一起變形，然後投射到放映性囚徒影像的同一個螢幕。一份隱私權聲明提醒觀眾，只要進入展區，他們就要接受成為監控系統的一部分。這個契約暴露了監獄和博物館視覺設備中出現的殖民知識論和父權知識論之間的歷史關係，讓我們質疑展覽空間的中立性。然而，當鄭淑麗把展覽觀眾作為銀行(和市場)的數據和樣本來展示他們的主體位置的時候。她也提供線索，希望喚醒集體意識和行動的方法。這個展覽有意識地把性別和種族變成為酷兒數位策略，來抵制殖民和人體測量識別傳統——這些技法包含甚廣，從十九世紀阿方索·貝蒂雍(Alphonse Bertillon)發明的犯罪攝影到今天的人工智慧人臉辨識技術都有。

例如，史丹佛大學在2017年創造了一個電腦演算法，宣稱它有百分之九十三的準確率可以區分男同志和直男，而百分之八十一的準確率可以區分女性中的同志和非同志。為了創造這個演算法，研究人員米凱·克辛斯基(Michal Kosinski)和王軼倫(Yilun Wang)使用了他們稱之為「深度神經網絡」的東西。即一個根據大型數據庫分析視覺元素的數學系統。¹⁹貝蒂雍只能依靠警察、醫院或殖民拘留紀錄來建立自己的視覺檔案；與貝蒂雍不同的是，這個新型人工智慧性向識別裝置，使用的是美國一個交友網站上，人們自動、公開上傳的三萬五千多幅臉部影像。

但如果機器能猜測性向，不是因為性身分是可以解讀的自然特徵，而是因為機器依賴的視覺體系和知識體系，正是建構了異性戀和同性戀之間差異的相同體系。我們既不是同性戀也不是異性戀，但我們的視覺

知識論體系有這些區別；我們既不是白人也不是黑人，但我們把技術父權的二元論和種族主義作為語言，教給了我們的機器。透過讓現場和網路觀眾把自拍影像發送給線上展出系統，《3x3x6》展現了這一點。觀眾上傳的圖片被添加到監控系統的影像庫中，然後被打造成3D數位化身。這些人臉數據被計算系統進行跨性別化和跨種族化，從而發生轉化。監控系統進一步被一個反殖民、跨女性主義、反中心化的游擊隊入侵：被性政治體系罪化的人臉和身體與觀眾的影像混合在一起，創造出一個單一的視覺世界。在這個世界中，每人一方面反思，同時被集體轉化。

透過把展覽和內部網路的3D監控攝影機相連，同時也與外部上傳數據相連，鄭淑麗把全景監獄打造成了一座下監控(sousveillance)塔。加拿大評論家史蒂夫·曼(Steve Mann)用這個詞來描述可穿戴、便於隨身攜帶的科技產品帶給監控技術的巨大轉變。²⁰如果法語詞*surveillance*強調的是全景監獄系統中的人眼或科技眼睛的位置「來自上面」，那麼*sousveillance*一詞描述了監獄從垂直、放射狀的建築樣式轉換成了水平的、脆弱的個人電腦裝備。儘管對監控技術的迷你化和數位化製造了一個分散、去中心、無限的觀察體系，讓控制網絡變得更密。但是，這也使監控倒置成為可能，用戶們可以觀察體系的眼睛。在當代全景監獄和億萬個人智慧型手機交織構成的複雜網絡中，政治影響力既可能出現在觀察者的位置上，也可能出現在用戶引發異議、抵抗，甚至是造反的策略性運動的集體力量中。首先，這揭示我們使用的科技是控制和抵抗的工具(而不只是交流或娛樂的手段)；第二，要理解這些技術的功能，且敢於干預它們的運作系統。

透過讓觀眾以不一樣的方式使用個人智慧型手機和APP，並把觀眾的數據不斷上傳，並整合到展覽圖像流。鄭淑麗把《3x3x6》延伸到了展場外，讓博物館和網際網路、藝術家和觀眾、製造者和接收者之間的界線變得模糊。她思考的問題還包括：個人自由和親密關係，以及集體能動性和參與。《3x3x6》告訴我們，智慧型手機和電腦是小型攜帶式監獄。而博物館在禁錮、製造、展出我們的性自我(sexual selves)時，讓我們錯以為我們擁有獨立和隱私。同時，這個展覽邀請我們在這科學技術

上(下) 監控 (sur(sous)veillance) 年代，在展場內外採取行動與抵抗。

數位先鋒：創造異議界面

鄭淑麗挑戰數位監控技術和社交媒體，利用威尼斯文藝復興時代的監獄古蹟來創作出一個即時異議界面，邀請觀眾進入。但這種「進入」不再只是一個身體行為。觀眾的臉部影像被追蹤，被轉化成數據，被用來改變與性別、性和種族等文化符碼相關的參數，然後被重新混入由歷史上和虛構的「性罪犯」和性別反抗者臉部構成的生物政治庫。觀眾還可以以數位化形式進入系統，並引入可以轉化為展覽圖像的東西，例如重新上傳因張貼舞蹈影片以示團結而被捕入獄婦女的舞蹈影片。

如果二十世紀初前衛藝術抗議的是十九世紀傳統的藝術表達手法，並把這些傳統手法作為政治控制工具來貶低。今天我們看到的是新的數位化前衛藝術的出現，它改變了視覺、聽覺和意義製造的框架，反思從類比社會到數位社會的變化：做為對性別規範和線上共享數位資料的合法、非法文化之轉換的反思。《布蘭登》(Brandon) (1998–1999) 和《派樂西王國》(Kingdom of Piracy，於2002年與阿爾敏·麥多士 (Armin Medosch) 及四方幸子 (Yukiko Shikata) 共同創作)，是鄭淑麗在這個運動之中的兩個先驅作品。現代主義協調了傳統手工藝和當時出現的技術之間的對抗，而數位前衛藝術則源自後網際網路技術（包括資料探勘、大眾監控及人工智慧）對現代美學的重估、批判及摧毀。正如我們在《3x3x6》中看到的，這個數位前衛運動採取了兩個反向的策略。首先，鄭淑麗沒有僅僅為網際網路提供內容，而是利用或誤用製造、傳播網路藝術的種種可能。第二，鄭淑麗實施了我們可以稱為「虛擬不服從」的策略：她的編碼和敘述方式對抗了將性、性別和種族少數人群入罪化的霸權敘事；她質疑在正常和病態、真實與虛擬、社會承認和被忽視之間建立區別的規範。鄭淑麗與網際網路技術的關係就像帕索里尼 (Pasolini) 與電影、凱西·艾克 (Kathy Acker) 與文學的關係：讓一個媒介自我對抗，只是為了將其與政治史和社會能動性重新連結。藉此，鄭淑麗所屬

的後網際網路數位前衛藝術挑戰了網際網路全球資本主義的美學，以及被社交媒體推波助瀾，與被市場和政治控制剝削的身分建構政治。

1. 謹以此文獻給所有身陷真實監獄或知識監獄中的性與性別囚徒。
2. 出於法律和政治原因，《3x3x6》展中訪問過和虛擬化的當代受刑人名字皆被隱瞞或改造。
3. Gilles Deleuze, "Postscript on the Societies of Control," *October* 59 (Winter 1992): 3.
4. 同上，頁4。
5. 同上。
6. 作為《3x3x6》調查研究的一部分，我們造訪了若干全景監獄，包括臺灣的嘉義舊監獄——這個監獄建於日據時代，直到2000年代初仍作為監獄在使用。
7. 關於花花公子豪宅中這個控制室的詳情，見Paul B. Preciado, *Pornotopia: An Essay on Playboy's Architecture and Biopolitics* (New York: Zone Books, 2014)。
8. 參見Aine Collier, *The Humble Little Condom: A History* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2007)。
9. 有關柔弱亞洲男性特質的種族主義迷思的討論，參見David L. Eng, *Racial Castration: Managing Masculinity in Asian America* (Durham NC: Duke University Press, 2001)。
10. 參見Ewa Majewska, "Public Against Our Will? The Caring Gaze of Leviathan, 'Pink Files' from the 1980s Poland and the Issue of Privacy," *InterAlia: A Journal for Queer Studies* (2017), http://www.interalia.org.pl/en/artykuly/on_a_rolling_basis/public_against_our_will_the_caring_gaze_of_leviathan_pink_files_from_the_1980s.htm。
11. 關於這個事件的不同說法，參見戴維·梅西 (David Macey) 和迪迪艾·艾利伯恩 (Didier Eribon) 各自寫的傳記，並請特別參見Remigiusz Rzyziński, *Foucault w Warszawie* (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Dowody na Istnienie, 2017)。
12. Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archeology of the Human Sciences* (London: Routledge, 1989), 422.
13. 關於這個俱樂部的描述，見Gayle Rubin, "The Catacombs: A Temple of the Butthole," in *Leatherfolk—Radical Sex, People, Politics, and Practice*, ed. Mark Thompson (Boston: Alyson Publications, 1991), 119–41。
14. 參見Angela Y. Davis, "Rape, Racism and the Myth of the Black Rapist," in *Women, Race, & Class* (New York: Vintage Books, 1983)。
15. 同上，頁106。
16. 2012年部落客薩塔·貝赫施提 (Sattar Beheshti) 在被拘時死去，伊朗警方就已經受到了公開批評。
17. 參見Silvia Federici, *Witches, Witch-Hunting, and Women* (Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2018)。
18. 同上，頁3–4。
19. Michal Kosinski and Yilun Wang, "Deep Neural Networks Are More Accurate Than Humans at Detecting Sexual Orientation from Facial Images," *Open Science Framework*, February 15, 2017, 2019年2月11日參閱，<https://osf.io/zn79k>。
20. 參見Steve Mann, "Sousveillance: Inverse Surveillance in Multimedia Imaging," in *Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual International Conference on Multimedia* (New York: ACM, 2004), 620–27。