I. Visibility, Surveillance, and Safety

Everyone who passes through an airport today is familiar with the following scene: before boarding the airplane, the passenger is subjected to a series of inspections which aim at expanding and insuring the realm of visibility by erasing every last remnant of invisibility and by dragging every object that evades visibility into the light of visibility. A relatively extensive apparatus, a network of detectors and cameras, is constructed to place the local events under the dictates of absolute visibility. This absolute visibility is legitimated with the claim and the guarantee of absolute security. Thus, at the airport, the regime of the panoptic principle reigns: everything must be seen and all must be shown.
Under the rituals of control, however, quite different libidinal regimes form. A social pretext legitimizes the massive besiegement of public and social life with voyeuristic and exhibitionist modes of behavior. The pleasure principle of the voyeur, to see everything and the pleasure principle of the exhibitionist, to show, all have shifted from the sites of private drives to social norms. Voyeurism, exhibitionism, and narcissism are transformed from individual-psychological criteria to social categories. These are accompanied by a narcissistic identification with the all-seeing power of the observer and infantile castration fears of those who do not wish to show all. As Foucault has already revealed, behind the mechanisms of surveillance lie the mechanisms of power, which are likewise supported by libidinal mechanisms. These power mechanisms are formed from psychological mechanisms. Through this entanglement, exhibitionism and voyeurism transform from illegitimate to legitimate pleasures. Likewise, the sadistic pleasure associated with the control of the gaze and the masochistic pleasure associated with submission under the gaze, are afforded new liberties in the social realm. Massochistic and sadistic behavior, exhibitionist and voyeuristic pleasures, invade the public realm and move in new zones whose genesis is still undetermined. The morphology of desire appears daily in new forms. A theater of drives is concealed beneath the masks of control rituals; as the official version proclaims visibility is the top maxim in the name of security for all.

One particular movement makes the specific conditions of the contemporary Panopticon clear: namely, the movement of the hand luggage on the conveyor belt, which accompanies the traveler. The passenger goes through a corridor in the form of an electronic gate, which recalls medieval inspections at the city gates. Simultaneously, the hand luggage crosses through a corridor in the form of a sluice-way. The luggage is visible for a while, then it becomes invisible in the sluice, but the contents of the bags are visible on a screen. Finally, the luggage is visible again but its contents are invisible. The luggage thus passes through zones of visibility and invisibility. These zones vary not only spatially and temporally, but also in relation to their dispassionlessness. In the zones of visibility the objects are not dispassionate. In the zones of invisibility, on the contrary, they are dispassionate. The luggage suddenly submerges from the zone of visibility into the zone of invisibility, revealing however its interior, and, after passing through the luggage shaft, returns to the zone of visibility. Paradoxically, the objects are dispassionate in the zone of invisibility.

This dialectic of visibility and invisibility, dispassionfulness and non-dispassionfulness forms a model for today's society. In the shaft, shielded from the natural "scopic regime," unavailable to the human eye, with the aid of technical instruments the objects become transparent, or more precisely, become dispassionate, transparent images. In the masks of invisibility, the truth shines through.

Jean-François Lyotard brought the problem of visibility into the postmodern discussion. For him, the essential work of the artist lies in "showing that there are invisible things in the visible." Although for modern artists such as Paul Klee, the task of art was making the invisible visible, postmodern artists are presented the somewhat more complex task of showing that there is still something invisible in the visible. Not as agents of total control who want to erase the last remains of invisibility, but, rather, as analysts who point out that the realm of visibility is not limitless and that there are, in fact, principle borders of visibility. The principle structure of the regulation of visibility and invisibility refers to rejection, not only as it is registered within paranoia — although there especially — but in the entire social order. The visible field is a field of symbolic order, and just as rejections are necessarily arrived at in the symbolic order, the field of the visible necessarily arrives at invisible zones. Many realms of reality are not available to our natural senses. The natural human eye cannot see them, only through specially created instruments. Thus we do not see the world, but, rather, images of a world that the instruments create for our eyes. If the image is the only reality that signifies the sensually experienced reality, and if the reality is no longer available to our natural senses, then it becomes a matter of correctly interpreting the image. There are, namely, instruments that penetrate deeper and further into reality than the human eye. Photographic conditions therefore also determine the conditions of the world.

The postmodern formulation of that which is visible refers to the technology of seeing, to the images of the technological world, to the experience of technical seeing. Technical seeing teaches us that there is a reality that is invisible to the natural eye which can be made visible in (technical) images. Visibility and invisibility, the visible and the hidden, form a new equation in the technical world: the hidden can become visible; the visible can contain the
invisible. An invisible reality can become visible in images. A repressed reality is articulated in images because the reality principle is not sufficient to solve the conflict. The pleasure principle assures that the psychological function of attention withdraws from phenomena that do not stir desire — it represses them. But since desires cannot be satisfied by reality, they are satisfied through images that function like hallucinations. The result is post-real satisfaction. The images of the mass media show the social unconscious, the repressed collective desires and fears. A visible world can show the invisible in images. Actors on the political stage who can also not achieve the reality principle produce the depraved and ideologically occluded as images. Through real deeds they produce images for the mass media in order to make the socially repressed visible. The postmodern image theory of simulation, as Baudrillard explains, is "the desert of the real," the negation and the repression of the real, precisely because of the fact that the images to which we make reference become reality. We produce for the images. A postmodern image theory therefore does not begin with an observation of the world, but, rather, with an observation of the image. The communicative act occurs through images. And this act refers, in particular, to the shifting of the zones of visibility and diaphanousness. Visibility is controlled as though with a regulator; the visible field becomes a mobile hatch; the screen is the regulator that travels along the zones of visibility: the visible field becomes a variable zone, in which the diaphanous state of the object is likewise variable. This variable visibility and diaphanousness is a decisive characteristic of the postmodern world after the electromagnetic, technological transformation of the earth, after the erection of the wall of electromagnetic waves and beams via radio, TV, and satellite. Total global control via satellite, GPS, and data surveillance is precisely this variable visibility and diaphanousness; its power but also its border.

II. Reality as Phantom

In 1996 a work appeared that for the first time provided a detailed description of this world of electromagnetic waves and beams, called another "phantasmagoria of the image, the world of the faceless, shadowy, and the image of the naked. The shift in the subject, the shift in the subject, the shift in the subject, the shift in the subject."

In the chapter "Die Welt als Phantom und Maske," in his book "Die Welt als Phantom und Maske," he describes the modeling of images and reality from personal and social life through technical media.

"What now predominates through TV at home is the real or fictitious — broadcast outer world; and this reigns so absolutely, that it thereby makes the reality of the home — not only that of the four walls and the furniture, but communal life — phantom-like and invalid. When the phantom becomes reality, reality becomes a phantom."

The actual revolutionary achievement of radio and TV is that the world comes to people and through this, bow the world and people change.

"When the world comes to us, although only as an image, it is half present and half absent, thus phantom-like. When the event is mobile and appears in virtually countless examples, then it can be considered a serial product, and when payment is made for broadcasting the serial product, then the event is a commodity. When it first becomes socially noteworthy as an image, through its form as a reproduction, the difference between being and appear-

Politics becomes a soap opera, rebellion an action thriller. In the spectacle of the images, public activities become mere reproductions of the mass media forms, which, for their part, are only reproductions. Politics becomes a theatre of instincts, subjected to compulsive repetition because it undermines a tendency to ensure an earlier state of affairs. This compulsive repetition becomes particularly visible at moments of mass media hysteria and political catastrophes. The images of political and social catastrophes are nearly always repeated, almost mimetically, and become visual symbols of political degradation and rituals of instincts. An adequate political and humane reaction to 11 September 2001 would have been to recognize the images as the rejected that had returned to reality instead of hypothetically repeating the images to stir up emotion. To withdraw with a feeling of shame from the repetition and to refrain from continuously and compulsively showing the images of the collapsing Twin Towers would have been media politics for those who did not shamelessly bend to the logic of profit. But what we saw was the politics of profit was victorious over people, and politics exists only as long as it is capable of being an image. The dialectic of desire is also
sparked by political images, and the morphology of voyeurism and exhibitionism, sadism and masochism take shape. Making politics erotic also invades new areas of the fear of power and the identification with power, the results of which remain unknown. The action thriller and disaster film deliver the images of those psychological thrillers; deliver those images that subordinate the real to its reflection.

In an essay on photography, Anders described the “phantom production in radio and television,” which results in “turning reality into a reflection of its images.” In the media world “everything exists only because it is an image; to be therefore means: having been and being reproduced and an image and property.” In the media world, “to be is the same as to be reproduced. The phantoms are not only the matrices of world experience, but rather, the world itself the real as a reproduction of its reproductions.” Anders therefore describes how the rule of the visual, broadcast world, how the reign of the electromagnetic waves, has transformed the world into a phantom world, and how the real is given phantom-like characteristics. He thus anticipates the later positions from Debord’s Society of the Spectacle (1967) and from Baudrillard’s theory of Simulacra.

Debord too described the transformation of the world into an image: “Where the real world changes into simple images, the simple images become real beings and effective motivations of hypnotic behavior. The spectacle, as a tendency to make one see the world by means of various specialized mediations (it can no longer be grasped directly), naturally finds vision to be the privileged human sense which the sense of touch was for other epochs; the most abstract, the most mystifying sense corresponds to the generalized abstraction of present-day society. But the spectacle is not identifiable with mere gazing, even combined with hearing. It is that which escapes the activity of reason, which escapes recontextualization and reeducation by their work. It is the opposite of dialogue. Wherever there is independent representation, the spectacle reconstitutes itself.”

The primacy of representation over reality, the copy over the original, illusion over truth, is the result of the mediation. The spectacle is not a collection of images, but a social relation among people, mediated by images. In societies where modern conditions of production prevail, all of life presents itself as an immense accumulation of spectacles. Everything that was directly lived has moved away into a representation. The concept of spectacle unifies and explains a great diversity of apparent phenomena. The diversity and the contrasts are appearances of a socially organized appearance, the general truth of which must itself be recognized. Considered in its own terms, the spectacle is affirmation of appearance and affirmation of all human life, namely social life, as mere appearance. But the critique, which reaches the truth of the spectacle, exposes it as the visible negation of life, as a negation of life which has become visible.

According to Paul Virilio, this primitiveness of the image leads to the catastrophe, the “accident” that is the core of the postmodern world.

III. The Decline of the Panoptic Principle

Visuality and representation must be reconsidered. In the game between making the phantom visible and making the visible a phantom, new definitions of the equation between visibility and security have become necessary. The panoptic principle—which whose hidden axioms states total visibility guarantees total security—is lifted under the postmodern world’s technical conditions of exposure to variable zones of visibility.

In 1777 an entire epoch was started by the reports of the philanthropist and reformatory Howard. “The State of Prisons in England and Wales, with an Account of some Foreign Prisons.” Howard (1726-1790) can be considered the father of prison reform. In 1779 he was named High Sheriff of Bedford and was thereby made responsible for the regional prisons. He traveled for three years not only through England, but all of Europe, from Belgium to Turkey, to inspect the prisons and discovered that they were “damp, dark and evil, airless and unsanitary.” He bred contagion and disease. Typhus and small pox were rampant. Prisons were operated for financial gain. The gloiter received money from the prisoners for his board and lodging. The painter George Romney (1763-1802), a colleague of Reynolds, Gainsborough and Hogarth, who likewise depicted the dark side of life in his paintings and drawings, was inspired by Howard’s report to do a series of drawings that movingly showed the inhuman inferno of prison detention at that time.

Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) wanted to build the ideal prison architecture to meet Howard’s demands: clean, healthy accommodation with the provision of adequate clothing and linen; separation of prisoners according to sex, age, and nature of offence; proper health care; the operation of prisons should be a charge on the public purse and not on the imprisoned. But Bentham, a strong believer in the work ethic, was not interested solely in improving the sanitary state of prisons. Bentham, as an enlightening philosopher and utilitarian whose philosophy aimed at the greatest good for the greatest number, drafted his ideal prison that was based on the assumption that transparency and visibility would deter delinquent behavior. Thus he designed the
architecture of the Panopticon, a semi-circular prison with open walls and the warden located in the middle. The warden had a constant view of the rooms that were flooded with light and air for the benefit of the inmates. The prisoners, on the other hand, did not know if and when the warden was watching them, because he was protected behind a system of Venetian blinds. They had to therefore assume that they were always being watched and that everything they did was always visible. All of their actions stood under the regime of total and constant visibility.

Bentham, as a rationalist, assumed that the prisoners would not be so foolish as to commit a crime in the light of day before the eyes of the warden. The visibility would prevent them from becoming delinquent. Over the course of time, they would internalize this panoptic principle of being constantly visible and not knowing if they were being observed; thus, of knowing less than the warden. It is the same when we pass by a radar system and do not know whether it is real or just a dummy, and we abide by the law precisely for this reason. All of those who use the roads have internalized the panoptic principle. Bentham knew that physical punishment and miserable living conditions were not effective; on the contrary, the inmates were socially de-integrated and criminalized more so than ever. Therefore, he maintained belief, in keeping with the sense of enlightenment morals and reform, in the view that all people behave rationally, and that the inmates would become accustomed to these panoptic conditions and after years would leave the prison improved.

The classical equation therefore stated that visibility and transparency prevent crimes. Criminals abuse light and only commit their deeds in the dark. Security measures like those at airports, which drag what is hidden inside bags into the light of the scanning screen, also aim at increasing the degree of security and eternally expanding the regime of visibility. Infinite visibility, not infinite justice, could therefore be the true for those global operations with which the United States attempts to protect itself from illegal activities. The events of 11 September 2001 show, however, that this old equation of visibility and security is no longer valid.

In the world of phantoms and matrices described by Günther Anders, where the real becomes a copy of its image, where the event's reproduced form is more important than its original form, and where the world comes to us only as an image, it is clear that illegal activities also have their affect only as images, and more precisely, only as reproductions of images previously disseminated through film and television. If the world reaches people only through TV, then the events will be produced for TV. In this respect, terrorism, who understands the logic of this world, don't seek out the dark; they seek the light. They act like the luggage on the conveyor belt of the x-ray box, remaining for a long time in the zone of invisibility as so-called sleepers, suddenly thrusting powerfully into absolute visibility. They produce their activities directly for the beams and electromagnetic waves of the television. The world is meant to see what they are doing. The event is broadcast live as an image. It is seen and imaged and only becomes an event because it is observed, because it is an image. They use the rules of the media world: everything exists only because it is an image. Thus the new equation states: visibility no longer guarantees security. Instead, security is reduced in the realm of the visible. The actors produce catastrophes precisely for the field of visibility, to be seen in the window of the picture screen, where the world becomes an image.

The more the state attempts to make its citizens become transparent people and the community a transparent community, the more insecurity is created. The more visibility is supported and produced as an agent of security, the less security there is in reality. The diaphanousness of social processes, like that of images, has long become variable and controllable. Visibility is likewise a variable zone. And precisely a social observation for ideological reasons refuses to accept certain facts, which excludes minorities and rejects legitimate issues in favor of its own interests, is that much more subject to this new logic of visibility according to the dictum of Jacques Lacan. That which is rejected and refused in the symbolic order, reappears in reality. Specters, ghosts, and phantoms haunt the world.

IV. Surveillance as Spectacle of Entertainment

This variability of the visual zones and the increasing diaphanousness can also be seen in the mass media in the realm of entertainment in radio, films, and television. In today's society of the spectacle, Debord, following from the same Marxist logic of productive-fetishism as Anders, denounced the advancing reification of culture — as Adorno and Horstheimer had already done in 1949 in their Diatonic of Enlightenment — as having reached its final point in the so-called reality shows and in the afternoon talk shows where people expose their most intimate emotions. The same panoptic principle, which George Orwell, as the sum of his political experience with the totalitarian systems of National Socialism and Stalinism still felt to be a threat — the authoritarian system of total observation, which in his 1949 novel 1984, he described as "big brother" — sank into the entertainment industry. There, however, the panoptic principle is felt as artistic, as fruitful, not punishment, but, rather, as amusement, liberation and pleasure.

In the reality shows Big Brother in Germany, Left in France, and Texit Orange in Austria, staged by TV stations for the mass audience, the panoptic principle, "every- thing must be seen and all must be shown," is put into effect more than ever before as a model for becoming immi- nently towards the society of the future. Observation is no longer an object of entertainment. In the field of surveillance, the panoptic pleasures of exhibitionism and voyeurism, or scopophilia, unfold. The TV viewers at home are members of a television society, inhabitants of a mediated world, enlightened in the ways of the artificial, technological far-senses ("teles" means "far" in Greek) such as television, telephone, telefax. They observe the inhabitants of a long lost, "near-society" without newspapers, TV, fax, phone, etc., they watch carefree, so to say, which consists of close conversation, face-to-face communication. The container is present as entertainment. From the heights of "near-society," the people of the technological "far-senses" are observed like diaphanous, transparent images. They are the objects of seeing. They cannot see the TV observers like the prisoners could not see the guards. Narcissism, femininity, humanity become spectators, objects of the gaze, sources providing the power of presence, the pleasure of sadism, voyeurism, exhibitionism, scopophilia, and narcissism. Andy Warhol was not only the pope of pop, but also the pope of soap. In his early video works and films such as Outer and Inner Space (1967) and Screen Test (1965) he exploits the narcissism of his community members. His factory was the first container in TV history, the first arena for reality-TV. The lives of the members of his factory community were documented as comprehensively as the technological means available at the time made possible. Every conversation was tape-recorded, every telephone call documented (see the novel A: A Novel, 1968); there was constant photographing and filming. Warhol exploited the exhibitionism and narciss-
A Video Artist Disputes Orwell's 1984 "Video of TV"

In his cautionary novel 1984, George Orwell wasn't kind to television. He saw it basically as "Big Brother," a tool of totalitarianism. But today, in the first 33 days of that prophetic year, his view will be repeatedly challenged, by the Russian-born video artist and impresario, Nam June Paik. Good Morning, Mr. Orwell, a live-satellite-relayed program to appear on approximately 20 Canadian television stations, including CHOI/Channel 123, and on WNET/Channel 13, in New York, will Paik's guidelines for television on the basis of a description his technological understanding, rather than an erroneous means of communication.

Mr. Paik's claim that his work is "the first global interactive use of the satellite among international artists" is no small feat. Other video artists, such as Nam June Paik, have employed satellite transmission, but the Paik venture is larger and more complex. And while commercial television has led other parts of the world for informational purposes, Mr. Paik is using works designed specifically for the technology of the satellite itself to relate interactive performances, linking different stages in different parts of the world, as you will see.

Good Morning, Mr. Orwell, as shown essentially a global variety show, originating in the United States, France and Germany, but its lineup of performers will be more familiar to Mr. Paik's avant-garde followers than to mainstream audiences. And while the program does not directly address Orwell's philosophy, Mr. Paik believes that in presenting established and new young talent from both sides of the Atlantic, it will "inaugurate the positive side of the medium."

Among those who will appear, live or on tap, are the rock singers Леонид Андросов and Peter Gabriel belting out the title song (composed and recorded by them especially for the broadcast); on a split screen, the choreographer Merce Cunningham and the composer John Cage in New York improvising to Salvador Dalí reciting a poem (on tape), learned from Germany: the artist Joseph Beuys playing the piano, live from the Poisson Bleu in Paris: the poet Allen Ginsberg and Peter Orlovsky singing one of their own compositions; a group of 10 French street performers and vocalists known as Urban Sex, and the irreplaceable Charlotte Moorman, a cellist famed for playing Paik compositions dressed in almost nothing. She'll be fully clothed for her satellite debut: Laughter — it is hoped — will be provided by interludes with the comedians Mitchell Keesman and Leslie Fiedler, both formerly of "Saturday Night Live." And viewers will also witness a world television premiere: Act III, a film stretching the boundaries of electronic graphic display by Dennis Wieland and John Sanders, with music by Philip Glass.

Now, Mr. Paik still looks, with crumpled clothes and tousled hair, very much the wily kid who first came to the attention of the art world as a video innovator in the 1960s. "I never read Orwell's book — it's boring," he said recently during an interview at WNET. "But he was the first free media communications prophet. Orwell portrayed television as a negative medium, useful to dictators for one-way communication. Of course, he was half right. Television is still a repressive medium. It controls you in many ways."

Grace Glucksman

Nam June Paik

Good Morning, Mr. Orwell

1984
sien of his factory members and made use of the voyeurism of the mass media. Just like every śweatshop production, the owner becomes a millionaire and most of the production workers leave empty-handed or die from amphetamines and other drugs that supported the staging of them as diaphanes, "eccentric", and "original" — as their radical and uninhibited physical and mental fantasy exhibited before the cameras. Possession and destruction are well-known historical strategies of sexuality in the western world.

Warhol's world presented for the first time: surveillance is enjoyment; observation is entertaining. Warhol was a pioneer, paving the way for the soap operas, game shows, and reality shows.

Good Morning, Mr. Orwell [1984] from Nam June Paik is a further example of media art that cleared the way for the mass media game shows and afternoon talk shows. On the occasion of the Orwell year — 1984, a live broadcast was made from the Centre Pompidou in Paris and the studio of WNET-TV in New York. A heterogeneous mixture of pop (Peter Gabriel, Laurie Anderson, Philip Glass, Urban Sax) and avant-garde (Joseph Beuys, Ben Vautier, John Cage, Mauricio Kagel) was electronically collaged and transformed. Through split-screen technique, the TV picture showed simultaneous events occurring in different locations. Good Morning, Mr. Orwell was broadcasted at the same time in the Netherlands, Germany. The panoptic principle turned into the pleasurable.

Two models of explanation can be offered for this transformation in the reception of the panoptic principle; on the one hand, a psychological explanation: new forms of voyeurism and exhibitionism have formed under the new conditions of the gaze in the technical age. Laura Mulvey, in her influential essay, "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema" (1975) investigated cinematic spectatorship and came to the conclusion that film is constructed as an instrument of the male gaze which designs images of women from a male point of view. In mainstream cinema, the man is the subject of the gaze and the woman is the object of seeing. The male gaze controls, and not only enjoys dominance and the pleasure of power to the point of sadism ("pleasure lies in ascertaining guilt — asserting control and subjecting the guilty person to punishment or forgiveness") (Mulvey), but also enjoys the infantile "scopophilia," the pleasure involved in looking at other people's bodies as "erotic" objects. The woman becomes an image, a spectacle. Men do the looking; women are there to be looked at. The situation of the warden in the panoptic prison is repeated in the cinema. In the darkness of the auditorium, neither the figures on the movie screen nor the members of the audience see the observer, whereas they see the persons on the movie screen.

This situation of the panoptic prison also applies to the spectatorship in front of the TV-screens of game shows and reality shows such as Big Brother. A group of people lives in a container and is observed by a crowd of cameras. The viewers in front of the picture screen see everything. The inhabitants of the container see nothing. Exhibitionism and voyeurism complement each other, like the sadism of control and the masochism of being controlled. Additionally, the formation of narcissistic processes of identification with power or an ideal self are made easier, as is the voyeuristic process of transformation of a gazing subject to an object subjected to the gaze. The gaze of the TV spectator watching reality TV becomes an inspective gaze of power. The TV viewer is like the warden in a panoptic prison. The people in reality TV shows become images, spectacles, observed, and controlled. The spectator in front of the picture screen has the pleasure of the controlling gaze.

This formation of new scopophilic pleasures and other pleasures of surveillance also offers the second model of explanation: development of new forms of desire and the gaze serves for conforming to future social relations. "Enjoying surveillance," means enjoying the advancing militarization of perception and the progressing armament of society. When in fact, as can be observed, society is militarily and technically armoring visibility, when the experience of the world is determined by the mediated apparatus from film to television, and even daily life is ever more mediated through the omnipresence of surveillance cameras, then the danger lurks that the population, under this increasing pressure of surveillance and control, will feel a sense of unease and eventually begin to protest, demonstrate and even to revolt against the system of control. To avoid civil revolt against the future surveillance state, the population is acquainted with, and adapted to, progressively increasing doses through the entertainment media.

The entertainment industry has always fulfilled this function in totalitarian systems: becoming increasingly accustomed to the advancing repression through the entertainment media and voluntarily sacrificing to surveillance in the containers of the thousand eyes of Doctor Mabuse, voluntarily becoming the victim of total control. To these new zones, reinforced, technically armed visibility surveillance is not perceived as a threat or a punishment, as Foucault still described the disciplinary society, but instead — finally having arrived at the society of the spectacle — surveillance is enthusiastically enjoyed. Instead of punishment, surveillance becomes pleasure.

This transformation of surveillance from punishment to pleasure and the psychological mechanisms on which that is based, as well as the related structures of power are very explicitly expressed in the film, Rear Window (1954) by Alfred Hitchcock and Peeping Tom by Michael Powell. In these films, the camera becomes a voyeuristic eye, and finally, a sadistic eye (Peeping Tom). In Discipline and Punish Foucault wrote: "Our society is not one of spectacle but of surveillance... We are neither in the amphitheatre, nor in that shape, but in the panoptic machine." But it seems apparent to us that in postmodern society, surveillance can become spectacle and the people can enjoy surveillance as a spectacle because seeing is outdated with sexuality and power (a further theme of Foucault), Martin Jay, in Downcast Eyes (1993), wrote: "Foucault once thought that the very desire to know, rather than being innocent, was itself ultimately derived from an infantile desire to see, which had sexual origins. Sexuality, mastery and vision were thus intricately intertwined in ways that could produce problematic as well as 'healthy' effects. Infantile scopophilia could result in adult voyeurism or other perverse disorders such as exhibitionism and scopophobia (the fear of being seen)."

Fear too, belongs in the topology of enjoyment and pleasure and terror is also on the psychological map of voyeurism. Terror and voyeurism, joy and fear are rings of a common geometry. No one knows that better than Alfred Hitchcock: "My special field is fear which I have split into two categories — terror and suspense... Terror is induced by surprise, suspense by forewarning. Suspense is more enjoyable than terror, actually, because it is continuing experience and attains a peak crescendo-fashion; while terror, to be truly effective, must come all at once, like a bolt of lightning, and is more difficult, therefore, to savour."

This film, Rear Window (1954), is the story of a photographer, Jeff Webber (James Stewart), who is confined to his apartment with a broken leg. While he is there, he watches the lives of his neighbors and observes how they react to situations that are either amusing, frightening, or sad. The film explores the idea of surveillance and how it can be used to manipulate and control. As the plot unfolds, it becomes clear that the photographer is using his observations to uncover a murder. The film is a commentary on the way in which surveillance can be used to control and manipulate people.

We have arrived at the view that we live in a society that prefers the sign to the thing, the image to the fact. We have
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attempted to investigate those visual dispositions that affect and transform the psychological structure in a possibly dangerous morphology and topology of desire. Belonging to this morphology along with marxism, psychoanalysis, and forms of scopophobia, are also the so-called forms of scopophobia. Fear has long been a field of the picture industry as Hitchcock indicates. The cinematic form of emotion, from suspense to apocalyptic horror films, is, secretly, also a field of enjoyment. Nonetheless, "suspense is more enjoyable than terror," Hitchcock reveals, but simultaneously proves that pleasure can take a masochistic form that neater the tension up to the moment of terror. The pleasure spectacle can also achieve indirectly and effectively benefit from fear. If the image, the spectacle, only proceeds reality, then the fear will soon become real. In the same way that reality becomes phantasm-phantom-like through the image, this image-like reality also becomes frightening through psychological mechanisms, an invention of the principle of desire. A regime of fear, of the uncanny, has long ruled in Hollywood films: The Sieg, Independence Day, Armageddon, Executive Decision, Outbreak, Die hard, Escape from New York, and, of course, countless other disaster films have shown exploding and collapsing skyscrapers, attacks on the White House, etc.; they have visibly displayed the insecurity. The "calcified hallucinations" (Mike Davis) of Hollywood have enjoyed such great popularity because American society suffers from fear. "Fear studies" accompanied the transformation of American society. Various forms of fear crept from the refusal to reform the real conditions of inequality and racism: sociophobia, cultural conspiracy, plague of paranoia, hermetic suspension. Not only Hollywood, but also society in general believe in this self-generated illusion. The decline of the image, the illusion, and the media of the image are the principal agents of the transformation of American society. The spectacular is the apotheosis of the image.