

***(S)he said that***  
**Script**

titles:

(S)he said that  
the only grace they could have  
was the grace they could imagine

Paul Preciado voice over:

Before the 18th century, power was defined as a necro-political technique. As a technique of giving death.

The figure of the father is defined not by the power of giving life, but by the power of giving death. The techniques of death.

Anyone in this audience who has been produced historically as a male body, your masculinity has been historically defined by your power to give death.

In the eighteenth century - and it's close to the way we define our bodies now - the techniques of producing truth are displaced from theology to science.

When you say "I am a man" or "I am a woman" you're producing a truth about yourself.

During the eighteenth century we see a displacement, an epistemological rupture from these necro-political techniques, these techniques of giving death, to new techniques of producing life.

The father was the central figure of the necropolitical regime. The female figure is the centre of biopolitical government.

If anybody here has been defined by the medical regime as having a uterus, you are a centre of biopolitical reproduction. That's the way you're defined. You're defined as sperm producers or uterus.

Key issues that will affect the way we have to revolt or the way we have to resist. One is the invention of femininity as an anatomical entity, and being a uterus that must be controlled by power.

New medical discourses define a "natural" continuity between sexuality and reproduction.

The reason homosexuality was considered pathological is because it's not a reproductive biopolitical practice.

We are treated as "homosexuals" because we are a biopolitical failure.

The invention of race as a scientific notion is a key question for biopolitics.

The prohibition of interracial marriage and reproduction is one of the main political strategies of biopolitics.

Male, female, homosexual, heterosexual.

The whole marriage question introduces within the law the notions of homosexuality and heterosexuality.

Those notions are obsolete because we aren't in a biopolitical regime anymore.

In the 1950s, all the war technologies developed during the Second World War, are turned into technologies of production of the body and sexuality.

In the 1940s and 50s, the invention of the idea of gender, that had nothing to do with sex. Sex was defined by nature, gender was defined by the techniques that can be used to produce it.

Those techniques are surgical and chemical. Hormonal and endocrinal.

The bomb that starts the biopolitical regime is the invention of the pill in the 1950s. The pill is a chemical hormonal technique that separates heterosexuality from reproduction. Which means that heterosexuality doesn't exist anymore.

Anybody here who continues to say "I'm heterosexual" or "I'm homosexual..." What are you talking about? According to what regime?

The pill was invented in the US but tested in Puerto Rico and was used as a technique of managing race.

The techniques of controlling and managing reproduction have a lot to do with techniques of producing race.

The last bomb that happened in the 1950s was the transformation of pornography into popular culture.

Pornography became the new media form.

Porn is a new management of sexuality and the body that is not about reproduction. It's for the production of capital.

When people tell me they're doing well, I ask: how could you be well? You have three regimes of power working against each other within your body.

I'm going to stop here so we can continue the discussion.

closing titles:

based on a talk by Paul B. Preciado  
"Pharmacopornographic counter fictions"

Tate Modern's The Tanks, London, 2013

all pictures and sounds are quotations  
like the DJ