SECTION 14

MARGINALITY AND DIFFERENCE

Most of the early works in surveillance studies were primarily concerned with tracing the growth of surveillance practices throughout society and questioning their gestalt implications rather than their differential effects. This scholarship nonetheless set the stage for inquiry into profiling and discrimination. For instance, when Gary Marx raised the problem of "categorical suspicion" in his classic book *Undercover*, he articulated a universalist anxiety about a society where "everyone becomes a reasonable target" (Marx 1988: 219), but in so doing he drew attention to the ways in which surveillance increasingly targeted groups, beginning with categories of suspicion of which individuals were a part. Others developed this emphasis on groups to theorize the inherently discriminatory logics and uses of contemporary surveillance. For instance, Oscar Gandy (1993; excerpted in Section 1) analyzed the ways in which bureaucracies panoptically sort groups, such that poor people of color are especially disadvantaged; Clive Norris and Gary Armstrong (1999; excerpted in Section 7) documented the ways in which video surveillance operators targeted male youth as potential troublemakers and women as objects of voyeuristic desire; and David Lyon (2001, 2003) characterized modern surveillance as being fundamentally a mechanism of "social sorting" along lines of presumed risk or value.

Feminist approaches to surveillance studies, while certainly troubled by issues of social sorting, have generally taken a different tack. This line of inquiry situates surveillance in the historical context of patriarchal domination of women, minorities, and others. For instance, the male gaze is one mechanism of constructing women as passive and vulnerable objects of masculine desire (Mulvey 1975). In such instances, surveillance can serve both as a tool of objectification and control *and* as a protective, patriarchal response to gendered violence. As such, surveillance-based problems and solutions tend to reify patriarchy and the subordination of women. For example, Hille Koskela (2000; excerpted in Section 7) describes how the integration of video surveillance into traditional women's spaces in Helsinki (e.g., places of shopping and transport) had the effect of masculinizing those spaces, making women the objects of new forms of scrutiny while perhaps exposing them to intensified harassment through remote video monitoring. If attention to embodiment, context, and difference are central to feminist analysis, then most contemporary surveillance can be thought of as reproducing masculinist rationalities of disembodied control at a distance because they "artificially abstract bodies, identities, and interactions from social contexts in ways that

both obscure and aggravate gender and other social inequalities" (Monahan 2009: 287).

Recently, there has also been a dynamic move in surveillance studies to cultivate feminist and race studies critiques that confront intersectional forms of oppression, which are increasingly enforced by surveillance practices (e.g., Dubrofsky and Magnet 2015; van der Meulen and Heynen 2016). Intersectionality, here, refers to the ways in which one's various identity classifications—race, class, gender, sexuality, (dis)ability, and so on—might overlap to amplify discrimination or disadvantage. As an exemplar of this work, Rachel Dubrofsky and Shoshana Magnet's (2015) edited volume *Feminist Surveillance Studies* places intersectional analysis at the forefront and calls upon scholars to connect embodied experiences of surveillance to larger systems of structural inequality and violence. Examples might include things like state identification systems that do not accommodate transgender people (Moore and Currah 2015) or battered women's shelters that report undocumented women to immigration authorities (Smith 2015). Surveillance in these cases can be thought of as having an agential, marginalizing capacity: it reproduces the conditions and subjectivities of marginality through its application (Monahan 2010). Key to such investigations is also a focus on the ways in which privilege, and especially white privilege, is encoded in surveillance and security apparatuses, such that the white body is viewed as transparent, normal, and unthreatening. Rachel Hall describes this as the "aesthetics of transparency," indicating how the white body becomes the transparent ideal, while opaque, dark-skinned bodies are translated as threatening and in need of further investigation (Hall 2015; see also Browne 2015).

It is important to note that the developments sketched here—from concerns about universal exposure to surveillance, on one hand, to critical investigations into the gendered, racialized, and classed dimensions of surveillance, on the other—are also indicative of disciplinary shifts in the field. As an oversimplification for the purpose of illustration, whereas sociologists and criminologists might concentrate on social structure, social norms, and stratification, scholars in the fields of communication, cultural studies, women's and gender studies, queer studies, and critical race studies are more likely to analyze the role of representation, discourse, and experience in materializing power relations and politics across social and cultural contexts. Thus, the turn to feminist and intersectional surveillance studies also signals the inclusion of more voices from the humanities in conversations of the field.

The excerpts in this section tilt toward such newer explorations of surveillance, marginality, and difference—ones that stress intersectionality, inequality, and power. Oscar Gandy explores how abstract systems of probabilities and statistics, upon which most organizations rely, discriminate especially against poor minority populations, creating tenacious systems of "cumulative disadvantage." Jasbir Puar critiques the racializing effects of anticipatory surveillance in the context of the "war on terror," noting how normative whiteness is constructed in opposition to the presumed dangerousness of non-white Muslims. Corinne Mason and Shoshana Magnet illustrate how everyday technologies such as mobile phones, GPS units, and websites can create new vulnerabilities for and exacerbate violence against women, especially for marginalized victims for whom encounters with law enforcement may bring about further violence. Finally, Simone Browne persuasively argues that the history of surveillance must be seen as inseparable from the history of racism. With examples ranging from the physical branding of slaves up to contemporary

digital systems of biometric identification, Browne shows how race is imprinted onto bodies, even as slippages between externally imposed and self-asserted identities open up vital opportunities for resistance.

REFERENCES

Browne, Simone. 2015. *Dark Matters: On the Surveillance of Blackness*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Dubrofsky, Rachel E., and Shoshana Amielle Magnet, eds. 2015. *Feminist Surveillance Studies*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Gandy, Oscar H. 1993. *The Panoptic Sort: A Political Economy of Personal Information*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Hall, Rachel. 2015. *The Transparent Traveler: The Performance and Culture of Airport Security*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Koskela, Hille. 2000. 'The Gaze without Eyes': Video-Surveillance and the Changing Nature of Urban Space. *Progress in Human Geography* 24 (2):243–65.

Lyon, David. 2001. *Surveillance Society: Monitoring Everyday Life*. Buckingham, England: Open University.

———, ed. 2003. *Surveillance as Social Sorting: Privacy, Risk, and Digital Discrimination*. New York: Routledge.

Marx, Gary T. 1988. *Undercover: Police Surveillance in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Monahan, Torin. 2009. Dreams of Control at a Distance: Gender, Surveillance, and Social Control. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies* 9 (2):286–305.

———. 2010. *Surveillance in the Time of Insecurity*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Moore, Lisa Jean, and Paisley Currah. 2015. Legally Sexed: Birth Certificates and Transgender Citizens. In *Feminist Surveillance Studies*, edited by R. E. Dubrofsky and S. A. Magnet, 58–76. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Mulvey, Laura. 1975. Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema. *Screen* 16 (3):6–18.

Norris, Clive, and Gary Armstrong. 1999. *The Maximum Surveillance Society: The Rise of CCTV*. Oxford: Berg.

Smith, Andrea. 2015. Not-Seeing: State Surveillance, Settler Colonialism, and Gender Violence. In *Feminist Surveillance Studies*, edited by R. E. Dubrofsky and S. A. Magnet, 21–38. Durham. NC: Duke University Press.

van der Meulen, Emily, and Robert Heynen, eds. 2016. *Expanding the Gaze: Gender and the Politics of Surveillance*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.