TORIN MONAHAN AND DAVID MURAKAMI WOOD

INTRODUCTION

Surveillance Studies as a Transdisciplinary Endeavor

Surveillance studies is a dynamic field of scholarly inquiry. It emerges, in large part, from recognition of the ways in which pervasive information systems increasingly regulate all aspects of social life. Whether with workplaces monitoring the performance of employees, social media sites tracking clicks and uploads, financial institutions logging transactions, advertisers amassing fine-grained data on customers, or security agencies siphoning up everyone's telecommunications activities, surveillance practices—although often hidden—have come to define the way modern institutions operate. This development indicates more than just the adoption of information-based technological systems by organizations; rather, it represents a larger transformation in how people and organizations perceive and engage with the world. It now seems completely reasonable and responsible to collect data by default and base decisions on those data. It seems rational to use data to sort people into categories according to their anticipated risk or value and to treat people differently based on their categorization. These are surveillance logics that transcend any particular technological system, and indeed they do not require technological

mediation at all. Face-to-face surveillance, of people watching and controlling others, is certainly not rendered obsolete by new technologies.

Although definitions of surveillance vary, most scholars stress that surveillance is about more than just watching; it depends also on some capacity to control, regulate, or modulate behavior. This reading draws upon the French origins of the word *surveillance*, which means "watching from above." It implies a power relationship. It is not just passive looking but is instead a form of oversight that judges and intervenes to shape behavior. Importantly, one does not need to be aware of such control dynamics for them to be effective; these dynamics can perhaps have greater force if they are felt as natural and their politics are hidden. The excerpts in this book sketch a number of definitions with different accents and nuances, but as a starting point, surveillance can be understood as "monitoring people in order to regulate or govern their behavior" (Gilliom and Monahan 2013: 2). While academics may agree, more or less, with general definitions, the term "surveillance" invites a range of interpretations. For some it is restricted to specific technologies

or legal designations, whereas for others it signals any form of systematic monitoring that exerts an influence or has a tangible outcome. Additionally, because of its negative connotations, practitioners on the ground often disagree about whether surveillance is taking place. For instance, social scientists who conduct empirical work with policing agencies have found that most law-enforcement personnel do not see their work in that way, even as they describe their professional functions in terms that researchers would label as surveillance.

Surveillance may be ubiquitous, but it acquires different forms, functions, and meanings across social settings. Broadly, one could say that all formations of capital, nation, and state—three aspects that constitute the structure of contemporary societies (Karatani 2014)—depend on mechanisms of surveillance to control markets, regulate bodies, and protect institutions. Recently, these processes were illuminated in the arena of national security and state intelligence, where the public gained newfound awareness of the extent of state surveillance operations with the trove of US National Security Agency (NSA) documents released by Edward Snowden in 2013. Clearly, surveillance flourishes in other spheres too, beyond explicit state operations or formal governance structures. For instance, public interest in surveillance has likewise been piqued by revelations about peer and corporate monitoring on social media sites like Facebook, which are platforms that also engage in the robust collection, analysis, and sharing of data, sometimes even running undisclosed "experiments" on users to see how they respond to different types of content.

Across domains, from state security agencies to social media sites, surveillance regulates boundaries and relations. It reinforces separation and different treatment along lines of class, race, gender, sexuality, age, and so on. Regardless of the context, surveillance is never a neutral process. There are always value judgments and power imbalances, and they usually reproduce social inequalities. Because of growing awareness of the central role of surveillance in shaping power relations and knowledge across social and cultural contexts, scholars from many different academic disciplines have gravitated to surveillance studies and contributed to its solidification as a field.

But academic fields do not develop entirely on their own, just from a set of shared ideas or concerns. Rather, they depend on the concerted efforts of individuals to pull and hold people together, to initiate and sustain conversations over time, and, ultimately, to institutionalize the field in a set of organizational practices and artifacts (Mullins 1972). For surveillance studies, those practices entailed workshops beginning in the early 1990s and continuing with greater frequency in the 2000s; the formation of the international Surveillance Studies Network (SSN)[1] in 2006; and the hosting of international conferences every two years, starting in 2004. The artifacts include numerous edited volumes, many of them outgrowths of the aforementioned workshops, and, crucially, the founding of the open-access online journal *Surveillance & Society*[2] in 2002. Many of the people involved in these activities, including the editors of this Reader, are represented in this book, but special mention must be made of sociologist David Lyon, who was instrumental early on in organizing workshops and conference panels and producing edited volumes that drew scholars into dialogue, thus helping to constitute the field.

Clearly this is an "origin story," and such stories are always political: they set the parameters for who and what counts or should be counted. As a collection of curated materials, Readers, such as this one, are similarly political and necessarily exclusionary, if only because there simply is not sufficient room to include everything

that one would like to—or should—include. Although such politics and exclusions are unavoidable, we choose to be self-reflexive about our standpoints and the choices we are making. We are interdisciplinary scholars with backgrounds and direct experience in surveillance studies, science and technology studies (STS), geography, sociology, communication, and history. Indirectly, through conferences, publications, and collaborations, we participate in many other fields: anthropology, political science, law and society, criminology, American studies, gender studies, cultural studies, and others.

This interdisciplinary orientation inflects the explicit and implicit arguments of this Reader. Instead of overemphasizing the contributions of one discipline, for instance, we seek to illustrate how different disciplinary perspectives bring different concerns, methods, and theoretical positions to the study of surveillance in society. We feel that this is an empirically accurate representation of the field, as well, in that there are many voices and disciplines represented in the conversations of the field, as any perusal of conference programs will bear out. More than being a static "snapshot," however, there is a deeper and ongoing story here about a correspondence between the field's institutionalization and its increasing interdisciplinarity. The two have occurred, and continue to occur, together. Perhaps the field's defining feature is its search for commonalities among tensions in disciplinary approaches to surveillance. This is the reason we prefer to call surveillance studies a "transdisciplinary field." It draws its strength and forms its identity from shared general concerns and productive frictions among disciplines, all the while fostering departures and innovations. It has achieved cohesion as a bona fide new field with shared concepts, "citation classics," and forms of institutionalization (e.g., a journal and conferences), but it also invites, and often seems to embrace, critiques.

This should not be read as a romanticization of the field. Certainly not every surveillance studies scholar welcomes being challenged from a disciplinary perspective other than her or his own. That said, as the field as a whole has been forced to grapple with such challenges, and continues to do so, the general tone has not been one of defensiveness but rather appreciation. Not of exclusion and ostracism, but of inclusion and acceptance. These are the norms that characterize the field for many participants, and they are ones we try to reproduce with our selection, grouping, and framing of excerpts in this book.

Histories of Surveillance and Surveillance Studies

There may be an allure to seeing surveillance as novel, but there are important historical contexts and lineages that inform and shape the present. Some of the earliest influential work in the field, by pioneers like James B. Rule and Michel Foucault, came out of a 1960s and 1970s context of state surveillance that included the monitoring, disruption, and repression of progressive groups by both totalitarian and democratic states (Murakami Wood 2009b). At this time, as is still the case today, state actors were emboldened by new technologies that afforded the collection and analysis of information on an unprecedented scale. Rule's book *Private Lives and Public Surveillance* (1973) delved into these trends with a focus on the implications of government agencies and corporations adopting new computer databases as central tools of governance and customer management. Rule saw these changes as introducing the threat of a "total surveillance society" that could lead to diminished autonomy, curtailed rights, and political repression.

Foucault (1977), on the other hand, cast his eye backward to illustrate how

surveillance became a central method for governance and the construction of modern subjects. Foucault's observations about the emergence of distributed methods of rule and self-disciplining forms of subjectivity were incredibly generative and explain his substantial and sustained influence in the field, however much scholars might question the specifics of his historical analysis or particular aspects of his theory. Ironically, as Gilles Deleuze (1992) later pointed out, the combined technological transformations and sociopolitical crises of the 1960s and 1970s presaged the end of the modern surveillance regime described by Foucault in *Discipline and Punish*, leading to today's more machinic, automated, and inhuman late-capitalist regime.

The history of surveillance, of course, goes back much further. As David Lyon's *The Electronic Eye* (1994) described, surveillance can be detected in population documents from ancient Egypt and also in records of English landholding with the Domesday Book from 1086. Interestingly, the word "eavesdrop," which had its first printed use in 1606, originally referred to someone who literally stood within the space next to a house where rainwater dripped from the eaves, where one could secretly listen to what was said inside (OED Online 2016). These historical references reveal a mixture of hierarchical politics, technological affordances (writing itself and the vernacular architecture of wooden houses, respectively), and local social practices, which come together to produce particular forms of surveillance. It is not accurate in most cases to make an arbitrary distinction between "technological" and "non-technological" surveillance. However, it is certainly true that the earlier the form of surveillance, the greater and more obvious the role that people played in the process. The actual or suspected presence of spies, informers, watchmen, and guards looms larger in social imaginaries about surveillance in the premodern and early modern periods than it does today.

The biggest historical transformations were associated not so much with the development of new technologies as they were with the social functions and goals of surveillance. In early modern Europe, states sought to discover commonalities in *groups* and codify descriptions of them in bureaucratic archives, thus creating identities against which individuals were measured (Groebner 2007). By the end of the eighteenth century, however, rulers became increasingly interested in identifying *specific* people, both in nation-states and their colonies, to effectively create "police states" of well-governed and transparent societies (Fichte 2000 [1796/97]). By the late nineteenth century, this identification imperative reached crisis levels, fueled by concerns about anonymous individuals—perhaps with criminal inclinations—circulating in newly industrialized cities and challenging established social hierarchies (Cole 2001; Torpey 2000). Identification regimes were combined with generalized surveillance and mass enforcement, which were often supplemented by spectacular and exemplary punishments to deter criminal behavior by others.

Modern surveillance also concerned itself increasingly with individual subjectivity and the management of populations in ways that generated compliance, productivity, and even health and happiness (Foucault 1978). In this, surveillance was always associated with scientific advances, particularly with the new science of numbers, statistics (Hacking 1990; Porter 1995; Scott 1998). As Ian Hacking shows in *The Taming of Chance* (1990), throughout the nineteenth century, a general belief in determinism gradually gave way to regimes of probability. The quantification of everything (grain, forests, people, suicides, and so on) gave rise to statistical bureaus and allowed states to invoke scientific rationality in governance decisions.

At the same time, the science of the body—in terms of both the broad

picture of biology and evolution and the development of physiology and kinetics (movement)—was inspired by and provided the basis for a new kind of efficient and compliant workforce. Typically, these efforts mobilized surveillance to extract as much labor from bodies as was physically possible. Frederick Winslow Taylor (1911) is well known in this regard, due to his efforts to implement a system of "scientific management" of factory workers. This early form of workplace surveillance relied on close observation, segmentation of tasks, and division of labor, all overseen by a new class of managerial elites whose technocratic functions would, in Taylor's view, advance the social and economic prosperity of the nation.

Whereas Taylor believed in a voluntary system where incentives and effective management would compel heightened productivity, brutal forms of involuntary labor extraction—as with slavery in the United States, Brazil, Haiti, and elsewhere—also depended on surveillance innovations. As Nicholas Mirzoeff (2011) explains, state visuality regimes, including those used in the institutional management of slaves, rely on techniques of classification, separation, and aestheticization, such that people are reduced to governable units and represented in bureaucratic systems that obscure the symbolic and real violence of dehumanizing complexes. In the case of slavery in the United States, especially as the institution started to unravel, surveillance took the form of hot-iron branding, slave passes and "lantern laws" to regulate movement, and wanted posters encouraging the apprehension of runaway slaves (Browne 2015). In her important work on the surveillance of blackness, Simone Browne reveals how forms of agency and resistance were always a part of the slave experience and that exercises of resistance continue today in people's confrontations with discriminatory and racist surveillance apparatuses (see Section 14).

In the late nineteenth century, biological theories of racial inferiority fused with new identification techniques like physiognomy, photography, and fingerprinting—the early systems of biometric measurement (Cole 2001; Sekula 1986). These were policing technologies deployed in an effort to catalogue offenders and make criminality legible, and perhaps even predictable, through scientific means. In tandem with the rise of the eugenics movement of the Progressive Era in the United States, these scientific schemes drew upon narratives of biological difference to justify unequal treatment of supposedly inferior groups: immigrants, racial minorities, the poor, the illiterate, or the cognitively impaired (Kevles 1995). Behind the facade of objective science, discriminatory practices were institutionalized through such identification systems, and social hierarchies were reinforced in a time of heightened migration and social mobility.

The period at the end of the nineteenth century saw the creation of new rights and freedoms. The modern legal concept of privacy arose in the context of polite New England society and the frustrations of the American bourgeoisie with an increasingly intrusive media, in particular popular newspapers in their reporting of society functions. Louis Brandeis and Samuel Warren's (1890) famous line about the "right to be let alone" comes from this context, where privacy was mobilized as a right of the privileged. Perhaps awareness of unequal access to privacy rights, even during its emergence as a legal construct over a century ago, helps explain the general reservations that many surveillance studies scholars have about privacy discourses today. As we develop in Section 8, there are clearly disciplinary reasons as well for one's commitment to—or suspicion of—privacy protections as responses to surveillance. However, for better or worse, within policy arenas and liberal academia, privacy and the "private life" remain both tactically

and ideologically the dominant forms of response to surveillance. This is true even as scholars search for more comprehensive, powerful, and flexible ways of responding to surveillance encroachments and abuses.

Before the field of surveillance studies started to coalesce in the late 1990s, scholars largely followed the thread of the early 1970s critiques of centralized computer databases, state surveillance, and policing. For example, Gary Marx's classic book *Undercover* (1988) connected the use of older forms of human surveillance with police informants and undercover operations to the emergence of new technologies, such as infrared cameras, that could circumvent privacy expectations without concomitant increases in legal protections. Likewise, Roger Clarke (1988) described dangers brought about by forms of "dataveillance" that allowed for the large-scale combination of data points and the construction of profiles that could be used to discriminate against people even in advance of any wrongdoing. David Lyon (1988) echoed these anxieties as well in his first major work to deal with surveillance, where he concluded by developing the ominous figure of the "carceral computer." With greater attention to racial inequalities and corporate profiling of customers, Oscar Gandy (1993) similarly noted how information systems were acting politically to sort people in unequal ways while obscuring the inherent biases of the systems in question. As a culminating point, of sorts, in 1987 a number of significant players in the emergent field (e.g., Priscilla Regan, Gary Marx, Andrew Clement, and James Rule) contributed to an influential report by the US Office of Technology Assessment (1987) on workplace surveillance; this report rearticulated some of the above critiques but also, perhaps more important for this discussion of field formation, served as an early and explicit articulation of shared concerns.

In the early 1990s, a conceptual change began with consideration of new technological innovations in conjunction with popular theorizations about postmodernism. In addition to the aforementioned Gilles Deleuze (1992) and Oscar Gandy (1993), Mark Poster (1990) described surveillance operations in new media technologies and human-machine interfaces, which simultaneously deterritorialized subjectivity and dispersed control mechanisms. David Lyon (2001, 1994) synthesized many of these themes by explicating the ways in which "information societies" are necessarily "surveillance societies" because the automatic collection of data by information systems affords the classification of individuals and groups, behaviors and risks, leading to differential treatment of people. Kevin Haggerty and Richard Ericson (2000) developed these foundations further, describing the role of the individual's "data double" in a larger "surveillant assemblage," an amorphous network of public and private systems where individuals have little recourse to alter or contest the surveillance that is taking place. More than that, almost all organizations engage in such acts of data collection, analysis, and intervention (Staples 2000), meaning—among other things—that surveillance has become one of the dominant modes of ordering in the postmodern era.

Conceptual Challenges

As scholars from a variety of disciplines engaged with surveillance studies, they relied upon a common set of concepts to advance collective knowledge. In particular, Foucault's interpretation of Jeremy Bentham's Panopticon, the legal and moral concept of privacy, and George Orwell's figure of Big Brother were quite productive in sparking analysis. Over time, however, these concepts became strained and seemed dissonant with the empirical conditions described by researchers or the field's growing theoretical interests.

To start with, the allure of Foucault's (1977) writings on Bentham's Panopticon prison design was that he transformed it into a powerful metaphor for the ways in which institutions could provide scripts for people to internalize the surveillant gaze and police themselves into social conformity (see Section 2). There has been increasing dissatisfaction with the concept, though, perhaps because of the way people feel compelled to modify it and devise clunky spin-off terms (e.g., "superpanopticon," "synopticon," "ban-opticon") to match new phenomena rather than invent something altogether new. Foucault intended the Panopticon to serve as an illustration of a particular historical moment in the development of modern thinking about subjectivity and social control (Murakami Wood 2009), but it has become an almost hegemonic construct in the field. It is often applied or intoned as if it has some kind of universal explanatory value but, if used this way, it lacks empirical validity. Rather than being rational, centralized, and totalizing, surveillance is more often particularistic, multi-sited, and highly specialized, leading Bruno Latour (2005) to refer to contemporary surveillance—using another derivative neologism—as oligoptic, that is, narrow and focused rather than broad and distributed. Of course, the focus and intensity is not random. It varies according to one's social address (Monahan 2010) and is more likely to sort, exclude, and marginalize populations, not homogenize people and shape them into uniform docile bodies (see Section 14).

The concept of privacy remains salient in the field, as well as in legal, policy, and popular discourses. Along with data protection concerns, privacy resonates deeply with many people and provides something to organize around. That said, whereas the concept's universalizing and individualizing tendencies undoubtedly lend it force in legal and policymaking arenas, these have been seen as deficiencies as well, especially by academics trained to be suspicious or critical of such discourses. We have already observed, for example, that although perceived threats to privacy may be a clarion call to arms for civil-society groups and progressives more generally (Bennett 2008; Regan 1995), whether in its origins or today, privacy has never truly been a universal human right. Some other limitations of the concept might be its difficulty in overcoming the individualistic frame to assist with understanding encroachments on social groups or public spaces (Patton 2000); tensions between its presentation as an easily identifiable universal value and its remarkable messiness in practice (Nippert-Eng 2010); or the empirical reality that some of the targets of the most intrusive forms of surveillance are more concerned with issues of domination and power, not abstract notions like privacy (Gilliom 2001).

Finally, George Orwell's (1949) exceedingly disturbing fictional portrayal of a totalitarian society (in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*), with the human face forever crushed under the boot of Big Brother, has similarly made it difficult to escape motifs of all-powerful, centralized state surveillance. Notwithstanding the resilience of the Big Brother figure in the media or common parlance, the field continues to stress the heterogeneous mix of surveillance flows, even with state surveillance (e.g., Guzik 2016; Hayes 2009; Monahan and Regan 2012; Walby and Monaghan 2011). Edward Snowden's revelations about NSA surveillance programs, for instance, reveal that private companies are the source of much data analyzed by state agencies and that private contractors, just as Snowden was, are essential to the state surveillance apparatus. In other words, state surveillance is only part of the picture. Across many arenas, the blend of state, corporate, and social surveillance shapes life chances in concrete ways: whether someone gets health insurance or a bank loan, gets fired because of a Facebook posting or discriminated against because of their

credit score, gets targeted for police scrutiny because she lives in a crime "hot spot," or spied upon as a potential "terrorist" because he protests environmental polluters. Thus, even within surveillant assemblages, as Sean Hier and Josh Greenberg (2009) note, hierarchies of visibility persist, such that descriptions of exposure alone are insufficient to account for the uneven politics of surveillance.

On the other end of the spectrum, many people would find Orwell's dystopian vision bizarre today because they see surveillance—especially social networking and media-based surveillance—as fun, convenient, or inconsequential (Albrechtslund 2008; Ellerbrok 2011; McGrath 2004). It is worth mentioning here that scholars doing literary analyses of surveillance have long observed that Orwell's vision was highly derivative of earlier writing by the Russian author Yevgeny Zamyatin (1972 [1921]). It also seems that Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932)—in which control is exercised through a combination of eugenics, pleasure, drugs, and peer pressure—provides a far more convincing set of metaphors for the contemporary situation (Marks 2005; Murakami Wood 2009a).

With the exception of the concept of privacy, which remains central for many scholars in surveillance studies, the field has largely departed from these generative concepts. Nonetheless, they have profoundly shaped the field's discourses and remain useful as symbols of the extremes of universal or totalizing forms of surveillance. As the next section will show, the field's topical and conceptual apparatuses have exploded as the field has grown, adding complexity, nuance, and renewed vigor to what came before.

Book Overview

There are many possible ways to organize a Reader such as this one. It could be divided into sections based on historical periods, geographical focus, conceptual frameworks, topical areas, or disciplinary perspectives, among other options. Following from our earlier observation that surveillance studies is a transdisciplinary field defined by its search for commonalities among tensions in disciplinary approaches to surveillance, we have chosen a hybrid organizational approach that seeks to triangulate, somewhat loosely, topical areas, disciplinary perspectives, and the field's chronological development. Thus, each section concentrates primarily on a topical area, but this often reflects disciplinary preferences, and those preferences have changed over time as scholars from different disciplines have joined the conversation. So, by reading the sections in order, one can also get a sense of how the field has mutated over time.

Emphatically, the order of sections does not represent a neat evolutionary development but instead a fascinating iterative process, where scholars studying in one area are oftentimes influenced by the contributions of those in an entirely different area, leading to recombinant knowledge for the *collective* advancement of the field. For instance, while criminological studies of police video surveillance were some of the earliest and most formative empirical projects in surveillance studies, researchers did not cease to investigate police video surveillance once others drew the field toward explorations of resistance, ubiquitous surveillance, or the political economy; instead, scholars folded these lines of inquiry into their projects, making their findings both unpredictable and refreshing, all the while furthering the dialogue with others (e.g., Coaffee and Fussey 2015; McCahill and Finn 2014; Smith 2015). Likewise, world events can suddenly rekindle interest in older areas of investigation, as can be observed with terrorist attacks drawing attention back to national security, Snowden's leaks foregrounding state intelligence operations, or police killing of unarmed black men raising

interest in the documentary evidence that video surveillance might provide, albeit with an emphasis on police accountability, not citizen wrongdoing. This iterative process is represented *within* most of the sections too, where we include excerpts from older and newer explorations of the area and note the influences in our section introductions so that these iterations and cross-fertilizations can be appreciated.

It should be mentioned that some of the excerpts are by scholars who would not necessarily identify with the field of surveillance studies. This is to be expected with foundational theoretical works that predate the formation of the field, but there are other instances of more contemporary selections by people working in aligned fields. We chose to include such pieces if they were exemplary works in new areas or they challenged the status quo in ways we found productive. Given that we valorize the relative porousness and inclusiveness of the field, it seemed appropriate that we would not exclude significant publications simply because of how an author positioned themself.

The Reader's first content section, "Openings and Definitions," offers a presentation of originary works that helped constitute surveillance studies. The authors wrestle with different definitions of surveillance, illustrating a lack of consensus at the incipient stages of the field. Some position the target of surveillance as an individual person whose freedoms are infringed upon, while others question the larger effects on subject populations or society as a whole. There is general agreement, however, that surveillance is widespread, facilitated by information systems used by most organizations, and permeating down to the capillary level of society—that is, on the level of everyday interactions in most arenas of public and private life. This movement between the macro and the micro is indicative of authors working to develop what C. Wright Mills (1959) called "the sociological imagination," situating everyday practices within larger systems of power and influence. This makes sense given that with the exception of Oscar Gandy, who is a communication scholar, each of the other authors in this section would identify as a sociologist.

Section 2, "Society and Subjectivity," provides excerpts from some of the key theoretical texts that shaped the field. These include Bentham's and Foucault's writings on the Panopticon prison design, Deleuze's delineations of the emergence of control dynamics replacing the disciplinary ones outlined by Foucault, and others exploring how such control might manifest in decentralized networks or articulate with powerful media institutions that are characterized more by the many watching the few. Because the emphasis is on how subjectivity is produced through exposure to surveillance, especially in or by institutions, we also include selections that illustrate how public health campaigns inform medical imaginaries and surveillance-based zoo designs cultivate conservationist values in zoogoers.

The next two sections, "State and Authority" (Section 3) and "Identity and Identification" (Section 4), explore the ways in which surveillance was a critical part of the rise of the modern nation-state, especially pertaining to the identification and governance of people at borders and within state territories. The authors analyze incarnations of state surveillance in the service of totalitarian and postcolonial regimes, such as Cold War–era East Germany and apartheid-era South Africa, respectively, and question the extent to which totalitarian tendencies are present in all modern nation-states. When states define themselves by territorial demarcations, then the regulation of movement, through passports or other identity documents, effectively conjures "citizens" into being as identifiable representatives of the state. Unfortunately, identification efforts cannot be divorced from the prejudices of their cultural contexts, so they usually reproduce those prejudices in technological form.

The section on "Borders and Mobilities" (Section 5) picks up these themes and places them within more of a contemporary national-security context. The identification and sorting of populations is increasingly embedded in computer algorithms, facilitating social exclusion through automated means. This is perhaps most apparent with border control systems that are effectively distributed across geographic territories and temporalities, as anywhere or anytime that someone is identified and assessed against software-encoded risk profiles. As a few of the excerpts in this section reveal, these functions are delegated not only to computer systems, but also to individual travelers and the general public, who are responsibilized to submit voluntarily to security demands and inform on others who seem suspicious in some way, usually due to their racial or ethnic identity markers. Given this focus on territory, mobility, and risk management, it is not surprising that the main disciplines represented in this section are geography, political science, and criminology.

National security and policing are two of the most prevalent areas of concern in non-academic discussions of surveillance. The sections on "Intelligence and Security" (Section 6) and "Crime and Policing" (Section 7) offer a sampling of critical academic and journalistic works in these areas. Some of it details the mind-boggling extent of the NSA's telecommunications surveillance systems, while other pieces allow us to situate these intelligence practices in a longer history of state overreach, with illegal targeted spying on activists, journalists, international allies, and others. Importantly, as other excerpts show, internal state surveillance is almost always coupled with and informed by similar applications in distant war zones and occupied territories.

When it comes to domestic policing (Section 7), video surveillance—or closed-circuit television (CCTV)—is the most obvious focal point. Criminologists, who conducted the first empirical research on police video surveillance, largely found that it was not effective at preventing most crimes, just for displacing criminal activity to areas under less overt observation or, at best, assisting with the identification of suspects after the fact. While not entirely absent from these criminological accounts, other excerpts advance an explicit gender critique of surveillance, seeing technological systems as potentially adding layers of harassment while not mitigating violence against women. Additional pieces investigate the ways in which police and security schemes connect to the political economy—securing places of commerce, advancing the security industry, and enforcing an actuarial form of risk management that invariably punishes poor and racialized populations. Of course, with the spread of camera-equipped mobile phones, the power dynamics between the police and the public may be open, at least partially, to renegotiation.

We turn next to "Privacy and Autonomy" (Section 8), with a number of treatments that address the field's apprehensions with the privacy concept. These selections add complexity to the concept, showing both how it is a dynamic social norm and how theorizations of it have advanced well beyond many of the depictions of its critics. Technological developments seem to produce the greatest threats to privacy, at least from the perspective of surveillance studies, especially as information gathering and sharing become routine. Privacy scholars—who tend to come from the disciplines of political science, philosophy, and legal studies—point out that as long as privacy is presented solely as an individual good, it is destined to be compromised and eroded in policy realms that, fairly or not, tend to view any other concerns as advancing public interests. Thus, persuasive arguments are needed about the *social good* provided by privacy protections. A few of the excerpts offer just such arguments,

while others concentrate on the importance of respecting the context of information generation or of safeguarding opportunities for boundary negotiation between individuals and information systems. Finally, to flesh out the surveillance-studies debate a bit further, we offer both a critique of privacy and a more general response in defense of the concept.

Privacy concerns are so pressing, in part, because surveillance is becoming routine, pervasive, and increasingly *hidden*. The next section, "Ubiquitous Surveillance" (Section 9), brings together insights from scholars with backgrounds in information studies, communication, geography, and architecture to document this move toward invisible, automated control in built environments and data practices. The excerpts show how information-rich environments—characterized by embedded sensors, mobile computing, and algorithmic processes—are fundamentally surveillant. Their logic is that all data elements (objects, people, conditions) must be "addressable" and subject to remote or automated management. This can be seen with what has been called the "Internet of things," with networked appliances like refrigerators or with "smart cities" that use embedded sensors and other technologies to regulate transportation systems, electricity usage, and sewage treatment in "real time." Whether integrated with urban infrastructure or occurring in abstract "big data" practices, ubiquitous surveillance depends on decisions about data priorities and values that are clearly political in their effects.

The next two sections, "Work and Organization" (Section 10) and "Political Economy" (Section 11), are closely related, as two sides of the same coin. From a largely sociological perspective, analyses of workplace surveillance show how early techniques of scientific management and performance monitoring have mutated into managerial strategies to cultivate self-discipline on the part of workers, for instance through team-based projects where peers depend on one's reliability. Information technologies facilitate the reach of workplace surveillance too. On one hand, mobile technologies lead to a condition that Melissa Gregg (2011) refers to as "presence bleed," where one is expected to be always available to work and to be monitored, even at home. On the other hand, the very systems of commerce or communication (e.g., cashier checkout systems or social media sites) are fundamentally ones of surveillance: either of employee performance or of user activity, where, in the case of social media, users effectively engage in "free labor" to generate value for companies. Then again, it is important to remember that those charged with surveilling others are themselves engaged in mostly tedious and unrewarding *work*.

This brings us to closer scrutiny of the relationship between surveillance and the political economy (Section 11). In the service of company profits, customer surveillance takes many forms, ranging from the development of customer categories to facilitate effective advertising throughout the twentieth century to the hidden screening of customers by financial industries charged with implementing risk-management techniques to block potential money launderers or terrorists. The emphasis on company brands also compels technological innovations in surreptitiously "reading" customers' physiological responses to products and shaping their affective attachment to brands. Finally, several excerpts enumerate the ways that Internet giants such as Facebook and Google have made value extraction through information systems a science, creating new information ecologies that threaten to become totalizing systems of control. In these selections, one can see the convergence of historical, sociological, criminological, and communication approaches to the political economy of surveillance.

Operating in more of a communication and media studies register, the next section, "Participation and Social Media" (Section 12), problematizes the dominant surveillance-studies paradigm of top-down control by institutions or institutional actors. On the whole, the excerpts recognize that such institutional surveillance persists in online environments, but rather than jump to quick conclusions about the totalizing capacities of Internet platforms, they pose questions about the cultural meanings or practices that exceed those systems of control. Perhaps forms of peer or lateral surveillance (e.g., social media users following each other's posts or profiles) introduce the possibility for empowerment by fostering experimentation with self-presentation or developing relationships of trust and intimacy. Then again, these exchanges could trap individuals in what Mark Andrejevic (2007) has called "digital enclosures," where people derive social value but can never achieve robust forms of democratic empowerment. These two conclusions are not mutually exclusive, of course. Vitally, the questions posed by the excerpts in this section invite the field to reconsider fundamentally its understandings of and value judgments about surveillance.

Section 13, "Resistance and Opposition," presents excerpts from scholars intrigued by the potentials for contesting surveillance, for "fighting back" in some way. These selections offer a diverse array of disciplinary perspectives, informed by political science, criminology, information studies, engineering, philosophy, and cultural studies. Some countersurveillance techniques covered here include attempts to turn surveillance against institutional agents, such as the police, by filming their activities; organizing through coalitions of civil society groups, policymakers, and activists to implement or maintain privacy protections; or using technological tools or masking techniques to obfuscate and temporarily evade surveillance

systems. With perhaps the exception of Steve Mann's work on *sousveillance*, or surveillance from "below," the work in this area is generally measured and pragmatic. On one hand, it is eager to find solutions to power asymmetries, but, on the other, it recognizes the limitations and sometimes even the dangers (or risks to others) of trying to do so.

The next section, "Marginality and Difference" (Section 14), turns further toward humanities-inflected critiques of surveillance. The selections highlight how surveillance imbricates with intersectional forms of oppression, exposing marginalized populations to differential and often augmented forms of violence and control. This can manifest in abstract ways, such as with discriminatory actuarial assessments by financial institutions, contributing to tangible "cumulative disadvantage" (Gandy Jr. 2009) for poor and racialized groups. It could also take the form of violent encounters with armed police, stalkers and domestic partners, or racist citizens concerned about terrorist threats. In order to confront surveillance that materializes or reinforces unequal conditions of marginality, one must come to terms with the fact that "threatening" racialized bodies are always constructed in opposition to normative "white" bodies that are seen as symbolically stable, compliant, and transparent (Hall 2015). If the history of surveillance is inseparable from the history of racism, as Simone Browne (2015) contends, then exposure to surveillance can never be neutral and scholarship on surveillance should reject, once and for all, any universalist claims about it.

The final section in the Reader, "Art and Culture" (Section 15), emphasizes performance theory, literary analysis, visual studies, and game studies in its consideration of surveillance-themed cultural products and practices. Representations of surveillance in literature and film, for instance, are hugely influential in shaping

popular perceptions and understandings of surveillance, yet until recently there has been surprisingly little sustained academic discussion of them in the field. This is rapidly changing with a flurry of new books on these and related subjects (e.g., Lefait 2013; Rosen and Santesso 2013; Wise 2016; Zimmer 2015). The excerpts in this section offer sophisticated critical interpretations of various cultural works, thereby correcting deficiencies in the field and suggesting directions for future investigation.

Conclusion

The thing that holds most of surveillance studies' areas together is a general agreement that surveillance is central to the functioning of contemporary societies, from the level of state practices all the way down to interpersonal exchanges among family members and friends. While some may not agree that surveillance is *the most important* social process or cultural logic, it is difficult to contest its pervasiveness and influence. It is how organizations and people make sense of and manage the world. It is also how power relations are established and reproduced. For scholars, surveillance offers a rich approach to investigating social and cultural phenomena and detecting the power relations inherent in them.

As represented in the organization of this Reader's sections, the field started out with more of an institutional focus, questioning the increasing influence of state and corporate actors over others. Technology was central in facilitating this influence, whether with architectural embodiments of control with panoptic designs or with databases and video-camera systems. The early institutional focus makes sense in that hierarchical relationships and power differentials—the roots of surveillance—are more apparent when there are extreme disparities between parties, such as between institutions and individuals. Moreover, this initial framing of

the problems of surveillance reflects classic sociological concerns about the place of individuals in society and the relationship of structure to agency. As others sought to flesh out these concerns, they did so with empirical research on people in context, classically of workplaces or police departments, where the latest surveillance systems, such as computer keystroke tracking or CCTV, were used to monitor others from a distance. Such sociological and criminological framings were formative for the field, establishing the initial parameters for the study of surveillance, and because these framings resonate with conventional understandings of surveillance (e.g., Big Brother), they continue to exert a force on new scholarship. This can be seen, for instance, with the impulse of scholars to study the next big organizational incarnation of surveillance (e.g., Google, Uber, the Department of Homeland Security), whatever it might be.

As the field expanded, this interest in institutions and technological systems persisted, but it shifted to reflect a wider range of disciplinary concerns and approaches. Privacy scholars, for instance, framed the issues in terms of rights, values, and legislative processes. The focus remained on institutional abuses facilitated by technology, but privacy scholars also outlined pragmatic solutions that might be achieved through legislative changes or technological designs (e.g., with encryption). Geographers stressed how the integration of surveillance systems into urban infrastructure was actualizing new regimes of governance and fueling neoliberal capitalism, which benefited corporations and the military but aggravated social inequalities. Communication scholars similarly situated surveillant media systems in the context of the political economy, describing how large media and technology companies shape ideologies while profiting from the labor of viewers or users.

The latest "cultural turn" in surveillance studies is significant in that it largely breaks from the institutional framework, at least as

a necessary element, in order to trace power relations in the production and circulation of cultural meanings, many of which rely on representations of people and narratives about their identities (Monahan 2011). Thus, feminist studies, queer studies, and critical race studies scholars might draw attention to depictions of threats or worthiness, showing how those markers are encoded in surveillance systems and practices, propagating violence against marginalized groups. Those studying cinema, literature, media, or art often highlight the ways in which cultural products form perception and a sense of personhood, normalizing the idea of being a surveillance subject, while also presenting avenues for resistance and critique. Performance studies scholars interrogate and contest, sometimes through performance, the meaning and politics of the many surveillance routines that characterize daily life. Finally, communication scholars and others seek to understand the participatory trend in self- and peer-surveillance (e.g., through the "Quantified Self" movement or social media use), often by starting from the perspective of users themselves.[3]

This Reader provides one possible mapping of the field of surveillance studies. We take our inspiration from the field's many generous participants—our mentors, colleagues, and students—who have brought, and continue to bring, this vibrant field into being. Importantly, this book does not aspire to be a final representation of what the field is or what counts in it, but instead a provisional sketch of a dynamic and exciting process of mutation. Foremost, it is an invitation for others to explore, delve deeper into full texts that are only partially reproduced here, and participate in the ongoing conversations and debates.

NOTES

1. http://www.surveillance-studies.net/.

2. http://www.surveillance-and-society.org/.

3. Obviously, these are broad brushstrokes that occlude much of the nuance and do not represent all contributions to the field. The aim of this summary is to offer a general sense of the arc of the field's development.

REFERENCES

Albrechtslund, Anders. 2008. Online Social Networking as Participatory Surveillance. *First Monday* 13 (3). Available from http://firstmonday.org/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/viewArticle/2142/1949 [accessed December 26, 2010].

Andrejevic, Mark. 2007. *iSpy: Surveillance and Power in the Interactive Era*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.

Bennett, Colin J. 2008. *The Privacy Advocates: Resisting the Spread of Surveillance*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Brandeis, Louis D., and Samuel D. Warren. 1890. The Right to Privacy. *Harvard Law Review* 4 (5):193, 195–97.

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

Clarke, Roger. 1988. Information Technology and Dataveillance. *Communications of the ACM* 31 (5):498–512.

Coaffee, Jon, and Pete Fussey. 2015. Constructing Resilience through Security and Surveillance: The Politics, Practices, and Tensions of Security-Driven Resilience. *Security Dialogue* 46 (1):86–105.

Cole, Simon A. 2001. *Suspect Identities: A History of Fingerprinting and Criminal Identification*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Deleuze, Gilles. 1992. Postscript on the Societies of Control. *October* 59:3–7.

Ellerbrok, Ariane. 2011. Playful Biometrics: Controversial Technology through the Lens of Play. *The Sociological Quarterly* 52 (4):528–47.

Fichte, Johann Gottlieb. 2000 [1796/97]. *Foundations of Natural Right*. Translated by M. Baur. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Foucault, Michel. 1977. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage.

———. 1978. *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*. Vol. 1. New York: Vintage.

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

Gandy Jr., Oscar H. 2009. *Coming to Terms with Chance: Engaging Rational Discrimination and Cumulative Disadvantage*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Gilliom, John. 2001. *Overseers of the Poor: Surveillance, Resistance, and the Limits of Privacy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gilliom, John, and Torin Monahan. 2013. *SuperVision: An Introduction to the Surveillance Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gregg, Melissa. 2011. *Work's Intimacy*. Malden, MA: Polity.

Groebner, Valentin. 2007. *Who Are You? Identification, Deception, and Surveillance in Early Modern Europe*. Translated by M. Kyburz and J. Peck. Cambridge, MA: Zone Books.

Guzik, Keith. 2016. *Making Things Stick: Surveillance Technologies and Mexico's War on Crime*. Oakland: University of California Press.

Hacking, Ian. 1990. *The Taming of Chance*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Haggerty, Kevin D., and Richard V. Ericson. 2000. The Surveillant Assemblage. *British Journal of Sociology* 51 (4):605–22.

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

Hayes, Ben. 2009. Neoconopticon: The EU Security-Industrial Complex: Statewatch and the Transnational Institute. Available from http://www.tni.org/sites/www.tni.org/files/download/neoconopticon_0.pdf [accessed May 17, 2013].

Hier, Sean P., and Josh Greenberg. 2009. The Politics of Surveillance: Power, Paradigms, and the Field of Visibility. In *Surveillance: Power, Problems, and Politics*, edited by S. P. Hier and J. Greenberg, 14–29. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Huxley, Aldous. 2006 [1932]. *Brave New World*. Reprint ed. New York: Harper Perennial.

Karatani, Kojin. 2014. *The Structure of World History: From Modes of Production to Modes of Exchange*. Translated by M. K. Bourdaghs. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Kevles, Daniel J. 1995. *In the Name of Eugenics: Genetics and the Uses of Human Heredity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Latour, Bruno. 2005. *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lefait, Sébastien. 2013. *Surveillance on Screen: Monitoring Contemporary Films and Television Programs*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, Inc.

Lyon, David. 1988. *The Information Society: Issues and Illusions*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

———. 1994. *The Electronic Eye: The Rise of Surveillance Society*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

———. 2001. *Surveillance Society: Monitoring Everyday Life*. Buckingham, UK: Open University.

Marks, Peter. 2005. Imagining Surveillance: Utopian Visions and Surveillance Studies. *Surveillance & Society* 3 (2/3):222–39.

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

McCahill, Michael, and Rachel L. Finn. 2014. *Surveillance, Capital, and Resistance: Theorizing the Surveillance Subject*. New York: Routledge.

McGrath, John E. 2004. *Loving Big Brother: Performance, Privacy, and Surveillance Space*. New York: Routledge.

Mills, C. Wright. 1959. *The Sociological Imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mirzoeff, Nicholas. 2011. *The Right to Look: A Counterhistory of Visuality*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

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

———. 2011. Surveillance as Cultural Practice. *The Sociological Quarterly* 52 (4):495–508.

Monahan, Torin, and Priscilla M. Regan. 2012. Zones of Opacity: Data Fusion in Post-9/11 Security Organizations. *Canadian Journal of Law and Society* 27 (3):301–17.

Mullins, Nicholas C. 1972. The Development of a Scientific Specialty: The Phage Group and the Origins of Molecular Biology. *Minerva* 10:52–82.

Murakami Wood, David. 2009a. Can a Scanner See the Soul? Philip K. Dick against the Surveillance Society. *Review of International American Studies* 3 (3)–4 (1):46–59.

———. 2009b. The 'Surveillance Society': Questions of History, Place and Culture. *European Journal of Criminology* 6 (2):179–94.

Nippert-Eng, Christena E. 2010. *Islands of Privacy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

OED Online. 2016. "eavesdrop, v." Available from http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/59159?rskey=elS7Jf&result=2&isAdvanced=false [accessed August 19, 2016].

Orwell, George. 1949. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Centennial ed. New York: Harcourt Brace.

Patton, Jason W. 2000. Protecting Privacy in Public?: Surveillance Technologies and the Value of Public Places. *Ethics and Information Technology* 2:181–87.

Porter, Theodore M. 1995. *Trust in Numbers: The Pursuit of Objectivity in Science and Public Life*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Poster, Mark. 1990. *The Mode of Information: Poststructuralism and Social Context*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Regan, Priscilla M. 1995. *Legislating Privacy: Technology, Social Values, and Public Policy*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Rosen, David, and Aaron Santesso. 2013. *The Watchman in Pieces: Surveillance, Literature, and Liberal Personhood*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Rule, James B. 1973. *Private Lives and Public Surveillance: Social Control in the Computer Age*. London: Allen Lane.

Scott, James C. 1998. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Sekula, Allan. 1986. The Body and the Archive. *October* 39:3–64.

Smith, Gavin J. D. 2015. *Opening the Black Box: The Work of Watching*. New York: Routledge.

Staples, William G. 2000. *Everyday Surveillance: Vigilance and Visibility in Postmodern Life*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Taylor, Frederick Winslow. 1911. *The Principles of Scientific Management*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Torpey, John C. 2000. *The Invention of the Passport: Surveillance, Citizenship, and the State*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

U.S. Office of Technology Assessment. 1987. The Electronic Supervisor: New Technology, New Tensions, OTA-CIT-333. Washington, DC: U.S. Office of Technology Assessment.

Walby, Kevin, and Jeffrey Monaghan. 2011. Private Eyes and Public Order: Policing and Surveillance in the Suppression of Animal Rights Activists in Canada. *Social Movement Studies* 10 (1):21–37.

Wise, J. Macgregor. 2016. *Surveillance and Film*. New York: Bloomsbury.

Zamyatin, Yevgeny. 1972 [1921]. *We*. Translated by M. Ginsburg. New York: Viking.

Zimmer, Catherine. 2015. *Surveillance Cinema*. New York: New York University Press.