

"Your Papers Please": Personal and Professional Encounters With Surveillance*

"You ought to have some papers to show who you are."
The police officer advised me.

"I do not need any paper. I know who I
am," I said.

"Maybe so. Other people are also
interested in knowing who you are."

—B. Traven, *The Death Ship*

Students of communication and of science need to be attentive to how social and psychological factors can condition what we take to be reality and truth. Advocacy, self-promotion and self-exegesis can hide under the mask of academic neutrality and dispassion. Yet there is always a person behind the formality of the scholarly book and the choices, questions, methods, and interpretations offered. To help the reader better understand that my stand is based on where I have sat, here I reflect on the growth of surveillance and the importance of scholarly efforts to understand it through the prism of a half a century's involvement with the topic.

I will cover some sources of my initial interest in and later work on the topic; the kinds of questions surveillance developments raised for me in the latter part of the 20th century; and conclude with a discussion of the characteristics of surveillance studies as an emerging field.

—

*This is an expanded version of an article with the same name in K. Ball, K. Haggerty and D. Lyon, (eds.) International Handbook of Surveillance Studies, Routledge, 2012

—

Early Interest

The French poet Paul Valery (1965) has written, "in truth there is no theory which is not a fragment of an autobiography." But can we trust the autobiographer? Mark Twain doubted it: "The man has yet to be born who could write the truth about himself." (Jones 2011)

A little skepticism is always in order—Proust after all stressed that his recalls involved a theory not a record of the past. Kierkegaard observed that while life must be lived forward we seek to understand it by looking backwards. Our retrospective efforts involve linear stories in which discrete events are tied together in neat sense-making packages,—even with good will, there is none-the-less downplaying the role of chance, memory failures, disconnection and other possible interpretations. And with ill will, mendacity, distortion and purposeful omission are added to the brew.

The dots of life are there, but is the *ex post-facto* pattern? To what extent does the coherence and explanation lie (but hopefully not lie too badly) in the imposed interpretation, not in the facts such as they are believed to be. The facts of course are unknowable absent a method and conceptual framework for knowing. Yet as Dmitri Shalin (2010) observes personal characteristics and experiences can hardly be ignored in their affect on the work produced, even as we may be only vaguely aware of them.

The roots of my interest in surveillance are varied. Of course all children have fantasies of being omniscient and omnipotent and imagine being able to transcend the senses and the laws of physics. Most persons can recall the childhood thrill of seeing things that glowed in the dark. Those growing up in the 1940s and 1950s may recall the excitement of looking in the shoe store’s fluoroscope machine the first time and seeing the eerie green image of foot bones through shoe and skin.

Such “real” magic made the transition to fantasy easy. Superman and his x-ray vision suggested one model --although it is well to note his principled use of x-ray vision, [which was usually turned off](#). [The new surveillance tools with their supra-human](#) powers to break with hundreds of thousands of years of dependence on the unaided senses give us all some of superman’s power. The technologies appeal to our curiosity and our fantasies.

Growing up in Hollywood during the cold war, when little boys everywhere wanted to be the heroic sheriff of the western movie with the white hat, or the square-jawed G-man with the fedora watching from the shadows of a comic book, further supported an interest in the topic. Hollywood itself was a propellant toward watching and being watched. The affable and stalwart police officers who led my Boy Scout troop in Los Angeles no doubt contributed to the interest. Other early influences include having a relative who worked closely with the director of the CIA and a distant English relative who was George Orwell's first publisher.

I was raised under the watchful eyes of a stern paternal disciplinarian who stressed the importance of liking what you see when you look in the mirror the next morning. With a strong super-ego of course comes the potential for guilt and the fear of being discovered (whether because of actions or mere thoughts), in spite of the front one offers to the world. As the work of Franz Kafka and his progeny suggest, conditions of modernity and marginality heighten such feelings and no doubt, an interest in surveillance.

Gender may also be a factor. The dominant spies of popular culture have been male. No female has risen to the level of prominence of James Bond. And men on the average seem much more interested in the dazzling power of surveillance technologies than do women, at least for conventional spying. As noted, one strand of advertisements for the personal use of surveillance devices is directed toward men and not infrequently involves men secretly watching women. Advertisements directed at women emphasize a more passive protection, whether for themselves or their families, rather than aggressive spying.

Some more general factors characterizing secrets and American society have also made the topic interesting to me. As Graham Greene (1971) observes in his autobiography, "every novelist has something in common with a spy: he watches, he overhears, he seeks motives and analyzes character." This can also hold for the social analyst.¹

More broadly, as Georg Simmel (1950) noted, the secret holds particular fascination.² To have insider knowledge and to be able to go beyond the taken-for-granted world can make one feel important and can be a source of power. Surveillance offers a means of assessing one of sociology's (and indeed more broadly science's) first assumptions—that "things are often not as they seem" (Berger 1974). By disposition and training scholars seek to probe deeper and discover things that others don't know. In that regard studying surveillance technology and its fruits is appealing as both means and end. Ironically the method is also the message.

Studying surveillance is a natural topic for sociology, a profession informed by skepticism until there is empirical documentation (and even after that, given what we know of errors, perspectivalism and the potentially duplicitous nature of self and organizational presentations).³ Doubts are also encouraged by awareness of the impact of power on culture and on what is presumed to be knowledge. The skepticism involves an interest in the sociology of knowledge and how facts can be socially and technically generated and interpreted. Given its history and organization American society may have a particular (or at least) distinctive fascination with surveillance --both the need for it and curiosity about its results.

In its uncovering (rather than its mere documentary and verification) capacity surveillance may reveal disjuncture, anomalies, and fraudulent or erroneous claims and beliefs. The surprises of incongruous perspectives noted by Burke (1965) makes life interesting, encourages questioning and can advance knowledge and the search for resolution, even as it may demoralize and thrust toward cynicism.

"Your Papers Please"

With respect to young adult experiences as a subject—it was a dark and stormy day at the Russian-Polish border when I first heard the words "your papers" (there was no *please* in the gruff command). I was held for half a day's interrogation in a windowless room—without explanation by persons of whom it could not charitably be said English

was their second (or any) language. Call for Mr. F. Kafka on the hotline. My interest in political surveillance and control was furthered on that trip (part of a year spent traveling around the world) by finding an electronic bug in my Moscow hotel, the clumsy efforts of a spy-in-training assigned to our Intourist tour group, and the difficulty in finding and the purposeful inaccuracy in street maps.

As I pondered those experiences, filtered through a late-1950s, high school civics perspective, I found it easy to contrast the USSR with the presumably free society of the United States. I thought of surveillance in cold war and political terms as an unwelcome activity by a repressive state.

However, as a graduate student and professor in Berkeley and Cambridge in the next decade I came to appreciate surveillance as a fundamental social process—both functional and risky--characteristic of all societies. The practice could be seen within institutions, between individuals in interaction, between organizations with each other, and in multiple forms in both the public and private sectors. Surveillance was neither good nor bad, but context and comportment made it so.

In the classroom my studies were posing questions and presenting perspectives that involved surveillance, although the term was rarely used. In studying the creation and presentation of social reality, I saw that things are often not as they appear, that rule breaking and rule enforcement could be intricately interwoven, that deception and covert information collection were common, and that information used by large organizations was becoming an ever more important social resource, paralleling, sometimes surpassing, and often intertwined with class, status and power. The capillaries of computerization and other new surveillance and communication tools that would rapidly expand in the next decades were beginning to be visible. At the time, however, few saw information changes as being as potentially impactful as the invention of the steam engine, the railroad, the telegraph, the auto or the airplane. My first graduate student paper written for Professor Erving Goffman was on passing among blacks. I became interested in issues of identity and in the formal records used for constructing it, which ironically might also offer space for undermining official categories of identification.

Professor Goffman offered an incipient sociology of personal information, emphasizing the rules and contingencies around the discovery and protection of such information. At the time of the course he was working on the book which would become *Stigma* (1964). And in my other courses, Professor S. M. Lipset offered a model for understanding the social requisites and correlates of democracy and the enduring presence of inequality tied to social stratification. Professors Neil Smelser and Charles Glock illustrated how the flow of empirical events could be better understood and compared when broken into analytic dimensions.

Beyond the classroom, my perspective broadened as a result of personal experiences. I was active in CORE (Congress of Racial Equality), an organization dedicated at that time to integration through non-violence. After a major fundraising effort, our treasurer disappeared with the money--an event that severely damaged the

group. It turned out she was a police agent, as were several other disruptive members. I was shocked and angered that a peaceful democratic organization dedicated to ending racial discrimination could be a target of such police actions. Within the classroom it was widely believed that some students secretly reported on their professors and fellow students. There were also police officers out of uniform in the classes I taught at Berkeley. I recall discussions with them about role conflicts, democracy and social order and how their presence in the classroom might affect what other students said.

But tracing back in time from there, to tease out another thread in my developing interest, in high school, I had taken a speech/debate class and won an oratory contest held at Beverly Hills High School. My teacher, Mr. Day Hanks, wrote in my year book: "this boy could really move an audience with the power to thrill, quicken and compel." I was most pleased. Somewhere along my path, I had learned that concision, colorful examples and contrasts, metaphor, aphorism, repetition, poetics, a strong confident voice, humor and attention to timing in delivery were strong tools for getting my point across. At about that time I also encountered the early self-help book, *How to Win Friends and Influence People* by Dale Carnegie. I uncritically saw oratory and interaction techniques as exciting means for making things happen. In my naïve ebullience, however, I did not think of them as tools--like dynamite, which could be used to destroy as well as to build.

As smog continued to engulf Los Angeles, my naiveté began to erode, when at UCLA, in a collective behavior class with Ralph Turner, I encountered the Lees' (1939) wonderful book on propaganda, read sociologist-journalist Vance Packard's *The Hidden Persuaders* (1957), and took on the downer of the summer of 1959—Nevil Shute's apocalyptic *On the Beach*.

I came to understand the dangers of demagoguery and saw how emotion could overcome careful thought, whether in politics or sales. I did my master's thesis on Father Coughlin, who was among the first US demagogues to effectively use national radio. That led to a lifelong interest in manipulation, trickery, deception and authenticity and in the double-edged (and more) potentials of any tool.

I became fascinated by broad questions involving the nature of social order and the factors associated with a democratic society, including openness, surveillance and technology. I saw that modern society increasingly relied on interdependent, formal agencies, and increasingly moved beyond the more informal mechanisms characteristic of pre-industrial and pre-urban homogenous societies. Which led to my interest in the police, as the most visible and symbolic applied agents of the state, who play a key institutional role in social control with their resources to support or undermine democratic ideals. Democratic orders were indeed fragile, and abusive surveillance was hardly restricted to authoritarian and totalitarian states. Yates' question--"What if the church and the state are the mob that howls at the door?"--became more than rhetorical for me. Along with many others, I became more fully aware of abusive surveillance following Watergate and the release of reports by the Church Committee (U.S. Congress 1976) and the Rockefeller Commission 1975 documenting wrongful surveillance and the misuse of power.

Initial Research

Still deeply affected by my experiences at Berkeley as a student and teacher and in CORE, I spent my first decade of research studying morally suspect and often illegal state surveillance against non-violent and generally non-criminal protest groups (Marx 1974, 1979.) And as the 1960s and early 1970s protest movements receded, surveillance for other uses expanded, as did my potential topics for research.

At the same time, a more equitable science- and technology-based enforcement ethos emerged for the FBI and other agencies following the death of J. Edgar Hoover, and federal funds became available for local police efforts. The new approach to enforcement blended traditional undercover means with the latest in bugging, video and tracking tools; computers to identify subjects and document their activities and networks; and emerging technical forms of forensics such as DNA and other patterns of identification and evidence. Surveillance was clearly changing in response to new social conditions and the availability of new technologies.

These emerging tools formed the *new surveillance*. Developments such as databases and video were linked in practice with traditional undercover activities. They were also conceptually linked. With their invisibility and the absence of subject consent, many of the tools served as electronic informants similar in some ways to police informers and infiltrators, if more passive (Marx 1988, Marx and Reichman 1984). The potential for abuse was clear, but so was the potential to better serve citizens—for example, with respect to identifying health risks and needs or improving efficiency.

As the year 1984 approached, there was much public discussion about whether we were well on the way to George Orwell's dystopia. In a paper written for a Council of Europe conference in Strasbourg, I examined various social indicators to assess how close we were to the society Orwell had described (Marx 1986). As noted in the concluding chapter, on most of the easily measurable items, society had moved in an opposite direction from that Orwell imagined.

Still, Orwell was an adept prognosticator in his treatment of language and culture—for example, with his newspeak and his take on public relations, self-inhibitions created by fear of censorship, and uncertainty about being observed. However, the dominance of the boot on the human face and the reappearance of state violence the book described did not apply to contemporary society (see Huxley's 1948 letter to his former student Orwell in Ch. 5. p. -)

Orwell's prognostication failures would be cause for celebration were it not for the fact that new and potentially repressive (if non-violent in conventional meaning) social forms and technologies were rapidly proliferating. Softer, low-visibility, engineered, connected, and embedded domestic forms were clearly in ascendance. These technologies swept across society, far beyond criminal justice or the military, where many of the tactics originated and were first used.

In my Strasbourg paper, I noted that violent and nonviolent forms of social control were being uncoupled, with the latter increasing in importance. Seemingly less coercive forms of control had emerged within societies even though they had not become formally less democratic and even though the state's use of domestic violence might have contracted. Threats to privacy and liberty were not limited to the use of force, or to state power. On the other hand, in some ways, these tools were merely tools, so developments in surveillance and communication technology also could bring a cornucopia of benefits.

Surveillance may ironically encourage sociability and community by fostering trust. But it can of course also do the opposite in communicating distrust (at least initially) of the other. The line is thin indeed between trusting and verifying. As Professor Goffman instructed, the themes of presentation, with the assumption of authenticity on the part of the actor, and the absence (or suppression) of doubt on the part of the audience, are fundamental to sustaining the social order.

Yet the counter imperative, (if less often openly stated) to validate through surveillance, also paradoxically sustains that order by offering a safety net for trust. The failure to more frequently directly confront the contradiction of these two imperatives is an excellent illustration of the kind of rose-colored, somewhat disingenuous cooperative effort that makes interaction possible.

A great deal was going on in the mid-1980s with the arrival of ever more powerful and seemingly omniscient, omnipresent knowledge machines. Consider video cameras; drug testing regimens; computer documentation, discoveries, predictions and networks; location- and communication-monitoring devices; and DNA analysis among the many other new forms. There was much to study and discuss.

The 1980s was an exciting time to be considering these issues, and I particularly profited from the pioneering work of Jim Rule (1973), Ken Laudon (1986) and David Burnham (1983) on the social implications of computer databases and from discussions with Egon Bittner, Stan Cohen, Bob Fogelson, Carl Klockars, Peter Manning, Nancy Reichman, Pris Regan, Sanford Sherizen, Jay Wachtel and Chuck Wexler and from work with several federal agencies.

The forms that appeared in the later 20th century were distinct, but they also shared certain key attributes, and because they are all variants of a broader social phenomenon, they have elements in common with non-technological forms. The social analyst can help us see this by offering constructs that separate what appears to be connected and by connecting what appears to be separate and by noting what is changing and what is enduring.. Between the potions of the structuralists and the post-structuralists, I'll take a cold beer anytime --always looking for continuity as well as difference.

In the early 1980s, in addition to my work on undercover policing, I began empirical studies of computer matching and profiling, and location and work monitoring, and I wrote public policy op-ed articles on topics such as drug testing, DNA analysis, credit reports, Caller-ID, manners and new communication means, and video

surveillance. While substantively distinct, each of these forms I wrote about also shared certain characteristics.

Looking across institutions brought me beyond the formal organization called police to the function called policing and back to the broader questions about modes and means of social ordering (or in current parlance, governance) that my graduate education began with. I had an abundance of facts that called out for more systematic organization in order to locate similarities and differences. I wanted to develop a framework that went beyond newspaper descriptions and the shoot-from-the-lip rhetoric of those strongly favoring or opposing the new forms in the absence of detailed analysis.

My goal, pursued over the next decades, became the creation of a conceptual map for the collection, analysis and application of personal data. In doing this I was helped a great deal by colleagues at conferences I organized on the *new surveillance* at the University of Colorado (1995) and Harvey Mudd College (2008.) A conceptual introduction to the Mudd conference and paper abstracts are at <http://web.mit.edu/gtmarx/www/witsabstracts.html>.

The question was not as many people initially ask, "is surveillance good or bad?", but rather "what concepts are needed to capture the fundamental surveillance structures and processes across diverse tools and settings in order to make better comparative statements (whether across tools, institutions or countries)?" We can then ask, "what are the facts?", "what are the values?", "where is society headed?", and "how can we differentiate appropriate from inappropriate uses?" In the appendix to an early paper on privacy and technology (<http://web.mit.edu/gtmarx/www/privantt.html>.) I listed almost 100 related questions the topic raises.

In developing this conceptual map, the overarching concept was the new surveillance. Viewing the separate technologies with overlapping characteristics as an ideal type offered a way to think about broad changes in society. Identifying the major dimensions of surveillance could provide a means to contrast the tools and to actually measure where, and the extent to which, changes were (or might be) occurring in social organization and behavior and to see more clearly the implications for liberty, security, privacy and life chances.

An Emerging Field

The field of surveillance studies came to increased public and academic attention after 9/11. (Monaghan 2006.) But the topic in its modern form has been of interest to scholars at least since the 1950s. This is related to greater awareness of the human rights abuses of colonialism, fascism, and communism, anti-democratic behavior within democratic societies, the literary work of Huxley, Orwell and Kafka and the appearance of computers and other new technologies with their profound implications for social behavior, organization and societies.

Foucault (although writing about earlier centuries) is certainly the dominant grandfather of contemporary studies and further in the background are Taylor, Weber, Nietzsche, Marx, Bentham, Rousseau and Hobbes; and of course even further back the watchful and potentially wrathful (although also sometimes loving and protective) eye of the Biblical God of the old testament.

What were those interested in the topic reading at mid-century and in the following several decades? In the 1960s The Who sang "talkin' about my generation." While I can't speak for others, neither are these observations only reflective of my experience.

I will note the kinds of literature the cohort who entered social science graduate schools from the 1960s into the 1980s were likely reading. From the 1950s to the early 1980s the ardor of the surveillance studies or privacy bibliophile could be easily and responsibly sated. That satiation was provided by journalists Barth (1951) and Packer (1964), legal scholars Samuel Dash, R. Schwartz, and K. Knowlton (1959) and Arthur Miller (1971), political scientist Alan Westin (1967), and sociologists Edward Shils (1956), Rose Coser (1961), Barry Schwartz (1968), Stanton Wheeler (1969) and Jim Rule (1973.) In the early 1980s attention to the topic increased with work such as that by journalist David Burnham (1983), philosophers Sissela Bok (1978, 1982) and Fred Schoenman (1984), and sociologist Ken Laudon (1986.) A small social and environmental psychology literature also existed (Altman 1975; Margulis 1977; Ingram 1978.) In addition, some classic law articles reviewed cases and asserted central principles or values. (Fried 1968; Bloustein 1979; Gavison 1980.)

The modest amount of scholarly and media attention to the topic in that early period has been replaced by a continuing flood of attention —see summaries of recent literature in Marx and Muschert 2007, Lyon 2007 and the articles in recent edited collections such as Zureik and Salter 2005; Haggerty and Ericson 2006; Lyon 2006; Monahan 2006; Norris and Wilson 2006; Staples 2007; Hier and Greenberg 2007, 2009; Leman-Langlois 2008; Kerr et al 2009; Wall 2009; Hempel et al 2010; Zureik et al 2010. The growth involves many fields: philosophy, sociology, criminology, social psychology, political science, geography, law, architecture/planning, history, economics, communications, cultural studies, computer, public administration, public health, business, and science, technology and society studies.

How does the emerging field of surveillance studies compare to other fields preceded by an adjective? Social studies of surveillance start with an empirical topic,—that is different from beginning with a research question, theory or method. The focus on a kind of behavior necessarily calls for breadth and crosses disciplines, institutions, methods and places. This catholicity is furthered because there is no formal organization for surveillance studies, unlike for the established disciplines and many other studies fields. This gives the field egalitarian openness, energy, and contemporaneity and the ability to incorporate rapid changes and new ideas. Fields with more established cultures and formal gatekeepers vigilantly patrolling their intellectual borders are more prone to ossification. This openness is a source of the field's strength and energy. Yet it can also

be seen as a source of weakness—the field is diffuse, scholars lack agreement on many important issues and knowledge is not very cumulative.

The field's openness harks back to 19th century generalists such as Karl Marx, Max Weber and Georg Simmel who looked broadly across areas to understand the big changes associated with modernization. They considered social change from historical, economic, social, legal and cultural perspectives. Today, specialization is hardly in danger of being replaced, nor should it be. Yet surveillance studies in focusing on substantive topics in their richness and in bringing perspectives and findings from various fields together has an important role to play.

The area is so far best characterized as multi-disciplinary rather than inter-disciplinary. In an inter-disciplinary field the distinct ideas and levels of analysis from various disciplines are integrated, rather than being applied in a parallel fashion. Illustrative of the former would be finding that workers of a particular personality type respond positively (in terms of attitude and productivity) to intensive work monitoring, while those with a different personality respond in an opposite fashion, showing how concepts from geography can inform the ethical, legal and popular culture labeling of places (whether physical or cyber) as public or private, or demonstrating how the different historical experience of Europe relative to the United States led to the former's greater concern and different policies over private sector surveillance as against that of government, while in the United States that pattern was reversed.

Surveillance studies as a growing epistemic community is unlike most other "studies" fields. It is not based on a geographical region, ethnicity, gender or life style (e.g., as with urban or women's studies.) Nor is it based on a single disciplinary, theoretical or methodological perspective (e.g., sociology, post-modernism or survey research.) Rather it is based on a family of behaviors all dealing in some way with information about the individual (whether uniquely identified or not) or about groups. The social significance of the activity is in crossing or failing to cross the borders of the person—factors which can be central to life chances, self-concept and democracy. Such activity also defines and can redefine what the borders of personhood are.

The field overlaps several related areas. It shares with technology and society studies an interest in the social impacts of (and upon) tools, but is restricted to one class of tool defined by its information function. It shares an interest in surveillance technology with many fields such as engineering and computer and forensic science, but it is concerned with the social and cultural, not the technical elements. Some of the forms studied do not even involve technical hardware (e.g., social technologies such as reading lips, facial expressions and body language.) By far the largest number and methodologically most sophisticated studies preceded by the adjective surveillance are in the area of public health. Foucault (1986) analyzes power and the mapping of the plague in the 17th century as a precursor to modern surveillance. The epidemiological studies of disease and epidemics however reflect only one of many strands in studies surveillance.

The field also overlaps some of the topical interests of management information, library science and criminal justice studies, but it is decidedly not a policy, applied or managerial field. While it tends to share value concerns with civil liberties, privacy and human rights studies, most researchers begin with the values and norms of scholarship in order to advance knowledge, rather than beginning with policy, reform or activism.

Social studies of surveillance share with global studies an interest in the causes and consequences of increased world interdependence and cooperation; in the standardization of techniques and policies, new trans-border organizations; and in cross border flows of data and persons. Relative to most study fields it is (and should be) more international with respect to its practitioners and its subject matter.

The journal and web resource *Surveillance and Society* has editors and advisors across western societies. The Canadian New Transparency and the European Living in Surveillance Societies projects also have participants from many countries—although English is the dominant language which tilts toward an over-representation of Anglo-phone scholars and few comparative studies. Any generalizations from the English speaking world to the world must be empirically grounded—not to mention the need to be aware of differences between (and within) English speaking countries. More work has been done in western than in eastern Europe and little is available on other countries. An important question is the extent to which we are moving toward a pretty uniform world surveillance society driven by a common ethos, problems, and technology developed in Western societies—as against a commonality based on convergence and amalgamation, or will we see a world of uncommonality where local differences in narratives and uses remain strong even as common technologies are adopted?

The field departs from global studies in the many non-global aspects it is concerned with. Much scrutinizing is at the local level and is strongly influenced by the particular cultural context—whether involving parents and children, friends, workers or shoppers and society's with democratic or authoritarian traditions. Across countries the local language used to justify or challenge a tactic may reflect different value assumptions, priorities and models of society e.g.,—the welfare state, the threatened state, the religious state, the libertarian state. Social studies of surveillance are university based and bound by norms of scholarship involving logic, method, awareness of prior research, evidence and civility. These norms prescribe fairness and objectivity in the conduct of research; listening carefully to those we disagree with; and continually reflecting on the positions we hold. Value neutrality is necessary for reasons of principle and of strategic legitimacy.

The topic however does have great moral bite and scholars are drawn to it because they are concerned over its implications for the kind of society we are, are becoming or might become, as technology and changing life conditions alter the crossing of personal and group informamasking borders.

Perhaps to a greater degree than for most fields, the social issues driving researchers are manifest (e.g., autonomy, fairness, privacy and transparency.) These value concerns are not easily characterized in conventional terms as liberal or conservative and there are

conflicting legitimate goals (e.g., between the rights of the individual and the needs of the community, the desire to be left alone and to be noticed, rights to privacy and to information.) A concern with underdogs and the negative aspects of inequality is present, but so too is awareness of the interconnected parts of the social order which brings cautiousness about social change introduced too quickly and without adequate discussion. Genuine informed consent and level playing fields are issues shared across most conflicting ideologies. An overarching value in much research is the Kantian idea of respect for the dignity of the person and the related factor of respect for the social and procedural conditions that foster fair treatment, democracy and a civil society.

After so little scholarly interest in the field for so long, the insights and sustained and focused intellectual energy reflected in this volume are most welcome! This book fills a need. While the last decade has seen many *studies of surveillance*, there has been little work seeking to define and present the broad field of *surveillance studies* and to create an empirical knowledge base. The game has many players. This comprehensive handbook by leading scholars, in offering an introduction, mapping and directions for future research provides a field for them to play on. Scholars as well as computers need platforms.

The book serves as a reminder that while they (whether the state, commercial interests or new, expanding public-private hybrid forms) are watching us, we are watching them. Surveillance studies have an important role to play in publicizing what is happening or might happen, ways of thinking about this and what is at stake. Making surveillance more visible and understandable hardly guarantees a just and accountable society, but it is surely a necessary condition for one.

References

Altman, I. 1975. The Environment and Social Behavior: Privacy, Personal Space, Territory, and Crowding. Pacific Grove, Ca.: Brooks/Cole Pub. Co.

Barth, A. 1951. The Loyalty of Free Men.

Bloustein E.J. 1979. Individual and Group Privacy. New Brunswick: NJ: Transaction.

Bok S. 1978. Lying. New York: Pantheon.

- 1982. Secrets. New York: Pantheon.

Burnham, D. 1983. The Rise of the Computer State. New York: Random House.

Carneige, D. 1936. How to Win Friends and Influence People.

Coser, R. 1961. "Insulation from Observability and Types of Social Conformity." *American Sociological Review*.

Marx, *Windows Into the Soul*: "Your Papers Please" additional material

Cunningham, D. 2003. There's Something Happening Here: The New Left, the Klan, and FBI Counterintelligence. Berkeley: University of California Press

Dash S, Schwartz R, Knowlton R. 1959. Eavesdroppers. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press

Donner, F. 1980. The Age of Surveillance. New York: Knopf.

Earl, J. 2011. "Political Repression: Iron Fists, Velvet Gloves, and Diffuse Control." *Annual Review of Sociology*. 37.

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

Fried C. 1968. "Privacy." *Yale Law Journal*. 77: 475-93. Gavison R. 1980. "Privacy and the limits of law." *Yale Law Journal*. 89: 421-71.

Gilliom, J. 2001. Overseers of the Poor. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Goffman, E. 1961. Asylums. Garden City, N.J.:Anchor Books.

Haggerty, K. and Ericson, R. 2006. The New Politics of Surveillance and Visibility. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Haggerty, K. and Samatas, 2010. Surveillance and Democracy. Glasshouse Books.

Hier, S. and Greenberg, J. 2007. The Surveillance Studies Reader. New York: McGraw Hill.

Hier, S. and Greenberg, J. 2009. Surveillance Power, Problems and Politics .Surveillance Power, Problems and Politics. Vancouver: UC Press.

Hempel, L. Krasmann, S. and Brockling, U. 2010. Sichtbarkeitsregime. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.

Ingram, R. 1978. Privacy and Psychology. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Jones, 2011.

Kerr, I., Steeves, V. and Lucock, C. 2009. Lessons from the Identity Trail. New York: Oxford University Press.

Laudon K.C. 1986. The Dossier Society. New York: Columbia University Press.

Leman-Langlois, S. (ed.) Technocrime. London: Wilan, 2008.

Lee, A.M. and Lee, E.B. 1939. The Fine Art of Propaganda.

Marx, *Windows Into the Soul*: "Your Papers Please" additional material

Lyon, D. 1994. The Electronic Eye: The Rise of Surveillance Society. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- 2006. Theorizing Surveillance: The Panopticon and Beyond. Portland: Wilan Publishing.
- 2007. Surveillance Studies: An Overview. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Marx, G.T. 1974. "Thoughts on a Neglected Category of Social Movement Participant: the Provocateur and the Informant." *American Journal of Sociology*. 80. 402-442.

- 1979. "External Efforts to Damage or Facilitate Social Movements: Some Patterns, Explanations, Outcomes, and Complications." In The Dynamics of Social Movements. M. Zald and J. McCarthy, (ed.) Cambridge, Ma.:Winthrop Publishers.
- 1986. "The Iron Fist and the Velvet Glove: Totalitarian Potentials Within Democratic Structures." in J. Short (ed.) The Social Fabric: Dimensions and Issues. Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, CA. 1986.
- 1988. Undercover: Police Surveillance in America. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- 2002. "What's New About the New Surveillance? Classifying for Change and Continuity." *Surveillance and Society*, 1.
- 2005. "Some Conceptual Issues in the Study of Borders and Surveillance." In E. Zureik and M. Salter, Who and What Goes There? Global Policing and Surveillance.
- 2006. "Varieties of Personal Information as Influences on Attitudes Toward Surveillance." In K. Haggerty R. Ericson (ed.), The New Politics of Surveillance and Visibility. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- 2011. "Turtles, Firewalls, Scarlet Letters and Vacuum Cleaners: Rules about Personal Information." In W. Aspray and P. Doty (eds.) Making Privacy. Scarecrow Press.
- Forthcoming. Windows Into the Soul: Surveillance and Society in An Age of High Technology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Marx, G.T. and Muschert, G. 2007. "Personal Information, Borders, and the New Surveillance." *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*.

Marx, G.T. and Reichman, N. 1984. "Routinizing the Discovery of Secrets: Computers as Informants." *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 27, no. 4, 1984, pp.423-452.

Margulis, S. 1977. "Privacy as a Behavioral Phenomenon." *Journal of Social Issues*. 33:3.

Monaghan, P. 2006. "Watching the Watchers." *Chronicle of Higher Education*. 52:28, March 17, 1 and 18-25.

Miller A. 1971. The Assault on Privacy. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Marx, *Windows Into the Soul*: "Your Papers Please" additional material

Monahan, T. 2006. Surveillance and Security. New York: Routledge.

Norris, C. and Wilson, D. 2006. Surveillance, Crime, and Social Control. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Packer, V. 1957. The Hidden Persuaders.

- 1964. The Naked Society. New York: Pocket Books.

Rockefeller Commission Report. 1975. *Report to the President by the Commission on CIA Activities Within the U.S.* Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Congress, Senate, 94th Congress, 2d sess. Church Committee (Select Committee to Study Government Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities) 1976. Supplemental Detailed Staff Report on Intelligence Activities and the Rights of Americans, Book III, Final Report (Washington D.C.:GPO.

Rule, J. 1973. Private lives, public surveillance. London: Allen-Lane.

Schwartz,B. 1968. "The Social Psychology of Privacy." *American Sociological Review*.

Schoenman F (ed.) 1984. Philosophical Dimensions of Privacy. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Shils, Edward (1956). The Torment of Secrecy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shute, N. 1957. On the Beach.

Smith, G. 1969. Letters of Aldous Huxley. Chatto & Windus.

Staples, W. 2007. Encyclopedia of Privacy. Westport: Greenwood.

Starr, A., Fernandez, L. and Scholl, C. 2011. Shutting Down the Streets: Police Violence and Social Control. New York: New York University Press.

Shalin, D. 2010. "Erving Goffman as a Pioneer in Self-Ethnography? 'The Insanity of Place' Revisited." Paper presented at the 2010 Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, Atlanta, GA.
http://www.unlv.edu/centers/cdclv/ega/articles/ds_insanity.html.

Valery, P. 1965. Oeuvres. Paris: Editions Gallimard.

Wall, D. 2009. Crime and Deviance in Cyberspace. Surrey: Ashgate.

Westin A. 1967. Privacy and Freedom. New York: Columbia University Press.

Marx, *Windows Into the Soul*: “Your Papers Please” additional material

Wheeler, S. 1969. Files and Dossiers in American Society. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Zureik, E. and Salter, M. Global Policing. Portland: Wilan Publishisng.

Zureik, E. et al 2010. Surveillance, Privacy, and the Globalization of Personal Information. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press

¹ Our subjects, particularly in far removed settings, rather naturally also suspect social scientists asking questions -- but so too do police and intelligence agencies when they are the subjects. Conflicting views on the appropriate role of anthropologists in military settings for example can be found in Price (2008) and Lucas (2010). Social researchers are also the subjects of surveillance, whether in their self studies or in those by authorities (Keen 1999, Price, 2004). They may also work for them as with Project Camelot (Horowitz 1967) and programs in 2010 that embedded social scientists within military units. See for example the debates in <http://fabiusmaximus.wordpress.com/anthropology-war/>]

² According to one account (Ash 1997) more books are published in England on spying than any other subject except sex and gardening.

³ Consider a bumper sticker seen on a university campus, “don’t believe anything until it has been officially denied.”