SPACES

O F

SURVEILLANCE

States and Selves

Edited by
Susan Flynn &
Antonia Mackay

palgrave
macmillan

Spaces of Surveillance

Susan Flynn · Antonia Mackay
Editors

Spaces of Surveillance

States and Selves

palgrave
macmillan

Editors
Susan Flynn
School of Media
University of the Arts London
London, UK

Antonia Mackay
Department of English and Modern
   Languages
Oxford Brookes University
Oxford, UK

Cover illustration: maja/Alamy Stock Photo

Printed on acid-free paper

CONTENTS

EDITORS AND CONTRIBUTORS

About the Editors

Susan Flynn is a lecturer at the University of the Arts, London where she specialises in contemporary media culture, digital and body theory and media equality. Her work is featured in a number of international collections and journals such as *American, British and Canadian Studies Journal* and *Ethos: A Digital Review of the Arts, Humanities and Public Ethics.*

Antonia Mackay is an Associate Lecturer at Oxford Brookes University and Visiting Lecturer at Goldsmiths, University of London. She has taught on a wide range of undergraduate and postgraduate modules including American Theatre, American Vistas, Critical Theory, Narrative and Narratology and Special Options in experimental Avant Garde and Twentieth Century Writing. She has published articles on Manhattan Maleness and Cold War ideology, as well as articles on space, technology and identity and won the Nigel Messenger Teaching Award at Oxford Brookes in 2014 and 2016.

Contributors

Simon Bacon Poznan, Poland

Tapo Chimbganda York University in Toronto, Toronto, Canada

Amy Christmas Qatar University, Doha, Qatar

Jeffrey Clapp Department of Literature and Cultural Studies, Education University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China

Francesca D'Amico York University in Toronto, Toronto, Canada

Susan Flynn University of Arts, London, UK; School of Media, University of the Arts London, London, UK

Alison Lutton University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

Antonia Mackay Department of English and Modern Languages, Oxford Brookes University, Oxford, UK

William Thomas McBride Illinois State University, Normal, USA

Jaclyn Meloche Art Gallery of Windsor, Windsor, Canada

Chloe Anna Milligan University of Florida, Gainesville, USA

Frances Pheasant-Kelly Wolverhampton University, Wolverhampton, UK

Virginia Pignagnoli University of Turin, Turin, Italy

Mary Ryan Department of Political Science, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, USA

Sam Tecle York University in Toronto, Toronto, Canada

Yafet Tewelde York University in Toronto, Toronto, Canada

LIST OF FIGURES

Introduction

Susan Flynn and Antonia Mackay

In 1948, George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* portrayed a bleak future for mankind. A future almost entirely filled with surveillance technologies and surveilling practices; one where all seeing eyes and ears threaten to destroy individualism in favour of blind conformity. Orwell's ominous vision of Big Brother and the control exerted by the Ministries of Oceania, is one premised on the notion of surveillance, and with it, states of selfhood where the system "controls matter because we control the mind" (Orwell 1948, p. 268). The grim reality of Orwell's Big Brother is not merely the weight of sheer political power, but rather, the effects of surveillance on those who are watched, and thereby, those who are policed. By extension, as the novel's protagonist Winston Smith informs us, the power of these technologies to maintain the societal system around him, indeed Oceania itself, means this is not only a surveilled space, but a space of surveillance where "BIG BROTHER IS WATCHING YOU" (Orwell 1948, p. 3). The importance of surveillance technology in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* cannot be

S. Flynn
School of Media, University of the Arts London, London, UK
e-mail: susan.flynn.1@ucdconnect.ie

A. Mackay (✉)
Department of English and Modern Languages, Oxford Brookes University, Oxford, UK
e-mail: antoniamackay@brookes.ac.uk

underestimated, for here is a system that can both watch and thereby control the masses; and furthermore, by affecting the spaces we inhabit, can manipulate and reshape our selfhood: "who controls the past … control the future; who controls the present controls the past" (Orwell 1948, p. 37).

Orwell's now recognizable environment is pertinent to this collection of essays on the nature of surveillance; from the manner in which spaces can affect identity; to how the gaze of these technologies can determine individual behaviour and selfhood. Jeremy Bentham's panopticon (1843) inculcated surveillance within architecture. What Bentham ascertained was the creation of a consciousness solely based on permanent visibility as a form of power; in effect, a space "based on a system of permanent registration" (Foucault 1975, p. 196). Orwell's urban landscape is not dissimilar in its structure; where "you had to live—did live from habit that became instinct—in the assumption that every sound you made was overheard, and except in darkness, every movement scrutinized" (Orwell 1948, p. 3). Big Brother exhibits the same power as Bentham's panopticon, constantly observing the bodies of Oceania; only in Orwell's version, the power of surveillant technologies not only affects behaviour through a system of power, it also creates identity, where "each individual is fixed in his place … the gaze is alert everywhere" (Foucault 1975, p. 195).

Unlike the inmates of Bentham's prisons, Winston Smith is fully aware of the potential control wielded over him by the all seeing eye of Big Brother, and rather than behave, he merely performs correctly: "he had set his features into the expression of quiet optimism which it was advisable to wear when facing the telescreen" (Orwell 1948, p. 5). Winston, under the gaze of the telescreens, continually shifts his identity in order to reflect a visibly acceptable, and more importantly, conformist identity. What we witness with Orwell's form of surveillance is not only panopticism, but also how the gaze of surveillant technologies can shift identity within spaces of visibility. However, as readers of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* will well know, this isn't a system which can be overcome—it is merely a space of continual identity immobility where acts of individualism are punished, and a life of perpetual performativity upheld. As Michel Foucault's work on panopticism states: "power has its principle not so much in person as in certain concerted distribution of bodies, surfaces, lights, gazes" (Foucault 1975, p. 202), and for this reason, Winston Smith will never be able to defeat the power of surveillance.

What we can learn from Orwell's vision is the manner in which technology can impact our understanding of reality, and with that, the ensuing

issues of who is surveilled, who has the power of the gaze, and how architectural structures can impact our surveilled potential. Martin Fuglesang and Bent Meier Sorenson's work on Gilles Deleuze extends this idea further, where identity is marked by spaces and given corporeality by its action (Fuglesang and Sorenson 2006). In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Winston's identity is almost entirely created by the surveillance of Big Brother and by Winston's actions—he is both given identity as a body to be watched, and one to be watched as he disobeys the laws of Oceania. However, according to Fuglesang and Sorenson, if we require a frame in order to have an identity (in Winston's case, his apartment and the telescreen) then it is, rather confusingly, this same frame which allows us to be real—in essence, it is by being watched that we can become real. The potential contained in surveillant technologies is therefore twofold: providing bodies with identities they may not want, but at the same time providing them with an identity that can be determined as real – I am watched, therefore I am. Surveillance technologies may not, therefore, deserve their dystopian image, and as these chapters suggest, may contain the potential for individuals to become more than just a body to be watched.

Orwell's Oceania is arguably, the most recognisable fictional example of a surveilled state, but the reality of surveillance in the modern world appears to be far more entrenched than the all seeing eye of Big Brother. Salient media discourses remind us that surveillance exists all around us, and in a multitude of forms. In May 2016, artist Laura Poitras exhibited "Astro Noise" at the Whitney owned Hurst Family Gallery in New York. The exhibition consisted of a series of documentary clips, architectural plans and documents, and thermal radiation images on the subject of mass surveillance and the US drone project. Hailed as a form of "political art" which "reveals mass surveillance at home and [the] extensive drone wars abroad" (Cotter 2016a, p. C21), the exhibition exposed Poitras' involvement with the Edward Snowden files following her collaboration with the documentary film *Citizenfour*. Some of the exhibition was shaped by the Snowden leaks and featured images of rooftops in Baghdad and slow motion images of New Yorkers staring at Ground Zero. One particular exhibit, "O Say Can You See" featured a two sided video installation of black and white footage of prisoners in Afghanistan cut with the military aftermath of 9/11. As Holland Cotter determines, the exhibit draws attention to the need for survival in the age of mass surveillance, calling it "art of the 'we shall overcome' sort" (Cotter 2016b, p. C21). Poitras' exhibition unveils the impact of surveillance not only on ourselves, but also

on our understanding of others. In a similar vein, in June 2016, the International Center of Photography (ICP) in New York unveiled its inaugural exhibition entitled "Public, Private, Secret". The ICP's curator, Charlotte Cotton, conceived of the exhibition in an attempt to address timely questions concerning how the images we broadcast communicate something about ourselves, and what happens when others view these images without our knowledge (Budick 2016). Much like Poitras' exhibition of post 9/11 surveillance, Cotton's exhibition confronts us with images from webcam stills, Instagram and Twitter in a manner that renegotiates the links between self, viewer and other (Budick 2016). These exhibitions demonstrate, not only the prevalence of surveillance technologies, where real surveillance can be turned into art, but also the many forms surveillant practices can take where, "visual fiction stands in for truth" (Cotter 2016a, p. C21). This collection returns both to 9/11 and to the promise of art in order to capture our current surveillant reality.

Perhaps the most recognizable images of surveillance are those found on the Internet. Much like the ICP's exhibition, the Internet and, by extension, web imagery found on social media, has quickly become a form of individual surveillance—observing ourselves through 'selfies' and others through 'likes'. In 2009, Ondi Timoner made a documentary about Internet pioneer Josh Harris entitled *We Live in Public*. Timoner's documentary charted the rise and fall of Harris' career from the dot com boom of the late 1990s, to his meteoric fall following the art project 'Quiet'. In 1999, Harris invited one hundred artists to live in a human terrarium under New York City where their every move was followed by cameras. Living in "pods" these artists could tune into other people's monitors around them, viewing each other's CCTV channels and living constantly "in public". Harris' experiment took the loss of privacy in the Internet age to a new level, resulting in participants claiming to feel like "rats" and "slaves" and reporting a loss of identity and increasing detachment. As Harris' opening lines in Timoner's documentary disclose, "the Internet is like a new human experience. At first everyone's going to like it, but there will be a fundamental change in the human condition. As time goes by we will become more constrained in these human boxes. Our every action will become accountable. One day we will wake and realise we are all just servants" (*We Live in Public* 2009). Harris' words strike a chord with the central concerns contained in this collection—the manner in which states, selfhood and indeed spaces can be affected by our constant watching and being watched; where, according to the film maker, we will become nothing more than a

zoo where we ourselves are the animals (Timoner 2009). Both Timoner and Harris later reflected that we are fast approaching this state, where we are already "trapped in virtual boxes" through our Blackberry and iPhone devices (Alter 2009). As Timoner's film, and Harris' project make clear, Orwell's Big Brother is no longer an individual watching our every move, rather it is a collective consciousness maintained and perpetuated by our need to feel constantly connected through technology, where our engagement with contemporary technologies alters the multiple sets of social relations in which we exist.

Many of these examples touch on a central issue at the heart of surveillance studies—privacy. Orwell's Big Brother denied privacy; Poitras' exhibition demonstrated its loss; the ICP's exhibition unveiled our imaging obsessions; and Harris' 'Quiet' demonstrated our inability to be truly private in a world of growing communication. Perhaps nowhere is this more evident than in our investment in social media where our personal video and imagery share the same tenets as news footage and global surveillance technologies. Twitter, for example, has revolutionized the way news reports are written and broadcast, becoming increasingly integrated into the realm of public statements. We now consume and produce content, becoming what Toffler originally termed "prosumers", embroiled in a culture of speed and sound bites. As one journalist has noted, the manner in which Twitter engages with news events as they unfold, ultimately threatens to undermine more than just the integrity of the news they report, where "embedding a third party hosted tweet in a news article has consequences for privacy—it gives Twitter the possibility of tracking the reading habits of users around the web" (Higgins 2015, [online]). The ability for our actions to be tracked, monitored and surveilled through the Internet is not dissimilar to Harris' vision of our future, where a "Wired City cyber ship" will host and observe our every move, rewarding us for "likes" with cash in place of a "normal" job (Boys-Myer 2011). Many television series and films have similarly warned us of the dangers of losing our privacy through surveillant practices such as CBS' *Person of Interest*'s 'Machine' (2011–2016), *V for Vendetta*'s street spy vans (2005), *Minority Report*'s retina scanning (2002), and *The Truman Show*'s pastiche of reality television (1998). *The Truman Show*'s inversion of reality television (seen elsewhere under the guise of entertainment in shows such as *Big Brother* (2000—present), *Keeping up with the Kardashians* (2007—present) and *Geordie Shore* (2011—present)) has a much darker side to its pastiche of television and privacy. Peter Weir's film also includes shots of the audience

who scrutinise Truman's every move in a similar fashion to ourselves as we watch the film. Watching *The Truman Show* is perhaps more uncomfortable viewing than the Kardashians as we suddenly become aware of our own part to play in the surveillance structure; we too are his audience, maintaining his position as entertainment. Given that Truman's identity is also mixed with advertising, the play on modern television is further compounded, reminding us that information, whether it be real of artificial can always be fashioned into an identity (Marks 2005).

Yet these artistic and fictional accounts reflect a much wider concern regarding the impact of surveillance. The events that unfolded during 9/11, Hurricane Katrina and the much broader Western 'war against terror' all share a common denominator with the above examples—the filming and surveilling, as well as the viewing of individuals. Much like *The Truman Show* there is an implicit voyeurism attached to the televised viewing of these disasters. As Laura Mulvey's work on scopophilia details, the idea of being looked at and the pleasure derived from gazing at a screen, is implicit in the viewing of surveillance footage—a form of gazing that connects identity on screen to that of the viewing individual (Mulvey 1973). During 9/11, CNN ran live footage of the disaster and the imagery shot by news crews was reborn in numerous documentaries, such as Jules and Gedeon Naudet's *9/11* and the *Here is New York* exhibition that featured a collection of photographs gorily entitled "*Victims*". Perhaps the most iconic image of 9/11 is Richard Drew's photograph of *Falling Man*, an image which still manages to encapsulate the events of 9/11 despite its unnamed subject. Arguably, it is these images that remain in the public consciousness, overtaking the event itself to become the defining image of all that 9/11 was and became, deriving an identity, of and in itself, as the "real" and authentic version of events. As Junod's article in *Esquire* suggests, *Falling Man* is now "falling through the vast space of memory" (Junod 2003, [online]). By extension, the surveillance technologies throughout the Middle East, and specifically in Afghanistan in order to combat the 'war on terror', have become part of the modern landscape. Much like Orwell's vision, in Kabul, such spaces of continual surveillance are common place where "the blimp has become their constant overseer … 'It watches us day and night'" (Bowley 2012, p. A15). The impact of this is felt in our understanding of the modern world, where our vision of the Western war on terror is almost entirely derived, and indeed, contrived, by the all-seeing eyes of drones. Much like the imagery of 9/11, and Poitras' exhibition, we consume camera footage through our television screens in

news reports, and in imagery on the Internet in order to observe and ultimately feel connected to the world around us.

Surveillance therefore, features much more in the shaping of our identity than it may first appear to. As these examples demonstrate, our sense of identity can be formed by the spaces of surveillance, the images of surveillance, and even the act of looking itself. And we ourselves are part of the expansive documenting of bodies, where, beyond the observing of others, we too are part of the surveillance society. Consider the use of wiretapping and speech recognition software, (long outdated since the arrival of the Internet in 1991), which is now replaced by government databases and pattern recognition software which cross-correlates our Internet surfing against our likes and dislikes, often "stealing" information from social media to personalise advertisements. In 2012, both Google and UK mobile phone networks collected data from their users through the collation of users' email content and web traffic (Cellan-James 2012), and web pages are increasingly utilizing various data collection methods such as: Cookies (when the website "knows" you have visited before), Clickstream Data (recording where the mouse clicks), Search Data (based on frequently searched terms), Purchase Data (online shopping) and Profile Data (from social media). Financial transactions can now be tracked, our vehicle number plates 'recognised' and our mobile phones tracked through GPS (Global Positioning System). Whilst it may have once been relegated to the realm of science fiction, DNA profiling, facial recognition and body scanners are all part of our modern culture, indeed, part of the societal systems which aim to ease our concerns over our identity and our possessions. So expansive is surveillance, that a quick search on the Internet for the terms "Mass Surveillance" brings hits for: 2013 Global Surveillance Disclosures; Computer and Network Surveillance; Data Privacy; Data Retention; Government Databases; National Security; Pen Register; Phone Surveillance; Police State; Security Culture; Sousveillance; and Tracking Systems. Far from being something we witness in art exhibitions, dystopic novels and television programmes, surveillance occurs on our computers, through our phones, in our homes and during our conversations.

Mass surveillance pervades our daily lives, but with CCTV cameras and securitynetworks comes a reactionary phenomenon—the rise of personal surveillance. In 1990, Cop Watch sought to reverse the surveillance culture in America, by filming police officers who stopped and searched individuals. The movement gained notoriety in 2003 when Kendra James was fatally

shot in Portland as she drove away from a traffic officer, and Cop Watch has continued to re-use surveillance technologies against police agencies in an attempt to take back some form of bodily control (Monahan 2006). More recently, the movement gained followers from the Black Lives Matter movement—a movement which emerged from the Ferguson riots and the killing of Michael Brown in 2014. Black Lives Matter has itself been the subject of surveillance, as the *Intercept* claims "the department [of Homeland Security] frequently collects information including location data, on Black Lives Matter activities from public social media accounts, including Facebook, Twitter and Vine" (Joseph 2015, [online]). Personal surveillance seems to be growing in response to the global surveillance at the core of governing bodies, where even cyclists in London have installed GoPros on their helmets in an attempt to offer security against unsafe drivers. The correlation between seeing and controlling is apparent – a symptom of the insecurity of the individual.

It is clear surveillance is a far reaching, and immeasurably myriad subject, affecting spaces, selves and states in profound and sometimes invisible ways. As the examples considered in this Introduction demonstrate, surveillance is often capable of either reducing our identities, but also, occasionally, enhancing them. As David Lyon's seminal works on surveillance culture testify: "thinking about surveillance today … means confronting the broken, stranded presents of a temporal disunity, shining with an eerie glossiness … meaning is an effect produced in the passage from signifier to signifier" (Lyon 2006, p. 127). In a manner similar to the earlier consideration of Deleuze, there is a complex issue at the heart of these technologies which questions our selfhood—by being watched are we made real? As Lyon makes clear, effect can only be produced when there is a passage between signifier to another signifier. By being viewed, do we pass over some signification from and to the camera, each enabling each other's existence and thereby making each other real? Recalling the works of Frederic Jameson, in this postmodern world of constant observation, there is some truth behind the idea that through camera intensification, we can become "more literal and more vivid" (Lyon 2006, p. 126); but this intensification comes at a cost—where we are instead "disconnected from the other signifiers that give … an identity" (Lyon 2006, p. 129). Much like Timoner's documentary, Harris' "Quiet" proved exactly this double bind—we are at once desperate for connection, but we seek it by watching others, who in turn watch us, distancing us from the real; a cycle that can never be diminished or satiated. William Staples' *Everyday Surveillance*

(2014) similarly reflects on modern society by suggesting that the collection of data has always existed, whether through technological means or otherwise (Staples 2014). For Staples, technology is frequently employed to 'watch' the body—its habits, movements, activities and, ultimately to shape, or change, its behaviour so that identity, becomes data. What Staples makes clear is that we are entering into a metaphorical age of Bentham's panopticism where we will be permanently visible and susceptible to the technological gaze. Rapheal Sassower's *Digital Exposure* (2013) argues that far from standardising the capitalist market, the introduction of consumer surveillance has resulted in the personalisation of consumption (Sassower 2013). By collecting data on individuals, there is no longer a drive to create uniform consumption but rather, individualised purchasing power, reversing the Orwellian idea of surveillance as a malignant force in modern society. Shoshanna Zuboff's *In the Age of the Smart Machine* (1988) similarly expresses the idea that technology can be understood as a duality, and not a simplistic and negative entity. On the one hand, when applied to automatic operations that can replace the human body, technology is seemingly humanity's eradicator (Zuboff 1988). On the other hand, technology generates information about production and human and bodily action. Activities, events, and objects are translated when a technology informates as well as automates. Technology can therefore, be both the eraser of humanity and inform on it, and for this reason, remains misunderstood and feared, entering into the double bind expressed by Lyon. Arguably, Michel Foucault's work on panopticism in *Discipline and Punish* (1975) offers the most established criticism on surveillance studies. For Foucault, visibility is a trap—by being visible, we ensure power can be exerted over our bodies (Foucault 1975), and whilst we may not require a panopticon in every street, its methods have been adopted by modern society through systems of control and observation. As these writers make clear, surveillance almost certainly affects our understanding of individual liberty and identity. This edited collection seeks to interrogate some of these established discourses through an examination of cultural productions, expanding on these established discourses and into new interdisciplinary discussions. The three sections included here demonstrate how art, photography, film, literature and place can impact the body, investigating issues such as how trauma affects how bodies are viewed; how sight, and vision can be associated with othering; how identity can be complicated by the 'camera eye'; how technology can mutate spaces

into panopticons; the effects of clinical development; and how the body is policed in a post 9/11 climate.

Unlike previous studies, this collection aims to develop the discourse of the surveilled self and expand on the lived realities of post-panopticism by unpacking a unique variety of cultural products which articulate contemporary experiences of surveillance. The authors in this collection approach modern surveillance through art, photography, literature and through the body itself, examining how contemporary cultural production offers new insights into the Foucauldian version of biopower which modern surveillant assemblages inculcate. These cultural products repeatedly challenge modern moralities and modes of being, performing or causing us to perform what Bauman and Lyon (2013) terms 'adiaphorization', in which our human processes and systems become disengaged from morality. Bauman and Lyons' term 'liquid surveillance', addresses the manner in which contemporary surveillance is engaged in the colonizing of new and disparate areas of life. *Spaces of Surveillance* develops the vision of the 'liquid' sphere which seeps into each area of modern life and into our performance of selfhood at each and every level; into art, literature, film, lived spaces, and psychic worlds. This collection engages with the cultural aspects or the "felt" elements of this global discourse. *Spaces of Surveillance* contributes to these ongoing debates about privacy, selfhood and visibility, but does so from a position of cultural expansiveness, engaging with established discourses on 9/11, government surveillance and the collation of personal information through a collection of chapters which examine the repercussions of these desires, both for the individual and for society. This edited collection attempts to consider how spaces, places and states of selfhood have been impacted by surveillant technologies, offering a unique insight into the ways in which bodies have both voluntarily and involuntarily been shaped and defined by changing technology. The exponential growth of these technologies purports to facilitate our self-management, security and control, and the ubiquitous character of contemporary 'selves'. Entry and exit from multiple identities and networks is seemingly made easier, but as the following chapters illustrate, the psyche is not always comfortable in these liquid surveillant times.

This collection features ground-breaking analyses of a variety of approaches to, and perspectives on, contemporary surveillance as it is expressed in cultural production. The first section in this collection, "Art, Photography and Film" features contributions which examine the works of

artists Jill Magid and Susan Collins. Amy Christmas' chapter engages in the representation of surveillance in art; something which she deems has been popularly seen as a reaction to notions of modern anxieties. While many surveillance art projects—especially those by female artists, such as Sophie Calle and Mona Hatoum—have proved incisive and provocative in terms of their delineations of the contemporary subject, they have in common an entrenched pessimism regarding the state of identity in relation to the state of surveillance. This chapter explores the early work of American multimedia artist Jill Magid and investigates several artworks and writings from 1999–2004. Christmas' chapter considers the 'lack' observed within the field of surveillance studies, working with, in Magid's words, "function at a distance, with a wide-angle perspective, equalizing everyone and erasing the individual" (Magid 2000). In an attempt to harness the potential of these technologies to exploit a way to 'see', and thereby construct selfhood in our own terms, Christmas explores the development of Magid's subject through the exploration of the body of the artist. Examining works such as *Kissmask*, *Surveillance Shoe*, *Monitoring Desire* and *Evidence Locker* this chapter explores how the writings of Magid cohere with the installation pieces, and by extension, how they contribute to surveillance studies through engagement with the individual's experience of being observed. The second chapter on Susan Collins' *Glenlandia* by Jaclyn Meloche, similarly questions the impact of surveillance on the individual. In *Entangled: Technology and the Transformation of Performance* (2010), Christopher Salter discusses the transformative function of the camera in order to argue that its frame is no longer a device, but rather is a mechanical lens which can reproduce meaning (Salter 2010). Meloche outlines this same theoretical framework of performativity and digital performance in order to complicate the function of the webcam and mechanical lens in digital art, examining the power of the gaze in Susan Collins' work. This chapter investigates the questioning of representation in lens culture, and by extension, the performativity implicit in digital surveillance of the body. By reinterpreting Collins' work, Meloche's chapter modifies the technological function of the webcam into one of selfhood and identity formation. By becoming spectacle as Meloche suggests, Bill McBride's chapter on the film *Her* (2013) extends the debate about shifting bodies and selves into new and perhaps, less autonomous versions of identity. McBride examines the possibility for the flow of subjectivity to be reversed, where machinery becomes threatening by

posing the potential to become more human than ourselves. Set in the near future, Spike Jonze's film explores the evolving nature of love with an operating system called Samantha. Through an investigation of ethical dimensions of artificial intelligence and cybernetic threats to humanity, McBride analyses the film's stylized gestures to recover and define what it means to be human. What emerges from this chapter is the potential for bodies to mirror their surroundings—in effect, to become machine-like, once again questioning the notion of realness in a world of surveillance technologies and increasing mechanization. In continuation of the pursuit of "realness", Frances Pheasant Kelly's chapter examines scopic strategies for monitoring criminal transgression through an examination of Kathryn Bigelow's *Zero Dark Thirty* (2012). Pheasant Kelly determines that in a similar vein to films made after 9/11, Bigelow's text promotes American notions of surveillance for the greater good and protection of democracy, but does so from a position which justifies the intrusion of the spectator into privacy. Following the observation of Bin Laden's location through US military technologies, Pheasant Kelly observes that the film's narrative corresponds with Foucauldian theory for almost its entirety before making Bin Laden visible in the final scenes. Engaging with the work of Mathisen (1997), this chapter considers the multiple scopic regimes evident in the film, and pays attention to the relationship between surveillance and terrorism in the context of post 9/11 America. The final chapter in this section focuses on trauma, extending Pheasant Kelly's investigation of the trauma of war, Simon Bacon's chapter questions the manner in which trauma can impact bodies and their identity. Referring to Pramod K Nayar *Citizenship and Identity in the Age of Surveillance* (2015), Bacon considers the manner in which surveillance links directly into the formation of the global subject and how cultural trauma can construct an identity, where trauma is a loss of the collective, national, global identity and that the personal one created in front of the camera can become unreal, or even unnatural. This unique chapter argues that the vampire is a symbol for national and cultural disconnection, which goes beyond not only humanity, but also national belonging; arguing for the victims of the vampiric gaze to have a constructed identity formed entirely from trauma. Examining films such as *Vampires* (2010), *Afflicted* (2013), and *Daybreakers* (2009), Bacon's chapter extends the discussion of the surveilled subjects from earlier chapters, and reconfigures them into those who have been infected by the camera, resulting in a self-surveilling selfhood.

Bacon's reading of film, in line with Pheasant Kelly's, questions an identity that appears "Othered" by surveillance—a distancing which can render the body as unreal and alien by its position on screen. This is further developed in the second section of the collection through an examination of surveillance in literature. Alison Lutton's chapter on Bret Easton Ellis' *The Informers* (1994), considers the spaces of Ellis' narratives as those of observation and constant gazing. With brief consideration of *American Psycho* (1991) and *Less than Zero* (1985), Lutton's chapter investigates the postmodern urban environment as one of a cultural and spatial framework premised upon observation of varied contested locales, as featured in *The Informers*. Her chapter unveils the plurality of spaces and the overlooked surveilling subjects therein, foregrounding contemporary cityscapes of Los Angeles and Tokyo as representative of 'feedback' spaces, thereby continuing the discussion of identity placement and how the act of surveillance can suggest a performativity of bodies within its gaze. Chloe Milligan's chapter on Don DeLillo's *White Noise* (1984), argues that reading DeLillo's text alongside the emerging technologies of that year, can help us to better understand how the "surveillance of sousveillance" can be traced into our current cultural moment. Citing the surveillance prophecy of Orwell's text, Milligan discusses the impact of monitoring oneself as much as we too are monitored in modern society, and in doing so, analyses the fear of, and desire for, the computer's coded messages in *White Noise* to contribute to current culture. Contending the development of gaming as a medium to become 'other', we too seek to become extended selves through surveillance technologies. Rather than categorize surveillance as only "them watching us," he argues it is "us watching each other"; a clarification that nuances the idea that the surveillance of sousveillance constitutes our trend of being watchable to give others something to watch. Therefore, through specific applications of literary and media studies, this chapter contends that our cultural narratives are affected by not merely the surveillant gazes of multiple media, but our sousveillant desire to connect with those gazes. This connection with multiple gazes established in Milligan's chapter, is extended by the discussion of the ethical complications present in digital narratives through Virginia Pignagnoli's chapter on Dave Eggers and Jonathan Franzen. Pignagnoli's chapter provides a unique and highly original analysis of the narratives created in the Internet age, investigating the relationship between

surveillance, technology and literature and the ethical issues they raise through their encounter with one another. Examining three recent novels, *The Circle* (2013), *Purity* (2015) and *Super Sad True Love Story* (2010), Pignagnoli's chapter explores narratives produced in the Twenty-First century, and the main rhetorical resources the authors employ to express a world of poor communication, shallow selfhood and the digitization of our lives. Through the mapping of narrative spaces contained in these novels, and comparison with geographical spaces, Pignagnoli determines the creation of a totalitarian space entirely determined by digital communication, the result of which is a world where surveillance becomes both the principal concern of the narratives' ethical dimension and the framework through which the novels become an implicit plea for the printed book against the rise of digital technologies. The urgency of these troubled communication forms is both implicit and explicit: the chapter urges action while it acknowledges the contradictions in which we now live. The final chapter in this section from Jeffrey Clapp, on selected works from Claudia Rankine, investigates the notion of ethics and communication in literature. Clapp's exploration of Rankine's *Citizen* (2014) and *Don't Let Me Be Lonely* (2004), considers the stakes of surveillance, counter surveillance, sympathetic identification, and media culture in the post 9/11 period through an examination of citizenship and the position of the spectatorial subject. This remarkable contribution to the collection addresses the radicalization of the self, post 9/11, proposing that Rankine's pronoun work can be understood as a reflection on the strange proximity of surveillance society to the society of the spectacle, confusing classically liberal demands for political representation and personal expression.

The concluding section of the collection entitled "States, Place and Bodies" engages with notions of the bodily self as it manoeuvres through the complex systems of contemporary surveillance. The section examines the use of surveillance in the practice of 'profiling' and interrogates the implicit quest for an essence of selves. Sam Tecle, Yafet Tewolde, Tapo Chimbganda and Francesco D'Amico's chapter investigates, in the words of Simone Browne, blackness as a metaphor, in order to reveal how surveillance has been constituted in, and through, antiblackness in Canada. Employing Browne's framework, the chapter considers the multiculturalism of Canada's national integration policy, exploring practices, performances and policies in order to demonstrate how the surveillance of

blackness facilitates and results in the racial profiling and management of blackness that is already an historically ordained issue. Through an extension of the concept of racial management, the authors of this chapter suggest that popular culture, higher education and sites of activism within the Canadian context, are all spaces of surveillance, and begins to address issues of race in relation to national borders. Mary Ryan's contribution addresses the concept of sousveillance, as it identifies cultural trends and political implications through political and social agendas. Engaging in issues of body worn cameras, Ryan's chapter examines a broad range of participants, from individual actors to government officials, in order to reflect on the implications of sousveillance and modern surveillance systems in civic engagement, political discourse, and socio-political experiences in American life; ultimately evaluating the threats, as well as opportunities these practices offer. This chapter engages with some positive possibilities of this new sous-scopic regime. Susan Flynn continues this theme to some extent, attempting to identify positive angles as she investigates medical surveillance through a consideration of digital imaging, diagnostic techniques and biometrics. In this chapter, she explores the manner in which emergent medical techniques bring new forms of knowledge that can shape the understanding of ourselves. By critiquing that information which is omitted from the data we share, this chapter attempts to identify the parameters of the medical gaze. Flynn's chapter considers the configuration of bodies, and by extension identity, through surveillance technologies both as positive (through a sense of possibility) and negative (the interruption of the body's privacy) through regimes such as data sharing. The chapter attempts to reconceptualise sousveillance as both a means of sustaining biological integrity and maintaining individual intellectual freedom, as the graph leaves our inner individuality to our own control.

The afterword to the collection is provided by Professor Vian Bakir, who considers the authors' contributions in light of the recent Snowden leaks. Structured in two parts, Professor Bakir's afterword recognises the rising tide of surveillance awareness in both critical and practical scholarship, noting the depth and pervasiveness of what and whom is surveilled in corporate and digital forms of surveillance. The second section considers the impact of public opinion polls on surveillance and privacy, identifying the need for greater digital literacy among the public in order to make sense of the scale of the surveillance culture unveiled by the Snowden files. Ultimately, Professor Bakir's afterword highlights the original contribution

this collection makes in the humanities, asking what does it feel like to be surveilled, and, perhaps more importantly, does it really matter?

This book seeks to bring a multitude of surveillance based discussions into dialogue with each other, questioning why, when, and by whom, are we surveilled. *Spaces of Surveillance* questions the subsequent formation of identity and states of selfhood from within a cultural context where surveillance is not only around us, it is already part of who we are. If we are already within the surveillance matrix, then the question surely isn't will we always be watched, but rather what will happen to us when we are watched; and furthermore, if our bodies are agents of these spaces, will we ever be truly free? This book examines the idea of being watched, of policing ourselves and others, through the notions (both literal and theoretical) of surveillance. In doing so, these chapters begin to question our understanding of privacy, how identity can become complicated by technology, and what this intrusion can mean in terms of our being 'real' in a surveilled world. Television programming and Hollywood movies, continue to exploit our fears over being watched in nightmarish versions of surveillance systems: in *Homeland* (2011—present), *CSI* (2000—present), *CSI:Cyber* (2015–2016), *Hunted* (2015—present) and movies such as *Gattaca* (1997), *Panic Room* (2002), *The Purge* (2013) and *Cache* (2006). Authors too, continue to write dystopian visions of our technological world: in Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale* (1985), Lisbeth Salander's *The Girl with the Dragon Tattoo* (2005) and Suzanne Collins' *The Hunger Games* (2008). What we can learn from this collection, and indeed from the continued interest in surveillance expressed through literature, art, film and television, is that despite the deluge of cultural material concerning our paranoid thoughts—those of someone watching us wherever we go—our paranoia is futile; the matrix is already internalized.

REFERENCES

Alter, A. (2009). Culture—Just Asking/Josh Harris and Ondi Timoner: The Truman show for everyone—A documentary filmmaker and her now reluctant subject on living in public. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved August 14, 2016, from http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB123879482878387933.

Bauman, Z., & Lyon, D. (2013). *Liquid surveillance*. Cambridge: Polity.

Bentham, J. (1843). *The Works of Jeremy Bentham*. Retrieved August 14, 2016, from http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/bentham-works-of-jeremy-bentham-11-vols.

Bowley, G. (2012). Spy balloons become part of the Afghanistan landscape. *The New York Times*. Retrieved August 13, 2016, from http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/13/world/asia/in-afghanistan-spy-balloons-now-part-of-landscape.html.

Boys-Myers, C. (2011). The future according to Josh Harris. *Entrepreneur*. Retrieved August 14, 2016, from http://thenextweb.com/entrepreneur/2011/07/24/the-future-according-to-josh-harris-but-wait-whos-josh-harris/#gref.

Budick, A. (2016). Public, Private, Secret: International centre of photography. New York: Meagre. *Financial Times*. Retrieved August 13, 2016, from http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/57a1b88e-4213-11e6-9b66-0712b3873ae1.html.

Cellan-James, R. (2012). Web surveillance—Who's got your data? *BBC News*. Retrieved August 14, 2016, from http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/technology-17586605.

Cotter, H. (2016a). Laura Poitras: Astro Noise' examines surveillance and the new normal. *New York Times*. Retrieved August 13, 2016, from http://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/05/arts/design/laura-poitras-astro-noise-examines-surveillance-and-the-new-normal.html.

Cotter, H. (2016b). Photography's shifting identity in an insta world. *New York Times*. Retrieved August 13, 2016, from http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/24/arts/design/review-photographys-shifting-identity-in-an-insta-world.html.

Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline and punish*. Paris: Edition Gallimard.

Fuglesang, M., & Sorenson, B. M. (2006). *Deleuze and the social*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Heir, S., & Greenberg, J. (2007). *The surveillance studies reader*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Higgins, P. (2015). Twitter axes accountability projects. *Electronic Frontier Foundation*. Retrieved August 13, 2016, from https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2015/08/twitter-axes-accountability-projects-sparing-politicians-embarrassment.

Joseph, G. (2015). Feds regularly monitored black lives matter since ferguson. *The Intercept*. Retrieved August 14, 2016, from https://theintercept.com/2015/07/24/documents-show-department-homeland-security-monitoring-black-lives-matter-since-ferguson/.

Junod, T. (2003). Falling Man. *Esquire*. Retrieved August 14, 2016, from http://classic.esquire.com/the-falling-man/.

Lyon, D. (2006). *Theorising surveillance: The panopticon and beyond*. New York: Routledge.

Magid, J. S. (2000). *Monitoring desire*. M.Sc., Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Accessed 22 Aug 2011.

Marks, P. (2005). Utopian visions and surveillance studies. *Surveillance and Society*, *3*, pp. 222–239.