An extraordinary decade has passed since I first published Everyday Surveillance. During that time, four hijacked planes crashed into the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and a field in Pennsylvania killing more than 3,000 people; the United States engaged in wars in Iraq and Afghanistan; and we faced a near global financial collapse. Most recently we endured an astonishing week that began with the bombings at the Boston Marathon and left that major metropolitan area and much of the country on edge. These events have rattled our social and political institutions, undermined our sense of security, and brought about increased fear and uncertainty.

In the aftermath of the September 11, 2001, attacks, the Bush administration ushered in the "War on Terror" and with it an unprecedented level of state surveillance and monitoring of the population. As part of the government's sweeping Homeland Security agenda, including the USAPATRIOT legislation, federal, state, and local agencies were empowered to scrutinize the lives of ordinary citizens in extraordinary ways. Pressured by the Bush administration to bypass civil liberties and skirt formal legal channels, a secret and illegal wiretapping program authorized the National Security Agency (NSA) to collect phone records and even listen in on calls to or from the United States. In 2007, the essential elements of the Bush program were made legal by Congress with the proviso of greater oversight by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) Court. To this day, continuing under the Obama administration, the NSA is engaged in the systematic collection of what most would consider "personal" data of the American public. This situation has prompted many to declare that George Orwell's government-run, "big brother" surveillance state has finally arrived and has contributed to the idea that after 9/11, "everything changed."
Yet for a number of us who have been studying surveillance practices historically, developments after 9/11 reflect much deeper social and cultural changes that have been going on for some time now. As David Lyon states, "The attacks brought to the surface a number of surveillance trends that had been developing quietly, and largely unnoticed, for the previous decade and more." So while legislation and other actions in the post-9/11 period dramatically enhanced the state's ability to keep a close eye on the public and contributed to the notion that "everything has changed," a better characterization might be "more of the same," albeit with a shift in the scope and quality of social monitoring. In my view, one of the more fascinating and yet troubling developments in this period is how, in the time of crisis, the state was able to turn to private corporations for their support in facilitating the collection of information about the populace: I call this "big brother" meets his "tiny brothers."

What I have been doing for the past two decades is documenting the appearance of what I call postmodern surveillance practices. These relatively mundane, microtechniques of social monitoring and control—the "tiny brothers"—include the activities of large commercial enterprises that specialize in collecting, processing, aggregating, and storing comprehensive and detailed information about us. So, rather than building their own politically dubious surveillance network, evidence suggests that, in the post-9/11 period, state security agencies were able to turn to these corporate accomplices—for example, as many as fifty telecommunications, Internet, and data brokerage companies—and buy access to the enormous amount of data that they had already collected about the citizenry. For instance, Acxiom, Inc., which maintains its own database on about 190 million individuals and 126 million households in the United States, worked with the government to provide information on eleven of the nineteen 9/11 hijackers. Similarly, cell phone companies have reported that in 2013 they responded to more than 1.3 million demands from various law enforcement agencies for subscriber information including the content of text messages and caller locations.

The extent of this corporate teamwork was made glaringly public when Edward Snowden, a 29-year-old former technical assistant for the CIA and employee of the defense contractor Booz Allen Hamilton, and former employee of other private contractors including computer giant Dell, spoke out about the scope and workings of the NSA surveillance activity. One such program, codenamed MAINWAY, contains "metadata" (descriptive characteristics, not content) for hundreds of billions of telephone calls placed with the largest corporate telephone carriers in the United States. Yet, while technically classified, Snowden's revelations about these programs were not really as startling as they were portrayed in the media: the existence of MAINWAY and other programs has been publicly known since 2005 and, again, under authorization of the PISA Court, their core activities have been carried out within the parameters of current law.

Although the events of 9/111 and its aftermath force us to pay attention to the institutional level of the security state and what figures to be a reconstitution of state power within its complex web of affiliations with civil society, I maintain that the state still does not have a monopoly over the practice of watching people. I continue to focus on the more commonplace strategies used by governmental, but even more likely, private organizations and individuals that target and treat the body as an object to be watched, assessed, and manipulated. These are local knowledge-gathering activities often enhanced by the use of new information; visual, communication, and medical technologies that are increasingly present in the workplace, the school, the home, and the community. In this book I argue that, although our inherited, modern ideas about the nature of human beings, deviance, and social control continue to shape the ways in which we keep a close watch on people, a new set of meanings, attitudes, and practices is taking hold that is constituted by and indicative of conditions of postmodernity.

Sociologist Wendy Griswold points out that we study culture when we observe a community's pattern of meanings; its enduring expressive aspects; its symbols that represent and guide the thinking, feelings, and behavior of its members as they go about their daily lives. The word surveillance, in the most general sense, refers to the act of keeping a close watch on people. The purpose of this book is to examine the meanings, attitudes, and behaviors surrounding the ways in which people in the United States are being watched, monitored, and controlled in their everyday lives. This book was written to be accessible to a wide audience of students, scholars, and the interested public. While deeply informed by the work of social theorists and other scholars, the text is relatively free of academic jargon. My intent is to challenge the reader to deliberate on a salient and important topic and consider it from what is likely to be an alternative vantage point. My hope is that you will find the book enjoyable, informative, and worthy of considerable discussion and debate.
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Chapter One

Everyday Surveillance

Throughout the United States, thousands of offenders are placed under "house arrest," their movements monitored electronically by a transmitter attached to their ankle or a computer placed in their home. In a number of cities, police deploy mobile fingerprint scanners to check the immigration status and criminal records of day laborers. In several states, prison inmates are issued radio frequency ID-enabled (RFID) wristbands to track their movements in the facility. In New York City, a digitized courtroom collects myriad information about a single defendant that is kept in an electronic file. Most "clients" in community corrections programs are subjected to random drug testing.

At the same time:

More than 70 percent of major U.S. employers engage in some form of electronic monitoring of workers. At Walt Disney World in Florida, a biometric "measurement" is taken from the finger of "guests" to make sure that a multi-day ticket is used by only one person. School districts around the country have issued RFID student badges that monitor a pupil's movements on campus. A company in Arkansas has constructed the world's largest consumer database containing detailed information on about five hundred million consumers worldwide. And about 90 percent of U.S. manufacturers test workers for drugs.

These examples illustrate a blurring distinction between the surveillance and social control practices of the official justice system and those existing in the everyday lives of ordinary people. How are we to understand these developments? Are they simply "advances" in our struggle against possible illegal, deviant, or problematic behavior or do they signal the rise of what might be called a "culture of surveillance"? What kind of society has produced these practices, and why do we appear so willing to adopt or permit them? The
A while ago I sat in the cafe section of a large, suburban bookstore talking with a friend. She asked me what I was working on these days and I told her that I was writing a book about social control in contemporary life. At this she said, "You mean about crime and prisons?" "No," I said, "not really. More like the issue of surveillance." "Oh," she replied, "so you are looking into how the government spies on people?" To many of us, including my friend, issues of discipline, social control, and surveillance tend either to revolve around the criminal justice system or to invoke the image of George Orwell's notorious Big Brother. Yet as important as our vast prison system and the activities of domestic "spying" organizations are, I am most interested here in the relatively small, often mundane procedures and practices, the "tiny brothers," if you will, that are increasingly present in our daily lives. These techniques exist in the shadow of large institutions; they are not ushered in with dramatic displays of state power; nor do they appear as significant challenges to constitutional democracy. The methods I want to consider are the evermore commonplace strategies used by both public and private organizations to influence our choices, change our habits, "keep us in line," monitor our performance, gather knowledge or evidence about us, assess deviations, and in some cases, exact penalties. I argue that it is these routine kinds of surveillance and monitoring activities that involve many more of us than does life in a state prison or a National Security Agency (NSA) "warrantless wiretapping" of our phone conversations.

The practices I have in mind range along a continuum. They begin on one end of the spectrum with the "soft," seemingly benign and relatively inconspicuous forms of monitoring and assessment such as those used in the very bookstore where I sat with my friend. In that business, as in thousands across the United States, a "security" system chronicled our interaction with video cameras while the store's spatial arrangement was designed for optimal surveillance of customers and employees alike. Computerized checkout stations kept track of inventory, calculated store performance figures, assessed the credit worthiness of patrons through remote databases, collected personal information about customers so they could be targeted for marketing campaigns, monitored the log-on and log-off times of employees, and calculated the average number of customers those employees processed per hour. All of this was accomplished "behind the scenes" as it were, without disruption to the manufactured ambiance of soft leather chairs, the "narrowcast" background music, and the sound and smell of cappuccino brewing.

At the "hard" end of the spectrum are the most obtrusive and confrontational practices—often taking on the qualities of what I call "surveillance ceremonies"—that may begin with the assumption of guilt, are often designed to uncover the truth about someone's behavior, to test an individual's character, and, more generally, to make them consciously aware that they are indeed being watched and monitored. This element was also present at the corporate bookstore I visited with my friend since the employees there were subjected to pre-employment drug testing and we were also aware that the merchandise was "tagged" so that we could be electronically "frisked" as we walked through the observable sensor gates at the exit. Other "surveillance ceremonies" include the use of lie detectors, pre-employment integrity tests, mobile fingerprint scanning, drug and alcohol testing, electronically monitored "house arrest," and the use of metal detectors and various body scanners.

Between these soft and hard types of surveillance lies a vast array of techniques and technologies that are designed to watch our bodies, to monitor our activities, habits, and movements, and, ultimately, to shape or change our behavior. These procedures are often undertaken in the name of law and order, public safety, fraud prevention, the protection of private property, or "good business practice"; other measures are initiated for an individual's "own good" or benefit. But no matter what the stated motivation, the intent is to mold, shape, and modify actions and behaviors. Surveillance and social control of this type, sans "big brother," is not orchestrated by a few individuals; it is not part of a master plan that is simply imposed on us. Rather, in my view, we are all involved and enmeshed within a matrix of power relations that are highly intentional and purposeful: arrangements that can be more or less unequal but are never simply one-directional.

The subjects of this book, then, are the cultural practices that I call "meticulous rituals of power." Most generally, I include those microtechniques of surveillance and social monitoring that are often enhanced by the use of new information, communications, and medical technologies. These are knowledge-gathering strategies that involve surveillance, information and evidence collection, and analysis. I call them meticulous because they are "small" procedures and techniques that are precisely and thoroughly exercised. I see them as ritualistic because they are often embedded in organizational procedures, faithfully repeated, and quickly accepted and routinely practiced with little question or resistance. And they are about power because they are intended to entice, cajole, prod, discipline, or outright force people into behaving in ways that have been deemed appropriate, normal, beneficial, productive, or lawful.

So while these techniques may be "small," monotonous, and even seemingly trivial, they are not without effect. In this way, meticulous rituals are the specific, concrete mechanisms that help maintain unbalanced and unequal relationships between clusters of individuals (e.g., between managers and workers, teachers and students, store employees and customers, parents and children, police officers and suspects, probation officials and offenders) and, in a larger sense, between individuals and the public and private organ-
izations where these rituals take place. Meticulous rituals often operate in such a way as to create a form of "information asymmetry" where one person, group, or organization gains important information about a person and uses it as leverage to modify their behavior. On the "softest" end of my spectrum, this information may be offered up "voluntarily," as in the case of someone who uses a geolocation social network application on their cell phone to announce to their friends their whereabouts and are then prodded by advertisers to patronize businesses in that area. At the "hardest" end of the spectrum, information may be taken on demand of formal authority such as a community corrections officer ordering a client to submit to a drug test.

"OK," you may say, "so what is really new here? Hasn't society always had ways of keeping people in line? Aren't these 'meticulous rituals' just newer, perhaps more effective ways of doing what we have always done to ensure social order?" In some ways, yes, they are logical extensions of "modern" approaches to the problems of crime, deviance, and social control, and they may indeed be more efficient at accomplishing these societal goals. Yet, at the same time, they have qualities that make them fundamentally new, and, I want to argue, more postmodern in design and implementation. That is, I see these strategies as a product of our contemporary period of history that contains profoundly new and distinctive patterns of social, cultural, and economic life. Therefore, I argue that there are at least four defining characteristics of postmodern meticulous rituals of power and surveillance that set them apart from modern methods of social control. First, consider the following.

In the past, the watchful eyes of a small shopkeeper may have deterred a would-be shoplifter; her surveillance was personal, not terribly systematic, and her memory, of course, was fallible. She was more likely to know her customers (and they her), to keep a "closer eye" on strangers, and to "look the other way" when she saw fit (and to make a call to say, an offending would-be shoplifter; her surveillance was personal, not terribly systematic, and her memory, of course, was fallible. She was more likely to know her customers (and they her), to keep a "closer eye" on strangers, and to "look the other way" when she saw fit (and to make a call to say, an offending juvenile’s parents later). This kind of "personal" social control was once typical of small communities or close-knit societies where people certainly watched one another very diligently and where a shared, customary culture, as well as fear of ridicule or exclusion, was a powerful inducement to conformity.

By contrast, the part-time employees of the large corporate bookstore where I sat with my friend have less interest in watching for thieves; their huge number of customers is an anonymous horde. Here, store management relies on subcontracted security personnel as well as the faceless and ever- voyeuristic, who must now be monitored both for their productivity as workers and as potential thieves themselves. In this way, the surveillance practiced at this store has become oddly democratic; everyone is watched, and no one is trusted.

So, the first characteristic of postmodern surveillance is that it tends to be systematic, methodical, and automatic in operation. It is also likely to be impersonal in that the "observer" is rarely seen and is anonymous and often not an individual at all but rather what I call something like "data sponge": a computerized system, video camera, scanner, barcode reader, drug-testing kit, RFID chip, or automated tracking system of some kind. Once collected, the data may become part of a permanent record in the form of a digital file of some kind. In fact, the role played by highly efficient digital databases is crucial. The storage capacity of these machines is now boundless, spatially efficient, and incredibly inexpensive. Corporate personnel files, hospital, mental health, and substance abuse agency records, as well as insurance company databases, join all those demographic, financial, credit, and consumer habits information to create what is now called "big data"; massive conjoined datasets that can be used to create "virtual" data-based identities of us as well as new analytic tools used to "mine" these data in search of patterns and to sort people into different categories. Once created, our "virtual doppelgangers" are, as Mark Poster suggests, "capable of being acted upon by computers at many social locations without the least awareness by the individual concerned yet just as surely as if the individual were present somehow inside the computer." For example, credit ratings may be destroyed or medical benefits denied without personal input or influence of the individual involved.

Second, meticulous rituals of power often involve our bodies in new and important ways, and I want to distinguish two primary tactics of bodily monitoring. I agree with Donald Lowe when he writes, "As living beings, we are more than body and mind, more than the representations and images of our body. We lead a bodily life in the world." My thesis is that these bodily lives are shaped, manipulated, and controlled by a set of ongoing practices that compose our daily lives as workers, consumers, and community members.

The first tactic I want to distinguish has to do with types of surveillance and monitoring that enhances our visibility to others. We seem to be entering a state of permanent visibility where our bodies and our behaviors are being monitored, tracked, or watched continuously, anonymously, and systematically. This kind of surveillance happens when people engage in such diverse activities as driving a company truck, accessing a "free" wireless "hotspot" in a coffee shop, using a credit card, or simply walking down a public street. These instances signify different forms of visibility: the company vehicle is equipped with digital sensors that track the driver's activities and movements; the wireless access point collects historical data on how frequently a
The third defining characteristic of postmodern meticulous rituals relates to a shift in the location of surveillance and social control. Since the early nineteenth century, our primary method of dealing with lawbreakers, those moving the most "troublesome" people from society is still a significant substance and alcohol (ab)use, sexual offenses, "dysfunctional" families, and "treat" a variety of behaviors, conditions, and "lifestyles" associated with them.

A second tactic of bodily surveillance and social control relates to new developments in science, technology, and medicine. These intersecting fields are making the human body infinitely more accessible to official scrutiny and assessment. This means that the ability of organizations to monitor, judge, or regulate our actions and behaviors through our bodies is significantly enhanced. It also means that it becomes less important to trust anyone to speak the truth or to "tell us what we need to know." In this way, the body is treated as an "object" that holds proof of identity or evidence of possible deviance. On the soft side of my spectrum of social control, we see that corporations are using medical data collected on employees in their "wellness" and exercise clinics to confront the "unhealthy lifestyles" of those not conforming to prevailing standards (about, for example, tobacco use or appropriate weight). Meanwhile, at the hard end of the spectrum, DNA samples are being systematically collected on most people who come in contact with the justice system and permanently stored in a vast database. The body, I contend, is a central target of many postmodern surveillance techniques and rituals.

The third defining characteristic of postmodern meticulous rituals relates to a shift in the location of surveillance and social control. Since the early nineteenth century, our primary method of dealing with lawbreakers, those thought to be insane, deviant, criminal, and even the poor, has been to isolate them from the everyday life of the community—such as in the case of the mental asylum, reformatory, modern prison, and the poorhouse. Yet the kinds of practices I am most concerned with here attempt to impose a framework of accountability on an individual in everyday life. Although, obviously, removing the most "troublesome" people from society is still a significant means of formal social control (after all, in the United States, we "mass incarcerate" more people, at a rate per one hundred thousand of the population, than any country on the planet). Today we also attempt to regulate and "treat" a variety of behaviors, conditions, and "lifestyles" associated with substance and alcohol (ab)use, sexual offenses, "dysfunctional" families, and a host of psychological or psychiatric disorders and medical conditions.

Under this thinking, the segregative or quarantine model of social control developed in the nineteenth century, while, again, still very much with us, is increasingly considered by many to be too costly, ineffective, and outmoded. The incentive in recent years has been to develop new ways to control and "keep an eye on" the variety of problematic individuals and deviants through an evolving network of "community correction" programs; regulatory welfare, health, and social service agencies; as well as in schools and other community institutions. And new developments in the forensic, medical, and computer and information sciences—generated by corporate research and development, universities, and the military/security industrial complex—are creating more remote, more flexible, and more efficient ways of making this happen. For example, consider the "accountability" regimes enforced through intensive supervision programs in the criminal justice system that monitor the behavior of "substance abusers" living in the community with random drug and alcohol tests. Or, we find that school truants, who were once sent to a juvenile detention center, are now ordered to carry a handheld GPS tracking device and required to key-in a numeric code five times throughout the day.

Finally, as new forms of social control are localized in everyday life, they are capable of bringing wide-ranging populations, not just the official "deviant," under their watchful gaze. As I indicated earlier, trust is becoming a rare commodity in our culture. The notion of "innocent until proven guilty" seems like a cliche when people are apt to be subjected to disciplinary rituals and surveillance ceremonies because aggregate statistical data suggests that they have a higher probability for being offenders (e.g., "flying while Muslim" or "driving while black"). Data generated through surveillance techniques can produce whole classes of individuals who are deemed "at risk" for behavior, whether any one particular individual has engaged in such behavior or not. These data, of course, are then used to justify even closer surveillance and scrutiny of this group, thereby increasing the likelihood of uncovering more offenses; and so it goes. In the context of these changes, social control becomes more about predicting deviance—always assuming that it will, indeed, happen—rather than responding to a violation after it has occurred. Therefore, when put in place, ritualistic monitoring and surveillance ceremonies often blur the distinction between the official "deviant" and the "likely" or even "possible" offender. Indeed, what distinguishes the convicted felon from the college athlete from the discount store cashier if each is subjected to random drug screening? One consequence of this blurring is that we may be witnessing a historical shift from the specific punishment of the individual deviant, postoffense, to the generalized surveillance of us all.

So, it would seem that while these meticulous rituals are "more of the same," they are, in other respects, strikingly new; and this, I propose, is how we should come to understand them. In other words, we need to see how the
world we are creating today is a product of both our modern historical past and our *postmodern* cultural present. This historically grounded perspective has two advantages. First, if we connect these "new" disciplinary techniques to significant long-term processes and trends, we can see the continuity of social life and can understand that contemporary developments reflect an ongoing struggle to deal with problems and issues set in motion by the birth of the modern age. Second, by looking at how differently we have responded to the problems of social order in the past, we can also see that matters of deviance and social control are not fixed categories but are changing, socially constructed ideas. Therefore we begin to realize that what is defined as "deviant" behavior or as a "social problem" today-as well as what seems like appropriate responses to them-may not have been considered worthy of attention one hundred or even twenty years ago.

These long-term changes I refer to are some of the major themes that have come to characterize the period of modernity (from around the late eighteenth century until the middle of the twentieth century) and have had considerable influence on our strategies of social control. These themes include the increasing rationalization of social life; the rise of large centralized states and private organizations; and strongly held beliefs in reason, rationality, and the certainty of "progress." This modern faith in our power to shape the world was grounded in our apparent ability to control and to "know" nature through the physical sciences. This rational model of science was increasingly applied to the manipulation of "man" through the knowledge of the "human sciences" such as medicine, public health, criminology, psychology, sociology, and demography. In other words, with the birth of the modern era human beings-our bodies, minds, and behaviors-became the *subject* or *topic* of scientific inquiry as well as the *object* or target of its knowledge. Thus, we see in the modern era the gradual disappearance of public torture, stigmatization, and banishment as primary means of punishment and social control, and their replacement by rationally organized reformatory institutions such as the prison, the poorhouse, and the asylum. Rather than seek retribution and public punishment, these institutions would isolate the offending individual and introduce behavioral modification—the transformation of the individual criminal, deviant, or the poor—through the administration of techniques of knowledge and power; techniques frequently developed by those in the human sciences. It is this relationship between knowledge and power that is central to the operation of meticulous rituals. Many of these influences are still with us today and continue to shape social life.

Yet, much like the fairly gradual movement from so-called *premodern* to modern times, the character of social change in the last half of the twentieth century is such that, while elements of this older modern social order are still with us lodged in various social institutions and practices—it has been giving way to new patterns and practices in social, cultural, and economic life. This *postmodernization* of societies, especially in the United States, originating in developments since World War II and more intensely since the early 1970s, is characterized by fragmentation and uncertainty as many of the once-taken-for-granted meanings, symbols, and institutions of modern life seemingly dissolve before our eyes. Time as well as social and geographical spaces are highly compressed by rapidly changing computer/media and advanced technologies, information storage and retrieval, and scientific and medical knowledge. Ours is a culture deeply penetrated by commodities and consumer "lifestyles." In our day, consumption rather than production has become the wellspring of society, while highly bureaucratic (although increasingly "decentralized") state agencies attempt to order and regulate social life. What is "real" in this culture is presented to us through the mass media in video imagery that has become the primary source of our cultural knowledge. In much of this media, we are offered a nonstop barrage of "crisis-level" social problems, leaving us to wonder "what the world is coming to." In turn, we are left cynical by mistrusting each other and furthering the disintegration of public life and discourse. This cultural hysteresis creates a fertile ground for those selling "science" and "advanced" technological fixes that they claim will ease our fears. Under these conditions, rather than trust the actions and judgments of others, we turn to more depersonalized, pervasive, and what appear to be more predictable means of surveillance and social control. In essence, we are seduced into believing that, given the apparent tide of problems we face, subjecting ourselves to more and more meticulous rituals is an unfortunate but necessary condition. The forgoing conditions form what I will refer to simply as "the everyday life of the postmodern," and it is in this cultural context, I believe, that we continue to struggle with problems and issues that arose during the early nineteenth century.

As an example of how our current disciplinary practices are a product of both our historical past and our cultural present, let us consider an incident that took place a few years back in my hometown. In this case, a school bus driver was accused of physically restraining an unruly child on his vehicle. In short order, the driver was fired, and much debate took place in the local newspaper about the child's supposed "bad" behavior on the bus, the reported good reputation of the driver, and about the way school district administrators handled the case. It was clear that no one trusted anyone's account of what actually transpired on the bus that day. A few months later, right before the beginning of the new school year, there was an announcement that each of the district's fleet of buses would be equipped with a video camera "black box." The bus company claimed that, on any given day, just three video cameras would be rotated among all the district's buses and that, given the design of the boxes; neither the students nor the drivers would know when their bus was equipped with a camera. The bus company's manager
stated that the use of the cameras would "help to improve student discipline" as well as ensure that the drivers follow "proper procedures."

Now, the principle behind the rotating camera is not new; it originates with a design by Jeremy Bentham dating from 1791 called the panopticon (from the Greek, for "all-seeing"); a design for a central guard tower inside a prison or reformatory. The tower was planned in such a way that prisoners were never quite sure whether a guard was present or not and would have to assume that they were being watched. The inmates, in effect, would watch themselves, internalizing, if you will, the watchful gaze of their keeper. It was a simple, even elegant, solution to the problem of disciplining people in an enclosed space—a dilemma brought about with the birth of the asylum, the modern "solution" to criminal behavior, madness, poverty, and the like. The evolution of this idea more than two hundred years later—deployed in a postmodern context—produces a technological design, routinely applied in the everyday life of schoolchildren and their adult supervisors, none of whom apparently are trusted to act responsibly. Inexpensive video technology and our willingness to define schoolchildren's behavior on a bus as being so problematic that it warrants "objective" surveillance rather than personal monitoring makes the use of this new form of social control possible. Curious about what people thought of the cameras, I casually spoke with friends and others in the community about the new policy. Most seemed shocked at the idea at first, but then, in resignation, many conceded that it was probably a "good idea" for the "safety" of everyone involved. I see the new disciplinary techniques, then, both as a product of important, long-term processes set in motion more than two centuries ago and as shaped by a newly emerging cultural context. My goal, echoed nicely by Best and Kellner in writing about their own work, is to "grasp the continuities and discontinuities with the earlier modern era, while mapping the changing threats, and promises now before us."10

One challenge I make to the modernist "grand narrative" of the inevitability of historical progress is to assert that the last two hundred or so years of "reforming" justice practice has unequivocally produced a system that is more "just" or more "humane" than the brutal, public punishment that came before it. In other words, I want to challenge the idea that, simply put, we keep building a better mousetrap. Rather, I want to argue that the modern attempt to transform, mold, shape, and "rehabilitate" the criminal, the deviant, and the poor in the name of more effective and even "progressive" social policy may, in fact, be seen as a more general model for the rational ordering of the entire society-intended or not. That is, I am concerned here with a process, set in motion in the early nineteenth century, whereby the enforcement of ever-finer distinctions between what is "acceptable" and "unacceptable" behavior has become part of all our daily lives, and not just the lives of those who break the law. Ultimately, I will show how we are building a culture of surveillance when we infuse daily life with practices that constantly assess our behavior, judge our performance, account for our whereabouts, and challenge our personal integrity.

As I have argued in this chapter, postmodern surveillance practices, these meticulous rituals of power, have four defining characteristics:

1. They are increasingly technology-based, methodical, automatic, and sometimes anonymously applied, and they usually generate a permanent record as evidence.
2. Many new techniques target and treat the body as an object that can be watched, assessed, and regulated.
3. The new techniques are often local, operating in our everyday lives.
4. Local or not, they manage to bring wide-ranging populations, not just the official "deviant" or suspect, under scrutiny.

These characteristics form an "ideal type" postmodern meticulous ritual of power. An ideal type is not "ideal" as in desirable, but rather it is the "pure form" of a social phenomenon; it is an analytical construct that serves as a benchmark to compare the similarities and differences of concrete cases. In what follows, I use this ideal type to identify practices that resemble this pure form of meticulous ritual and I locate the settings where these practices take place. The location is crucial since I argue that in recent times we are seeing the spread of disciplinary practices throughout social life where surveillance and social control strategies that were once aimed at people who had broken the law are now as well targeted at those simply capable of transgressing social norms and laws. So, in my analysis, I demonstrate this blurring distinction as I begin each chapter by highlighting examples from, and sometimes move back and forth between, the world of criminal justice and our everyday postmodern lives.

The plan for the book is as follows: I begin chapter 2 by focusing on the work of the late French philosopher Michel Foucault (1926-1984). It is from Foucault, a pioneering social theorist, that I take the idea to concentrate on the small, seemingly benign rituals at the intersection of power, knowledge, and the body. In his strikingly original book, Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison, Foucault presented a political history of two basic forms of discipline: the physical torture associated with the "Age of the Sovereign" and, later, the emergence of the asylum, a product of modernity. 11 Building on Foucault's analysis, I chart the evolution of disciplinary practices and surveillance techniques from the invention of the asylum on and, by taking up where Foucault left off, I hope to extend his study of modern social control into the postmodern era. In chapter 3, I focus on new forms of surveillance that systematically watch and monitor our bodies and behaviors; I show how our communities, homes, schools, and workplaces are increas-
ingly infused with meticulous rituals and surveillance ceremonies. In chapter 4, I turn my attention to practices that treat the body itself as the site and source of evidence and knowledge or, alternatively, that attempt to take control of the body through the use of various technologies. In chapter 5, I consider the postmodern qualities of the Internet and examine a number of surveillance and social control practices developed for and facilitated by the Web. Finally, in chapter 6, I return to considering the important issues and questions I have raised throughout the book about these contemporary developments, assess their consequences, and modestly suggest at least one strategy should we decide to confront the culture of surveillance we are creating.

BEFORE WE MOVE ON

My goal for this book is to offer a theoretically informed description and examination of a variety of surveillance and disciplinary techniques that have become part of our contemporary lives. My agenda is not explicitly "for" or "against" these practices but rather to engage the reader in a process of critical thinking: I want to raise important questions and problems, express them clearly, gather relevant information, use abstract ideas to interpret that information effectively, and to come to well-reasoned conclusions about how surveillance and disciplinary practices actually operate. In my experience, the topic of this book generates passionate feelings that can lead quickly to what are called "normative judgments" or the commonplace view that some things are decidedly "better" than others. So, in this case, it might be a hasty assessment about whether, say, surveillance cameras in public places are a "good" or "bad" thing. These value-laden determinations often turn on a crude cost-benefit analysis of perceived usefulness of the cameras versus a sense of potential harm from their installation. Although, ultimately of course, values are critically important in, for example, drafting public policy regarding the installation of video surveillance, premature normative judgments tend to close off further consideration, impede deeper analysis, and limit our ability to see the "big picture." For the sake of understanding, I encourage the reader to "suspend" their normative judgments and approach the text with a "beginner's mind," that is, with an attitude of openness and Jack of predeterminations.

Let me try also to make a few other points clear from the outset. I am neither a technological determinist nor a neo-Luddite. That is I do not believe that technology "drives" social life or that it is inherent! "bad." I do assume, however, that technologies are social products, created and implemented within a complex milieu of cultural, political, and economic influences. 12 In this book I attempt to uncover those influences as they relate to the actual workings of disciplinary power, its daily practices, rituals, and minute procedures, and how those workings are often bound up with the use of new technologies. Moreover, I am not suggesting that there is no need for social control in society or that shoplifting, drug abuse, or violent crime are not real problems with real victims. Of course they are. I lived in Los Angeles for a decade and witnessed firsthand the crime, violence, and chronic social problems that seem to define the hard edge of urban life in the United States. But the issues I am raising are of broader sociological concern and have to do with that "big picture" of where we are going as a culture and with the balance of power, if you will, within that larger society. In other words, I want to look at the evolution of surveillance as an entry point to observing and understanding our changing attitude and practice toward discipline and social control in general.

By implying that surveillance is becoming more universal and thus oddly more democratic, I am not suggesting that we are all necessarily subject to the same quantity or quality of social control or that it does not have differential effects. Historically and cross-culturally, the amount and character of monitoring, discipline, and punishment that individuals are afforded have varied considerably by such defining characteristics as age, racial and ethnic categories, class, and sex. We see, therefore, teenagers more likely to be subjected to police scrutiny, the poorly dressed to reap more inspection by store security, and women to experience more informal and formal social control of their bodies. 13 Without question, this continues today. My point is that there are more impersonal, more methodical, and more technology-driven forms of surveillance and social control in our society than ever before, and today's forms and their sheer volume are enveloping even those who might have been previously immune. 14 For example, the surveillance camera positioned in the bookstore I discussed earlier where I sat with my friend does not differentiate or discriminate whose image it captures; breathalyzers are administered to all the students attending the prom, and no employee is exempt from a health "screening" program.

For those who have traditionally been the target of more monitoring and control than others, these developments serve only to intensify and increase the amount of ritualized regulation and monitoring already in their daily lives. Moreover, as David Lyon points out, surveillance often supports a process of "social sorting." 15 That is, some surveillance practices should be considered not only as potential threats to individual privacy and liberties but, from a sociological perspective, they may operate as a powerful means of creating and reinforcing social differences and enhancing the life chances of some while diminishing those of others. For instance, "data mining" techniques can tell a bank that certain "high-value" customers should be offered low-interest loans and personal services and advice while other "low-value" ones are charged higher interest rates and fees or are even discouraged from becoming a customer at all.
Reflecting on the simultaneous modern and postmodern world we live in today, I should also point out that my analysis is centered on a "sociology of the postmodern" period rather than "postmodern sociology." The former approach applies a blend of both classical and contemporary social theory and methods—for example, the ideas of Max Weber (1864-1920) on the functioning of bureaucracy along with the insights of Jean Baudrillard (1929-2007) regarding our inability in a mediated culture to distinguish reality from fantasy, or David Harvey (1935-) who views postmodernity as a new stage of global capitalism. By contrast, the latter tactic—postmodern sociology—tends to be associated with more avant-garde ways of writing and thinking about the social world that are more artistic than traditionally analytical in style.

This book was written as an essay-argument rather than as a typical academic monograph. Fitting this style, it is filled with anecdotal evidence, journalistic accounts, and my own and others' research of contemporary surveillance practices. I use this pastiche of material as my primary data for several reasons. First, like many sociologists, I see culture as inconsistent, contradictory, and complex; it simply defies the more linear, "cause and effect" models associated with "scientific" inquiry. Does this mean that I do not need empirical evidence to support my claims? Hardly. It simply means that my objective is, as Diana Crane states, "to interpret a wide range of materials in order to identify what might be described as an underlying 'gestalt.'" Therefore, I take recorded culture to be both a window into society as well as a legitimate source for the interpretation of social meaning.

Second, my goal is to offer an account of how ordinary people experience, live with, and actually contribute to the new surveillance practices. Sociology is sometimes referred to as "slow journalism" since it often takes quite some time to conduct formal studies, collect data, and publish findings. By bringing in and referencing the work of professional journalists, I hope to weave together accounts of the current, lived experiences of average citizens and the power of sociological theory and analysis. And, while I recount the stories of particular individuals in my narrative, I also try to support my arguments by referencing, where available, broader trends as indicated by government reports and data, pertinent legal cases, changes to federal and state laws, the results of national opinion polls, industry-wide trends and assessments, and relevant scholarship and debate.

Finally, readers will notice my frequent use of quotation marks on words and phrases without necessarily citing sources (when I am indeed quoting someone in particular, I do indicate the source). The use of these marks in this way is both stylistic and substantive. Some of this punctuation simply references everyday colloquialisms. Yet others are intended to alert the reader to the socially constructed nature of language and to suggest that meanings are inherently unstable and potentially contested. Expressions such as "substance abuse," "dysfunctional family," "at risk," and "learning disability" are labels created by those who claim professional expertise or are used by those in positions of authority. Readers should decide if they agree with the meanings evoked by this language or if they wish to contest their legitimacy.