



Editorial

Political geographies of surveillance

Francisco R. Klauser

*Institute of Geography, University of Neuchâtel, Espace Louis Agassiz 1, 2000 Neuchâtel, Switzerland***1. Introduction: Surveillance and the everyday**

Information technologies have permeated many different domains of human activity, leading scholars and commentators alike to declare the present era an information age (Lyon, 1988; Webster, 1995; Castells, 1996, 1997, 1998). Whilst the meaning and adequacy of the term are matters for discussion (Castells, 2000, p. 10; Webster, 2002), the prevalence of information generation and processing in the present-day world is scarcely open to dispute (see for example Lefebvre, 2005).

If information technologies proliferate today, they also imply ever-increasing possibilities of tracking and profiling our daily activities. Recent disclosures regarding the U.S. National Security Agency's mass-surveillance programmes have provided dramatic evidence thereof. However, the role of information technology in the monitoring and administration of everyday life reaches far beyond such state-driven and policing-centred schemes. Today, computerised systems that act as conduits for multiple cross-cutting forms of data gathering, data transfer and data analysis control, protect and manage everyday life on multiple levels, for security, administrative, commercial and political purposes. Think, for example, of the rapidly expanding use of RFID chips in tickets and goods, of the increasing number of surveillance cameras in public places, of computerised loyalty systems in the retail sector, of location-, user- and practice-aware smartphone applications, or of the development of smart traffic systems and electricity grids. The information age has spawned a range of novel techno-mediated forms and formats of surveillance, understood here as the "ensemble of focused, systematic and routine practices and techniques of attention, relating to human or nonhuman objects, for purposes of influence, management, protection or direction" (inspired by Lyon (2007, p. 14)). The information society is also a surveillance society (Murakami Wood et al., 2006).

2. Towards a spatial problematic of surveillance

The papers brought together in this themed issue share a critical sensitivity to the driving forces behind and implications of the current proliferation and intensification of surveillance. How are these developments being produced? And what are these developments in turn producing? In more geographical terms, how does surveillance affect sociospatial practices and relationships? How do contemporary surveillance developments interact with pro-

cesses of globalisation? How do they invest the fabrics of our cities, our mobilities, the spaces of the everyday? What implications are there in terms of border control, the exercise of power, the control of territory?

Responding to precisely such questions, this collection invites a more systematic reflection aimed at exploring, conceptualising and problematising contemporary IT-mediated techniques of regulation and management-at-a-distance – here subsumed under the term of surveillance – in their relation to space. To avoid any misunderstanding, this ambition does not imply that the surveillance-space focus advocated here should trump or be substituted for other analytical levels of enquiry. On the contrary, the contributions in this themed issue reiterate again and again the need to centrally place the complex political, economic and social conditions, processes and relationships through which surveillance is conditioned and co-produced, in order to understand its spatial logics and implications (also see Haggerty and Ericson, 2000; Coaffee and Murakami Wood, 2006). The themed issue's ambition to add a particularly space-sensitive perspective to the existing surveillance literatures merely expresses a shared sense that surveillance has important spatial dimensions, which are palpable yet not explored systematically enough in scholarly research. As the papers show, such a perspective is of critical importance because space contributes in many ways and on many levels to the functioning and impacts of surveillance. Space must be approached as one of the constitutive dimensions of surveillance, rather than as a static background structure. Furthermore, the focus on space is of critical importance for the understanding of the wider implications of surveillance: Surveillance relates to, focuses on and projects itself into space, becomes inscribed there, and in the process contributes to the very production of the spaces concerned. Thus the theoretical ambition of this collection is to conceptualise surveillance as an ensemble of heterogeneous techniques of power that are intrinsically bound up with space, through multiple processes and relationships, on different scales and for numerous reasons.

In addressing this problematic, the collection also wants to encourage critical reflection on the possibility of what could be called a "political geography of surveillance". Referring here to political geography as the academic field that investigates power and space in their co-constitutive and mediated relationship (Raffestin, 1980; Painter, 2008), the special issue thus advocates a long-range theoretical and analytical ambition to rethink the problematic of power and space from a perspective focused on the IT-mediated forms and techniques of control and regulation in the information age (Klauser, 2013). However, the aim is not

E-mail address: Francisco.klauser@unine.ch

to cover the entirety of this problematic, or even to set out all its complex dimensions. Rather, the collection is voluntarily exploratory in ambition and scope, knowing that it is only a start on the road towards a richer and more systematic engagement with the relationship between surveillance, as a complex means of power, and space.

Of course, the papers brought together here do not stand alone with this endeavour. In recent years, the rapidly developing field of surveillance studies (Lyon, 2002; Haggerty and Ericson, 2006) has sparked revealing theoretical and empirical research that provides a fertile ground for the investigation of the proliferating range of new objectives, agents, technologies and practices of surveillance in the contemporary world. These studies highlight the social and personal consequences of the increased possibilities of knowing, tracking, data mining and profiling everyday life. They also generate an ever more detailed understanding of the functioning of particular surveillance systems, the interests they serve and the problems they evoke (Jones, 2001; Lyon, 2003; Aas et al., 2008; Cost Action IS0807, 2008).

Furthermore, a range of scholars now explore the surveillance-relevant role of space, and, in turn, the space-producing role of surveillance (Graham, 1998; Kitchin and Dodge, 2011; Zurawski, 2012). A rapidly developing body of literature indeed seeks not only to examine the spatialities of surveillance in particular buildings – from airports (Adey, 2004) to shopping malls (Benton-Short, 2007) – but also, more generally, to investigate the relationships between surveillance and the spatialities of everyday life, with a particular focus on public urban space, on critical civil infrastructures and on spaces of mobility (Graham, 1998, 2005; Coleman and Sim, 2000; Koskela, 2000; Franzen, 2001; Coaffee, 2004). Theoretical and empirical research thus suggests that the functions and logics of surveillance operations, their scope, their impact and the risks they pose cannot be understood without referring to the spaces concerned and created by their deployment and performance.

However, despite the wealth of insight provided by recent research on the relation between surveillance and space, a systematic debate regarding the co-constitution of space and power from a surveillance perspective is currently missing in both surveillance studies and in geography (as in other social sciences). This themed issue brings together an agenda-setting collection of papers in this respect.

3. Content of the themed issue

The collection aspires to add both empirical depth and theoretical nuance to our understanding of how surveillance, in its logics, functioning and implications interacts with space. The first paper, written by Torin Monahan and Jennifer T. Mokos, addresses this problematic from a viewpoint centred on the U.S. Department of Homeland Security's "Cell-All" project. Under development since 2007, the project is concerned with equipping mobile phones with nanoscale sensors for the detection of abnormal levels of potentially dangerous chemicals in the surrounding environment. When dangerous levels are detected, the cell phone sends sensor and location data to a server, centralised in the "network operation centre", which alerts appropriate agencies and first responders.

In exploring the functioning and development of the Cell-All project, the paper makes at least two major contributions to the understanding of the surveillance-space relationship. The first major contribution arises from the paper's elaboration upon the fundamentally space-related surveillant logic of the Cell-All project: The project (1) stands for a logic of surveillance that is inherently diffuse and mobile in space (based on smartphones as roving data collectors and distributors); that (2) implies a spatially articulated,

centralised network structure for the transfer, management and analysis of data (converging in the aforementioned network operation centre); that (3) presupposes a logic of risk calculation that is essentially location-related (aggregating data from cell phones that are co-located in particular sites); and that (4) embraces space not merely as a visual surface – as in the case of video surveillance, drones or satellites – but as a volume, whose gaseous composition is being monitored. Thus Cell-All implies a type of surveillance that is inherently diffuse and mobile in its data generation, networked and centralised in its data transmission, co-locational in its data analysis and voluminous in its space conception. For the understanding of the functioning of the project, these comments are of central importance.

The second main contribution of the paper lies in its discussion of the interacting public and private actors and interests behind Cell-All. The case study thus also provides an exemplary picture of the processes and relationships that underpin and drive contemporary surveillance developments.

Francisco Klauser's paper also explores a number of interacting spatial logics of surveillance. Grounded in a Foucauldian governmentality framework, the paper explores the spatial orderings around mega-event surveillance from three complementary perspectives, focusing on separation and access control (security rings around stadiums, access-controlled fan zones), the management of circulations (fan corridors, passage points for traffic management, tracking of fan flows), and the internal organisation and monitoring of security enclaves (sponsor sectors, separation of fan groups, physical barriers and obstacles as "wave breakers"). This analysis exemplifies how differing spatial logics of surveillance support, modify and shape each other, but also conflict with each other in ceaseless reciprocity. As the paper highlights, the centrality of space to mega-event surveillance, and, in turn, the impacts of surveillance on the event cities can only be fully grasped when the different logics are brought together.

This investigation also illustrates in exemplary fashion one of the defining regulatory dynamics of globalisation, relating to the intertwined pair of impulses to facilitate, accelerate and promote flows of people and objects on the one hand, and to reinforce enclosures and restrict accessibilities on the other (Bauman, 2000; Aas, 2005). Thus if surveillance in its spatialities has to be studied simultaneously with regard to fluidity and fixity, circulations and enclosures, external separation and internal organisation, it is because the articulation of precisely these contrapuntal pairs of logics conditions the functioning and implication of surveillance today.

Finally, Klauser's study also offers an investigation of the stakeholders, driving forces and interests motivating the massive surveillance systems deployed at mega events. In this, emphasis is placed on the interacting commercial and security rationales – in terms of branding, urban entrepreneurialism and policing – underpinning event security, thus reiterating that the surveillance-space relationship cannot be separated either from the interests and needs which are mediating the spatial articulations of specific measures and practices or its modalities and, consequently, its implications on everyday life.

The paper written by Peter Adey et al. complements the two previous ones in its focus on the internal atmospheres of secured places, understood here not as a gaseous volume but as a fleeting "thickness" that results from the material-affective relations between the place-bound human and nonhuman entities (Anderson, 2009). More specifically, drawing upon the study of St. Pancras International and Paris Gare du Nord, the authors explore the constitution and experience of the phenomenal setting that appears with the surveillance technologies and practices in particular sites. This analysis is of interest for conceptual, analytical and methodological reasons.

Firstly, bringing together Anglophone conceptual approaches to affective atmospheres and Francophone theoretical work on ambiences, the paper's conceptual contribution lies in the development of an understanding of the surveillance-space relation that is sensitive to the affective relations coalescing between the subjects in, and the intangible and ephemeral materialities of, the considered spaces. As such, the paper also challenges more established, often predominantly two-dimensional spatial vocabularies used for the investigation of the spaces produced by surveillance and security. Secondly, analytically speaking, the paper offers an important insight into the myriad of often mundane and banal elements that contribute to the atmospheric implications of security and surveillance. As the authors show, atmospheres/ambiances of security are the product of often random activities, collections of things and events, which are inherently unpredictable and uncontrollable and thus often neglected by both security professionals and researchers. Thirdly, the paper's methodological contribution lies in its attention to the challenges that arise from the enigmatic character of atmospheres and ambiences (of security). The paper draws upon a range of experimental research techniques, which allow the auto-ethnographic study of the researchers' own positions within and contributions to the atmospheric modes of experience of the studied spaces of surveillance. Thus the paper not only investigates how the performance of security and surveillance is lived in everyday life, but also asks how we can research this performance.

Anders Albrechtslund and Peter Lauritsen's article also examines how surveillance relates to differing spaces of the everyday, albeit from a different if complementary perspective, inspired by Actor Network Theory. Drawing upon Latour's work on the oligopticon, the paper offers a conceptualisation of "participation", as an analytical tool that allows the study and understanding of surveillance as a necessarily co-produced, yet also inherently limited and fundamentally fragile network of participating human and nonhuman actants. This conceptual and analytical discussion is grounded in the study of three particular spaces of surveillance: sports-focused tracking devices and online communities, parental surveillance, and video surveillance of public space. Mirroring the overall approach adopted in this themed issue, this discussion sets surveillance in relation not only to the fields of risk and security, but more broadly to the management of everyday life. The advantage of such a broad approach is that it allows investigation of the cross-cutting characteristics, driving forces and implications of different contemporary forms and formats of surveillance, from policing to self-surveillance and parental care.

The examples discussed by Anderson and Lauritsen touch on a range of situations where participation ranges from being obvious, voluntary and enjoyable to something inconspicuous, involuntary and feared. They illustrate that different types of participation are involved in diverse spaces of everyday surveillance, from the proactive self-surveillance of sports activities to negotiations about parental surveillance and the police's attempts to enrol actors with the purpose of making video surveillance work. Furthermore, the examples show that participation is negotiated in diverse ways by the actors concerned; sometimes the process is simple and straightforward, whilst other negotiations are complicated. On these grounds, it becomes clear that as a network of participating entities, surveillance is inherently unstable and fragile. Human and nonhuman actors can resist participation, just as small mishaps or malfunctions can make the network collapse. The paper thus elucidates that surveillance, in its internal logics and effects, always depends on how heterogeneous actors are aligned, how their participation is negotiated and how their intentions and actions are translated.

David Murakami Wood's paper adds a complementary, macro perspective to Albrechtslund and Lauritsen's micro focus, that

investigates the relationship between surveillance and the global. The paper makes a broad theoretical argument for a relational political economy of global surveillance that brings surveillance studies, assemblage theory and political economic work on globalisation and neoliberalism in and around geography into a closer conversation. The paper's main claim can be summarised as follows: If today, surveillance has a particular affinity for "the global", this has to do with the scalar politics of neoliberalism, which, inherently, aim at the establishment of a global market that is matched by appropriate global forms of government – i.e. a global surveillant assemblage – that ensures and legitimises the functioning of this market.

Murakami Wood thus portrays surveillance in its technologies and rationalities (Miller and Rose, 2008) as a mode of ordering, which ensures that "the global" is seen and indeed functions as the normal or natural space of neoliberal governmentality. As the paper shows, this global market-supporting role is distributed and carried out through a proliferation of public agencies, quasi-public bodies and private companies, and networked through both formal and informal settings that penetrate far beyond the economic realm. Thus emerges a post-panoptic era of surveillance, effected by computing and communications, militarism, and the growth of finance capital, which is characterised both by proliferating specific, intense oligoptic forms of surveillance as well as by a more generalised periopticity directed at ensuring a belief in government *per se*.

There are various spatial aspects relevant to this investigation, but three of these are especially important: The paper's insistence on the role of surveillance in the expanding scalar politics of neoliberalism; the paper's elaboration upon the relation between the concepts of surveillance and scale more generally; and, finally, the paper's example-based discussion of how exactly the global surveillant assemblage is materialised in particular settings and instances of "actual global surveillance", in terms of the relevant actors (mobile technocrats, expanding industrial clusters, opening surveillance markets) and their (spatial) dynamics.

Together, the five papers in this themed issue address the surveillance-space problematic on at least three broad levels, relating to (1) the spatial logics of surveillance, (2) the processes and relationships through which surveillance is being shaped in its scalar and spatial dynamics, and (3) the wider sociospatial implications of surveillance. These could represent the basic lines along which to further advance the themed issue's initial foray into the realms of a possible "political geography of surveillance", as a project that not only explores the logics, functioning and effects of contemporary IT-based techniques of regulation and management-at-a-distance, but also invites a broader reconsideration of power and space in the information age, in their co-constitutive and mediated relationship.

Acknowledgements

This themed issue brings together selected papers from the "Power Geographies of Surveillance" workshop, held in the Institute of Geography at Neuchâtel University in January 2012. I am very grateful to all the speakers and participants, who have contributed to the very inspiring two days, and to the University of Neuchâtel for the funding provided. This collection has also benefitted greatly from many discussions had at other occasions. Special thanks to Steve Graham, Hille Koskela, Anders Albrechtslund, Stuart Elden, Kevin Haggerty, Jenny Robinson and Ola Söderström. Many thanks also to Pádraig Carmody for his thoughtful inputs and continuous support during the work on this theme issue.

References

- Aas, K.F., 2005. Getting ahead of the game: border technologies and the changing space of governance. In: Zureik, E., Salter, M.B. (Eds.), *Global Surveillance and Policing*. Willan, London, pp. 194–214.
- Aas, K.F., Gundhus, H.O., Lomell, H.M. (Eds.), 2008. *Technologies of Insecurity*. Routledge, London.
- Adey, P., 2004. Surveillance at the airport: surveilling mobility/mobilizing surveillance. *Environment and Planning A* 36 (8), 1365–1380.
- Anderson, B., 2009. Affective atmospheres. *Emotion, Space and Society* 2 (2), 77–81.
- Bauman, Z., 2000. *Liquid Modernity*. Polity, Cambridge.
- Benton-Short, L., 2007. Bollards, bunkers and barriers: securing the National Mall in Washington, DC. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 25 (3), 424–446.
- Castells, M., 1996. *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*, vol. 1: The Rise of the Network Society. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Castells, M., 1997. *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*, vol. 2: The Power of Identity. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Castells, M., 1998. *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture* vol. 3: End of Millennium. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Castells, M., 2000. Materials for an explanatory theory of the network society. *British Journal of Sociology* 51 (1), 5–24.
- Coaffee, J., 2004. Rings of steel, rings of concrete and rings of confidence: designing out terrorism in central London pre and post September 11th. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 28 (1), 201–211.
- Coaffee, J., Murakami Wood, S., 2006. Security is coming home: rethinking scale and constructing resilience in the global urban response to terrorist risk. *International Relations* 20 (4), 503–517.
- Coleman, R., Sim, J., 2000. You'll never walk alone: CCTV surveillance, order and neo-liberal rule in Liverpool city centre. *British Journal of Sociology* 51 (4), 623–639.
- Cost Action IS0807, 2008. *Memorandum of Understanding, Cost Action IS0807, Living in Surveillance Societies*. <<http://www.liss-cost.eu/about-liss/description/>> (accessed 31.07.13).
- Franzen, M., 2001. Urban order and the preventive restructuring of space: the operation of border controls in micro space. *Sociological Review* 49 (2), 202–218.
- Graham, S., 1998. Spaces of surveillant-simulation: new technologies, digital representations, and material geographies. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 16 (4), 483–504.
- Graham, S., 2005. Software-sorted geographies. *Progress in Human Geography* 29 (5), 562–580.
- Haggerty, K.D., Ericson, R., 2000. The surveillant assemblage. *British Journal of Sociology* 51 (4), 605–621.
- Haggerty, K., Ericson, R. (Eds.), 2006. *The New Politics of Surveillance and Visibility*. University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
- Jones, R., 2001. Digital rule: punishment, control and technology. *Punishment and Society* 2 (1), 5–22.
- Kitchin, R., Dodge, M., 2011. *Code/Space. Software and Everyday Life*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Klauser, F., 2013. Through Foucault to a political geography of mediation in the information age. *Geographica Helvetica* 68 (2), 95–104.
- Koskela, H., 2000. The gaze without eyes: video-surveillance and the changing nature of urban space. *Progress in Human Geography* 24 (2), 243–265.
- Lefebvre, H., 2005 (1981). *Critique of Everyday Life*, vol. 3. Verso, London.
- Lyon, D., 1988. *The Information Society: Issues and Illusions*. Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Lyon, D., 2002. Surveillance studies: understanding visibility, mobility and the phonetic fix. *Surveillance and Society* 1 (1), 1–7.
- Lyon, D. (Ed.), 2003. *Surveillance as Social Sorting*. Routledge, London.
- Lyon, D., 2007. *Surveillance Studies. An Overview*. Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Miller, P., Rose, N., 2008. *Governing the Present*. Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Murakami Wood, D., Ball, K., Lyon, D., Norris, C., Raab, C. (Eds.), 2006. *A Report on the Surveillance Society for the Information Commissioners Office by the Surveillance Studies Network. Policy Report. Information Commissioner, London*. <<http://www.statewatch.org/news/2010/nov/uk-ssn-surveillance-report-for-home-select-committee.pdf>> (accessed 31.07.13).
- Painter, J., 2008. Geographies of space and power. In: Cox, K.R., Murray, L., Robinson, J. (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Political Geography*. Sage, London, pp. 57–72.
- Raffestin, C., 1980. *Pour une géographie du pouvoir*. Litec, Paris.
- Webster, F., 1995. *Theories of the Information Society*. Routledge, London.
- Webster, F., 2002. *The Information Society Revisited*. Sage, London.
- Zurawski, N., 2012. *Raum – Weltbild – Kontrolle: Die Bedeutung räumlicher Diskurse für Überwachung, Kontrolle und gesellschaftliche Ordnung*. Habilitation, TU Darmstadt, Darmstadt.