

SOC 38201 SURVEILLANCE AND SOCIETY

Department of Sociology
Methodist University
Spring 2012; T TH 9:30-10:45

Vida Bajc [pronounced *vee-dah bytes*]
Office T116
910-630-7089
vbajc@methodist.edu

Course Description:

Surveillance has become a central means of social ordering and governance worldwide. In this class we ask the following questions: What is surveillance? Where should we trace cultural and historical roots of surveillance which today underlies the foundation of the modern state? What form does surveillance take in different situations and contexts? How does the emerging imperative of security shape the use of surveillance? How is the practice of surveillance related to scientific and technological developments? How is it changing our social life, our notions of private and public, and our conceptions of public spaces? How can social theory inform our understanding of these developments?

Course Requirements:

Discussion Reading: 25%
Research Report: 25%
Film Review: 25%
Final Exam: 25%

Discussion Reading:

Seminars tend to be heavy on readings because they are designed to expose you to a wide range of issues and perspectives on a particular topic. This assignment is meant to stimulate you to immerse yourself deeply into one reading of your choice, listed under the headings 'Discussion.' You will do this by first, critically summarizing the reading; second, preparing a one-page hand out for your colleagues in class; and third, presenting this reading in class in a way that stimulates discussion. The critical summary of 1000 words (single-spaced), due on the day of presentation should consist of the following: 1) What is the article discussing? What are its main points? What are its conclusions? 2) How does it approach the topic? What kinds of arguments are used to present the point? What is left out that you think should have been included? 3) How is the article related to the topic and how does it complement other articles discussed that week? 4) Take-home points for the class? 5) One research question you propose as emerging from the reading.

No credit for late reading summary.

Research Report:

The purpose of this assignment is to get you sensitized to surveillance practices and help you open intellectually to active observation and analysis of how surveillance is shaping our individual and collective daily life. The goal is to help you learn first, how to notice ways in which surveillance operates; second, how to reflect on the multiple dimensions through which the practices of surveillance today are challenging our conceptions of social relations and our understanding of what it means to be human; and third, how to make use of the theories discussed in class in your observations. Most surveillance goes unnoticed so I suggest that you start paying attention to specific sites that make surveillance practices and technologies most clearly visible or particular social situations that make them stand out. Prepare a detailed report of about 2000 words (single-spaced) that speaks to the following questions: What is happening? How is it happening? What does it mean? How do the readings we have discussed in class so far help us make sense of all this? The academic sources must be properly referenced in the Bibliography

section, following the ASA format. On-line sources (i.e. newspapers, websites of different organizations, blogs, etc.) are of a different category and should be referenced using footnotes. No credit will be given for late reports.

Film Review:

We will all watch the following film: *The Lives of Others (Das Leben der Anderen 2006)* directed by Florian Henckel von Donnersmarck. You are welcome to make this into a movie night with friends - however, your film review must be your own. Keep in mind that a film review takes much time and effort. It takes patience, attention, and concentration to watch a film with a critical eye. The actual writing of a review calls for a critical analysis that examines whether and why the film succeeds or fails in its presentation. In your 1000 word essay (single-spaced), focus around a larger argument, that is, a major thesis and support this thesis using scenes and dialog from the film. Identify its intended audience and show how it works psychologically, emotionally, intellectually, and politically. Include information on the director, main characters, historical period used in the film, the geographic area of the plot, and descriptions of the most significant parts and details in the movie. Your review is due on the day we discuss the film in class. No credit will be given for late film review!

Final Exam:

Through this take-home exam you will demonstrate that you have read all the readings and thought about the issues discussed. Consider this an opportunity to critically evaluate in about 2000 words (yes, single-spaced) what you are learning in this class. There is no make-up exam.

On-Line Resources

www.surveillance-and-society.org (free on-line journal and resource center)

www.queensu.ca/sociology/Surveillance/ (The Surveillance Project)

<http://epic.org/> (Electronic Privacy Information Center)

COURSE OUTLINE

WEEK 1: Introduction

Surveillance refers to the ability to identify, classify, monitor, track, channel, and block the movement of individuals, objects, and communications across social, physical, and virtual spaces. Studies of surveillance are focused on cultural and social aspects of these developments and their consequences for our understanding of social relations and human nature.

Jan 10: Review of the Syllabus

Jan 12: How will I conduct my research report?

Background Readings:

Vida Bajc. 2007. Introduction: Debating Surveillance in the Age of Security. In Bajc and Torpey (Eds.) Special Issue: Watching Out: Surveillance, Mobility, and Security. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 50 (12 August).

David Lyon. 2007. *Surveillance Studies: An Overview*. Polity Press

David Lyon. 2001. *Surveillance Society*. Open University Press

David Lyon. 2003. *Surveillance after September 11*. Polity Press.

David Lyon (Ed.) 2006. *Theorizing Surveillance: The Panopticon and Beyond*. Devon, UK: Willan.

A Symposium on Surveillance Studies. *Contemporary Sociology: A Journal of Reviews*. 2007. Vol. 36 No. 2 (March)

WEEK 2: Western Cosmology in Perspective: Individuation

Cosmology, that is, the way in which human beings perceive and interpret the world and their relationship

to it has consequences on human actions on the world. These actions become part of a socio-cultural environment and underlie social relationships and patterns of social organization. Surveillance technologies and practices are based on the assumption that human beings can be separated from each other, that through this separation each human being can be assigned his or her individual mark that is unique to that person, and that so identified human beings can then be regrouped based on such individually assigned markers. This *individuation* is only one (Western) way of understanding the world which has, however, become so ubiquitous that it seems universal and we take it for granted.

Jan 17: Frankfort, Henri. 1948. *Kingship and the Gods: A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Religions as the Integration of Society and Nature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 3-12.

Jan 19: Dumont, Louis. 1982. A Modified View of Our Origins: The Christian Beginnings of Modern Individualism. *Religion*, 12(1): 1-27.

Bajc, Vida. 2010. "On Surveillance as a Solution to Security Issues." In: Cassano and Dello Buono (Eds). *Crisis, Politics, and Critical Sociology*. Leiden: Brill, pp. 186-187.

Further Readings:

Douglas, Mary. 1996[1973]. *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology*. London: Routledge.

Barth, Fredrik. 1987. *Cosmologies in the Making*.

WEEK 3: Exclusionary Classification and its Logic

We classify living and nonliving things in our surroundings to make sense of the world and our life within. Dividing the world into categories is a part of social life and is integral to any kind of social organization. Classification is therefore not something we think about but rather something we think with. The unique kind of classification that emerges in Europe is one that is independent from theism. Its defining characteristic is the ability to classify every living and non-living thing unambiguously into one category. *Exclusionary classification* makes acquisition of information possible and also allows for this information to be classified and reclassified at will.

Jan 24: Bowker, Geoffrey & Suzan Star. 1999. "Introduction: To Classify is Human" In: *Sorting Things Out: Classification and its Consequences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 1-32.

Jan 26: Handelman, Don. 2004. "Bureaucratic Logic." In: *Nationalism and the Israeli State: Bureaucratic Logic in Public Events*. Oxford, UK: Berg, pp. 19-28.

Bajc, Vida. 2010. "On Surveillance as a Solution to Security Issues." In: Cassano and Dello Buono (Eds). *Crisis, Politics, and Critical Sociology*. Leiden: Brill, pp. 187-189.

Further Readings:

Douglas, Mary & David Hall (Eds) 1992. *How Classification Works: Nelson Goodman among the Social Sciences*. Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press, pp. 1-12.

Foucault, Michel. 1973. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Vintage Books, pp. 50-58.

Durkheim, Emil & Maurice Mauss. 1963. *Primitive Classification*. London: Cohen and West.

George Lakoff and Mark Johnson. 1999. *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books.

WEEK 4: State and Population Management: Governmentality of Potentialities

Individuation and exclusionary classification made it possible to conceive of bureaucratic surveillance as we know it today. Its manifestations, however, originate with the modern state and its sovereign right over a bounded territory and the people who reside within. The official social organization of the modern state, indeed, its very existence, is based on the state's ability to order human life on the basis of

obtaining, classifying, and processing information about human behavior. Bureaucratic surveillance has become a form of governance which is fundamental to ordering, organizing, managing, and controlling activity in social institutions and organizations, be it political, economic, social, or cultural.

Jan 31: Foucault, Michel. 1997. "Security, Territory, and Population" and "The Birth of Biopolitics." In: *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*. (P. Rabinow Ed.). NY: The New Press, pp. 67-71 and 73-79.

Feb 2: Torpey, John. 1998. Coming and Going: On the State Monopolization of the Legitimate "Means of Movement." *Sociological Theory*, 16(3): 239-259.

Further Readings:

Robertson, Craig. *The Passport in America: The History of a Document*. Oxford University Press.

Higgs, Edward. 2001. The rise of the information state: The development of central state surveillance of the citizen in England, 1500-2000. *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 14(2), 175-197.

Foucault, Michel. 1991. "Governmentality." In: G. Burchell, C. Gordon, and P. Miller (Eds) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. University of Chicago Press, pp. 87-104.

Desrosières, Alain. 1998. *The Politics of Large Numbers: A History of Statistical Reasoning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Dandeker, Christopher. 1990. *Surveillance Power and Modernity*. Polity

Agamben, Giorgio. 1998. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stanford University Press.

Foucault, Michel. *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-1978*.

Foucault, Michel. *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-1979*.

Porter T. 1986. *The Rise of Statistical Thinking, 1820-1900*. Princeton University Press.

Philo C. 2001. Accumulating populations: bodies, institutions and space. *International Journal of Population Geography* 7: 473-490.

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

Scott, James. 2009. *The Art of Not Being Governed. An Anarchist History of Upland Southeast Asia*. Yale.

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

Giddens, Anthony. 1987. *Nation-State and Violence*.

WEEK 5: Colonial Legacies of State Population Control

Colonial subjects are an unknown and threatening other that must be subjugated if the colonial state is to prevail. Such control is possible when the other is differentiated into individually identified human bodies that can be sorted out and in this way governed. Colonial contexts have therefore often served as a testing ground for surveillance practices and a laboratory where technologies of control are developed and perfected.

Feb 7: Zureik, Elia. 2001. Constructing Palestine through Surveillance Practices. *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, 28(2): 205-227.

Feb 9: Evans, Ivan. 1997. "From Native Administration to Bantu Administration." In: *Bureaucracy and Race: Native Administration in South Africa*. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 224-245.

Further Readings:

Alfred McCoy. 2009. *Policing America's Empire: The United States, the Philippines, and the Rise of the Surveillance State*. U of Wisconsin.

Cohen, Hilel. 2008[2004] *Army of Shadows: Palestinian Collaboration with Zionism, 1917-1948*.

Cohen, Hilel. 2011. *Good Arabs: The Israelis Security Agencies and the Israeli Arabs, 1948-1967*. U of California P.

Thomas, Martin. 2007. *Empires of Intelligence: Security Services and Colonial Disorder after 1914*.

Hevia, James. 2012. *The Imperial Security State: British Colonial Knowledge and Empire-Building in Asia*. Cambridge
Bayly, Christopher. 2000. *Empire and Information. Intelligence gathering and social communication in India 1780-1870*. Cambridge.

- Smith, Keith D. 2009. *Liberalism, Surveillance, and Resistance: Indigenous Communities in Western Canada, 1877-1927*. Edmonton: Athabasca University Press. Ch 2-5.
- Cohn, Bernard. 1996. "Law and the Colonial State in India." In: *Colonialism and its Forms of Knowledge: The British in India*, 57-75.
- Scott D. 1995. Colonial governmentality. *Social Text* 43: 191-220.
- Bowker, Geoffrey & Suzan Star. 1999. Ch. 6 "The Case of Race Classification and Reclassification under Apartheid" In: *Sorting Things Out: Classification and its Consequences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 195-225.
- Mitchell, Timothy. 1988. *Colonizing Egypt*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hannah M. 2000. *Governmentality and the Mastery of Territory in Nineteenth-Century America*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sen S. 2000. *Disciplining Punishment: Colonialism and Convict Society in the Andaman Islands*. Oxford University Press.
- Stoler AL. 2002. *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule*. University of California Press.

WEEK 6: Surveillance as a Way of Seeing and Controlling

Biopolitics is a form of governmentality through self-discipline. That is, the state's ability to govern human life becomes fully successful when subjects come to govern themselves according to state specifications of what is ordinary and what is not acceptable, or what is secure and what can be potentially dangerous. A prototype of this governance is panopticon, an architectural structure, designed to expose those encircled within to the perpetual gaze of the watcher. The scope of control through surveillance is now global.

Lecture:

Feb 14: Foucault, Michel. 1995. *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of the Prison*. A Sheridan (Trans.). NY: Vintage Books. Part III, Ch 3 "Panopticism," pp. 195-228.

Discussion:

Feb 16: Deleuze, Gille. 1992. Postscript on the Societies of Control. *October*, 59 (Winter): 3-7.
<http://users.california.com/~rathbone/deleuze.htm>

Further Readings:

- Božovič, Miran. 1995. Introduction: "An Utterly Dark Spot." In: Božovič (Ed.) Jeremy Bentham, *The Panopticon Writings*. London: Verso, pp. 1-27.
- Boyne, Roy. 2000. Post-Panopticism. *Economy and Society*, 29(2): 285-307.
- Foucault, Michel. 1995. *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of the Prison*. A Sheridan (Trans.). NY: Vintage Books. Part III, Ch 1 "Docile Bodies," pp. 135-169.
- William Bogard. 1996. *The Simulation of Surveillance*. Cambridge
- Oscar Gandy. 1993. *The Panoptic Sort*. Westview
- David Lyon. 1994. *The Electronic Eye*. Polity
- Haggerty, Kevin. 2006. "Tear Down the Walls! On Demolishing the Panopticon." In: Lyon (Ed) *Theorizing Surveillance: The Panopticon and Beyond*. Devenon, UK:
- Smith, Philip. 2008. Chapter 4: The Panopticon. In: *Punishment and Culture*. University of Chicago Press.
- Haggerty, Kevin and Richard Ericson. 2000. The Surveillant Assemblage. *British Journal of Sociology*, 51:605-622.
- Mathiesen, T. 1997. The Viewer Society. Michel Foucault's "Panopticon" Revisited. *Theoretical Criminology*, 1(2): 215-234.
- Deibert, Ronald J., John G. Palfrey, Rafal Rohozinski, and Jonathan Zittrain. 2010. *Access Controlled: The Shaping of Power, Rights, and Rule in Cyberspace*. MIT Press.
- Landau, Susan. *Surveillance or Security. The Risks Posed by New Wiretapping Technologies*. MIT Press.

WEEK 7: Surveillance as a Way of Being Seen

A deeper understanding of panoptic surveillance is complicated by the Western cultural acceptance, even desire of exposure of one's private life to the gaze of others.

Discussion:

Feb 21: Koskela, Hille. 2004. Webcams, TV Shows and Mobile Phones: Empowering Exhibitionism. *Surveillance and Society*, 2(2/3): 199-215.

Feb 23: Pecora, Vincent. 2002. The Culture of Surveillance. *Qualitative Sociology*, 25(3): 345-358.

Further Readings:

Andrejevic, Mark. 2002. The Kinder, Gentler Gaze of Big Brother. Reality TV in the Era of Digital Capitalism. *New Media and Society*, 4(2): 251-270.

Bennett, Tony. 1995. The Exhibitionary Complex. In *The Birth of the Museum*. London: Routledge.

Niedzviecki, Hal. 2008. *The Peep Diaries: How We're Learning to Love Watching Ourselves and Our Neighbors*.

Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.

Goffman, Erving. 1971. *Relations in Public: Micro Studies of the Public Order*. New York: Basic Books.

Zhao, Shanyang, Sherry Grasmuck, and Jason Martin. 2008. Identity Construction on Facebook: Digital Empowerment in Anchored Relationships. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 24:1816-1836.

WEEK 8: Security Meta-Frame: State Defense

Surveillance is today offered as a policy of choice to attend to the so-called “security problem.” When security rises to the top of collective priorities, it becomes a dominant ordering principle which frames how we live social life. Security meta-frame comes to be articulated throughout the Long War (the two World Wars, the Cold War, and the War on Terror) in relation to the state.

Lecture:

Feb 28: Waever, Ole. 1995. Securitization and Desecuritization. In: Rony Lipschutz (Ed) *On Security*. NY: Columbia University Press, pp. 46-86.

Discussion:

Mar 1: Bacevich, Andrew. “Introduction.” In: *The Long War: A New History of U.S. National Security Policy Since World War II*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. vii-xiv.

Further Readings:

Fierke, Karin M. 2007. *Critical Approaches to International Security*. Polity.

Zedner, Lucia. 2009. *Security*. Routledge.

WEEK 9: Mar 6, Mar 8: SPRING BREAK

WEEK 10: Security Meta-Frame: Everyday Life

State defense is based on a binary logic of allies and enemies. This exclusionary logic of security meta-framing now permeates numerous spheres of social and individual life, using surveillance as the means of control.

Lecture:

Mar 13: Bajc, Vida. 2011. Security Meta-framing: A Cultural Logic of an Ordering Practice. In: *Security and Everyday Life*; Bajc and de Lint (Eds). Routledge, pp. 1-28.

Discussion:

Mar 15: Bajc, Vida. 2013. Sociological Reflections on Security through Surveillance. *Sociological Forum*, 28(3): 615-623.

Further Readings:

Artega Botello, Nelson. 2011. Security Metamorphosis in Latin America. In: *Security and Everyday Life*; Bajc and

- de Lint (Eds). Routledge, pp. 236-257.
- Caldeira, Teresa P. 2001. *City of Walls: Crime, Segregation, and Citizenship in Sao Paulo*. University of California Press.
- Bigo, Didier. 2002. Security and Immigration: Toward a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease. *Alternatives*, 27(1):62-93.
- Flyghed, Janne. 2003. Normalising the Exceptional: The Case of Political Violence. *Policing and Society*, 13(1): 23-41.
- Agamben, Giorgio. 2005. *State of Exception*. Kevin Attell (Trans.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Ch 1 "The State of Exception as a Paradigm of Government", pp. 1-31.
- De Lint, Willem and Sirpa Virta. 2004. Security in Ambiguity: towards a radical security politics. *Theoretical Criminology*, 8(4): 495-519.
- Monahan, Torin (Ed) 2006 *Surveillance and Security*. Routledge
- Clarke, Lee. 2006. *Worst Case: Terror and Catastrophe in the Popular Imagination*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Masco, Joseph. 2008. Survival is Your Business: Engineering Ruins and Affect in Nuclear America. *Cultural Anthropology*, 23(2 May)

WEEK 11: Institutional Settings

Workplace has long been a setting for the practices of surveillance because control over workers and the production process enabled maximization of output. Today we observe how these tendencies to control social activity within institutional settings are progressively extended to other institutional domains.

Lecture:

Mar 20: Kupchik, Aaron and Torin, Monahan. 2006. The New American School: Preparation for Post-industrial Discipline. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 27(5): 617-631.

Discussion:

Mar 22: Scott C. D'Urso. 2006. Who's Watching Us at Work? Toward a Structural–Perceptual Model of Electronic Monitoring and Surveillance in Organizations. *Communication Theory*, 16(3): 281-303.

Further Readings:

- Electronic Frontier Foundation. 2003. "Biometrics: Who is Watching You?"
<http://www EFF.org/wp/biometrics-whos-watching-you>
- Ball, Kirstie. 2002. "Categorizing the Workers. Electronic Surveillance and Social Ordering in the Call Center." In: Lyon (Ed) *Surveillance as Social Sorting: Privacy, Risk, and Digital Discrimination*. Routledge.
- Gandy, Oscar. 1993. *The Panoptic Sort: The Political Economy of Personal Information*. Boulder: Westview, pp. 53-122.
- Dandeker, Christopher. 1990. "Capitalism, Surveillance and the Modern Business Enterprise." In: *Surveillance, Power, and Modernity: Bureaucracy and Discipline from 1700 to the Present Day*. Cambridge: Polity Press, pp.
- Lane, F. 2003. *The Naked Employee: How Technology is Compromising Workplace Privacy*. New York: American Management Association.
- Zureik, Elia. 2003. "Theorizing Surveillance: The Case of the Workplace." In D. Lyon (ed.) *Surveillance as Social Sorting*. New York: Routledge.

WEEK 12: Public Spaces

The public domain is where we, the public, are able to see and experience how exclusionary classifications and their specifications are used to order our social life. We see a tendency to exert control over mobility through surveillance technologies and by parceling out public space into various types of enclosures.

Lecture:

Mar 27: Adey, Peter. 2004. Surveillance at the Airport: Surveilling Mobility/Mobilizing Surveillance. *Environment and Planning A*, 36:1365-1380.

Discussion:

Mar 29: Bajc, Vida. 2007. Surveillance in Public Rituals: Security Meta-ritual and the 2005 U. S. Presidential Inauguration. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 50 (12 August): 1648-1673.

Further Readings:

Williams, Katherine and Craig Johnstone. 2000. The Politics of the Selective Gaze: Closed Circuit Television and the Policing of Public Space. *Crime, Law and Social Change*, 34(2):183-210.

Björklund, Fredrika and Ola Svenonius (Eds) 2012 *Video Surveillance and Social Control in a Comparative Perspective*. Routledge.

Fyfe, Nicholas. 1995. Policing the City. *Urban Studies* 32 (4-5):759-778.

Paperman, Patricia. 2003. Surveillance Underground: The Uniform as an Interaction Device. *Ethnography*, 4(3):397-419.

Welsh B. and Farrington, D. 2004. "Surveillance for Crime Prevention in Public Space: Results and Policy Choices in Britain and America." *Criminology and Public Policy*, vol. 3:3 497-526.

WEEK 13: Global Events

Highly complex, planned global events such as the Olympics demonstrate surveillance as a mode of governing which seeks to reduce the immense complexity of social life by treating human behavior as data to be analyzed for the purposes of planning and preempting collective human activity as it is envisioned to occur at some future time. Security meta-frame provides this mode of governing with a sense of urgency that every measure be taken for the future to transpire in the way it was envisioned and to ensure that steps are taken to try to preempt something projected to happen which was not planned.

Lecture:

Apr 3: Bajc, Vida. Forthcoming. "The Olympic Games as a Complex Event: Between Order and Uncertainty through Surveillance and Security Meta-Framing." In: *Surveilling and Securing the Olympics: From Tokyo 1964 through London 2012 and Beyond*. Palgrave.

Discussion:

Apr 5: Case studies: Moscow 1980; London 2012. Forthcoming. In: *Surveilling and Securing the Olympics: From Tokyo 1964 through London 2012 and Beyond*. Palgrave.

WEEK 14: Private Lives

With the goal of preventing future events from materializing, the surveillance apparatus seeks the kind of information about individuals that can be followed in real time and, as it is followed, provide clues to the surveillance experts when it is time to act. Perhaps more than any scholarly article ever could, the film *The Lives of Others* suggests the potentials of state power through surveillance and demonstrates its ability to permeate into every aspect of our private, intimate life.

Lecture:

Apr 10: Screening *The Lives of Others*

Discussion:

Apr 12: Solove, Daniel. 2007. "I've Got Nothing to Hide" and Other Misunderstandings of Privacy. *San Diego Law Review*, Vol. 44.

FILM REVIEW DUE IN CLASS

Further Readings:

Wiener, Jon. 2000. *Gimme Some Truth: The John Lennon FBI Files*. University of California Press.

Landau, Susan. 2011. *Surveillance or Security? The Risks Posed by New Wiretapping Technologies*. MIT Press

Landau, Susan and Whitfield Diffie (Eds) 1998. *Privacy on the Line: The Politics of Wiretapping and Encryption*.

Rosen, Christine. 2004. Our Cell Phones, Ourselves. *The New Atlantis, a Journal of Technology and Society*,

6(Summer):26-45.

Colin Bennett and Charles Raab 2006 *The Governance of Privacy*. MIT Press

Daniel Solove 2008 *Understanding Privacy*. Harvard University Press.

James Rule 1974 *Private Lives and Public Surveillance*. Allen-Lane

Ven-Hwei, Lo and Ran Wei. 2006. Staying connected while on the Move: Cell Phone Use and Social Connectedness. *New Media and Society*, 8(1):53-72.

Van Harten, D. and Van Est, R. 2003. "Special Issue: Privacy in an Information Society." *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*. 11:1-36.

WEEK 15: Ethical Implications and Venues of Resistance

In its final instance, the potential of the surveillance apparatus to interfere in our public and private life is no longer simply a matter of jurisprudence but rather becomes a profoundly ethical issue. This is so because surveillance practices undermine our understandings of human nature and challenge our notions of what it means to be social.

Lecture:

Apr 17: Lyon, David. 2001. Facing the Future: Seeking Ethics for Everyday Surveillance. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 3(3): 171-181.

Discussion:

Apr 19: Sion, Liora. 2011. When the Israeli State of Exception Meets the Exception: The Case of Tali Fahima. In: Bajc and deLint (Eds) *Security and Everyday Life*. Routledge, pp. 79-100.

Further Readings:

Gilliom, John. 2005. Resisting Surveillance. *Social Text*, 23(2): 71-83.

Marx, Gary T. 1998. Ethics for the New Surveillance. *The Information Society*, 14(3): 171-185.

Ottensmeyer, Edward J & and Mark A. Heroux. 1991. Ethics, Public Policy, and Managing Advanced Technologies: The Case of Electronic Surveillance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 10(7): 519-526.

Patton, Jason W. 2000. Protecting Privacy in Public? Surveillance Technology and the Value of Public Places. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 2(3): 181-187.

Sewell, Graham & James R. Barker. 2001. Neither Good Nor Bad but Dangerous: Surveillance as an Ethical Paradox. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 3(3): 181-194.

WEEK 16: In-Class Presentations of Research Projects

Apr 24

TAKE HOME FINAL EXAM: Will be e-mailed after class on April 19;

DUE (via e-mail) by noon April 21.

NO ATTACHEMENTS!

Paste your text into the body of the e-mail

In the e-mail Subject Heading, mark your Exam as: SOC 382 – FINAL - your name.

HAVE A GREAT SUMMER!