The big news is that our “New Transparency: Surveillance and Social Sorting” project received a definitive thumbs-up from the SSHRC in November. Thanks to the excellent team participation in the Mid-Term Review process, the site visit was very affirming for all concerned. Now we can turn confidently to work on part two of our program, with its innovative Surveillance in Canada report, the workshops on “Doing Surveillance Studies” and “Surveillance and the Military” and the launch of IRSP V, “The Politics of Surveillance.”

Daily newscasts and personal experience offer more than enough evidence of the need for surveillance research and this timeliness and relevance is reflected in the other reports in this Newsletter. The SSHRC’s response to our work is a spur to the quest for solid knowledge about contemporary surveillance with a view to both enhancing our explanations of trends in today’s world and to fostering evidence-based decision-making and policy. Encouragingly, we have a resounding renewed mandate!

The report notes our high levels of productivity, the collegiality and commitment of the team, the involvement of students at each stage, the creative uses of various modes and media of research dissemination and – rightly! – the dedication of our vital support staff, Joan Sharpe, Emily Smith and, for much of the past year, Sarah Cheung. The SSHRC also praised our international reach and the “groundbreaking” Middle Eastern component. They urge us to continue; to reinforce our research base, to find fresh ways of sharing our work and of ensuring that it continues in the long-term.

May you have a fruitful New Year!

David Lyon
By Gemma Galdon Clavell

It took me a while to understand why everyone would giggle when discussing the conference on The Political Economy of Surveillance that was to take place in Milton Keynes in September 2010. Milton Keynes is... an interesting place. When you work on surveillance with a background in Urban Studies, place matters. And having to walk through fields and highways to get from the hotel to a student-less university felt like going from the middle-of-nowhere to the middle-of-nowhere. It’s called suburbia, I’m told, and while I’m sure there are similar places around where I live, I have happily managed to avoid them until now – and intend to continue to do so.

Meeting in the middle-of-nowhere, however, has its advantages: it is likely that governments looking to hide secret programs end up doing secret things in similar places. And so the conference on The Political Economy of Surveillance offered participants the chance to visit Bletcheley Park, the historic site of British codebreaking activities during the II World War. Just that trip made the whole experience make sense.

And then, of course, there was the conference. Seven panels exploring issues related to the relationship between surveillance and the private sector, the urban, corporate crime, law, digital surveillance, personal information and new technologies, with the overall goal to put the ‘economy’ back into the political economy, by exploring issues related to the interests and strategies of governmental and corporate organizations involved in the field of surveillance and the management of personal data.

During the two days of the meeting, an impressive array of panelists from around the world addressed issues related to fundamental rights and surveillance in the digital world, business interests organized around mega-events, health and engineering, the new spaces of corruption and mis-management of data in the finance sector and the role of the state in the maximum surveillance and security society, among others.

The conference was, as far as I am aware, the first attempt to present ways to explore the relationship between business interests and surveillance studies, thus contributing a critical eye to the study of the private sector and private interests involved in the managing of personal data and digital identities. Being a ‘first’ event, its scope was necessarily broad, but it succeeded in getting across a key message which has so far been somewhat neglected: surveillance studies needs to engage critically with the private sector if it wants to have a significant impact on the way public and private actors and the public in general perceive the threats and possibilities that
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By Francesca Menichelli

I arrived in Kingston at the beginning of May as a visiting research student at the Surveillance Studies Centre and participant in the Surveillance Studies Summer Seminar, and spent a whole week beforehand house hunting. The flats were sketchy and it rained most of the time. As I’d expected for Canada (but don’t tell Canadians!), it was also cold – though I later found out such bad weather was unusual for that time of year. As a visiting research student, I was due to spend 7 months in Kingston and, at the time, I wasn’t particularly pleased with the prospect. Luckily, things got better.

The summer seminar attracted PhD students and researchers from a variety of countries and, most crucially, from a variety of disciplines. From film studies to philosophy, sociology to engineering, via critical geography and development studies, people came to the seminar bringing their own backgrounds – both personal and theoretical – as well as their own questions and research, and everybody was more than willing to learn and share with the others. Isn’t this what a community of scholars should be all about?

Faculty members – David Lyon, David Murakami Wood and Valerie Steeves – encouraged the constant exchange of ideas from one side of the table to the other and provided much valued insight and experience. They were also nice and kind to all of us beyond words. Personally, I remember a particularly stimulating conversation with Val Steeves on the notion of privacy, which moved from the classroom to the ladies’ washroom and then back to the classroom again. It probably sounds hard to believe, but no stalking was involved.

In the course of the week, the guest speakers presented their surveillance-related work, which gave us an idea of what people are currently working on. Especially for a field as diverse and interdisciplinary as surveillance studies, it was good to see how different methods, theories and approaches can all be applied successfully to the study of surveillance in all its forms.

The best, and hardest, part of the week was the group work. The task was daunting: in five days, we had to come up with a – more or less – fully formed research project and be ready, by the last day, to present it to the other groups. In my experience – and I think most people will
Cyber-Surveillance in Everyday Life Workshop Report
May 12-15, 2011, University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada

By Kate Milberry

Issues of privacy, security and freedom online continue to be a pressing concern, for both the public and researchers alike. In the shadow of the disastrous G20 surveillant assemblage in Toronto, and with federal “lawful access” legislation looming, members of IRSP II Digitally Mediated Surveillance held a workshop entitled ‘Cyber-Surveillance in Everyday Life’. Held at the University of Toronto in May 2011, the international workshop featured a unique format, pairing academics with advocates in privacy and surveillance in order to facilitate a meaningful discussion about how to actually make change, not just talk about it. Importantly, graduate students were integrated into the program, presenting alongside their teachers, sharing cutting edge research and learning by engaging in discussion as equals with their mentors.

The workshop opened with a public panel called “(Un)Lawful Access? Cyber-surveillance, security and civil liberties”. This standing-room only event gathered experts to speak on the potential pitfalls of state-sponsored online domestic spying, including the BC Civil Liberties Association’s Micheal Vonn, Christopher Prince, from the Office of the Privacy Commissioner, and Jacob Appelbaum, an independent computer security expert and hacker. They discussed a range of problems associated with the impending legislation, not least the danger of building a surveillance architecture into our digital communication network.

The next two days unfolded as a dynamic and enlivening series of conversations, presentations and exchanges between those conducting research in the academy, and those using that research in the field to bring about progressive policy and legislative change. Advocates from the UK's Privacy International, the American Civil Liberties Union, the Canadian Internet Policy and Public Interest Clinic and the Canadian Civil Liberties Association advised leading privacy, cybersecurity and surveillance scholars on how and what type of research could make their work more effective. The opening plenary panel, ‘Codes, Techniques & Technologies of Resistance’, was significant for highlighting academics who also identified as activists, and whose work incorporated overtly political objectives in service of progressive social change.

While the workshop was by peer-reviewed selection, there were several public events associated with it. In addition to the panel, there was an art exhibit by the same name co-presented with InterAccess Electronic Media Arts Centre and featuring multi-media works on the theme of cyber-surveillance. The opening night of the two-week exhibition served as a reception for the workshop, and once again, it was a packed house as workshop attendees mingled with Toronto's artsy set.
The Expanding Surveillance Net: Ten Years after 9/11
September 9-11, 2011, Queen’s University, Kingston, Canada

By Chris Prince and Ozgun Topak

On the 8th of September, 2011, a unique symposium was held at the Queen’s University campus in Kingston to survey how our laws, our relations and our lives had changed since the terror attacks in Washington and New York City in 2001. The Surveillance Studies Centre brought together researchers from around the world, specialists in the often-invisible informatics programs and exchanges that fuel government monitoring programs in the digital era.

David Lyon, the pioneer of the surveillance studies field, began the conference with a stark overview of the past ten years. As national priorities around the world refocused upon national security, surveillance and public safety measures, how do we even recapture the ethos of an era before that. When surveillance was, arguably, not viewed by most policy-makers as a credible solution to social problems or political questions? When enlisting the private sector to conduct surveillance on citizens would have struck many in government as deeply problematic? When the notion of migrating military intelligence techniques into the domestic legal sphere would have struck most experts in the legal community as a dire shift in constitutional footing?

In his keynote address, Prof. Lyon noted how all these reservations (and a great many others) have been cast aside by most advanced Western democracies; instead, they have embraced pre-emption, mass surveillance and deepening secrecy. However, he encouraged participants to have heart. To resist the rhetoric of inevitability attached to each new government program. To avoid fatalism in viewing the world, which only feeds into the mantra of securitization. To emphasize the need for human security, not simply state security. To trumpet the primacy of the rule of law. To deflate the twin obsessions of technology and efficiency. To question and counter the praxis of surveillance with principles of fairness. To insist on accountability and demand oversight.

Following that initial survey, a wide range of experts and observers shared the podium. Arthur Cockfield ably described the accession of the Information State in the era of global digital networks, where the rising power and ubiquity of information aggregation, data mining and covert monitoring have forced law to be driven by a single technique (surveillance), as opposed to law governing that technique. Torin Monahan then mapped out with frontline detail how the spreading use of fusion centres across the US security domain have bound (and blurred) together federal, state and international actors, as well as sources from both the commercial and governmental sectors. The networked approach to knowing and suspicion, to searching and surveillance, he described, while seemingly effective, is rather like the ghost in the machine. In terms of oversight, it leaves little trace. In terms of accountability, it is everywhere, and nowhere. And David Murakami-Wood brought forth a whole global ecosystem of data in which questions of lawful access and intellectual property, censorship and anonymity, are all merely manifestations of an underlying effort to fully control how information flows. That competition, capitalization and commoditization are the real drivers, for which concerns of security are but convenient cover. After these insights which outlined how surveillance has expanded after 9/11 via new
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emerge with the diffusion of surveillance technologies to all corners of the world, all levels of administration, all sectors of the economy and all spaces of leisure.

Gemma Galdon Clavell is a researcher at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB) and the Universitat Oberta de Catalunya (UOC). She is a member of the COST action ‘Living in Surveillance Societies.’

The abstracts and some of the papers presented can be found on the conference website: [http://www.sscqueens.org/events/OU_program](http://www.sscqueens.org/events/OU_program)

For more on the workshop partner, LiSS, see: [http://www.liss-cost.eu/](http://www.liss-cost.eu/)

There are plans for an edited book with Routledge.

As a plus, we spent our last day of seminar at Queen’s biological station. We sang, went canoeing and played silly card games. With no rain – or bear! – in sight, we just enjoyed each other’s company and we finished off a great week of learning immersed in the most beautiful of landscapes. Even mosquitoes weren’t that bothersome, which for here, is in itself quite something.

Francesca Menichelli is a PhD Candidate in urban sociology at the University of Milano-Bicocca and is currently doing a visiting studentship at the Surveillance Studies Centre, Queen’s University.

The third biennial Surveillance Studies Summer Seminar was held May 16-21 2011, at Queen’s University, Kingston and led by David Lyon, David Murakami Wood and Valerie Steeves. The next SSSS will be held in June 2013.

For more information, see: [http://www.sscqueens.org/event/ssss11](http://www.sscqueens.org/event/ssss11)
Cyber-Surveillance in Everyday Life Workshop
(Continued from Page 4)

(including Canadian filmmaker Don McKellar), to the downtempo beats of a local deejay. Andrew Clement closed out the workshop with a rendition of his surveillance-themed Jane's Walk, leading workshop attendees on a tour of downtown Toronto's video surveillance hotspots.

Workshop organizers Colin Bennett, Andrew Clement and Kate Milberry co-edited a special issue of Surveillance & Society based on a peer-reviewed selection of workshop papers. That issue is due out in early 2012. Clement and Milberry also produced a video on lawful access, building upon the interest generated from the workshop. Milberry travelled with a video crew to Kingston, Ottawa and Toronto to interview the leading Canadian experts on the issue, including several NewT collaborators. The video, (Un)Lawful Access? Canadian Experts on the State of Cyber-Surveillance, had its Toronto premiere in November, 2011. The Vancouver premiere will take place in January 2012, and coincide with the release of a report on lawful access published by the BC Civil Liberties Association. An Ottawa showing is scheduled for February 8.

Kate Milberry is an activist academic and NewT postdoctoral fellow in the Faculty of Information at the University of Toronto.

For more information about the workshop, go to: http://www.sscqueens.org/events/cybersurveillance

See the workshop website at: http://www.digitallymediatedsurveillance.ca/

The Expanding Surveillance Net
(Continued from Page 5)

technologies, institutions and regulations, the symposium continued with specific case studies focusing on how surveillance operates over different groups in different parts of the world and how these new developments could be understood with new surveillance theories.

Yasmeen Abu-Laban and and Abigail Bakan focused on the expansion of surveillance after 9/11 over academics and civil rights activists in Canada which threaten the freedom of speech. For instance, now it has become increasingly difficult to address certain human rights abuses against Muslim communities such as the Palestinians. Surveillance over “public space” has been elevated after 9/11, which limits what could be freely discussed. Alanur Çavlin Bozbeypolu and Ayça Tomaç, on the other hand, focused on the increasing surveillance practices over Muslim women. As they pointed out, being Muslim and a woman at the same time put this group into double disadvantage after 9/11. Dean Wilson, in the same panel, discussed the surveillance over another “suspect category”, i.e. undocumented migrants in the UK. In each of these cases, we saw how surveillance technologies increased pressure over marginalized and
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disadvantaged segments of the population, limiting their life chances.

On the 9th of September, this theme continued with case studies focusing on the expansion of surveillance over ethnic minorities, political dissidents and ordinary travellers. While Chiara Foni’s presentation focused on the expansion of ethnic profiling in the European Union after 9/11 via counter-terrorism measures, Kate Milberry and Andrew Clement focused on surveillance over political dissidents who participated in the G20 demonstrations in Toronto. Jeffrey Monaghan and Kevin Walby on the other hand, discussed the development of the new surveillance infrastructures in Canada such as the Integrated Threat Assessment Centre (ITAC) which aims to collect and process data on social movement participants. These new infrastructures would make data collection of political dissidents (and other ‘suspected categories’) even more continuous and arbitrary. Finally, Brenda McPhail et. al.’s presentation focused on the development of the Canadian ePassports and the role of the Civil Aviation Agency (ICAO) and the USA influence in their development. In each of these cases, we saw how different groups (ethnic minorities, political dissidents and even ordinary travellers) have become subjects of intensive surveillance that is driven by counter-terrorism rationalities of 9/11. However, as many presenters stressed, these developments should not lead us to pessimism for there could be different forms of resistances against the expansion of new surveillance mechanisms. In her presentation, Lisa Austin for instance advocated for a more robust legal framework that would limit state surveillance in Canada.

Another prevalent theme of the symposium was the theories of surveillance that could help explain why and how surveillance technologies expanded after 9/11. David Barnard-Wills for instance focused on the relationship between language and securitization. As he pointed out, both threats and subjects of security are constituted through language. It is through the discourses of security, which are visible in the mainstream media, that suspicion over trust has been privileged and certain groups of people are rendered as ‘threats to public security’. Andre Mondoux & Pierre-Olivier Zappa’s presentation took a more psychoanalytical approach and discussed how surveillance creates a new way of sociality in the form of ‘hyper-individualization’ on social networking websites. This has prevented people from taking action against surveillance even if their privacy rights have been violated.

In brief, over two days, new technologies, techniques, regulations, subjects and theories of surveillance after 9/11 were described and discussed in detail. A new global infrastructure and information landscape was laid bare. And very real questions were put to the absent, silent builders of that infrastructure – what reasoning lies behind these networks? What logic guides their decisions? At what cost will this stop? To what ends will we go to protect this new online machinery? And who will control it?

Chris Prince is a Policy Analyst with the Office of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada.

Ozgun Topak is a PhD Candidate in Sociology at Queen’s University.

For more information on the workshop program, see: http://www.sscqueens.org/event/surveillance_net

There was also a public panel held before the workshop at the University of Ottawa, entitled “Liberties Lost: Surveillance Since 9/11”, see: http://www.sscqueens.org/event/liberties_lost
To watch the video, go to: http://prism-magazine.com/2011/09/video-liberties-lost-panel-presentation/
Team News

CONGRATULATIONS

To the NewT team on the very successful mid-term review by SSHRCC.

Colin Bennett who has been awarded a three-year SSHRC Research Grant for work on “Social Networking and Privacy Protection.”

Kirstie Ball, who has been promoted to Reader in Organization and Surveillance at the Open University, UK.

David Murakami Wood and Charles Raab who are both involved in the “Security Impact Assessment Measures” project (SIAM), which aims to develop new ways of assessing the social impact of proposals for new security systems. SIAM has been awarded funds from the EU7 Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7).

David Murakami Wood is involved in the “Cidade e (In)segurança na Literatura e nos Média” (The City and (In)security in Literature and Media) (CILM) project. This project is led by Susana Araujo of the University of Lisbon and aims to examine the portrayal of the city and its (in)security in contemporary literature, film, art and new media.

Cagatay Topal, former PhD student in Surveillance Studies at Queen’s, who has been appointed as Assistant Professor of Sociology at Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey. http://www.metu.edu.tr/


Charles Raab who has been elected an Academician of the UK’s Academy of Social Science.

Nelson Arteaga Botello has been elected a member of the Academia Mexicana de Ciencias (Mexican Academy of Sciences).
PARTNERSHIPS

The Latin American Surveillance Studies group met in Toluca, Mexico December 2-4, 2010, to discuss a planned research project funded by the Government of Canada’s International Development Research Centre. Nelson Arteaga Botello hosted the event and David Lyon was present as a consultant. The planned research, to be carried out initially in Brazil and Mexico, is on ID systems, camera surveillance and digital surveillance.

The exhibition “Sorting Daemons: Art, Surveillance Regimes and Social Control” curated by NewT partner, the Agnes Etherington Art Centre, was on tour at the Art Gallery of Mississauga from March 10th to May 1st, 2011. The tour kicked off with a free opening reception on March 10th, 2011.

WELCOME NEW NEWTS

Sachil Singh joined NewT in September 2010 as a PhD candidate at the Surveillance Studies Centre, Queen’s University, working with David Lyon.

Jeff Monaghan joins NewT in September 2011 as a PhD candidate at Queen’s University. Jeff will be working with David Murakami Wood on surveillance, informers and infiltration in activist movements in Canada.

Kiyoshi Abe, a NewT team member, is visiting the Surveillance Studies Centre while on sabbatical leave from Kwansei Gakuin University, Japan until March 2012.

Jianjun Liu is a visiting scholar at the Surveillance Studies Centre from Shandong University of Political Science and Law, China, funded by the China-Canada Scholar Exchange Program until March 2012.

Francesca Menichelli is doing a visiting PhD studentship at the Surveillance Studies Centre, Queen’s University from the University of Milano-Bicocca.

Lucas Melgaço is a visiting post-doc at the Surveillance Studies Centre, Queen’s University investigating surveillance on university campuses. His PhD on ‘Securitizing the Urban: from psycho-sphere of fear to techno-sphere of security’ was awarded jointly by the University of São Paulo and the Sorbonne, Paris.

RESOURCES

Surveillance & Society
http://surveillance-and-society.org/
Current issue:
9(1/2) A Global Surveillance Society?, special double conference issue
Future issues:
9(3) Cities and Surveillance, edited by Randy Lippert and David Murakami Wood;
9(4) Latin America, edited by Rodrigo Firmino, Marta Kanashiro, Fernanda Bruno, Nelson Arteaga Botello and Vanessa Lara Carmona;
10(1) Cyber-Surveillance, special conference issue, edited by Colin Bennett, Andrew Clement and Kate Milberry;
10(2) Open Issue
10(3/4) Special 10 Year Anniversary Issue
Resoures (Continued)

Digitally Mediated Surveillance website launched, featuring research papers from the CSIEL workshop, annotated bibliographies, videos and more:
http://www.digitallymediatedsurveillance.ca/

Surveillance Games website launched:
http://www.security-games.com/

Photo by Mélanie Provencher

Upcoming Events

Report on Surveillance in Canada working group meetings
Queen’s University
May 2012

Military and Surveillance Workshop
University of Alberta
Date TBA

Doing Surveillance Studies: Concepts, Theories, Methods in Surveillance Studies
Queen’s University
May 2013

Surveillance Studies Summer Seminar
Queen’s University
June 2013

For the events calendar, go to:
http://www.sscqueensu.org/project/the-new-transparency/events/calendar

The Surveillance Studies Centre (SSC) is now on Twitter. Follow us at @sscqueens

Newt News was compiled and edited by Emily Smith and Sarah Cheung

Staff Contacts:
Joan Sharpe
Project Administrator
surveill@queensu.ca
613-533-6000, ext. 78867

Emily Smith
Research Associate
smithea@queensu.ca
613-533-6000, ext. 78824

The Surveillance Studies Centre
c/o Department of Sociology
Kingston, Ontario K7L 3N6