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The authors of *Surveillance and Crime* analyze the problem of surveillance in terms of the interest and values that have shaped its development, deployment, and targets. The authors contest the notion of a paradigm shift in power relations from disciplinary to risk-based surveillance, that is, from the problem of how to shape the morality and actions of individuals to the problem of how to pre-empt the harms posed by certain dangerous groups. This contestation emerges as a result of the authors’ analytic shift away from the ‘how’ questions of the methodologically inspired, Foucauldian analytic on power relations, or, as they prefer to call it, the more ‘technical operations’ of surveillance, in favour of the theoretical problem of ‘who’ has power and what interests are served by surveillance. What emerges from their analysis is a conception of surveillance monitoring as embedded in structural imbalances and power inequalities. Surveillance monitoring does not fall equally on all members of the population but rather serves as an instrument for the maintenance of long-standing social divisions, namely those of class, race, gender, sexuality, and age. Thus, there are powerful agents, social groups, and institutions behind the surveillance apparatus that work to promote their interests and control the surveillance discourse, reinforcing common-sense notions of what constitutes problematic and criminal behaviour and reproducing inequalities in criminal justice processes. Functioning to maintain traditional social divisions, the ‘surveillance reach’ is uneven and falls disproportionally on those already disadvantaged, further effecting their life chances with punitiveness, psychological injury, and barriers to full social participation. ‘New surveillance technologies’ are embedded within traditions of reactive policing and traditional social inequalities; even automated socio-technical surveillance systems include racial and other forms of bias that perpetuated social divisions.

The perspective on power adopted by the authors favours an analysis of continuities. The powerful ‘correspondence of interests’ that have shaped surveillance discourses and monitoring since their inception continue to influence who will be the subjects of the surveillance gaze and who will be targeted for intervention. The targeting of marginal groups predates the development of new surveillance technologies, suggesting that surveillance is shaped by older governing values and practices. The ‘heavy-handed surveillance’ applied to marginal groups is associated with a tradition of reactive, law-enforcement style policing, one that emphasises the ‘usual suspects’ and reinforces long-standing ways of seeing the crime problem. Conversely, in what the authors call ‘light touch surveillance,’ fewer resources and less enforcement are applied to the activities of powerful groups and the array of potentially more serious social harms they incite, such as workplace injuries, environmental degradation, corporate and financial criminality, and domestic violence. Powerful voices and interests, they argue, have been successful in
shaping the surveillance agenda and in defining surveillance priorities and risks, but they have also been successful in warding off surveillance though the strategic deployment of the discourses of privacy and security and in trading privacy for enhanced forms of mobility. A long-standing alliance of interests between state authorities and other powerful agencies and institutions, combined with shared assumptions about what should be monitored and who should be targeted for intervention, have worked to ensure the centralization of the surveillance function and the centrality of the state in maintaining social divisions. Resistance by the disadvantaged is, by contrast, less discursive and more practical, largely consisting in efforts to neutralize a surveillance gaze already deployed.

*Surveillance and Crime* is a unique contribution to current debates on the theories and practices of surveillance. However, the analytical perspective adopted by the authors could have developed a more nuanced understanding of the relationship between the state, capital, and powerful elements within civil society in terms of ‘values and interests.’ The idea of a seamless continuity of values and interests shaping surveillance and crime perhaps ascribes too much homogeneity to the powerful (and the state) and therefore discounts much of the theoretical work and research on the fragmentary character of interests and of rule generally. This understatement of the problem of power relations will no doubt be provocative of much debate among the readers.

*Surveillance and Crime* presents a significant review of current theories and perspectives related to the problem of surveillance and the surveillance society in relation to crime. Key concepts and central themes are clearly and extensively developed and the argument is supported by, and linked to, a wealth of relevant and thoughtful empirical illustrations and policy examples. The book is also very well written, well organized, and clearly suited to its target audience of senior undergraduate students. It will no doubt prove a stimulus to intellectual debates about surveillance in the classroom and beyond.