Article

From surveillant text to surveilling device: The face in urban transit spaces

Kaima Negishi

Australian National University, Australia. kaima.negishi@anu.edu.au

Abstract

This paper considers the power, the significance and the operation of the human face as it transitions from being a mere object for defining dispositions to an agency for transmitting control in contemporary transit spaces. Seen as the most idiosyncratic surface of the body, the face has become a critical object for the measurement of truthfulness in recent years. CCTV and facial recognition technologies have increasingly been deployed in various transit spaces such as airports and railway stations to scan, detect and recognise particular facial characteristics of the target face so as to identify risky situations and intervene before they become hazardous events. However, this paper shows that in addition to these techniques of control-at-a-distance, the face is becoming an important site for a different technique of control as well. Specifically, the face is becoming a key site for circulating a particular range of affects to modulate individuals and to maintain security in transit space. A growing number of transport operators are now supplementing ‘detached’ infrastructures such as CCTV and security personnel, with more ‘affective’ infrastructures of social control such as friendly smiling platform staff and welcoming station concierges at information desks. By taking a closer look at one Japanese railway operator, *Keikyu Corporation*, and its implementation of the ‘Smile Scan technology’, this paper investigates how the face of the passenger is modulated, made receptive and thus turned into an agent of social control in urban transit spaces.

Introduction

This paper considers the role of the human face in the context of intensifying modes of surveillance. As much contemporary writing on the body has shown, the face is a contested surface of the body on which a series of feelings, emotions and affects are most intensely projected, received and circulated (Gibbs 2010: 191). Michael Taussig (1999: 37) has pointed out that, across many cultures, the face (as part of the head) tends to be one of the least covered surfaces of the body, making it not only ‘the window to the soul’ but also ‘the window to the heart and to the emotions’. Among the many body surfaces, the face plays a central role in evoking, mediating and receiving a wide range of feelings, emotions and affects such as pleasure, contentment, comfort, security, anger, frustration, shame, sorrow and regret. Yet in spite of this significance, there is also an elusiveness about the face. The feelings, emotions and affects that are expressed on people’s faces often ‘can’t be *seen* even if [they] can be intensely *felt*’ (Blackman and Venn 2010: 24) precisely because they tend to bypass our cognitive processing functions. Due to their transient and ephemeral nature (Massumi 2002: 35), affects expressed on the face often evade linguistic signification. Thus, intensities communicated at the visceral level of the body often escape definition, especially as this relates to social control.

Nevertheless, in spite of its elusiveness, the face has become a key object of capture within contemporary regimes of surveillance. With the development of surveillance technologies, a range of body surfaces such as the face, the voice, the iris, the hand, and the fingerprint have been rendered into measurable objects

that can communicate reliable truths (Lyon 2007: 112). Andrejevic (2011: 613) shows how this kind of biometric surveillance is being widely practiced by marketers in sentiment analysis to ‘manage risks before they emerge or become serious while at the same time maximizing sales’. While collecting these identifiable features of the body often requires a certain degree of consent from the target subjects, facial images are often extracted without the knowledge or awareness of those being photographed or videotaped (Introna and Wood 2004: 178). Furthermore, facial images that are collected for official identification documents, including passports, driving licenses and proof of age cards, can also be used by authorities as data to link name, address and other identifiable information with the face of the subject.

Over the past few decades, substantial investments have been made by public authorities and private corporations to advance facial recognition technologies and their applications in the control of populations. There are many rationales lying behind these identification technologies. For example, some applications are for specific tasks such as granting entry or denying access to private spaces such as office buildings. Others are for the more general purpose of surveillance in public spaces, specifically in transportation nodes such as railway stations and airports. Whilst facial recognition technologies have been installed in a variety of spaces and objects—including CCTV, electric billboards, vending machines, pet robots, Facebook and other entertainment gadgets—the main function of facial recognition technologies remains to establish verifiable identities. However, as Lyon (2009) has pointed out, the state’s collection of biometric data is often tolerated as part of its remit as a protector and as a service provider.¹ In response, a number of Surveillance Studies scholars have raised concerns about the problematic nature of deploying computer powered CCTV systems to monitor populations in public space and to profile individuals (Dubbel 2003; Graham and Wood 2003; Gray 2003; Abe 2004; Introna and Wood 2004; Introna 2005; Klauser 2009; Doyle et al. 2011). These concerns relate to several issues. First, to locate a few potential target faces requires authorities to subject a large number of individuals to excessive scrutiny (Introna and Wood 2004: 189). In other words, it is necessary to identify every single individual so as to target a particular few. Second, the authorities’ over-reliance on the facial recognition algorithm removes the nuance of human discretion in the process of executing actions on suspects (Graham and Wood 2003: 232). Hence, suspects are judged and processed solely by the algorithm regardless of its potential bias and inaccuracy.

However, and significantly, facial recognition technologies are not the only devices monitoring and profiling individuals as they move through space. Adey’s research on airport security personnel has indicated that security mechanisms governing transit spaces are now deploying personnel to perform anticipatory behavioural profiling on the basis of ‘knowledges of affect, psychological discourses and other rationalities’ (2009: 275). Adey shows that security personnel are being tasked with carefully observing passengers’ faces so as to figure out their intentions and affects, and to act on any prospective threats before they develop in scale. This preemptive logic renders the face primarily as a ‘truth-defining object’ that can be observed and assessed by authorities in order to identify malignant or criminal intent.

However, this body of literature opens up a fundamental question concerning the face that has yet to be addressed. Is the face merely a passive object of surveillance? While the face has long been perceived by surveillance operators as an easy target for security operations, evidence suggests that this corporeal

¹ Please see the links below for media coverage on (respectively): face-recognising computer locks, billboards, vending machines and pet robots.

i. http://news.cnet.com/8301-1009_3-10193482-83.html (accessed 22 July, 2013).

ii. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/02/26/billboard-with-face-recognition-technology-ad-women-not-men_n_1302286.htm (accessed 14 June, 2013).

iii. http://www.reuters.com/article/2010/11/15/us-japan-machines-idUSTRE6AE0G720101115_ (accessed 7 July, 2013).

iv. <http://www.nec.co.jp/products/robot/en/functions/index.html> (accessed 24 June, 2013).

surface may actually be emerging as a much more *active* medium of modulation. This paper takes up this task by exploring how faces change and transform in the pursuit of security. It examines how faces are activated and mobilised to surveille other faces with the aim of controlling urban transit space. I will consider how the *potentiality* of the face is utilised not just as an object for measuring intent, but also as a device for *transmitting* authority. In this respect, the face actively engages in a transmission of feelings, emotions and affects. Based on a reading of one railway operator's new initiative, I highlight two different roles that the face plays: the face as the target of surveillance operation and the face as the transmitter of particular affects such as fear, anxiety and distrust. In this light, this paper contends that the face is much more than just a passive, static surface that can be inspected and adjudicated. I argue that, in large urban railway stations, passengers' faces are being actively enacted as surveilling agents to create a web of control that operates to regulate behaviour. This mechanism of social control takes advantage of the power and the capacity of the face in communicating social cues. Faces are constantly shaped and reshaped as they come into contact with one another in daily encounters. In this sense, this body surface can be understood as an *effect* of the events in which it routinely takes part (Thrift 2004: 60). This paper thus examines the processes through which passengers' faces are turned into interventional agents that can modulate and influence adjacent bodies.

The key function of security operations is to maintain a certain level of order in a space so as to protect inhabitants from intrinsic dangers. As Foucault indicated, the operation is underpinned by the power to 'let live and make die...achieving an overall equilibrium that protects the security of the whole from internal dangers' (2003: 241, 249). In order to exert dominion over people, the security operator engages the subject both distantly through disciplinary surveillance and in affective ways through face-to-face modulation. The former technique has been the subject of extensive commentary (see, for example, Rose 1999) whereas the affective mode of control has hitherto evaded sufficient levels of attention. To remedy this gap, the paper draws upon a rich vein of affect theory, whereby 'affects' are regarded by some social theorists such as Massumi (2002) and Thrift (2008) as 'felt intensities' that are constantly manipulated, modulated and transformed through a range of phenomena and stimuli. Affects are not structured in full for they remain ephemeral, and often escape any kind of linguistic signification. In this way, the face becomes the primary vehicle in mediating, channelling and communicating these incorporeal intensities that are present in almost all encounters (Gibbs 2001). The significance of attending to the affective dimension of the face is that it invites us to contemplate the potential opening up of a new mode of security operation.

The remainder of the paper is divided into two principal sections. The first section introduces one Japanese railway operator's desire to implement a 'smile-measuring' machine as part of the corporation's employee training regimen. It looks at how and why workers' faces are conscripted with the aim of encouraging passengers to relax and reveal their moods and dispositions. In reviewing a body of literature which engages with the preemptive mode of security operation in the context of urban space, this section considers how the faces of railway workers are enrolled to display particular affective intensities. It is through this process that faces become a constitutive part of the social control assemblage. The second section considers how surveillance and social control are initiated by intimate and co-present techniques: in short, railway workers' projections of a smile can be understood as a way of modulating passengers who might be harbouring malevolent or disagreeable intentions. Since the railway operator considers the maintenance of station security as part of its service provision, eliminating passengers' vexation contributes to service enhancement. As evidence, *Keikyu* links the reinforcement of security directly with improvement of service, making very little distinction between them on the corporation's webpage and in its Corporate Social Responsibility reports. While the corporation does not explicitly state it, the initiative can be read as a mechanism by which *Keikyu* expects workers to direct in positive ways the passenger experience. In sum, the overall aim of this paper is to provide a closer inspection of the face as (a) a surveillant technology that can be harnessed biometrically to reveal subjective disposition, and (b) a mechanism for controlling the conduct of others.

Surveilling the face closely and remotely

In 2009, a Japanese urban railway operator, *Keikyu Corporation*, set up smile-measuring machines in fifteen of its key station offices to enhance the customer services provided by their staff. This machine, known as the ‘Smile Scan’, was developed by the Japanese electronics company Omron to measure peoples’ smiles, and allocate to them a rating from 0 to 100 per cent. Feedback is provided on how to improve one’s smile, for instance, ‘lift your cheeks’ and ‘narrow your eyes’ (Negishi 2012). As part of the company’s employee training regimen, *Keikyu* instructs platform staff to check their smiles ahead of commencing work, and to keep with them photo records of their highest-rated smile during working hours. While a similar kind of smile-exercise is commonly practiced in a majority of service-oriented corporations in Japan, the Smile Scan is unique not just because a worker’s smile is assessed numerically, but also because the machine personalises the exercise, making it a more entertaining and reflective experience for workers. The Smile Scan prompts workers to individually check their own smile quality and hence regulate their own feeling states before serving customers.

While the smile-check might be regarded as a form of surveillance itself, in that it exposes and measures affective states, it can also be understood as a tool that asks workers to manipulate their feelings and to express positive affects.² Despite the corporation’s statement that the smile-exercise facilitated by the Smile Scan is only intended to improve the standard of customer service, it can be argued that a secondary function of the technology is for railway workers to actively work on themselves: to exhibit approved sentiments and to make passengers feel more welcome and comfortable as they transit through railway stations.³ Reflecting on their own faces as set against a smile-scale on the computer screen prompts workers to distinguish a ‘natural’ face from an ‘unnatural’ face and to eliminate ‘unnaturalness’ in order to interact with passengers in more authentic and effective ways. The corporation itself argues that the smile-exercise augments workers’ capacities not only for treating passengers in cordial ways but also for detecting their current moods and determining likely motivations (Keikyu Corporation 2009).

To create comfortable spaces, the railway operator instructs its workers to act in a manner that enables passengers to voice their enquiries, opinions and complaints more openly. In this sense, the Smile Scan helps the workers not just to leave positive impressions on clientele, but also to relax passengers enough so that they become more pellucid. To prevent their bodies from becoming susceptible to negative affects such as anger and frustration, particular facial postures (such as grinning) provide workers with a critical distance from which they can evaluate their surrounding environments. Hence, the emotional management acquired through smile-exercises can be read as enabling workers to stay alert and to ‘retain a critical distance so as not to be caught up by the flow of action and emotion’ (Slater 2009: 225). As such, it can be argued that through the Smile Scan technology railway workers are being trained to become hyperconscious of—and attentive to—their facial expressions because these are pivotal in regulating flows of events and affective intensities that are constantly unfolding in railway stations. Controlling their own facial expressions permits workers to retain a critical distance from the action unfolding on the platforms.

However, the Smile Scan is not just about the management of workers’ bodies. Recent writings on affective transmission show how affects can become contagious, spilling out across groups of people (Brennan 2004). As such, the workers’ smiles become crucial in transmitting and circulating these positive affects amongst passengers themselves. As the affects generated by workers’ smiles transcend their

² Some might point out that this smile measuring exercise is itself a practice of surveillance on the workers (see Gawne 2012 for such rendering of the exercise). However, this point is beyond the scope of this paper.

³ In this way, the workers are expected to become self-managing individuals who can constantly project a positive cheerful attitude. This pursuit of the positive attitude is implicated in the choice between patronising dependency and responsible autonomy (Rose 2000: 334).

individual bodies, they can affect the people in their immediate environment to form a ‘mobile collective’. This, in turn, reinforces the contagion of the affect to others nearby (Bissell 2010: 485). This transmission of affect which seeps through bodies is ‘felt’ as an atmosphere, creating ‘the shared ground from which subjective states and their attendant feelings and emotions emerge’ (Anderson 2009: 78). In this respect, *Keikyu*’s implementation of the Smile Scan technology can be read as an attempt to create a particular affective atmosphere in which passengers are mobilised to modulate one another, dampening in the process the frictions and discontents that might otherwise develop into unexpected events.

The implementation of the Smile Scan shows how *Keikyu* effectively exploits the non-cognitive technique of smiling to mobilise and modulate the bodies of passengers as they occupy transit space. Seeping through bodies without being cognitively registered (Brennan 2004; Gibbs 2001), this mechanism of integration is carried out firstly by transit workers and then, through affective contagion, by passengers. Being affected by and affecting other passengers in what are adjudged to be positive neutralisations helps govern the interactions occurring within and across these spaces of sociality. When passengers’ bodies are modulated by a passing smile, the non-cognitive qualities of affect work to incorporate disparate subjects into a collective that extends above and beyond the self. It is this affectively charged collective that in turn changes the affective atmosphere of the space. The affective atmosphere in the space quickly captures the bodies of passengers and, through ‘affective transfer’ (Brennan 2004: 49), prompts them to scrutinise the faces of others. In short, it is the face that is enrolled in the project of atmospheric manipulation, and the catalyst for this is the smiles generated by the Smile Scan technology. Of course, transit spaces are not always so convivial. The frustrations and grievances that train travel generates means that other atmospheres are always just around the corner, repeatedly taking shape and evaporating, cropping up and fading (Bissell 2010; Anderson 2009). Through this incessant and spontaneous forming and deforming of atmospheres, passengers’ capacities for affecting and being affected are continually modified, responding to the affective resonances of the moment. The smile can therefore be read as a technique that dampens these volatile atmospheres. Such volatility is controlled as railway workers modulate passengers’ bodies to develop high levels of receptivity to a certain range of ‘conductive’ affects.

What we can observe in this reading of *Keikyu*’s initiative is a prevailing mode of security operation in the contemporary urban transit space. In this mechanism of social control, we can observe an emerging logic of security orientated to preemptive strategies of intervention. The Smile Scan induces the emergence of convivial affective atmospheres that can pre-emptively dampen volatile, negative affects. Such preemption is essentially about early intervention, specifically using probabilistic and correlative assessments to anticipate future risks and threats. It is also about using knowledge to act in ways that control and manipulate expected futures (Elmer and Opel 2008). In this case, the logic of transit operators is to forecast risk of losses in advance and to provide passengers with ‘the appearance and assurance of protection’ (Zedner 2007: 265).

This logic is at the heart of insurance practice, which advocates for the ‘managementization’ of uncertainty (Ericson et al. 2003: 49). Taking into account a range of factors and statistical models, actuaries calculate a client’s future risk of injury, disease, accident and so on, and categorise and rate her or him according to a set of probable risk factors. This can be considered a form of simulation which ‘creates images of the world not as it really is, or even as it apparently is, but as it (really) will have been’ (Bogard 1996: 35). This approach to security envisages a future through figures, numbers and metrics. Such practices can be regarded as one arm of what Foucault (1988) called ‘technologies of the self’. In Foucault’s view, technologies of the self are designed to transform individuals so that they can ‘attain a certain state of happiness, purity, wisdom, perfection or immortality’ (1988: 16). These technologies as governing apparatuses characterise individuals by rendering them into descriptive texts such as figures and numbers so as to govern their multiplicities. However, whilst ostensibly enrolled into similar pre-emptive logics, the techniques of affective control in railway stations contrast significantly from more familiar

techniques of control that are distanced. In order to better contextualise the former, we need review the characteristics of the latter. It is to this task that I now turn.

In urban transit spaces it is CCTV, police guards and intelligence agents that are some of the key preemptive technologies that visualise and deter disruptive events. The operation of these technologies renders individuals into decipherable objects. These ‘detached’ measures of revealing and judging through technologies that permit asymmetries in terms of watchers’ rights are predicated on the aspiration to ‘govern at a distance’ (Rose 2000: 337). The distance allows security authorities to determine scope, and simplify and objectify a complex web of interactive human relations. Due to their complexities, it is almost impossible to entirely predict future events orchestrated by a variety of actors. However, this unpredictability is considered manageable ‘by knowing a range of possible futures that may happen, including those that are improbable’ (Anderson 2010: 782). The urgent task for authorities is to specify targets as quickly as possible. Hence, the detachment provided by surveillance technologies allows this aspiration to be realised in the most efficient fashion.

In urban railway stations, which are often a ‘publicly available but privately surveilled space’ (Murakami Wood et al. 2007), the nature of pre-emptive control is primarily premised on the power relations between the watcher and the watched. Every single passenger becomes subject to this pre-emptive gaze. Rather than spotting certain groups or individual persons and ignoring the rest, this mode of security turns its gaze on all those who enter the space. In other words, before potential suspects can be identified, CCTV in railway stations is inevitably required to profile every single person passing by. In this regard, Muller and Boos have contended that the multiple functionalities of CCTV located across Zurich railway stations are ‘*observing everybody*, not just some specific social groups or subcultures—and not for a specific reason, but for a generalized prevention’ (2004: 162, original emphasis). This mode of security is legitimised via the sovereign’s ‘right to intervene ... to improve life by eliminating accidents, the random element, and deficiencies’ (Foucault 2003: 248). Composed of multiple layers of surveilling devices, this kind of power works as a networked ‘surveillant assemblage’ to regulate the mortality of populations (Haggerty and Ericson 2000: 615). That is to say, the assemblage turns abstract phenomena into discrete observations through ‘bring[ing] into the visual register a host of heretofore opaque flows of auditory, scent, chemical, visual, ultraviolet and informational stimuli’ (ibid.: 611). It is designed to control the access and conduct of individuals, to register evidence, and to plan and administer interventions. A pre-emptive approach to security is premised upon trusting no-one and making everyone a subject of scrutiny (Lyon 2002).

The security operation mediated by visual input/output is conducted at a distance, which, it could be argued, reinforces a culture of suspicion and distrust that is ridden with stereotypes. As Noble and Poynting (2008) suggest, markers of distrust such as a thick beard and a brown complexion are rendered more visible than others (see also Patel 2012). In this kind of configuration, individuals are sorted into different ‘visually-constructed’ categories (Lyon 2007: 55). Such ‘statistical discrimination’ and categorical suspicion denies opportunities to a particular individual ‘on the basis of the attributes of the group to which he or she is assumed to belong’ (Gandy 2012: 126). Certain distinctive facial features are spotlighted and identified as a reliable measure of one’s character and intentionality. This obsessive pursuit to map onto subjects a one-dimensional identity is made possible by establishing the face as a key medium of interiority. Seen as the window to the soul, if not a ‘token of (dis)trust’ (Lyon 2002), the face is the most distinguishable, recognisable and thus tangible feature of the body. From this view, the face is considered by authorities as a signifier of truthful inner intent and disposition which cannot be suppressed by one’s will, in that ‘what is expressed on [the] faces indicates their subjective states; the face provides an instrument panel upon which a scale of reflexes, emotions, and thoughts are registered’ (Rushton 2002: 224). Therefore, targeting the face with the aid of advanced technologies renders visible from a distance the surveillant object’s composition. In other words, the face provides the canvass upon which a classificatory regime can distinguish the good from the bad, and whether one is compliant with authority or, in contrast, subversive. In sum, a subject’s truthfulness is set against one’s ‘face’ value.

Security personnel are also increasingly concentrating their attention on reading and decoding passengers' faces. In transit spaces where passengers rhythmically gather and disperse, the skill for identifying even the most subtle facial gesture is considered extremely vital in spotting potential threats as they emerge and being able to act on those phenomena before they become hazardous—and thus costly—actualities. Thus, security personnel in airports and railway stations search for potential threats by 'systematically reading the faces of passengers in order to discover ... intentions and emotions displayed in facial expressions' (Adey 2009: 280). Since spontaneous facial expressions cannot consciously be suppressed, minute movements of facial musculature, such as twitching eyelids and shuddering lips, come to be regarded as a sign or clue of subject intent. This endless pursuit for truth has in some cases meant monitoring subjects' blood flow by deploying brain scan monitoring technologies (Andrejevic 2010: 31). Targeting the body parts that are considered difficult to manipulate or control, authorities are seeking to obtain 'the promise of immediate access to hidden depths' (ibid.). This immediacy of access has also been facilitated by radio-frequency identification tags (RFID) that have the potential to be embedded in the human skin to trace from a remote location the precise whereabouts of the subject and potentially measure a range of somatic signifiers of inner intent, including heartbeat and blood flow (Monahan and Wall 2007: 157). In this regard, the body has been deployed by authorities as the ultimate site of truthfulness. The molecular channels of bodily processes are becoming crucial for security operators as they provide intercessory evidence for adjudicating one's character and motivation. In Japanese urban railway stations, these techniques are certainly evident. Passengers' faces are conscripted not only as biometric surfaces but also as transmitters of particular affects. In this sense, it becomes crucial for transit workers to enhance their knowledge of authentic affective displays and capacities for effective interaction and for reading and deciphering affects being exhibited on the faces of passengers as they occupy and move through transit space.

Affective social control

As the earlier discussion conveyed, the methods of control represented by the Smile Scan are of a somewhat different nature. Supplementing the 'detached' or 'distant' technologies of surveillance, the Smile Scan mobilises more 'affective' control techniques. Whilst technologies of surveillance are less reliant on body-to-body contact (Lyon 2002), there might be an affective and intimate dimension in terms of their operation. Distantiated techniques of surveillance not only capitalise on passengers' corporeal capacities as signifiers of character and intent, but also seek to act on their behavioural conduct. For example, by setting up CCTV cameras in every corner of the railway station, authorities effectively cultivate a particular affective atmosphere that can generate fear and suspicion among passengers, but also encourage them to take self-responsibility for policing the actions of external others. Indeed, this technique is a crucial dimension of how social control is administered in contemporary life (Garland 2001). However, and crucially, passengers in railway stations are not just observed by 'detached' and inanimate surveillance technologies. They are monitored also by fellow passengers and station workers.

Surveillance technologies in transit space are utilised to create and amplify a culture of fear, distrust and anxiety (Furedi 2006) among passengers, so that they become vigilant in policing and regulating the conduct of others. Therefore, these surveillance technologies play an important role in transforming passengers' faces from passive texts of surveillance to active agents of surveillance, diffusing 'negative' affects such as fear, distrust and anxiety. The scrutinising eye of the security personnel is conveyed and embodied by the target of the gaze which in turn casts the eye on surrounding others, effectively transforming the face into an interface of security operation (Ureta 2013: 610-611). The development of the Smile Scan technology can be read as a key way that railway authorities are interested in generating more than just 'negative' atmospheres to ensure the ordering of transit space. The Smile Scan shows how 'positive', convivial affects including contentment, joy and comfort are increasingly part of how passengers' moods and dispositions are modulated (Negishi 2012). These affects expressed on the faces of

transit workers become devices to ‘articulate actions’ by making others act (Muniesa et al. 2007: 2). Seen in this light, one can argue that the faces of transit workers thereby become an important new technology of governance, mediating affective transmissions that are not just ‘authoritative’ and ‘hierarchical’ but also ‘pacificatory’ and ‘lateral’.

In this way, the human face is conscripted not just as a ‘truth-defining’ object but also as the surface for transmitting and circulating affects. The face becomes an affective infrastructure of social control, transforming itself from being a medium of surveillance to an active modulator of targets’ tempers and behaviours, diffusing desirable affective intensities in order to modulate feeling-states and social space. Witnessing a smile does important things to bodies in these spaces. It makes them more susceptible to the internalisation of a certain range of desirable affects. These can then be transmitted to others around them through embodied encounters and facial interchanges. A consequence of the Smile Scan is that railway workers’ faces develop a high level of interactivity and reactivity, enabling them to instigate a circulation of both ‘positive’ and ‘negative’ affects among passengers in a bid to better modulate their etiquette and actions. As we can observe in *Keikyu Corporation*’s initiative, a growing number of transport operators are being increasingly enrolled to supplement ‘detached’ surveillance infrastructures with ‘affective’ infrastructures that rely on ‘interpersonality’ as a technique of control. In addition to conventional or familiar control mechanisms that collect and analyse information, these alternative techniques are predicated on the power of *received* and *expressed* affective intensities. Authorities can utilise such methods to penetrate more deeply into the bodies and minds of the workers and passengers that they seek to attitudinally reveal and manipulate. They can transform the bodies of their employees and customers into devices for regulating the actions of those around them. This is a superlative means of directing and managing the population as they move through transit space.

As Lyon (2007: 51) makes clear, the body is ‘no longer a bastion to be protected as “private space”’. While railway workers are taking part in modulating passengers’ conduct and attitudes, passengers’ faces, which are seen not just as textual objects for surveillance but also as manipulative devices, become the main vehicle for inducing appropriate behaviours in others. This evolving approach reduces the need for actual physical and coercive interventions by security operators and thus enables a hyper-efficient policing and control of passengers. That is to say, this form of disciplinary power is enacted and sustained neither through robust violence nor through spectacle but is predicated on the corporeal mechanism of affective transmission and affective resonance (Clough et al. 2007: 74). Importantly, this mechanism is non-cognitive, flying beneath the threshold of explicit recognition. It might be conceived of as ‘free labour’. Along with railway workers, passengers are subtly turned into agents of the security assemblage and are encouraged to embrace, embody and communicate a range of targeted affects that will reduce the likelihood of external disruptions materialising.

As exemplified in the railway company’s efforts to make the workers more cheerful, responsive and interactive, the railway station functions not just as a surveillant space in which passengers’ movements are regulated, but also as an affective space whereby customers’ feelings are transfigured. To exploit passengers’ corporeal capacities for internalising and externalising specific expressions of affect, transit workers increasingly ‘modulate’ their own bodies and the bodies of others. In this sense, transit spaces have been transformed into a de-politicised space where activities such as negation, rebuttal, contestation and subversion that bring into play conflictual resonances are significantly reduced. As passengers’ faces are affectively laid bare to reveal their interiorities and cognitive states, and then modulated in terms of their capacities to convey desirable sentiments, their subjectivities are governed to the extent that they have little recourse to contest the affective order of this space. Hence, the affective modality of social control discussed here—its orientation to interiority and exteriority regulation—adds an extra layer of dominion to the space under observation. Social control in such places is thus about environmental engineering as much as it is about atmospheric manipulation.

Conclusion

This paper has examined how the face has been conscripted as both a truth-transmitting surface and machinery of control into the ordering of transit spaces. As these spaces are defined by flux and uncertainty, securitising and directing passengers' disorderly bodies has, for transport operators and regulators at least, become one of the most pressing priorities. The result has been to alter the role of transit workers. The introduction of the Smile Scan shows how transit workers are being deliberately encouraged to exploit their affective resources, and to use their expressions as a means to influence passengers in particular ways. As such, the railway workers who interact with passengers are increasingly configured as the 'tipping point' for producing affective spaces of control. In this way, surveillance systems have evolved markedly and now deploy affective feedback loops and diffuse particular affective intensities in the securitisation of social spaces. By way of expanding on the effects of *Keikyu's* implementation of the Smile Scan technology, this paper has suggested that one's relationship to authorities is now increasingly set against one's capacity to participate in the autonomic circulation of affects. This capacity has become a mark or quality of the good passenger.

The recent addition of 'affective' techniques of control has mobilised the face as a device for modulation and as an object for measurement. This is to say, the face is no longer just a surveillant text, but has evolved into an affective modulator transforming passengers' susceptibility to a desirable range of affects. The mobilisation of the face as an active agent of affective control is in this sense very much predicated on its capacity for affecting the host and affecting the emotional intensities of others. The rise of affective control does not mean, of course, that the significance of disciplinary surveillance has declined. Rather, affective modes of control form a complementary layer in the security assemblage. While such ephemeral and 'soft' techniques of control might be obscure and tend to fly under the radar, it is vital to explore more critically this intangible side of control, so as to better understand evolving logics, aspirations and practices of security.

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank the two anonymous referees and the editors of this special issue for reading through and commenting on earlier versions of this paper. I would also like to thank David Bissell for his invaluable feedback.

References

- Abe, K. 2004. Everyday Policing in Japan: Surveillance, Media, Government and Public Opinion. *International Sociology* 19(2): 215-231.
- Adey, P. 2009. Facing Airport Security: Affect, Biopolitics, and the Preemptive Securitisation of the Mobile Body. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 27: 274-295.
- Anderson, B. 2009. Affective Atmospheres. *Emotion, Space and Society* 2: 77-81.
- . 2010. Preemption, Precaution, Preparedness: Anticipatory Action and Future Geographies. *Progress in Human Geography* 34(6): 777-798.
- Andrejevic, M. 2010. Reading the Surface: Body Language and Surveillance. *Culture Unbound* 2: 15-36.
- . 2011. The Work that Affective Economics Does. *Cultural Studies* 25(4-5): 604-620.
- Bissell, D. 2010. Vibrating Materialities: Mobility-Body-Technology Relations. *Area* 42(4): 479-486.
- Blackman, L. and C. Venn. 2010. Affect. *Body & Society* 16(1): 7-28.
- Bogard, W. 1996. *The Simulation of Surveillance: Hypercontrol in Telematic Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brennan, T. 2004. *The Transmission of Affect*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Clough, P.T., G. Goldberg, R. Schiff, A. Weeks and C. Willse. 2007. Notes Towards a Theory of Affect-Itself. *ephemera* 7(1): 60-77.
- Doyle, A., R. Lippert and D. Lyon. 2011. Introduction. In *Eyes Everywhere: The Global Growth of Camera Surveillance*. Edited by Aaron Doyle, Randy Lippert and David Lyon, 1-20. London and New York: Routledge.
- Dubbeld, L. 2003. Observing Bodies. Camera Surveillance and the Significance of the Body. *Ethics and Information Technology* 5: 151-162.
- Elmer, G. and A. Opel. 2008. *Preempting Dissent: The Politics of an Inevitable Future*. Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.
- Ericson, R.V., A. Doyle and D. Barry. 2003. *Insurance as Governance*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Foucault, M. 1988. Technologies of the Self. In *Technologies of the Self: A seminar with Michel Foucault*. Edited by Luther H. Martin, Huck Gutman and Patrick H. Hutton, 16-49. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

- . 2003. *"Society Must Be Defended": Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-76*. Translated by David Macey. London: Penguin.
- Furedi, F. 2006. *Culture of Fear Revisited*. London and New York: Continuum.
- Gandy Jr., O.H. 2012. Statistical Surveillance: Remote Sensing in the Digital Age. In *Routledge Handbook of Surveillance Studies*. Edited by Kirstie Ball, Kevin D. Haggerty and David Lyon, 125-132. London and New York: Routledge.
- Garland, D. 2001. *The Culture of Control: Crime and Social Order in Contemporary Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gawne, M. 2012. The Modulation and Ordering of Affect: From Emotion Recognition Technology to the Critique of Class Composition. *Fibreculture* 21. Available: <http://twentyone.fibreculturejournal.org/fcj-151-the-modulation-and-ordering-of-affect-from-emotion-recognition-technology-to-the-critique-of-class-composition/>. (accessed 17 August, 2013).
- Gibbs, A. 2001. Contagious Feelings: Pauline Hanson and the Epidemiology of Affect. *Australian Humanities Review* 24 (December). Available <http://www.australianhumanitiesreview.org/archive/Issue-December-2001/gibbs.html>. (accessed 18 August, 2013).
- . 2010. After Affect: Sympathy, Synchrony, and Mimetic Communication. In *The Affect Theory Reader*. Edited by Melissa Gregg and Gregory J. Seigworth, 186-205. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Graham, S. and D. Wood. 2003. Digitizing Surveillance: Categorization, Space, Inequality. *Critical Social Policy* 23(2): 227-248.
- Gray, Mitchell. 2003. Urban Surveillance and Panopticism: Will We Recognize the Facial Recognition Society? *Surveillance & Society* 1(3): 314-330.
- Haggerty, K.D. and R.V. Ericson. 2000. The Surveillant Assemblage. *British Journal of Sociology* 51(4): 605-622.
- Introna, L.D. 2005. Disclosive Ethics and Information Technology: Disclosing Facial Recognition Systems. *Ethics and Information Technology* 7: 75-86.
- . and D. Wood. 2004. Picturing Algorithmic Surveillance: The Politics of Facial Recognition Systems. *Surveillance & Society* 2(2/3): 177-198.
- Keikyu Corporation. 2009. News Release: Ekikakariin no Egao-do wo Sokutei Dekiru Smile Scan wo Dounyu Itashimasu. *Keikyu Web*. Available: <http://www.keikyu.co.jp/company/news/2009/detail/000802.html>. (accessed 18 July, 2011).
- Klauser, F.R. 2009. 'Lost' Surveillance Studies: A Critical Review of French Work on CCTV. *Surveillance & Society* 6(1): 23-31.
- Lyon, D. 2002. Everyday Surveillance: Personal Data and Social Classifications. *Information, Communication & Society* 5(2): 242-257.
- . 2007. *Surveillance Studies: An Overview*. Cambridge: Polity.
- . 2009. *Identifying Citizens: ID Cards as Surveillance*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Massumi, B. 2002. *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Monahan, T. and T. Wall. 2007. Somatic Surveillance: Corporeal Control through Information Networks. *Surveillance & Society* 4(3): 154-173.
- Muller, C. and D. Boos. 2004. Zurich Main Railway Station: A Typology of Public CCTV Systems. *Surveillance & Society* 2(2/3): 161-176.
- Muniesa, F., Y. Millo and M. Callon. 2007. An Introduction to market devices. *The Sociological Review* 55: 1-12.
- Murakami Wood, D., D. Lyon and K. Abe. 2007. Surveillance in Urban Japan: A Critical Introduction. *Urban Studies* 44(3): 551-568.
- Negishi, K. 2012. Smiling in the Post-Fordist "Affective" Economy. *Transformations* 22. Available: http://www.transformationsjournal.org/journal/issue_22/article_02.shtml. (accessed 15 August, 2013)
- Noble, G. and S. Poynting. 2008. Neither Relaxed nor Comfortable: The Uncivil Regulation of the Muslim Other. In *Fear: Critical Geopolitics and Everyday Life*. Edited by Rachel Pain, and Susan J. Smith, 129-138. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Patel, T.G. 2012. Surveillance, Suspicion and Stigma: Brown Bodies in a Terror-Panic Climate. *Surveillance & Society* 10(3/4): 215-234.
- Rose, N. 1999. *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2000. Government and Control. *British Journal of Criminology* 40(2): 321-339.
- Rushton, R. 2002. What Can a Face Do? On Deleuze and Faces. *Cultural Critique* 51: 219-237.
- Slater, D. 2009. The Ethics of Routine. In *Time, Consumption and Everyday Life: Practice, Materiality and Culture*. Edited by Elizabeth Shove, Frank Trentmann, and Richard Wilk, 217-230. Oxford: Berg.
- Taussig, M. 1999. *Defacement*. Stanford CA: Stanford University Press.
- Thrift, N. 2004. Intensities of Feeling: Towards a Spatial Politics of Affect. *Geografiska Annaler* 86(B): 57-78.
- . 2008. *Non-representational Theory: Space, Politics, Affect*. London: Routledge.
- Ureta, S. 2013. Waiting for the Barbarians: Disciplinary Devices on Metro de Santiago. *Organization* 20(4) 596-614.
- Zedner, L. 2007. Pre-Crime and Post-Criminology? *Theoretical Criminology* 11(2): 261-281.