SOCIOLOGY OF CRIME, LAW AND DEVIANCE

Series Editors: Mathieu Deflem (Volumes 6–10)
Jeffrey T. Ulmer (Volumes 1–5)

Recent Volumes:

- Volume 1: Edited by Jeffrey T. Ulmer, 1998
- Volume 2: Edited by Jeffrey T. Ulmer, 2000
- Volume 3: Legal Professions: Work, Structure and Organization – Edited by Jerry Van Hoy, 2001
- Volume 4: Violent Acts and Violentization: Assessing, Applying and Developing Lonnie Athens' Theory and Research – Edited by Lonnie Athens and Jeffrey T. Ulmer, 2002
- Volume 5: Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism: Criminological Perspectives – Edited by Mathieu Deflem, 2004
- Volume 6: Ethnographies of Law and Social Control – Edited by Stacey Lee Burns, 2005
- Volume 7: Sociological Theory and Criminological Research, Views from Europe and United States – Edited by Mathieu Deflem, 2006
- Volume 8: Police Occupational Culture: New Debates and Directions – Edited by Megan O'Neill, Monique Marks and Anne-Marie Singh, 2007
- Volume 9: Crime and Human Rights – Edited by Stephan Parmentier and Elmar Weitekamp, 2007

SOCIOLOGY OF CRIME, LAW AND DEVIANCE VOLUME 10

SURVEILLANCE AND GOVERNANCE: CRIME CONTROL AND BEYOND

EDITED BY

MATHIEU DEFLEM

University of South Carolina, Columbia, USA

JAI

United Kingdom – North America – Japan
India – Malaysia – China

JAI Press is an imprint of Emerald Group Publishing Limited
Howard House, Wagon Lane, Bingley BD16 1WA, UK

First edition 2008

Copyright © 2008 Emerald Group Publishing Limited

Reprints and permission service

Contact: booksandseries@emeraldinsight.com

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without either the prior written permission of the publisher or a licence permitting restricted copying issued in the UK by The Copyright Licensing Agency and in the USA by The Copyright Clearance Center. No responsibility is accepted for the accuracy of information contained in the text, illustrations or advertisements. The opinions expressed in these chapters are not necessarily those of the Editor or the publisher.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-0-7623-1416-4

ISSN: 1521-6136 (Series)

Awarded in recognition of
Emerald's production
department's adherence to
quality systems and processes
when preparing scholarly
journals for print

INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

To the memory of our colleague and friend Richard V. Ericson (1948–2007)

CONTENTS

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS	<i>xi</i>
INTRODUCTION: AN EYE ON SURVEILLANCE AND GOVERNANCE <i>Mathieu Deflem</i>	<i>1</i>
PART I: BOUNDARIES AND SPACES	
COMMUNITY, SURVEILLANCE AND BORDER CONTROL: THE CASE OF THE MINUTEMAN PROJECT <i>James Walsh</i>	<i>11</i>
THE POLITICS OF SIGHT/SITE: LOCATING CAMERAS IN VANCOUVER'S PUBLIC SPACES <i>Kevin D. Haggerty, Laura Huey and Richard V. Ericson</i>	<i>35</i>
THE CONQUEST OF SPACE: NEW YORK CITY'S NEW FRONTIER OF SOCIAL CONTROL <i>Kirsten Christiansen</i>	<i>57</i>
THE CHECK AND THE GUARDIANSHIP: A COMPARISON OF SURVEILLANCE AT AN AIRPORT AND A HOUSING-ESTATE AREA IN THE PARIS OUTSKIRTS <i>Fabien Jobard and Dominique Linhardt</i>	<i>75</i>

LEX VIGILATORIA: GLOBAL CONTROL WITHOUT A STATE?

Thomas Mathiesen

101

PART II: TECHNOLOGIES AND STRATEGIES

TECHNOLOGIES OF THE BODY, TECHNOLOGIES OF THE SELF: HOUSE ARREST AS NEO-LIBERAL GOVERNANCE

William G. Staples and Stephanie K. Decker

131

ACADEMIA, SURVEILLANCE, AND THE FBI: A SHORT HISTORY

Scott G. White

151

"WHAT IF SHE'S FROM THE FBI?" THE EFFECTS OF COVERT FORMS OF SOCIAL CONTROL ON SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

David Cunningham and John Noakes

175

PLURAL POLICING AND CCTV SURVEILLANCE

Michael McCahill

199

PART III: OBJECTIVES AND COUNTER-OBJECTIVES

THE NEW LATERAL SURVEILLANCE AND A CULTURE OF SUSPICION

Janet Chan

223

CITIZENSHIP, HYPER-SURVEILLANCE, AND DOUBLE-CONSCIOUSNESS: RACIAL PROFILING AS PANOPTIC GOVERNANCE

Karen S. Glover

241

HACKING THE PANOPTICON: DISTRIBUTED ONLINE SURVEILLANCE AND RESISTANCE

Benoît Dupont

257

SURVEILLANCE AND SOVEREIGNTY

Kevin Stenson

279

PART IV: BEYOND CRIME CONTROL

SURVEILLANCE AND EDUCATIONAL TESTING: NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND AND THE REMAKING OF AMERICAN SCHOOLS

John Gilliom

305

GOVERNING BEYOND COMMAND AND CONTROL: A RESPONSIVE AND NODAL APPROACH TO CHILD PROTECTION

Nathan Harris and Jennifer Wood

327

FROM THOUGHT CONTROL TO TRAFFIC CONTROL: CCTV POLITICS OF EXPANSION AND RESISTANCE IN POST-OLYMPICS GREECE

Minas Samatas

345

SUBJECT INDEX

371

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

<i>Janet Chan</i>	School of Social Sciences and
International Studies, University of New
South Wales, Sydney, Australia
<i>Kirsten Christiansen</i>	The Graduate Center of the City
University of New York and John Jay
College of Criminal Justice, New York,
NY, USA
<i>David Cunningham</i>	Department of Sociology, Brandeis
University, Waltham, MA, USA
<i>Stephanie K. Decker</i>	Department of Sociology, University of
Kansas, Lawrence, KS, USA
<i>Mathieu Deflem</i>	Department of Sociology, University of
South Carolina, Columbia, SC, USA
<i>Benoît Dupont</i>	Centre International de Criminologie
Comparée, Université de Montréal,
Montreal, Quebec, Canada
<i>Richard V. Ericson[†]</i>	Centre of Criminology, University of
Toronto, Toronto, Canada
<i>John Gilliom</i>	Department of Political Science, Ohio
University, Athens, OH, USA
<i>Karen S. Glover</i>	Department of Sociology, Criminology
and Justice Studies Program, California
State University, San Marcos, CA, USA
<i>Kevin D. Haggerty</i>	Department of Sociology, University of
Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
<i>Nathan Harris</i>	Regulatory Institutions Network,
Australian National University,
Canberra, Australia

- Laura Huey* Department of Sociology, Concordia University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada
- Fabien Jobard* Center of Sociological Research on Penal Institutions (CESDIP-CNRS), Guyancourt, France
- Dominique Linhardt* Centre de sociologie de l'innovation (CSI-CNRS), École nationale supérieure des mines de Paris (ENSMP), Paris, France
- Thomas Mathiesen* Department of Criminology and Sociology of Law, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway
- Michael McCahill* Department of Social Sciences, University of Hull, Hull, UK
- John Noakes* Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminal Justice, Arcadia University, Glenside, PA, USA
- Minas Samatas* Sociology Department, University of Crete, Rethymno, Crete, Greece
- William G. Staples* Department of Sociology, University of Kansas, Lawrence, USA
- Kevin Stenson* Crime and Conflict Research Centre, Middlesex University (London), Enfield, Middlesex, UK
- James Walsh* Department of Sociology, University of California Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, USA
- Scott G. White* The Graduate Center, City University of New York and LaGuardia Community College, Long Island City, New York, USA
- Jennifer Wood* Department of Criminal Justice, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, USA

INTRODUCTION: AN EYE ON SURVEILLANCE AND GOVERNANCE

Mathieu Deflem

ABSTRACT

This volume presents recent insights in the sociological study of surveillance and governance in the context of criminal justice and other control strategies in contemporary societies. The collected chapters provide a varied set of theoretical perspectives and substantive research domains on the qualities and quantities of some of the most recent transformations of social control as well as their historical precursors in diverse social settings. Drawn from several quarters of the world, the contributors to this volume testify to the increasing relevance of surveillance and governance across the globe and, at the same time, demonstrate the cross-national spread of scholarly ideas on the study thereof.

Surveillance is not a conceptual invention of recent social science scholarship. In fact, the term has a very long history that appears more closely related to the multitude of policy functions that historically were increasingly monopolized by the state, including matters pertaining to health, deviance, poverty, geography, and economy (e.g., Forrest, 1896;

Surveillance and Governance: Crime Control and Beyond
Sociology of Crime Law and Deviance, Volume 10, 1-8
Copyright © 2008 by Emerald Group Publishing Limited
All rights of reproduction in any form reserved
ISSN: 1521-6136/doi:10.1016/S1521-6136(07)00219-9

GOVERNING BEYOND COMMAND AND CONTROL: A RESPONSIVE AND NODAL APPROACH TO CHILD PROTECTION

Nathan Harris and Jennifer Wood

ABSTRACT

This chapter is interested in the challenge of governing beyond crime, surveillance and control. It argues for the need to re-imagine the governance of security in ways designed to both build and enrol the capacities of different actors. The authors draw on regulatory theory and the ideas developed in the areas of 'responsive regulation' and 'nodal governance' to explore the opportunities for, and the challenges associated with designing governance institutions and processes that serve to de-centre hierarchy, command and interventionism as essential rationalities and practices. Its empirical focus is on the case of child protection, where the authors argue for the importance of nurturing the capacities of families and communities to govern both beyond and in tandem with hierarchical modalities. It is hoped that the theoretical issues raised and the agenda articulated can be engaged with across a variety of empirical domains.

INTRODUCTION

This chapter is interested in the challenge of governing *beyond* crime, surveillance, and control. It is less concerned with the changing character of surveillance and crime management than it is with the need to re-imagine how to do the 'governance of security', that is, to undertake 'conscious attempts to shape and influence the conduct of individuals, groups and wide populations in furtherance of ... "security"' (Wood & Dupont, 2006a, 2006b, p. 2). The first step in meeting this challenge is, in our view, an acknowledgement of 'governance deficits', whereby the knowledge and capacities of some governing actors – such as those who do statutory enforcement, intelligence gathering, and surveillance – are more privileged and better resourced than others. The second step is to re-design our formal institutions and processes in ways that more effectively enrol the capacities and resources of those who bring diverse strengths to governance. There must be a renewed commitment, in our view, to recognize, build and harness the strengths of families and communities in this process.

There are 'weak' and 'strong' actors in the field of security, as in other governmental domains (Braithwaite & Drahos, 2000). This is a situation which is being further cemented through quests to 'ratchet up' the surveillance and coercive resources of state in various realms, ranging from the control of disorder on the streets, to the social regulation of youth, to the prevention of terrorism (Garland, 2001; Crawford, 2006; McAlinden, 2007; Parton, 2006). Even inter-agency efforts to enhance 'interoperability' in intelligence gathering and actuarial risk management in areas such as child protection (Deukmedjian & Cradock, 2008) and sex offender management, are serving to bolster the capacity of (already strong) state systems to govern in ways that privilege 'hierarchy, command and interventionism' (Crawford, 2006, p. 449). Regardless of the instrumental reasons for these broad shifts, what has been lost, in our view, is a previously articulated commitment to nurturing community-based and plural forms of governance (Deukmedjian & Cradock, 2008).

It is this general 'governance deficit' problem that forms the starting point of this chapter. We draw on regulatory theory and the ideas developed in the areas of 'responsive regulation' (Ayres & Braithwaite, 1992) and 'nodal governance' (Burris, Drahos, & Shearing, 2005) to explore the opportunities for, and the challenges associated with, designing governance institutions and processes that serve to de-centre hierarchy, command and interventionism as essential rationalities and practices. We focus empirically on the area of child protection which has been gradually moving away from

community-based governing modalities to renewed practices of surveillance and risk-based intervention (Parton, 2006; Deukmedjian & Cradock, 2008). While our focus is on child protection, our hope is that the theoretical issues we raise, and the agenda we articulate, can be engaged with across a variety of empirical areas.

NODAL GOVERNANCE, AND THE 'WEAK' AND THE 'STRONG'

Scholars over the world are arguing for the need to expand our governance imagination. For instance, criminologists, regulatory scholars and other social scientists are now less narrowly concerned with the problem of 'law enforcement' or 'crime control' than they are with the 'governance of security'. This broadened analytical frame makes it explicit that 'security' – and the related conceptions of 'safety' and 'well-being' – is contested in definitional terms, and more importantly, that it is a problem that can be understood and acted upon in a variety of ways and through various competencies and resources. Academics from distinct disciplinary traditions are now coming together around a broadened notion of 'governance', seeing it as a set of activities for 'structur[ing] the possible field of action of others' (Foucault, 1982, p. 220 cited in Simon, 1997, p. 174) or for 'shap[ing] the flow of events' (Parker & Braithwaite, 2003) in our social world (see also Braithwaite, 2005).

There is also greater inter-disciplinary interest in 'de-centred' (Black, 2000) or 'plural' (Loader, 2000) governance, which is seen as occurring through the activities of numerous entities or 'nodes'. In simple terms, nodes can be seen as locations for distinct forms of knowledge, capacity and resources that are assembled and channelled around particular social problems (Shearing, 2004). Of course, some nodes are more formally organized, recognized, nurtured and developed than others. Families are nodes, as are schools, as are other individuals and groups that bring to bear different ways of seeing, constructing, and acting on the problem of security (see Burris, 2004).

Curiously, in a world of 'plural' or 'nodal' governance, where different means of shaping our social world are possible, we continue to 'govern *through* crime,' to borrow a phrase from Jonathan Simon (1997, 2007), a great deal of the time. 'We govern through crime', Simon (1997) writes, 'to the extent to which crime and punishment become the occasions and the institutional contexts in which we undertake to guide the conduct of others

(or even of ourselves)' (p. 174). Even in regulatory realms beyond criminal justice such as in child protection and other statutory-based sectors, hierarchical techniques for shaping our conduct remain central to our governance imagination and thus to practice. This reflects, in our view, a deep tendency to privilege particular governing capacities – the ones that we know and are comfortable with – in ways that trump the contributions that other nodes can make in shaping our social world.

In countries like the United States, Australia and the United Kingdom, politicians are devoting extensive efforts to strengthen the capacities of states to govern through new forms of risk management, monitoring and surveillance (Garland, 2001), all of which can contribute in making command and control work better. This is occurring in various empirical domains, ranging from the 'zero tolerance' of policing on the streets to a 'penal populist' approach to the management of sexual offenders post-release (Garland, 2001, Simon, 1998) to, of course, the 'war on terror' (Daniels, Macklem, & Roach, 2001). This is all happening, some suggest, at the expense of efforts to recognize and further develop the capabilities of families and communities to manage security risks (Parton, 2006; McAlinden, 2007; see also Blair (2005) on the needed link between neighbourhood policing and the management of terror).

Not everyone participates equally in the nodal governance of our world (Wood & Shearing, 2007, chapter 4). There are 'weak' and 'strong' actors, as Braithwaite and Drahos (2000) describe it, who possess varying opportunities and capacities to shore up the resources required to promote the security and protection of themselves and others. State and corporate actors have done particularly well in a nodal environment, due to their access to economic and other forms of capital which bolsters their ability to self-govern. This is now a rather well-established observation, articulated in different ways, which has generated varying normative responses (Bayley & Shearing, 1996; Loader & Walker, 2007).

Beyond this observation about the weak and the strong, there is a broader, perhaps more instrumental, problem that concerns us here, and it has to do with what regulatory scholars would describe as 'regulatory design'. While at some levels governments are captured by a vision of the world which requires greater control and surveillance, at many other levels of government and in many non-government organizations the rhetoric, at least, is one that espouses the importance of collaboration and participation. Given the seemingly contradictory requirements of these world views, the question for us pertains to how to design systems that can more effectively identify, build and enrol the governing capacities of those who are best

placed to carry out functions beyond those required for governing through command (see Black, 2003). As Burris puts it, '[t]he task is to find ways to make security institutions more responsive to the least powerful, and where responsiveness, resources or ability to respond effectively are lacking, to redirect resources and power to new institutions that can do the job (Burris, 2006, p. 206)'.

In the following, we will discuss the importance of designing governance systems that can more effectively build and enrol the capacities of traditionally weak actors. We will focus empirically on the case of child protection, and explore the theoretical contribution of 'responsive regulation' and 'nodal governance' to this agenda.

RE-IMAGINING CHILD PROTECTION

Child protection agencies in a number of countries such as Australia and the United Kingdom are under increasing pressure on a number of fronts. Greater awareness of child abuse within the community, changing definitions of what constitutes abuse, and legislative moves towards mandatory reporting have led to enormous growth in the number of child protection reports (Parton, 1997). Under increased political and media pressure to prevent child abuse, governments have become increasingly focused on systems that emphasise the detection of vulnerable children and protecting them through statutory child protection agencies (Scott & Swain, 2002). But at the same time child protection has come under increasing criticism for failing to provide services that substantively improve the welfare of children and for failing to live up to the ideal of supporting families (Thorpe, 1994). The dilemma for governments is that the very tools that they have come to rely on to identify and respond to concerns are also perceived to undermine their effectiveness in improving the welfare of children.

A primary response of child protection agencies to mounting pressure has been to develop risk assessment models that deal with escalating numbers of referrals by directing scarce resources to those cases in which children are considered at high risk of harm (Scott & Swain, 2002). Statutory action has increasingly become the primary tool employed as services target risk in the worst cases: either because court orders are taken or because statutory requirements are seen as the justification for intervening. This represents a shift in emphasis away from the provision of family support services and towards surveillance and control; where surveillance is represented by investigations and increased information sharing (Parton, 2006), and

control is located in court orders that authorise the assessment, supervision or removal of children. This redirection of resources has not necessarily helped those who are deemed at high risk, because it has not led to an increase in the pool of support services available, and families who are assessed as low risk are often 'screened' out of the system only to reappear later as serious neglect and abuse cases (Cashmore, 2001). Critics, therefore, have called for a rebalancing of services towards providing support (Parton, 1997; Wise, 2003).

Criticism of this trend towards an emphasis on 'protection' rather than 'support' is accepted by many (e.g. Standing Committee on Social Issues, New South Wales Parliament, 2002), but reorienting services towards providing early intervention and building the self-governing capacities of families to nurture and protect their children has proved difficult. Rapidly increasing notification rates mean that the resources of child protection services are often consumed just investigating and managing those incidents that are deemed as high risk. A second hurdle in changing the emphasis of child protection practice is that many of the cases that might benefit from an increased emphasis on support and capacity building are also ones where the child is assessed as at risk. This judgement, and the responsibility that comes with it, pushes child protection agencies quickly towards a command and control response, through statutory-based action, which is often driven by a desire to secure the immediate safety of children. While parents are often invited to cooperate, relationships between workers and parents are often antagonistic and there are clear limits to the degree of negotiation that is possible.

A growing concern expressed by scholars and practitioners is that this emphasis on statutory responses is undermining, or swamping, other important (regulatory) strategies, such as the provision of support. While the focus on child protection relies on law to coerce families to accept decisions that are seen as in the child's best interests, a focus on family support and capacity building emphasises working with families to empower them to care for their children in an acceptable way. The fact that this latter approach is dependent upon voluntary participation by parents makes it difficult to reconcile with interventions that are coercive (Trotter, 1999). Legitimate reservations are raised about whether families, subsequent to an investigation or statutory action, will be willing to engage with services in a way that improves their situation (Thorpe, 1994). Indeed, research has shown that child protection investigations often leave parents feeling alienated and angry (Cleaver & Freeman, 1995; Farmer & Owen, 1995; Parton, 1997).

As Simon (2007) points out, while politicians from different points on the political spectrum stress the importance of individual and community responsibility in the management of collective problems like security, nothing less than a 'a zero-risk environment is treated as a reasonable expectation, even a right' (p. 16). This preoccupation with risk not only trumps other objectives – especially the building of capacities in communities to self-regulate – it also necessitates a highly active and dominating state apparatus that readily wields its coercive power. Furthermore, the protection of children and communities tends to be understood in a way that bolsters efforts to reduce *immediate* risks rather than to build long-term risk management capability.

Thinking Responsively: Nurturing the Capacities of Families

Responsive regulation is of great importance, according to Burford and Adams (2004) because 'it offers us a way to reconcile empowerment practices with the context of coercion', and in doing so provides a practical way in which to expand community-based forms of governance. Reconciling the potential for coercive action and empowerment of communities, within the framework of responsive regulation (Ayres & Braithwaite, 1992) occurs through varying the kind and degree of intervention that is made in any particular case, based upon the response of individuals to concerns that are conveyed to them. While traditional models of governance, such as child protection systems, move quickly to impose predetermined solutions, responsive regulation argues that governments should initially seek to address problems through deliberative, non-coercive processes that build capacity. Only if this is unsuccessful should the level of intervention become more directive and coercive in nature.

The domain of child protection has only quite recently benefited from the theoretical insights of responsive regulation (The Allen Consulting Group, 2003; Adams & Chandler, 2004; Burford & Adams, 2004; Neff, 2004). A central tenet of restorative justice is that decisions about how to govern, and which governing actors to enrol in the process, need to be transformed into deliberative ones that, to borrow phrasing from Simon (2007), 'creat[e] new pathways to knowing and acting on ... people and relationships' (p. 4). Only by altering fundamental decision-making processes and the relationships between governing nodes will child protection systems take full advantage of responsive and nodal thinking.

Two principles can be taken from responsive regulation in relation to such decision-making processes: *firstly* that agencies should be able to vary, in

terms of intrusiveness, the kinds of response they take to problems, and *secondly*, that the decision about what kind of response to take should be based upon evidence as to whether the situation has improved or deteriorated as a result of a previous intervention, with a preference for using the least intrusive intervention possible. These two principles can be imagined as existing within a 'regulatory pyramid' (Ayres & Braithwaite, 1992).

At the bottom of the pyramid are strategies that rely largely on self-governance, or supported self-governance, because they involve helping to build the capacity of parents to make changes, while also making it clear that changes are necessary. In the middle of the pyramid, interventions are directed at protecting the child through more directive means. This might initially involve requiring parents to engage in certain decision-making processes, but leaves parents and their immediate communities with considerable control within those decision-making forums. At the very top of the pyramid, statutory action results in the courts making decisions about what is in the best interests of the child.

There are two unique aspects of the way in which responsive regulation conceptualises this decision-making pyramid. The first is that decisions to move up the pyramid are made retrospectively rather than prospectively. The presumption of responsive regulation is that, unless there is a strong reason not to, concerns should initially be addressed at the bottom of the pyramid. In practice, this should mean that attempts to solve problems initially occur through deliberative processes, and that the success of these attempts should guide any further action that will be taken. While there is a preference for regulating at the bottom of the pyramid there is always the possibility of escalating to more coercive decision-making processes.

A second significant characteristic of the decision-making pyramid, as a number of researchers have pointed out (Adams & Chandler, 2004; Neff, 2004), is that escalation up the pyramid, at least in the case of child protection, does not necessarily equate with more intensive intervention, but rather a change in how decision-making is made. For instance, a family might respond to concerns about the welfare of a child by deciding to have her live with relatives for a period of time during which time they would receive intensive support. This decision might occur at the base of the pyramid, as the result of counselling with the family, where there was no immediate suggestion that the child would be removed through court action. However, the same outcome could also occur at the peak of the regulatory pyramid through a court order over which the family had little say. The variation between decision-making steps can be illustrated by three possible steps on a hypothetical decision-making pyramid.

Family Support Meetings

At the bottom of the pyramid it is possible to imagine the use of informal Family Group Decision Making (FGDM) processes that locate families as the central decision-making hub. An example can be found in the Family Engagement Model, which has been developed and is used in one office (Cannington) of the Western Australian Department of Community Development (Harris, 2008). It involves working with families almost entirely through Family Support Meetings, which focus on identifying the issues that are of concern and developing plans to address these concerns. These meetings might be held with families up to once a week, and on each occasion previous plans will be reviewed or new plans will be formulated. Private family time, in which the family is left alone to discuss how they would like to address an issue, is sometimes used, and extended family and professionals can be invited to attend where this is seen as useful. The meetings are fairly informal, do not involve independent coordinators, involve limited preparation, and the outcomes of these meetings do not have any formal (legal) status.

Family Group Conferencing

In the field of child protection the primary decision-making forum that has been associated with responsive regulation is family group conferencing (FGC) (Marsh & Crow, 1998). A number of authors (Adams & Chandler, 2004; Pennell, 2004; Neff, 2004; Merkel-Holguin, 2004) have argued that FGC's provide a logical mechanism for translating the principles of restorative justice because they provide child protection services with an alternative to taking court orders, which provides the family with much greater power in decision-making.

While there is considerable variation between jurisdictions in how FGCs are used, they are primarily convened as a response to an assessment that a child is in need of care and protection. A facilitator in consultation will invite the family, their immediate community of friends and other possible supporters, professionals who might be able to offer assistance and the child protection worker to the conference. The meeting itself will discuss the child protection concerns, hear what kinds of service might be relevant to the family and provide the family and their community with private time in which they can come up with a plan to address the child protection concerns. Usually a conference concludes with an agreement by the family and the child protection worker or facilitator on a plan. In some jurisdictions, such as New Zealand, the plan is automatically implemented unless it proves to be impractical or breaches legislation in some way.

Conferences do not occur entirely in the absence of coercion because they are usually instigated by statutory services, and while empowering the family do not allow unrestricted decision-making. Nevertheless, they might be considered a regulatory option that governments have towards the middle of the pyramid; that is, they emphasize the family's ability to self-regulate with assistance from a broadened community network. Conferences now represent an increasingly important component of child welfare services in many parts of the world such as New Zealand, where they were first used, as well as the United States, the United Kingdom, and in many states of Australia.

Court

Responsive regulation does not argue that we should entirely abandon the use of coercion. Indeed, Braithwaite (2002) argues that strong interventions at the peak of the decision-making pyramid are necessary when other approaches have failed. In the case of child protection the use of court orders to impose assessment, supervision, or alternative guardianship on families is a common outcome in a large proportion of those cases that are the subject of ongoing attention. The aim of a responsive pyramid is to significantly reduce this proportion and to increase the legitimacy of such action when it is used.

Many child protection workers already employ aspects of responsive regulation in their work. They use their professional judgement to vary their approach to individual families, and place a priority on working with families cooperatively wherever that is possible. The model that is outlined here extends this approach to the formal decision-making processes of child protection. An important aim is to increase the confidence of both families and workers to engage in collaborative problem solving by establishing a transparent decision-making structure. This should increase confidence of workers because they know that if a collaborative approach fails, they have the capacity to call on a more directive approach to safeguarding children.

Responsive Appraisals: Building Hope and Limiting the Harm of Interventionism

These fairly simple changes in the way that decisions are made could have profound implications for child protection systems, but that outcome would also require significant changes across child protection practice. Current preoccupations with risk and statutory action would need to shift towards a focus on creating contexts in which families and communities have genuine opportunities to develop their own capacity. This is most apparent in

investigatory practices, which are currently shaped by overriding requirements to determine whether a child has been abused or is at future risk and to document this in possible preparation for a court case. Our intention is not to imply that all investigations are conducted in a confronting or unsympathetic way, but rather that it is likely that these overriding requirements are accurately understood by many parents, and that this has a profound impact on the outcome of investigations (Trotter, 2004). For example, research conducted in the United Kingdom by Farmer and Owen (1995) found that 70 percent of parents felt marginalised and badly treated following an investigation. In 40 percent of these cases feelings of anger and violation were long-lived, and meant that families kept workers at arm's length (p. 315).

Engaging families and communities in capacity building requires a model of investigation that is able to reflect the way in which child protection services want to work with families. Increased use of assessments by child protection services for some lower risk cases in the United Kingdom, United States, and some other countries reflects recognition of the importance of working with families in a more collaborative manner (Platt, 2006). However, a more fundamental transformation of practice requires a more flexible model of investigation that can be applied to all families. A practical way of doing this is possible by drawing on the same basic principle used in the decision-making pyramid above to develop a model of responsive assessments. In the vast majority of child protection cases, investigation could have a much stronger focus on voluntary provision of support, while leaving the door open to escalating to more coercive or forensic approaches if this proves unsuccessful, and is necessary because of risks to a child. Responding to social problems such as socioeconomic disadvantage, mental illness, drug dependencies, and relationship dysfunction, which are often the underlying causes behind reports of abuse or neglect, should not be based on the assumption that surveillance, control and statutory action will provide the most effective solutions.

Nodal Risk Management: Building Social Networks of Concern

It can be seen that a responsive model of child protection would also have implications for how risk is conceived and managed in child protection. Current practices have moved towards the development of actuarial based systems that are used to guide the actions taken by departments in response to reported concerns. The responsive decision-making pyramid and responsive assessments, outlined above, would not entirely displace such an approach, but would enrich the framework for decision-making by informing subsequent decisions about how risks should be managed.

Current conceptions of risk management would be broadened through recognising the contributions made by social networks to the management of risk. An assumption of the model proposed here is that it involves significant engagement with various actors, or nodes, in the community, such as families, schools, doctors, child care centres, and many others. These nodes would take on a significant role in risk management, through contributing to responsive assessments and the various decision-making processes (e.g. FGCs). As a result, risk management would shift from being understood as an actuarial process, based on risk factors and performed by a professional, to a dynamic process that draws on the insights and concerns of multiple nodes that are directly interested in the well-being of a family.

Enrolling Wider Nodes of Community Capacity

The responsive model that has been outlined so far has implications for how decision-making, risk assessment and risk management is understood within a responsive framework that endeavours to enrol families in child protection. This model poses a new set of challenges for child protection workers, the police and other statutory agencies with whom they work. One of these challenges, which may be a key to realizing the model in practice, is that child protection workers and agencies need to maintain and foster reciprocal relationships with community nodes. The model proposed here relies on such relationships because children's social networks, such as extended family, friends, professionals, and community organizations are clearly essential to the nodal governance of child security. For example, members of a child's community may be important in convincing their parents to engage with workers, so that they can conduct an assessment collaboratively. They may be even more essential in guiding a worker's subsequent strategy if the parents refuse to engage with workers. Being able to locate and draw on such nodes of capacity is both central to implementing the model described and also one of the greatest challenges.

One positive effect of pluralism is that governments have the opportunity to expand their capacity to provide services through enrolling actors that have additional capacities (and indeed rationalities) to offer. In child protection there are a multitude of actors, both organizations and individuals, who possess different forms of knowledge and skills that can contribute to the welfare of children. These nodes represent major resources that can be harnessed in ways that compensate for the weaknesses of command and control governance.

A responsive approach to child protection provides a framework in which these actors can be utilized more effectively because the greatest contribution that most of them can make is at the deliberative end of the pyramid, which is where the capacity of statutory agencies is probably weakest.

A primary difficulty for child protection services in locating and drawing on these nodal capacities is that workers tend to be located in organizations that are remote from the social networks that are most important to children and their families. Contact with professionals and families in organizations, such as schools, is likely to be infrequent and tends to occur as a result of interventionist actions. In some cases, particular workers will develop strong relationships with particular organizations due to their involvement in particular cases, but these are likely to occur in a fairly unsystematic way. This means that individual workers, or even teams, are much less likely to form systematic nodal relationships. This may become a significant impediment to the responsive model that is proposed, because experiences of inter-agency collaboration suggest that interpersonal relationships of trust and reciprocity form a crucial foundation for robust nodal linkages (Rhodes, 2006). It might be argued that this will be even more so where the focus is linkages within and across professional and community-based nodes. Child protection workers would be, in effect, seeking to enrol others to assist them. While each of these organizations will have their own motivation to safeguard children, the degree of cooperation with child protection services will depend greatly on the ability of workers to develop trust in these organizations and vice-versa.

Processes of enrolment, however, need not be one-way and state-driven. It has been argued elsewhere that more energy needs to be placed in creating the conditions in which traditionally weak actors can do the enrolling as well (Shearing, 2001; Burris, 2006; Wood & Shearing, 2007). This could be one avenue towards greater self-direction on the part of various nodes (Shearing & Wood, 2003) whilst also creating opportunities for nodes to negotiate competing interests and build trust. Efforts to build responsive and nodal models that place families and communities in decision-making hubs and in roles requiring them to enroll the knowledge and capacities of themselves and others has been expressed, for example, in the contexts of security governance in shantytown communities (Shearing & Wood, 2003; Johnston & Shearing, 2003; Burris, 2006) and youth safety and well-being promotion in schools (Marks & Wood, 2008).

If child protection agencies are to forge sustained relationships of mutual enrolment with other nodes, they may need to restructure their organizations

around maximizing their ability to nurture networks within various communities associated with children and families. In practice, this probably means that child protection workers need to be located within, or spend considerable amounts of time working from organizations that are responsible for the safety and well-being of children. Particular workers, or possibly small teams of workers, could be responsible for a single organization, such as a large school, so that they could develop and maintain relationships based on the mutual exchange of knowledge, capacities and resources. As part of this, child protection workers could undertake activities in relation to early intervention, outreach and advocacy for families in need. A child protection worker at a high school might conduct workshops on how to parent teenagers. This has the potential to give the worker a meaningful role within that community that helps them to nurture and build networks with teachers and parents. When child protection issues arise, such as a child protection report, the same worker would be able to investigate, and provide ongoing assistance to particular families where that was necessary.

A significant advantage of locating workers within organizational nodes like schools is that it would provide a useful mechanism for shifting the resources of child protection systems from the current emphasis on reactive and crisis-driven intervention to early intervention. Locating workers within such organizations would mean that they would be aware of families who were struggling before reports were made, and would have the opportunity to offer assistance. In some respects, such a model would move towards the public health model advocated by Dorothy Scott (2006), which proposes a child protection system that places greater emphasis on strategies that improve the well-being of children across the population by tackling the underlying causes of problems associated with neglect or abuse. In this way, child protection workers would play an increased role in addressing universal needs of children and their families. Rather than being entirely focused on addressing abuse in a specific population, they would also be increasingly concerned with building capacity within community-based nodes to address such issues as mental illness, inadequate housing, drug problems and social isolation.

In summary, child protection workers would both enrol, and be enrolled by a wide range of nodes, including health and education services, as vehicles for safeguarding the welfare of children and their success would need to be seen not just in reducing child abuse and neglect, but in advancing the social opportunities for all children (Parton, 2006). As an ultimate result, we could potentially move beyond the governance of security *through* security (Valverde, 2001) towards the governance of security through health

(Burris, 2006) and other rationalities that can serve to de-centre hierarchy and control as central modes of shaping our social world.

CONCLUSION

Despite what many observe to be the markers of plural or nodal governance, there are equally clear indications that established ways of constructing and managing our social world remain central to our imagination. It would appear that in many areas that pertain to the 'security' of our lives, nodal governance has simply offered new opportunities for modalities of hierarchy, command and interventionism to intensify and diffuse (Crawford, 2006). At the same time, we suggest there is potential in a nodal world to reinvent governance, especially in ways designed to both build and enrol the capacities of different nodal actors. Our empirical focus has been on the case of child protection and we have argued for the importance of nurturing the capacities of families and communities to govern both beyond and in tandem with hierarchical modalities.

This enterprise we are committed to is not pre-occupied with abandoning rationalities and practices of command and control, but rather to de-centre them whilst building on the latent strength of other governance forms and nodes. In so doing, we are engaging with the theory and model of 'responsive regulation', which conceptualizes coercive interventionism as a last resort and locates it figuratively at the top of a 'pyramid' of other (preferred) options for shaping the conduct of individuals and collectives. In our analysis we also draw from existing work on 'nodal' and 'network' governance which places both instrumental and normative emphasis on drawing on the knowledge and capacities of numerous entities, especially those who are currently at the margins of governance efforts; what Braithwaite and Drahos refer to as 'weak actors' in the system.

By weak actors we mean those whose capacities are not recognized, nurtured, developed, or are otherwise used sub-optimally or ineffectively. It could be argued that all governing nodes are 'weak' in some way, including state ones. While we accept this to be true, our discussion focussed on the need to better recognize, build, and harness the capabilities of nodes contained in families and communities. We may never wish to abandon crime and control as central to how we shape our social world, but we can certainly take better advantage of opportunities for governing nodally and governing beyond what our imagination might currently allow. There are obviously numerous challenges associated with stretching our imagination

and putting new ideas into practice. We are committed therefore to facing the hard questions as we 'sow the seeds of innovation' (Scott, 2006).

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This chapter was developed with the support of two grants from the Australian Research Council (grants LP0348682 and LP0669230). Jennifer Wood was a Fellow in the Regulatory Institutions Network, Australian National University, when this chapter was initially drafted.

REFERENCES

- Adams, P., & Chandler, S. (2004). Responsive regulation in child welfare: Systemic challenges to mainstreaming the family group conference. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 31(1), 93–116.
- Ayres, I., & Braithwaite, J. (1992). *Responsive regulation: Transcending the deregulation debate*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bayley, D., & Shearing, C. (1996). The future of policing. *Law and Society Review*, 30, 585–606.
- Black, J. (2000). Decentring regulation: Understanding the role of regulation and self-regulation in a 'post-regulatory' world. *Current Legal Problems*, 54, 103–146.
- Black, J. (2003). Enrolling actors in regulatory systems: Examples from UK financial services regulation. *Public Law* (Spring), 63–91.
- Blair, I. (2005). 'The Richard Dimbleby lecture', *BBC News*. November 16. Available at <http://www.news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/4443386.stm>
- Braithwaite, J. (2002). *Restorative justice and responsive regulation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Braithwaite, J., & Drahos, P. (2000). *Global business regulation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Braithwaite, V. (2005). Ten things you need to know about regulation and never wanted to ask. *Australian Law Librarian*, 14(3), 19–28.
- Burford, G., & Adams, P. (2004). Restorative justice, responsive regulation and social work. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 31(1), 7–26.
- Burris, S. (2004). Governance, microgovernance and health. *Temple Law Review*, 77, 335–359.
- Burris, S. (2006). From security to health. In: J. Wood & B. Dupont (Eds), *Democracy, society and the governance of security* (pp. 196–216). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burris, S., Drahos, P., & Shearing, C. (2005). Nodal governance. *Australian Journal of Legal Philosophy*, 30, 30–58.
- Cashmore, J. (2001). Child protection in the new millennium. *Social Policy Research Centre Newsletter*, 79, 1–5.
- Cleaver, H., & Freeman, P. (1995). *Parental perspectives in cases of suspected child abuse*. London: HMSO.
- Crawford, A. (2006). Networked governance and the post-regulatory state? *Theoretical Criminology*, 10(4), 449–479.

- Daniels, R. J., Macklem, P., & Roach, K. (2001). *The security of freedom: Essays on Canada's anti-terrorism bill*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Deukmedjian, J.E. and Craddock, G. (2008). From community to public safety interoperability in policing and child protection. *Canadian Review of Sociology*, (in press).
- Farmer, E., & Owen, M. (1995). *Child protection practice: Private risks and public remedies*. London: HMSO.
- Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. In: H. L. Dreyfus & P. Rabinow (Eds), *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (pp. 208–226). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Garland, D. (2001). *The culture of control: Crime and social order in contemporary society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Harris, N. (2008). Family group conferencing in Australia 15 years on. *Child Abuse Prevention Issues*, 27, 1–19.
- Johnston, L., & Shearing, C. (2003). *Governing security: Explorations in policing and justice*. London: Routledge.
- Loader, I. (2000). Plural policing and democratic governance. *Social and Legal Studies*, 9(3), 323–345.
- Loader, I., & Walker, N. (2007). *Civilizing security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marks, M. and Wood, J. (2008). Generating youth safety from below: Situating young people at the centre of knowledge-based policing. In: T. Williamson (Ed.), *Handbook of knowledge based policing: Current conceptions and future direction*. West Sussex: Wiley. Available in <http://www.wiley.com/WileyCDA/WileyTitle/productCd-0470028998,descCd-tableOfContents.html>
- Marsh, P., & Crow, G. (1998). *Family group conferencing in child welfare*. Oxford: Blackwell Science Ltd.
- McAlinden, A. (2007). *The shaming of sexual offenders: Risk, retribution and reintegration*. Oxford: Hart.
- Merkel-Holguin, L. (2004). Sharing power with the people: Family group conferencing as a democratic experiment. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 31(1), 155–174.
- Neff, R. (2004). Achieving justice in child protection. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 31(1), 137–154.
- Parker, C., & Braithwaite, J. (2003). Regulation. In: P. Cane & M. Tushnet (Eds), *Oxford handbook of legal studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Parton, N. (1997). Child protection and family support: Current debates and future prospects. In: N. Parton (Ed.), *Child protection and family support: Tensions, contradictions and possibilities*. London: Routledge.
- Parton, P. (2006). *Safeguarding childhood: Early intervention and surveillance in a late modern society*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pennell, J. (2004). Family group conferencing in child welfare: Responsive and regulatory interfaces. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 31(1).
- Platt, D. (2006). Investigation or initial assessment of child concerns? The impact of the refocusing initiative on social work practice. *British Journal of Social Work*, 36(2), 267–281.
- Rhodes, R. (2006). The unholy trinity and network governance. In: J. Fleming & J. Wood (Eds), *Fighting crime together: The challenges of policing and security networks* (pp. 15–34). Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.

- Scott, D. (2006). Sowing the Seeds of Innovation in Child Protection. Paper presented at the 10th Australasian Child Abuse and Neglect Conference, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Scott, D., & Swain, S. (2002). *Confronting cruelty: Historical perspectives on child abuse*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- Shearing, C. (2001). Transforming security: A South African experiment. In: H. Strang & J. Braithwaite (Eds), *Restorative justice and civil society* (pp. 14–34). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shearing, C. (2004). Thoughts on sovereignty. *Policing and Society*, 14(1), 5–12.
- Shearing, C., & Wood, J. (2003). Governing security for common goods. *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, 31(1), 205–225.
- Simon, J. (1997). Governing through crime. In: L. M. Friedman & G. Fisher (Eds), *The crime conundrum: Essays in criminal justice* (pp. 171–189). Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Simon, J. (1998). Managing the monstrous: Sex offenders and the new penology. In *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 4, 452–467.
- Simon, J. (2007). *Governing through crime: How the war on crime transformed American democracy and created a culture of fear*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Standing Committee on Social Issues (New South Wales Parliament). (2002). *Final Report on Child Protection Services* (Parliamentary paper, no. 408), Sydney.
- The Allen Consulting Group. (2003). *Protecting children: The child protection outcomes project*. Sydney: The Allen Consulting Group.
- Thorpe, D. (1994). *Evaluating child protection*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Trotter, C. (1999). *Working with involuntary clients*. Crows Nest, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Trotter, C. (2004). *Helping abused children and their families*. Crows Nest, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Valverde, M. (2001). Governing security, governing through security. In: R. J. Daniels, P. Macklem & K. Roach (Eds), *The security of freedom: Essays on Canada's anti-terrorism bill*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Wise, S. (2003). The child in family services: Expanding child abuse prevention. *Australian Social Work*, 56(3), 183–196.
- Wood, J., & Dupont, B. (Eds). (2006a). *Democracy, society and the governance of security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wood, J., Dupont, B. (2006b). Introduction: Understanding the governance of security. In: J. Wood and B. Dupont (Eds), *Democracy, society and the governance of security* (pp. 1–10). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wood, J., & Shearing, C. (2007). *Imagining security*. Cullompton: Willan.

FROM THOUGHT CONTROL TO TRAFFIC CONTROL: CCTV POLITICS OF EXPANSION AND RESISTANCE IN POST-OLYMPICS GREECE

Minas Samatas

ABSTRACT

This chapter demonstrates that while in most late modern societies there is a neoliberal hegemony to expand police Closed-Circuit Television (CCTV) surveillance for crime control and antiterrorism, in Greece there is serious controversy and resistance against the post-Olympic use of more than 1,200 Olympic CCTV cameras. Drawing on the interesting politics of CCTV expansion and resistance, the chapter traces the reasons why, in the Greek context, this very expensive Olympic surveillance "dowry" has been opposed, even for traffic control. It critically attributes Greek citizens' fear and mistrust primarily to their past police-state experience of authoritarian, thought-control surveillance.