

2013

Normalizing Surveillance: A Study of Cinematic Representation of Camera Surveillance

Jolina Scalia

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd>

Recommended Citation

Scalia, Jolina, "Normalizing Surveillance: A Study of Cinematic Representation of Camera Surveillance" (2013). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 4744.

<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd/4744>

This online database contains the full-text of PhD dissertations and Masters' theses of University of Windsor students from 1954 forward. These documents are made available for personal study and research purposes only, in accordance with the Canadian Copyright Act and the Creative Commons license—CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivative Works). Under this license, works must always be attributed to the copyright holder (original author), cannot be used for any commercial purposes, and may not be altered. Any other use would require the permission of the copyright holder. Students may inquire about withdrawing their dissertation and/or thesis from this database. For additional inquiries, please contact the repository administrator via email (scholarship@uwindsor.ca) or by telephone at 519-253-3000ext. 3208.

Normalizing Surveillance:
A Study of Cinematic Representation of Camera Surveillance

by
Jolina Scalia

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
through the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Master of Arts
at the University of Windsor

Windsor, Ontario, Canada

2012

© 2012 Jolina Scalia



Library and Archives
Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-84885-2

Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-84885-2

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada[!]

Normalizing Surveillance:
A Study of Cinematic Representation of Camera Surveillance

by

Jolina Scalia

APPROVED BY:

Dr. Michael Darroch
School for Arts and Creative Innovation

Dr. Danielle Soulliere
Department of Sociology, Anthropology, & Criminology

Dr. Randy Lippert, Advisor
Department of Sociology, Anthropology, & Criminology

Dr. John Deukmedjian, Chair of Defense
Department of Sociology, Anthropology, & Criminology

December 10, 2012

AUTHOR'S DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I hereby certify that I am the sole author of this thesis and that no part of this thesis has been published or submitted for publication.

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge, my thesis does not infringe upon anyone's copyright nor violate any proprietary rights and that any ideas, techniques, quotations, or any other material from the work of other people included in my thesis, published or otherwise, are fully acknowledged in accordance with the standard referencing practices. Furthermore, to the extent that I have included copyrighted material that surpasses the bounds of fair dealing within the meaning of the Canada Copyright Act, I certify that I have obtained a written permission from the copyright owner(s) to include such material(s) in my thesis and have included copies of such copyright clearances to my appendix.

I declare that this is a true copy of my thesis, including any final revisions, as approved by my thesis committee and the Graduate Studies office, and that this thesis has not been submitted for a higher degree to any other University or Institution.

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines how Hollywood films facilitate the normalization of surveillance within society. In particular, this thesis delves into the realm of Hollywood cinema to lend understanding into messages that scenes with camera surveillance images may impress upon its audience. This thesis adds to the surveillance studies literature and contributes to criminology by examining scenes with camera surveillance images from 30 Hollywood films using both a content analysis and a critical discourse analysis. The results indicate that Hollywood facilitates the normalization of surveillance through various ways. While some aspects of cinema appear to be critical of camera surveillance ultimately cinema actually displays the necessity of camera surveillance to society.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank the members of my committee. To my external reader Dr. Michael Darroch – thank you for agreeing to be on my committee and for providing your guidance and wisdom whenever you were asked too. To my secondary reader Dr. Danielle Soulliere – thank you for fitting me into your busy schedule and providing valuable critiques which have helped strengthen my thesis. I owe the biggest gratitude to my advisor Dr. Randy Lippert. Randy sets a precedent of greatness that I hope all other thesis advisors follow. His hard work and dedication to my success will never be forgotten. I am eternally thankful. I appreciate all the time and effort that my entire committee has given to aid in the completion of my thesis. I could not have asked for better people to work with. A special thanks to Dr. Muhammad Shuraydi – thank you for providing your guidance and encouragement.

I would like to thank two fellow classmates and friends – Pat and Stephanie – your support and advice have helped me reached this point. As well, thanks to my close friends – Charli, Chelsey, Kari and Mary – and to two other classmates – Cassandra and Tony – who have always believed in my success. To my father and stepmother – thank you for relieving certain stressors from the equation of doing my undergraduate program and for providing your encouragement. To my siblings – Joe and Jeanine – thank you for listening to my ideas and presentations. Your comments, advice, love and support have guided me to finish one the most difficult challenges I have ever faced. To my mother – your love and unwavering support have meant more than words. I thank you for everything that you have done to support my academic journey and life.

To the love of my life – Adam – I cannot express in words how much your love and support have meant to me. You have been with me since the start of my academic career. On this emotional roller coaster you have provided the strength, encouragement and love that at times I desperately needed to continue. Mon amore, je t'aime fort.

DEDICATION

To my mother and boyfriend,

Thank you for your unwavering love and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

AUTHOR’S DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
DEDICATION	vi
LIST OF TABLES	ix
1. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS	1
Purpose of the Thesis	2
2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	5
Normalization	7
3. LITERATURE REVIEW	9
Normalization Research	10
Surveillance Research	10
Surveillance in Cinema Research	13
4. METHODOLOGY: OPERATIONIZATION AND RESEARCH PROCEDURES	17
Operationalization	17
Research Procedures	19
The Sample	22
5. RESULTS	24
Introduction	24
Content Analysis	24
<i>Where and How Surveillance Occurred</i>	25
<i>Images Depicting Women and Minorities</i>	28
<i>Reasons for Surveillance</i>	30
<i>Plot Changes</i>	33
<i>Realism</i>	34
<i>Privacy</i>	36
<i>Resistance</i>	38
<i>The Efficacy of Camera Surveillance</i>	41
Critical Discourse Analysis	46
<i>The Camera Never Lies</i>	47
<i>Cameras That Malfunction Create Cause for Concern</i>	48
<i>Mass Media is a Form of Camera Surveillance</i>	50
<i>Camera Surveillance as a Normal Background</i>	53
<i>Cameras can Identify, Locate and Follow Persons</i>	53
<i>One can be Mischievous with Camera Surveillance</i>	56
<i>Images can be Altered</i>	58
6. ANALYSIS	59
Introduction	59
<i>How Films Normalize Camera Surveillance</i>	60
<i>The Efficacy of Camera Surveillance and Normalization</i>	66
7. CONCLUSION	69

NOTES	72
REFERENCES	74
FILMOGRAPHY	78
APPENDIX A	79
APPENDIX B	80
APPENDIX C	81
VITA AUCTORIS	83

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Space in which Images Were Captured	26
Table 2: Location of Viewing and Reviewing Images	27
Table 3: Reasons for Surveillance	32
Table 4: Type of Crime Captured in Images	42

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

It is obvious technology is incorporated into modern daily life. Perhaps what is unrecognized by the public is that many of these technologies are used for population surveillance. This surge in technologies used for surveillance in society has transformed affluent nations into ‘surveillance societies’ (Murakami Wood and Webster 2009; 2011). Surveillance technologies exist in all realms, whether private or public; somehow these technologies are able to manoeuvre their gaze into everyday existence without opposition (Monahan 2010: 8). Although surveillance always has been present in society, recently the technical capability to surveil has greatly increased. This is called the ‘new surveillance’ (Marx 2002), and digital camera surveillance is its prototype (Lyon, Doyle and Lippert 2012: 1).

In the era of new surveillance, the ability to use camera surveillance not only includes corporations and governments but has been expanded into the general population. Today for example, almost anyone with a cell phone with its standard camera feature has the power to capture whatever image he/she desires. Due to advancements in technology, camera surveillance can occur everywhere, any time, whether concealed or overt (Koskela 2004) and can be administered by anyone.

Traditional surveillance suggests ‘serendipitous cloak-and-dagger or undercover investigations into individual activities’ (Lyon 2007: 13) where direct or close observation of the subject is required (Marx 2002: 11). However, with the advantages of new surveillance technologies, the definition of surveillance has expanded and tends to focus on the fact that it is used to collect personal data. Generally, ‘[s]urveillance can be defined as the systematic monitoring of people or groups in order to regulate or govern their behavior’ (Monahan 2011: 498).

Purpose of the Thesis

This thesis focuses on camera surveillance,¹ specifically images represented in contemporary cinema, to lend understanding into the process of normalization of surveillance within society. It is situated within the body of work called ‘surveillance studies’ (see Lyon 2007). Considered a cross-disciplinary field, surveillance studies tries to understand new and existing forms of surveillance that scrutinizes populations (Lyon 2002: 2). However, normalization of surveillance has not been directly addressed in the surveillance literature (but see Murakami Wood and Webster 2009; 2011). Therefore, a central purpose of this thesis is identifying and describing the normalization of surveillance.

Unfortunately, there appears to be a lack of concern by the citizenry about the implications a surveillance society has for individuals (Murakami Wood and Webster 2009). The era of new surveillance yields loss of privacy (Holtzman 2006). Privacy concerns surface when corporations, and even governments, needlessly collect and store information about individuals which is often later sold to other corporations to develop profiles of individuals (Haggerty and Ericson 2000: 616; Holtzman 2006: 10). Of equal concern are other societal issues, including social inequality, which will be discussed in detail later.

This thesis is interested in the normalization of surveillance through media, particularly in cinematic representation of camera surveillance. Surveillance in the media has been studied in many different forms from print to broadcast news (see Norris and Armstrong 1999; McCahill 2003; Doyle 2006), as well as in entertainment (see Andrejevic 2004; Doyle 2006; Murakami Wood and Webster 2009). However, less scholarly attention has been paid to surveillance in cinema despite the increased use of

camera surveillance images as a motif (Levin 2002). For instance, even a cursory examination of films like *Time Code* and *Faceless* (the latter using actual camera surveillance footage) reveals that some films use camera surveillance as the central point of view through which the audience views the film. Other feature films use camcorders as the narrator of the film, such as *The Blair Witch Project*, *Cloverfield*, and *Quarantine*. As well, in fictional films it seems that scenes with camera surveillance images are also likely to be used to create a plot twist, which is a major turn of events – such as when an image captures the real culprit of a crime as in *Snake Eyes*. In addition, images are increasingly used to address a minor change of direction in characters' interests, which includes identifying potential suspects from the camera surveillance image, such as in *The International* or pursuing persons of interest through camera surveillance as in *Enemy of the State*.

Therefore, it is legitimate to raise the question: what are the driving forces behind surveillance normalization? Perhaps no force is more significant than that of mass media, which also of course includes cinema. Mass media have the ability to influence the public (Cricher 2006: 25-6) since they are viewed as 'the principle vehicle for popular views, ideology, and information' (Rothe and Muzzatti 2004: 334). Generally, what people know about surveillance 'is mediated and largely determined by media representations' (Norris and Armstrong 1999: 63), and for the general population, media offer a window into modern surveillance strategies (Gates and Magnet 2007: 284). People are more likely to receive their information of camera surveillance practices from fictional depictions than academic studies since, for example, '[m]any more people read Orwell than read Foucault' (Marks 2005: 236).

Research by Finn and McCahill (2010) and Barnard-Wills (2011) indicate that there are two attitudes regarding public surveillance portrayed in the media: criticism and acceptance. Thus, media portray citizens to be somewhat concerned about new and existing uses of surveillance technology. However, the overall outcome appears to be public acceptance of this technology when surveillance is focused on criminals and only becomes criticized if it invades the privacy of law-abiding citizens (Finn and McCahill 2010; Barnard-Wills 2011).

In this thesis, I examine how Hollywood films facilitate the normalization of surveillance within society. In particular, this thesis delves into the realm of Hollywood cinema to lend understanding into messages that scenes with camera surveillance images may impress upon its audience. This study was conducted in a North American context, and therefore examines US (or ‘Hollywood’) cinema exclusively. The research was conducted from the perspective of the audience rather than as an academic researcher. It is essential to understand how US cinema depicts camera surveillance since US cinema is viewed predominately throughout North America (Penny 2004: 209-10). This thesis seeks to add to the surveillance literature and contribute to criminology by filling in a research gap concerning normalization of surveillance. It does so by examining Hollywood cinema for instances of normalization, which has never been previously explored in depth until now.

It is important to distinguish this thesis research from two other interrelated areas of surveillance studies. This research is not interested in the perspective of the cinematic camera as a surveillance tool. As well, it is not directly interested in the audience as surveillers (see Denzin 1995). These areas are beyond the scope of this research.

The normalization of camera surveillance is an important issue to current Western society. Camera surveillance in North America has been steadily and increasingly implemented through the years. Although exact figures are difficult to determine (Smith 2012: 123), currently camera surveillance is very common in private or semi-private areas such as malls, airports, taxi-cabs and universities (SCAN 2009: 12). Private surveillance systems have been established longer and are more frequent than public operating systems (Norris, McCahill and Murakami Wood 2004: 114). Public camera surveillance systems gained momentum in the late 1990s and early 2000s (Walby 2006; Norris 2012), and are generally located in metropolitan areas with an established downtown district. Public camera surveillance systems are also found in public transits (Monahan 2006; SCAN 2009) and schools (Dinkes et al. 2009). Camera surveillance can be a useful tool to essentially keep a watchful eye on unfolding events. Unfortunately, often times it is implemented or operates based on unsubstantiated suspicion and who gets watched by whom reflects broader social inequalities, which in turn help to reproduce these types of relationships (Monahan 2010: 90) within society. Therefore, the normalization of this extensive camera surveillance, which threatens privacy rights of the individual and the perpetuation of social inequalities, must be addressed.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This section seeks to further define surveillance and surveillance societies. The subsection that follows provides some theoretical insight into how surveillance has become normalized in society. The subsection also includes a discussion of Foucault's work on normalization and discourse in particular.

At its root, surveillance 'start[s] with any elementary watching of some by another in order to create an effect of looking *after* or looking *over* the latter' (Lyon 2007: 3). The

word surveillance has a literal interpretation, where ‘sur’ derives from the French word meaning above and ‘veiller’ meaning to watch. However, dictionary definitions rarely ‘capture current understandings of surveillance’ (Marx 2002: 10). This is especially the case with camera surveillance specifically regarding ‘new surveillance’ which may seek first to discover ‘patterns of interest’ rather than focus on ‘persons of interest’ (Marx 2002: 11). These patterns of interest are searched for by new ‘smart’ cameras that do not require direct human observation (Ferenbok and Clement 2012). New surveillance is also known by several other terms that encompass its relatively new capacity to surveil anyone. These include ‘sousveillance’, created from the French words ‘sous’ (below) and ‘veiller’ (to watch) (Mann, Nolan, and Wellman 2003: 332; Lyon 2007: 13), and ‘subveillance’, from the Latin word ‘sub’ (below or under) (Lake 2010: 235).² These new types of surveillance are most commonly derived from the general concept of ‘synopticism’ – the ability for the many to watch the few (Mathiesen 1997). Surveillance, at its core, encompasses visibility (Lyon 2007: 16). Since the focus of this thesis is camera surveillance, it will be defined for the purpose of this thesis as a visual image viewed after the fact or in real time through a camera for the purpose of data collection, protection, voyeurism, or control of individuals or situations within its gaze.

The study of surveillance in society became increasingly popular in the late twentieth century (Lyon 2007: 22). Thereafter, surveillance studies gained recognition and credibility with introduction of the open access journal *Surveillance & Society*, in 2002. Surveillance studies has largely acknowledged and readily used the concept of the ‘surveillance society’ to describe modern-day Western societies. The concept is synonymous in media with the Big Brother state in Orwell’s novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (Murakami Wood 2009: 266). Essentially, a surveillance society is one that always

surveils its population; in these societies ‘the gaze is ubiquitous, constant, inescapable’ (Lyon 2007: 25). No matter where a person goes ‘some check occurs, some record is made or some image is captured’ (Lyon 2007: 25) through a multitude of data surveillance (dataveillance) and electronic surveillance systems used to identify risky individuals (Roger 1994; for an example of the proliferation of dataveillance see Amoore 2006).

The UK is the leading symbol of the ultimate surveillance society (Murakami Wood and Webster 2009; 2011). While camera surveillance is only one form of many types of surveillance technology used in the UK, it is what makes the UK appear as a surveillance society. Early estimations of camera surveillance in the UK were over four million units but more recently were estimated at 1.85 million (Lyon et al. 2012: 1). It has been determined that on average, a person walking the streets of London will be caught on camera approximately 300 times daily (Holtzman 2006: 6; Monahan 2006: 3). As discussed earlier, camera surveillance is also increasingly embedded in North America. It appears that North America is moving in the direction (albeit slower than the UK) of becoming a total surveillance society.

Normalization

To clarify, normalization refers to the process by which something becomes normal or widely accepted within society. Michel Foucault contends that all norms (i.e. something that has become normal), even the most basic that are needed to interpret and understand the world, should not be blindly accepted since the refusal to accept norms could lead to alternative ways of thinking. Refusal brings forth an ‘increase [in a] person[’s] capacities and expand[s] their possibilities without simultaneously increasing and expanding the proliferation of power within society’ (Taylor 2009: 46). Refusing to

accept a norm as such means a person engages in and expands ‘the practice of freedom’ (Taylor 2009: 46). A norm ‘links the increase of capacities and expansion of possibilities to an increase in and expansion of the proliferation of power within society’ (Taylor 2009: 47). Thus, ‘[n]ormalizing norms encourage subjects to become’ proficient at executing ‘a narrowly defined range of practices’ (Taylor 2009: 47).

Foucault believes not every norm is normalizing, such as those norms that are questioned and negotiated. Normalizing norms function to hinder critical analysis, and to make the action or practice viewed as natural or needed (Taylor 2009: 47). Norms that remain unquestioned are worrisome to Foucault, since they provide the differentiation between abnormal and normal individuals and populations. From this differentiation comes the ability for sanctioned interventions of both groups to produce or maintain conformity to the norm and eradicate any potential resistance. Consequently, Foucault believes that modern authority relies heavily on norms for legitimacy and power (Taylor 2009: 53).

Surveillance within society, especially camera surveillance, has become a societal norm. Those under the gaze of camera surveillance are expected to continue daily life as if no one is watching, to essentially ignore the camera surveillance, but to behave in a manner appropriate to society. Citizens are expected to repeat these behaviours on a daily basis, and the repetition of these behaviours helps create the acceptance of this norm. Also, the media’s typically positive association with camera surveillance (see Norris and Armstrong 1999; Andrejevic 2004; Gates and Magnet 2007; Barnard-Wills 2011), along with citizens’ habitual watching of these media outlets, suggest that camera surveillance is something for individuals to feel positive about, thus again aiding in its normalization. Foucault would likely describe the proliferation and operation of camera surveillance

(and other surveillance technologies) as a process that has become normalized in societies since it has developed into a fact of life. It is a way of life that appears to have very minimal resistance, which is problematic to Foucault. In fact, the general acceptance of surveillance among citizens, whether forthright or from ignorance or indifference, is much more commonplace than any form of resistance (Marx 2009: 303).

Normalization is also associated with Foucault's work on discourse. Discourse 'refers to groups of statements which structure the way a thing is thought, and the way we act on the basis of that thinking. [Basically, it] is a particular knowledge about the world which shapes how the world is understood and how things are done in it' (Rose 2007: 142). Foucault believes that power resides in discourse, specifically, the power to discipline 'subjects into certain ways of thinking and acting', which is not administered solely in a top-down approach, but instead 'subjects are produced through discourses [themselves]' (Rose 2007: 143). Therefore, power, like discourse, is rather dispersed. Foucault (1979: 95 cited in Rose 2007: 143) acknowledged that 'where there is power, there is...a multiplicity of resistance'. Thus, many discourses compete to structure how subjects understand the world; however, particular discourses are more dominant than others. It is of interest to this research to uncover any competing discourses structuring camera surveillance in cinema.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Several themes in the literature pertinent to this thesis research are evident in the surveillance studies literature generally and in the surveillance in cinema literature more specifically. The section on 'Surveillance Research' discusses social inequalities, resistance, and the efficacy of camera surveillance, whereas the section on 'Surveillance in Cinema Research' discusses realism, privacy, infallibility of camera surveillance,

scenes with camera surveillance images as tools for acceptance or as resistance of the technology, and sub-veillance. However, the subsection ‘Normalization Research’ that follows briefly discusses previous research on surveillance normalization.

Normalization Research

Recent literature on surveillance normalization focuses solely on the UK and only briefly examines one media outlet that facilitates normalization (see Murakami Wood and Webster 2009 and 2011). Murakami Wood and Webster (2009; 2011) argue that camera surveillance provides the public with some ease that something is being done about domestic crime. Second, it implies a form of brotherly care rather than just Big Brother; it is a caring gaze over citizens and not solely a disciplinary gaze. Third, the media’s use of surveillance as entertainment has made surveillance part of the UK’s cultural landscape. Essentially, reality TV has helped citizens become accustomed to the fact that surveillance is experienced in everyday life, and to take enjoyment from it; it has ‘train[ed] our eyes and minds for surveillance’ (Murakami Wood and Webster 2009: 264). Yet, their explanation alone cannot establish how surveillance has become normalized, thus leaving a gap to be filled. This thesis therefore examines how North America has normalized camera surveillance by analyzing scenes with camera surveillance images in Hollywood cinema.

Surveillance Research

Within a surveillance society, everyone is suspect. This idea is true yet quite misleading because it suggests that everyone is surveilled equally, when in actuality, surveillance varies in intensity and intrusiveness (Lyon 2007: 25). Certain groups are still targeted for more intensive surveillance for various reasons, including suspicion and voyeuristic pleasure – such as in the case of camera operators recording images of female

body parts (Norris and Armstrong 1999). As can be noted from above many social inequalities arise due to surveillance technologies. Social inequalities refer to differential treatments among groups based on social issues, which include (but are not limited to) gender, class, and race (see Tepperman, Curtis and Kwan 2007). Generally, social inequalities are established or maintained by two mechanisms: social sorting and marginalizing surveillance (Monahan 2010: 9-10). Social sorting implies that groups are organized based on characteristics, and that pressure is applied to the individuals involved within each group to prevent deviation from their group. This is evident in commodity consumption with the ‘preferential treatment of the relatively affluent [such as for instance] discounts based on past purchases’ (Monahan 2010: 9). Traditional social sorting was obviously discriminatory, whereas contemporary social sorting is viewed as not necessarily so since people have a tendency to believe that these technological systems are neutral and not inherently discriminatory (Monahan 2010: 10). Surveillance is marginalizing since it focuses on marginalized populations; it applies ‘enhanced control [on] populations considered to be risky, dangerous, or untrustworthy’ (Monahan 2010: 10). This includes, for instance, the intensive surveillance of welfare recipients (Monahan 2010: 10). Therefore, not only are there individual concerns about surveillance systems but social concerns as well, where in our contemporary society ‘[s]ocial exclusions and inequalities become mere collateral damage’ (Monahan 2010: 11). One theme, therefore, that this thesis explores is whether social inequalities have been depicted in cinema.

For something to become normalized it must receive little or no resistance. Marx (2003) described 11 techniques of resistance to surveillance by surveillance subjects, which also can be applied to resistance of camera surveillance. These techniques, used to ‘avoid suspicion and sanctioning’ (Marx 2009: 297), are not mutually exclusive and at

times may overlap in certain instances. Countersurveillance, as Marx describes it, is a 'role reversal as subjects apply the tactics to agents' (2009: 298), essentially turning the surveillant gaze onto the surveillers. Koskela (2004) extends countersurveillance to include private home webcams, since webcams empower the individual while resisting the shame and desire to hide. In essence, by displaying their lives to millions these individuals become free. Individuals gain power but not necessarily control as a result.³

A second theme in this thesis examines whether camera surveillance captures acts of resistance to camera surveillance as discussed by Marx (2003) and extended by Koskela (2004). As well, previous research suggests that surveillance is only perceived negatively by citizens when used against those considered to be within society, such as law-abiding citizens, rather than those who are not, such as criminals (Barnard-Wills 2011: 563; see also Finn and McCahill 2010). Therefore, I also determined what social class or position (insider or outsider) the resisters belong to within the community. In turn, questions of resistance were linked to whether the norm of camera surveillance is in fact a normalizing norm as defined by Foucault.

Scholars worry that the lack of opposition to implementing more camera surveillance systems has led citizens to forget that these systems pose real threats to both individuals and groups within a society (Murakami Wood and Webster 2009; 2011). What is most puzzling to scholars is the acceptance of camera surveillance in society when there is a lack of actual evidence that these surveillance systems are truly efficient (Lyon et al. 2012: 3). Most evaluations offer ambiguous conclusions or inconclusive results (see Verga 2010). Independent and government studies time and again suggest that camera surveillance is limited as an effective preventative measure since it is reliant upon factors such as type of crime and location of the cameras (Verga 2010: 10). A cross-

international survey examining citizens' perceptions of camera surveillance determined that almost half of the respondents in North America believed camera surveillance to be somewhat effective in reducing crime (Dawson 2012). But why is this the case when such evidence is lacking? It is possible that cinema may overemphasize the efficacy of camera surveillance. Thus, this thesis also assesses whether cinema depicts camera surveillance as efficient for crime fighting purposes.

Surveillance in Cinema Research

While other areas of media have been heavily studied, cinema's portrayal of camera surveillance practices has been less widely discussed. Relatively little research has examined surveillance in cinema. Usually within cinema, researchers study crime films – typically defined as films that include some relation to crime and criminal justice – by analyzing potential interpretations of what these films convey (for example see Allen, Livingstone and Reiner 1998; Rafter 2006).

As established earlier, the embedment of scenes with camera surveillance images appears to be increasing in the cinema culture. Levin (2002) examined films from the 1990s to early 2000s and noticed that many newer films were more often using narration of surveillance through a recorded image (allowing for the captured footage to narrate the story), such as in *Thelma and Louise*, while even more recent approaches to narration incorporate real time observation, such as in *Snake Eyes*, where characters watch live monitors to follow persons of interest. Levin argues that there has been a shift in cinema from spatial indexicality to a temporal indexicality, the latter being referred to as a 'guaranteed' fact, since it is uninterrupted by manipulation and occurs in 'real time' (2002: 592). Thus, 'while cinema's primary category was that of *space* (pro-filmic space, photographic space, narrative space), the semiotic signature of television is ... *time*'

(Levin 2002: 592). Accordingly, by taking on this new narration, cinema becomes a more believable reality, since what viewers see in the real time image is happening at that moment of viewing and is less susceptible to digital manipulation. Research, in general, has linked camera surveillance to the perception of certain realism, especially if viewed in real time (Levin 2002). Camera surveillance footage is associated with the notion that 'seeing is believing' and that the camera never lies (Doyle 2006: 211). The theme of realism is examined in this thesis too.

In addition, this thesis explores Levin's two suggested distinctions of the use of camera surveillance and determined which is presented more frequently, but rather than referring to Levin's terms, 'real time observations' and 'recorded', I refer to them as 'in-the-moment' and 'after-the-fact', respectively. As well, since the use of these two distinctions of in-the-moment and after-the-fact could involve crime deterrence, crime capture, and/or types of resistance, I investigated these themes as well.

Most researchers studying surveillance in cinema attempt to discover concurrent themes within films by analyzing several films at a time. Albrechtslund (2008) notes that films, as well as television series, focused on disasters (e.g. terrorist attacks) typically ignored ethical issues of the potential privacy invasion surveillers impose unto surveillance subjects. These films and TV series engage in a utilitarian justification for their gaze. In general, privacy violations have not been thoroughly examined in cinema and, therefore, another theme this thesis explored was whether privacy has been violated, and if so, whether it was somehow justified.

Kammerer (2004) analyzed three Hollywood films (*Enemy of the State*, *Minority Report*, and *Panic Room*) with surveillance as the primary theme and found that a central feature of the first two films was the flawlessness of technology. According to Kammerer

(2004), these films attest to the infallibility of the technology of surveillance; only human misinterpretation of the images is error prone, and not the technology itself. This thesis seeks to determine whether this is evident within Hollywood films too.

Turner's (1998) research consists of a relatively large sample of films and television series analyzed within the context of surveillance. Turner believes that the overabundance of depictions of surveillance in media 'transforms the will and practice of the surveillance society into a spectacle' (1998: 107) – which translates resistance of surveillance 'into objects or images of consumption' (1998: 95) – and reduces the anxiety of constant surveillance to that of voyeuristic pleasure. Turner believes these films reduce 'audiences to passivity' and acceptance of technology, while 'Kammerer...view[s] these texts as potentially progressive,...inspir[ing audiences] to question and resist negative trends, while critically assessing technological changes as positives' (Lake 2010: 234). These two distinct perspectives concerning the function of surveillance in cinema is explored through this thesis, and linked to Foucault's work on normalization.

More often cinematic researchers will discuss, at length, the relevance of one film to contemporary society. In a study of the film *Red Road*, for example, Lake (2010: 232) recognizes that traditional surveillers depicted in cinema are white, middle-class men and that research largely classifies the distinction among the surveillers and surveillance subjects as ideological, while ignoring other distinctions such as gender, race, class and sexuality. *Red Road* is unique in that it recognizes other possible surveillers and challenges traditional power dynamics for it is not the expected male doing the surveilling, but rather a female voyeur. Lake describes the film as a 'sub-veillance' thriller and is considered to be so because women have traditionally never been in power. Lake (2010: 235) describes sub-veillance as watching that is administered 'by those

traditionally positioned in social and political relations as subordinates', such as children, women, and non-white racial minorities. Lake's view of sub-veillance and traditional roles of power relations also relates to questions of inequalities noted earlier. Many researchers in fact examine entire films that focus on surveillance like this. This thesis, however, tries to move beyond the study of a single film or relatively small multiple film analysis sample by using a broader sample. It examines a multitude of films across various genres to understand how cinema is a conduit of messages for the acceptance of camera surveillance specifically. Also, this previous research focused on plots rich with scenes of camera surveillance images and technologies while films studied in this thesis did not necessarily rely on surveillance, nor were they necessarily 'crime films'; each film in the sample (see Appendix B) needed only to include at least one scene with a camera surveillance image.

As can be noted from the literature review above, normalization and cinema have not been entirely overlooked in surveillance studies. And several key themes come out of this previous research that should be addressed in this thesis research, which are social inequalities, resistance, the effectiveness of camera surveillance for crime fighting, privacy and realism. This research examines the subtle ways surveillance is incorporated into films, just like in real life.

The overarching research question of this thesis is: how have Hollywood films facilitated the normalization of surveillance within society? An examination of this topic requires several subquestions based on the literature review and found in the paragraphs that follow: Do scenes with camera surveillance images in cinema depict social inequalities such as marginalization? Do these images depict public resistance to camera surveillance as suggested by Marx (2003) and extended by Koskela (2004)? Do images

suggest the efficacy of camera surveillance? Are camera surveillance images viewed in-the-moment or as a recorded image after-the-fact, and do these images have anything to do with crime deterrence, crime capture, or resistance? Was the camera surveillance violating an individual's privacy? Was camera surveillance depicted as capturing reality? However, it should be noted that these questions are not mutually exclusive; often the analysis of one question relates to another. As well, these questions and themes are not exhaustive and do not limit the entire amount of research that took place within this thesis. Other themes were identified during the research process.

METHODOLOGY: OPERATIONIZATION AND RESEARCH PROCEDURES

In what follows I describe how the subquestions were operationalized and describe the research procedures in detail to answer how have Hollywood films facilitated the normalization of surveillance within society?

Operationalization

First, do scenes with camera surveillance images in cinema depict social inequalities such as marginalization? To examine this I determined who were the targets of surveillance and why as well as who were the surveillers and whether the camera surveillance system was being used for its supposed or stated purpose. In addition, I took note of whether images contained sub-surveillance by acknowledging the age, sex, race, and social class of the surveillers and surveillance subjects, and through what technology the surveillance had been undertaken (e.g. a security camera or a cell phone). If social inequalities were depicted, I then determined whether the surveillance of the targeted individual seemed justified based on the outcome in the film (e.g. targeted individual was a criminal). From an audience perspective, the audience would most likely agree that camera surveillance is justified if the surveillance subject is truly a criminal, for example,

it was proven that the subject had stolen private property, hurt or killed others, especially in cold blood. If these crimes, however, occurred as a result of a just cause, for instance, the crime occurred in a case of self-defence, or occurred when a subject was reclaiming an object that was rightfully theirs, and so on, then the audience would most likely not agree with the surveillance.

According to law, a criminal is someone who has actually broken the criminal code. In films, however, sometimes the antagonists (the criminals) are actually the protagonists (the heroes). The audience often becomes connected with these individuals and therefore want the criminal to succeed; however, the audience would not be outraged if these criminal protagonists are being surveilled.

Do these images depict public resistance to camera surveillance as suggested by Marx (2003) and extended by Koskela (2004)? For example, I determined whether subjects hid from camera surveillance, or used it for empowerment. I then determined whether resisters were considered to be generally law-abiding citizens or outsiders (suspects or criminals) of society. At times, however, these categories were fluid and overlapped.

Do images suggest the efficacy of camera surveillance? To determine this, I examined whether camera surveillance captured a crime, the type of crime captured, and whether criminals were eventually brought to justice (arrested or convicted) by the image. Are camera surveillance images viewed in-the-moment or as a recorded image after-the-fact, and do these images have anything to do with crime deterrence, crime capture, or resistance? Once it was determined whether the camera surveillance image was being viewed in real time or as a recording, it was then analyzed for any connection to crime deterrence, crime capture, and resistance.

Was the camera surveillance violating an individual's privacy? Citizens still maintain certain privacy expectations, such as privacy from surveillance in one's home or in public restrooms (Lyon 2007: 174). I determined whether privacy was violated by examining the location of the camera surveillance (e.g. home or public restroom), as well as determining who was surveilling, why surveillance was being undertaken, and whether surveillance subjects knew they were being surveilled. If privacy was determined to have been violated, I then examined whether the intrusion was later justified based on the outcome of the surveillance subjects (e.g. the person is actually a criminal).

Was camera surveillance depicted as capturing reality (what actually happened versus what the camera surveillance captured)? Realism was determined through an examination of whether there was doubt of the surveillance image (i.e. doubt over what events the camera surveillance actually captured) by any observers of the image. This question involved examining the dialogue of characters within the films.

Research Procedures

This thesis required two basic types of research methods. The first was a quantitative content analysis, which is a popular method for examining media images (Yar 2010: 70). Researchers take incidents of interest and catalogue them according to established criteria to search for emerging patterns (Krippendorff 2004). However, putting the incidents of interest into predetermined categories for this research would have only limited the ability to detect patterns, as many times events cannot easily be placed into mutually exclusive categories. Therefore, these incidents were not catalogued into broad categories but instead were placed into categories that were reduced to their minimal description. Categories were sometimes formed after the fact for a more generalized discussion. The content analysis addressed questions such as who, what,

where, why, and when, and noted the frequencies of the answers. Appendix A contains all aspects examined in the content analysis.

One major limitation of a content analysis, as Yar (2010: 71) acknowledges, is that ‘counting the frequency or incidence of representations does little to help [researchers] understand the meanings of those representations’. In order to better discern meaning, therefore, a content analysis was accompanied by a qualitative critical discourse analysis. This thesis is concerned with ‘the notion of discourse as articulated through various kinds of visual images’ (Rose 2007: 146). More particularly this thesis is concerned with those visual images depicting camera surveillance within cinematic representation; thus, any film images that are of camera surveillance. A critical discourse analysis allows researchers ‘to explore how images construct specific views of the social world’ (Rose 2007: 146). A critical discourse analysis helps to uncover any competing discourses to understand how Hollywood cinema constructs camera surveillance.

The critical discourse analysis identified themes following two processes: open coding and focused coding. The open coding began with the examination of images without previously formulated categories (Babbie and Benaquisto 2002: 382); essentially images were examined with ‘fresh eyes’ (Rose 2007: 157). Focused coding followed open coding, for which I subjected the images to predetermined themes of interest (developed from open coding), which provided the major themes for the final analysis (Babbie and Benaquisto 2002: 382). Following Foucault’s work on discourse analysis (see Rose 2007), this thesis is not interested in why scenes with camera surveillance images are present in films, such as why producers or directors included the image, but more so with what the images mean for the audience.

The two research methods were complimentary, and allowed for a better interpretation of how each scene with a camera surveillance image could be relevant, while taking into account how often similar events occurred in the sample. The combination of the quantitative and qualitative research methods brings both rigour and flexibility. A content analysis is more rigorous than a discourse analysis in the sense that a content analysis is expected to be replicable (Krippendorff 2004: 18). A discourse analysis is more flexible than a content analysis and allows for the capturing of new themes without spending vast amounts of time revising categories and reviewing already coded images (Rose 2007: 161).

I referred to the images of camera surveillance that I recorded as ‘camera surveillance images’, which included both stills and moving documentation (or footage), but excluded images from infrared cameras. The term also included both surveillance from authority figures (e.g. state agencies and corporate elites) and non-authority figures (e.g. non-state agents) using devices such as surveillance cameras, handheld cameras, mobile phone cameras, webcams, handheld camcorders, or exposure to mass media (newspaper and broadcast news).

The primary unit of analysis was not the entire film, but film scenes that depicted camera surveillance images. To enter this sample, films had to incorporate at least one scene of a camera surveillance image that created a plot change or provided doubt over the image or captured a criminal act. Plot changes are divided into two categories: minor and major. A ‘minor plot change’ is defined as an event captured on camera surveillance and the viewing of the image changes the current direction of the plot, for instance, a suspect is identified. These events are typically expected by the audience. A ‘major plot change’ is defined as an event that changes the course of the plot that typically surprises

the audience and not just characters in the film, such as figuring out the true culprit of a crime. These images were then subjected to further analysis, such as determining whether the image captured resistance to camera surveillance.

The Sample

To answer my research question this thesis engaged in a different approach from almost all previous analyses of surveillance in cinema. Rather than examining one or a few films at a time, I examined scenes from 30 Hollywood films that have been screened in American and Canadian movie theatres from 1998 to 2011. Rather than only being about surveillance this sample represented most genres including (but not limited to) action, comedy, drama, horror, and thriller, and excluding animation or documentary films. Also, the sample only included films that depicted the present time period, and excluded films that depict the past or future. Films from the past were excluded since many of them do not depict current capabilities of camera surveillance, as discussed below. Films depicting the future were excluded since this thesis is more concerned with how films depict camera surveillance in current times, rather than how camera surveillance is perceived to be in the future (although it is acknowledged that these kinds of films could also lead to normalization of camera surveillance). The reason for narrowing the cinematic choices to Hollywood films, rather than all films made in America, is that films that have been screened in theatres are more likely to reach a larger audience than straight-to-DVD films.⁴ The 30 films chosen (see Appendix B) should not be considered exhaustive, however, it is an adequate sample size for research purposes.

Camera surveillance had been depicted in cinema long before the time period I have targeted, dating back to the 1890s (Zimmer 2011). However, surveillance does not actually become central to a range of films until the 1990s (Levin 2002: 583). Therefore,

the specific starting point of 1998 should not be viewed as a cap. However, since the 1990s there has been a movement away from analogue cameras (i.e. closed-circuit television systems) and closed networks to digital techniques, which allow for better quality and a greater ability to transmit, store, analyze, and encode images (Ferenbok and Clement 2012: 220). Through Levin's analysis of cinema, among others, it appears that many of the films prior to 1998 relied on analogue cameras. Based on this fact, it is more appropriate to study films featured since the late 1990s as these films likely used newer digital surveillance systems, which currently tend to be the most prolific in western societies.

Unfortunately, subtle incorporations of scenes with camera surveillance images meant that no search engine would aid in determining my sample. Therefore, films were gathered based on previous research, my previous knowledge of viewing the film, and through recommendations from others. All films were (re-)watched from start to finish in order to determine whether the film should enter into the sample.

A summary of selection criteria for this sample is as follows: films entered the sample if they were released into American and Canadian movie theatres between 1998 and 2011; films depicted the present time period; and films included at least one scene with a camera surveillance image, excluding infrared cameras, that was of relevance to the plot or for other research purposes (i.e. including whether the image captured a crime or identified a suspect). Films were rejected from the sample if they did not possess the aforementioned criteria as well as if they were animated or documentary films and if they depicted a time period in the past or future. All of the aforementioned themes helped to discern surveillance normalization in North America, and additional themes were

discovered during the actual research process. The results are discussed in the next section.

RESULTS

Introduction

A total of 30 films were included in this research, all of which are listed in Appendix B. For films that were part of a series – classified as two or more films in a set – only one film from the series was included for research purposes in order to not bias the sample to a particular genre. The genre for each film was noted from the website IMDB,⁵ a popular website used to gather information about films and their various components. The films varied in genre, though IMDB does not necessarily classify films into only one genre but as many as three different genres. Genres included in this research were action, adventure, comedy, crime, drama, horror, mystery, romance, and thriller.

This ‘Results’ section is divided into subsections. The first includes the findings of the content analysis. The findings from the critical discourse analysis are then discussed in the second subsection. It is appropriate to use different sections to discuss the results of the two methods since, although there is some overlap between the two, valuable information was gleaned by one method but not by the other.

Content Analysis

A total of 70 images were coded in the content analysis. At least one scene with a camera surveillance image was coded per film and as many as five scenes were coded for several individual films. Scenes with camera surveillance images were primarily coded if either a minor or major plot change occurred or if the image captured important events that did not lead to a change but were relevant to the research, such as an image that captured a crime or doubt stated over the image. If a camera surveillance image was

repeatedly shown during the film, the image that provided the most relevance to the plot was coded. This section discusses the findings through different subsections, previously highlighted through the literature. The subsections begin with a discussion about: where and how surveillance occurred, images depicting women and minorities, reasons for surveillance, plot changes, realism, privacy, resistance, and lastly, the efficacy of camera surveillance. Tables are provided for sections containing more than several categories

Where and How Surveillance Occurred

To answer where surveillance occurred, it was necessary to consider two separate possible venues for surveillance. The first venue included the location of the actual camera surveillance device. The second venue included the location in which camera surveillance images were actually viewed or reviewed. Both venues yielded locations contained in the same general categories – government, private company, personal dwellings, public, and other – though the frequency of occurrences for these categories did vary. The category ‘government’ includes camera surveillance that occurred in government operated facilities, such as images captured or viewed in locations operated by the CIA, FBI, or state police, as well as within court rooms, government buildings, prisons, military bases, and the White House. For example, camera surveillance is established and monitored in the CIA headquarters in the film *Salt*. The category ‘private company’ includes areas owned by a private corporation, such as casinos, train stations, stores, cruise ships, arenas, nightclubs, buses and hotels. In *Snake Eyes*, a camera surveillance system was established within a privately operated casino and the images were also viewed from within the security room of the casino. The category ‘personal dwellings’ includes locations that are owned or rented by an individual and are considered to be private, such as one’s apartment, home, or hotel room. In *State of Play*, a

group of journalists establish camera surveillance in the hotel room next to their own in order to surveil an individual in that hotel room. Images captured outside in public, such as on streets, beaches, parks, and cities are categorized as ‘public’ locations. In *Eagle Eye*, for instance, a camera surveillance drone is deployed to a small city in the Middle East in order to identify terrorists. In another example, the recording of a discussion of how a murder was about to take place was viewed outside in a city park in the film *15 Minutes*. The category ‘other’ includes various and unknown locations, such as in *American Pie*, where many different students were watching an image from a webcam in their home or place of work.

In scenes with camera surveillance images, images were most prevalently captured at the location of a private company, occurring in 28 scenes (40%). This was then followed by images captured in personal dwellings with 19 scenes (27.1%), in public with 11 scenes (15.7%), followed by in government buildings with ten scenes (14.3%) and other locations with two scenes (2.9%). For location of viewing or reviewing camera surveillance images, 24 (34.3%) images were viewed at a private company, 22 images (31.4%) in government locations, 17 images (24.3%) in personal dwellings, three images (4.3%) in public, and four images (5.7%) in other locations. In this respect, the location of camera surveillance devices as well as the location of viewing and reviewing camera surveillance images both occurred most frequently within locations owned by a private company. (See Table 1 for space in which images were captured and Table 2 for the location of viewing and reviewing camera surveillance images).

Table 1: Space in which Images Were Captured

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Private Company	28	40

Personal Dwellings	19	27.1
Government	10	14.3
Public	11	15.7
Other	2	2.9
Total	70	100

Table 2: Location of Viewing and Reviewing Images

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Private Company	24	34.3
Personal Dwellings	17	24.3
Government	22	31.4
Public	3	4.3
Other	4	5.7
Total	70	100

As well, in 37 scenes with camera surveillance images the images were captured and viewed within the same location. Therefore, if the image was captured on private property, there was approximately a 50 per cent chance that the image was also viewed within that same private property. As an example, if an incident occurred at a casino or airport, the image was viewed from the security room of these locations. If the location of the camera surveillance was at a home the image was also viewed in another location of the home. For instance, in *Fracture*, Ted Crawford (played by Anthony Hopkins) – a wealthy entrepreneur – uses his camera surveillance to see if others outside of his home have been made aware of the gun shots that occurred inside his home, in order to

commence his clever plan of being acquitted of his wife's murder. However, in over half of the scenes with camera surveillance images the images were viewed from different locations than where the image took place. In *The Bourne Ultimatum*, for instance, a reporter is followed by camera surveillance located in a train station, but the images are being observed from the headquarters of the CIA. In *Eagle Eye*, a camera surveillance drone is surveilling a small city in the Middle East while the images are being viewed from a US military base. It thus appears as if camera surveillance can transcend boundaries of space.

The majority camera surveillance images – 48 images (68.6%) – were captured from camera surveillance intended to surveil. There were 19 camera surveillance images (27.1%) captured from devices not intended to be used as surveillance, such as TV broadcasts and print news (where approximately half of these images were found), as well as handheld camcorders, webcams, cell phones, or cameras meant to capture sporting events. For the remaining three camera surveillance images (4.3%) the type of camera used to capture the image was unknown. Although the majority of images were from camera surveillance, other means of capturing the image were also used, suggesting that surveillance can not only be administered through a standard camera surveillance but through any technology with the capability to capture an image.

Images Depicting Women and Minorities

In order to determine who the surveillers were in these films, 67 scenes with camera surveillance images were eligible for coding. Two scenes were excluded because the identity of the surveiller was unclear, and another was excluded because the image was only viewed by artificial intelligence (in *Eagle Eye*). Of the eligible scenes with camera surveillance images, 38 (56.7%) scenes depicted women and minorities. More

specifically, when breaking down the 38 scenes with camera surveillance images, 27 scenes included women, 20 black men, and three included other racial minorities (Asian and Arab). Five scenes depicted only female surveillers, ages ranging from adolescence to middle-aged though all with upper class status. Only four scenes included black women. Relatively few male and female surveillers seemed to be less than 30 years of age. Of the 67 scenes with camera surveillance images, 59 scenes included white men, whereas 29 (43.3%) included only white men, and 40 scenes included men of all races. No persons of lower socioeconomic standing – as identified through character backstories in the film – were depicted as surveillers.

Men were depicted far more often as surveillers than women, and women were typically only surveillers when paired with men. Furthermore, although it would appear that racial minorities were depicted often, black male surveillers were usually always in the presence of and outnumbered by white male surveillers. Only on one occasion was the sole surveiller black and on only one occasion did black surveillers outnumber white. Therefore, the most frequently depicted surveiller is a white man, typically middle-aged. As well, almost all of the surveillers were in positions of power, not just because they were the ones surveilling but because they belonged to a state apparatus or private security firm, and thus were granted permission to gaze.

It can be established that none of these films were sub-veillance films as defined by Lake (2010). It appears that sub-veillance films are not as popular as traditional surveillance films. However, there was a higher likelihood of finding sub-veillance scenes embedded within traditional surveillance films. The presence of sub-veillance scenes was still few and far between though. In the 30 films chosen, the only film to closely resemble a sub-veillance film was *Panic Room*, which tells the story of a newly divorced wife and

her adolescent daughter who are forced to spend the first night in their new apartment trapped in their panic room while robbers break into their home. These women watch as the robbers struggle to break into the panic room in order to get something of value that is inside. For approximately three quarters of the film the women were the surveillers and thus these were sub-veillance scenes. However, towards the end of the film the men became the surveillers.

There were 57 eligible coded scenes with camera surveillance images for surveillance subjects. Five scenes with camera surveillance images were excluded since the images involved unknown subjects, indicating that although a person was in the camera surveillance image their face was concealed. As well, an additional eight scenes were excluded since images depicted objects (including vehicles, houses, and images of written materials). Examining the race and sex of surveillance subjects, 25 camera surveillance images (43.9%) included women and minorities: 14 included women (no black women were depicted), eight were black men, and four included other minorities (Hispanic, Asian, and Arab). Of the 57 scenes with camera surveillance images, 32 images (56.1%) included only white men. Thus, the typical surveillance subject was a white man.

Reasons for Surveillance

There was large variation concerning why surveillance occurred, though there were several broad reoccurring themes. The most common reason for surveillance was identifying or observing criminal suspects or persons of interest through camera surveillance, which occurred in 29 scenes with camera surveillance images (41.4%). This is discussed in greater detail below in the subsection on 'The Efficacy of Camera Surveillance'. A second common reason for surveillance was due to routine surveillance

– occurring in 15 scenes (21.4%) – in which individuals usually noticed something of interest through their routine monitoring of camera surveillance. In these circumstances, surveillance systems were already established in a static location prior to knowledge of events taking place, and any discovery was made as a result of individuals consistently watching these cameras. For example, in the film *After the Sunset*, a camera surveillance system was established around a valuable diamond to prevent theft. While watching the camera surveillance, security officers witnessed a robbery taking place. Another common reason for surveillance was that the camera that had captured the image was originally used for documentation, occurring in 16 scenes (22.9%). In these circumstances, the image was initially used to document a character’s personal life or some event but through different circumstance became used for surveillance. For instance, in *The Perfect Getaway*, a couple documented their wedding through pictures on a handheld camcorder, and these pictures later provided a major plot change within the film. Furthermore, the documentation on some occasions occurred due to news sources. In *Showtime*, a television news channel overhears of a potential story on a police scanner and decides to head to the location in order to film where this story may develop. At the same time a drug deal is taking place, and moments later the dealers see their hideout on television and assume the others involved in the drug transaction are police officers.

Ten scenes with camera surveillance images (14.2%) displayed the capturing of an event on camera surveillance due simply to chance or curiosity. For example, a couple in the film *Vacancy* is forced to spend the night in an isolated motel. The husband becomes curious of the videotapes that happen to be on top of the television and decides to put one of the tapes into the VCR. He watches the video as horrific (but believed at the time to be fictitious) events of torture and murder unfold. As he continues to watch the video he

examines it closely and begins to realize that the room depicted in the image is the exact same room that he and his wife currently occupy. The couple eventually realizes that they have entered a motel where people are murdered and videotaped for sport. In some scenes with camera surveillance images the camera surveillance system was already established but there was no routine observation of it. In *Panic Room*, Meg Altman (Jodie Foster) has returned to her bed from a midnight bathroom run, though before she can return to sleep she is disturbed by a blinding, bright light from the panic room in her bedroom. While in the room to turn this light off, she notices movement in the camera surveillance image, and begins to realize that there are strangers in her house. (See Table 3 for a summary of the general reasons surveillance was undertaken).

Table 3: Reasons for Surveillance

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Identify/Observe Persons	29	41.4
Documentation	16	22.9
Routine Surveillance	15	21.4
Chance/Curiosity	10	14.2
Total	70	100

Regarding the general reasons why individuals are targeted for surveillance, it would appear that these films did not depict social inequalities. For instance, women were generally not the targets of surveillance by a voyeuristic male gaze. Black men were rarely the targets of surveillance, and when they were it was usually for unjust reasons such as in *Enemy of the State* where the targeting of a black man occurred because of a personal vendetta. It is difficult to determine, for the most part, whether surveillance from

previously established camera surveillance occurred for its intended purpose since the true intent of the camera surveillance was not discussed within the films. Therefore, marginalizing surveillance was not observed. As well, social sorting did not tend to occur within these films. Particular subsets of the population did not seem to be placed into categories of risk, and thus favoritism was not observed. To conclude, no social inequalities, concerning surveillers, surveillance subjects, and reasons for surveillance were actually documented in these films.

Plot Changes

It does appear that films have been increasingly using camera surveillance as an intricate part of plot development. The importance of a scene with a camera surveillance image appeared multiple times within a film, though, relatively few scenes with camera surveillance images within these 30 films led to major plot changes. Only eight (11.4%) of 70 scenes with camera surveillance images or seven (23.3%) of the 30 films led to a major plot change. These changes included discovering the true identity of a person (typically their culpability or extent thereof). On one occasion in the film *Saw II* it was discovered that the images were not in real time. On another occasion the image did not capture a major change but led to one. This occurred in the film *Salt*, where the image of Evelyn Salt (Angelina Jolie) in the White House led an undercover Russian spy to reveal himself.

By far, the greatest use of scenes with camera surveillance images across films was to create a minor plot change. Minor plot changes occurred in 50 (71.4%) of 70 scenes with camera surveillance images or in 27 (90%) of the 30 films. This indicates that camera surveillance is quite often used in film to lead to valuable information. The majority of the time the effects of the change occurred immediately following the image,

though on three occasions viewing the image led to effects later in the film. For instance, knowledge of a videotape led Robert Clayton Dean (Will Smith) in *Enemy of the State* to bring two of his nemeses together for a confrontation in which he was victorious over both. The most popular use of images leading to a minor plot change – occurring in 38 scenes with camera surveillance images – involved identifying or locating suspects or persons of interest as well as images having to do with crime, which will be discussed in depth later in this thesis. Twelve scenarios could not be labelled under a broad theme and were therefore classified as ‘other’. For instance, in *Hall Pass*, the wife decided to give her husband a week off from marriage, termed a ‘hall pass’, after viewing camera surveillance footage from the inside of a panic room. After the entire school views the humiliating scene that took place in Jim Levenstein’s (Jason Biggs) bedroom in *American Pie*, Levenstein becomes the laughing stock of the entire school, but eventually obtains a prom date because of it. Camera surveillance footage also led to the discrediting of a politician due to the discovery of an affair in *State of Play*. In *Dawn of the Dead*, the chance viewing of a camera surveillance image led to the introduction of new characters into the plot. As can be noted, camera surveillance is often used for purposes other than catching a criminal. As surveillance technologies (and technological capacities) increase, Hollywood has become increasingly creative as to what camera surveillance can actually capture. There were 11 (15.7%) scenes with camera surveillance images that did not lead to either a minor or major plot change but were used to capture a crime or state doubt over the camera surveillance image, which will be discussed in the subsections following.

Realism

There was essentially little doubt offered in films about the authenticity of the images captured by camera surveillance. There were 69 scenes with camera surveillance

images eligible for analysis in examining doubt; one was eliminated since only artificial intelligence viewed the image. There were eight scenes with camera surveillance images (11.6%) that contained some degree of doubt. Of the eight scenes, four contained initial doubt, meaning that characters were in disbelief or disagreement at the beginning of viewing the camera surveillance image but quickly came to believe or understand the implications of the image. For instance, the dialogue for initial doubt in the film *Vacancy* consisted of just one short sentence: ‘That can’t be real!’. In *Street Kings*, a shooting of a police officer was caught on camera surveillance and there was a discussion of doubt over what the image appeared to represent:

Tom: It’s not what it looks like. It’s not

Jack: That’s all there is Tom, what it looks like. What everybody sees... The DA sees this, ... [you’re] going to prison...

Tom: Why, cause Washington was in the wrong place at the wrong time?

Jack: No cause you were....Captain Biggs will say that you got two thugs off the street and went after a cop who was dimming you out to internal affairs.

In this scene from *Street Kings*, there is the suggestion that the camera is not necessarily fully capturing reality. In fact, it misses the background information and intention of the character. Although the camera is recording reality, it is not capturing the full extent of that reality. However, at the same time, Tom (Keanu Reeves) begins to understand that when it comes to violence captured on camera, the full story does not necessarily matter. Essentially, what is occurring is that the visual image becomes more real than reality itself.⁶

Four scenes with camera surveillance images had complete doubt over what the image actually captured, which included two debates concerning positive identification and the other two concerning image representation. In *After the Sunset*, two FBI agents spot a suspect on a basketball arena’s kiss camera. The two agents believe the suspect is

in the building but another agent disagrees and requires the other two agents to have a direct visual on the suspect. In *Fracture*, the lack of a positive identification led to an argument between characters over how jurors will interpret the camera surveillance image:

Cop: You know it's him. Alright. There's no doubt that that guy is him.

Prosecutor: Well, there's no face.

Cop: So, we enhance it.... the point is that you're missing ... is that he's a psycho we just caught on tape.

Prosecutor: ...I don't have a face so I don't have him!... I'm not gonna end my career on a case where all I have is an enhanced hat.

This latter example exemplifies the fact that zooming in on the image will not reveal any more information, which is typically a topic of concern for the effectiveness of camera surveillance.⁷

Of the 69 eligible scenes with camera surveillance images in which someone could express doubt, 61 (88.4%) had no degree of doubt whatsoever. Essentially, whatever was displayed or discussed within the image was taken as fact or reality by the surveillers. There is no pause by characters watching the camera surveillance images to wonder if what they are seeing is what is actually happening, only blatant acceptance. In this respect, there is a suggestion that camera surveillance has no need to be doubted since what is depicted is supposedly reality. Neither the quality of the image, whether subpar or excellent, nor viewing the image in-the-moment or after-the-fact had an effect on whether doubt was discussed among characters.

Privacy

Of the 70 total scenes with camera surveillance images, 64 were eligible for coding concerning privacy. Six scenes with camera surveillance images were eliminated since the images did not include people, but rather images of objects. The majority of the

time – within 32 scenes – subjects were aware that they were under or could be under intense surveillance. In 23 scenes subjects were unaware of surveillance, and within the remaining seven scenes it was unclear whether or not subjects were aware. However, when subjects were unaware of intense surveillance, the scene typically took place in locations saturated with surveillance that were considered likely to have captured that character's image. Therefore, even though these characters were unaware, the surveillance occurred in locations where there is a lower expectation of privacy, such as out in public or within semi-private areas. As well, images that were captured when subjects were unaware were not captured by ordinary citizens but rather by members of authority (government or private security).

Of the 64 eligible scenes with camera surveillance images, there were only five occasions (7.1%) in which privacy was obviously violated, with two such occurrences found in the same film. In *15 Minutes*, two murderers broke into a publicly known detective's apartment to videotape his murder. In *Vacancy*, people were being recorded in their hotel room while being murdered. While it is implicit that characters' privacy were being violated since they did not overtly consent to the surveillance and since the surveillance occurred in a location where there is a strong expectation of privacy (i.e. a hotel room), it was impossible to tell if those in the images were actually consciously aware of this violation prior to their deaths. In an example from *State of Play*, a man believed to have knowledge of a conspiracy is being surveilled and his conversations recorded by surveillers in the hotel room beside the one in which he is staying. In the last occurrence of a privacy violation the victim was unaware of her violation until after the fact. In *American Pie*, the foreign exchange student is oblivious to the fact that the entire school is watching her undress in her classmate's bedroom.

Resistance

Resistance was observed in 15 (21.4%) of the scenes with camera surveillance images. By far, resistance occurred most frequently in-the-moment in ten of the 15 scenes. The most common form of resistance referred to as 'blocking' occurred in 11 camera surveillance images. Blocking according to Marx (2003) includes hiding one's face, such as when wearing a mask or simply by covering one's face with one's own hands. In the film *Showtime*, while two detectives are watching a television show they stumble across another employee of the police department in a nightclub known also to be the hangout of a dangerous arms dealer. They see this employee detect that he might be recognized as he then raises his hands in front of his face to protect his identity (though he was unaware that he was captured by the camera), which only draws more suspicion. Three of the scenes with camera surveillance images included blocking with empowerment. 'Empowerment' is defined as the subject directly interacting with camera surveillance instead of hiding from it (Koskela 2004). In *Inside Man*, for instance, the robbers directed the camera surveillance attached to a truck owned by the FBI to a room inside the bank where they proceeded to kill an individual (though it is later discovered that the murder was a hoax), to demonstrate to the officers that they were serious criminals. These robbers used the camera surveillance for empowerment (despite the fact that they were wearing masks) to maintain control and power of the situation. In *Panic Room*, the robbers are desperately trying to get Meg Altman and her daughter out of a panic room to retrieve something inside it. After Meg's ex-husband walks into the house, the robbers' position the ex-husband's driver's licence in front of a camera surveillance. After a moment it is removed and one of the robbers wearing a mask begins to assault her ex-husband, while the other expresses to the camera with his body language that the

assault will stop once the women open the door to the panic room. The robbers maintain power by being within the image, and are attempting to gain control.

One scene with a camera surveillance image of resistance included empowerment and countersurveillance. In *Ocean's Eleven*, Tess Ocean (Julia Roberts) receives a phone call instructing her to turn to a certain television channel. After finding the channel she watches an area inside of the casino where her boyfriend Terry Benedict (Andy Garcia) states that he is willing to end his relationship with her in order to receive information from her ex-husband, Danny Ocean (George Clooney), on the whereabouts of Benedict's stolen money. Benedict was entirely unaware that his own technology had been turned against him. Danny planned this scenario, and it ultimately led him to the return of his ex-wife. The image granted him power and control. Another scene with a camera surveillance image included only empowerment. In *Knight and Day*, a camera surveillance image believed to be used to turn against Roy Miller (Tom Cruise) in reality was used for the protection of June Havens (Cameron Diaz) to remove her from harm's way.

'Piggy backing' was the last form of resistance which was used in two of the scenes with camera surveillance images. Marx (2003) defines piggy backing as confronting camera surveillance head on by 'accompanying or being attached to a legitimate subject or object' (Marx 2003). For instance, in *The Bourne Ultimatum*, Jason Bourne (Matt Damon) is helping a reporter avoid being spotted by the camera surveillance in a train station by making the reporter blend into the crowd.

Of the 15 scenes with camera surveillance images containing some form of resistance, the majority of resistors were criminals. Resistors were classified into two categories: outsider but not criminal, and insider but criminal. Only two scenes were

recorded for outsider but not criminal, which indicates that these individuals were considered outsiders (outcasts from society) but were not actually criminals. For instance, Jason Bourne in *The Bourne Ultimatum* is constantly on the run because he is considered a threat to the CIA. However, he is by no means a criminal and would merely prefer to be left alone. Bourne does not use conventional forms of identification cards, however, it is possible that the camera surveillance can capture and broadcast his location. In *Knight and Day*, Roy Miller is on the run from a person of high authority in the CIA, who has given false information about him to the department. He is then hunted down by the CIA for the possession of a dangerous weapon, which he is actually trying to keep safe from the other agent who wishes to gain financially from it. Miller however is not a criminal.

Thirteen scenes with camera surveillance images were coded for the second category, which refers to those individuals who were masquerading as insiders (law-abiding citizens) but were truly criminal, and where resistance was used to hide this fact. In *The Score*, Nick Wells (Robert Di Nero) plays an established businessman during the day and a thief at night, and while on a heist wore a mask to protect his identity. In *Inside Man*, other than the fact that the robbers had guns, the robbers wore disguises similar to the hostages in order to pretend to be hostages and thus escape when the robbery was over. In some films, despite a disguise the identity of the character was still able to be determined via surveillance. For instance, in *Vantage Point*, although in the camera surveillance image Kent Taylor (Matthew Fox) wore a disguise, Thomas Barnes (Dennis Quaid) was able to recognise him as an actual criminal given the circumstances. The most frequent form of resistance, as defined by Marx (2002) for this category was blocking, seen in eight of the scenes with camera surveillance images.

The Efficacy of Camera Surveillance

As mentioned earlier, the most common form of a minor plot change – occurring within 26 of 70 scenes with camera surveillance images – was to identify or locate suspects or persons of interest. Of the 26 scenes, on 18 occasions suspects were identified or located, which created a minor plot change. In *The International*, Louis Salinger (Clive Owen) is searching for an assassin with an artificial leg. Through good police work he discovers a surveillance image of this potential assassin which eventually led to the assassin's identification. In *Traitor*, the FBI is on the hunt for those who may have been responsible for a terrorist attack in France. While surfing through various public camera surveillance images, the agents came across an image of a suspect believed to be involved with a terrorist organization. Of the 26 scenes persons of interest were discovered on eight occasions. Persons of interest refer to people who are relevant to an ongoing investigation but are not necessarily considered to be possible culprits. In *Saw II*, Eric Mathews' (Donny Walberg) son – among others – is discovered in one of the camera surveillances surveilling a house that is being exposed to a lethal toxin.

Furthermore, as discussed earlier, a primary reason for surveillance, which occurred in 28 of 70 scenes with camera surveillance images, was also to identify, locate, or observe suspects or persons of interest. Surveillers in this category were actively searching for or watching persons of interest or suspects. In *The Bourne Ultimatum*, the CIA is on the hunt for a source within its own ranks that is divulging classified information to a reporter. Through the process of elimination based on virtual evidence, the source has been narrowed down to three men. Photographs were taken of the apartment of the reporter to whom the source gave information for surveillance purposes. The CIA agents display the photographs and begin to look for clues as to the identity of

the suspect. Shortly after they find the initials of a CIA agent among the various photographs, and determine that he is the source.

Films that captured a crime included the genre of crime, thriller or both. Twelve of the 30 films included a camera surveillance scene which captured a crime. Of the 70 scenes with camera surveillance images, 25 images (35.7%) captured a crime. The most frequently occurring crime involved murder – occurring in 12 images – which also include a terrorist attack, conspiracy to commit murder, and attempted murder. On two occasions murder occurred in conjunction with another crime: murder while escaping police custody, and murder/torture. Robbery was the next most frequently occurring crime, and was captured within five of the images, including one break and enter. Assault occurred in three images. Escaping police custody occurred once on its own without the accompaniment of another crime. The remaining crimes were captured only once within the images: kidnapping, parole violation, sports fixing, and treason. (See Table 4 for a summary of the types of crime captured by camera surveillance within these 30 films). Crime was captured equally between in-the-moment and after-the-fact depictions. However, only attempted murder was captured in-the-moment whereas the rest of the images involving murder occurred after-the-fact.

Table 4: Type of Crime Captured in Images

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Crimes involving Murder	10	40
Murder with another crime	2	8
Robbery and Break and Enter	5	20
Assault	3	12

Other	5	20
Total	25	100

Of the 25 scenes with camera surveillance images that captured a crime, only six of these camera surveillance images led to some form of justice for culprits. Two of these images actually resulted in an arrest, though one of the arrests was intentionally arranged by the culprits. In the film *15 Minutes*, the video-recorded murder of a famous New York City detective was displayed to the world such that the culprits were intentionally arrested in order to make movie deals about their story. The other four images led to the death of the culprit. Two of these deaths occurred due to law enforcement while the remaining two were committed by others. In *Vantage Point*, the image of a fellow Secret Service agent caught on camera dressed in an Italian police officer's uniform leads Thomas Barnes to the realization that this agent is a traitor, and shortly after Barnes kills this traitor. In *Hostel Part II*, the audience watches a camera surveillance image in a security room as a man is about to murder a female victim. Shortly after, this man is murdered by one of the friends of this victim, who had knowledge that he was the culprit of the crime.

Examining crimes captured and whether they led to plot changes, of the 25 scenes with camera surveillance images that captured a crime five images did not lead to any plot changes. Only three images created a major plot change. In the film *Snake Eyes*, Rick Santoro (Nickolas Cage) is in a room in the casino arena that records pay-per-view events. Santoro requests to see a camera that faced the crowd rather than the main event. While watching he observes the terrorist shooter who assassinated the Secretary of Defence, as well as his long time friend Commander Kevin Dunn (Gary Sinise) who appeared to wait close by this shooter, with gun and hand, while the attack took place.

This indicated to Santoro that his long time friend was involved in the plot to kill the secretary. In two other scenes, the result of the camera surveillance image led to a major plot change within the film, where on both occasions criminals became identifiable. For example, in *The Perfect Getaway*, two couples have made their way to a popular beach in a secluded area. While on this beach, one woman decides to look at the wedding photos of the other newlywed couple on their handheld camcorder. As she flips through the images she sees that the image of the bride and groom is not the couple she has been spending time with, and in fact, this leads her to the realization that this couple is responsible for the recent murder of another newlywed couple.

There were 16 scenes with camera surveillance images that captured a crime which led to minor plot changes in these films. The after-effects of a camera surveillance image led to a variety of results for the plot. Five of these images led to the identification of suspects or persons of interest. Two images led to the commission of another crime. In *15 Minutes*, the discussion of the planned murder was captured on a handheld camcorder and later displayed to a reporter in a crowded area. Once this reporter expressed aloud what he had obtained, the result ended in a shootout. Two other images – occurring in the films *Panic Room* and *Vacancy* – led to the understanding that the characters were not safe where they were staying. The results for the rest of the images that caused a minor plot change were quite unique. In *Snake Eyes*, Rick Santoro is in a casino arena watching the playback of a boxing pay-per-view event. He asks to see all angles of the knockout punch, since directly afterwards the Secretary of Defence was assassinated. The last camera angle he examines is an aerial view of the fight that captures the boxer being knocked out by a punch that never actually touched him, referred to as an ‘air ball’ or a ‘phantom punch’, which led to the uncovering of a conspiracy. In *Enemy of the State*,

Robert Clayton Dean watches camera footage that his old friend gave to him; the friend was killed shortly thereafter. Dean observes a man being murdered under the order of another individual. Dean finally realizes that this is what the men chasing him are after, and with this knowledge he now has the ability to fight back.

Of the 25 scenes with camera surveillance images that captured a crime, 12 camera surveillance images depicted white men as perpetrators, three images depicted black men and white men, one image was of a white man and woman, three depicted only women, another three depicted only minorities (black, Hispanic, Arabic), while three images did not capture any perpetrators. Eighteen of these images included middle-aged men. Thus, the most frequently portrayed perpetrator was a white, middle-aged man. As for the victims, eight camera surveillance images depicted only white men, two images depicted white men and women, one a black man and white man, one a black man and Asian man, and another included multiple victims both men and women, including those of white, black, and Hispanic origin. On five occasions the victims were members of the government or a private institution. For instance, in *After the Sunset*, a priceless diamond is stolen from a cruise ship. On another five occasions the victims were the general public, such as in the film *Vantage Point* when a terrorist bomb exploded killing and injuring many. However, the most frequently portrayed victims were white men, typically middle-aged but ranging upward from their early twenties. Furthermore, the relationship between perpetrator and victim for most of the crimes was that of strangers. Of the serious crimes committed – murder, assault and kidnapping – the majority of these crimes were committed by someone who was a complete stranger to the victim. For instance, as captured by the camera surveillance images, only three of the crimes involving murder were committed by an acquaintance while the other nine were committed by strangers.

Within these films, there appeared to be no connection between the sex, age, or race of the perpetrators and their victims. No connection was apparent between the physical appearance (sex, race, or age) of the victim or type of crime committed and whether the perpetrator received some form of justice. As well, no association was noted between the relationship of the victim and perpetrator and whether the offender received justice.

Critical Discourse Analysis

The critical discourse analysis, although concerned with scenes with camera surveillance images, discusses the frequency of the occurrence of a particular discourse across the 30 films.⁸ There emerged seven dominant discourses that appeared to help facilitate the normalization of camera surveillance: 1) the camera never lies; 2) cameras that malfunction create cause for concern; 3) mass media can be used as a form of camera surveillance; 4) camera surveillance images can sometimes act as a background image within films; 5) camera surveillance can help identify, locate and follow suspects or persons of interest; 6) one can be mischievous with camera surveillance; and 7) camera surveillance images can be altered. Each of these discourses is discussed below and films that can be found within each discourse are located in Appendix C. Examples of scenes are provided for each discourse, however, the examples are not exhaustive but illustrative. Some of these discourses overlap with information discovered through the content analysis, while some information does not. However, before continuing it is important to clearly define the term ‘camera angle’ to avoid confusion. Camera angle is referring to the location of the main camera that creates the film in which the audience always views and not the camera surveillance image that characters view in the film.

The Camera Never Lies

It was discussed earlier in this thesis that the camera is thought to always depict events that actually occurred; essentially that the camera never lies in that it always depicts the truth. Often, in these films the camera surveillance would capture events in-the-moment, but no character was observed watching these events. This suggests the camera is depicting reality, events that are occurring in real time and that the characters in the films are unaware of these images because they are not monitoring the camera surveillance. The surveillance image that characters failed to observe would have been valuable to their purpose had they only noticed the camera surveillance image. For example, in the film *Hostage Part II*, people are bidding on the killing and torturing of innocent people, which is controlled by a private company. In the location of the killing ground of the private company, the audience watches an image of a monitor as a hostage takes control over her hired killer while the security guards are paying no attention to the monitors. Perhaps this is an indication that these events could have been prevented, or had they been watched, better preparation could have occurred. Therefore, the inability for characters to keep up with the camera surveillance prevents the attainment of valuable information.

However, in some scenarios it was impossible for the character to pay full attention to the image, especially when the image was among thousands of camera surveillance images. For instance, in *Snake Eyes*, Rick Santoro is sifting through 1,500 cameras in the security room of a casino to search for a suspect and a person of interest. In one scene, while he is focusing on one of the camera surveillance images displayed in that room the person of interest happens to walk through an image that is directly beside him.

In several films, people are not ignoring the camera surveillance but rather there is no one in the vicinity of the camera surveillance to monitor it. In the film *Inside Man*, Dalton Russell (Clive Owen) is removing the camera surveillance's capacity to function with an infrared camera. While this is going on, the audience is shown the inside of the bank's security room where we see the camera surveillance beginning to malfunction but, oddly enough, no security guards or operators are presently in the room to watch this.

In these films, camera surveillance images are presented to the audience as occurring in real time. The usefulness of the technology is slowed down by its operators, or lack thereof. Agreeing with Kammerer's (2004) argument, films within this discourse did speak to the infallibility of camera surveillance, though in a different sense than Kammerer has described it. The camera surveillance is access to reality and is only misread or is limited due to human capacity. If this is the case then there is no reason for citizens to be weary of camera surveillance because it only depicts reality.

Cameras That Malfunction Create Cause for Concern

In some films, camera surveillance was rendered inoperable such that a visual image was completely inaccessible. This was typically accomplished by blocking, breaking or disabling the unit. For instance, in the film *Salt*, Evelyn Salt is trying to escape police custody while in the CIA's headquarters after she has been accused of being a Russian spy. On one of the floors in the building she is trapped and so she devises a plan to escape. In order to prevent her plan from being thwarted she blocks the camera surveillance on that floor with the foam produced by a fire extinguisher, and on one occasion uses her panties to accomplish the same purpose.

Cameras can be rendered useless for surveillance purposes, however, the fact that the image is no longer functioning causes alarm for those characters who notice its

sudden interruption. In the above example from the film *Salt*, covering the camera surveillance only makes the lead investigator more certain of Salt's culpability. In *Hostage Part II*, one hostage takes control of the room she is held in. She realizes she is being watched on camera surveillance, so to leave the room unnoticed she disables the unit. Unfortunately for the hostage, each room requires a password by which permission to leave is then granted by an operator in the security room. Once she enters the request to leave through the password, the surveillers look to the image to see if the hostage was killed. However, what they found in this case was no image at all, which led the surveillers to believe that events had not transpired as expected and thus extra security was called to that room. In another example from *The Score*, security guards at a government building are monitoring a very valuable item using a newly installed camera surveillance system. In one instance, the camera surveillance system shuts down for a minute. One of the two security guards simply blames the out of date system. The next time it shuts down the system is again blamed. After several minutes, however, the lead security guard becomes very suspicious and sends some other guards to search for any foul play. As the guards are on their way, the camera surveillance system begins to operate again and the lead security guard watching the monitor sees an unauthorized individual dressed in black close to the valuable item being protected.

This discourse entails two meanings. The first is that the blockage or breakage of the surveillance system in most of these cases can be viewed as a form of defiance or resistance to the camera surveillance. For instance, in the aforementioned scene from *The Score*, the device was disabled so a theft could take place without alarms being set off. By rendering the device inoperable, it is an assertion by the character that made it inoperable that their image cannot be captured. Marx labels this type of resistance as 'breaking', and

he considers it to be the crudest of its kind (Marx 2003). This type of surveillance, along with the others noted above, were typically not administered by the average citizen but by those trying to avoid capture from a criminal act. The destruction of the camera surveillance provided a way of gaining control of the situation. However, in *Panic Room*, the destruction of camera surveillance gave the robbers a feeling of uneasiness as they wondered what Meg Altman was up to, and thus once she destroyed the cameras she was able to have an advantage over the robbers.

One such occurrence of disabling camera surveillance within this discourse was not an act of resistance. In *Dawn of the Dead*, characters were watching the television to gain knowledge of what was happening in the outside world because they were trapped inside a mall due to a zombie apocalypse. At one point, a character turns to the television and sees white static. Another character asks ‘what’s the news’ and the other replies ‘bad’. Here, the significance of camera surveillance is highlighted, which is the second meaning of this discourse. It shows our reliance on surveillance technologies and the belief that once they stop functioning one should or (as seen through the aforementioned examples) will have a feeling of uneasiness because this means something is occurring that we would not want to occur. Camera surveillance is a technology that has become so embedded in the normal everyday life that once it does stop working there is a general concern that either creeps or erupts within the individual(s) witnessing the malfunction.

Mass Media is a Form of Camera Surveillance

Oftentimes, mass media is simply thought of as a vehicle to provide information to the public. Although it does provide this function, in some respect it could also be used as a form of camera surveillance in that it inherently watches and produces information about people. In this sense, what some may consider to be strictly documentation others

may consider a form of surveillance. For instance, in *The Manchurian Candidate*, Ben Marco (Denzel Washington) uses the local library's computer to research Manchurian Global, a multinational corporation. During his investigation he stumbles across an image that sparks his interest. This image shows the lead researcher of an underground project whose goal is to put a 'sleeper' in the White House. This researcher's responsibility was to place an implant into Marco – along with several others – in order to replace actual memory with modified memory. Upon watching a video image of this researcher, Marco begins to recognize him, and through the use of media as a form of surveillance Marco starts to connect the pieces and realizes that Manchurian Global is up to no good.

Media used for surveillance purposes can create a wealth of valuable knowledge about those that cannot easily be watched. In *State of Play*, during a live television broadcast of a hearing with a private security contractor, Stephen Collins (Ben Affleck) is giving his condolences to the family of his lead researcher who allegedly committed suicide. While doing so, he is overcome with grief. At this time the audience is watching employees of a newspaper, who are watching Collins leave the hearing in tears through a television monitor at their newspaper headquarters. The people watching from the headquarters know that Collins' emotional behaviour could only mean one thing, that he – a married politician – was having an affair with his lead researcher.

As can be seen the event is merely being documented, but in some circumstances it can be extremely relevant to other parties watching it to the point that the image no longer is a documentation of the event but rather is also a direct surveillance of it. Essentially, this discourse coincides with what Mathiesen (1997) coined as the 'synopticon', in that the many have the ability to watch the few. The synopticon exists simply due to the mass media (1997: 219), and more importantly due to the visual mass

media of television (1997: 221), and this discourse does well to remind the audience that this is exactly what the mass media can be used for: keeping tabs on individuals who cannot usually be watched.

On several occasions, it is not so much what the image depicts in the media but the verbal information that is vital. In *Dawn of the Dead*, a number of people are trapped in a mall with hundreds of zombies just outside. Broadcast news is their way to receive information about the outside world. While watching a segment, they hear of the best method to kill zombies (shooting them in the head). This information is vital as it is used throughout the rest of the film. In *Spy Games*, Tom Bishop (Brad Pitt), a CIA agent, went on a rogue mission to save an ally imprisoned in a jail in Japan. Bishop was captured and sentenced to die the next day. Bishop's boss Nathan Muir (Robert Redford) has made it his mission to get Bishop out alive. He devises a plan to use the media in order to inform the public that a CIA agent has been captured by Japan in order to force the CIA to make arrangements to release Bishop. However, just as Muir is about to leave the CIA headquarters, he overhears on the news channel that the information that was stated about a captured CIA agent was false. This left Muir with no other option than to return to the building and devise another plan to free Bishop. Had it not been for Muir overhearing the news he would have never known that the execution was still to be carried forward.

This discourse highlights that mass media as camera surveillance can be extremely useful to the average citizen. Surveillance of these traditionally non-surveilled individuals can be accomplished by simply turning to a form of news (broadcast, print, or the internet). This discourse helps to create a positive association with documentation as a form of surveillance.

Camera Surveillance as a Normal Background

In many of these films camera surveillance images were not the main focus of the camera angle. In fact, they merely acted as background. Nothing in the camera surveillance image was of any significance but for some reason it was displayed in the camera angle. Nearly all of these background images were viewed in security rooms at private companies or at government locations. For instance, in *After the Sunset*, two FBI agents are discussing the possibility of a theft of a diamond to the captain of the cruise ship while the surveillance images are in the background of the camera angle. Only two films, *Fracture* and *Panic Room*, had camera surveillance images in the background in an affluent character's personal home. A large part of the film *Panic Room* was filmed within a panic room in the home, and the camera surveillance images were often depicted in the background of the camera angle.

This suggests that it is normal to see a great deal of camera surveillance, particularly within certain areas. It is a way for the audience to become more familiar with camera surveillance and to come to the realization that it is found in a majority of semi-private areas. The fact that the majority of the time camera surveillance took place in semi-private areas may also suggest that there is an abundance of camera surveillance in these areas and therefore there should be an understanding that privacy should not be expected within these areas.

Cameras can Identify, Locate and Follow Persons

A popular discourse in the examined films was that camera surveillance has the capability to identify, locate and follow suspects or persons of interest. Camera surveillance yields an image that leads to the identification of a suspect or person of interest. In the film *Enemy of the State*, Robert Clayton Dean is shopping for a gift for his

wife in a lingerie store. While there he runs into an old friend who appears to be very frantic. The friend desperately asks for Dean's help and then runs out of the store. Shortly after, Dean discovers that his old friend was killed just outside of the store. Unfortunately, the men who were after his old friend did not find what they were seeking. These men, who are employees of the government, managed to secure footage of inside the lingerie store at the time that Dean and his old friend interacted. During their interaction, it would appear as if the friend dropped something into Dean's shopping bag, and because of this Dean was labelled a priority person of interest to these government agents.

In *Showtime*, detectives Trey Sellars (Eddie Murphy) and Mitch Preston (Robert Di Nero) happen to be watching an episode of their hit reality television show entitled 'Showtime' at their own houses. While on the phone with one another, Preston glances up at the television and notices a person who works within the ballistics department of the police station, in a location that is rather suspect – a bar with a known arms dealer. Before this point, the detectives were at a dead end in their investigation, but with this image they identified a suspect which then ultimately spiralled into solving the case.

Locating involves a suspect or person of interest being detected or identified. In *The Bourne Ultimatum*, Jason Bourne is in a train station communicating through a cellular phone with a reporter and providing instructions to the reporter to avoid being spotted by camera surveillance. Unfortunately, the reporter distinguishes himself by running through the crowd and is then located by the surveillers, who are government agents, and assassinated shortly afterwards.

On several occasions a person of interest is not identified by law enforcement but by ordinary citizens. In *Fracture*, after shooting his wife, Ted Crawford awaits inside his home for a person of interest to arrive. Upon receiving a phone call Crawford knows this

person is close by, so he waits for this person to be on his front porch. From his camera surveillance, Crawford notices this person of interest on his front porch and requests that the person come into his home alone in order for his plan to perfectly unfold.

On occasion, it is not a person of interest that is being sought but an object. In *The Italian Job*, a gang of thieves are on the search for one of three trucks that contains gold bricks. As each truck passes through the camera surveillance, the three images are compared to see which truck is lower to the ground, thereafter the location of the bricks is revealed.

Often in these images people were identified and then followed. Typically characters following persons of interest used a multi-camera surveillance system. In *Enemy of the State*, after Robert Clayton Dean is identified as a person of interest he is constantly on the run from a group of rogue government agents out to capture and kill him. Throughout the film, he is continuously being monitored through an array of satellite camera surveillances. In *The Italian Job*, following the identification of the correct truck carrying gold, a hacker hacks into the traffic security system of the city to follow the truck's location in order to direct it to a desired location to be robbed. In *Snake Eyes*, after locating a person of interest on the casino floor from the security room of the casino, Rick Santoro races to that location with a walkie-talkie, through which he is connected to the head security officer who remains in the security room. The security guard directs Santoro to the person of interest by following this person through the various camera surveillances within the casino.

In these films, suspects were usually followed by persons of authority, while persons of interest on occasion were not. However, the overall impression is that camera surveillance can be quite useful in obtaining information, such as who might be outside of

a home or where another person is going. This information can be used for a variety of purposes, whether for good or for bad, but always benefits the surveiller of camera surveillance. Therefore, there is a positive association with the use of camera surveillance. This also brings the point across that camera surveillance is only useful when it is established. If it is not established it cannot benefit anyone.

One can be Mischievous with Camera Surveillance

In this discourse, main characters were able to extract the advantage of camera surveillance from another character through mischievous usage, and manoeuvre this advantage for their own purpose. Therefore, the advantages of camera surveillance did not fall to the character(s) who established the camera surveillance but to another. How characters were able to extract the advantage varied by film. In the film *Inside Man*, New York City detective Keith Frazier (Denzel Washington) becomes suspicious of a group of bank robbers who seem to be buying time for some unknown reason, and are not actually going to hurt any of the two dozen hostages they captured. The robbers know that Frazier is becoming extremely suspicious and so they position a camera surveillance to see directly inside the bank lobby. In this scene – which the audience watches through a camera surveillance image – the robbers surround an individual who is covered in a mask. Next, we see the lead robber hold a gun up to this victim and shoot. The audience sees blood disperse from the victim as the victim falls to the floor. The robbers used the camera surveillance for their own purpose in order to show the police that they should be taken very seriously, and to hopefully buy more time in order to accomplish their true intentions.

In films, the audience will connect to those that are mischievous since they are easily identifiable as main characters. Thus, the audience desires positive outcomes for

these characters. In *After the Sunset*, Max Burdett (Pierce Brosnan) creates the perfect diversion to steal a diamond by setting up another character to be captured for trying to steal the same diamond, thus preoccupying security officers with the other robbery. It was not until Burdett nearly completed his mission that they noticed another robbery was occurring. For the most part, characters within this discourse are using, what Marx (2003) termed as, 'countersurveillance techniques' that is using the surveillance technology against those doing the surveilling. Again, this discourse indicates that camera surveillance is beneficial to those who use it.

Being mischievous with camera surveillance could also imply using the camera surveillance to trick other characters into thinking that what is happening in the image is occurring in real time. In the following example, the camera surveillance system was originally established by the antagonist and was also only advantageous to the antagonist. In *Saw II*, officers have located a house believed to contain kidnapped victims. Once inside, an officer recognizes the house to be the one he had seen previously on the monitors in a warehouse owned by the antagonist, though his partner watching those monitors sees neither him nor the other officers in the house. After a few minutes the officers in the house enter a room with another set of monitors that also depict the inside of this house. The officer looks around the room and uncovers a VCR that says 'play'. The officer pushes the pause button and the monitors in front of him show the camera surveillance image on pause, and the monitors in the warehouse depict the same image, thus indicating that the prior events they witnessed had been a pre-recorded image all along, and not in real time. The camera surveillance was used to deceive another officer in order for the antagonists to attain their desired result.

The use of this discourse allows the audience to understand that although surveillance is occurring it may not necessarily be something negative. In fact, it is possible to use camera surveillance to one's advantage when necessary. This evokes a positive association with camera surveillance, and creates the idea that when camera surveillance is available perhaps it can somehow be useful.

Images can be Altered

Although in a minority of films, scenes with camera surveillance images also depicted how not every image can be trusted since images can be altered or manipulated. This would appear to challenge the previous discourse that the image captures only reality. In the film *Eagle Eye*, a computer with artificial intelligence is carrying out an elaborate plan by manipulating people to do its will in order to murder certain people in the president's line of succession. While passing through a screening point at the airport, a security guard takes her eyes off the x-ray bag scanning screen. During this moment the image is altered to depict random mundane items rather than the actual image of syringe injectors. In *The Manchurian Candidate*, a photo of the vice president's assassin is released to the public. However, just before it is released to the news media, the image of Ben Marco is replaced with a Manchurian Global employee in order to remove Marco as a culprit and give the public someone else to persecute.

Lyon (2007: 6) states that it is important to take note of how surveillance is being portrayed in media since sometimes the depictions aid in critique or further compliance. Though there may be a question of whether or not these images portray reality, the audience may realize that sometimes the alteration of the image is needed for the best interest of the characters involved. As in the case of *The Manchurian Candidate*, it was unnecessary for citizens to know that Marco was the true assassin since what would

follow would be a long investigation made very public. In *Eagle Eye*, had the two been caught with the injectors they would have been captured and perhaps the artificial intelligence would have included many others in its dangerous plan. In *Ocean's Eleven*, a camera surveillance image depicts Linus Caldwell (Matt Damon) standing in a secured elevator that leads directly to the vault of the casino, which he – among others – intends to rob. While in the elevator, the camera surveillance operator is distracted and the audience watches as the image of Caldwell vanishes and what remains is simply an empty elevator. Had the image not been altered, Caldwell would not have been able to succeed with the planned robbery and would have been possibly jailed. Thus, it appears that when camera surveillance images are manipulated it is done so for the best interest of those involved (characters that the audience tends to connect too).

Within this discourse reality was still being captured but in some sense was not heeded; whereas this inattention to the camera surveillance image in some effect is linked with the discourse that the camera never lies, because had these individuals paid attention to the camera surveillance the plans of these individuals would have never carried forward. Thus, in retrospect, this discourse does not actually challenge the other but is complimentary to it. Therefore, this discourse is not a critique to camera surveillance but projects further compliance to it in that camera surveillance requires constant supervision.

ANALYSIS

Introduction

This section will assess the overall analysis of understanding how camera surveillance has been depicted and normalized within these 30 films. The overall analysis includes both the content analysis and critical discourse analysis. This section is broken into two subsections that will discuss how findings from the results help to facilitate the

normalization of camera surveillance. The first section includes the analysis of the general use of camera surveillance, whereas the second focuses exclusively on the normalization of camera surveillance as a crime fighting tool.

How Films Normalize Camera Surveillance

Camera surveillance images in these films did not actually capture social inequalities, such as marginalization. For instance, minorities were not unreasonably portrayed as the ones that need to be surveilled, nor were they exposed often as criminals. Thus, no social inequalities were depicted in these films. However, it could be argued that social inequalities are present in Hollywood given that Hollywood still largely grants the permission to gaze to white, middle class, middle-aged men, therefore excluding other minorities and women.

Keeping in mind that racial minorities were hardly ever depicted as surveillers or surveillance subjects without being accompanied by white men, a question may arise as to why this is the case. Although marginalization specifically was not captured in the images of these 30 films, perhaps it is marginalizing in itself to not display as many racial minorities – especially in the case of African Americans who comprise about 12 per cent of the US population (Humes, Jones and Ramirez 2010: 4). This is why marginalization cannot be captured by camera surveillance; the absence of these images in itself is implicitly marginalizing. This type of exclusionary marginalization has been observed before. For instance, Rafter (2006: 10) notes that black people were denied certain forms of power due to marginalization; as an example, it was not until the mid 1990s that black men gained full recognition as heroic sleuths in films. In addition, perhaps the same could be said about women as surveillers in that the lack of women as surveillers yields a form of marginalization in Hollywood films. Although women were often depicted as both

surveiller and surveillance subject, they were always accompanied by men. It is as if the suggestion is that women would be unable to interpret the meaning of the images without men present; it suggests women are inferior. As Lake (2010: 232) noted regarding contemporary cinema, the films included in this research appear to reinforce ideas of who is allowed to look, namely the white man.

In another sense, the absence of surveillance subjects that are black and typically not women actually is perfectly logical, as the point of the normalization of any surveillance technology would be to make it appear as if this technology holds no biases regarding sex or race as well as to leave the audience with the belief that it is impossible for surveillance technology to be discriminatory. It reflects the notion that everyone is suspect, and that those under more intense surveillance deserve it because of some affiliation (i.e. to crime or authority) rather than due to their physical characteristics. Thus, this helps to normalize camera surveillance as a practice that is not inherently biased.

Additionally, it would appear that Hollywood does not portray camera surveillance to be intrusive to one's privacy, which also helps to normalize its use. Although several privacy violations were depicted, privacy was not an issue in these films. In fact, when privacy was violated it was simply ignored by other characters in the film and by the audience alike. The privacy violation in *Vacancy* is unacknowledged since the violation that occurred in the video is the least of the worries of the couple now trapped in their hotel room, who may suffer the same fate as those they watched in the images. The violation is minimized due to other serious events occurring. In *State of Play*, a man holds valuable information about a conspiracy involving a large corporation that reporters want to obtain officially on the record, though this man does not want to be

identified. However, the violation is minimized due to his knowledge, and the man is no longer seen as a victim but as the key to uncovering a conspiracy. In *American Pie*, the humorous act of watching Jim Levenstein fail in a sexual escapade leads the audience to forget that there was a serious privacy violation of the foreign exchange student that took place since she was completely unaware that anyone was watching her. The character herself does not even acknowledge the embarrassment she faced and by the end credits of the film she is still communicating with Levenstein. To a researcher, it is particularly clear that this was a serious privacy violation; however, as the audience it is not so clear. Basically, the violation is minimized in the comedic context of the film. The film leads to an understanding that a privacy violation can be incredibly entertaining, and should not be feared. Overall, by minimizing these violations a positive association can be formed with the use of camera surveillance, thus helping to normalize its use.

As well, only two films (*Enemy of the State* and *Eagle Eye*) discussed the implications and potential harm that surveillance technologies could pose if in the wrong hands. They questioned how much surveillance is necessary, though both films still finish with camera angles that include camera surveillance images. Thus, these films never suggest that society should stop using the technology, but to merely keep a better watch on the surveillers. Therefore, although these films appear to question the use of camera surveillance, ultimately they succumb to the fact that camera surveillance is inevitably a fact of life.

There is no suggestion in these films to resist camera surveillance since surveillers typically use the images of people appropriately, thus usually not for sexual gratification. For instance, those in authority use the camera surveillance images to discover valuable information for their cases rather than for some personal gain. It can be noted from the

results that in the majority of scenes with camera surveillance images those who did resist camera surveillance did so to either protect their true identity (e.g. being a thief), and/or to protect themselves from unwanted capture. Thus, the only reason one would have to resist camera surveillance is if one is involved in criminal activity (or if someone else is trying to use the camera surveillance against the original owner of it, such as in *Panic Room*). Therefore, there is no need for the average citizen to resist camera surveillance, unless they have something to hide. This argument is consistent with the real world argument in favour of camera surveillance known as the ‘nothing to hide argument’ (Solove 2007). The argument is that obviously those with something to hide (criminal activity) will not want their privacy violated. As well, the argument suggests that typically deep, dark secrets that average law-abiding citizens may not wish to disclose are unlikely to be discovered by the government. However, if such secrets are exposed there is assurance that there is limited disclosure or dissemination of this information, and perhaps only a computer or several individuals would know (Solove 2007: 753). It appears that these films suggest this argument since it is only necessary to resist camera surveillance if an individual is involved with criminal activity. This only helps to normalize the use of camera surveillance since if a person has nothing to hide then why not allow camera surveillance to pervade every corner.

Doubt about authenticity was hardly expressed over camera surveillance images. Scenes that did express doubt were equally viewed with images that were after-the-fact and in-the-moment, and therefore, not necessarily agreeing with the literature that doubt is observed more often in images that are after-the-fact (Levin 2002). Moreover, the results of both methodologies suggest that camera surveillance depicts reality. With the changeover of technology into more sophisticated systems, the quality of some camera

surveillance will remain subpar but will nonetheless display the reality of events. When it comes to cinema, the ‘effect of the real’ no longer requires a time and date stamp (see Leblanc 2010). Unfortunately, sometimes camera surveillance is neglected and vital information is missed that could have been used to prevent or to better prepare for events. This notion of camera surveillance as capturing reality only further normalizes it since if it always records and displays an accurate reality, then it has an important societal function. These films advocate for the use of camera surveillance and for constant supervision of camera surveillance. If the events are accurate depictions of reality, then camera surveillance is by no means bad to have on city streets and in other areas, thus normalizing the use of camera surveillance.

As well, these films support the notion that documenting events can be quite beneficial in situations where further information is required about an individual. Documentation provides the ability to look back through events to discover information that may not have been noticed before. Whether the documentation is administered by the media or by an individual, it is important to do so as this information could have value in the near future. Thus, there is a positive association of camera surveillance in the form of personal documentation which also helps to normalize its use for this purpose.

It appears that Hollywood cinema has increasingly involved camera surveillance within its plots, providing major and minor plot changes within films. Images can be used for many different kinds of changes and not exclusively to simply locate suspects or persons of interest. This bombardment of scenes with camera surveillance images suggest that camera surveillance is needed to provide a good story. Hollywood’s extensive use of this technology for this purpose helps to normalize the use of camera surveillance as the audience becomes more accustomed to its inclusion. As well, the fact that a majority of

scenes with camera surveillance images provide a minor plot change rather than a major plot change expresses that the normalization of camera surveillance is a subtle phenomenon.

As well, it is very interesting to find camera surveillance in films where you would not readily expect to find such images, such as *American Pie* or *Hall Pass*. These types of films express the subtle ways that camera surveillance is incorporated into daily life. The inclusion of camera surveillance in films such as these emphasize that camera surveillance is now so ingrained in everyday life that it pervades all spaces. It is so pervasive that when it stops functioning, as in some of the films, it should cause concern. Even in films that occur away from civilization, where other technology is not readily available, such as in *The Perfect Getaway*, surveillance technologies always seem to be present. Camera surveillance has become so prolific in films that it pervades all genres which help to normalize it. The audience has become saturated with camera surveillance images in films and the fact that it is presented in all genres helps to naturalize the expectation of camera surveillance in every situation in turn – such as comedic, horrific, romantic, and so forth.

It is evident that camera surveillance images can transcend boundaries of time and space. The images have the ability to be viewed from incredibly distant locations and can be viewed either in-the-moment and/or after-the-fact. As well, sometimes camera surveillance images are shown for no real purpose. They are just within the background image of the camera angle, typically located within public and semi-private locations. This display of camera surveillance appears to be used to normalize it within these areas by providing awareness that camera surveillance is almost naturally located within public and semi-private locations. Moreover, camera surveillance within these 30 films was

more often used by private companies. These results are to be expected since the use of camera surveillance has always been more prevalent among private corporations (Norris et al. 2004: 114), and the more prevalent ownership in films merely reflects this.

Furthermore, images predominately captured in semi-private and public locations are less likely to yield privacy violations, since most people already expect loss of privacy to occur in these areas (R. Smith 2012), and films tend to reinforce and thus normalize this expectation.

Several of the results in this research support the notion of a surveillance society in North America. For instance, the fact that camera surveillance images can be viewed anywhere, and at virtually any time, and that camera surveillance may be depicted in the background of camera angles pervading many semi-private and public spaces. However, the greatest evidence is the high volume of the use of camera surveillance within Hollywood films which suggest that while some films may directly depict a surveillance society (such as *Enemy of the State* or *Eagle Eye*), overall all of these films combined depict one as well. Thus, the fact that many current films incorporate scenes with camera surveillance images suggest that North America is already within a surveillance society. These films convey that camera surveillance is all around us and that it is a necessary component of life; the depth and exposure to surveillance is typically experienced the same to the average citizen, that being, for the most part, as benign and unobtrusive (Murakami Wood and Webster 2009: 266-7).

The Efficacy of Camera Surveillance and Normalization

Whether or not these films overemphasize the efficacy of camera surveillance for crime fighting purposes will be clear towards the end of this subsection. As can be noted within all of these films no system ever deterred perpetrators from attempting their illegal

activities. If the system was highly sophisticated – such as in *Ocean's Eleven* – characters were concerned with whether the crime could be possible given the circumstances, but still carried out their plan nonetheless. Other times, the camera surveillance was completely ignored and the incident occurred as a crime of passion. For example, in *State of Play*, Collins, a politician, is in a hotel room watching a camera surveillance image of a man in the next room. This man explains that the research assistant Collins had an affair with was actually surveilling him and was pregnant with his child. This greatly frustrated Collins who, after watching the image, went into the hotel room next door and began to assault the man. As well, on several occasions camera surveillance made it possible for the crime to occur, such as in *The Italian Job*, when a traffic control camera system had been hacked into in order to direct a truck carrying gold to the location to be robbed.

As discussed above, an overwhelming majority of these images did not lead to conventional justice for the criminals involved, namely an arrest or conviction. On occasion, viewing the image directly resulted in an unconventional method of justice, such as the death of the culprit. Although camera surveillance may not be instrumental in solving the case or bringing a criminal directly to justice, it ultimately aids investigators in accomplishing these goals. In an overwhelming number of films the discovery of suspects or persons of interest occurred because of camera surveillance and its capacity to provide the possibility to solve any case. For instance, in *State of Play*, camera surveillance footage of the day a lead researcher committed suicide was examined by a reporter to look for any evidence contradictory of a suicide. As the reporter is watching the footage she recognizes a man from a previous encounter who she now believes might be involved in this case. She discusses this with a colleague who later sees in the newspaper a picture of this man with the politician that the researcher worked for,

indicating that the politician was somehow involved in researcher's death. Therefore, camera surveillance in cinema is not purported to have some all-seeing ability to catch the bad guy. It is not possible for it to zoom into a picture and develop further knowledge of the event. Camera surveillance is never presented as an effective preventative tool or as an effective retroactive one to bring criminals directly to justice.⁹ However, what is being suggested, and is by all means realistic, is that camera surveillance has the capability to capture those who may try to hide their true involvement in a crime, and by capturing the image of these individuals provides an opportunity to solve a case that would not have occurred without the existence of camera surveillance. This creates a positive association to camera surveillance for crime fighting purposes.

Thus, these 30 films did not suggest camera surveillance as having an overall effectiveness for crime fighting. However, camera surveillance is still depicted as a necessary component to help solve crime. This aids in the normalization of camera surveillance because while it does not suggest its complete inability to capture crime, it is shown to be very effective for some crime fighting purposes.

Certain discourses may appear to be critical of camera surveillance but in the end actually display the necessity of it. For instance, although camera surveillance images can be altered, and therefore, lead to a questionable reality, ultimately the audience sees the manipulation of the image as a necessary component for the characters involved. Essentially, within the 30 films analyzed there appears to be just one ultimate discourse: camera surveillance is a positive development in society. Therefore, within these 30 Hollywood films, camera surveillance appears to function as a normalizing norm, that hinders critical analysis, and thus eradicates resistance to its use. Camera surveillance is a

norm that seems to be blindly accepted and is thus viewed as a natural and expected practice. Hollywood facilitates this acceptance in a subtle manner.

CONCLUSION

The results of the analysis in this thesis suggest that there are many ways camera surveillance is becoming normalized within society through Hollywood film. Both content analysis and discourse analysis aided in determining dominant discourses found in the analysis of 30 Hollywood films which help facilitate the normalization of camera surveillance. Through both methods, this thesis has moved beyond previous cinematic and surveillance studies to discover the ways images help to form and shape how camera surveillance is depicted. Through an examination of 30 Hollywood films, this thesis has discovered how camera surveillance is being constructed within a subsection of Hollywood cinema.

As was discussed throughout this thesis, the question of how 30 Hollywood films have facilitated the normalization of surveillance within society is not a question that could simply be answered directly but required answers to other questions. Normalization of camera surveillance occurs in a multifaceted manner within these 30 films, which was discovered through this research, and the results were as follows.

Through this analysis it is clear that camera surveillance has the ability to transcend boundaries of space and time. This is because camera surveillance can be viewed from virtually anywhere and at any time. These films also promote camera surveillance as an unbiased technology that is blind to physical appearance of subjects. Those who are surveilled are typically involved within a case. Therefore, resistance of camera surveillance by ordinary citizens is unnecessary since these images are not used to target the average law-abiding citizen.

Surveillance cannot only be captured from devices that are intended to surveil but from any technology with the capability to capture an image, for example, a cell phone or webcam, which recognizes that the average citizen has this ability to capture surveillance images. However, there is no need to worry about being inappropriately surveilled, because those who usually watch the images – even those captured by citizens – are likely to be law enforcement, and will thus treat the image as confidential. On the contrary, if a captured image is displayed inappropriately there is no need to worry as the image will be quite entertaining or there will be greater concerns to worry about other than issues of privacy.

Furthermore, camera surveillance provides access to the real; it is an accurate representation of real world events and therefore there is no need to doubt its capability. By keeping close attention to camera surveillance, we as surveillers can see events unfold and perhaps better prepare against those events we do not wish to see unfold. Although camera surveillance could perhaps be manipulated, it only occurs out of necessity for protection. Camera surveillance, therefore, can be advantageous to its users, even to those that are not the original owner of it. In addition, media can be viewed as a source of surveillance of those with authority or power that the average citizen can use. Oftentimes, camera surveillance will just be in the background, and acts to inform viewers that camera surveillance is always located in certain areas, such as one's private home or locations operated by government or private corporations. Lastly, camera surveillance is not an almighty tool to fight crime; however, it can provide leads to solving crime. It has the ability to identify, locate, and follow persons involved in a case.

Although North American society is by no means the ultimate surveillance society, it appears that cinema is helping to push North America in this direction by

displaying camera surveillance with positive attributes in mainstream film, which would not be so problematic if these were true attributes of camera surveillance use (see Monahan 2010). These 30 films analyzed appear to coincide with Turner's (1998) view of the function of Hollywood cinema with camera surveillance, namely that these films only problematize surveillance when it is in the wrong hands (i.e. the system is not being used for its intended purpose). The surveillance itself is a spectacle that emits a wow factor, or a mesmerisation over the ability of current surveillance technologies, which by doing so, mitigates these technologies to not be very problematic (Turner 1998:120).

There are several limitations to this research that should be noted. This research does not have the ability to generalize camera surveillance representations to all of Hollywood cinema. While these discourses may be representative of those discourses present within films examined, further research is required. As well, of interest to this research is how the audience could interpret the surveillance images. What is not taken into consideration is location of viewing the films (in theatres or at home) which could have an effect on how the audience perceives camera surveillance.

This research is essentially a building block that future research may wish to use to identify and further analyze these discovered discourses. It would be appropriate for future research to administer focus groups with citizens to see whether they question the growth of this phenomenon and determine if in fact camera surveillance is normalizing. As well, future research may wish to consider whether scenes with camera surveillance images have been increasingly implemented into cinema throughout the years. It is a possibility that more and more films are becoming saturated with camera surveillance images.

This thesis focused on the tools used in cinema to understand how the audience may interpret the use of camera surveillance in films. Future research can concentrate on how audience members interpret these images as well as how the cinematic camera and narratives help to shape their views. Although this thesis did not focus on the use of the cinematic camera as a form of surveillance, it has opened up new possibilities for this research.

There is no question that camera surveillance has become a norm in society, so much so that it is found in all spheres of entertainment. In cinema, this can be exemplified by the fact that many films have incorporated camera surveillance somehow into its plot, and it is increasingly being used to provide different layers to a film's storyline. Of course, cinema is just one avenue that helps to normalize the use of camera surveillance. It is by no means the only route to which camera surveillance has become normalized. However, it is quite an influential one that has really only begun to be understood. This thesis has attempted to fill in this large gap within the literature. It has added relative content to surveillance studies and to criminology as a whole. Although North America is not a total surveillance society, with such positive associations to camera surveillance and other surveillance technologies found in one of the most influential aspects of society, the media including cinema, it would not be impossible for it to reach that point.

Notes

1. Camera surveillance is often described by the term CCTV – closed-captioned television. However, CCTV cannot capture current trends of camera surveillance given that contemporary camera surveillance is no longer exclusively closed circuit nor has it anything to do with television (Lyon et al. 2012: 5). CCTV ignores the surveillance networks' ability to store, transmit, and search for images (Lyon et al. 2012: 5); thus, it is not representative of the digital changeover. CCTV also excludes broadcast television (Gates and Magnet 2007: 283) and other forms of surveillance technologies, such as camera phones. Therefore, the term

camera surveillance takes into account the new digital era of surveillance, as well as all potential forms of surveillance.

2. Sousveillance, coined by Mann et al. (2003: 333), is essentially ‘reflectionism’, which refers to ‘a philosophy and procedures of using technology to mirror and confront bureaucratic organizations’, and thus disrupts the power relationship among the surveillers and subjects of surveillance. The term was later criticized by Lake (2010: 236) for only recognizing a distinction among ‘powerful organizations and powerless citizens’, while ignoring other distinctions such as age, class, sex, and race. Thus, Lake (2010) developed the term ‘sub-veillance’ to account for the lapse.
3. Koskela outlines two types of power developed by Sharp and others. The first is ‘dominating power’ seen as the traditional form of power which seeks to control and coerce individuals. The second is ‘resisting power’ and is defined as ‘power which attempts to set up situations, groupings or actions which resist the impositions of dominating power [that] can involve very small, subtle and some might say trivial moments [...]’ (Sharp et al. 2000 cited in Koskela 2004). Koskela believes that webcams are the later form of resistance.
4. It can be debated as to whether Hollywood films continue to maintain predominate viewership with new avenues such as Netflix.com; though while browsing Netflix one will notice that the most popular films listed are overwhelming from Hollywood cinema. As well, the most frequently downloaded films from the internet have often reached theatres. Purchased DVDs are also more likely to be films that have been screened in theatres (see the-numbers.com).
5. <http://www.imdb.com/>
6. This falls in line with Baudrillard’s (1994) concept of hyperreality.
7. In television shows such as *CSI* the camera surveillance image does not become blurry when the image is zoomed into and in fact it may become clearer (Ehrenberg 2012). Therefore, the example of *Fracture* goes against what is known as the *CIS* effect. The *CSI* effect is termed so because all television shows similar to *CSI* heavily rely upon forensic evidence to solve cases (Deutsch and Cavender 2008).
8. I examined every image that could be considered camera surveillance but I am not suggesting that merely because a camera surveillance image is present in a film that it necessarily has a normalizing effect.
9. It appears that in these films, unlike television (Deutsch and Cavender 2008), the *CSI* effect is not ingrained in their storylines. In films, camera surveillance images are hardly ever the direct result of criminals being arrested.

References

- Albrechtslund, A. (2008) 'Surveillance and Ethics in Film: *Rear Window* and *The Conservative*', *Journal of Criminal Justice and Popular Culture*, 15 (2).
- Allen, J., Livingstone, S. and Reiner, R. (1998) 'True Lies: Changing Images of Crime in British Postwar Cinema', *European Journal of Communications*, 13 (1): 53-75.
- Amoore, L. (2006) 'Biometric Borders: Governing Mobilities in the War on Terror', *Political Geography*, 25: 336-51.
- Andrejevic, M. (2004) *Reality TV: The Work of Being Watched*, USA: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Babbie, E. and Benaquisto, L. (2002) *Fundamentals of Social Research* (1st ed. Canadian), Scarborough: Thomson-Nelson.
- Barnard-Wills, D. (2011) 'UK News Media Discourses of Surveillance', *Sociological Quarterly*, 52 (4): 548-67.
- Baudrillard, J. (1994) *Simulacra and Simulation*, USA: University of Michigan Press.
- Critcher, C. (2006) *Critical Readings: Moral Panics and the Media*, NY: Open University Press.
- Dawson, D. (2012) 'What Do You Think?: International Public Opinion on Camera Surveillance', in David Lyon, Aaron Doyle and Randy Lippert (eds), *Eyes Everywhere: The Global Growth of Canada Surveillance*, Canada: Routledge, 274-91.
- Denzin, N.K. (1999) *The Cinematic Society: The Voyeur's Gaze*, UK: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Deutsch, S.K. and Cavender, G. (2008) 'CSI and Forensic Realism', *Journal of Criminal Justice and Popular Culture*, 15 (1): 34-53.
- Dinkes, R., Kemp, J., Buam, K. and Synder, T.D. (2009) *Indicators of School Crime and Safety: 2009*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs, and U.S. Department of Justice.
- Doyle, A. (2006) 'An Alternative Current in Surveillance and Control: Broadcasting Surveillance Footage of Crimes', in Kevin Haggerty and Richard V. Ericson (eds), *The New Politics of Surveillance and Visibility*, Canada: University of Toronto Press Incorporated, 199-224.

- Ehrenberg, E. (2012) 'The Digital Camera Revolution: Instead of Imitating Film Counterparts, New Technologies Work With Light in Creative Ways', *Science News*, 181 (2): 22-5.
- Ferenbok, J. and Clement, A. (2012) 'Hidden Changes: From CCTV to 'Smart' Video Surveillance', in David Lyon, Aaron Doyle and Randy Lippert (eds), *Eyes Everywhere: The Global Growth of Canada Surveillance*, Canada: Routledge, 218-34.
- Finn, R. and McCahill, M. (2010) 'Representing the Surveilled: Media Representations and Political Discourse in Three UK Newspapers', Political Studies Association Conference Proceedings. Available HTTP: <http://www.psa.ac.uk/journals/pdf/5/2010/266_348.pdf>
- Gates, K. and Magnet, S. (2007) 'Communication Research and the Study of Surveillance', *The Communication Review*, 10 (4): 277-93.
- Haggerty, K.D. and Ericson, R.V. (2000) 'The Surveillant Assemblage', *British Journal of Sociology*, 51 (4): 605-22.
- Holtzman, D.H. (2006) *Privacy Lost: How Technology is Endangering Your Privacy*, USA: Jossy-Bass.
- Humes, K.R., Jones, N.A. and Ramirez, R.R. (2010) 'Overview of Race and Hispanic Origin: 2010', US Census Bureau. Available HTTP: <<http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-02.pdf>>
- Kammerer, D. (2004) 'Video Surveillance in Hollywood Movies', *Surveillance & Society*, 2 (2/3): 464-73.
- Koskela, H. (2004) 'Webcams, TV Shows and Mobile Phones: Empowering Exhibitionism', *Surveillance & Society*, 2 (2/3): 1995-215.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004) *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology* (2nd ed), USA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Lake, J. (2010) 'Red Road (2006) and Emerging Narratives of 'Sub-veillance'', *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies*, 24 (2): 231-40.
- Leblanc, Baretto (2010) 'From Closed-Circuit Television to the Open Network of Live Cinema', *Surveillance & Society*, 7 (2): 102-14.
- Levin, T.Y. (2002) 'Rhetoric of the Temporal Index: Surveillance Narration and the Cinema of "Real Time"', in Thomas Y. Levin, Ursula Frohne and Peter Weibel (eds), *CTRL [Space]: The Rhetorics of Surveillance from Bentham to Big Brother*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 578-93.

- Lyon, D. (2002) 'Editorial. Surveillance Studies: Understanding Visibility, Mobility and the Phenetic Fix', *Surveillance & Society*, 1 (1): 1-7.
- Lyon, D. (2007) *Surveillance Studies: An Overview*, Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Lyon, D., Doyle, A. and Lippert, R. (2012) 'Introduction', in David Lyon, Aaron Doyle and Randy Lippert (eds), *Eyes Everywhere: The Global Growth of Canada Surveillance*, Canada: Routledge, 1-19.
- Mann, S., Nolan, J. and Wellman, B. (2003) 'Sousveillance: Inventing and Using Wearable Computing Devices for Data Collection in Surveillance Environments', *Surveillance & Society*, 1 (3): 331-55.
- Marks, P. (2005) 'Imagining Surveillance: Utopian Visions and Surveillance Studies', *Surveillance & Society*, 3 (2): 222-39.
- Marx, G.T. (2002) 'What's New about the 'New Surveillance'? Classifying for Change and Continuity', *Surveillance & Society*, 1 (1): 9-29.
- Marx, G.T. (2003) 'A Tack in the Shoe: Neutralizing and Resisting the New Surveillance', *Journal of Social Issues*, 59 (2). Available HTTP: <<http://web.mit.edu/gtmarx/www/tack.html>>
- Marx, G.T. (2009) 'A Tack in the Shoe and Taking off the Shoe: Neutralization and Counterneutralization Dynamics', *Surveillance & Society*, 6 (3): 294-306.
- Mathiesen, T. (1997) 'The Viewer Society: Foucault's Panopticon Revisited', *Theoretical Criminology*, 1 (2): 215-34.
- McCahill, M. (2003) 'Media Representations of Visual Surveillance', in Paul Mason (ed), *Criminal Visions: Media Representations of Crime and Justice*, Devon, UK: Willian Publishing, 192-213.
- Monahan, T. (2006) 'Questioning Surveillance and Security', in Torin Monahan (ed), *Surveillance and Security: Technological Politics and Power in Everyday Life*, New York: Routledge, 1-23.
- Monahan, T. (2010) *Surveillance in the Time of Insecurity*, New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Monahan, T. (2011) 'Surveillance as Cultural Practice', *The Sociological Quarterly*, 52: 495-508.
- Murakami Wood, D. (ed.), Ball, K., Lyon, D., Norris, C. and Raab, C. (2006) *A Report on the Surveillance Society*, Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) (UK).

- Murakami Wood, D. (2009) 'The 'Surveillance Society': Questions of History, Place and Culture', *European Journal of Criminology*, 6 (2): 179-94.
- Murakami Wood, D. and Webster, C.W.R. (2009) 'Living in Surveillance Societies: The Normalization of Surveillance in Europe and the Threat of Britain's Bad Example', *Journal of Contemporary European Research*, 5 (2): 259-73.
- Murakami Wood, D. and Webster, C.W.R. (2011) 'The Normality of Living in Surveillance Societies', *Information Technology and Law Series*, 20 (3): 151-64.
- Norris, C. (2012) 'Reflections on the Global Growth of CCTV Surveillance', in David Lyon, Aaron Doyle and Randy Lippert (eds), *Eyes Everywhere: The Global Growth of Canada Surveillance*, Canada: Routledge, 23-45.
- Norris, C. and Armstrong, G. (1999) *The Maximum Surveillance Society: The Rise of CCTV*, Oxford, England: Berg.
- Norris, C., McCahill, M. and Murakami Wood, D. (2004) 'Editorial. The Growth of CCTV: A Global Perspective on the International Diffusion of Video Surveillance in Publicly Accessible Space', *Surveillance & Society*, 2 (2/3): 110-35.
- Penny, S. (2004) 'Mass Torts, Mass Culture: Canadian Mass Tort Law and Hollywood Narrative Film', *Queen's Law Journal*, 30 (1): 205-59.
- Rafter, N. (2006) *Shoots in the Mirror: Crime Films and Society* (2nd ed), USA: Oxford University Press.
- Roger, C. (1994) *The Digital Persona and Its Application to Data Surveillance*. Available HTTP: <<http://www.rogerclarke.com/DV/DigPersona.html>>
- Rose, G. (2007) *Visual Methodologies: An Introduction to the Interpretation of Visual Materials* (2nd ed), UK: Sage.
- Rothe, D. and Muzzatti, S.L. (2004) 'Enemies Everywhere: Terrorism, Moral Panic, and US Civil Society', *Critical Criminology*, 12 (3): 327-50.
- SCAN (2009) – Surveillance Camera Awareness Network – *A Report on Camera Surveillance in Canada*, The Surveillance Project. Queen's University, Canada. Available HTTP: <<http://www.sscqueens.org/projects/scan>>
- Smith, E. (2012) 'The Piecemeal Development of Camera Surveillance in Canada', in David Lyon, Aaron Doyle and Randy Lippert (eds), *Eyes Everywhere: The Global Growth of Canada Surveillance*, Canada: Routledge, 122-35.
- Smith, R. (2012) 'Sometimes What's Public is 'Private': Legal Rights to Privacy in Public Spaces', in David Lyon, Aaron Doyle and Randy Lippert (eds), *Eyes*

Everywhere: The Global Growth of Canada Surveillance, Canada: Routledge, 370-9.

Solove, D.J. (2007) “‘I’ve Got Nothing to Hide’ and Other Misunderstandings of Privacy”, *San Diego Law Review*, 44: 745-72.

Taylor, D. (2009) ‘Normativity and Normalization’, *Foucault Studies*, 7: 45-63.

Tepperman, L., Curtis, J. and Kwan, A. (2007) *Social Problems: A Canadian Perspective* (2nd ed), Canada: Oxford University Press.

Turner, J.S. (1998) ‘Collapsing the Interior/Exterior Distinction: Surveillance, Spectacle, and Suspense in Popular Cinema’, *Wide Angle*, 20 (4): 93-123.

Verga, S. (2010) *Closed-Circuit TV Surveillance Evaluation: Statistical Analysis of the Effects on Rates of Crime*, Technical Report. Defense Research and Development Canada, Centre for Security Science. Available HTTP: <<http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA535554>>

Walby, K. (2006) ‘Little England? The Rise of Open-Street Closed-Circuit Television Surveillance in Canada’, *Surveillance & Society*, 4 (1/2): 29-51.

Yar, M. (2010) ‘Screening Crime: Cultural Criminology Goes to the Movies’, in Keith J. Hayward and Mike Presdee (eds), *Framing Crime: Cultural Criminology and the Image*, USA and Canada: Routledge, 68-82.

Zimmer, C. (2011) ‘Surveillance Cinema: Narrative between Technology and Politics’, *Surveillance & Society*, 8 (4): 427-40.

Filmography

The Blair Witch Project. Directed by Daniel Myrick and Eduardo Sánchez, 1999.

Cloverfield. Directed by Matt Reeves, 2008.

The Departed. Directed by Martin Scorsese, 2006.

Enemy of the State. Directed by Tony Scott, 1998.

Faceless. Directed by Manu Luksch, 2007.

The International. Directed by Tom Tykwer, 2009.

Minority Report. Directed by Stephen Spielberg, 2002.

Panic Room. Directed by David Fincher, 2002.

Quarantine. Directed by John Erick Dowdle, 2008.

Red Road. Directed by Andrea Arnold, 2006.

Snake Eyes. Directed by Brian De Palma, 1998.

Thelma and Louise. Directed by Ridley Scott, 1991.

Time Code. Directed by Mike Figgis, 2000.

Appendix A: Content Analysis

- 1) Year movie released
- 2) Genre - IMDB
- 3) Was the image after-the-fact or in-the-moment?
- 4) What was the source of the image?
- 5) Describe the surveillers.
- 6) Describe the surveillance subjects.
- 7) Where was the location of the image captured?
- 8) Where was the image viewed?
- 9) Why was surveillance being undertaken?
 - Was it being used for its stated purpose?
- 10) Was surveillance subject aware of intense surveillance?
- 11) Was privacy violated?
 - Was surveillance later justified?
- 12) Was there any resistance to camera surveillance? Describe type.
- 13) Is the resistor considered to be an insider or outsider of society?
- 14) What was the quality of the image?
- 15) Did the image bring about a change in the plot?
- 16) Were any crimes captured?
- 17) If a crime was captured, note characteristics of perpetrators.
- 18) If a crime was captured, note characteristics of victims.
- 19) What was the relationship between perpetrator and victim?
- 20) Were criminals brought to justice because of image?
- 21) Was there doubt about the image in the film?

Appendix B: Films in the Sample

1. 15 Minutes. Directed by John Herzfeld, 2001.
2. 21. Directed by Robert Luketic 2008.
3. After the Sunset. Directed by Brett Ratner, 2004.
4. American Pie. Directed by Paul Weitz, 1999.
5. The Bourne Ultimatum. Directed by Paul Greengrass, 2007.
6. Dawn of the Dead. Directed by Zack Snyder, 2004.
7. Eagle Eye. Directed by D.J. Caruso, 2008.
8. Enemy of the State. Directed by Tony Scott, 1998.
9. Fracture. Directed by Gregory Hoblit, 2007.
10. Hall Pass. Directed by Bobby Farrelly and Peter Farrelly, 2011.
11. Hostel Part II. Directed by Eli Roth, 2007.
12. Inside Man. Directed by Spike Lee, 2006.
13. The International. Directed by Tom Tykwer, 2009.
14. The Italian Job. Directed by F. Gary Gray, 2003.
15. Knight and Day. Directed by James Mangold, 2010.
16. The Manchurian Candidate. Directed by Jonathan Demme, 2004.
17. Ocean's Eleven. Directed by Steven Soderbergh, 2001.
18. Panic Room. Directed by David Fincher, 2002.
19. A Perfect Getaway. Directed by David Twohy, 2009.
20. Salt. Directed by Phillip Noyce, 2010.
21. Saw II. Directed by Darren Lynn Bousman, 2005.
22. The Score. Directed by Frank Oz, 2001.
23. Showtime. Directed by Tom Dey, 2001.
24. Snake Eyes. Directed by Brian De Palma, 1998.
25. Spy Games. Directed by Tony Scott, 2001.
26. State of Play. Directed by Kevin Macdonald, 2009.
27. Street Kings. Directed by David Ayer, 2008.
28. Traitor. Directed by Jeffrey Nachmanoff, 2008.
29. Vacancy. Directed by Nimród Antal, 2007.
30. Vantage Point. Directed by Pete Travis, 2008.

Appendix C: Critical Discourse Analysis: Films Within Each Discourse

Discourse 1: The Camera Never Lies

1. After the Sunset
2. Hostel Part II
3. Inside Man
4. The Italian Job
5. Ocean's Eleven
6. Panic Room
7. Snake Eyes
8. Vacancy

Discourse 2: Cameras That Malfunction Create Cause for Concern

1. The Bourne Ultimatum
2. Dawn of Dead
3. Hostel Part II
4. The Italian Job
5. Ocean's Eleven
6. Panic Room
7. The Score
8. Salt

Discourse 3: Mass Media is a Form of Camera Surveillance

1. 15 Minutes
2. Dawn of the Dead
3. Enemy of the State
4. The Manchurian Candidate
5. Salt
6. Showtime
7. Spy Games
8. State of Play
9. Traitor
10. Vantage Point

Discourse 4: Camera Surveillance as a Normal Background

1. 21
2. After the Sunset
3. Hostel Part II
4. Enemy of the State
5. Fracture
6. The Italian Job
7. Ocean's Eleven
8. Panic Room
9. The Score
10. Spy Game
11. Vacancy

Discourse 5: Cameras can Identify, Locate and Follow Persons

1. 15 Minutes
2. 21
3. After the Sunset
4. The Bourne Ultimatum
5. Dawn of the Dead
6. Eagle Eye
7. Enemy of the State
8. Fracture
9. Hall Pass
10. The International
11. The Italian Job
12. The Manchurian Candidate
13. Ocean's Eleven
14. Panic Room
15. Salt
16. Saw 2
17. Snake Eyes
18. Showtime
19. State of Play
20. Traitor

Discourse 6: One can be Mischievous with Camera Surveillance

1. After the Sunset
2. Inside Man
3. Knight and Day
4. Ocean's Eleven
5. Saw 2

Discourse 7: Images can be Altered

1. After the Sunset
2. Eagle Eye
3. The Manchurian Candidate
4. Ocean's Eleven
5. Eagle Eye

VITA AUTORIS

Jolina Marie Scalia was born in Windsor, Ontario in 1987. She graduated from Kennedy Collegiate Institute in Windsor, Ontario in 2006. She obtained her BA[H] Criminology and Psychology with Distinction from the University of Windsor in 2010.