Graduate Scholarly Paper
Kathleen Thompson
Faculty member advisor: Dr. Samantha Close
2019-2020 Autumn Term

Database to Delinquency

Imagine if your name was on a list, you don't know how it got there, and you're not able to remove it, but it continues to haunt your life--from disqualification from future employment opportunities and housing to increased likelihood of arrest. Since 2002, the Chicago Police Department has compiled a data set of over 128,000 individuals supposedly affiliated with a gang, but these numbers are egregiously and racially aggregated (Sweeney, 2018). In this analysis, I will highlight how surveillance methods have been used in both modern and historical contexts in order to control and criminalize people of color. Historically, these punitive techniques have been imposed on black and brown bodies in order to render these populations more legible and subject them to racially driven disciplinary tactics. In the contemporary age of information that we are living in, these surveillance patterns that subject black and brown bodies to hyper surveillance have been replicated by means of indiscriminate data gathering and recordkeeping that is systematically weaponized against people of color.

Primarily using the case study of the Chicago gang database, I will complicate the idea of how predictive policing tools are typically framed and marketed as tools for good policing, but that seemingly innocuous design features embedded in these

biometric technologies have led to the disproportionate criminalization and policing of black and brown bodies. Using a Foucauldian lens, I will analyze how the construction and design of these algorithms and databases facilitate their usage as weaponized instruments of bio-power, at the disposal of states and private corporate interests.

Simone Browne traces the hyper systemic surveillance of black bodies back to the age of slavery. She argues that the branding of slaves played a key role in the historical formation of the surveillance of black bodies because the branding of blackness rendered blackness visible to the gaze of white oppressors (Browne, 2015, p.126). Browne explains, “by making blackness visible as a commodity and therefore sellable, branding was a dehumanizing process of classifying people into groupings, producing new racial identities that were tied to a system of exploitation” (Browne, 2015, p. 132). Contemporary technologies and biometrics (like gang databases, facial recognition, and GIS systems) have the ability to reinforce racial thinking and stereotypical assumptions about blackness and facilitates the ease of rationale/justification to continue surveillance on these bodies.

It is possible to trace a history of accounting for the black body by comparing the management, inventory, and processes of rendering black bodies legible. The historically present workings of branding and racialized surveillance techniques that use biometric data permits a lens for us to critically rethink surveillance and discipline within technological borders. Of course branding and current practices or surveillance using biometric technologies have marked differences, when we conceptualize the contemporary moment concerning the way we collect and aggregate data on ‘suspect’

citizens, immigrants, prisoners, and welfare recipients, the key parallel lies in how we have informationalized black and brown bodies by way of biometric surveillance (usually without consent or awareness of the subjects), and then stored in large-scale, automated databases sometimes managed by the state and private third-party interests, there are correlations between the historic patterns of the tracking of blackness and modern surveillance methods (Browne, 2015, p. 172).

Branding of black bodies allowed for the tracking of blackness and rendered black bodies legible as a form of property. Using contemporary biometric surveillance methods such as facial recognition or the formation of gang databases, we are tracking and rendering black bodies legible to the state and private interests/corporations. Sites that are ripe for carceral gaze and biopower are data-fusion centers such as Oracle, that function to coordinate and facilitate third party data-sharing between state and local police, intelligence agencies, and private companies (Benjamin, 2019, p.39). The relationship between Oracle and the CPD (Chicago Police Department) exemplifies this issue, as well as other State and corporate partnerships with biometric technology surveillance companies that are currently being developed and implemented around the world.

In the late 1990s, CPD received a $40 million development contribution from Oracle Corporation, the huge data fusion center warehouse that is essentially a system of relational databases that the gang database currently feeds into. Systems of relational databases are used to manage and query relational models of data that can be accessed or reassembled by the user in many different ways with ease. The gang

database was first rolled out in 2002, hosted on the CLEAR (Citizen and Law Enforcement Analysis and Reporting) system servers, which is where CPD houses all of its policing and gang-related data. CLEAR servers allows officers to submit queries and organize their results into text charts and map formats that can be easily cross referenced and act as a tool to predict crime patterns using GIS (geographical information system) tools.

Officers can essentially arbitrarily admit individuals to the list based on criteria of observing distinctive emblems, attire/colors, tattoos, marking of a specific gang, gang symbols, identification by an officer with “special gang intelligence”, corroboration by a police informant, and/or being in the vicinity/arrested with other individuals with designated gang affiliations. Individuals are added to the database in each police district’s yearly audit. Predictive policing systems like the CLEAR map and dataset of informationalized suspect citizens facilitates and automates the ease of the hyper surveillance, racial profiling and criminalization of black and brown bodies.

Because the gang affiliation designation is so hard to permanently remove, it follows individuals for life. Once listed in database, individuals are more likely to encounter police attention and harassment. Undocumented immigrants who are alleged to be involved with gangs are at the top of immigration enforcement priorities for deportation, according to the Department of Homeland Security, as DHS targets this population based on their gang designation in database.

Since the mid 1990s “digital explosion” of low-cost computing and merge database software with geographical information systems used to cartographically map

crime, systems of relational databases like the Chicago gang database have become more commonly integrated with GIS capabilities, such as the CLEAR map functionality. The CLEAR map is implemented in the Chicago gang database as a tool used to pathologically trace and popularize 'hotspot' articulations of areas of concentrated crime (Jefferson, 2017, p.776) Systems of relational databases and their GIS capabilities are inherently racist due to how they pathologize black and brown bodies and function to render communities of color hyper-legible. Analyzing the CLEAR map from a standpoint of how it works as a nexus of racialized carceral power exemplifies how these discourses on racial surveillance, otheri-ng, and database thinking intersect.

In addition to improving the efficiency of rendering black and brown bodies legible to the state and private interests, the Chicago gang database facilitates and streamlines data-driven criminalization. Criminalization is the process by which individuals are deemed delinquent/criminal through actions/behaviors that are not necessarily a crime. The methods by which municipalities and democracies employ the criminalization of specific population demographics (often marginalized communities, racial minorities, or undocumented immigrants) is through official government collection of extensive information on thousands of individuals: this is biometric technology at work.

Other databases like Chicago's are being aggregated in major cities all over the world that have problematic ways of informationalizing race in its datasets. In October of 2019, the Astana City government in Kazakhstan announced its plans to use biometric facial recognition technology on public transportation systems in the capital city. While the technology is marketed as a convenience to use facial recognition to pay transport

fares instead of using fare tickets and will aid in preventing passenger fare evasion, there are growing concerns from activists about state surveillance and how this data will be stored in a database that can then be weaponized against the ethnic minority Muslim population in Kazakhstan. The Astana government purchased this facial recognition technology from a Chinese company called 'Hikvision,' that was recently blacklisted and banned by the United States government for the company's complicity in human rights abuses in China's Xinjiang province (Rickleton, 2019). Activists worry that this database containing biometric data will have the most impact on the hyper surveilled ethnic Kazakh Muslim population that is already oppressed by the government.

According to the French philosopher Michel Foucault, bio-power is defined as wanting a cleanliness of race, gender, mental fitness, and the increasing politicization of biological matters. The role of bio-power tactics used in the construction of the Chicago gang database includes increasing treatment of the populace (residents of the west and south sides of Chicago) as a species/biological entity that has been identified as pollutants and biological threats through being labeled as associated with gang membership. Foucault argues that disciplinary power encourages the idea that we are all quasi-criminals and that finally committing the crime is evidence of one's abnormal pathology or psychology, and this is precisely the logic of predictive policing systems such as the CLEAR system. He suggests that as bio-power functions, rather than silence, we have multiplication of discourses; proliferation of new "subjects" that can be studied through confession and discourse—especially where causal polluting factors can be predicted (in disease, morality, etc.).

This element of bio-power is ever-present in the Chicago gang database, as the database harnesses “predictive policing power” (Bonsu, 2018). The software utilized by CPD packages data and uses mathematical algorithms in order to target geo-hotspots and gain intelligence on individuals expected to be involved in violent crime. It uses network analysis in order to determine individuals likely to be involved in any given violent crime. When neighborhoods or blocks are experiencing high rates of violent crime, according to the database, they are labeled with a higher score on list, which determines where people are offered social services for those who are deemed at risk. The GIS function also identifies which people likely to commit violent crime and indicates where violent crime is likely to be committed.

In *Discipline and Punish,* Foucault suggests a discursive shift in the emphasis on legibility of the individual (Foucault, 1978, pp.17). The emphasis on legibility of a government’s body of constituents presents itself by being able to “read” men, the increasing importance of knowledge, and therapeutic prescriptions to correct persons into docile model citizens. Disciplinary power operating in disciplinary societies is categorized by hyper-classification, hierarchization, normalization, and binary modes of operation (Foucault, 1977, pp.98), exemplified by the Chicago gang database’s attempt to monitor black and brown people based on predictive policing system recommendations.

Legibility and the synoptic view of space/territory encompasses optimizing design and arrangement. There are ways to create synoptic views of people as opposed to space-some are interchangeable, but there are important differences by what this

means in practice (Scott, 1998). Some of these approaches include health, education, property and wealth, demographics. This technique is distinguished from former techniques because it goes beyond controlling people and encouraging or discouraging behaviors.

Scott (1998) suggests that states seek to render their populations increasingly legible in order to intervene and implement changes to reflect what a “better society looks like.” There are racially problematic processes that city planners/states have historically gone through and skewed statistics that they used to arrive at the decision to intervene. He argues that if you change society based on statistical representations of something, reflecting selective data, that there will always be biases present. Planners and governments have goals and data is generated with those goals/purposes in mind, and these goals are usually not consistent with peoples lives in which they are intervening (Scott, 1998). With this, I propose that using a selective dataset in order to monitor and police black and brown bodies, that there is inevitably biases present in the system.

Some ways that these disciplinary techniques are implemented within high-modernist planning and policies formed in cities is through increased monitoring, surveillance, and more aggressive forms of policing, today more so in digital spaces. Governmentality of rule is a form of exercising political power that takes the population as its object and seeks to improve the wellbeing of the population (Foucault, pp.104). Statistical aggregate effects look at population as a whole and trace statistics on variables such as the patterns of infection and figure out how these patterns can be

manipulated over time. Governmentality looks at society as a whole in order to determine the population. Statistics become an issue in the way that you present it because the presentation is usually giving a synoptic view of people through the scope of measurable statistics. According to Foucault, through collecting and analyzing aggregate statistics, a government can achieve a synoptic view of people. Reducing quantitative information and simplifying data becomes the way the government calculates what it needs to do in order to improve the wellbeing of the population as it sees fit. And more often than not, as we have seen in historical and contemporary examples, the standards of fitness as determined by a state are often racially biased.

Making a city more legible, in Scott's terms, is always intended by city planners/policy makers to eliminate the possibility of having dark corners to do anything out of purview of the government, and is a dangerous mode of social control. This mode of social control can be dangerous because, for example, when it comes to urban renewal, public housing, welfare recipients, or individuals listed in a gang database, statistics can be used to declare entire low-income neighborhoods with low funding/political capital to be blighted and leveled (Gans, 1965).

Governments tend to act on simplification in terms of policymaking and intervene based on a set of flawed aggregate data. Data is purposely used that reflects certain agendas and hide others, and data used selectively usually has inherent biases reflected within it. Surveillance practices carried out systemically upon black and brown bodies have functioned with the purpose of making black and brown bodies more legible so that they could be scrutinized and rendered more controllable and complicit. Skewed

studies and statistics from places like the University of Chicago's sociology department or the pioneer fund are leveraged in order to level entire communities of housing projects and displace residents at the whim of a city planner's high-modernist ideologies. Automated predictive policing systems, like the CLEAR database, fosters the discourse of delinquency under the scrutiny of a carceral gaze by supporting the privatization and weaponization of biometric data used historically to marginalize and displace black communities.

The Chicago gang database and other biometric technologies have aided in the proliferation of the delinquent archetype. The crystallization of the "suspect" citizen, labeled as such permanently, and other delinquent figures leads to the concept of delinquency to be funneled into all institutions. Designated affiliation in gang databases amounts to labeling an individual as a delinquent for life, as this label can also impact bail decisions, rendering alleged gang members ineligible for I-bonds (cash bonds), enforcing sentencing enhancements (gang enhancement), and stricter conditions of community supervision. For undocumented immigrants, the gang designation label often results in targeted raids, detention, and higher priority deportation status. Foucault theorizes that this phenomenon of "useful delinquency" has helped funnel the war on drugs and managing crime rather than getting rid of it in order to keep our prisons open and running.

According to Foucault, power relations/techniques of surveillance utilized inside prisons are continuously reiterated in other spheres of society-not necessarily in explicit ways, but can be present in physical architecture and digital mediums, like the use of

the CLEAR database by the Chicago Police Department. He argues that the disciplinary power techniques that were originally used in prisons have been replicated in other institutions, and deliberately designed in order to encourage the creation of a disciplinary society and docile people/ good workers under the capitalist system (Foucault, 1977, pp.209).

Michel Foucault's bio-power theoretical framework is primarily discussed in *History of Sexuality (volume 1)* but is broadly referenced and works in conjunction with his ideas about disciplinary power. Like disciplinary power, bio-power emphasizes systematic and methodological classification and hierarchization of a given population (Foucault, 1978, pp.36-37). Foucault, writing in the late 1960s/early 1970s in France, explains the history of confession (pastoral power), the role of the confession and how this mechanism has proliferated to become central to education, psychiatry, medicine, and science.

He discusses the power dynamics of confessing and argues that discourses on individual hygiene and health have led to concerns with social hygiene and groups that pollute society, which are inherently problematic and discriminatory in any context. Some historical examples that Foucault references in relation to this notion of classification as biological pollutants include (but are not limited to) the hysterization of women, the pedagogization of children's sex, the socialization of procreative behavior, the psychiatrization of perverse pleasures, and an increasing trend in medicalizing and pathologizing of individuals by informal agents of power (Foucault, 1978, pp.101).

From public health, to the census, to sexual matters—bio-politics have become increasingly important—the politics of the increasing involvement of the state in matters of biology as an end in itself which has a dark side: on the one hand, the promotion of life through public health measures; on the other, the emergence of eugenics and state sponsored racism, leading to racist institutions, like the CLEAR map, gang database and other biometric technology. It is imperative to consider the value judgments of those controlling the use of database. Sharing CLEAR and SSL (strategic subject list) data with private third parties can have harmful effects, because the gang designation often results in lack of access to schooling, housing, and disqualification from employment opportunities.

Operating under bio-power, governments view people as biological entities, instead of seeing them as people with multifaceted talents, and indices populations by measuring factors like birth rates, deaths rates, and infant mortality. Then, politicians and policy-makers decide if the given population is allowed to live or not. With this increasing views of populations as a species, the state decided who eats, who drinks clean water, who has access to basic rights, and the biologically weak/parasitic biological pollutants (people with designated gang affiliations) can be “rationally” abandoned and systematically blighted (Foucault, 1978, pp.36-37).

Foucault argues that doctors, nurses, and psychologists use this logic to pathologize people, in turn demonizing them and facilitating their longer imprisonment in detention facilities, mental institutions or prisons (Foucault, 1977, pp.21). Instead of exercising overt power, modern day torture is overseen by doctors, nurses and

psychologists in the form of these informal agents of power legally overseeing executions and having a say so as to whether an individual is released from custody. Foucault's point is that political power is no longer sovereign and solely up to a judge, extralegal powers exercised by doctors and nurses now influence the length and type of punishment (Foucault, 1977, pp.48-49). Locally, the Chicago Police Department, policy-makers and database designers act as informal agents of power, as they act as the gatekeepers that are in control of individual names being admitted or purged from the database.

According to the Chicago Police Department, the gang database is merely a tool for good policing. Officers are instructed to document the known gang affiliation of anyone they arrest or stop on the street. The record keeping of and pathologization of individuals within the data set serves as a technique of bio-power. Not only are people on this list discriminated; the data is filled with discrepancies and errors. There is no set criterion for adding names to the database, people don't know if their name has been added, and in many cases the raw data is outdated (Sweeney, 2018). The Chicago gang database is most often weaponized as a tool for discriminating against black and brown people, who comprise 95% of the individuals in the database. For example, people in the gang database are more likely to be wrongfully arrested, disqualified from jobs or housing, and wrongfully deported. The database is also harnessed as a tool that aids officers in racial profiling.

Academics have confirmed that there are major fundamental flaws in predictive policing algorithms, like the ones used in Chicago's gang database, because of the

effect of “runaway feedback loops” (Ensign et al., 2017). Runaway feedback loops are a big issue for biometric technology including machine learning used for predictive policing and other recommendation systems. Feedback loops occur whenever the model is controlling the next round of data, so the model quickly contaminates the data (Ensign et al., 2017). Technically speaking, this is how racial biases are built into these systems such as gang databases or facial recognition technology. Even if race and gender are not inputs to the algorithm, the algorithm can still be biased based on these factors because machine-learning technologies excel at finding latent variables.

Scholars and activists that are proponents of the idea of algorithmic accountability seek to hold the engineers and corporations that design these systems responsible for their potentially harmful impacts. The purpose of algorithmic accountability is to counter the effects of discriminatory design and encoded inequalities, such as the case with the Chicago gang database, facial recognition in Kazakhstan, and the surveillance of undocumented immigrants in detainment facilities. In *Weapons of Math Destruction*, scholar Cathy O’Neil explains how algorithmic effects reflect the design choices that are inherently biased due to their biased human designers/engineers. She argues, “algorithms are infused with the biases of their designers and developers, and further, the math powered applications powering the data economy were based on choices made by fallible human beings. Some of these choices were no doubt made with the best intentions. Nevertheless, many of these models are encoded with human prejudice, misunderstanding, and bias into software systems that increasingly manage our lives” (O’Neil, 2016, p.3).

Langdon Winner explicates how there has been a trend in the eagerness to interpret technical artifacts in a political language as a result of a long lineage of narratives that propagates that science and industry, as well as technology and rational thinking, are the best guarantees of democracy, freedom, and social justice (Winner, 1980, pp.121-122). He argues that artifacts can have politics, firstly, by the design of a technical device/system being used as a means to an ends in efforts to solving a problem/issue within a community or secondly, through "inherently political technologies" which require compatibility with specific kinds of political relationships (Winner, 1980, pp.123).

Winner suggests that finding virtues of evils, or any set of ethics built into technology hardware is a foolish and a deterministically skewed view of how technology shapes society (Winner, 1980, pp.123), and that technologies have to land somewhere on the spectrum of unintended to malicious intent in their construction/design, which allows for nuance. His concept of fixed versus flexible technologies highlights the need to be aware of the political implications of the technologies that we have. Flexible technologies have varying sets of regulation/oversight and have the potential to support the contexts of different governmental agendas/schemes. According to Winner, "it is precisely because they are flexible that their consequences for society must be understood with reference to the social actors able to influence which designs and arrangements are chosen" (Winner, 1980, pp.134). Fixed technology are innovations that are not as susceptible to social factors, and certain power relations tend to be

statically built into the technology in black and white, yes/no, binary terms (Winner, 1980, pp.127).

Ultimately, Winner's point is, whether it is deliberate/intentional or not intentional, societies choose structures for technology that influence how people live their lives – how we get to work, travel, communicate, consume, and move through spaces and we cannot ignore the contexts in which objects are situated or created (Winner, 1980, pp. 127). Similarly to Winner's examples of flexible technologies being discriminatory in the form of seemingly innocuous architecture and design features that were driven by the political biases built into them (either implicitly or explicitly), the social factors influencing the structure and design of the Chicago gang database and other biometric technology has led to harmful impacts of the tool that we can evaluate on the spectrum of unintended versus malicious intent.

Alternatively, new media researchers like Carlos Magalhães offers a more nuanced critical approach to the benefits and detriments of the proliferation of use of algorithms. As Michel Foucault would probably conclude (if he was still alive) that there is no use of algorithms that could ever be beneficial, Magalhães defines a model for "ethical subjectivation" to suggest that there are levels of potential harms and benefits as a consequence of using algorithms that must be evaluated by decentering algorithms and their controllers in favor of end users' contextualized perceptions of reality (Magalhães, 2018, pp.6). He argues, "algorithmic decisions do not engender harmful subjectivations, but that these harms are neither necessary nor necessarily inflicted upon users from the outside. Instead, it might be that by trying to comply with what we

think algorithms want from us, users consciously act in ways that harm themselves' and others' autonomy" (Magalhães, 2018, pp.8).

Pinch and Bijker (1984) argue that artifacts, including science and technology are all socially constructed (Pinch & Bijker, 1984, pp.28). Their article examines how certain relevant social groups are concerned and involved with the production of an artifact or technological advancement, highlighting the relevancy of power and economic strength attributed to agent groups that have the ability to develop, influence, or design a product or piece of technology. Pinch and Bijker suggest that this is characterized by creating and upholding systemic power differentials between non-agent groups and relevant social groups. Non-agent groups are inherently left out of the decision making process, whereas relevant social groups see the problem as being solved, but don't take into account the needs of all groups (Pinch & Bijker, 1984, pp.35).

Regarding the Chicago gang database, Pinch and Bijker's claims raise the issue of whose perspectives might be considered in the redesign of Chicago's gang database. In order to avoid discriminatory design features, content creators and policy-makers must work in conjunction in order to not be complicit in the systematic discrimination and surveillance of non-agent groups, such as the black and brown bodies whom the database effectively targets in its current form. Non-agent groups are already marginalized and limited access to fair representation, so content creators must work to emancipate non-agent groups from being left out of decision-making processes via intentionally seeking out a variety of perspectives that could influence the redesign of the database. Having a few "experts" involved in the decision-making process in regards

to the database's redesign will inherently exclude non-agent groups. In order to counteract this proactively, future content creators should consider the diverse perspectives of people with varying backgrounds and experiences. Similarly, biometric technologies that states are considering employing around the world must be vetted and scrutinized to the same degree in order to make sure that a variety of diverse perspectives are taken into account, to avoid algorithmic biases and discriminatory design. Other suggestions for the redesign of the database moving forward include: structuring information so that it isn't permanently fixed, and is easier to edit and add/purge data, as well as banning sharing CLEAR and SSL data with third parties.

Los Angeles is an example of a city with similar gang issues that made sweeping reforms to its database. In the last nine years, Los Angeles has cut its database in half, and an appeals process to remove names from the database has also been established (Sun-Times Editorial Board, 2019). In Portland, Oregon, the police department recently announced plans to scrap its list altogether. There are activists and collaborative grassroots organizations, headed by the Organized Coalition Against Deportation, Mi Jente, and the Black Youth Project, working to launch a large-scale campaign to Erase the Database. Other activists are currently working to develop more stringent policies on how individuals are added, and furthermore how individuals are admitted to and purged from the database.

In the case of Chicago's gang database, significant traction has been made in support of considering the redesign and/or abolition of the database as a whole. As of February 20, 2019, an ordinance vote was passed by the Cook County board in support

of permanently dismantling the gang database (Dumke, 2019). If the Cook County local records commission approves the database's destruction during its next session, the Chicago gang database could be entirely dismantled within a year (Dumke, 2019). Encouraging discourse on the issues of unequal methods of surveillance can also prevent the replication of these seemingly innocuous design features from seeping into other institutional practices that have the potential to reinforce the criminalization of black and brown bodies.

This road of utilizing technology to enhance the surveillance of black and brown bodies is a slippery slope and if not being completely abolished, we must be careful with how we use it and somewhat regulate this new technology because of potential ethical concerns and racist implications. For example, in *Race After Technology*, Ruha Benjamin explains how corporations like N-Tech market their extremely accurate facial recognition software for 'practical applications in retail, healthcare, entertainment and other industries' while they are really selling the technology to law enforcement agencies and immigration officials. This just further illustrates how easily this seemingly innocuous technology can lead to criminalizing misrepresentation (Benjamin, 2019, p.48).

Ruha Benjamin states how there is a growing segment of the public that want more regulation of the tech industry. According to a recent survey, 55% of the public (up from 45%) is calling for more heavy regulation of the tech industry (Benjamin, 2019, p. 39). In fact, some scholars in the UK are calling for bans on indiscriminate data

gathering altogether, stating that the ban would be the best approach to regulating mass-scale indiscriminate gathering.

As the Chicago gang database is being torn down, there are other databases and technologies in other parts of the world that are still planned to be constructed. Some of these biometric technologies will be built in the same vein as they have been historically: infused with the bias of its engineers and racially pointed to subject brown and black bodies to increased surveillance and standards of legibility. The issue is not just about one gang database, the larger issue is surrounding the systemic impact that this standardized way of thinking about race, surveillance and other-ing has on marginalized populations.

Informationalizing race has serious consequences. We need to change the way the way that we collect and synthesize information pertaining to race and consider its potential ramifications. We have to work together to draw attention to forms of coded inequity and discriminatory design patterns, and pull back the curtain on how these social dimensions of technology support the emergence of a digital caste system and the oppression of people of color. Without pulling back the curtain, we assume a dangerously passive stance and welcome the absence of nuanced discussions about how such racial thinking shapes the research and development of contemporary information technology, which in itself reinforces existing power relations and coded assumptions surrounding race and blackness.

Works Cited

Benjamin, R. (2019). Introduction. In *Race After Technology* (pp. 21–76). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Bonsu, J. (2018, May 22). *Data-driven criminalization: The case of Chicago's gang database* [Scholarly project]. In *Chi Hacknight*. Retrieved from https://chihacknight.org/events/2018/05/22/janae-bonsu.html

Browne S (2015) Dark Matters: On the Surveillance of Blackness. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Dumke, M. (2019). Cook County Takes Steps to Erase Its Regional Gang Database. *ProPublica Illinois*. Retrieved from https://www.propublica.org/article/cook-county-sheriffs-office-database-new-ban-law

Ensign, D., Friedler, S. A., Neville, S., Scheidegger, C., & Venkatasubramanian, S. (2017). Runaway Feedback Loops in Predictive Policing. *Computers and Society*, 1–12. Retrieved from https://arxiv.org/pdf/1706.09847.pdf

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish* (2nd ed.) (A. Sheridan, Trans.).

Foucault, M. (1978). *The History of Sexuality* (Vol. 1) (R. Hurley, Trans.).

Gans, H. J. (1965). The Failure of Urban Renewal, 1–23.

Jefferson, B. J. (2017). Digitize and punish: Computerized crime mapping and racialized carceral power in Chicago. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, *35*(5), 775–796.

Lillington, K. (2019, November 7). Karlin Lillington: Ban all indiscriminate data gathering. Retrieved from https://www.irishtimes.com/business/technology/karlin-lillington-ban-all-indiscriminate-data-gathering-1.4074670.

Carlos Magalhães, J. (2018). Do Algorithms Shape Character? Considering Algorithmic Ethical Subjectivation. *Social Media + Society*. Volume, issue, pages?

O'Neil, C. (2016). Introduction. In *Weapons of Math Destruction*(pp. 1–13). New York, NY: Broadway Books.

Pinch, T. J., & Bijker, W. E. (1984). The Social Construction of Facts and Artifacts: or How the Sociology of Science and the Sociology of Technology might Benefit Each Other. *Social Studies of Science, 14(*3), 399–441.

Rickleton, C. (2019). Kazakhstan embraces facial recognition, civil society recoils. *Eurasia Net*. Retrieved from https://eurasianet.org/kazakhstan-embraces-facial-recognition-civil-society-recoils

Scott, J. C. (1998). *Seeing Like a State*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press

Sun-Times. (2019, January 15). Overhaul Chicago's gang member database — but don't chuck it. *Chicago Sun-Times*. Retrieved from https://chicago.suntimes.com/crime/chicago-police-gang-database-toni-preckwinkle-macarthur-justice-center/

Sweeney, A. (2018, April 30). Massive gang database kept by Chicago police under fire as inaccurate, outdated. *Chicago Tribune*. Retrieved from https://www.chicagotribune.com/news/local/breaking/ct-met-chicago-police-gang-database-20180411-story.html

Winner, L. (1980). Do Artifacts Have Politics? *Daedalus*, 109(1), 121–136.