5 – Surveillance

Chapter Five is named after the proposed excess, or line of flight, that can emerge from an affective encounter with *Creepers I*. In order to explore the emergence of surveillance through the text the chapter incorporates *criminological aesthetics* and the Deleuzian concept of excess to trace what this text can *do.* This exploration will show how governmental messages about road safety cannot be completely controlled. The chapter also utilises governmentality as a tool to address how the fear invoked by this text *works* on the failed subject. This perspective will again highlight how the fear of crime, as a technology, is used by late modern governments to motivate both the failed *other* and the ethical *self*. Finally, the chapter will discuss the representation of the *other* provided in *Creepers I*. Unlike in Chapters Two to Four, it will be argued that the representation of the *other* at work in this text is an unproblematic representation of the failed subject because it depicts the subject as a *becoming*, prefiguring the discussion in Chapter Six.

Creepers I

Creepers I (maccampaigns, 2008) is the precursor of *Creepers II* which was the focus of Chapter Two. As connected campaigns there are obvious similarities between the two texts. Like *Creepers II*, the *Creepers I* campaign elements comprise of a mixture of television, news print, radio, bus shelter and billboard advertisements that feature the morphing of an ordinary looking driver into the monstrous *other*. Moreover, both share the primary objective of rebranding low level speeding as illicit through the notion of 'creeping'. On this and other points that the two texts align, it would be remiss to repeat an analysis of issues already presented in Chapter Two. Instead this chapter tackles the issues within *Creepers I* that did not dominantly present themselves in *Creepers II*. What is particularly different about *Creepers I* is the use of a rapid montage style,

featuring a collection of images captured by real closed circuit television (CCTV) and road traffic safety cameras. It will be argued that this stylistic approach carries the potential to produce an excess that can lead to surveillance.

The first scene is shot in black and white and from the lofty perspective of a traffic safety camera. The frame incorporates an intersection presumably governed by traffic lights. There are vehicles travelling in two lanes from the right to left of the screen and vehicles travelling in two lanes from left to right. There is obscured white text at the top of the screen (03) and blurred text at the bottom of the screen which look like a series of numbers counting, not unlike a CCTV time stamp. From the bottom of the frame a 4WD travels slowly towards the white line and comes to a stop, adjacent to the moving traffic. Although the frame does not include the traffic signals (only their support poles), it appears that the 4WD has stopped upon encountering a red light. From the left of the frame two dark figures emerge near the pedestrian lights. One of the pedestrians appears to be a female adult on account of her long hair, silhouette and clothing. The other pedestrian, much shorter than the first, appears to be a child who is holding the hand of the adult. In the child's other hand is a string which is tied to a stark white balloon. Throughout this part of the scene the audio features the same metallic crackle that is used in *Creepers II*. The audio is also overlayed with the muffled sound of filtered road traffic noises.

The two pedestrians begin to walk onto the roadway travelling left to right across the screen. At the same time a light coloured sedan enters from the bottom of the frame at a faster speed than the 4WD had previously (Figure 5.1). The sedan comes to an abrupt stop over the white line at the same time as the two pedestrians are aligned with the front of the vehicle. The two pedestrians disappear from the frame, presumably under the sedan's bonnet (Figure 5.2). At the same time that the collision occurs, a loud but muffled bang can be heard above the metallic crackles. Several unidentifiable items shoot out from under the bonnet and land in front of the 4WD in the next lane. At the same time the stark white balloon slowly bobbles upwards and across the screen and the

balloon's shadow transverses over the asphalt until it is out of view. The driver's door opens and a stooped figure emerges from vehicle. The screen turns black, and white text appears which reads: 'Creepers think driving a bit over the speed limit is ok' (Figure 5.3). The audio then increases in rapidity and intensity. Amongst the familiar crackles a loud metallic clanging and a high pitched revving can be heard. This intense audio continues as the frame changes from black to a rapid montage of CCTV footage, moving images and photographs that flicker over the space of eight seconds.

Figure 5. 1

Figure 5. 2

Figure 5. 3

The rapid montage of images that follow were able to be captured as separate images by slowing down the text. This manner of slowing down the images is inconsistent with the speed that the spectator would view it. It is conceded that images of such brief duration can be missed. However, while some images may be missed, memory fragments integrated in the narrative can keep "haunting

us" (Schmetterling 2006, 566 in Young, 2010, 141), perhaps even subliminally. In this way some but not all images will be untangled from the collection by the spectator, enabling some perception. For this reason each image from the rapid montage below will be treated separately and not as a collection in order to acknowledge that the spectator does not have the time to sit and ponder over each separate image, as you might a work of art.[1] The rapid montage begins with the image of a 60km sign which travels from left to right of the screen from the lowered perspective of a driver looking up through a windscreen (Figure 5.4).

Figure 5. 4

The sign quickly flashes away to reveal coloured traffic camera footage of a vehicle travelling rapidly off a wet motor way exit[2] and rear-ending a stationary vehicle, causing the vehicle to bounce out of the queued traffic and travel up a grass embankment (Figure 5.5).

Figure 5. 5

The scene flicks to a still image of a dead female with her blue eyes open to screen (Figure 5.6). The scene then flicks to an image of the same female from another perspective, revealing her bloodied head bandages (Figure 5.7).

---

[1] This methodological approach was undertaken as a result of a discussion with Professor Kevin Haggerty at the *Surveillance and/in Everyday Life Conference*, Sydney, 20-21 Feb 2012 where the author presented a paper, *Creeper Vision,* based on this chapter.

[2] In metropolitan Adelaide, Australia.

Figure 5. 6

Figure 5. 7

The shot changes to a close up of a male's face with deep lacerations to his head, nose and right eye (Figure 5.8). The same image zooms and warps as it changes to the graininess of close up CCTV footage. The male's face becomes stretched and discoloured, and largely unrecognisable (Figure 5.9).

Figure 5. 8

Figure 5. 9

The shot fluctuates to another image of a lifeless man wearing a white shirt, lying on asphalt. His head and arms are relaxed as if dead or unconscious and his nose is bloodied (Figure 5.10).

Figure 5. 10

The shot varies to a close up still image of the ear of a neatly groomed male. There are several lines of congealed blood that have dripped downward from his face, across his neck and into his ear (Figure 5.11).

Figure 5. 11

The shot then changes to a coloured, still image of a white sedan with the front end collapsed over the front two seats; and two paramedics working around the vehicle (Figure 5.12).

Figure 5. 12

The shot fluctuates to a grayscale CCTV image of an intersection at night. Two brightly illuminated ambulances dominate the frame. Numerous people and other vehicles can be seen to collect around an obscured object of interest on the road (Figure 5.13).

Figure 5. 13

The screen blurs and the image of two vehicles twist and flicker in shades of black, white and green (Figure 5.14). The image comes into focus to reveal a grainy traffic camera image of a mid-intersection collision, littered with emergency services vehicles and a lone paramedic looking into a vehicle. Layered over the image is white text that reads Ch 2, Operator 2, GR2 Philips (Figure 5.15).

Figure 5. 14

Figure 5. 15

The shot then changes to reveal a moving image from another traffic camera. The perspective is very high over a cross roads and the monitored traffic is in the far distance and difficult to distinguish (Figure 5.16). Pedestrians can be seen on the road that traverses from the bottom to the top of the screen and several vehicles travel on the road that traverses from the right to the left of the screen. A vehicle is depicted as travelling at a rapid speed from the right to the left and then the scene changes without apparently revealing a collision.

Figure 5. 16

The shot varies to a moving CCTV image of a collision with people manoeuvring around the damaged vehicles (Figure 5.17). White text overlays the image which states: '11' and '8 May 06, 14:35:36'.

Figure 5. 17

The shot then deviates to a clear, coloured image of a VW Beetle crumbled behind a pole and the legs of an emergency service worker attending inside the vehicle (Figure 5.18).

Figure 5. 18

The scene flashes away and is replaced by a coloured still image of a sheet of shattered windscreen glass peeled over to reveal a woman with a swollen, bloodied nose whose eyes are closed (Figure 5.19).

Figure 5. 19

The scene changes to a grainy CCTV moving image of two males in high visibility wear, pushing a damaged car through an intersection. Layered over the image is white text which reads: TS056 (Figure 5.20). This image zooms, blurs and morphs and becomes grainier (Figure 5.21).

Figure 5. 20

Figure 5. 21

The grainy CCTV camera style continues and the frame travels to the right as if the camera is moved to view another spot within its range (Figure 5.22). A blurred white square enters the frame and comes into focus to reveal the close up of a traffic camera view of a blanket covering a dead body on the side of a road. A lone witch's hat demarcates the lane that the body traverses. At the top right of the image are the legs of a person on the curb facing away from the blanket (Figure 5.23).

Figure 5. 22

Figure 5. 23

The scene varies to a coloured traffic camera image of an emergency services worker comforting a woman with her hands over her face. They appear to be seated on a rock face near the side of a road and an open car door is visible in

the frame. Two other figures are in the frame, standing over the woman. One (perhaps a police officer) points at the woman and the other figure (a female) points towards the vehicle (Figure 5.24).

Figure 5. 24

The shot fluctuates to a coloured image of a male seated in the driver's seat of a vehicle. The shot is filmed through the closed passenger window and is slightly obscured on account of the reflective properties of the glass. The driver has a neck brace attached to his neck and is attended through the driver's side window by an emergency services worker in gloves (Figure 5.25).

Figure 5. 25

The shot then changes to a close up of a deep laceration on the sweaty and dirtied forehead of a person with dark hair (Figure 5.26).

Figure 5. 26

The shot deviates to a moving image shot from the perspective of a person gazing the scene of an accident as they travel past in a vehicle. A male police officer wearing gloves picks up a bloodied item (perhaps a shoe) and places the item in a blue evidence bag. A large wet spot remains on the road from where the item was retrieved. Beside the police officer is the lifeless body of a male with his left leg in a twisted and unnatural position (Figure 5.27).

Figure 5. 27

The scene then changes to a moving image of a dark vehicle sliding at a fast pace on its roof, captured by a tunnel safety camera. There are scratches over the image and blurry white text (Figure 5.28). The scratches and text come into focus revealing the words: 'CREEPING is wrong' (Figure 5.29). Behind the words the dark vehicle continues to slide on its roof through the tunnel and out of frame.

Figure 5. 28

Figure 5. 29

The shot finally varies to the grainy view of a high traffic camera overseeing a three lane carriageway. Traffic is queued in all three lanes and a white sedan travels at a fast pace into the rear of one of the lanes of traffic, causing multiple vehicles to collide with each other (Figure 5.30). The force of the collision causes the white sedan to bounce away from the site of the collision and travel up an exit ramp.

Figure 5. 30

The rapid montage ceases and the image slows, revealing a frame shot from the perspective of another driver or pedestrian at a crossroads intersection. The frame depicts a maroon sedan travelling faster through an intersection than the vehicle beside it. The shot then changes to view the driver of the maroon sedan through the front windscreen. The driver of the vehicle is a young male wearing a collared blue polo shirt (Figure 5.31). His previously uninjured face morphs to reveal sunken black eyes, lacerations to his face and bruising. His eyes change from a driving gaze to an intense stare (Figure 5.32). At the same time the music intensifies with the sound of a deep revving engine overlade with a piercing ringing, like a tuning fork. As the engine revving stops, the driver changes back to his original appearance and the high pitch ringing ceases. The screen turns black with blurred white text that comes into focus to read: 'Stop CREEPING' (Figure 5.33). The crackle fades out and the screen turns black.

Figure 5. 31

Figure 5. 32

Figure 5. 33

Illegality, dangerousness and the gaze

There are three key categorical statements which underpin this text to assist with the constitution of modes of subjectivity. The first truth presented is that low level speeding is illicit. The narrative informs the spectator that a Creeper is a driver who 'thinks driving a little over the speed limit is ok'. After viewing a series of rapid images that portend to reveal the consequences of 'driving a little over the speed limit', the spectator is presented with the proposition that it is not 'ok': it is 'wrong'. As discussed in Chapter Two the creators of the *Creepers* campaigns (MAC) were forthright about the necessity to rebrand low level speeding as illicit. This rebranding of low level speeding as 'creeping' gave the behaviour entrance into the categories of bad and wrong, and distinguish it from the desirable categories of good and right. Through this process the spectator is led to the conclusion: *If I creep a little over the speed limit I am bad, and if I do not, then I am a responsible driver*. Such binary categories like right/wrong and good/bad are essential features in the process of forming active and reflexive subjects.

The second categorical statement presented in the text relates to the notion that creeping a little over the speed limit causes death, injury and damage to vehicles. The spectator is thus informed that low level speeding is not only illicit but dangerous. The dangerousness of the behaviour is depicted through a series of 21 chilling images which are flashed before the spectator over the space of eight seconds. The images are presented so quickly that they could be assessed as subliminal. Whether the rapidity of the images can be contested as subliminal

or merely supraliminal is not for discussion here. Rather a more important discussion is that the threshold of conscious perception is being traversed here as a *biopolitical* strategy. In *Creepers I* MAC has employed a technique which is thought to stimulate mild emotional activity (subliminal) in an effort to convey a road safety message. Some well-informed spectators of television advertising may have awareness of the illegality of subliminal advertising.[3] In Australia the *Commercial Television Industry Code of Practice 2010* (*the Code*) regulates the matters concerned in s. 123 of the *Broadcasting Services Act 1992 (Cth)*. Section 1.9.4 of *the Code* states:

> *A licensee may not broadcast…a community service announcement which is likely, in all circumstances, to:…use or involve any technique which attempts to convey information to the viewer by transmitting messages below or near the threshold of normal awareness.*

Whether the rapidity of *Creepers I* meets the 'threshold of normal awareness' is not important. What is central is that viewing a series of rapid images may cause some spectators to believe that governments have the power to circumvent advertising laws. Correspondingly, most spectators would be accustomed to the censorship warnings displayed before gory images in television programs. In *Creepers I* there is no warning provided to parents to allow them to vet the viewing of their children,[4] nor a warning to Aboriginal (Australian) viewers that the images may portray deceased persons.[5] The absence of these warnings before the gruesome images of real road traffic fatalities depicted in *Creepers I* may reinforce an idea that governments can evade advertising regulations.

---

[3] For example, in 2008 the Australian Communications and Media Authority (ACMA) found the *Ten Network* in breach of s. 1.9.4 of the *Commercial Television Industry Code of Practice 2010.* During the broadcast of the 2007 ARIA Music Awards on 28 October 2007 *Ten* transmitted images of sponsors (eg. KFC and Toyota Yaris) below or near the threshold of normal awareness. The investigation was instigated after several complaints were received by ACMA from viewers concerned about the use of subliminal advertising (Australian Communications and Media Authority, 2008).

[4] While there are guidelines in *the Code* concerning the use of warnings and classification symbols for news and current affairs programs (s. 4.3) there are no requirements to provide warnings or display classifications in commercials or community service announcements (s. 6.6.2) because the "material is typically very brief, and cannot in practice be preceded by a warning" (s. 6.1.1).

[5] Section 1.9.5 of *the Code* prohibits material that may "seriously offend the cultural sensitivities of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people" and goes further in an advisory note to clarify: "particularly the widespread prohibition of displaying images of the deceased" (Advisory Note: The Portrayal of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples, *The Code*, note 7, page 57.)

While a discussion concerning whether governments can or do evade the regulations in place surrounding television advertising has its merits, more central to this discussion is the perception that they can. The perception that a government can circumvent their own advertising regulations serves to strengthen the validity of the categorical statement contained within the advertisement. The subtext is: *if governments are prepared to breach their own regulations that govern advertising then what they are saying must be important and right*. In this way the ostensive straddling of regulatory thresholds pertaining to advertising strengthens the message that 'creeping is wrong' (Figure 5.29). In doing so it makes categorical the notions of right/wrong and safe/dangerous. The spectator can conclude: *if I creep over the speed limit then I could kill a child with a balloon* (Figure 5.2), *or have to wait by the side of the road with a blanket over someone I have killed* (Figure 5.23). The discursive properties of such categorical statements assist creeping over the speed limit to slide from 'ok' into the category of dangerous.

The final categorical statement presented in the text, and perhaps the most worthy for discussion, is that the spectator's driving is being watched. The spectator is presented with a series of real images captured by CCTV and road safety cameras. The authoritative perspective (from above) of the images are suggestive of their usefulness to police and courts in the prosecution of driving offending. This is further reinforced through the image of a police officer collecting evidence at the scene of a fatal road collision (Figure 5.27). This imagery creates the proposition that: *your driving is being watched.* This proposition enlivens the binary categories of the *watched* and *the watcher*. The spectator is led to believe that they may be under surveillance, the result of which may lead to prosecution or at the very least identification. Entangled within this categorical statement is the idea that the camera never lies. Doyle suggests that televisual surveillance is "epistemologically forceful" because the crude and under-produced quality of surveillance footage suggests that it is from a real source and is undoctored (Doyle, 2006, 211). The apparent legitimacy of

camera footage validates the image as truth and serves to strengthen the idea that: *your driving is being watched*.

Veiled beneath this categorical statement concerning the legitimacy of the camera image is the role of the operator. Surveillance is often mediated through human agents who, either during collection or reproduction, can alter the image. For this reason the outcome of CCTV image collection can be ambiguous and variable (Smith, 2007; McCahill, 2002). The legitimacy of the CCTV image is a live issue in *Creepers I*. Dispersed amongst the real images are simulated images made to appear real. In the first scene, depicted in Figures 5.1 and 5.2, a small child with a balloon and (perhaps) their parent are portrayed as being run over by a vehicle approaching too fast into an intersection. The image is made to appear real but it is in fact a simulation, as a representative from Clemenger BBDO explains:

> *it came from another jurisdiction … and the car was on the wrong side of the*
> *road and we had to flip the image or something so in the end we just recreated*
> *it. It was on the right-hand side of the screen or the left, or something,*
> *whatever. So that one we actually reproduced and made it look like it was*
> *captured but the others were, sort of, real things that happened. (Interview*
> *Clemenger BBDO, 17/11/10)*

Clearly, the first scene of *Creepers I* is made to 'look like it was captured' to give the simulation more credence by borrowing from the surveillance trope. Doyle suggests that this credibility occurs because the:

> *crudeness, starkness and graininess of surveillance video suggests… a grim,*
> *harsh street-level 'reality' evoking a 'gritty realism'. The grey and black palette*
> *has a 'film noir' quality which fit with a common sense view of crime – because*
> *crime is committed on dark streets at night by strangers (Doyle, 2006, 210)*

As such the use of the grainy black and white surveillance trope is adopted in *Creepers I* to portray simulation as actual event. Additionally, the angle of the shot (as if from the perspective of a traffic camera) and the overlaying of blurred text (giving the appearance of censorship) add to the realism of the image. This legitimacy is furthered strengthened through the presentation of the simulated

image amongst other real images. The spectator has no cause to view this image as anything other than undoctored footage that portrays a real event. It is convincingly presented as truth and serves to strengthen the overall viability of the binary categories it creates.

The categorical statements in *Creepers I,* concerning legality, dangerousness and the gaze, oblige several binary divisions. Most obviously, the narrative presented in white text (Figures 5.3 and 5.29) create the categories of right/'wrong' and 'creeper'/non-creeper. Similarly, the images depicting death and injury, particularly Figures 5.2, 5.23 and 5.27, create the categories of safe/dangerous for the spectator. Finally, the use of the surveillance trope in the majority of the images creates the important categories of *watched/watcher*. The spectator is asked to conclude: *If I am the watched then my behaviour may be seen by others*. This is what Haggerty and Ericson call the "disappearance of disappearance", which refers to the phenomenon whereby it is increasingly difficult for individuals to maintain their anonymity or to escape the monitoring of surveillance cameras in late modernity (Haggerty et al., 2000, 619). The lack of anonymity on the road portrayed in *Creepers I* does not just pertain to the *watched* (the creeper). The presentation of the category of the *watched* criminal necessitates the presentation of its binary opposite, the *watched* victim. Implicit in the notion that the *other* is being watched are the consequences of detection, evidence gathering and prosecution. However, the subsequent monitoring of the victim may contribute to the idea that their injury or death may be recorded and displayed as a televisual spectacle. Regardless of how this resonates in a spectator, the presentation of these categories in *Creepers I* aids in the formation of subjectivities.

The failed subject

The binary representation of such categories facilitates the spectator to recognise their place within the presented categories. The categorical

right/wrong, victim/criminal, safe/dangerous and *watched/watcher* force contemplation of those possible binary options. By reflecting on these available categories the spectator is asked to recall their previous behaviours and align themselves with one binary mode, thus constituting a subject. *Creepers I* is capable, through the presentation of fear inducing imagery, to constitute variable modes of subjectivity, one of which is the fearful subject. A spectator, when presented with the binary notion of victim/criminal, may align themselves with the injured or deceased victims portrayed in the text. However, it is suggested that the constitution of a fearful subject is not what *Creepers I* can predominantly *do*. *Creepers I*, while having the capacity to constitute a fearful subject through its presentation of images of road traffic victims, principally addresses the feared, not the fearful subject.

The feared *other* is the intended subject addressed in *Creepers I*. This is clear from the placement of the cameras and the gaze they portray throughout the text. There are no images that are shot from the perspective of a victim gazing upon the source of their injury or death. Aside from the final image where the *creeper* morphs into a monster, depicted in Figures 5.31 and 5.32, the *other* is absent. The absence occurs because the *other* is situated (in some shots) from the vantage point behind the camera. It is the *other's* gaze that the spectator views. The image of the passing 60 km/h sign in Figure 5.4 is shot from this perspective. Similarly, the coloured shots of injured and deceased bodies (Figures 5.6-5.8, 5.10-5.12, 5.18-5.19, 5.25-5.27) can also be construed as the inspecting gaze of the *other*. Importantly, the driver (and potential *creeper*) is never an object within the text; it is the victim who exists in the text as a visual object. The creeper is the subject of the text. Furthermore, the text does not provide any guidance for a potential victim to manage their own safety. The narrative advises the spectator that 'creeping is wrong' and that those who do it think it is 'OK'. There is no transformative message to motivate an ethical subject to eliminate their own risk. The bloodied and monstrous imagery is likely to create a fearful but docile subject, leading to an unproductive fear of crime like was discussed in Chapter Two. If *Creepers I* aimed to address the fearful

186

subject in this way, it would fundamentally conflict with the principles of efficiency in late modern governmentality. For these reason it is argued that *Creepers I* intends to constitute the feared and failed subject, again highlighting that the fear of crime is a dual technology aimed at both the failed and ethical subject.

The surveilled subject

An additional aspect to the constitution of a failed subject by *Creepers I* is the subject of the gaze. Most of the images in the *Creepers I* montage are shots taken from road safety cameras which provide the perspective of a third party watching from a distance. Viewing these surveillant images the spectator is presented with the binary categories of *watched* and *watcher*. Through these categories a spectator can align themself with those who are *watched*, and thus a *surveilled* (or observed) subject is constituted. The *creeper* may be the failed subject of the images in *Creepers I* but s/he is also portrayed as the object of the voyeuristic gaze. When the *other* is the subject of the image, the *creeper's* body is absent. When the *other* is the object of the voyeuristic gaze, the *creeper* is visualised but disembodied. This notion of the decorporealised body of surveillance understands the gazed body as being broken down because it is abstracted from its territorial setting, such as the scene of a collision. It is then reassembled elsewhere, say on a television advertisement, through striated data flows (Haggerty et al., 2000, 611). The result of this disembodiment is an observed body of "hybrid composition" (Haggerty et al., 2000, 611).

The surveillant assemblage

For Haggerty and Ericson this disembodiment through surveillance is "a 'data double' of pure virtuality" (Haggerty et al., 2000, 611). This notion closely ties with Deleuze's conceptualisation of the *dividual* (Deleuze, 1992b, 5). The *dividual*

is the "the multiplication of the individual, the constitution of an additional self" (Poster 1990, 97 in Haggerty et al., 2000, 613). This multiplication, or data double, is a new body created through technology. The technology which observes the gazed subject, in this case the *creeper:*

> *is a visualising device that bring[s] into the visual register a host of heretofore opaque flows of auditory, scent, chemical, visual, ultraviolet and informational stimuli (Haggerty et al., 2000, 611).*

Borrowing from Deleuze, Haggerty and Ericson collectively call this technology a *surveillant assemblage* because of its many connected facets. The *surveillant assemblage* breaks down the observed body into discrete signifying flows and then funnels or striates the flow. For example, drug testing striates the flow of chemicals, photography captures flows of reflected light waves (Haggerty et al., 2000, 612), and in this case CCTV and road traffic cameras striate the flows of petrol, blood, flesh, space, and criminality. The *surveillant assemblage* captures this flow of information about the body and transforms it into pure information so that it is more mobile and comparable and can be reassembled and scrutinised at other sites (like police stations and the office of the Motor Accident Commission) to assist strategies of governance and control (Haggerty et al., 2000, 613).

The *surveillant assemblage* assists governance and control by reducing the flesh of the gazed body to pure information. In place of the corporeal body is its data double that acts as a marker for "access to resources, services, and power in ways unknown to the actual body"(Haggerty et al., 2000, 614).   The flows of information represented by the *dividual* allow institutions to gain knowledge about the behaviour of both individuals and populations. Red light cameras and speed cameras, both facets of the *surveillant assemblage*, allow institutions like the police and road traffic authorities to observe and collect information about the driver of a particular vehicle. The driver of the vehicle is broken down into flows of speed, space, time, numbers, letters, petrol and money; and then reconstituted as a data double for categorical purposes. The data double is

categorised as either failed (speeds or enters an intersection on a red signal) or ethical because they comply with relevant regulations concerning a particular intersection or stretch of road. For example, the data double of a *creeper* caught travelling four km/h faster than the speed limit is an amalgam of flows of information that are striated, sorted and categorised as criminal. Interestingly, disciplinary power in response to this scrutiny can be exercised over the failed data double, before the categorisation of the data double is superimposed back onto the corporeal driver. This is what has come to be known as *simulated justice* (O'Malley, 2010b; Bogard, 2006a; Bogard, 2009).

Simulated justice

It is helpful to consider road traffic regulation when describing the notion of *simulated justice*. Constituted by a speed camera, a data double is categorised as criminal and coded with a series of numbers and letters: including the number plate of the vehicle, the license number and address of the corporeal owner of the vehicle, the detected speed and signed speed limit of the area, and the number of the expiation notice that is issued as a result of the criminal categorisation. Categorised and coded the notice is issued to the *dividual*. The *dividual* is the flow of information that creates the knowledge that a certain corporeal body, who is the registered owner of a certain number plate, was at a certain place and time when a vehicle travelled four km/h over the speed limit through an intersection governed by a traffic camera. The *dividual* is coded with this information, not the corporeal body that opens a windowed envelope bearing official government insignia and discovers that they have been superimposed with the criminal categorisation of their data double. The *dividual* remains constituted, even as the flows of money are striated and captured (paying the fine) and coding administered (demerit points applied) (O'Malley, 2010b, 797). At no point in time since the offence has the embodiment of the categorical *other* been necessary, as O'Malley points out:

I am policed, judged and sanctioned but no one has seen me, nor have I been 'sensed' in any human way (O'Malley, 2010b, 795).

In this way justice becomes simulated. However, not all justice on the road can be simulated. As O'Malley suggests, drivers can "flirt with the possibility of being hailed as individuals" (O'Malley, 2010b, 803) by committing a driving act that crosses a deemed risk threshold of dangerousness (O'Malley, 2010b, 797). Provided they are detected by corporeal policing bodies some acts of driving, such as *causing death or harm by use of vehicle*,[6] may warrant an immediate arrest without bail and a penalty of imprisonment. In this case the *dividual* is not constituted. However, for the majority of offences the driver only becomes embodied when the truthfulness of the flows of information represented by the *dividual* are disputed in court, or if a digitally detected offence passes the risk threshold of dangerousness (O'Malley, 2010b, 797): in which case the *dividual* disperses (O'Malley, 2010b, 795).

Othering through the gaze

The flows of information represented by the *dividual* are not only useful in governance and control of the individual, it also allows institutions to gain knowledge about large populations. In fact the notion of the *creeper* developed as a result of flows of information from *dividuals* that allowed for low level speeding to be categorised as a problem. Curiously, the *dividuals* represented in the images portrayed in *Creepers I* are also used as a strategy to address the problem they helped to articulate. This categorisation and coding of flows, or what Lyon calls "social sorting" can be problematic (Lyon, 2007, 94). He suggests that the *surveillant assemblage* does not classify, sort and manage social outcomes in an objective or neutral way, but is based on meaning-making and judgement calls (Lyon, 2007, 94). As such, the data doubles reconstituted in the *Creepers I* montage undergo a process of *othering* through the categories and

---

[6] This is an indictable offence in the state of South Australia which carries a maximum penalty of 15 years imprisonment and ten years or more disqualification from driving (*Criminal Law Consolidation Act* 1935 (SA), s. 19A).

codings ascribed to the flows of information they represent. However, the flows of information are limited. For example, the pure information reassembled in *Creepers I* concerning the collision depicted in Figure 5.5 has been categorised and coded as being an event caused by creeping (low level speeding). However, it may have been drink-driving or inattention or hypoglycaemia that led this vehicle to rear end another on an exit ramp. The flow of information has been categorised and coded as *creeping* and the *dividual* criminalised all without the use of other aspects of the *surveillant assemblage,* like: breathalysers, glucose screening devices, or the statements of eye witnesses. In this case the *surveillant assemblage* has not been used objectively. Rather a judgement call has been made about the flows of certain information to suit a certain governance and control objective; namely reducing low level speeding in a large population.

This objective to reduce low level speeding through the reassembling of flows of data on television is both collectivising (reaches diverse and vast audiences) and individualising (singles people out) (Doyle, 2006, 212). For example, the driver involved in the collision (Figure 5.5) is singled out in a way that could lead to their recognition as being party to this event. Similarly, the broadcast allows the audience to be involved in a collective experience, namely the process of *othering* of the driver. Doyle suggests that broadcasting surveillance footage is anti-actuarial, or a "criminology of the other" (Garland, 1996, 461) because it heralds difference by showing the "few to the many" as well as the "many to the many" (Doyle, 2006, 216). Following this argument, by reassembling flows of data on television *Creepers I* constitutes a *surveilled* (and disembodied) subject who is aware that their behaviour on the road is being watched by the many (television viewers) and the few (the police and road traffic authorities). This notion of being watched by the many and the few assists the transformative message that underpins *Creepers I*. The presentation of the category of *watched/watcher*, alongside dangerous/safe and failed/ethical, enables *Creepers I* to constitute a failed but disembodied

(*dividual*) subject in the hope that they may be transformed and improved (Foucault, 1979).

Fear of being watched

Once a failed (and disembodied) subject is constituted, fear can be used as a technique to transform them. In *Creepers I* fear is prompted through the portrayal of real-life images surrounding road traffic fatality and injury. The spectator is led to the conclusion that if they drive 'a bit over the speed limit' they may be the cause of the possible unwanted future of causing death, as in Figure 5.23, or injury to themselves or another (Figure 5.25). Additionally, the spectator is presented with the possible unwanted future of being monitored by authorities (as depicted in the identification marking at the bottom of the screen in Figure 5.15) or evidence collected against them (as demonstrated by the actions of the police officer depicted in Figure 5.27). These particular fears hinge on the possibility of an unwanted future within the criminal justice system. The remaining possible unwanted future that is presented in the text concerns being the object of another's gaze. The spectator is presented with the undesirable possibility that the consequences of their driving may not only be recorded but also televised. This broadcast could reach audiences through: a government funded road traffic advertisement like *Creepers I*; a reality television show like *D.U.I.* (Mike Mathis Productions, 2011) and *Canada's Worst Driver* (Proper Television, 2005); or uploaded to *You Tube*. This type of spectatorship has "voyeuristic entertainment value" (Haggerty et al., 2000, 616) that may lead to the undesirable possibility of embarrassment or shame.[7] Additionally, the spectator is made aware that their driving is not only being watched by traffic cameras but also by surrounding drivers who are able to relay their behaviour through eye witness account, as the pointing bystanders in Figure 5.24 illustrate.

---

[7] Of course, this would only be the case if the driver's vehicle or face is identifiable, otherwise it is their *dividual* who is the subject of the gaze.

Awareness of this gaze is a particularly potent tool for transforming modes of subjectivity.

The awareness of being watched allows a subject to recognise their place in a system of meaning. Foucault considered this in his discussion of Bentham's *panopticon* model (Foucault, 1979). Foucault suggests that the thought of "an inspecting gaze" allows the subject to interiorise until they exercise surveillance over themselves (Foucault et al., 1980, 155). Foucault also proposed that the potential for observation is equally as important as observation itself, as it reshapes individual subjectivities "through the promise, if not the reality, of omniscient observation" (Haggerty et al., 2011, 232). In this way surveillance is an exercise of disciplinary power because the threat of an overarching gaze affords the *surveilled* subject the opportunity to reflect on their own behaviour, perhaps leading to a more reflexive and productive subject (Haggerty et al., 2000, 607). Additionally, surveillance can also be understood as an exercise of *biopower* because the same gaze can monitor the wellbeing of the individual subject and large populations. Accordingly, the images in *Creepers I* highlight road traffic surveillance as an exercise of biopower because it allows the early detection of road traffic collisions and the timely despatch of emergency services to the scene, as depicted in Figures 5.12, 5.13, and 5.15. The images portrayed in *Creepers I* are also an exercise of disciplinary power because the text allows drivers to reflect on their speeding, affording the opportunity to reflect on the consequences of that behaviour in the hope that it produces more ethical modes of subjectivity.

More ethical modes of subjectivity can be produced through spectatorship of *Creepers I* because the failed subject is presented with images portraying 'possible worlds' that can emanate from their behaviour. These possible futures, such as injury, fatality or being watched, are presented because of their undesirability. Fear is invoked because the unwanted possible futures convey logical consequences to the spectator. These consequences include potential exposure to the criminal justice system, license disqualification, fines,

imprisonment, insurance claims, and at the very least, inconvenience. They also convey more emotional consequences like shame, ostracism, guilt, grief and embarrassment. At least one of these possible consequences is likely to resonate as unwanted for the spectator. In line with the definition of fear presented in Chapter One, the *possible worlds* portrayed reveal an unwanted consequence that 'might still be' and thus fear can be invoked. For the failed subject viewing *Creepers I* these logical consequences of travelling 'a bit over the speed limit' can inspire fear of one, or more, of the *possible worlds* depicted. The emotion of fear can then inspire the failed *other* to transform away from the category of dangerous and towards more ethical modes of subjectivity. In this way *Creepers I* does not invoke a fear of the *other*, it invokes fearfulness of *becoming* the *other*.

Compliance and resistance

Through the presentation of graphic imagery and concepts *Creepers I* can trigger a fear of the consequences of crime that makes undesirable the category of *other*. The aim is that this fear leads the failed subject toward more ethical behaviour in the future. Principally, this is what *Creepers I* can *do*. However as discussed in previous chapters, this kind of road safety text always carries the potential for resistance. Resistance could manifest itself whereby a driver actively chooses to travel over the speed limit after watching *Creepers I*. However, the notion of being watched could lead to other acts of resistance, such as the avoidance of CCTV cameras and intersections with speed and red light cameras. Similarly, it could result in the obscuring of number plates, fixing stolen number plates to a vehicle, or simply slowing down at known camera sites but speeding up afterwards. Even protests and petitions against road traffic cameras might be employed as "an example of the unconventional politics which ordinary people express and mobilise their opposition to surveillance policies" (Gilliom, 2006, 113). These resistant acts denote a failed mode of subjectivity because they attempt to veil visibility and identification in order to frustrate a

system of detection, judgment, and punishment aimed at channelling behaviour for the wellbeing of all road users (Gilliom, 2006, 125). In this way an affective encounter with the text can transform a failed subject toward future ethical modes of subjectivity or lead toward future resistance.

Interestingly, this threshold between ethical and deviant is clearly demarcated in law in respect to the issue of speeding. On a section of road that is designated as a 60 km/h zone, if you are detected travelling at 61 km/h, you are speeding. If you are detected travelling 60 km/hr or less, you are not speeding. The law in Australia is particularly binary on the issue of speeding, treating it as an absolute liability offence.[8] The upshot of this type of statutory interpretation is that the subjective intention of the driver is not a consideration for conviction. This however does not mean that there can be no legal defence to a charge of speeding, the defence of emergency being a good example. Another interesting example relates to a series of speeding charges in the United States that raised defences based on speed detectors that had been unfairly calibrated for revenue raising purposes.[9] *Creepers I*, and other texts like it, promote the idea that anyone who crosses the threshold from compliance to speeding is the criminal *other*, regardless of whether they have been detected or convicted of the behaviour. The law allows for detection and conviction to be negotiated after the fact but essentially the law surrounding speeding offences only recognises the binary divide between compliance and resistance. *Creepers I* however cannot be said to only lead to compliance or resistance. As text it carries the capacity to become something else, a line of flight that is excess to the expectations of the author. The excess that will be traced in this discussion is surveillance.

---

[8] As discussed in Chapter One.

[9] *People v. John Allen* (Cal. Sup. Ct., 57927SD, Aug 2001).

The surveillant subject

Creepers I carries the potential for excess by proliferating the use of the *surveillant assemblage*. The growth of the *surveillant assemblage* in crime control and other governmental regulation has been described as the rise of "societies of control" (Deleuze, 1995, Part 5). Deleuze suggested that society has moved away from closed environment and examination based order to a more instant and modulated environment, through control monitoring and micro management (Deleuze, 1995, Part 5). Surveillance allows the computerisation and decentralisation of data flow to modulate our mobile and contingent modern lives (O'Malley, 2010b, 796). It has become intrinsically integrated in other systems of power because its primary concern is the distribution of entitlements based on identity (Haggerty et al., 2011, 233). As already discussed above, the *surveillant assemblage* abstracts bodies from their territorialised setting, separates them into discrete data flows and then reassembles them as *dividuals* for the purposes of scrutiny and targeting for intervention (Haggerty et al., 2000, 605-606). Haggerty and Ericson suggest that populations have been "transformed into signifiers for a multitude of organised surveillance systems"(Haggerty et al., 2000, 605). The result of this transformation is a "rhizomatic levelling of the hierarchy of surveillance" which leads to groups who were not previously monitored now being monitored (Haggerty et al., 2000, 606). This proliferation of the gaze is something which *Creepers I* can *do*.

The categories of *watched* and *watcher* invoked by *Creepers I* can constitute a *surveilled* subject, assisting in the promotion of ethical behaviour on the road. However, this same binary division can also constitute a *surveillant* subject, one who is empowered by the "rhizomatic levelling of the hierarchy of surveillance" (Haggerty et al., 2000, 605) and watches the driving behaviour of others. The internet in particular permits omniveillant activities by the *surveillant* subject. Australian government based websites like *Live Traffic* (Road Traffic Authority (NSW), 2012; Vic Roads, 2012), *Traffic and Travel Information* (Queensland

Government, 2011) and *TraffiCam* (Western Australia Government, 2012) provide live access to traffic cameras free of charge and without restriction to anyone with internet access. Similarly, *Snarl* (Snarl Online Traffic Services, 2012) is a private operation which sources similar live access using a smart phone application (first released in 2009). It provides a more user friendly interface and easy access to surveillance cameras via mobile phone while driving in traffic. *Snarl* advertises that their free application can help users avoid those moments of frustration caused by grid lock: "whether you check us before you leave, or while you travel, we want to help you avoid these moments" (Snarl Online Traffic Services, 2012). Interestingly, *Snarl* is sure to remind users that despite the application being operated by a mobile phone: "please do not use your mobile phone while driving. It is illegal"(Snarl Online Traffic Services, 2012). While this (almost) disclaimer is an interesting discussion in itself, it is the access to the cameras that is the focus of this section.

At the time of writing the Australian based access to traffic cameras described above do not provide a live feed. Rather they capture an image of a particular road or intersection, store that image for 60 seconds and then recapture the same frame in repetitive succession every 60 seconds. This 60 second delay in the feed somewhat diminishes the ability for the sites to be used to conduct continual surveillance over traffic and pedestrians. *Go and Roam* (goandroam.com, 2011) however provides better opportunities for surveillance by providing free access to over 2000 surveillance cameras throughout the world, not just of intersections, but public spaces, like malls and beaches. Some of the cameras accessible on this website refresh every 5 seconds, providing an increased ability to maintain gaze over public space. Overseas, technology and funding initiatives are more progressive, providing 24 hour live streaming of roads and intersections, like *CalTrans,* which streams real time feeds from over 1000 traffic cameras across California (California Department of Transportation, 2013). This kind of free access to traffic cameras can facilitate the behaviour of the surveillant subject. An example of this is the recording and uploading to *You Tube* of a traffic camera image which depicts an elderly man being run over and

then several trailing vehicles swerving over double lines to avoid the scene and failing to stop as the man lay dying (robpricer, 2008). This phenomenon, made possible by the internet, not only provides the many with the opportunity to watch the many (*Omniveillance)* but also the many to watch the few.

The many watching the few

The notion of the many watching the few began with Mathiesen's theoretical conception of the *synopticon.* The *synopticon* denotes a system led by the mass media whereby the many watch the few. It was considered to be a parallel system of control that feeds into and on Foucault's concept of the *panopticon* (Mathiesen 1997, 231 in Lyon, 2006, 43). A good example of synoptic surveillance within road traffic regulation is evident in the type of surveillance that was encouraged in *Creepers II*. As discussed in Chapter Two, *Creepers II* discursively inspires the ethical subject to 'watch out for creepers', a form of synoptic surveillance whereby the 'many' good drivers maintain a gaze over the 'few' *creepers*. This synoptic surveillance is distinct and operates independently of the panoptic gaze portrayed in *Creepers I*, where a few government employed safety camera operators maintain surveillance over endless flows of traffic and presumably our behaviour within them. However, Mathiesons *synopticon* has been criticised in recent times. Doyle argues that synoptics upholds the dominant role of media personalities and executives, implying a conspiratorial influence (Doyle, 2011, 286), and denies that the audience are active meaning makers with the ability to resist the message (Doyle, 2011, 292). He recommends that it is best to use *synopticon* as a model in a more narrow way by looking at how the mass media and surveillance intertwine and interact, instead of looking at it as a way of thinking about the role of the media in social control (Doyle, 2011, 284). Applying Doyle's conception, the *Creepers II* advertisement interacts with surveillance by constituting a reflexive ethical subject who maintains surveillance over low level speeders. This is not an exercise of social control influenced by media executives and media identities, as

they have very little impact on the research and campaign development behind the *Creepers II* production, which is at all times guided by the scope of the organisation (MAC) that funds it. For this reason the surveillance that *Creepers II* endorses can still be understood as *synoptics*, even when applying Doyle's more narrow conception.

A variation of *synoptics*, which still upholds the notion of the many watching the few is *sousveillance. Sousveillance* is more of a community-based recording from first person perspective, without necessarily involving any specific political agenda. Particularly in respect to road traffic, there is an overabundance of road rage incidents recorded via mobile phone and posted on *You Tube*. A relevant example is the posting of a four minute recording of a road rage incident between a truck and a sedan in metropolitan Adelaide (wwwdotsvmsadotcom, 2008). The *surveillant* subject was a third party travelling behind the vehicles. The sedan is seen to chase and dangerously cut off the truck several times, forcing it to stop. The sedan driver exits the vehicle swearing and attempts to get the driver to exit the vehicle, causing minor damage to the truck. The sedan driver then turns his attention to the *surveillant* subject, causing him to speed of in his vehicle and ending the surveillance. The *surveillant* subject not only uploaded the footage to *You Tube* but supplied it to a local television station where it featured in the evening news (Channel Nine, 19th December 2008). Another example is a photograph taken by another *surveillant* subject in Melbourne, Australia who detected a young driver travelling on the freeway with both of his legs outside of the window. The photograph was then provided to police and media outlets and reported nationally (Thompson, 27 December 2012). Arguably, these *souveillant* activities may emanate as an excess from an affective encounter with texts like *Creepers I* because they depict the power and usefulness that derives from traffic surveillance.

A subset within *sousveillance*, known as *inverse surveillance*, has a particular emphasis on vigilant watchfulness from below (Mann, 2004, 620). *Inverse surveillance* involves the recording, monitoring, study, or analysis of surveillance

systems and the recording of authority figures and their actions for legal protection purposes. An early example is the public recording of the Rodney King beating (Haggerty et al., 2000, 618). Another interesting example is homosexual men filming police who are covertly monitoring public sex at "gay beats" (Biber et al., 2009). In the same vein is *Copwatch (Copwatch.org, 2011),* a "permanent, searchable repository of complaints filed against police officers" that exists for the purposes of "policing the police"(Copwatch.org, 2011). Like *Creepers I*, what websites like *Caltrans*, *Go and Roam* and *Copwatch* can do is constitute a *surveillant* subject through the depiction of the power that surveillance can bring. These feelings of power derive from the belief that the *watcher* is safe (in their home) and that they can see things that the *watched* cannot. This is consistent with Foucault's idea that power circulates and can be appropriated by all for particular ends. However, the degree of power is dependent upon the actor's place in the system (Davies 2008, p.362). The *surveillant* subject's place within the system can be quite powerful because it can have overarching consequences for the *watched*.

Surveillance as a line of flight

The power of surveillance "derives from aligning and integrating diverse actors and systems" (Haggerty et al., 2011, 233). However, the consequence of this process is that no one is outside of the *surveillant assemblage*. As discussed above, police are subject to *sousveillant* and *inverse surveillance* techniques, leading police to sometimes film those who are filming them (Haggerty et al., 2000, 618).[10] Similarly, spouses and employees are subject to the *synoptic* gaze made available through the live feed, internet based surveillance of public areas. Most poignantly, driving becomes the subject of the omniveillant (and perhaps voyeuristic) gaze as portrayed in *Creepers I*. The *surveillant assemblage* attempts to produce visibility but surveillance, like all power, flees the very thing

---

[10] Haggerty and Ericson suggest that when this happens it causes "a fractured rhizomatic crisscrossing of the gaze" (2000, p.618).

it produces; it flees determination (Bogard, 2006b, 100). Bogard gives the example of the CCTV camera which resists the decoding it imposes on everything else because it imposes visibility on everything but the operator of the CCTV. As Bogard rightly suggests:

> *the surveillance assemblage would like to close itself off from the outside but unfortunately the outside is where it must place its machines (Bogard, 2006b, 117).*

In this way surveillance can attempt to reserve freedom for itself (Haggerty et al., 2000, 618) but *omniveillance*, *sousveillance* and *inverse surveillance* can invert this visibility. This inversion of power is a line of flight that can manifest from surveillance.

The reproduction of road safety camera footage, like that in *Creepers I*, can also produce a line of flight; something other than what was intended. While a transformed failed subject is intended, this excess can produce something different and unrelated, a *surveillant* subject. While unrelated, this mode of subjectivity is not necessarily problematic because the way in which the flows of information are encountered may be consistent with desirable driving. For example a *surveillant* subject may capture an image of dangerous driving and the image may proliferate, creating opportunity for a future spectator to have an affective encounter with the image. This proliferation could lead to the transformation of a subject in a way that is consistent with the message in *Creepers I*. However the encounter could also lead the spectator toward a failed mode of subjectivity. In this way surveillance is unpredictable but does not necessarily conflict with the original message in *Creepers I* to 'slow down'. Through the constitution of a *surveillant* subject, third parties who are not privy to *Creepers I* can become exposed to what that text can *do* to the original spectator. In this way the excess of *Creepers I* can proliferate in such a way that it can constitute the ethical *self* and the failed *other* long after it has ceased to be broadcasted.

The other

In the three chapters that precede this chapter, the representation of the *other* in the texts have been construed as problematic because they infer two dichotomous driving subjects. One is the good and ethical subject who obeys the road rules, and the other is the monstrous and failed subject who drives dangerously at the peril of other road users. This binary conception fails to recognise the extreme likelihood that most subjects on the road, at some point in time, have travelled over the signed speed limit of an area.[11] Such representations of the driving *other* do not account for the driver as a body who is equally capable of becoming-criminal or becoming-law-abiding at any point on the road. The binary conception of good driver and bad driver is inadequate because it does not recognise the body as an intersection of forces at every intersection on the road. *Creepers I* however carries the potential to move beyond this limitation. Unlike the other campaigns explored within this thesis, the *other* is rarely depicted in *Creepers I*. For the most part the *other* is a dividual: just a stream of data that gives information to the viewer. The only point in *Creepers I* where the *other* is overtly objectified is at the end of the text. As depicted in Figures 5.31 and 5.32 a young male driver morphs into the monstrous and feared *other* as he speeds away from an intersection. As the sound of the revving of his engine and his relative speed declines, he morphs just as quickly back to his original appearance.[12] As will be discussed in detail in the following chapter, this is a largely unproblematic representation of the *other* because it depicts the driver as a body equally as capable of ethical behaviour as it is dangerousness.

This chapter has concluded the exploration of how these texts *work* and what they can *do*. The chapter showed that this text *works* by using fear to

---

[11] Approximately 60% of the drivers admitted to driving over the speed limit in the past three months and 61% of those speeders admitted that they 'sometimes' travel over the speed limit by one to five km/h (Colmar Brunton, March 2009, 57-58).

[12] An almost identical scene is portrayed in Creepers II, see Chapter Two.

transform failed subjects toward more ethical modes of subjectivity. In this way it reinforces the assertion that late modern governments use the fear of crime as a strategy to regulate both the fearful ethical *self* and the feared failed *other*. Secondly, the chapter explored surveillance as a potential line of flight that can emanate from an affective encounter with *Creepers I*. It was argued that this excess is not necessarily positive or negative for road safety, it is just something other than it was before. Again, this shows that government messages that attempt to promote safe and ethical behaviour on the road cannot be completely controlled. Finally, this chapter emphasized the unproblematic representation of the subject contained within *Creepers I*. This discussion makes way for the following chapter which concerns itself entirely with the complexity of subjectivity. In Chapter Six it will be argued that the subject cannot be easily reduced to the category of ethical *self* or failed *other* in respect to driving because the subject is an intersection of forces that is already in the process of fleeing the imposition of such problematic categories.