

## Article

## Building the Digitally Gated Community: The Case of Nextdoor

**Rahim Kurwa**

University of Illinois, Chicago, USA  
[rak@uic.edu](mailto:rak@uic.edu)

---

### Abstract

The neighborhood is a historic and contemporary site of the assertion of white racial and economic domination, particularly over Black people. Although there is strong evidence that whites continue to prefer racially segregated neighborhoods, fifty years of fair housing jurisprudence has made it more difficult to openly bar non-white residents. Among the many strategies used to protect white domination of residential space is the coordinated surveillance and policing of non-white people. In this paper, I show how Nextdoor, a neighborhood-based social network, has become an important platform for the surveillance and policing of race in residential space, enabling the creation of what I call digitally gated communities. First, I describe the history of the platform and the forms of segregation and surveillance it has supplemented or replaced. Second, I situate the platform in a broader analysis of carcerality as a mode and logic of regulating race in the United States. Third, using examples drawn from public reports about the site, I illustrate how race is surveilled and policed in the context of gentrification and integration. Finally, I discuss implications, questions, and future issues that might arise on the platform.

---

### Introduction

In a 2015 expose of the neighborhood social networking service Nextdoor, journalist Sam Levin (2015) writes that residents in Oakland, California “frequently post unsubstantiated ‘suspicious activity’ warnings that result in calls to the police on Black citizens who have done nothing wrong.” Often posted on the extremely popular “crime and safety” section of the application, these warnings seemed to be a ubiquitous condition of living in the neighborhood. As Levin explains,

In recent months, people from across the city have shared with me Nextdoor posts labeling Black people as suspects simply for walking down the street, driving a car, or knocking on a door. Users have suggested that Black salesmen and mail carriers may be burglars...Residents encourage each other to call police, share tips on how to reach law enforcement, and sometimes even alert cops and security guards about suspicious activity they’ve only read secondhand from other commenters.

Talking to residents in Oakland, Levin reports that, “[p]eople of color described stories of white residents running away from them, screaming at them to leave a shared garden space, and calling police on young children in their own home.” Indeed, the picture his reporting paints is one of daily racial panics articulated through criminalization and escalated by interactions on Nextdoor.

Kurwa, Rahim. 2019. Building the Digitally Gated Community: The Case of Nextdoor. *Surveillance & Society* 17(1/2): 111-117.

<https://ojs.library.queensu.ca/index.php/surveillance-and-society/index> | ISSN: 1477-7487

© The author(s), 2019 | Licensed to the Surveillance Studies Network under a [Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial No Derivatives license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

Nextdoor, a web and smartphone-based platform that allows verified residents of a neighborhood to communicate with one another semi-privately, was launched in 2011 as “a more locally relevant replacement to Craigslist or Angie’s List or Yelp” (Lacy 2013). While much of the platform’s content is centered on more mundane issues, as Sarah Lacy describes, the regulation of crime and safety has quickly become one of the platform’s most compelling features: by 2013, 20% of posts on the platform were in the crime and safety section (Lacy 2013). From those crime and safety pages has emerged a steady stream of reports of racist behavior and harassment, severe and widespread enough that the company itself has acknowledged the problem and begun to investigate means of curbing it (Nextdoor 2016).

In this exploratory analysis, I theorize Nextdoor as a tool used to build a *digitally gated community*. As gated communities have historically been sites of race and class exclusion enforced through private policing, today digitally gated communities achieve these ends through social policing. After situating the platform in the historic arc of mechanisms of segregation, I describe how it differs from prior modes of surveillance. I then use examples drawn from online and social media accounts to illustrate how Nextdoor creates digitally gated communities by allowing white residents to enhance gentrification or entrench segregation using racial surveillance and policing. While raising questions for further study, I argue that while the platform is a technological advance, it only provides new means of accomplishing old ends.

As the examples in this paper will illustrate, the contemporary mode of segregation employed by citizens on Nextdoor is quasi-carceral—by re-articulating racial difference as criminality and threat, participants may police and (attempt to) push out Black residents (including by calling police) without ever explicitly saying they do not wish to live with them. Translating segregatory preferences into carceral logic—what Kaba and Meiners (2014) define as addressing the issue through modes of punishment rather than other alternatives—is central to making fundamentally racist practices socially acceptable in a time period at least recently defined by color-blind racism.

### **Situating Nextdoor in the Historical Arc of Racial Residential Segregation and Domination**

The mechanisms white communities have used to create segregation have been fluid over time—ranging from the personal (white flight), to the communal (restrictive covenants and gated communities), to the governmental (tax and housing policy). Like racism itself, these mechanisms fit the strictures of their times, sometimes alternating in prominence and effectiveness. Such is the case with personal and communal strategies of segregation. Tracing the emergence of municipal segregation ordinances in the early 1900s, Troesken and Walsh (2017) find that, “Before segregation ordinances, white property owners relied exclusively on private forms of collective action, often in the form of threats and private vigilante activity, to deter blacks from migrating into previously all-white neighborhoods” (3-4). These personal and communal modes of segregation, which included lynching, were eventually subsumed by the emergence of institutional and state-based segregation practices. While civil rights legislation has struck down some of the worst state and institutional mechanisms of segregation, this has opened space for new types of personal and communal efforts.

These efforts are an expression of continued white preferences for segregation. Whites prefer to live in neighborhoods with less than 30% Black residency and consistently rate Black residents as their least preferred neighbors (Farley et al. 1978; Charles 2003; Krysan et al. 2009). There is also significant evidence that whites mobilize to enact those preferences. Black residents moving into white suburbs are consistently greeted with hate crimes (Bell 2013), white neighbors become politically mobilized in reaction to Black residents moving in during public housing relocations (Enos 2016), and white residents surveil and police Black residents moving into their neighborhoods through the Housing Choice Voucher program (Ocen 2012; Hayat 2016). This surveillance and policing also occurs on spaces such as message boards, neighborhood watch programs, chat applications, and Facebook groups (Associated Press 2016; McCoy 2015; Lowe, Stroud, and Nguyen 2017). In this light, Nextdoor can be understood as simply a superior venue for enacting similar behavior.

## Nextdoor's Emergence and the Evolution of Social Surveillance

Recent scholarship has highlighted the ways that digital platforms have automated inequality and reinforced race and gender stereotypes, but on Nextdoor, rather than algorithms producing inequality, users may produce it themselves (Eubanks 2018; Noble 2018). To participate in Nextdoor, a person must create an account linked to their residency in a neighborhood (boundaries are defined by the application). One can be confirmed either by being vetted by a neighbor who is a current user, or by submitting evidence of residency to the company. Once on the platform, users can communicate with their neighbors about a wide range of issues, sharing information, asking questions, and coordinating activities. Users participate using their real names but can only see content inside their neighborhood and those adjacent to it. In this way, the platform can serve as an iteration of neighborhood watch or a platform for homeowner association style communication. As in those spaces, interactions and outcomes may be driven by a minority of highly engaged users.

Nextdoor is unique from both a technological and surveillance standpoint. Earlier literature on technologies of surveillance focused on tools such as closed-captioned television (CCTV), which is deployed around urban space to both collect video surveillance and discourage crime by creating the constant possibility that one may be monitored. CCTV is depersonalized, unidirectional in its gaze from camera to subjects, and needs to be read and interpreted by a human being in order for subsequent action to be taken. Nextdoor, by contrast, is intensely personal, omnidirectional in its gaze, and constantly produced and interpreted by people, rather than merely available to be used by them. Exceptions to this description do apply—some residents do not participate in Nextdoor but are presumably still surveilled by neighbors, and non-residents entering the neighborhood are surveilled without their knowledge or consent. And unlike its predecessor, neighborhood watch, there are no signs announcing that you are being surveilled. Finally, participation itself might be linked to socio-economic status: one needs to know about the application, have the spare time, internet, language skills, and social capital to be able to use it.

Nextdoor also appears to be an iteration on earlier theories of surveillance. We can, for example, read it as a form of “lateral surveillance,” in which individuals are enjoined to surveil one another to minimize social risk and be savvy (Andrejevic 2005). Unlike Andrejevic’s formulation, the appeal of Nextdoor is not to one individual to be savvy, but rather to an entire community. But surveillance on Nextdoor is similar to his concept in that these forms of surveillance do not replace state practices, rather they “emulate and amplify them, fostering the internalization of government strategies and their deployment in the public sphere” (Andrejevic 2005: 479). More recently, Purenne and Palierse (2016) have identified “citizen-based surveillance” or “participatory surveillance,” in which the public joins community policing centers or neighborhood watch programs, either through the grassroots development of these programs or through top-down government encouragement. Nextdoor represents a variation on these typologies, as users join of their own accord, but their participation is not grassroots because it is structured and controlled by a profit-seeking corporation. However, across each of these formulations, the co-production of community through participation in surveillance is often based on the exclusion and suspicion of others.

## Situating Nextdoor in an Analysis of Carcerality

We can think of the development of the contemporary carceral state at multiple registers. At the upper register, we can consider the nation’s transition from slavery to Jim Crow to imprisonment (Blackmon 2009). Alexander (2012) labels the contemporary mass incarceration “the New Jim Crow,” Wacquant (2000) suggests the emergence of a “carceral continuum” between ghetto and prison, and Murakawa (2014) identifies the political logics that undergirded and motivated the rapid expansion of the country’s formal punishment regimes—now often referred to as the carceral state.

One register lower is the development of what Beckett and Murakawa (2012) call “the shadow carceral state,” or the rapid diffusion of the state’s power to sanction and punish outside of the boundaries of criminal law. As Stuart and Armenta (2015) point out, this often has a spatial dimension. For example, Beckett and Herbert (2009) identify the rise of “banishment,” or the use of municipal laws to expel and ban marginalized people from urban space. Similarly, gang injunctions have been used to regulate access to space for individuals labelled as members (Muñiz 2015).

But we might also conceptualize a third register in which quasi-carceral conditions are produced through social interactions that replicate features of punishment or literally precipitate it. In this example, Nextdoor is not formally carceral in the sense that it does not involve formal punishment through state institutions. But following Haley’s (2016) notion that carcerality includes practice and performance, we might theorize Nextdoor as a quasi-carceral space because interaction on the platform involves surveillance, racial profiling, and the precipitation of formal punishment. First, widespread use of the application traps people in surveillance—even if one does not participate in Nextdoor, one cannot opt-out of being watched by those who use the application. In this sense one’s freedom is deprived by being subject to surveillance. Second, people of color are often viewed as criminals in their own homes and neighborhoods, and this shapes the interactions they have with their neighbors. Third, users engaged in surveillance employ carceral logic by turning to police to resolve everyday racial panics. This proximity to formal punishment is perhaps the most consequential feature of Nextdoor for those subject to racial profiling on the platform.

I identify two settings where surveillance on Nextdoor may have significant racial consequences: instances of minority movement to white neighborhoods (integration), or instances of white movement into minority neighborhoods (gentrification).

#### *Social control under conditions of integration*

In the first instance, white residents of neighborhoods undergoing racial integration may try to eject non-white newcomers. Or, if they are unable or uninterested in preventing integration, might instead attempt to dictate its terms. Doing so through surveillance and policing is effective because it relies on de-racialized governing narratives of safety that nevertheless have racist implementation and results (Muhammed 2011). An example of this arises from a 2017 public Twitter post by site user Brandon Friedman. Friedman documents a case of racial profiling in Junius Heights, a predominantly white historic neighborhood in East Dallas. A Nextdoor user posted an alert about theft on the neighborhood’s Crime and Safety page titled “Porch theft?” The body of the post read, “Saw a A.A.male walking on south side of Gaston/Munger area about 5:45 a.m. carrying a white rocking chair over his head. After we passed he crossed over to the North side of Gaston. Can’t think of any reason for this at this time of day.” As Simone Browne writes, within “spaces shaped for whiteness...stereotypes, abnormalization, and other means that impose limitations” are the ways that Blackness is seen and understood (Browne 2015: 20). The surveilled person is only identified by race, and presumably that is the reason the user suggests a crime is in progress, and why he or she cannot imagine any legitimate reason for their presence. It is simply outside the realm of possibility that a Black person might be moving in or might otherwise belong there, or that they might have crossed the street for a legitimate purpose or because this person’s persistent gaze made them uncomfortable.

The post also illustrates carceral logic at work. Rather than considering any other explanation, or any non-punitive means of resolving the situation, the user turns to suggesting criminal activity, which if taken seriously would necessitate a police response. If indeed the man in question was moving in, the surveillance and racial profiling of him indicates a persistent discomfort with even the possibility of some racial integration.

#### *Social control under conditions of gentrification*

In the second instance, white newcomers to non-white neighborhoods also bring their preferences about neighborhood characteristics. They may use surveillance and policing to assert those expectations. Nisa Ahmad (2018), in a personal essay describing why she left the platform, provides a stark example of this phenomenon. She writes that her mid-city Los Angeles neighborhood, with an average per capita income of

\$37,000 was experiencing gentrification as wealthy residents moved in and raised property values. Conversations on Nextdoor centered on identifying “suspicious persons” and discussing how to maintain newly rising property values. Ahmad relates one of the incidents that made her decide to leave the application:

Then came an African American neighbor who had been reported as being “suspicious” during his morning run. He came on the app and asked people to be more mindful of the diversity of the neighborhood because he should not be criminalized for jogging. The responses were something straight of our Trump’s America. “We can’t take chances on safety” and “Perhaps you looked suspicious”. “You can’t blame us for wanting to protect our community”. How exactly is it “Ours” when the concerned inhabitants seem to only be the newly relocated gentrifiers.

Among other things, this passage demonstrates the power of carceral logic. Even when confronted with the strongest possible evidence that they were wrong, users who have relentlessly racially profiled their own neighbor refuse to see Black people in their neighborhood in any framework that is not criminal and punitive. This account also highlights how privacy deprivation itself is a weapon, a harm, and an assertion of dominance. Further, by labelling a resident a criminal and then making it clear to him that he does not belong, white Nextdoor users might push him out of the neighborhood. These tactics may make the neighborhood feel “safe” for white residents, increase vacancies through that pushout process, and increase property values through this demographic change and increased perception of safety.

Recent work seeking to understand the citizenship implications of the carceral state situates policing as a form of governance—regulating poor and minority communities through “coercion, containment, repression, surveillance, regulation, predation, discipline, and violence” (Soss and Weaver 2017: 565). Miller and Stuart (2017) introduce the term “carceral citizenship” to describe the way that onerous, invasive, and long-lasting duties and restrictions placed upon formerly incarcerated people create a separate form of political membership in the state. While neighbors engaged in surveilling and policing of their residential space cannot be said to be creating an equivalent to the state’s versions of these phenomena, there are similarities in the circumstances and relationships being created. The policing function of Nextdoor is used as a tool of neighborhood governance, and the experience of being surveilled and socially policed within one’s own neighborhood may itself feel carceral. After all, people may have the police called on them at any time by neighbors engaged in racial profiling.

## **The Carceral Possibilities of Neighborhood Surveillance Platforms**

Finally, a number of questions arise from a consideration of Nextdoor in a framework of segregation and carcerality. First, how do people outside of the Black-white binary I have discussed here experience and use this platform? Non-white users also employ these tactics of policing. And subjects of this policing may include non-Black groups as well—Latinx people whose presence is read through a discourse of citizenship or Arab and Muslim people who are read through a war on terror discourse. Examples in this paper are of men being policed, how might women experience this differently? And how might trans, queer, and gender non-conforming people experience this surveillance in distinction to cis people? How is disability, particularly when racialized, read by those engaged in surveillance? Outside the application, we have seen many recent cases of white people using police calls as a way of regulating Black life in public space. Taken together, do these phenomena represent a new mode of enacting racial power in urban life?

Second, as has been alluded to earlier, Nextdoor has economic interests in neighborhood interactions on its platform. If part of Nextdoor’s value lies in people’s interest in getting access to its crime and safety section, and if they often use that section to engage in racial profiling, then some portion of Nextdoor’s economic value is bound up with racial surveillance and policing. How will the company’s stated aversion to racial profiling and economic interest in high platform usage play out over time? These questions are all the more pressing as competitors to Nextdoor begin to emerge. Amazon’s video doorbell company, Ring, is just such



an example. The company has recently begun to develop a social network called Ring Neighbors,<sup>1</sup> in which users can post surveillance videos from their doorbell cameras into a digital community of like-minded users (with or without the product), who may escalate these concerns to police. The platform has also begun to develop facial recognition technology to allow doorbell cameras to process footage and alert police (Snow 2018).

Third, for those subject to the racialized gaze of Nextdoor, there are serious issues surrounding the carceral implications of one's digital presence. First, as Gurusami (2018) illustrates, digital labels, records, and connections can be difficult to navigate and overcome after incarceration. Incidents or labels that are time-bound in physical life are made permanent and decontextualized in digital space. On Nextdoor, a person may be labelled a criminal, suspicious, or threatening, or punished for speaking back to these labels. Whether these labels are similarly sticky, and to what ends they are used in the future, remains an open question. Second, Nextdoor's partnerships with police organizations are also a concern. Thus far they are confined to allowing police to issue warning messages to communities and providing pathways for users to communicate with police. But one step beyond this is the emergent pattern of law enforcement using digital surveillance of social media to police citizens without their knowledge or consent (Patton et al. 2017). Will this practice extend to Nextdoor?

Fourth and finally, how do surveilled people navigate these conditions? Are there modes of fugitivity that people might use to deny or subvert surveillance, such as refusal, disengagement, or escape (Sojoyner 2017)? Or, is organized resistance, through speaking back on the platform, publicizing racist incidents, and organizing anti-racist neighborhood groups, a viable way forward?

## Acknowledgments

The author thanks Peter Ibarra, Susila Gurusami, Phi Hong Su, and Randa Wahbe for their generative and insightful comments and feedback, and the University of Illinois at Chicago's Institute for Research on Race and Public Policy for institutional support.

## References

- Ahmad, Nisa. 2018 Why I Quit the Nextdoor App. *Medium*, June 16. <https://medium.com/@MzAhmad/why-i-quit-the-nextdoor-neighbor-app-fcb64bfaleae>. [accessed November 10, 2018].
- Alexander, Michelle. 2012. *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness*. The New Press.
- Andrejevic, Mark. 2005. The Work of Watching One Another: Lateral Surveillance, Risk, and Governance. *Surveillance & Society* 2(4): 479-497.
- Associated Press. 2016. Police: Neighborhood Watch Posts Call to Watch Young Blacks. September 25. <https://web.archive.org/web/20160926170131/http://bigstory.ap.org/article/91cd9de0474b4ada8e0bab09775f1c45/police-neighborhood-watch-posts-call-watch-young-blacks> [accessed: November 10, 2018].
- Beckett, Katherine, and Steve Herbert. 2009. *Banished: The New Social Control In Urban America*. Oxford University Press.
- Beckett, Katherine, and Naomi Murakawa. 2012. Mapping the Shadow Carceral State: Toward an Institutionally Capacious Approach to Punishment. *Theoretical Criminology* 16(2): 221-44.
- Bell, Jeannine. 2013. *Hate Thy Neighbor: Move-In Violence and the Persistence of Racial Segregation in American Housing*. NYU Press.
- Blackmon, Douglas A. 2009. *Slavery by Another Name: The Re-Enslavement of Black Americans from the Civil War to World War II*. Anchor Books.
- Browne, Simone. 2015. *Dark Matters: On the Surveillance of Blackness*. Duke University Press.
- Charles, Camille Zubrinsky. 2003. The Dynamics of Racial Residential Segregation. *Annual Review of Sociology* 29(1): 167-207.
- Enos, Ryan D. 2016. What the Demolition of Public Housing Teaches Us about the Impact of Racial Threat on Political Behavior. *American Journal of Political Science* 60(1): 123-42.
- Eubanks, Virginia. 2018. *Automating Inequality: How High-Tech Tools Profile, Police, and Punish the Poor*. St. Martin's Press.
- Farley, Reynolds, Howard Schuman, Suzanne Bianchi, Diane Colasanto, and Shirley Hatchett. 1978. 'Chocolate City, Vanilla Suburbs: Will the Trend toward Racially Separate Communities Continue? *Social Science Research* 7(4): 319-44.
- Gurusami, Susila. 2018. The Carceral Web We Weave: Carceral Citizens' Experiences of Digital Punishment and Solidarity. *Punishment & Society* 0(0): 1-19.
- Gustafson, Kaaryn S. 2011. *Cheating Welfare: Public Assistance and the Criminalization of Poverty*. NYU Press.
- Haley, Sarah. 2016. *No Mercy Here: Gender, Punishment, and the Making of Jim Crow Modernity*. UNC Press Books.

<sup>1</sup> See: <https://ring.com/neighbors>

- Hayat, Norrinda Brown. 2016. Section 8 Is the New N-Word: Policing Integration in the Age of Black Mobility. *The American University Journal of International Law and Policy / Washington College of Law* 51(1): 61–93.
- Jones, Elizabeth. 2017. Racism, Fines and Fees and the US Carceral State. *Race & Class* 59(3): 1–13
- Kaba, Mariame and Erica Meiners. 2014. Arresting the Carceral State. *Jacobin*, February 24. <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2014/02/arresting-the-carceral-state/>. [accessed: November 10, 2018].
- Krysan, Maria, Mick P. Couper, Reynolds Farley, and Tyrone A. Forman. 2009. Does Race Matter in Neighborhood Preferences? Results from a Video Experiment. *American Journal of Sociology* 115(2):527–59.
- Lacy, Sarah. 2013. Nextdoor's Unexpected Killer Use Case: Crime and Safety. *Pando*, January 22. <https://pando.com/2013/01/22/nextdoors-unexpected-killer-use-case-crime-and-safety/> [accessed: November 10, 2018].
- Law Atlas. 2018. *City Nuisance Property Ordinances*. Policy Surveillance Program. <http://lawatlas.org/datasets/city-nuisance-property-ordinances>. [accessed: November 10, 2018].
- Levin, Sam. 2015. Racial Profiling via Nextdoor.com. *East Bay Express*, October 7. <https://www.eastbayexpress.com/oakland/racial-profiling-via-nextdoorcom/Content?oid=4526919&showFullText=true> [accessed November 10, 2018].
- Lowe, Maria R., Angela Stroud, and Alice Nguyen. 2016. Who Looks Suspicious? Racialized Surveillance in a Predominantly White Neighborhood. *Social Currents* 4(1):34–50.
- McCoy, Terrence. 2015 The Secret Surveillance of 'Suspicious' Blacks in One of the Nation's Poshest Neighborhoods. *Washington Post*, October 13. [https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/social-issues/the-secret-surveillance-of-suspicious-blacks-in-one-of-the-nations-poshest-neighborhoods/2015/10/13/2e47236c-6c4d-11e5-b31c-d80d62b53e28\\_story.html](https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/social-issues/the-secret-surveillance-of-suspicious-blacks-in-one-of-the-nations-poshest-neighborhoods/2015/10/13/2e47236c-6c4d-11e5-b31c-d80d62b53e28_story.html) [accessed: November 10, 2018].
- Miller, Reuben Jonathan, and Forrest Stuart. 2017. Carceral Citizenship: Race, Rights and Responsibility in the Age of Mass Supervision. *Theoretical Criminology* 21(4): 532–48.
- Muhammad, Khalil Gibran. 2011. *The Condemnation of Blackness*. Harvard University Press.
- Muñiz, Ana. 2015. *Police, Power, and the Production of Racial Boundaries*. Rutgers University Press.
- Murakawa, Naomi. 2014. *The First Civil Right: How Liberals Built Prison America*. Oxford University Press.
- Nextdoor. 2016 Racial Profiling: The Opposite of Being Neighborly. *Nextdoor Blog*, October 15. <https://blog.nextdoor.com/2015/10/15/racial-profiling-the-opposite-of-being-neighborly/> [accessed January 10, 2018].
- Noble, Safiya Umoja. 2018. *Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism*. NYU Press.
- Ocen, Priscilla A. 2012. The New Racially Restrictive Covenant: Race, Welfare and the Policing of Black Women in Subsidized Housing. *UCLA Law Review* 59(August): 1540–82.
- Patton, Desmond U, Douglas-Wade Brunton, Andrea Dixon, Reuben Jonathan Miller, Patrick Leonard, and Rose Hackman. 2017. Stop and Frisk Online: Theorizing Everyday Racism in Digital Policing in the Use of Social Media for Identification of Criminal Conduct and Associations. *Social Media + Society* July-September: 1–10.
- Purenne, Anaik, and Gregoire Palierse. 2016. Towards Cities of Informers? Community-Based Surveillance in France and Canada. *Surveillance & Society* 15(1): 79–93.
- Snow, Jacob. 2018, Amazon's Disturbing Plan to Add Face Surveillance to Your Front Door. *American Civil Liberties Union – Northern California Blog*. December 12. <https://www.aclunc.org/blog/amazon-s-disturbing-plan-add-face-surveillance-your-front-door> [accessed January 10, 2018]
- Sojoyner, Damien M. 2017. Another Life is Possible: Black Fugitivity and Enclosed Places. *Cultural Anthropology: Journal of the Society for Cultural Anthropology* 32 (4): 514–36.
- Soss, Joe, and Vesla Weaver. 2017. Police Are Our Government: Politics, Political Science, and the Policing of Race–Class Subjugated Communities. *Annual Review of Political Science* 20(1): 565–91.
- Stuart, Forrest, Amada Armenta, and Melissa Osborne. 2015. Legal Control of Marginal Groups. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 11(1):235–54.
- Troesken, Werner, and Randall Walsh. 2017. Collective Action, White Flight, and the Origins of Formal Segregation Laws. *NBER Working Paper Series*. 23691: 1–51.
- Wacquant, Loïc. 2002. From Slavery to Mass Incarceration. *New Left Review* 13:41–60.