Prepression: The actuarial archive and new technologies of security

Willem Schinkel
Erasmus University Rotterdam, The Netherlands

Abstract
This article argues, on the basis of a discussion of current Dutch databases, that we are witnessing what can be called prepression. This combination of prevention and repression entails the archiving of risky individuals and their selection for 'early intervention'. Such databases can be seen in light of their work of social imagination: they visualize the constitutive outside of 'society', and in so doing function as part of a governing imaginary. Crucial in contemporary prepression is the archive, which is interpreted not as a recording but also as a recoding of the past, that is, as an ordering principle in the fields of law and order, social work and health. The cases on the basis of which this article develops a preliminary sketch of a theory of prepression are drawn from recent developments concerning actuarial archiving systems in the Netherlands.

> *The concept of the archive shelters in itself, of course, this memory of the name arkhē ... Contrary to the impression one often has, such a concept is not easy to archive.*
>
> (Derrida, 1995: 2)

Introduction: surveillance and children in the Netherlands

The Netherlands has in recent years developed some of the most encompassing forms of archiving its population in databases and surveillance registers, while its population appears barely interested in questioning the democratic character of such practices (van

Corresponding author:
Willem Schinkel, Erasmus University Rotterdam, PO Box 1738, Rotterdam 3000, The Netherlands
Email: Schinkel@fsw.eur.nl

den Berg et al., 2008). Since 2009, for every child born in the Netherlands, an Electronic Child Dossier (under the Dutch acronym of KIDOS or EKD) is constructed and kept up to date. The motto of this database is: 'no child out of sight'. It contains medical information, but it is deemed specifically important in relation to the risk of child abuse. A 'Basic Data Set' describes roughly 900 separate items to be maintained per child between birth and 19 (PwC, 2007: 7). A second database is connected to EKD that incorporates data of judicial interest called Reference Index Risk Youth (*Verwijsindex Risicojongeren*).[1] This database contains digital information on risks reported by social workers and others in the field of welfare professionally involved with youth up to the age of 23.

Recent advice from KPMG and the Dutch Association of General Practitioners (LHV) recommends giving doctors the ability to register patients in the Reference Index. Due to issues of privacy law, the Index does not contain detailed information, but simply registers which workers and institutions are involved with a child or youth. Such institutions can then contact each other, exchange files and convene on the best approach to deal with a youth at risk. In 2007 and 2008, the Reference Index contained data from 45 municipalities and led to 7000 contacts among care workers, and in 2009 it 'celebrated' its 10,000 match.[2] In 2010, that number had risen to 23,000, out of 230,000 registries (Ministry of Youth and Family, 2010). It is expected to have nation-wide coverage in 2010.

Finally, a third database was connected to the Reference Index in 2009. This database, called ProKidPolice (*ProKidPolitie*) contains digital information on all children below the age of 12 who have been in contact with the police, whether as witness to a crime, as victim or as perpetrator. Depending on the frequency with which a child has had such contact, he or she is allotted a code 'white', 'yellow', 'orange' or 'red'. After three reports, Youth Services are contacted and the child and family are further scrutinized.

Such databases raise various questions, from the technical (how to establish connections between databases?), to the legal (which information can be used when and for what?) and political (who bears responsibility for registration and for the regulation of registration?). A further obvious question concerns the efficacy of such records: do these databases help to prevent problems or to find solutions to them? Questions of privacy are complicated; the Reference Index, for instance, is a nation-wide system whereas enforcement of privacy law (*Wet Bescherming Persoonsgegevens*) is a local matter. A special, 'ethnic' version of the Reference Index, called 'Antilleans Reference Index', was granted suspension from privacy law from 2006 to 2008 and discussions continue on its possible future use (Ministry of Justice, 2006a).[3] The efficacy of such systems is far from clear since it depends first and foremost on what they are expected to deliver. Often, they are simply meant to establish relevant contacts and information-links between various institutions (police, social work, youth work, regional health services (GGD), educational institutions and drug-related care) *in time*. Yet, in itself, this is not enough. While the little girl 'Savannah', who was maltreated and eventually killed by her parents, has become a rallying point for the need for timely preventive measures in the Netherlands, in practice all institutions knew what was happening but were apparently unable to intervene not for lack of data-sharing or information-links (Gerson, 2008).[4]

In this article, the rapid development of risk-based registry systems is analyzed in terms of the workings of the *archive*, which enables the imagination of legitimate images of 'society'. Such systems, which record and recode the *past*, are first and foremost relevant

in the *present* by sketching the contours (under the name of 'prevention') of a statistically constructed *future*. At the same time, archival systems, with their capacities for selective actualization of memory, allow the stabilization of governing images of society. They in a sense 'visualize society' along lines that favor governing. Archives such as the Reference Index and the ProKidPolice contain electronic classifications with reference to various social *risks*. Such archives are part of a focus on what Zedner (2007) has identified as 'pre-crime'. They are part of a rhetoric of 'prevention' and 'early detection of risks'. Yet, at the same time, they facilitate the policing of families and criminalization of subjects with multiple archival registries. I therefore argue that the current 'archive fever' is a form of *pre-pression* that combines prevention and repression. The archive enables one contingent identification of 'society' by drawing all that does not conform to a *prescriptive* rather than *descriptive* ideal of society into the archive and by visualizing the 'milieu' of the archived subject. Prepression not only enables the repression of potential forms of life deemed unadjusted to governing images of 'society', it also constructs a border between the governing image of 'society' and its 'outside'. This government of the proper domain of 'society' is possible on the basis of the emergence of archival systems filled with actuarial data.

New 'risks', new 'risk registration' in the Netherlands

The ProKidPolice is but one example of an array of Dutch data systems used by social workers to make risk-calculations. Most operate at the local level, which is where they are often initiated, coordinated and financed. In 2008, for instance, more than 60 such projects existed at the local level, and the national implementation of ProKidPolice is unlikely to replace them all (Prins, 2008: 34). In this article, local examples are drawn from Rotterdam, which has the profile of a 'policy laboratory' and is regarded in many respects as a forerunner for the rest of the country in terms of safety policies (Tops, 2007; Noordegraaf, 2008).[5]

In Rotterdam, the Netherlands' second largest city, youth policy is mainly a local matter of the boroughs that combine to form the Rotterdam municipality. One 'approach' used on that level is what is called 'Borough-Level Organization Closed Approach' (Dutch acronym: DOSA).[6] Its website explains: 'DOSA aims at an early, coordinated and effective approach to risk youth and tries to prevent youth from falling into criminal behavior.'[7] DOSA is part of the more general 'Every Child Wins' (*Ieder Kind Wint*) program in Rotterdam which brings City Region (a coordinative policy level), municipality, youth health care, youth health services (Jeugd-GGD), educational institutions, welfare and social work institutions, Bureau Youth Care, other youth care providers, Child Care and Protection Board, police, DA-office and (Juvenile) Justice together under agreements such as the following:

> 1. Prevention is reinforced: 100% of the children is seen in time by the youth health services, and risk youth get extra attention. 2. One regional observation system is put into place, one electronic child dossier and a system of risk management through which more focus and quality can be put into the efforts.
>
> (Rotterdam Municipality, 2007: 3)

The program exists to identify various 'risks' at an early stage and to eliminate them: 'Risks are not observed and eliminated in time, as a consequence of which problems

appear that assume increasingly worrying proportions. Children are the victim of the faulty functioning of the system' (Rotterdam Municipality, 2007: 3).

In Rotterdam, the idea is that it is important 'that we gain a timely view of youth and caretakers facing risks or problems in growing up and caring, in order for problems to be prevented as much as possible or to be timely and adequately dealt with' (de Vries, 2007: 59). Rotterdam moreover deploys the web-based system MULTI-signal (*MULTI-Signaal*). That system is itself a further developed version of the SISA-registration system (SISA: City Instrument Closed Approach), which was an electronic database consisting of data on youth regarding school dropout.[8] MULTI-Signal gathers data on youth by various institutions. As soon as a person appears in the system twice (a 'match') a signal is sent to the institutions involved (and to the parents of the child involved) and one of these institutions is appointed as 'problem director' (de Vries, 2007). The system can also be used by institutions involved in a 'pro-active' exchange of information.

Such risk registration systems operate in other fields as well. In 2006, for instance, the Dutch Probation service introduced the RISc-method ('Recidive Inschattings Schalen': Recidivism Calculation Scales) ('Stichting Reclassering Nederland'). RISc is a computerized system that calculates a recidivism-risk for convicted offenders. On the basis of risk scores, courts are advised and a fitting probation and 'reintegration' trajectory is sketched out. This system is an adaptation of a British version and similar programs exist elsewhere. In the United States, for instance, such systems were used in 28 states in 2004 to guide parole determinations (Harcourt, 2007: 8).

One last example: in May 2008 Dutch State Secretary Albayrak (Justice) announced the nation-wide use of the Rotterdam-based and -developed database JCO-support system (JCO-ss) (Ministry of Justice, 2006b). This database is meant to support official judicial case review ('Justitieel Casusoverleg') in which police, DA and the Child Care and Protection Board discuss youth criminal cases. This database will be linked to the Reference Index (CVS-JC), which is, as mentioned above, itself linked to the ProKidPolice database. In this way, 'criminal youth' are connected to 'non-criminal youth'. All institutions involved in 'combating youth crime' have access to data from the JCO-support system, a surprising arrangement, given that the Dutch Child Care and Protection Board ('Raad voor de Kinderbescherming') is not a crime-fighting organization. It appears, then, that 'prevention' is the key phrase here, aligning institutions of various nature and organizational goals in a common effort mirrored in participation and the sharing of information in various databases.

Such systems thus appear in various fields, of which justice and youth policy are the most prominent. They have the following characteristics:

1. They are systems based on statistical risk calculations. A specific substance to the notion of *risk* is thus involved.
2. They are systems aimed at certain *risk populations* rendered observable *by* these systems.
3. They are systems that involve the building and linking of databases and that are thus characterized by an increasing relevance of the *archive*.
4. They are systems accompanied by an explicit effort to break through bureaucratically framed practices in care and law and order by means of new forms of *governance*.

The transformation of, and toward, risk

When Ulrich Beck popularized the notion of the 'risk society' in 1986, he meant to describe a type of society increasingly involved in the calculation, control and diffusion of the risks it creates itself (Beck, 1986). The notion of 'risk' used at that time primarily denoted risks of physical nature (Douglas and Wildavski, 1980; Luhmann, 1991; Douglas, 1992). Since then, it has become central to issues of crime and safety (Feeley and Simon, 1992; Ericson and Haggerty, 1997; Sparks, 2001; Shearing and Johnston, 2005). The notion of risk also occupies a central position in the field of care and social work (Gerris, 2007) particularly as they become enmeshed in law and order (van den Berg, 2008). Such developments are characteristic of a 'second modernity' (Beck, 1986) or a 'reflexive modernity' (Beck et al., 1994), in which 'second order observation' (Luhmann, 2006) takes precedence. Increasingly, the State turns into a 'monitoring state' (Noordegraaf and Noordegraaf-Eelens, 2009). Monitoring and surveillance take center stage, in crime (Harcourt, 2007; Lyon, 2007), terrorism (Lyon, 2003; Bauman, 2009), and (irregular) migration (Schinkel, 2009), but also in the regulatory oversight of financial markets (Noordegraaf and Noordegraaf-Eelens, 2009). Related to this are what Michael Power (1997a) has called 'rituals of verification' such as auditing and risk management (Power, 1997b, 2004). Visibility has thus become a crucial ordering category in social life (Brighenti, 2007).

Closely related to the notion of risk is the idea of the calculability of the associated danger that involves the ascent of a specific type of science based on risk calculation (Castel, 1991; Ewald, 1991; Silver, 2000). Such a view is apparent in statements by policy makers such as 'in scientific circles there is agreement on the fact that when diverse risks or problems combine, the chance that this hinders the development and chances of children increases exponentially' (de Vries, 2007: 56). It is well known that in the field of violence studies, neurologists, psychologists, sociologists and criminologists are eager to identify 'risk factors' in potential offenders (see, for instance, *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 2001; Elbogen, 2002). The same goes for the field of sexual offenses (see, for instance, Berlin et al., 2003; Mercado and Ogloff, 2006). In the context of what they called the 'New Penology', Feeley and Simon (1992) have pointed out that this often involves a form of actuarialism that leads to 'actuarial justice'. Actuarialism involves the production of risk-assessments on the basis of aggregated data which rate individual risks on the basis of certain group-characteristics (Feeley and Simon, 1992; Harcourt, 2007). Probabilistic methods replace clinical approaches in analysis of risk.

Systems such as MULTI-signal, ProKidPolice and RISc can be seen as—still relatively rudimentary—forms of actuarial archive systems. Some of the systems currently devised and deployed in the Netherlands, such as the Reference Index, are not based on advanced statistical tools at all, but rather on the 'matching' of input between interlinked systems, but even there a statistical given (at the very least: registration within at least one archive) is taken to be a risk-indicator. The *quality* of the registered 'contact' with institutions or authorities thereby becomes less important. A 'half-open' norm has been devised to determine which actions or occurrences merit registration (Prins, 2008: 34), but to be registered three times means to be scrutinized by services and institutions.

Other systems, such as RISc, are based on statistical modeling. So, too, is the Amazon-database, which is used by the Rotterdam police to keep track of individuals whose records

can be produced whenever a police officer wishes to, whether the individual is offender or suspect, or even just a 'potential' offender such as a member of a groups causing 'nuisance'. That database, like the 'Ingres' database used during the EC 2000 Football Championships, has been crafted in part by a commercial company whose clients consist of banks, insurance companies, lotteries, casinos, and the Dutch government—which is thereby placed squarely in the market for actuarial tools. Similarly, the Rotterdam Safety Index, which calculates the 'safety' of Rotterdam neighborhoods, involves statistical aggregation, involving, among others, the number of non-Dutch living in a neighborhood: if that number goes up, the neighborhood automatically scores lower on the Safety Index (Noordegraaf, 2008). Lastly, the ProKidPolice is a relatively advanced system, containing various 'background variables' drafted by the 'behavioral sciences' department of the University of Twente.

The actuarial archive: toward a theory of prepression

Prepression has a technological basis. As a Dutch report on Converging Technologies states: 'increasing possibilities of surveillance will induce more normalising effects on conduct, self-perception, personality, and world-view, than ever before' (WODC, 2008: 15). Similarly, in various other fields, such as youth work, complaints are often heard that 'interventions' are too often based on qualitative data (such as contacts with children and their parents), while that leaves out 'a more systematized and "normized" view of the problematic' (van Yperen, 2007: 22). Rendering the population as a whole manipulable and normalizable generalizes what Lucia Zedner (2007) has called a shift from 'post-crime' to 'pre-crime'. In this view, the 'post-crime society'—that was dominant during the 20th century and in which post hoc responses to crime were the main focus—is increasingly accompanied by a 'pre-crime' approach, based on surveillance, risk and prevention (Zedner, 2007: 262). 'Risks' are connected to future offenders, not victims. In the identification of risks the statistical archiving of data is of crucial importance. But the question is: what does the archive accomplish or enable?

Statistics – literally: the 'science of the State' – rose dramatically in prominence in the 19th century (Hacking, 1991; Foucault, 1994; Bowker, 2005). Many have noticed the importance of statistics in rendering populations classifiable and controllable (see, for instance, Hacking, 1975, 1990; Murdoch and Ward, 1997; Bowker, 2005). Statistics, as 'political arithmetic' (Foucault, 1994: 408), makes a population *observable*. Observability is a precondition for *governability*.

Statistics thus allowed for the differentiation between the *governing images* of a domain of 'society' and of that which falls 'outside of society'. That differentiation becomes apparent in the stress placed on 'integration' and 'citizenship' in various policy fields. Thus, in Rotterdam it is stated that 'we are dealing with a relatively large group of youth that deals with various risks and problems on the way to maturity and full citizenship' (de Vries, 2007: 55; compare Bauman, 2000: 23; Garland, 2001: 180; Hallsworth, 2005). State Secretary Albayrak (2008) likewise related the nation-wide implementation of the JCO-support system to the importance of 'involvement in society'.

Foucault (1994: 352) describes the 'discovery of society' in the 18th century. For François Ewald (1991: 210), this discovery occurred somewhat later, tied to the increasing definition of rights, law and politics in terms of 'society' at the end of the 19th century:

> European societies come to analyze themselves and their problems in terms of the generalized technology of risk. … Societies envisage themselves as a vast system of insurance, and by overtly adopting insurance's forms they suppose that they are thus conforming to their own nature.

In both accounts, the gradual rise of 'society' as a normative realm functions not so much as a description of the social but as a prescription (see also Schinkel, 2002), one that is strengthened by the *statistical imagination* of the collective. In turn, it involves the repression, dubbed 'prevention' of alternative potentialities, that is, of life forms not properly adjusted to governing images of 'society'. As Nikolas Rose (2007: 226) has argued, 'sociopolitical interventions are legitimated not in the language of law and rights, but in terms of the priority of protecting "normal people" against risks that threaten their security and contentment'. In youth and crime policies, 'society' is the prevailing concept used to denote these 'normal people' (Schinkel, 2007). The actuarial archive, I argue, therefore enables the visualization of the pathological, that is, the risky. The *governing imaginary* thereby produced is crucial to the regulation of the population through a combination of prevention and repression. Prepression thus involves the identification of what is legitimately called 'society' from a governing perspective, and it at the same time involves the repression, through 'early intervention', of potentialities deemed at odds with that image.

The archive: contingent classification and selective forgetting

The archive is often regarded as a memory system, as an *aide-mémoire*. Archives then register or record the past. But as Elena Esposito (2002) remarks in *Soziales Vergessen*, the notion of the archive is a memory model dating from the Renaissance. It is active in Giulio Camillo's *Gran Theatro delle Scienze*, through which Camillo intended the creation of a universal memory by means of magical emblems (Yates, 1966). Yet archives necessarily memorize by means of classifications and thus by means of contingent selections from the past. Archives also do more than select how to register the past. As Derrida (1995: 1) says in *Archive Fever*, in accordance with the etymology of *arkhē*, archives embody both a 'commencement' and a 'commandment'. They form a beginning because the reality before registration looks differently, and they embody a commandment because they force reality into their taxonomic principles.

The classifications that render reality observable within the archive, according to Derrida, should be seen as the ontological principles of the archive while the taxonomic rules that structure those classifications are its nomological principles (Derrida, 1995). The nomological function of the archive is in a certain sense juridical and enforcing particularly as it relates to the space of authority and the source of social order (the second meaning of *arkhē*). Archives thus render reality *observable in a contingent way*, and as such they have a *socially ordering* effect. For that reason, archives do not merely—or neutrally—preserve the past. Rather, they also help us understand the present (Bowker, 2005: 32).

Archives create a contemporary construction of the past, representing it in an ideal way that legitimizes the present, or by pressing present norms through the collection of 'deviance data' on the past. Archives make the ordering of the present possible; as Michel

Foucault (1972: 146) has stressed, the archive is a *formative principle*.[9] Moreover, because archives map the past on the basis of contingent criteria of observation, all registering of the past is equally accompanied by a forgetting (Weinrich, 2004; Bowker, 2005). Thus, in the Dutch examples mentioned earlier the *quality* of recorded 'contacts' with institutions is unexamined. Even though the *quantity* of contacts may in many cases be a good thing, it is automatically marked as 'risky'. So, too, only certain variables—such as the effects of neighborhood or 'ethnicity' in the Reference Index of Rotterdam Safety Index—are deemed relevant.

The archival observation of 'society'

As 'society' is no longer observable from a single privileged vantage point our reliance on actuarial techniques has increased. Modern society, in the words of Nikolas Luhmann (1997: 866), 'has no address'. Indeed various social scientists, ranging from Wallerstein to Urry or Bauman to Beck have gone so far as to argue that social science should abolish its use of the concept of 'society' altogether. It is, as Beck (2002: 47) says, a 'zombie category'.

Yet, perhaps it is more accurate to think of society as less of a zombie, and more of a social hypochondriac, needing constant self-monitoring. It is by problematizing its health that society upholds belief in the idea that it has the unity of an organic body. Indeed, fears of 'social decline' often legitimate the development of (intrusive) social policies. On the basis of such forms of continuous self-diagnostic, 'society' is the most general form of what Taylor has called a 'social imaginary'. It is also part of a *governing imaginary*. As such, in fields ranging from immigrant integration to crime and safety, 'society' is presented, though never defined, as unchanging (see, for an overview, Schinkel, 2007). Society, in this sense, operates through the statistical visualization of its 'outsides'. In the Netherlands, for example, 'integration' has become a general concept through which those who do not properly belong to 'society' are identified. Incarcerated convicts, for instance, are one day to be 're-integrated in society'. If unadjusted youth of convicted criminals are deemed 'outside society', where are they to be found? 'Dutch society' is construed as a homogeneous whole with an 'outside' that is not Belgium or Germany. Is not prison a crucial institution *in* and *of* 'society'? When the criminal is construed as 'outside society', that 'society' is constructed as a morally impeccable place, a Durkheimian 'ideal society' of impeccable moral character. From the moment a social problem, such as crime, appears, it becomes evident that it exists 'outside society'. The 'outside society' is a socially constructed liminal zone, a border region that allows 'society' to be seen as a still unbroken unity, an organic whole (Schinkel, 2010).

According to its logic, 'society', which is in policy texts *posited* as constant and unchanging, *has no problems*. Crime, poverty or 'immigrants' are part of its 'outside', although society does all it can to 'include' those outside, to 'integrate' them into its utopian domain. Such counterfactual images of society have the social advantage of being immune to factual falsification. The very positing of 'society' as a constant and fundamentally unchanging container of social life, allows for the attribution of the social change (or 'decline') that is at the same time observed. Given the importance of the issues of crime and safety in the observation of 'society' and its 'outside', the actuarial archives can be seen as part of one particular ocular center. In the former EKD's motto,

'no child out of sight' 'sight' is a governing gaze, and actuarial techniques thus are part of rendering visible the risky environments of 'society'.

As others have observed, risk statistics are a form of 'sorting'. They classify and sort populations in safe and dangerous (risky) subpopulations (compare Lyon, 2003). They do so by producing *images of risky subjects* as well as *images of risk geographies* when 'neighborhoods' are screened for risks or when the 'milieu' of risky subjects is charted and monitored. This archival activity of social imagination in the fields of youth work and crime allow for the redrawing of the borders between 'society' and the 'outside society', as Dutch discourse has it (Schinkel, 2002, 2007). The actuarial archive is one location (among many) where such constitutive outsides are produced. Under the name of 'prevention', a repressive exorcism thus takes place, with all the criminalizing effects related to it. That is why all those whose archival registration require an 'intervention' become subject to policies of 'inclusion', 'socialization' and 'integration'.

In a sense, then, the archive can be seen as the memory that 'society' retains in order to know itself. Precisely by archiving what does not belong to 'society', 'society' itself is contained in the archive. It exists at the flipside of every registration of a risky individual, neighborhood or city. In an age that lacks a single authoritative perspective on the definition of 'society', institutionalized forms of memory as embodied by the archive produce crucial visualizations of the collective.

The new prevention: prepression

Time also plays a very specific role in actuarial archiving. Archiving systems are highly technological, statistically tracking the lives of youth in such a way as to stress certain images while suppressing alternatives. The actuarial workers of these archives are interested in selecting the best—that is: least 'risky'—possible worlds and to prevent others from becoming real. The archive transforms the past into classifications (the ontological principle of the archive) and taxonomies (nomological principle) with relevance to present norms. It enables techniques of 'early intervention' in order to prevent certain possible worlds. That prevention may be more important in the present—as normalization, or population management—than in the future itself.

The linking of archives may in fact lead to the creation of one single archive or collection of information. Because they assess risks on the basis of deviations from the norm, these archives have a *visualizing* function in the *present*. They do so based on a peculiarly linear notion of time. Social reality is depicted as a linear path that, without 'intervention' and 'timely response' let recorded risk grow into 'problems' in a deterministic way. Such a 'pro-active enforcement' (Schuilenburg, 2004: 15) is called 'prevention'. But the new prevention in fact comes down to a form of repression, that is, to a *prepression*. It is a pro-active repression that attempts the timely suppression of certain forms of life. It attempts the 'adjustment of the present way of life' (de Vries, 2007: 56).

This is 'prevention' neither in the sense of the police patrol nor in the sense of raising socio-economic conditions. It is the *visualization of risk* and the attendant *repression of risky causal chains*. After 'early detection'—note how 'detection' has shifted from 'detecting crime to 'detecting crime risks''—comes 'early intervention', which often involves state-involvement with the private sphere, but in a highly socially selective

population. 'Intervention' then involves a bellicose rhetoric and at times invasive practice (Schinkel and van den Berg, 2011) of professionals and officials dubbed 'front line workers' and 'city marines' engaged in 're-conquering the city' with the help of the 'strike force' of 'housing brigades' or 'intervention teams'. The concept of *prepression* is devised as a form of counter-memory, since 'prevention' is a depoliticized notion that foregoes the selective repression it legitimates under the guise of 'early intervention'.

In the Rotterdam *Plan of approach* (*Plan van aanpak*) of the 'Every Child Wins' program, it is stated that:

> About 300.000 children and youth between the ages of 0 and 23 live in Rotterdam … about 20% has problems of development, nurture or education. For half of this group, about 30.000 children, an accumulation of problems in one or more areas exists. This may find expression in the form of a behavioral problem. For 10.000 children, the risks or problems are of such an extent that a call on services in youth care is necessary. The supply to especially this group is sometimes lacking, and as a result risks are not registered and taken away timely, problems appear and take increasingly worrying shape.[10]

In other words: 'an accumulation of problems' *can* result in a 'behavioral problem'. Monitoring is intended mainly to register problems early and to prevent worse. Sometimes 'school dropout' is a 'problem', and sometimes it is a 'problem indicator', a warning sign for a later problem such as crime. The notion of 'risk youth' thus allows the construction of an anthropological type that has two relevant characteristics. First, it is highly *diffuse*. One can be a 'risk youth' when one's parents argue or fight a lot, when you skip classes in school, when you are witness to physical violence, when you are perpetrator of physical violence, when you live in a certain neighborhood, when you smoke, and so on. Second, the type 'risk youth' is a *statistical* type. It is a youth that differs from the norm in at least one of a diffuse and open-ended set of 'indicators', if only the indicator 'being registered'.

This of course individualizes certain social problems (Wandall, 2007). But at the same time the problem is de-individualized because potential perpetrators are analyzed at an abstract, aggregated level and not as individuals (compare Feeley and Simon, 1992: 450; Zedner, 2007). Risks can also be signaled as a consequence of 'ethnic screening' and can thus be de-individualized (Schinkel, 2007; Noordegraaf, 2008). It is the individualization in terms of 'risks' at the level of the individual that enables the de-individualization into 'risk populations'. Hence it is equally possible to speak of a 'risk youth' as it is to speak of a 'risk group'. The combination of individualization and de-individualization enables a prepression that is aimed at once at an individual and at the life form, the culture, or the group that the individual exemplifies.

The same is true with respect to a more spatialized aspect. Surveillance—which is one form of social imagination—usually involves the governing of space. In the discourse of prepression this is often denoted (in striking analogy with Foucault's (2004) analyses of 'technologies of security') as 'milieu'. In Rotterdam, the family is for instance regarded as the '1st milieu', education and child care as '2nd milieu', and neighborhood and street are seen as '3rd milieu' (de Vries, 2007: 57).[11] The direct *environment* of the child thus takes center stage, similar to the way the UK saw recent plans to re-educate the parents of criminal youth.[12] The Netherlands has seen an increase in surveillance, archiving and controls 'behind the front door' (van den Berg, 2008). This not only functions as a proxy for 'lost

social control' from the times of a romanticized *Gemeinschaft* (compare Sennett, 1970). It also entails a form of prepression aimed at the identification of those that do not conform to a governmental imaginary of 'society'. A relatively limited *milieu*, closely surrounding risky individuals, is the focus of prepressive efforts, while a more general social context—such as socio-economic inequalities or processes of exclusion (see, for instance, Young, 1999)—is obscured from the governing gaze. This gaze cannot exist without an administrative transformation that runs parallel to the linking of actuarial archives.

Governing prepression: the institutional architecture of the archive

Governance, understood here as the move away from a unitary state towards a networked regulatory control at different levels (Rhodes, 1997), is increasingly called for in the field of risk archiving. This leads to pleas for more and better 'cooperation' between various services and institutions (compare Zedner, 2007: 262). In Rotterdam, the idea is that 'risk registration is a process focused on cooperation' (de Vries, 2007: 61). Cooperating partners in the Rotterdam-based SISA system are the City Education Unit, the Youth tracking system (police, DA and Child Care and Protection Board), Social Affairs and Labor, and the 'Werkstad' labor service (but only for the economically deprived areas Feyenoord, Delfshaven and Hoogvliet). Rotterdam has also seen the introduction of new Centres for Youth and Family (CJGs: 'Centra voor Jeugd en Gezin') in order to improve the 'chain cooperation' between the partner institutions involved. In it, Child Health Clinics, Regional Health Services and the municipal Bureau Youth Care work together. And the linking of the MULTI-Sigal, ProKidPolice, Reference Index and Electronic Child Dossier (ECD) databases is intended to further strengthen the network of local and national administrative levels. In the end, problems of 'safety' are connected with issues of education, health, neighborhood, camera surveillance, behavioral codes, 'integration', 'citizenship' and 'participation' (in 'society'). Private partners, from research- and advice bureaux's planning policies (such as the Beke Company) to private security agencies, are connected to public institutions and such 'cooperation' is equaled to 'professionalism', which is critiqued in its traditional forms (Schinkel and Noordegraaf, 2011). Elsewhere in Europe similar forms of governance on a diffuse problem field called 'safety' or 'security' have been noted (see, for instance, de Maillard, 2005; Edwards and Hughes, 2005; Selmini, 2005; Stenson, 2005).

Archiving systems such as the ProKidPolice require a cooperation that connects sectors as well as executive institutions and policy levels. The 'closing of the chain', the 'integral approach' and the 'closed approach' therefore make up the core rhetoric in the governance of prepression (see, for instance, Rotterdam Municipality, 2006). Such slogans aim at the manageability of a problems field that criss-crosses institutional boundaries. In practice, what takes place has all the characteristics of an actively promoted functional de-differentiation. As State Secretary Albayrak (2008) stated:

> We will have to make a big leap forward and we can. By acting sooner and more consistently. But more is needed … That is possible only when police, justice, municipalities, education and care really start working together. Really connecting those worlds is, to my opinion and to that of the Minister of Justice, the main task.

Next to such forms of governance, forms of 'responsabilization' have appeared (Schinkel and van Houdt, 2010). As part of an 'integral approach' to safety and security, the Netherlands has seen a publicity campaign mobilizing what Jane Jacobs (1961: 35; compare Lyon, 2003: 56) once called the 'eyes on the street'. In Rotterdam, a poster has been used depicting ordinary people waiting for the subway, next to an alarm post. The poster reads: '4 Rotterdam Alarm Systems. What is your role in a safe city?' Increasingly, citizens are co-opted by prepressive measures, up to the point where it is seen as the task of the good citizen to report on one's neighbors. Part of the Rotterdam Safety Approach is the establishment of 'vital coalitions' between citizens and various state and non-state institutions. This is part of the role that 'active citizenship' plays in the Safety Approach, which has to do with the 'own responsibility' of citizens for neighborhood 'prevention' (Rotterdam Municipality, 2008). 'Active citizenship' thereby becomes a *shibboleth* of the population that teams up with the state vis-à-vis the risky populations that 'active citizens' are to help render visible.

Conclusion

Current forms of archival actuarialism are part of a modern rise in statistical techniques that render society and its constitutive outsides visible. In an age that is no longer credibly 'centered', a variety of institutions exist, in differing fields of social life that aim at the visualization of social life. This often happens in counterfactual and idealized ways. Such processes of visualization stabilize the social imaginary of 'society' in different ways that do not add up to a neat puzzle of the whole of society. Rather, the images of society and of its many 'outsides' thus produced function as *governing imaginary*.

Archival actuarialism is one technique of visualization. On the basis of selectivity toward the past it allows a governing of the present on the basis of the production of statistical images of the future. While 'prevention' is its catchphrase, such archival work in fact combines prevention with repression in what I propose to call 'prepression': it criminalizes 'risks' and incriminates 'risky populations'. Their visualization as not properly adjusted to certain counterfactual governing images of 'society' offers the basis for what is called 'early intervention'. Archival practices thus form a crucial element in the contemporary governing of populations. They render objects of problematization visible and, since these objects are predominantly coded as 'not properly belonging to society', they render the social imaginary of 'society' visible. They do so without ever having to picture 'society'—which would of course be impossible—and this is indicative of the fact that 'society' functions as a governing imaginary. In that sense, the actuarial archives discussed here represent a new stage in the statistical imagination of social life.

The optical illusion fostered by archival visualization of risky subjects is that risks inhere only in these subjects and their immediate surroundings. That illusion is part of the political stakes of risk archiving. The biggest 'contribution to society' of such archiving is its functioning as an ocular center from which 'society' gains one image of itself, which is highly probable because it is moralized and hence counterfactual to begin with. But this involves the forgetting of the repressive aspect hiding behind the archival memory of 'prevention'. The concept of prepression is meant as a counter-memory against such depoliticized yet highly political forms of envisaging the social collectivity.

Notes

1. This article uses the shorthand (used in Dutch as well): Reference Index.
2. Available at http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/verwijsindex-risicojongeren/nieuws/2009/04/06/tienduizendste-match-verwijsindex-risico-s-jeugdigen.html (consulted 24 May 2010).
3. After that two year trial, former minister Vogelaar (PvdA) refused to go through with the Antilleans Reference Index, but at this point she was replaced by Minister van der Laan. After critique from the Discussion Board Caribbean Dutch (OCaN), however, it was decided in December 2008 that there would be no separate Reference Index Antilleans. In practice, however, Antilleans are one ethnic group of whom data are separately collected at the local level. This takes place as part of the 'group approach', in which youth groups, mostly Moroccans and Antilleans, are selectively surveilled in Rotterdam.
4. There has been a similar stress in the UK on the 'sharing' of 'information' by institutions, in order to prevent child abuse cases from 'being missed' ('Child Abuse Cases "Being Missed"', available at http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/health/3619316.stm (consulted 26 July 2010).
5. This is not to say that such systems do not exist in other large Dutch cities. In Amsterdam, the equivalent of the 'Every Child Wins' system is the 'Matchpoint' system. But Rotterdam, along with Gouda and Almere, has been the testing ground of the Reference Index.
6. The term 'closed' translates the Dutch 'sluitende' and denotes the closing of the institutional chain.
7. 'Alles over DOSA', available at http://www.rotterdamveilig.nl/do.php?fct=pages&op=showPage&pageId=731 (consulted 24 May 2010).
8. See http://www.leerplichtwijzer.nl/praktijkvoorbeelden/sisa-signaleringssysteem/ (consulted 3 January 2011).
9. Bowker gives the example of the navy, which keeps a record of the trajectories of ships but in such a way as to avoid possible future claims (in case of damage). Another example is Microsoft's internal email archive, which, after legal problems, turned out to be too transparent and had to be censored and recoded (Bowker, 2005: 7).
10. Http://www.iederkindwint.nl/#pagina=1006 (consulted 24 May 2010).
11. See also the website of the SISA-system: http://www.sisa.rotterdam.nl/ (consulted 26 July 2010).
12. See, for instance, Ford and Webster (2008). The article starts with: 'Children as young as 5 will be identified as being at risk of becoming criminals or troublemakers under government plans to tackle offending and disorder on the streets.' In July 2008 Gordon Brown made explicit mention of the forced re-education of parents.

References

Aggression and Violent Behavior (2001) 6(2–3): 115–356.

Albayrak, N. (2008) *Toespraak staatssecretaris van Justitie bij afsluiting kick-off programma Aanpak jeugdcriminaliteit, 21 mei 2008 in de Koninklijke Schouwburg in Den Haag.* Available at http://www.justitie.nl/actueel/toespraken/archief-2008/80521programma-aanpak-jeugdcriminaliteit.aspx?cp=34&cs=7401 (10 May 2009).

Bauman, Z. (2000) 'Social Uses of Law and Order', in D. Garland and R. Sparks (eds) *Criminology and Social Theory*, pp. 23–45. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bauman, Z. (2009) 'The Demons of an Open Society', in W. Schinkel (ed.) *Globalization and the State: Sociological Perspectives on the State of the State*, pp. 106–20. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Beck, U. (1986) *Risikogesellschaft: Auf dem Weg in eine andere Moderne*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp.

Beck, U. (2002) 'The Terrorist Threat: World Risk Society Revisited', *Theory, Culture & Society* 19(4): 39–55.

Beck, U., A. Giddens and S. Lasch (1994) *Reflexive Modernization*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Berlin, F.S., N.W. Galbreath and B. Geary (2003) 'The Use of Actuarials at Civil Commitment Hearings to Predict the Likelihood of Future Sexual Violence', *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment* 15(4): 377–82.

Bowker, G.C. (2005) *Memory Practices in the Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Brighenti, A. (2007) 'Visibility: A Category for the Social Sciences', *Current Sociology* 55(3): 323–42.

Castel, R. (1991) 'From "Dangerousness" to Risk', in G. Burchell, C. Gordon and P. Miller (eds) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, pp. 281–98. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

De Maillard, J. (2005) 'The Governance of Safety in France: Is There Anybody in Charge?', *Theoretical Criminology* 9(3): 325–43.

Derrida, J. (1995) *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

De Vries, M. (2007) 'Signaleren en samenwerken in Rotterdam: Een praktijkverslag', in J.R.M. Gerris (ed.) *Jeugdzorg: Professionaliteit, integrale aanpak, overdracht van warden en normen*, pp. 55–67. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Douglas, M. (1992) *Risk and Blame: Essays in Cultural Theory*. London: Routledge.

Douglas, M. and A. Wildavsky (1980) *Risk and Culture*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Edwards, A. and G. Hughes (2005) 'Comparing the Governance of Safety in Europe: A Geo-Historical Approach', *Theoretical Criminology* 9(3): 345–63.

Elbogen, E.B. (2002) 'The Process of Violence Risk Assessment: A Review of Descriptive Research', *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 7(6): 591–604.

Ericson, R.V. and K.D. Haggerty (1997) *Policing the Risk Society*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Esposito, E. (2002) *Soziales Vergessen: Formen und Medien des Gedächtnisses der Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp.

Ewald, F. (1991) 'Insurance and Risk', in G. Burchell, C. Gordon and P. Miller (eds) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, pp. 197–210. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Feeley, M.M. and J. Simon (1992) 'The New Penology: Notes on the Emerging Strategy of Corrections and Its Implications', *Criminology* 30(4): 449–74.

Ford, R. and R. Webster (2008) 'State to Take Action against Parents Who Can't Control Their Children', *The Times*, 27 June: http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/politics/article4221921.ece (consulted 3 January 2011).

Foucault, M. (1972) *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1994) *Power: Essential Works of Foucault 1954–1984*, Vol. III. London: Penguin.

Foucault, M. (2004) *Sécurité, territoire, population: Cours au Collège de France, 1977–1978*. Paris: Seuil/Gallimard.

Garland, D. (2001) *The Culture of Control: Crime and Social Order in Contemporary Society*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.

Gerris, J.R.M. (ed.) (2007) *Jeugdzorg: Professionaliteit, integrale aanpak, overdracht van warden en normen*. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Gerson, N. (2008) 'Kleine informantjes', *De Groene Amsterdammer* 132(27): 12–15.

Hacking, I. (1975) *The Emergence of Probability: A Philosophical Study of Early Ideas about Probability, Induction and Statistical Inference*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hacking, I. (1990) *The Taming of Chance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hacking, I. (1991) 'How Should We Do the History of Statistics?', in G. Burchell, C. Gordon and P. Miller (eds) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, pp. 181–96. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Hallsworth, S. (2005) 'Modernity and the Punitive', in J. Pratt, D. Brown, M. Brown, S. Hallsworth and W. Morrison (eds) *The New Punitiveness: Trends, Theories, Perspectives*, pp. 239–55. Cullompton: Willan.

Harcourt, B.E. (2007) *Against Prediction: Profiling, Policing, and Punishing in an Actuarial Age*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Jacobs, J. (1961) *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. New York: Vintage.

Luhmann, N. (1991) *Soziologie des Risikos*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Luhmann, N. (1997) *Die Gesellschaft der Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp.

Luhmann, N. (2006) *Beobachtungen der Moderne*. Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Lyon, D. (2003) *Surveillance as Social Sorting: Surveillance, Risk and Digital Discrimination*. London: Routledge.

Lyon, D. (2007) *Surveillance Studies: An Overview*. Cambridge: Polity.

Mercado, C.C. and J.R.P. Ogloff (2006) 'Risk and the Preventive Detention of Sex Offenders in Australia and the United States', *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry* 30(1): 49–59.

Ministry of Justice (2006a) 'Verwijsindex Antillianen wordt in gebruik genomen', press release, 19 December. Available at http://www.justitie.nl/actueel/persberichten/archief2006/Verwijsindex-antillianen-wordt-in-gebruik-genomen.aspx (consulted 8 December 2008).

Ministry of Justice (2006b) 'Managementletter landelijke invoering JCO-Support systeem'. The Hague: Ministry of Justice.

Ministry of Youth and Family (2010) *Voortgangsrapportage Samenwerken met de Jeugd*. The Hague: Ministry of Youth and Family.

Murdoch, J. and N. Ward (1997) 'Governmentality and Territoriality: The Statistical Manufacture of Britain's "National Farm"', *Political Geography* 16(4): 307–24.

Noordegraaf, M. (2008) 'Meanings of Measurement: The Real Story Behind the Rotterdam Safety Index', *Public Management Review* 10(2): 219–37.

Noordegraaf, M. and L. Noordegraaf-Eelens (2009) 'The Monitoring State and Financial Markets', in W. Schinkel (ed.) *Globalization and the State: Sociological Perspectives on the State of the State*, pp. 62–82. Basingstoke: PalgraveMacmillan.

Power, M. (1997a) *The Audit Society: Rituals of Verification*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Power, M. (1997b) 'From Risk Society to Audit Society', *Soziale Systeme: Zeitschrift für Soziologische Theorie* 3(1): 3–21.

Power, M. (2004) *The Risk Management of Everything: Rethinking the Politics of Uncertainty*. London: Demos.

Prins, C. (2008) 'Heeft digitale jeugdzorg de toekomst?', in M.A. van den Berg, C. Prins and M. Ham (eds) *In de greep van de technologie: Nieuwe toepassingen en het gedrag van de burger*, pp. 23–50. Amsterdam: Van Gennep.

PwC (2007) *Quick Scan Elektronisch Kind Dossier*. PriceWaterhouseCoopers: 2007–2599u.

Rhodes, R.A.W. (1997) *Understanding Governance*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Rose, N. (2007) *The Politics of Life Itself: Biomedicine, Power, and Subjectivity in the Twenty-First Century*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rotterdam Municipality (2006) 'Samen werken aan veiligheid: Voorkomen en handhaven', *Vijfjarenactieprogramma Veilig Rotterdam, 2006–2010*. Rotterdam: City Council.

Rotterdam Municipality (2007) *Ieder Kind Wint: Visiedocument*. Rotterdam: Rotterdam Municipality.

Rotterdam Municipality (2008) *Werken aan een veiliger Rotterdam, de aanpak: Methodiek actief burgerschap* [*Working towards a Safer Rotterdam, the Approach: Method Active Citizenship*]. Rotterdam City Council (Directie Veiligheid).

Schinkel, W. (2002) 'The Modernist Myth in Criminology', *Theoretical Criminology* 6(2): 123–44.

Schinkel, W. (2007) *Denken in een tijd van sociale hypochondrie: Aanzet tot een theorie voorbij de maatschappij*. Kampen: Klement.

Schinkel, W. (2009) '"Illegal Aliens" and the State, or: Bare Bodies versus the Zombie', *International Sociology* 24(6): 779–806.

Schinkel, W. (2010) 'The Virtualization of Citizenship', *Critical Sociology* 36(2): 265–83.

Schinkel, W. and M. Noordegraaf (2011) 'Professionalism as Symbolic Capital: Materials for a Bourdieusian Theory of Professionalism', *Comparative Sociology* 10(6).

Schinkel, W. and M.A. van den Berg (2011) 'City of Exception: The Dutch Revanchist City and the Urban Homo Sacer', forthcoming in *Antipode: A Radical Journal of Geography*.

Schinkel, W. and F. van Houdt (2010) 'The Double Helix of Cultural Assimilationism and Neo-Liberalism: Citizenship in Contemporary Governmentality', *British Journal of Sociology* 61(4): 696–715.

Schuilenburg, M. (2004) 'De noodtoestand als regel: Cyberkritische reflecties over de openbare ruimte', *Justitiële Verkenningen* 30(8): 9–21.

Selmini, R. (2005) 'Towards Città Sicure? Political Action and Institutional Conflict in Contemporary Preventive and Safety Policies in Italy', *Theoretical Criminology* 9(3): 307–23.

Sennett, R. (1970) *The Uses of Disorder: Personal Identity and City Life*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Shearing, C. and L. Johnston (2005) 'Justice in the Risk Society', *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology* 38(1): 25–38.

Silver, E. (2000) 'Actuarial Risk Assessment: Reflections on an Emerging Social-Scientific Tool', *Critical Criminology* 9(1/2): 123–43.

Sparks, R. (2001) 'Degrees of Estrangement: The Cultural Theory of Risk and Comparative Criminology', *Theoretical Criminology* 5(2): 159–76.

Stenson, K. (2005) 'Sovereignty, Biopolitics and the Local Government of Crime in Britain', *Theoretical Criminology* 9(3): 265–87.

Tops, P. (2007) *Regimeverandering in Rotterdam: Hoe een stadsbestuur zichzelf opnieuw uitvond*. Amsterdam: Atlas.

Van den Berg, M.A. (2008) 'Rotterdamse interventieteams zetten rechtvaardigheid op het spel. Boeventuig of vernieuwers?', TSS 1–2.

Van den Berg, M.A., C. Prins and M. Ham (eds) (2008) *In de greep van de technologie: Nieuwe toepassingen en het gedrag van de burger*. Amsterdam: Van Gennep.

Van Yperen, T. (2007) 'De praktijk van theoriegestuurd en "evidence-based" hulpverlenen: Weten wat je doet bij jeugdigen', in J.R.M. Gerris (ed.) *Jeugdzorg: Professionaliteit, integrale aanpak, overdracht van warden en normen*, pp. 19–30. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Wandall, R.H. (2007) 'Actuarial Risk Assessment: The Loss of Recognition of the Individual Offender', *Law, Probability and Risk*. doi:10.1093/lpr/mgm001.

Weinrich, H. (2004) *Lethe: The Art and Critique of Forgetting*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

WODC (2008) *Security Implications for Converging Technologies: Impact on the Constitutional State and the Legal Order*. Enschede: Telematica Instituut.

Yates, F. (1966) *The Art of Memory*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Young, J. (1999) *The Exclusive Society: Social Exclusion, Crime and Difference in Late Modernity*. London: SAGE.

Zedner, L. (2007) 'Pre-Crime and Post-Criminology?', *Theoretical Criminology* 11(2): 261–81.

Willem Schinkel (1976) is associate professor of sociological theory at Erasmus University Rotterdam. Among his recent publications is *Aspects of Violence: A Critical Theory* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).