

# Studies in Critical Social Sciences

*Series Editor*

David Fasenfest  
Wayne State University

*Editorial Board*

Chris Chase-Dunn, University of California-Riverside  
G. William Domhoff, University of California-Santa Cruz  
Colette Fagan, Manchester University  
Martha Gimenez, University of Colorado, Boulder  
Heidi Gottfried, Wayne State University  
Karin Gottschall, University of Bremen  
Bob Jessop, Lancaster University  
Rhonda Levine, Colgate University  
Jacqueline O'Reilly, University of Brighton  
Mary Romero, Arizona State University  
Chizuko Ueno, University of Tokyo

VOLUME 17

# Crisis, Politics and Critical Sociology

*Edited by*

Graham Cassano & Richard A. Dello Buono



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON  
2010

## CHAPTER TWELVE

### ON SURVEILLANCE AS A SOLUTION TO SECURITY ISSUES

Vida Bajc

#### *Introduction*

Current discourse in the media, the official thinking, as well as common sense perceptions of citizens tend to relate surveillance to the notion of security. These discussions reflect the prevailing sentiment that something must be done to protect the public from crime and terrorism. There is also a growing sense that the implementation of surveillance technologies and practices are interfering with our notions of privacy and individual freedoms, but this sentiment tends to be accompanied by a widespread persuasion that surveillance can deter crime (see Monahan 2006). As a result, the debate tends to be centered on the question of how much freedom, civil liberties, and right to privacy should be given up for state protection in the prevention of all sorts of crime, from shoplifting to terrorism. The assumption is that civil liberties and security are reciprocally related, the more of one the less of the other. Public debates on these issues are indeed extremely important, not the least of which is that because they allow the citizenry to participate in the political process, but they do not provide us with a deeper and broader understanding of how surveillance is related to the current security imperative.

In this chapter, I offer some preliminary thinking about the nature of bureaucratic surveillance and its relationship to security concerns. To understand the bureaucratic underpinning of surveillance, it becomes necessary to analyze the genealogy and the interrelationships of the foundational elements of surveillance. These elements are Western individualism, exclusionary classification, biopolitics, and the bureaucratic logic (Bajc 2007a). The rise of surveillance technologies and techniques now offered as a solution to security concerns is grounded in these elementary characteristics.

Bureaucratic surveillance is to be distinguished from peer surveillance and its manifestations in mass mediated popular culture (Pecora

2002). I use the term peer surveillance to distinguish mundane face-to-face mutual observation of people in social settings from bureaucratic surveillance which is done by credentialed professionals with the specific purpose of identifying, classifying, monitoring, tracking, channeling, or otherwise ordering the movement of individuals, objects, and communication across social, physical, and virtual spaces. While these two types of surveillance often come to be intertwined they should be analyzed separately so that their important differences and possible convergences can be more clearly grasped. Herein I speak only of bureaucratic surveillance. This type of surveillance has become an inevitable fact of our modern life in that it serves as a foundation for the functioning of all modern states as well as supra-state formations. This is so regardless of their political organization. Bureaucratic surveillance also underlies numerous parts of our daily life, particularly those facets tied to state services and institutional organizations of the state.

The deliberation about whether surveillance is good or bad, therefore, will only get us so far. What is needed beyond such discourse is a deeper understanding of how it is that this practice has emerged historically, how it orders our contemporary life, and how it became linked to security concerns. Below I offer a brief outline of the emergence and the workings of surveillance which I see grounded in the Western culture of individualism and the coming of modernity.<sup>1</sup> I suggest that the current responses to security concerns are simply a continuation of the state's bureaucratic surveillance practices. This brief sketch in some ways follows the working premises of Michel Foucault (1973) in his *The Order of Things* where he seeks to demonstrate that systems of knowledge and thought, or what he called 'discursive formations' are not simply a product of grammar and the outcome of the logic of language. Rather, they tend to be shaped by vectors that operate beneath the consciousness of a single individual. These forces work to articulate systems of conceptual possibilities that not only define the boundaries of what can be thought in a particular historical period or within a specific cultural domain. These realms of ideas, thinking and

<sup>1</sup> There is a burgeoning field of study which draws from a number of disciplines to address the practices of surveillance. For most recent reviews of this scholarship see David Lyon (2006, 2007) and David Murakami Wood (2009). The on-going scholarly research can also be followed in the freely accessible on-line peer-reviewed academic journal *Surveillance & Society*.

knowledge have direct and concrete implications for how social life is actually lived.

In a different sense, my analysis may be said to be analogical to the approach taken by Karl Marx (1967) in his analysis of capitalism. For Marx to be able to deliver a lasting critique of capitalism and its destructive characteristics to undermine those who uncritically praised its potentials to deliver prosperity and progress to all who embraced it, it was first necessary to understand the capitalist system. Marx seemed to have spent considerable energy studying in great depth the underlying logic of the structural interconnections between raw resources, industrial labor, ownership of the means of production, and accumulation of value. It is only through such in depth analysis that he was able to identify profound and irreconcilable internal contradictions of this system and draw lasting conclusions about its destructive potentialities. With this in mind, the discussion that follows is intended to stimulate further dialogue on the relationship between the emergence of security as a dominant social issue and the practices and technologies of bureaucratic surveillance offered as its solution.

### *Understanding Surveillance*

In order to surveil people, information, and objects it is necessary to be able to assign to them their own particular identification mark. For this mark to be useful in bureaucratic surveillance practices, it has to subsequently be classified into a very specific category: for example, citizen, illegal alien, safe, or potentially dangerous. Once identified as unique and unambiguously classified into a particular category, it becomes possible to monitor and track such an individual, object or information through time and across space by acquiring information about their movement and behavior and filing that information in that designated category. This movement can also be channeled or blocked, depending on the specifications of each particular classification to which such individual, object, or information has been assigned. Here we can think, for example, of individuals who find themselves on the no-fly list, objects such as shampoo that come to be classified as prohibited from entering a place in carry-on luggage if they are packaged in a container that is larger than three ounces, or information such as the use of specific words like

'terrorist' that the communications surveillance technologies are designed to intercept. If we are to make sense of these practices and the technologies that make them possible, we need to grasp the underlying logics with which they operate. These have historical origins in Western culture.

### *Individuation*

In its first instance, bureaucratic surveillance is an activity of identification. Whatever is being monitored has to first be identified as unique and singular. This activity is based on the assumption that every human being, object and pieces of information can be assigned its own, unique identification mark. By a way of random example from a non-Western culture, from what we know about the cosmologies of the ancients (see Frankfort 1948), it would be impossible for a member of the ancient Egyptian court bureaucracy to come up with the thought of assigning some version of a social security number to every person who was born or acquired a residential status within the kingdom, as is done today in nation-states worldwide. For the ancients as for other pre-modern cultures, all the elements of the universe were intricately interconnected, so to know something about one element one had to understand its connections to everything else. How does this kind of thinking that each human being and non-living thing can be marked as distinct and separate from all others—an idea so strange to pre-modern cultures and yet so typical and commonsensical in our modern world today—become possible?

Following the cosmologist Louis Dumont (1982), this thinking has its roots in Christian teachings which introduced a very novel idea in theology, namely that every human being has an individual relationship to the Christian monotheistic god. Through a centuries-long transition, this idea of the direct relationship between the individual and god helped bring about the dissolution of the holistic cosmos. The holistic cosmology conceptually unified life on earth with life in the afterworld and held together the relationships between all living and non-living things and the divine power of God. The new cosmology that develops in Europe is parceled into separate categories of state, economy, religion, and family and each has its own internal organization and regulation. This idea of unmediated god-individual relationship finds its fullest expression in the Protestantism of Luther and

Calvin, and, as Max Weber (2002) famously argued, also had profound implications for the development of Western capitalism.<sup>2</sup>

In this new cosmology which reached its peak in the events such as the American Revolution and the French Revolution, the individual stands independent from the categories of state, economy, religion, and family. No longer bound through the intricate conceptual interrelationships of a unified universe, the individual now stands as a central unit and chooses to be engaged in these categories to his or her best abilities and interests. For example, one becomes a member of a particular religious denomination, a citizen of a specific nation-state, or chooses to form a family union of a number of different types in practice today. The development of this cosmology of individualism and differentiation provides the grounds for other historical processes to emerge, most significantly for the purposes of this argument, a particular kind of bureaucratic classification through which every individual can be identified, classified and reclassified, and normalized.

### *Exclusionary Classification*

Once assigned a unique individual marker, the next step in bureaucratic surveillance involves an act in classification of this marker. As Durkheim and Mauss (1963) first suggested, classification seems to underlie all of our actions and thought. There is, however, an agreement among the social scientists and philosophers alike that there are no universal bases of classification. It therefore follows that classifications are social constructions and that different cultural and social groups have varying basis and conceptual schemata for how they classify, living and non-living world. Important for our understanding of bureaucratic surveillance are two premises. The first is that if classification is primary then categories are not what we think about but rather that with which we think. The implication is that how we classify the world is intimately related to how we order relations in the social and natural world, and how we act upon the social

<sup>2</sup> A cosmologist, Louis Dumont is interested in how configurations of ideas and values that underlie our modern cosmos came to existence while the sociologist Max Weber is focused on the social action of the individual as the product of causation. As evident in Dumont's (1977) analysis of Marxism as individualism, both share the concern with consequences of individualism for socio-political-economic organization. For a discussion on Weber's thinking about individualism in relation to capitalism, see Graham Cassano (2008).

universe. The second premise is that classifications are matrixes that order our thought and action and that these vary cross-culturally. The implication here is that to understand bureaucratic surveillance as we know and experience it today, we need to grasp the logic of a particular kind of bureaucratic classification which emerges in modernity in Europe.

Unlike other kinds of classifications which come to existence through tradition and reflexive and non-reflexive practice, bureaucratic classifications are purposeful creations. They are invented by specially trained professionals with the intent to order the social world so that management of the course of its transformation can be possible. The training and knowledge of these professionals endow them with authority and legitimacy. Bureaucracies, however, are not a phenomenon particular to modernity, and we can certainly see its forms already in highly organized ancient civilizations as far back as ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia (Frankfort 1948). These same ancients who would not be able to conceive of individualism in the sense discussed by Dumont above and taken for granted by us today, actually already had a developed bureaucracy. Their bureaucratic classification, however, was intimately tied with the world according to a god-given order. In their cosmology, every object, human being, or phenomenon was tied to every other so that explanations of how the world works emerged from the thinking that living and non-living beings are closely and intricately interconnected. What emerges in modernity, as Foucault (1973:50-58) observed, is a different kind of rationality for classifying the world which is based on dividing the world into categories in such a way that each identified element can be given a specific classification and unambiguously positioned in one category. This system of exclusive classification makes possible the acquisition of knowledge and has helped give rise to modern science and technology on which bureaucratic surveillance is based.

It is this logic of accumulation of information that makes bureaucratic surveillance viable and workable. This kind of reasoning lent itself easily to separation of the individual self from the elements that actually form its living being: for example, birth, death, marriage, divorce, land ownership, residence, number of children, religious affiliation and so on. These categories are now invented by the cadre of professionals whose job becomes to acquire and classify information. Monitoring of different aspects of human life through

surveillance enabled the development of modern bureaucracy. These developments also provide a favorable context for the rise of the possibility of governing of entire populations.

### *Biopolitics*

The modern state is grounded on the principle of clearly delineated territorial boundaries, claims to sovereignty, and the tendency to monopolize the legitimate use and means of violence. Historically, this required a development of the capacity to separate populations that belonged to the state from others, and then, regulate human movement across state borders. As Torpey (2000) documents, this was a slow and painstaking process of bureaucratic construction of the official internal identity documentation and what came to be known as the passport. According to Higgs (2001), this was connected to another process where within territorial boundaries states, increasingly sought to collect information on individuals rather than pockets of populations and they began to do so in a systematic and centralized fashion rather than follow serendipitous and localized ways. This documentation of individuals and centralization of information about them allowed for mobilization of the population for the purposes and needs of the state (Desrosières 1998). The needs of the state, its territorial boundaries and its sovereignty came to be enforced through the development of a state defense apparatus and policies that were geared toward what was developing into a global system of modern states (Buzan, Wæver and de Wilde 1998).

The question for the state becomes how to manage the population with meticulous attention to detail. Effective management of the state becomes possible through a way of governmentality that Foucault (2008) described as biopolitics. This is a particular rationalization of governing that makes different aspects of life, such as birth, death, marriage, owning a house, change of income, health, reproduction, or education the subject of governing and regulation. Modern states acquire power to actively shape the activities of their populations on the basis of accumulation of information about them, development of technologies to process this information, and by organizing these data into classification matrixes of carefully surveilled and managed lifelong individual habits. As Foucault (1979) emphasized, biopolitics also has a quality of disciplinary power which rests on the ability to impose norms and requirements on human behavior and interaction through

legitimized knowledge of specifically trained professionals and experts and their panoptic disciplinary means.

These are foundations of the official organization of the modern state on which depend not only the institutions such as the education system, the economy, or the polity, but also the smooth functioning of daily life. Biopolitics therefore rests on the development of what Max Weber (1964) analyzed as bureaucratic institutions. As Weber observed, methodical and orderly accumulation of information requires a trained cadre of professionals who have formal qualifications to perform specific tasks to which they have been assigned. Their tasks are performed according to specifically defined rules, follow hierarchies of responsibility and decision making and depend on the mastering of the information gathered. These elements, such as, specialization, rules, offices, efficiency, and legal-rational decision making all comprise what we think of as the Weberian structure of bureaucracy. Supporting and enabling this structure is the processual logic with which bureaucracy operates.

#### *Bureaucratic Logic*

Bureaucratic classification separates information from the individuals and things it seeks to classify. Once separated, the information is assigned an exclusive category, so a particular bit of information cannot be classified into multiple categories at the same time, which can then be formatted into data and made ready for analysis. This process, which begins with the separation of information from the actual persons, makes individuals invisible and operates with the data about them. When information is collected that cannot be classified in any existing categories, a new category is simply invented. Every time a new taxonomy is invented, it exposes the need for new knowledge and creates space for more acquisition of information. Each taxonomy can give rise to new cadre of specialists in ever more specialized domains, each claiming legitimacy, competency and conclusive truth. This makes it possible to envision governmentality of populations whose behavior can now be explained on the basis of information available, categorized in relation to other classifications, and projected on the basis of knowledge. Knowledgeable professionals and their ability to continuously classify and reclassify the world become a part of the state's power to govern. Don Handelmann (2004:19-38) suggests that this capacity to classify and re-classify at will gives bureaucratic clas-

sification its own logic and inertia. Once the information is extracted from the individuals, individuals as persons disappear, taxonomies are formed, and the bureaucracy is able to do its work through these categories. This is done by simply treating human behavior as information to be classified and re-classified according to any new situation. This provides the bureaucracy with the capacity to absorb, process, and act upon an ever growing amount and diversity of information. By simply inventing new categories, the system is able to easily deal with ambiguity and the endless complexities of human life.

By way of an example found in daily newspapers, the bureaucratic surveillance system responded to the situation of 11 September 2001 by classifying information about individuals, objects, and communication into two general categories, safe and dangerous, and then sub-classifying each into more specific sub-categories. When the information fit neither of the two categories, that is, when particular information about an individual could be classified neither as absolutely safe nor as absolutely dangerous, a third classification was simply invented. With this new classification, another set of specifications was devised to deal with it. When it comes to these particular classifications, the process is often shrouded in secrecy. One can, however, easily imagine that it was the invention of this third category, whatever its name, that led to the creation of policies surrounding what is taking place in Guantanamo Bay. This ability to respond to new situations in the social world by simply bringing to life new categories and procedures to deal with any new information about human behavior makes it possible for the bureaucracy to deal with endless amounts of information without a breakdown. Indeed, while the public may well question certain classifications and its corresponding surveillance practices, as is now the case with Guantanamo Bay, this tends to happen only after the fact. Moreover, as the polity is debating the legal and ethical implications of a particular case, there are few signs, if any, that the bureaucratic surveillance system and its practices associated with the classifications of security have been seriously undermined.

#### *Surveillance and Security*

Surveillance has indeed been offered as a solution to all sorts of social issues labeled as a security problem, from street crime to terrorism and even undocumented migration (Bigo 2002). This tendency reflects the

process that has come to be called securitization. The term is associated with a group of Danish theorists of international relations (see Waever 1995) who seek to demonstrate that the notion and practices of security as understood by the apparatus associated with state defense are no longer only a matter of inter-state relations. They are now increasingly also becoming a part of the daily life of ordinary citizens. The public discourse on security and surveillance masks the origins of the classification of security, the diverse specifications used by different social scientists and state officials, as well as the differing perceptions of what security means to different segments of the population (Staudt, forthcoming). For the purposes of this chapter, it is important to understand the origins of the classification called security and how its transformation into securitization is shaping our everyday living.

#### *From Security to Securitization*

Originally, security as a bureaucratic classification came into existence in relation to the modern state as a territorially organized political entity and was invented to respond to threats to state sovereignty and its borders. This classification continues to entail specifications of what kinds of activities in the realm of global inter-state relations threaten stability and survival of a given state. They also include instructions about what is to be marked as a threat and who is to respond to such threats and through what means. When designated officials identify specific inter-national developments as security threat, the relevant state agencies assigned to respond to this label in a particular way take on their role and act as instructed (see Buzan, Waever, and de Wilde 1998). Common parlance now suggests a conflation of security as the domain of state defense and international politics with security as perception of personal and communal safety. The concept of security has become almost a household word, the meaning of which extends beyond inter-state conflict of interest to encompass a general feeling of uncertainty, insecurity, and fear in the face of what the future may bring. This new taxonomy for security threat entails a set of specifications with a vastly broader scope than its original version to incorporate a wide variety of situations in multiple domains of everyday life. Securitization encompasses safety of the individual body, individual psychological well-being, protection of individual property and public resources, communal safety, as well national integrity. As security scholars have emphasized, despite all of its transformations, the

classification of security nevertheless continues to carry not only sets of responses that pertain to the original specification of state defense, but also, sets of professionals who act on the basis of their specialized knowledge of state defense—now to be used in a wide variety of social domains (Waever 1995).

With this tendency to label a whole host of social issues as a security problem, this phenomenon of so-called securitization is transforming the notion of security into a dominant ordering principle of social relations. As a classification, it is attached to multiple issues pertaining to the domains of the individual, the communal, the state, and the global. At the same time, the notion of security also permeates the consciousness of the general public. It tends to resonate with the public sentiment that steps must be taken to prevent certain kinds of possible future activities from happening. These sentiments tend to dominate the public sphere in specific historical moments, such as 9/11, then recede, only to resurface again following other such events. Public deliberations on the issues related to security suggest that security is seen as a value. In the public discourse, the value of security is compared to other values that govern liberal democracies, that is, with other ordering principles of contemporary political life, most notably individual liberty, privacy, protection from state intrusion, the right to due process, freedom of political participation, and human rights. This is expressed through debates referenced at the beginning of the chapter, namely, whether democratic principles should be traded for security and how much of the person's right to privacy should be given up for state protection. Securitization as an ordering principle of social life is brought into practice through what I call security meta-framing.

#### *The Security Meta-frame*

In the instances where the value of security outweighs other values and when particular social issues are classified as a security threat and treated as such, security becomes the dominant ordering principle. As the dominant ordering principle, security is organized hierarchically in such a way that designates security as a higher value than any other, thus encompassing and subordinating all other issues. This hierarchical organization of values is very much resonant with meta-framing as understood by Gregory Bateson (1972). In his sense, meta-framing is always organized hierarchically and always invokes

a choice of value, where the higher value is indexed through the 'meta.' The prefix 'meta' here refers to a higher level of discourse, a message of a higher level of abstraction that subsumes all other communication within its domain. The meta-message is a point of reference, a source of orientation, a higher order of abstraction that guides interpretation of other meanings and activity. In this way, the security meta-frame comes to encompass a set of conditions that define safety through clear-cut categories of certain and unpredictable, safe and dangerous. It is also a set of parameters that, if followed, promise to the public to deliver security into a wide variety of social contexts. If the security meta-frame is becoming a dominant ideology of the parameters and conditions of how life should be lived, then the question becomes how this hierarchy of values shapes specific contexts of our social life.

There are a number of manifestations on how taxonomies and their specifications produced within the security meta-frame are used to order social life. Most obvious examples include changes in our living environments that have the ability to make change in social relations. We can think of CCTV cameras and their face recognition software, positioned to overlook the flow of people into and out of public buildings and on streets in our urban centers. Then, there are those ubiquitous white concrete blocks, often positioned in front of public buildings or simply on streets so as to structure the flow of traffic. All sorts of check points force everyone who wants to enter into certain social spaces, from libraries to airports, to pass through their metal detectors, identification verification technologies, and designated security personnel. Zones of enclosure enforce boundaries by cocooning a group of people into a physical space and in so doing, separate it from its surrounding. Checkpoints, road blocks, metal detectors, monitoring devices, and zones of enclosure have become very much a part of our urban landscape and our interpersonal relations in public spaces. They signal suspicion that anyone of us in the crowd can be potentially dangerous and undermine interpersonal trust between people in public spaces. These ordering processes of the security meta-frame become most clearly noticeable in specific contexts and situations where different rules of interaction are visibly and physically imposed on the public. A most obvious example of such a context and one of the most frequently studied are the airports where all the most sophisticated surveillance technologies

and techniques are put to practice to ensure that people follow the specifications of the taxonomy of security (Salter, forthcoming).

My own ethnographic research has focused on public events, particularly those that invoke the involvement of the state. These are very interesting social happenings for the study of how security meta-framing orders social life because they allow us to study how surveillance is becoming intertwined with collective ritual experience. My studies of the Pope's visit to Jerusalem in 2000 (Bajc forthcoming) and the second inauguration of President Bush in 2005 (Bajc 2007b) suggest that as soon as such events are announced, the classification of security takes center stage. The event is classified as a national security event and its specifications involving surveillance begin to take place by subordinating all other social activity to its meta-message of order as envisioned by the security and surveillance apparatus. This involves the zoning off of usually an urban area that comes to be designated as such by the apparatus and in this area, separating individuals deemed safe from all others. In this way, the apparatus creates the so-called 'sterile area' which is considered an area of safety. In this intervention process, people are expected to cooperate and follow the rules of the apparatus. Those who wish to attend the event are expected to subject themselves to surveillance procedures, specifically designed for participants. We see that the security meta-frame has the effect of transforming a social environment from its daily routine social life to a security-sanctioned order, that is, order as envisioned by the security and surveillance apparatus. This transformation is one from a potentially threatening everyday social space into a zone of safety under maximum control. I suggest that these examples of security meta-framing have the effect of acculturation to this vision of social order and of acceptance of such surveillance practices as normal or even desirable.

#### *Concluding Remarks*

I have argued that bureaucratic surveillance is basic to our political and social organization. As Foucault's explications of the notion of governmentality and biopolitics suggest, much of it is done in the name of social progress and for the benefit of the citizenry. The logic with which the bureaucratic surveillance operates, however, is not democratic. Once this is understood, it becomes clear that modern states and democracy as their choice of political organization are intimately



intertwined with and deeply embedded in a non-democratic system of operations. For this reason and as Hannah Arendt (1951) emphasized early on, democratic states continuously walk the fine line between the realms of democracy on the one side and totalitarianism on the other. The ascendance of the classification of security to the top of our collective priorities at the expense of the democratic values and the effects of its meta-framing on our social life are an example of sliding away from the principles of democracy and into the realm of totalitarianism.

How this fine line is walked offers itself as an important empirical question that should be studied in historical and cultural-comparative terms. In the United States, there were other historical moments when the classification of security ascended to the top of collective values, most notably in the early years following World War II, also known as the McCarthy era, and the years following World War I and the Russian Revolution of 1917. In each of these moments, surveillance practices, together with public suspicion, fear, and mistrust forcefully cut into the fabric of social life as well as the intimate life of people. It remains to be studied under what conditions such classifications and their meta-framing trump over democratic values, how and how long they are able to sustain their dominance, how their waves of ascendance eventually subside, and what kinds of durable changes in culture and social relations they leave behind. No less important, therefore, is the inquiry into the subtle processes of normalization of such governing principles and acculturation into their visions of social order.

## CHAPTER THIRTEEN

### THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF SCHOOL VIOLENCE IN TRINIDAD: TOWARDS A CARIBBEAN THEORY OF YOUTH CRIME

Daphne Phillips

The aims of this study are to understand the real life conditions and experiences of children in the Junior Secondary Schools in Trinidad among whom the highest incidences of violence have been reported. To this end, I seek to construct an adequate theory about the upsurge in crime in this youthful section of the population. The present work investigates the experiences of students in the junior secondary school system in Trinidad and enquires into their perceptions/experiences of the root causes, consequences and outcomes of youth engagement in violence. Among other things, I analyze a poverty complex that involves low levels of material resources, parental flirtation with illicit drugs, parental neglect, and physical, verbal and sexual abuse of children in the home. These factors are associated with strong, negative emotional responses from children and the presence of a hidden school curriculum. Under these circumstances and in the context of an increasingly robust market economy, youth violence has become rampant. At the end of this chapter, I conclude with some social policy recommendations based on collaboration with stakeholders in the interest of addressing the root problems exposed by the research.

The increase in criminal behavior among the Secondary School population in Trinidad and Tobago has been of national concern for some time. Reports of serious crime—murder, attack with a weapon, rape, larceny, kidnapping—allegedly committed by school students and reported in the press, have given rise to great concern and stimulated resultant explanations from lay persons and policy makers alike. The reasons for and the appropriate methods of dealing with this relatively new phenomenon in the Trinidad context have abounded and are being discussed in various public arenas. A rough survey of the vast majority of explanations of the apparent upsurge in youth crime and violent behavior in Trinidad reveals that blame is generally attributed