

The New American School: preparation for post-industrial discipline

Aaron Kupchik^{a*} and Torin Monahan^b

^aUniversity of Delaware, USA; ^bArizona State University, USA

In this article we consider how broad shifts in social relations over the past 30 years have given rise to new social control regimes in US public schools. We argue that the contemporary mechanisms of control engendered by mass incarceration and post-industrialization have re-shaped school discipline. To illustrate contemporary discipline in the ‘New American School,’ we discuss the emergence of police officers and technological surveillance in schools. These two strategies of school social control facilitate the link between courts and schools, and expose students to both the salience of crime control in everyday life and to the demands of workers in a post-industrial world. By incorporating police officers and technological surveillance into the school safety regime, schools shape the experiences of students in ways that reflect modern relationships of dependency, inequality, and instability vis-à-vis the contemporary power dynamics of the post-industrialist labor market and the neoliberal state.

Introduction

In this article we consider how broad shifts in social relations over the past 30 years have given rise to new social control regimes in contemporary public schools. We focus on two developments that have risen concurrently in the United States—mass incarceration and post-industrialization—and theorize how these developments permeate public schools’ disciplinary practices. Specifically, we argue that police officers and technological surveillance in schools articulate larger mechanisms of social control in post-industrial societies. By increasingly relying on police officers and surveillance technologies, schools socialize youth into relationships of dependency, inequality and instability vis-à-vis the contemporary power dynamics of the post-industrialist labor market and the neoliberal state.

Our analysis of contemporary trends in school discipline draws upon prior research on the socializing function of schools. Almost a century ago, John Dewey (1916) recognized that the physical and social environment of schools—more so than the

*Corresponding author. Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice, University of Delaware, 322 Smith Hall, Newark, DE 19716, USA. Email: akupchik@udel.edu

content of classroom lessons—educates students into acceptable social roles and responsibilities. Even if this socialization process is unintentional on the part of administrators or others, students nonetheless learn about their positions in society and their proper modes of interaction, both with peers and with authority figures.

Since Dewey, others have argued that schools reinforce existing social class divisions, thereby socializing students into class-defined roles. David Tyack (1974), for example, illustrates how early schools taught working-class children skills necessary for factory labor. These children were taught obedience, punctuality and precision—they were literally required to ‘toe the line’ (to stand rigidly with their toes precisely on a line drawn on the floor) while reciting lessons. Early twentieth-century working-class students learned more than punctuality, however; they learned that they were subordinates in a labor market economy who could expect to be factory laborers (Bowles & Gintis, 1977). This mass production mode of schooling shaped students through the content of lessons (Apple, 1990), through tracking by ability levels (Oakes, 1985) and, most importantly, through the creation of disciplinary environments that were internalized by students (Parsons, 1959). Paul Willis’s (1977) research on working-class lads in the United Kingdom further documents how schools mirror and reproduce existing power dynamics and labor market relations. According to Willis, working-class youth perceived liberal arts curricula and credential-based education as having no relevance for them, given their limited career opportunities, so they left school early to begin blue-collar jobs, which were still available at the time.

Although some scholars identify class as the controlling element of school socialization (Tyack, 1974; Willis, 1977), other scholars flag the importance of race/ethnicity in social stratification in schools (McCarthy & Hoge, 1987). The process of socializing students into contemporary social roles is undoubtedly shaped by class and race/ethnicity; however, rather than search for disproportionate school treatment along lines of class, race or ethnicity, in this paper we focus on broader currents of control that prepare all public school students in the United States for life in an era of mass incarceration and post-industrialization.

We take as a starting point the socializing effects of schools to analyze armed police officers and technological surveillance systems on school campuses, and relate these new social control strategies to the social relations engendered by mass incarceration and post-industrialization. In contrast to schools in the early twentieth century, which prepared youth for dependable factory labor, contemporary schools prepare youth for volatile labor markets and uncertain service sector employment. The modern world that embraces students is marked by the demise of the welfare state, privatization of social services and entrepreneurial approaches to modern social problems, including private for-profit prisons and mass incarceration of over two million people (in the United States alone). Public institutions and public life are subjected to ongoing processes of globalization, militarization and corporatization, altering how citizens participate in politics and react to social problems, as well as how states control citizens in places like schools (Saltman & Gabbard, 2003). We argue that these larger forces are mediated by public education and manifested as police and surveillance

presence at school sites, such that students are exposed to social control forces that simultaneously create and are produced by conditions of mass incarceration and post-industrialization.

Defining mass incarceration

Since the mid-1970s, the US prison and jail population has more than tripled; it now measures over two million inmates, with a rate of 715 inmates per 100,000 in the population (Harrison & Karberg, 2004). This rate has grown more than fivefold since 1972 and is six to ten times greater than rates in European and Scandinavian countries (Garland, 2001a). Although the increase in imprisonment has occurred over the past 30 years, its rate of growth escalated significantly in the 1990s. The United States now boasts the highest recorded imprisonment rate of any nation, having recently exceeded that of Russia (Mauer, 2003).

This imprisonment binge has disproportionately affected young racial and ethnic minorities, especially African Americans in inner cities. For example, a recent estimate warns that 75% of African American males in Washington DC can expect to be incarcerated at some point during their lives (Braman, 2002). National data find that 12% of African American males in their twenties were in prison or jail in 2003, in contrast to 1.6% of whites (Harrison & Karberg, 2004). Some scholars have described urban, mostly racial and ethnic minority communities as police states, in which it is common to have friends and family members in prison and one accepts police activity as a frequent occurrence (Miller, 1996; Anderson, 2000). In particular, Loic Wacquant (2001) has argued that, due to mass incarceration, the ghetto has become more like prison and prisons have become more like the ghetto.

Yet suburban and rural communities, and individuals from varying racial/ethnic and social class backgrounds, also are affected by mass imprisonment and the factors related to it. In *The Culture of Control*, David Garland (2001b) argues that a preoccupation with policing and punishment pervades contemporary society in the United States and the United Kingdom. As suburban homeowners install house and car alarms, invest in security cameras and build gated communities, they demonstrate their obsession with social control functions previously seen as the responsibility of the state. Suburban homeowners certainly are not being incarcerated at near the rate of urban populations, especially racial and ethnic minorities, yet they are not immune to the themes of control and punishment that undergird the imprisonment binge. Although different groups experience the condition of mass incarceration very differently, its underlying logics of exclusion, control and fear affect the lives of everyone in contemporary society.

Defining post-industrialization

The term post-industrialization signifies more than just the loss of factory jobs in industrialized countries; it connotes profound changes in the operations of global capital and relations among states, industries and citizens. In the mid-1970s, crises

in capital accumulation compelled a shift away from Fordist mass-production regimes and toward what has been called post-Fordist flexible production. David Harvey (1990) describes the new logic of global capital as 'flexible accumulation,' indicating a host of practices for postponing capitalism's collapse through the colonization of new markets across time and space. Some of these practices include labor outsourcing, just-in-time production, decentralization, computerized automation and temporary employment. The social and environmental costs of these changes are then externalized, contributing to the decline of the welfare state, the neutering of organized labor, the fueling of uneven international development, the advancement of environmental pollution and degradation, and, arguably, the rise of mass incarceration.

As industries shift from manufacturing products to providing services, especially in 'developed' countries, low-wage service sector jobs become concentrated around sited materialities—or 'global cities'—of the information economy (Sassen, 1991; Castells, 1996). This results in dependent social relations of extreme inequality, with economically and culturally disparate groups co-existing in relatively close proximity. New mechanisms of social control emerge to manage ensuing tensions. Fortified enclaves such as gated communities, shopping malls, business centers and even schools enforce separation, restricting opportunities for democratic or economic inclusion (Davis, 1990; Caldeira, 2000).¹ Infrastructures for water, power, transportation and telecommunications hold groups in check by distributing access in uneven but seemingly natural ways (Graham & Marvin, 2001). Privatized institutions, spaces and services, such as 'business improvement districts' or private security companies, allow for the increased policing of public life while sacrificing civic responsibility and civil liberties (Zukin, 1995).

Just as flexibility is now valuable for industry practices and state/industry relations, it also represents a new form of social control over bodies in the post-industrialist era. Corporate training exercises intentionally mold compliant yet risk-taking employees, or 'flexible bodies,' who thrive upon instability and labor intensification (Martin, 1994). Schools reinforce these identities by teaching students the values of multi-tasking, reskilling and conforming to industry demands and market vicissitudes (Monahan, 2005). Flexibility is crucial to biopolitical production: 'the production of social life itself, in which the economic, the political, and the cultural increasingly overlap and invest one another' (Hardt & Negri, 2000, p. xiii). As this paper argues, the production of compliant bodies for the demands of post-industrial life also implies the reconfiguration of social control agents and mechanisms—namely, police and surveillance technologies—in public schools.

Police in schools

Public schools in the United States are becoming more tightly coupled with formal social control institutions as they add police officers to the list of full-time school personnel. According to a 1996–1997 survey by the National Center for Education Statistics, 19% of high schools and 39% of high schools with over 1000 students have

full-time law enforcement officials on campus (Heaviside *et al.*, 1998), usually referred to as school resource officers (SROs). The number of schools with full-time SROs is growing rapidly (Beger, 2002), with the National Association of School Resource Officers now claiming almost 15,000 members.² Much of this growth is due to federal funding; since 2000, the Department of Justice's Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (conveniently given the acronym 'COPS') has awarded over \$350 million to hire SROs nationwide (Girouard, 2001; Beger, 2002). State grants often subsidize these federal funds to hire additional SROs (Tran, 2004). As a result, law enforcement partnerships are on the rise in both public and private schools (Cohen, 2004).

Much of the growth in SROs has occurred since 1990, concurrent with a marked acceleration of imprisonment rates and *significant decreases* in juvenile delinquency. Despite the fact that schools are, statistically, the safest places for children to be (ACLU, 2001), school districts have placed police in schools in an attempt to prevent crime. Certainly, it is easy to understand how parents and schools have become increasingly concerned about school safety and motivated to take action to prevent school crime. A dramatic increase in juvenile crime and drug use in the late 1980s to early 1990s, followed by isolated but vicious school shootings in the late 1990s, have catalyzed parents' and schools' fears of school crime (Moore *et al.*, 2003; Newman, 2004). These fears may not match the statistical reality of school violence, but they are the forcibly expressed responses to high-profile acts of violence.

Reforms within the New York City public school system, the largest public school system in the United States, illustrate the growth and popularity of police officers in schools. According to John Devine (1996), in 1996 there were over 3200 uniformed school safety officers in New York City schools, a force bigger than that of the entire Boston Police Department. In the early 1990s, New York City vastly increased the number of law enforcement officers in schools despite fiscal crises that led to decreasing school budgets. With more recent additions of school safety officers (trained by the Police Department) and full-time police officers in 2002 and 2003, some New York City public schools have as many as 30 uniformed guards or police officers patrolling hallways (Medina, 2002; Gootman, 2004). Although these officers are stationed throughout the city, their concentration is highest in schools designated as the most violent, which are—most often—schools in extremely impoverished areas (Devine, 1996; Gootman, 2004).

The state of Arizona offers another example of this trend. Established in 1994 and funded by a combination of federal and state grants, the Arizona School Safety Program places full-time SROs and probation officers in Arizona public schools. Rather than school employees, these are professional police and probation officers who request re-assignment to schools instead of to precinct houses or probation offices. Consistent with other SRO programs, the Arizona School Safety Program is intended to prevent crime, enhance perceived safety among students and teachers, build goodwill between students and law enforcement officers, and teach 'good citizenship.' To achieve these goals, SROs maintain a visible presence in schools by

wearing full police uniforms, interacting regularly with students and teaching law-related courses (Horne, 2004).

Schools hope that having armed, uniformed police officers on campus during all school hours will deter offenses on school grounds (Johnson, 1999; Jackson, 2002). SROs also seek to deter crime by facilitating the link between schools and courts, thereby enhancing the punishments for school offenses beyond what a school would otherwise prescribe. Moreover, SROs attempt to build rapport with students so that potential offenders might come to them before committing a crime, but also so that students can inform SROs about classmates' plans for committing crimes (Mulqueen, 1999). Thus, schools hire SROs with the explicit goal of deterring crime and fostering pro-law enforcement views among students. Yet the presence of SROs has other effects as well, including increased personal surveillance, ubiquitousness of law enforcement and outsourcing of school discipline—each of which enhances the socialization of students into a society marked by mass incarceration and post-industrialization.

Personal surveillance

In the following sections, we discuss the importance of technological surveillance in detail. Personal surveillance deserves mention here as well because one of the primary functions of SROs is to collect evidence about students from other students. By enlisting informants, SROs hope to avert large-scale violent incidents and to arrest individuals when offenses do occur (Newman, 2004). This law enforcement effort mirrors urban police tactics of paying informants to report to police about their neighbors, a practice that some critics argue erodes trust among inner-city, minority community-members (Miller, 1996).

In addition to helping control students' actions, surveillance via classmate informants acts as a constant reminder of police presence. It also weakens the division between individual students' private conversations and police knowledge (Brotherton, 1996). In a manner reminiscent of Foucault's (1977) description of power through hierarchical observation, surveillance via SROs exposes students to the experience of law enforcement having privileged access to information about their offenses and deviant acts before they even occur. Students' experiences are thus framed within a climate of distrust under the watchful eye of the state.

Ubiquitousness of law enforcement

The constant link between schools and law enforcement officials lowers the threshold for entry to the justice system. As professional police officers, SROs have a duty to arrest students who violate the law. Instead of a student being punished only internally by the school, she is now more likely to be arrested and prosecuted in addition to receiving the school's punishment (Beger, 2002). This practical effect of SROs clearly mirrors the increasingly severe sentencing for criminal offenders, which is partially responsible for mass incarceration.

The presence of SROs also reflects symbolically the broad mechanisms of control that correspond to mass incarceration and post-industrial life. Rather than being an agency that responds on-demand, the police are now a part of the school's everyday life (Devine, 1996). Students may become socialized to expect a police presence in their lives, and for friends or family to be under the control of the criminal justice system. This would be especially true for racial and ethnic minority students in urban areas, who have the greatest likelihood of either being incarcerated or knowing people in prison (Miller, 1996), and who have little access to a post-industrial job market in which 'good' jobs are distantly located and/or require skills they might not possess (Wilson, 1987). The pervasiveness of law enforcement thus has the potential to socialize students to a unique form of citizenship in a society of mass incarceration and post-industrialization (Brotherton, 1996). Because school discipline is the primary avenue for students to learn about symbols of power and authority (Noguera, 1995), the presence of SROs may communicate to students (and others) that security maintenance is the most important state function.

SROs also signal the penetration into education of crime as a 'normal social fact.' According to Garland (2001b), the threat of crime is now accepted as a part of modern consciousness, an everyday risk rather than an aberrant event. He describes how the normalization of crime has, along with broad structural and cultural shifts, helped set the stage for mass incarceration. By placing uniformed police officers in schools full time, schools demonstrate this acceptance of crime as a social fact and encourage students to accept this feature of contemporary life.

Outsourcing of discipline

Importing SROs into schools represents a shift away from school self-maintenance of discipline, and toward a model where discipline is outsourced to other state agencies or private companies (Beger, 2002). According to Devine (1996), the proliferation of security guards in the New York City schools has helped produce a division of labor whereby teachers are responsible for students' minds, and security staff responsible for their bodies. SROs work with schools, but they are trained by, paid by and ultimately report to police departments. With the presence of police officers instead of (or in addition to) hall monitors, school security guards and assistant principals—all individuals who traditionally have handled discipline and who are paid by schools and report to the school principal—it is more likely now than in years past that students will be formally prosecuted rather than simply punished in-house (Beger, 2002). Thus students are exposed to a society where professional duties are increasingly specialized, law enforcement is a paramount concern and punishment for misbehavior is frequent and severe.

Furthermore, the presence of SROs leads to radical new solutions to problems of student discipline. Problems faced by schools or students are now more likely to be defined as 'criminal' problems rather than as social or counseling problems. The following story, told by Curt Lavarello, the current director of the National Association of School Resource Officers about his early career as an SRO, typifies this trend.

Lavarello describes his reaction when a female student who requested help from the school guidance counselor was offered only a 15-minute appointment for the following day:

Lavarello offered to help the girl as she left the office, and it turned out the girl's father was abusing drugs and beating her mother. Lavarello was able to work with the local community policing program to address the problem as both a school issue because a student had a problem and a community issue because a crime was being committed. (Mulqueen, 1999, p. 17)

Although the student sought counseling advice rather than a law enforcement solution, the presence of an SRO led to official police involvement.³ Directly incorporating police officers into school life means constant exposure to a law enforcement orientation to solving problems. As they help students solve personal problems and help school administrators manage school safety problems, SROs introduce their professional law enforcement training and perspectives into the school culture (see Devine, 1996). Thus, the school environment increasingly resembles and contributes to mass incarceration.

Surveillance in schools

If the presence of police officers on school campuses creates an overlap between schools and prisons, socializing students and school personnel into disciplinary roles and relations, then what are the implications of employing electronic surveillance systems in public schools? A common assumption about electronic surveillance is that it merely automates social monitoring functions previously accomplished by people watching other people (Nock, 1993). What this viewpoint ignores, however, are the ways that technological systems operate as political agents that produce social relations (e.g. of inequality, empowerment, dependency, trust) beyond the intentions of designers or policy-makers (Winner, 1977). Surveillance systems, like other technologies, embody rationalities and engender forms of life, so it is worth investigating what kinds of worlds they are contributing to, especially in the state's primary realm of social reproduction—public education.

Surveillance in schools can take many forms: metal detectors, video recording, Internet tracking, biometrics, ID cards, transparent lockers and book bags, electronic gates, two-way radios, and more. This complex array of devices, while certainly not present in all schools, functions as an emerging system of increased student and teacher monitoring. According to a 2000 national survey by the Center for Disease Control, 24.2% of high schools had surveillance cameras (Small *et al.*, 2001). Moreover, of the 950 new public schools built across the country in 2002, surveillance cameras were installed in 75% of them (Dillon, 2003). Take the following cases as instances of this larger trend.

In Biloxi, Mississippi, the school district has put cameras into each of its 500 classrooms and 300 cameras throughout the rest of its schools (in hallways, etc.) at an initial cost of \$2 million. The cameras are integrated into a digital surveillance system

that allows administrators to monitor almost all school activity, store recordings indefinitely and view recordings remotely through the Internet (Dillon, 2003; CNN, 2003). The superintendent asserts that the goal of the video surveillance system is 'to make our schools safer' (cited in Dillon, 2003), yet the district reported no previous problems with school violence. So far, the system has been used to transfer some disciplinary control away from teachers and toward administrators who are the only ones (along with district policy-makers and attorneys) with access to the system. For example, when a girl slapped a classmate, the principle used the video recording to implicate and then discipline her. Administrators promise not to use the system to evaluate the performance of teachers, but at least in other domains, such as workplace monitoring and law enforcement, 'surveillance creep' of this sort appears difficult to rein-in once systems afford it (Marx, 1988).

In Phoenix, Arizona, the Royal Palm Middle School has installed biometric face scanners with the purported goal of detecting sex offenders or finding missing children. The sheriff's department set up the system drawing from \$350,000 worth of equipment 'donated' by a local security company for pilot projects such as this one (Kossan, 2003). If the system works as intended, the sheriff's department will be silently notified when a positive match of a sex offender or missing child is detected. Just as Biloxi did not have a previous school violence problem, no previous instances of abduction have occurred at this school, yet parents seem to support the intervention as an important and possibly necessary safety precaution. The sheriff assures the public that the technology will be used for this narrow function only and that school districts need not become otherwise involved in law enforcement activities; that said, there are many opportunities for surveillance creep, such as scanning for anyone with a warrant, should the system prove to be efficacious in the first place.⁴

Clearly, the examples presented here represent a larger pattern of growing surveillance in public education. The dominant rationale for these systems is to provide safety and prevent violent shootings such as the incident at Columbine High School. For some reason, the rationale of 'preventing another Columbine' is prevalent in spite of the fact that video surveillance and an armed security guard were present at Columbine and did not prevent the shootings (ACLU, 2001).

Neoliberal embodiments

Even if surveillance systems were efficacious at enhancing security, we assert that they nonetheless advance regimes of post-industrialization and mass incarceration in public education. As with neoliberal trends across the public sector, the growing influence of private companies and diminishment of public resources and services does not necessarily imply full-scale privatization (Duggan, 2003). In the case of public education, it connotes a shift in schools' methods of enforcing control. It also illustrates the adoption of market logics that harmonize public education with the needs of a post-industrial marketplace characterized by the rise of high-tech industry and the adoption of technological solutions to complex social problems.

The examples of surveillance technologies in schools provided above affirm this strong link between public education and high-tech industry. Once parents, educators and policy-makers perceive surveillance systems as 'necessary' safety tools, then almost any cost is acceptable to protect students. The millions of dollars spent on these systems each year flow straight from the impoverished coffers of public education and into the flourishing accounts of private security and technology companies. This asymmetrical relationship serves the underlying goals of privatization without the political backlash that ensues whenever politicians propose outsourcing or dissolving public education. Importantly, the implementation of surveillance systems often precedes any discernable threat to safety. As with the cameras in all Biloxi classrooms or the biometric face recognition in the Phoenix school, these technologies are simply solutions looking for problems. High-tech companies like the one in Phoenix insert the systems into schools as a marketing strategy, hoping to cultivate fear and dependency so that they receive future contracts with public schools, and probably from other public institutions as well.

Surveillance systems in schools, as with computers in schools, function as symbols of 'progress,' as technological fixes to social problems. Regardless of their immense expense or questionable efficacy, these technologies are politically expedient interventions because they are flashy, quantifiable and (ostensibly) controllable. Within public institutions, these technologies reinforce accountability regimes and 'audit cultures' (Strathern, 2000) that privilege the production of documents (whether video recordings, spreadsheets or test scores) over all other activities or outcomes. This results in a state of 'fragmented centralization' (Monahan, 2005), or a dual shift in power relations that simultaneously increases accountability for students and teachers while enhancing the mechanisms of control available to administrators and police officers. This arrangement deflects inquiry into root causes of crime or underachievement by absolving policy-makers of responsibility beyond the purchasing of equipment; at the same time, it displaces blame for failure onto marginalized students and teachers who have little or no power in the system.

Cultures of control

Surveillance also inspires a culture of mass incarceration in schools by plugging law enforcement directly into the system and by subjecting students to constant scrutiny. In the Phoenix middle school example, the sheriff's department is literally connected to the face-recognition system. At other schools, on-site officers and security personnel monitor the video surveillance feeds and oversee the screening of students for weapons or drugs. To those at school sites, this creates an ambiguous situation in which security personnel seemingly have far greater control and authority over students and school functions than do teachers or administrators (Brotherton, 1996). Furthermore, video recordings or other surveillance documentation (such as Internet monitoring) become ready sources of evidence for prosecuting students who commit crimes or violate increasingly stringent school policies.

Civil liberties advocates and parents often focus on violations of privacy as the primary risk introduced by surveillance systems (ACLU, 2001). While privacy is an important right that should be safeguarded, much more is at stake in today's public schools. Conditions of constant monitoring promulgate a surveillance culture that both individualizes students and presumes guilt until proven otherwise. Some of the possible messages communicated to students by these systems are that they are always being watched, that they are embedded in relations of distrust and that they should behave out of fear of negative repercussions, not because it is morally right. Ironically, attending to privacy alone may aggravate the situation by individualizing students in much the same way cameras do. Because privacy is a value that can only be violated on an individual level, not on a communal one, the gestalt changes underway in schools may be masked by debates over privacy.

This section began by saying that electronic surveillance systems, like all technologies, operate as political agents that produce social relations. But what can be said of the social relations being produced by the particular surveillance regimes found in public schools? While it is unclear whether or not schools are 'safer,' it does seem to be the case that the public is much more afraid for students' safety than ever before (Burns & Crawford, 1999; Lawrence & Mueller, 2003). Surveillance systems contribute to this culture of fear, making people feel that the risks are greater than they really are. The culture of fear conveniently justifies the presence of such systems and cultivates dependency upon private industry, but it may also radically transform public schools into institutions of control that increasingly construct students as either criminals or victims (not as social or political agents).

While scholarly discussions of surveillance invariably invoke Foucault's (1977) writings on the panopticon as a metaphor for individual self-discipline, an emphasis on discipline may occlude the systemic changes underway. For Foucault, the panopticon was but one expression of modernity in a fluid field of production regimes; it was (and is) a contingent and situated articulation of rationalities, not a static or transcendent statement of disciplinary power (Foucault, 1980). Thus, for the sake of this inquiry into surveillance in schools, we cannot reduce the social implications to a facile conclusion that 'students learn to discipline themselves.' Rather, as Gilles Deleuze (1992) observes, these kinds of systems interlink, reducing social actors to system components in the production of a society of control.

The society of control enabled by surveillance regimes assists the production of students who can feed the hunger of global capital (Saltman & Gabbard, 2003). These idealized students embody extreme and flexible compliance to the vicissitudes of the marketplace; they submit willingly to scrutiny and manipulation; they demand nothing more than a chance to participate in rituals of mass consumption; and, when required, they provide a criminal counterpoint to justify the system's necessary exclusions and deferrals. This is not to say that students and others have no agency within this emerging system or that they cannot tactically appropriate or resist it—they can and they do. But manifestations of agency do not deny the colonizing reach of control networks that extend into the territories of public education.

Conclusion

This article has argued that mass incarceration and post-industrialization find expression in current discipline and control regimes in public education. The presence of police officers on school grounds may be slowly but dramatically reconfiguring social relations and altering the educational experiences of students. Law enforcement agents alert students to the ubiquitousness of law enforcement, and they institute a new set of school practices. Police interact with students on a daily basis, cultivate informants, spread an ambiance of control and streamline the formal disciplinary process to efficiently usher students into the criminal justice system.

Surveillance technologies expose students to constant monitoring, potentially socializing them to assume compliant subject positions within post-industrial society. Both fear of crime and dependency upon technological systems are cultivated through the deployment of technological surveillance regimes in public education, such that the public demands surveillance to make schools 'safer.' Surveillance justifies institutional shifts in authority and control away from teachers, parents or students and into the hands of administrators and police personnel. Thus, the social relations produced by these systems are those of asymmetrical power.

We began by discussing Dewey's important insight that the environmental conditions of education play a crucial role in structuring student learning experiences; in fact, regardless of the subject matter, the environment communicates powerful lessons about values, norms and social comport. The lessons of social control being taught in today's public schools appear to advance disconcerting trends in mass incarceration and post-industrialization. These are some emergent parameters shaping student experiences: police presence and intervention are facts of everyday life (which may normalize experiences of and expectations for incarceration); and electronic monitoring and scrutiny extend the reach of disciplinary agents (which may restrict any expectations of trust or privacy).

The 'New American School' described here links the production of students to the needs of post-industrial society. Importantly, this is not meant to imply direct intentionality on the part of school personnel or policy-makers to cultivate these links. Instead, the outcomes are a result of institutional responses to widespread shifts in dominant cultural dispositions—namely, toward neoliberalism and neoconservatism (Apple, 2000). Seen from this systemic perspective, the New American School facilitates the criminalization of poor students in order to establish and maintain a criminal class to legitimate systems of inequality in modern capitalist states. It rewards flexible students who can adapt or submit to labor instability, invasive monitoring and exploitative work conditions. It accommodates industry's desire for new markets by creating a demand for costly high-tech equipment that can only be provided by private companies, and can only be paid for, seemingly, with public funds. Because education is the primary institution for social reproduction, this new type of school should be one that is itself subjected to further scrutiny, critique and intervention, both by scholars and the public.

Notes

1. The shifts we describe have not ended democratic participation, of course, but have transformed both its meaning and its mechanisms, changing how citizens interact with each other and the state.
2. See www.nasro.com
3. Note that our intention is merely to document the mode of SRO intervention, not to debate whether the situation should have been perceived as a criminal problem instead of a counseling issue.
4. It is important to note that the same sheriff's department has recently been sued for its use of a 'jail cam,' an Internet camera that recorded and broadcasted live images from the county detention center (Lynch, 2004).

References

- ACLU (2001) *Safety in schools: are we on the right track?* Available from http://www.aclu-co.org/news/letters/paper_boulderschools.htm (accessed 1 July 2004).
- Anderson, E. (2000) *Code of the street: decency, violence, and the moral life of the inner city* (New York, W. W. Norton).
- Apple, M. W. (1990) *Ideology and curriculum* (New York, Routledge).
- Apple, M. W. (2000) Between neoliberalism and neoconservatism: education and conservatism in a global context, in: N. C. Burbules & C. A. Torres (Eds) *Globalization and education: critical perspectives* (New York, Routledge).
- Beger, R. R. (2002) Expansion of police power in public schools and the vanishing rights of students, *Social Justice*, 29, 119–130.
- Bowles, S. & H. Gintis. (1977) *Schooling in capitalist America: educational reform and the contradictions of economic life* (New York, Basic Books).
- Braman, D. (2002) Families and Incarceration, in: M. Mauer & M. Chesney-Lind (Eds) *Invisible punishment: the collateral consequences of mass imprisonment* (New York, The Free Press).
- Brotherton, D. C. (1996) The contradictions of suppression: notes from a study of approaches to gangs in three public high schools, *The Urban Review*, 28, 95–117.
- Burns, R. & C. Crawford. (1999) School shootings, the media, and public fear: ingredients for a moral panic, *Crime, Law & Social Change*, 32, 147–168.
- Caldeira, T. P. R. (2000) *City of walls: crime, segregation, and citizenship in São Paulo* (Berkeley, CA, University of California Press).
- Castells, M. (1996) *The rise of the network society* (Cambridge, MA, Blackwell Publishers).
- CNN. (2003) *School district installs cameras in every class, hall*. Available from <http://www.cnn.com/2003/EDUCATION/08/12/classroom.cameras.ap/> (accessed 9 July 2004).
- Cohen, H. (2004, October 15) Private schools rethink security, *The Miami Herald*, p. 1A.
- Davis, M. (1990) *City of quartz: excavating the future in Los Angeles* (New York, Vintage Books).
- Deleuze, G. (1992) Postscript on the societies of control, *October*, 59, 3–7. Available from <http://www.nadir.org/nadir/archiv/netzkritik/societyofcontrol.html> (accessed 1 July, 2004).
- Devine, J. (1996) *Maximum security: the culture of violence in inner-city schools* (Chicago, IL, University of Chicago Press).
- Dewey, J. (1916) *Democracy and education: an introduction to the philosophy of education* (New York, The Macmillan Co).
- Dillon, S. (2003) Cameras watching students, especially in Biloxi. *New York Times*, 24 September, p. B9.
- Duggan, L. (2003) *The twilight of equality?: neoliberalism, cultural politics, and the attack on democracy* (Boston, MA, Beacon Press).

- Foucault, M. (1977) *Discipline and punish: the birth of the prison* (New York, Vintage Books, Random House).
- Foucault, M. (1980) *Power/knowledge: selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977* (Brighton, Harvester Press).
- Garland, D. (2001a) Introduction: the meaning of mass imprisonment, in: D. Garland (Ed.) *Mass imprisonment: social causes and consequences* (Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage).
- Garland, D. (2001b) *The culture of control: crime and social order in contemporary society* (Chicago, IL, University of Chicago Press).
- Girouard, C. (2001) *School resource officer training program* (Washington, DC, Office of Justice Programs).
- Gootman, E. (2004, January 6) Police to guard 12 city schools cited as violent, *The New York Times*.
- Graham, S. & S. Marvin. (2001) *Splintering urbanism: networked infrastructures, technological mobilities and the urban condition* (New York, Routledge).
- Hardt, M. & A. Negri. (2000) *Empire* (Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press).
- Harrison, P. M. & Karberg, J. C. (2004) *Prison and jail inmates at midyear 2003* (Washington, DC, Office of Justice Programs).
- Harvey, D. (1990) *The condition of postmodernity: an enquiry into the origins of cultural change* (Cambridge, MA, Blackwell).
- Heaviside, S., Rowand, C., Williams, C., Farris, E., Burns, S. & McArthur, E. (1998) *Violence and discipline problems in U.S. public schools: 1996–1997* (Washington, DC, National Center for Education Statistics).
- Horne, T. (2004) *School safety program guidance manual* (Phoenix, AZ, Arizona Department of Education).
- Jackson, A. (2002) Police-school resource officers' and students' perceptions of the police and offending, *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 25, 631–650.
- Johnson, I. M. (1999) School violence: the effectiveness of a school resource officer program in a southern city, *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27, 172–192.
- Kossan, P. (2003, December 11) Phoenix school first to install face scanners, *Arizona Republic*.
- Lawrence, R. & Mueller, D. (2003) School shootings and the man-bites-dog criterion of newsworthiness, *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 1, 330–345.
- Lynch, M. (2004) Punishing images: jail cam and the changing penal enterprise, *Punishment & Society*, 6, 255–270.
- Martin, E. (1994) *Flexible bodies: the role of immunity in american culture from the days of polio to the age of AIDS* (Boston, MA, Beacon Press).
- Marx, G. T. (1988) *Undercover: police surveillance in America* (Berkeley, CA, University of California Press).
- Mauer, M. (2003) *Comparative international rates of incarceration: an examination of causes and trends* (Washington, DC, The Sentencing Project).
- McCarthy, J. D. & Hoge, D. R. (1987) The social construction of school punishment: racial disadvantage out of universalistic process, *Social Forces*, 65, 1101–1120.
- Medina, J. (2002) City steps up security patrols after violence at high schools, *The New York Times*, 22 November, p. B4.
- Miller, J. G. (1996) *Search and destroy: African-American males in the criminal justice system* (New York, Cambridge University Press).
- Monahan, T. (2005) *Globalization, technological change, and public education* (New York, Routledge).
- Moore, M. H., Petrie, C. V., Braga, A. A. & McLaughlin, B. L. (Eds) (2003) *Deadly lessons: understanding lethal school violence* (Washington, DC, National Academy Press).
- Mulqueen, S. (1999) School resource officers more than security guards, *American School and University*, 71, SS17.
- Newman, K. S. (2004) *Rampage: the social roots of school shootings* (New York, Basic Books).
- Nock, S. L. (1993) *The costs of privacy: surveillance and reputation in America* (New York, Aldine De Gruyter).

- Noguera, P. A. (1995) Preventing and producing violence: a critical analysis of responses to school violence, *Harvard Educational Review*, 65, 189–212.
- Oakes, J. (1985) *Keeping track: how schools structure inequality* (New Haven, CT, Yale University Press).
- Parsons, T. (1959) The school class as a social system: some of its functions in American society, *Harvard Educational Review*, 29, 297–318.
- Saltman, K. J. & Gabbard, D. A. (Eds) (2003) *Education as enforcement: corporatization of schools* (New York, RoutledgeFalmer).
- Sassen, S. (1991) *The global city: New York, London, Tokyo* (Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press).
- Small, M. L., Jones, S. E., Barrios, L. C., Crossett, L. S., Dahlberg, L. L., Albuquerque, M. S., Sleet, D. A., Greene, B. Z., Schmidt, E. R. (2001) School policy and environment: results from the school health polices and programs study 2000, *Journal of School Health*, 71, 325–334.
- Strathern, M. (2000) *Audit cultures: anthropological studies in accountability, ethics, and the academy* (New York, Routledge).
- Tran, Q. (2004, April 12) Police boost presence at schools, *Arizona Republic*, B1.
- Tyack, D. (1974) *The one best system: a history of American urban education* (Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press).
- Wacquant, L. (2001) Deadly symbiosis: when ghetto and prison meet and mesh, in: D. Garland (Ed.) *Mass imprisonment: social causes and consequences* (Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage).
- Willis, P. (1977) *Learning to labor: how working class kids get working class jobs* (New York, Columbia University Press).
- Wilson, W. J. (1987) *The truly disadvantaged: the inner city, the underclass, and public policy* (Chicago, IL, University of Chicago Press).
- Winner, L. (1977) *Autonomous technology: technics-out-of-control as a theme in political thought* (Cambridge, MA, MIT Press).
- Zukin, S. (1995) *The cultures of cities* (Cambridge, MA, Blackwell).