Critical Surveillance Literacy

Tyson Lewis
University of California, Los Angeles

In this article, the author provides a theoretical framework for analyzing the complex and contradictory matrix of surveillance technologies being deployed in U.S. schools. Through a review of the extensive literature on surveillance, the author charts the modalities of disciplinary and sovereign power as they relate to the overall social relations of late capitalism. In conclusion, the article offers a tentative reconstructive vision for schools both inside and outside the classroom.

Keywords: *surveillance; critical theory; critical pedagogy; sociology of education*

The ever-expanding proliferation of surveillance technologies and practices in U.S. schools is evidence of the tightening relationship between military, penal, and educational economies. For many schools, the surveillance proliferation was intensified and extended by the Columbine High School shootings in 1999, which triggered a nationwide response to student violence characterized by unprecedented levels of surveillance proliferation and technological control (Balfanz, Spiridakis, Neild, & Legters, 2003; Dimitriadis & McCarthy, 2003). With the outbreak of violence in a White, middle-class, "safe" suburban school in Jefferson County, Colorado, public interest in school safety issues suddenly shifted from urban to suburban schools (Bowman, 2001). To manage the new set of risk factors accompanying the school shooter phenomenon, school policy makers increasingly turned toward technologically advanced security surveillance systems wired directly to police stations, night-vision cameras in parking lots, and newly improved computerized student identification cards (Lewis, 2003). Now 15% to 30% of post-Columbine high schools have metal detectors, and there are security cameras in half of primary and secondary schools ("To Cope With Violence, Schools Divide and Conquer," 2000). In fact, Chicago's chief education officer ordered the installation of metal detectors in all of the district's 489 elementary schools (Portner, 2000). Psychological profiling accompanied this surveillance technology boom (Lewis, 2003). These psychological tests made everyone into a potential suspect or patient, and thus, students, to use Richard Ericson and Kevin Haggerty's (1997) language, became reconstituted as "risks" that must be carefully policed, monitored, and surveyed to preemptively halt violent behaviors. Thus, intensified and extended school surveillance technologies and psycho-

Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies, Volume 6 Number 2, 2006 263-281
DOI: 10.1177/1532708605279700

logical profiling began to redefine classroom pedagogical relations between teachers and students, further escalating a trend toward student criminalization and school militarization. As the articulation of domestic militarism, school surveillance substitutes compassion for suspicion and punishment, crippling the ability of education to foster critical thinking, democracy, or civic courage (Giroux, 2001).

Since the advent of the War on Terror, surveillance has become an important arena for political debate concerning abuses of civil liberties and the policing powers of the government in the name of national safety. The 2001 USA Patriot Act expanded the ability of law enforcement agencies to monitor the public with less regulations, with less public disclosure or accountability, and in increasingly intimate and intrusive ways. David Lyon (2003, p. 68) arranges the post-9/11 surveillance technology boom into four broad categories: biometrics (data culled from reading the human body), identification cards, closed circuit television, and Web-based or wire tapping surveillance. Thus, like Columbine, fear and paranoia were translated into high-tech, militaristic solutions with questionable effects on democracy. These quick technological solutions to complex social and political problems have resulted in what Lyon describes as a culture of fear, control, suspicion, and secrecy, where everyone is a potential terrorist (Lyon, 2003, p. 144).

Although the nation felt the undeniable presence of surveillance, so too schools once again saw an upsurge of frantic technological surveillance measures sweep across the country (Dodson, 2002). Heightened profiling also returned—this time targeting certain minorities and foreign exchange students. The new Border Security Act passed in 2002 escalates the government's ability to police international students. Visas will now include fingerprints, and computer tracking systems, paid for by the students themselves, are being devised. Universities are also required to report on foreign students who do not meet class deadlines. And finally, the act makes it next to impossible to issue visas to students from those countries labeled as sponsors of terrorism (Budd, 2002). On February 15, 2003, 4,000 high schools, international-exchange programs, and other institutions of higher education met a deadline to register for the Internet-Based Student and Exchange Visitor Information System, or SEVIS (Zehr, 2003). This is an attempt to centralize all information concerning foreign students with suspicious ties to their homelands. Thus, xenophobic paranoia concerning the racial or ethnic other is on the rise, and students are caught in the middle.

In this article, I will outline the basic elements of a critical surveillance literacy needed to understand these trends. In essence, critical surveillance literary enables teachers and students to read and/or map their local school geographies in relation to American imperialism and militarism on a national and international scale. In this sense, to become "surveillance literate" means to be able to decode our lived environments and to facilitate a critical comprehension of the world. Thus, critical surveillance literacy is a specialized form of Paulo Freire's

(2001) critical literacy, focusing explicitly on technologies, discourses, and practices of surveillance in a post-Columbine and post-9/11 world. The goal is to reclaim schools as part of a democratic public sphere by comprehending the modalities of surveillance that function to criminalize and pathologize student and teacher relations.

Surveillance literacy comprises three closely intersecting parts. First, we need a diagnostic form of surveillance literacy that connects the intersections between surveillance technology, relations of power, and the larger social relations of capitalism. Central to this analysis is how surveillance is differentially applied to raced, classed, and gendered bodies. From this dystopic cognitive mapping will emerge a prescriptive plan to resist hyper-surveillance through collective struggle that knits together teacher activism and broader antimilitary, anticapital struggles. In the classroom, teachers must also resist the internalization of the panoptic gaze as a viable pedagogical optic for viewing and interacting with students. With these components, critical surveillance literacy rebukes hyper-surveillance as a safety option and questions the connections between safety policies, school surveillance equipment, and the social technologies of late capitalism.

Foucauldian Power and Materialist Critique: Mapping the Logic of Surveillance

The recent anthology *Education as Enforcement* (Saltman, 2003) contains several key articles outlining why these security measures have been implemented in our schools. In the introduction to this volume, Kenneth Saltman (2003) argues "that militarized education in the United States needs to be understood in relation to the enforcement of global corporate imperatives as they expand markets through the material and symbolic violence of war and education" (p. 1). In the same volume, Julie Webber (2003) demonstrates that the cold war international policy of soviet containment through militarization has in many ways structured our recent domestic school violence prevention policy. Although these studies are well argued, they all too quickly jump from the local implementation of enforcement policies to the macrolevel of the structural relations of global capitalism and the dominant ideologies of the ruling elite. Thus, the authors gloss over the multiple microstrategies of power that constitute subjects on the ground level of phenomenological experience and the mediating technologies of surveillance that form a complex and paradoxical matrix of uneven relations of power. Agreeing with Greg Dimitriadis and Cameron McCarthy (2003), Michel Foucault's theory of disciplinary power is an important theoretical insight that enables critical educators to conceptualize the interrelationships between the local and the global. Thus, critical surveillance literacy must take heed of Foucault's (1980, p. 99) theory that any understanding of final causes (who acts and why) must begin with an ascending analysis of power.

The How and the Why of the Social Relations of Capital

To examine how enforcement ideologies have reconfigured school relationships between students and teachers, critical surveillance literacy must couple the ideological critique offered by the aforementioned authors with a more subtle analysis of the underlying play of power through which ideologies penetrate our bodies to form particular modes of subjectivity and sociality. An analysis of power has often been ignored by orthodox Marxists in their attempt to refocus critique on issues of class exploitation within the totalizing system of capitalism. Symptomatic of this trend are Mas'ud Zavarzadeh and Donald Morton (1994) who write the following: "Foucault's molecular politics . . . manages effectively to undermine a global analytics of the logic of the underlying relations of exploitation in capitalism" (p. 193). Here, Foucault's analysis of the local at the expense of the global is seen as postmodern ploy to obscure the extent of material exploitation under the weight of the totalizing juggernaut of late capitalism.

Although this is certainly a substantiated critique of Foucault's work, it nevertheless misses many of the articulation points between Marx and Foucault that emerge from a more dialectical synthesis of their theoretical problematics. Abdul Janmohamed (1995) analyzes Foucault's displacement of value or labor power as a culturalist strategy to infinitely postpone an engagement with political economy, yet he nevertheless recognizes the efficacious possibilities in reading Foucault through Marx and Marx through Foucault. Working toward such a synthesis, Janmohamed (1995, p. 53) argues that "value/power/knowledge" represents an important amendment to Foucault's original "power/knowledge" couple. Engaging both projects, Richard Marsden (1999) also argues that a theory of power is not so much antithetical to a Marxist ideological critique as it is complementary. Quoting Marsden, "if Marx's *explicandum* is a cluster of conclusions in search of a premise, then Foucault's *explicans* is a cluster of premises in search of a conclusion" (p. 150). In Marsden's reading of these theorists, Foucault pinpoints the implicit object of analysis underlining Marx's description of the working day: disciplinary power. Although Marx's description of the productive forces within capital gestures toward an analytic of power, it was left to Foucault to uncover, systematize, and rigorously delineate the various microarticulations of power functioning to sustain the capitalist mode of production. Drawing heavily on Marx's descriptions of factory organization, Foucault extracts the laws of disciplinary power, which circulate below its various particular, individuated manifestations. Hierarchical surveillance, panopticism, normalizing judgments, the training of the body, the micromanagement of time, and examinations are the necessary expressions of power that optimize the maintenance and productivity of factory production (Foucault, 1979). Thus, enriching Marx's own analysis, Foucault (1980) argues that disciplinary power was "one of the great inventions of bourgeois society" and has become "a fundamental instrument in the constitution of industrial capitalism and of the

type of society that is its accompaniment" (p. 105). Once the structural relationship between capitalist productive forces and disciplinary power is realized, it becomes increasingly clear that Foucault supplies the how and Marx supplies the why of capitalist social relations (Marsden, 1999, p. 145).

But it should be noted that there is not a perfect symmetry between power and the reproduction of economic relations. Within the social dynamics of capitalism, power relations play a complex and overdetermined role that both reproduces economic, political, and social relations and simultaneously generates friction points, points of flight, break flows, and fissures that allow for movement of insurgent uprising. Disciplinary technologies and procedures might be regulative and homogenizing, but power is also a "war continued by other means" (Foucault, 1980, p. 90). In other words, disciplinary technologies train the body of capitalist production, but power also unleashes contradictory forces, which inevitably lead to contestation. Because "points of resistance are present everywhere in the power network" (Foucault, 1990, p. 95), disciplinary regulation and contra-conduct become dispersed throughout multiple institutional state apparatuses. In this sense, society as a totality of social relations becomes ripe with unanticipated moments of subversion, inversion, and appropriation that can remain isolated or can congeal into revolutionary critical mass. Thus, an understanding of power is necessary not only to recognize how social reproduction occurs both inside and outside of schools but also to understand how a range of resistance practices are also possible in a variety of locations (schools, prisons, factories, and clinics) and in a variety of fields (political, cultural, educational, and economic). Specifically in terms of schools, we must then ask "How do surveillance technologies act as instruments of disciplinary power, and how do the resulting social relations replicate and challenge norms and behaviors beneficent to sustaining capitalism?" In the next section, I attempt to answer this question, beginning with an interrogation of Foucault's theory of panoptic surveillance.

Power, Ideology, and Contemporary Surveillance Society

Within the interstices of rampant neo-colonial economic policies, military imperialism, and post-9/11 hyper-surveillance, the connections between Marx and Foucault must not be forgotten. Although there have been various debates within the literature concerning the continued relevance of Foucault's theory (Yar, 2003), in our current historical moment, which is characterized by the extenuated surveillance capabilities and the centralization of information under the new umbrella agency of Homeland Security, America has witnessed an upsurge of disciplinary mechanisms that both validate Foucault's claims while also moving beyond them. In this section, I focus on the various technological modalities through which various modes of power articulate themselves in our hyper-surveillance age. In particular, I review the growing body of litera-

ture concerning surveillance to provide educators with the concepts and categories needed to read the surveillance matrix of contemporary schools.

Perhaps Foucault's theory of panopticism is the most useful but is also the most controversial point to begin an analysis of school surveillance. For Foucault (1979), the panopticon is a specialized mode of all-seeing, all-pervasive surveillance technology capable of around-the-clock inspection, the result of which is the internalization of disciplinary power by self-regulating subjects. In the current literature, there are many defenders of the panoptic model. Kevin Robins and Frank Webster (1999) argue that new communication and information technologies "permit a massive extension and transformation of that same (relative, technological) mobilization to which Bentham's panopticon principle aspired" (p. 120). Mark Poster (1990) also argues that computer databases and information superhighways collectively produce a "Superpanopticon." Yet others argue that escalating forms of surveillance technologies and a profusion of disciplinary apparatuses throughout society cannot be conflated with panopticism. As related specifically to the study of schools, John Devine (1996) argues that the paradoxical effect of increased security officers and surveillance measures in schools results in a virtual panopticon meltdown. In a post-Columbine, post-9/11 world, critical surveillance literacy cannot simply dismiss one or the other argument, but it rather investigates how increased surveillance is both panoptic (constructing self-regulating, docile subjects through normalizing examinations, centralizing technologies, and homogenizing practices) and antipanoptic (engendering decentered, entropic flows and fissures of power). Clearly, recent trends in school surveillance indicate a crisis in panopticism, a crisis that has generated multiple, sometimes conflicting disciplinary results.

Although many scholars agree that surveillance technologies in schools have been on the steady increase since Columbine, oftentimes, these trends cannot be examined through a Foucauldian perspective alone. William Bogard's (1996) theory of hyper-surveillance through simulation is one of the most interesting analyses of contemporary surveillance procedures and should be integrated into a comprehensive study of post-Columbine, post-9/11 surveillance technologies and practices. Bogard argues that we are on the precipice of a new age of surveillance that operates through the projection of codes and creates virtual realities. This is the age of simulated surveillance. Simulation is not so much the end of disciplinary power but rather its most perfected form. Quoting Bogard, simulation is "the panoptic imaginary" (p. 19) writ large. Instead of directly observing physical bodies in space, the simulation of surveillance constructs virtual, programmable hyper-realities that control events and outcomes before they actually occur. These models

> do not just passively record facts . . . they *simulate facticity*; rather than document the truth of events, they exploit and reinforce the uncertainty, the wavering line, between truth and fiction. Finally, they favor deterrence over the punishment

> aspect of disciplinary strategies, proactive or preventative over reactive measures. (Bogard, 1996, p. 28)

Such simulated modules are the "ecstasy of control" over a completely visible and manipulated virtual world that embodies the imagination of the "future-past." For Bogard, "simulation is not at all the opposite of power, but another mode of its exercise, in fact its most elevated and most paradoxical mode" (p. 72). Thus, militaristic, nationalistic, and capitalistic ideologies articulate themselves through the particular logic of hyper-surveillance technology of preemptive disciplinary power. In terms of schools, the use of student shooter profiling is an example of simulated surveillance that controls future variables in advance by compiling an abstracted data profile that simulates the psychology of the school shooter. Yet Bogard's theory at this time has at best limited applicability to schools. Surveillance has not become fully detached from the policing of actual bodies, nor have ideal simulations replaced actual social relations.

The virtualization of disciplinary power through profiling and simulation must also be positioned within the risk theory of Richard Ericson and Kevin Haggerty (1997). Drawing on Foucault's (1990) notion of biopower as the administration and care of the social body, these authors argue that contemporary society is a risk society interested in maintaining social order through surveillance and security rather than repressive control. The logic that underlines the risk society functions through the negative hypothesis of immanent and perpetual danger, hyperrationality, and a focus on the near future as a horizon for possible if not probable risk. There are two fundamental results of the risk society. First, communities are reconstituted around the "commonality of anxiety," where hope in a better tomorrow becomes fixated on the production of new technologies of risk management (Ericson & Haggerty, 1997, p. 86). And second, "knowledge of risk is not only a means of risk management but also a producer of new risks" (Ericson & Haggerty, 1997, p. 86). Thus, the system succeeds through its own perpetual failure to contain the growing list of designated risks that arise from the refinement of the surveillance system itself. From this process, a desire to alleviate risk is generated in the public being disciplined, leading to even further expansions of surveillance. As Foucault (1990) writes, "vice" does not exist before the institution of disciplinary power, but rather, it is the necessary by-product of surveillance, the disavowed prop whose function within an economy of power is "to preserve, to proliferate to the limits of the visible and the invisible, rather than to disappear for good" (p. 42). This symptom of the risk society is no where more apparent then in contemporary White, suburban schools where new risk behaviors are continually invented until all students become suspects and homework is turned into a psychological test against which student normalcy and emotional stability are measured (Lewis, 2003).

More recently, Ericson and Haggerty (2000) have adopted the Deleuzian language of the rhizome and the assemblage to describe contemporary surveillance. The authors argue that because of the decentralized, or more accurately deterritorialized, profusion of disciplinary technologies throughout multiple sectors of society, it is no longer helpful to maintain the centered, hierarchical model of panopticism as espoused by Foucault. Rather, discrete surveillance systems are coordinated into contingent assemblages in response to consumer desires. According to the authors, "assemblage operates by abstracting human bodies from their territorial settings and separating them into a series of discrete flows" resulting in "data doubles" which are then subjected to observation and control (Ericson & Haggerty, 2000, p. 606). Thorough heterogeneous assemblages of surveillance technologies, Foucault's surveillance panopticon becomes diffused and dehierarchized, resulting in a democratization of surveillance. Thus, in their theory, "no major population groups stand irrefutably above or outside the surveillance assemblage" (Ericson & Haggerty, 2000, p. 618).

On one hand, Ericson and Haggerty (1997, 2000) are certainly correct when they point out that the subjects of surveillance now desire their own subjugation. Since Columbine and 9/11, a predominantly White, middle-class populous has cried out for more stringent forms of surveillance, thus demonstrating the naturalization of ideological solutions networked through the matrix of disciplinary power. On the other hand, even if these new assemblages multiply, divide, and restructure themselves outside of the centralized control of the state, since 9/11, there has been an increasing call for reterritorialization of such systems of surveillance. As Lyon (2003, p. 89) observes, Total Information Awareness represents a new "integrating surveillance" system through which law enforcement, intelligence, and consumer data are tabulated by automated computer systems. Although this new surveillance society may not be centralized as in the Foucauldian panoptic model, nevertheless, surveillance assemblages are being reintegrated into an overall governmental apparatus of disciplinary control. In schools, the networking of surveillance equipment to police stations is an attempt to recentralize disciplinary tools under a single gaze. Thus, Ericson and Haggerty's (2000) latest work reveals a nascent yet underdeveloped trend in the trajectory of surveillance technologies, a trend that has been stifled by the terror of Columbine and 9/11. Finally, although the authors do acknowledge that within the leveling of surveillance hierarchies, differential effects of surveillance do in fact occur and critical surveillance literacy must recenter acts of surveillance racism, sexism, and classism and connect each form of subjugation with economic, political, and social ideologies of exploitation and fantasies of control and manipulation. Although an overall surveillance logic may pervade schooling as a whole, differences between urban and suburban centers must not be washed out (see below).

Although Bogard (1996) and Ericson and Haggerty (2000) provide newly updated revisions of Foucauldian theory of disciplinary power and its articula-

tion by surveillance and simulation technologies, they nevertheless fail to adequately link new modalities of surveillance with the maintenance of the social relations of capitalism. Kevin Robins and Frank Webster (1999, p. 110) foreground the connections between new technologies of disciplinary power, economic development of the capitalism, and the political system of the modern state. For them, innovations in communication technologies and decentralization of surveillance in the postmodern era of late capitalism are simply "extension[s] and reconfiguration[s] of Fordism" as it increasingly dominates all public and private spheres, resulting in a sort of "social Taylorism" (Robins & Webster, 1999, pp. 118, 125). Yet Robins and Webster misrecognize the contradictory nature of power and surveillance technologies as they function within society as a structural whole. Thus, their analysis leaves little room for any notion of transformative resistance arising from the internal contradictions within complex systems of administration and discipline. In the end, their theory needs to be tempered before it can be fully integrated into a comprehensive, critical surveillance literacy.

Taking surveillance studies in a slightly different direction, Kevin Vinson and Wayne Ross (2000) attempt to understand the convergence of surveillance and media spectacle within contemporary society. Combining Foucault and Guy Debord, Vinson and Ross argue that surveillance and spectacle have now merged into a mutually reinforcing apparatus where the few observe the many (surveillance) and, in turn, the many observe the few (spectaclism). Applying this theory to contemporary American education, the authors demonstrate that standards-based educational reform is the perfect example of surveillance spectaclism. Here, the teachers survey or monitor the students as the test is taken, and then, the media reports the test scores to the general public. Altogether, the spiraling system of surveillance conjoined with the logic of spectacle produces escalating states of educational alienation through antidemocratic optics of spectacularism as a technologically advanced version of sovereign power. Here, the school itself is on trial, and its crime is punished by execution via the retraction of necessary funds. Although Vison and Ross are certainly correct in their analysis, nevertheless, their theory must be articulated with the other aforementioned authors to understand how testing also includes elements of simulation and risk management functioning within an overall capitalist economy.

Finally, Giorgio Agamben's (2005) recent work on the state of exception offers the most acute critique of Foucauldian surveillance theory. Whereas disciplinary power has, in Foucault's genealogy, replaced the power of the sovereign, Agamben argues that the break is not so clear cut. Rather, the sovereign's power to define the state of exception—a zone of indistinction or anomy that conflates law and violence—has become increasingly pervasive, especially since 9/11. Here, the state of exception brought about by terrorist acts initiates a permanent state of war through which surveillance technologies multiply, and the state of exception is spatially concretized in the form of military camps, such as

Guantanamo Bay Prison in Cuba. This surveillance explosion and the extended use of the concentration camp as the *nomos* of contemporary political space is, in Agamben's theory, informed not so much by disciplinary power, which trains and normalizes, so much as sovereign power, which abandons life in the state of exception. Thus, Agamben reminds us that violence within the surveillance economy post-9/11 is not simply operating through invisible channels of administration but also through the exposure of life stripped of rights to the force of sovereign power in a state of perpetual war. As I will examine below, inner-city schools servicing low-income, minority populations are increasingly becoming more camp like, where surveillance is not so much to train or reform but to abandon educational life through zero-tolerance policies.

Synthetically, these theorists all add necessary insights to the study of surveillance as it exists in society and as it functions in schools. Simulation, assemblages, spectacle, sovereign power, and the "classical" forms of hierarchical panopticism all exist, in varying degrees, within the (potentially) contested terrain of school surveillance. Critical surveillance literacy must use these theories to explicate a nuanced and subtle reading of the differing technologies of surveillance and disciplinary procedures within schools to see how each functions within an overall environment saturated with surveillance relations and surveillance mechanisms. How do prepackaged curricula, standardized testing, zero tolerance, and school shooter profiles interrelate within an overall field of hypersurveillance? How do these mechanisms exhibit different instruments of surveillance/spectacle/simulation/panopticism? As Chela Sandoval (2000) argues, the complex space of postcolonial, postmodern late capitalism "demands that power be recognized as a site of multidimensionality" (pp. 75-76), which incorporates the horizontal power of the spectacle/rhizome and the vertical power of the hierarchical surveillance and panopticism.

Yet it must be noted that this overall apparatus of surveillance, which comprises multiple technologies and multiple vectors of power, is not inherently stable. Rather than an ironclad structure of absolute domination or mechanical social reproduction, this apparatus is itself internally barred. As Foucault argues, an apparatus comprises heterogeneous elements loosely coordinated to sustain a certain relation of power. Thus, this apparatus must be continually modified and adjusted to fulfill its strategic function. When applied to school surveillance, a multidimensional analysis of power must ask "How do differing technologies and modes of surveillance within this overall apparatus conflict with one another—producing tension points that could lead to its eventual collapse—and how do they reinforce and extend each other's domains?" Although Foucault's original analysis of disciplinary power focused on its ability to train bodies and construct modern homogenous and normalized selves, a contemporary form of critical surveillance literacy must always ask how the various technologies that network vectors of power may in fact produce fragmented, confused, or abandoned subjects that maneuver and navigate through competing discourses and practices of a contradictory surveillance terrain. On

the broadest interpretive horizon, the push and pull between disciplinary regulation and sovereign violence that marks the complexity of current surveillance usage is in fact an example of the very contradictions of capitalism itself, which simultaneously produces the homogenized space of the factory and the brutality of sovereign destruction (perhaps most dramatically witnessed in Auschwitz [Milchman, 2003]).

The Racial, Sexual, and Class Economy of Surveillance

The last component for critical surveillance literacy is an analysis of the differential effects of surveillance on particular populations. By analyzing the effects of surveillance in terms of class, gender, and race differences, we will be able to map whom surveillance privileges. Each contextually specific mode of racial, sexual, or class discrimination must be framed within an overall comprehensive critical surveillance literacy to refine and sharpen the macroanalysis of capitalist exploitation and state-sponsored paranoia as it is experienced in the everyday lives of different populations through varying power relations. Although this agenda is too large to explore in this theoretical treatise, several key observations need to be foregrounded for further research in this area.

First, Jennifer Obidah argues that the post-Columbine paranoid, zero-tolerance safety strategies developed and instituted in predominately White, middle-class suburban schools have become the driving policy force behind recent renovations to working-class, more multiethnic urban schools (Bowman, 2001). This observation should be framed within the overall history of biopower as described by Foucault (1990) in his *History of Sexuality: Volume One*. Outlining the history of the fetishized concept *sex*, Foucault (1990) argues that the "repressive" discourse of sexuality "was not established as a principle of limitation of the pleasures of others by what have traditionally been called the 'ruling classes.' Rather it appears to me that they first tried it on themselves" (p. 122). In other words, a technology of sexuality was deployed by the middle class to maintain, care for, and sustain their collective social body. Only later were these various techniques then extended to others "as a means of social control and political subjugation" (Foucault, 1990, p. 123). As Obidah points out, we are witnessing the same dispersal of safety logics and discourses from the reactionary White, middle-class suburbs to the indigent inner cities of the American educational system. Of course, surveillance apparatuses (e.g., zero tolerance and the proliferation of incarceration tactics) already existed in many inner-city schools, yet since Columbine and 9/11, the sophistication of the technologies and the frequency of their deployment are increasing but in multiple ways depending on which bodies are caught within the matrix.

The differentiation of subjection and discrimination through surveillance implementation is central to understanding how contemporary society attempts to manage and police a multicultural, multiethnic populous. For

instance, in suburban, middle-class, predominately White schools, disciplinary power functions to produce a surveillance economy that trains bodies needed to reproduce middle-management professionals or computer-literate workers (Brown, 2003). Here, disciplinary power contains the fear of school shooting through the incorporation of student life into an overall set of social relations and social expectations that map onto an ideology of care. In comparison, the composition and intensity of the surveillance economy in inner-city schools socializes African American boys and Latinos into a prisonlike labor system, preparing them for life behind both literal and figurative bars (Davis, 2003, p. 38). Here, surveillance does not master life through its incorporation but rather abandons life through zero-tolerance policies. Thus, urban schools begin to resemble a state of exception, a proverbial "outside" within the smooth functioning of the state (Lewis, in press). As such, students are not regulated but policed to be expelled. Foucault's theory of disciplinary power and panoptic surveillance must take into account the underlying racism and classism of the U.S. where "not everything, nor everyone, is to be saved" or normalized but instead exposed to the immediacy of sovereign force to decide who lives and who dies (James, 1996, p. 34). A racist state of exception is even more pronounced in relation to 9/11 surveillance policies and procedures. As Lyon (2003, p. 81) points out, since 9/11, "digital discrimination" is on the rise, usually targeting citizens of Middle-Eastern decent for expulsion into the liminal zone of indistinction characterized by Guantanamo Bay Prison. Thus, power articulated through militarized hyper-surveillance systems tends to reproduce certain social relations that divide populations along class and race lines.

In sum, critical surveillance literacy must simultaneously link the deployment of various surveillance technologies with social relations of capitalism while also historically grounding this analysis within the interwoven nature of economic growth and surveillance innovation. From this critical perspective, the overall surveillance apparatus of schooling is revealed to be a specific institutional arrangement that attempts to construct complacent consumers, docile citizens, and willing workers through the management of disciplinary circuits of power that structure subjectivities within a militarized ideology of imperialism and neo-colonial economics. Yet this overall apparatus of surveillance relations—comprising interlocking but potentially conflicting technologies and discourses—simultaneously produces ambiguous results (in the form of fear or educational paranoia), exceptional practices (suspensions, raids, etc.), and surplus violence (against both students and inner-city schools themselves [Vinson and Ross]) that suspend notions of educational efficiency and normalization often associated with strictly Foucaultian or social reproduction theories. Although Columbine might have routed the center for surveillance discussions from the urban to the suburban, the reapplication of such policies to different populations further establishes hierarchies of inclusion and exclusion based on one's skin color, ethnic background, and position in the mode of production.

Reconstructing School Relations Outside and Inside the Classroom

Although a dystopian approach to the surveillance economy of schooling is a necessary component of any critical surveillance literacy project, it is not by any means the end. In his analysis of the dialectics of hope, Fredric Jameson stated that

> unless that [Marxist] demystification is linked to the vision or the attempt to envision an alternated society altogether, unless there is a utopian component or drive which is linked to the drive to demystify, then it seems to me that the most productive result of demystification is not achieved. (quoted in Zhang, 1998, p. 372)

In other words, from a demystification of the present, the incomplete nature of reality will reveal itself, urging the subject to undertake a project to fully realize the not-yet-become of our material existence in a utopian—or as the case might be, a radicalized heterotopian—alternative. From a critical appraisal of our shared historical moment, a positive political reconstruction must be enacted to resist the current state of our militarized, commodified, and policed school system, a project that explores not only the disabling aspects of surveillance but also the inherent possibilities within the objective ambiguity of the present.

Reconstructing Safety and Surveillance in Schools

This ethical reconstruction of safety outside of military and capitalist ideologies does not mean the elimination of all power relationships or all technologies of surveillance. What I am arguing against is a particular hegemonic calcification of unequal and asymmetrical power relations under a paranoid (racist, sexist, and classist) regime. Opposed to harmful, hegemonic forms of power, Foucault (1997) proposes an ethical practice that would "allow us to play these games of power with as little domination as possible" (p. 298). Todd May (1994) argues that for Foucault, this play of power includes "the call for social, personal, and political experimentation, the expansion of situated freedom, the release of subjected discourses" (p. 112). I would add that such situated knowledge systems and technologies of self-creative production should further be networked with macrostruggles against shared forms of oppression, subjugation, and discrimination. Critical surveillance literacy recognizes the necessary connection between the local and global, conviviality and sociality, and the play of power while simultaneously critiquing surplus disciplinarity and the violence of the state of exception as impediments to the production of new practices of freedom.

In response to Foucault's ethical proposition, Lyon (1994, pp. 214-217) advocates the following principles against which safety policies and surveillance deployment can be measured: participation, personhood, and purpose. Surveillance in the name of safety cannot be allowed to restrict participation in schooling or to discriminate against particular segments of the population. Rather, surveillance directed by an ethical mandate should be used to expand participation and access to resources. In terms of personhood, Lyon suggests that the disembodied, virtual data selves compiled through the top-down abstraction of information from individuals as objects of analysis and statistical manipulation cannot come to replace the situated knowledge of the subject. And finally, we need to critique surveillance as it is mobilized in specific contexts. Rather than embrace rampant pessimism and dismiss surveillance as an absolute evil, we need to critically examine the localized appropriateness or inappropriateness of surveillance measures. Thus, critical surveillance literacy must recognize those technologies and safety measures that enhance personal freedom. To quote Lyon (2003), we must not endorse a surveillance regime where "proscription takes precedence over protection, social control over mutual care" (p. 17). What is at stake is the construction of a new community of safety based on trust rather than anxiety, fear, and paranoia. Such a surveillance economy would no longer be based on the model of the panopticon or the camp but on convivial social relations through which freedom is maximized.

Reading the world of school surveillance critically is not enough. Activism against militarized ideologies of control and high-tech solutions to safety problems has to occur. Within schools, students and teachers have to raise their collective voice of protest against abuses that will result from hypersurveillance, psychological profiling, zero tolerance, and so forth. Jeffrey Duncan-Andrade's (2004) recent work with teachers at Power Elementary School in South Central Los Angeles offers one site of resistance where critical surveillance literacy might be cultivated. In this example, a professional development program was used to facilitate critical teacher inquiry into the causes and effects of violence in the community. From the sessions, there emerged new solidarity among teachers and new collective strategies of resistance and empowerment that involved students in a collaborative effort to address a shared problem. Teacher development programs in urban areas most dramatically affected by militarism and criminalization are an important political sphere for generating critical teacher inquiry into school surveillance and its links to the rapid erosion of freedoms under the Patriot Act, the privatization of the prison-industrial complex, and escalating U.S. capitalist imperialism and militarization. The goal is to build toward "critical mass" where student and teacher voices demand safe schools outside of technological quick fixes or ideologies of discipline and/or punishment.

Resistance in the Classroom: Antisurveillance Pedagogy and Alternative Pedagogical Optics

Although institutional change is a difficult and long-term goal, the classroom itself is a sphere of relative autonomy where teachers and students can resist surveillance ideology and surplus disciplinary practices. Currently, the overall surveillance apparatus of schooling encourages and enforces a pedagogical model predicated on suspicion. Thus, teachers concerned with the adverse effects of hypersurveillance should adopt counterhegemonic pedagogical practices that resist the criminalization and pathologization of students. Most important, teachers can help students become surveillance literate through the analysis of their own schooling experience. Teaching critical surveillance literacy enables students to recognize the interconnections between school practices and national policies. It is also important for teachers to open up a pedagogical space were students will feel comfortable expressing their opinions concerning school militarization and hypersurveillance. According to University of Maryland researchers, "jail-like security" actually makes children feel less safe. The question for the critical educator becomes "How can student reactions to surveillance and violence in schools become objects of critical reflection within the classroom?" ("To Cope With Violence," 2000). The point is that teachers and students can be empowered through the language of critique and given a sense of agency by collectively imagining new visions and strategies of safety outside the hypersurveillance of late capitalism and the attending pedagogy of suspicion.

Perhaps more alarming is the possibility that pedagogical vision itself may be colonized by an optic of surveillance. As Judith Butler (1997) argues, power has a psychic life through which subjects constitute themselves and through which they construct their relations to others. If hypersurveillance has in fact been internalized, then the optical field of vision through which pedagogical relations are structured may be informed by a disciplinary gaze concerned with regulation, normalization, and homogenization rather than the practice of freedom. The gaze—as the disembodied, spectral optic of disciplinary power and sovereign right—is predicated on the negative: law, lack, and limit. Even in the "progressive" or critical classroom, this gaze may work covertly to situate the student within discourses of deficits, abnormalities, and behavioral problems. In sum, the gaze is a visual practice of mastery and control that can pollute pedagogical practices interested in critical inquiry. Although the preeminent historian of ideas, Martin Jay (1994), criticizes Foucault for his pathologization or denigration of vision, I would concur with Gary Shapiro (2003), who argues that Foucault provides the reader with an "archeology of vision" that emphasizes multiple modes of sight coextensive with (and perhaps in

opposition to) the gaze. Foucault would never suggest that vision has an essence but would rather suggest that vision is historically constructed. Thus, as a practice of contra-conduct, it is likely that Foucault would advocate the formation of a new type of vision outside of the logic of the gaze. But what are alternative metaphors of vision useful for the critical educator?

Critical surveillance literacy calls for a shift in pedagogical relations but also a concomitant shift from a gaze to what Mieke Bal (1996) would describe as a glance. For her, the glance is temporally bound, self-aware, and always already partial. Furthermore, the glance is receptive to the agency of the other. Rather than see the other as simply a passive object to be consumed, dominated, or subjected to social death in the form of abandonment, the glance recognizes the autonomy of the other and as such is dialogic and interactive. Thus, the glance is a form of visualization that opens up a space for dialog where the other can define himself or herself outside of normalization, criminalization, and pathologization. Shapiro (2003, p. 159) also argues that Nietzsche provides both a concept of the gaze, which gives purported access to pure presence, and the glance, which is an "embodied eye" and thus always already situated, self-reflexive, and perspectival. Such an embodied eye offers a counterpoint to a pedagogical gaze that reinforces disciplinary normalcy (structuring individuals in a hierarchical field of normalcy) or sovereign force (as it punishes through abandonment).

In many ways, the glance is the optical technology implicit in Paulo Freire's (2001) dialogic pedagogy. For Freire, dialogic education resolves the student-teacher dialectic, allowing the object (student) to become the subject (teacher) and vice versa. Such a relation necessitates the exchange of glances between student and teacher. Rather than a gaze bent on cataloging students in terms of deficiencies and deficits, the exchange of glances opens up a new space, a resisting visual field of pedagogical perception, that is experimental, challenging, and revolutionary. These visual relations that underlie Freire's linguistic, problem-posing pedagogy are antithetical to the total surveillance economy of contemporary American schools. In sum, a critical surveillance pedagogy has to be accompanied by a new optical technology of vision where the gaze is exchanged for the glance to resist what Donna Haraway (2003) would call the "God-Trick" of detached, omniscient, authoritarian visualization.

Thus, pedagogical relations and pedagogical practices of visualization must simultaneously be reworked so as to resist the reproduction of institutional hypersurveillance in the classroom. The glance is an integral component to critical surveillance praxis. This praxis embodies an ethic of empowerment that enables students and teachers to engage in acts of self-production without the fear of being policed and to employ critical tools to analyze their environments without being subjected to interrogation. In other words, the glance—as a constituent part of a Freirian pedagogy— is a counterhegemonic technology of vision that re-forms the field of educational relations to short circuit and rerout

power away from its conscripted role in social maintenance, capitalist reproduction, or state brutality.

Conclusion

Power and production, surveillance and ideology, discipline and resistance, gaze and glance. These are essential elements that construct the vocabulary and methodology of critical surveillance literacy. Mapping the intersections between these terms is essential for a political project that resists surveillance domination in its many variegated forms and modalities. Safety has to be reconstructed outside of harmful hegemonic ideologies, strategies of control, and violence of expulsion. If schools are to become places of critical thinking and transformative praxis, then learning communities built on mutual fear and paranoia have to be rejected. Outside the classroom, teachers and students must question increasing levels of surveillance implementation and policing measures as viable solutions to the issue of safety. Inside classrooms, teacher-student relations and pedagogical vision have to be reconstituted to resist the internalization of surplus forms of hypersurveillance. In our collective post-Columbine and post-9/11 world of military imperialism, and global capitalism, a critical surveillance literacy is a specialized technology of resistance and transformation that enables educators to read their environments against the grain to take political action against forms of surveillance that benefit the interests of the few at the expense of the many.

References

Agamben, G. (2005). *State of exception*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bal, M. (1996). *Double exposure*. New York and London: Routledge.

Balfanz, R., Spiridakis, K., Neild, R. C., & Legters, N. (2003). High-poverty secondary schools and the juvenile justice system: How neither helps the other and how that could change. *New Directions for Youth Development*, *99*, 71-89.

Bogard, W. (1996). *The simulation of surveillance: Hypercontrol in telematic societies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bowman, D. H. (2001, May 30). School safety lessons learned: Urban districts report progress. *Education Week on the Web*. Available at www.edweek.org

Brown, E. (2003). Freedom for some, discipline for "others." In K. Saltman & D. Gabbard (Eds.), *Education as enforcement* (pp. 127-152). New York and London: Routledge/Falmer.

Budd, J. (2002, May 14). Higher education: Border control. *Guardian Newspaper*, p. 12.

Butler, J. (1997). *The psychic life of power: Theories in subjection*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Davis, A. (2003). *Are prisons obsolete?* New York: Seven Stories Press.

Devine, J. (1996). *Maximum security: The culture of violence in inner city schools*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dimitriadis, G., & McCarthy, C. (2003). Creating a new panopticon: Columbine, cultural studies, and the uses of Foucault. In J. Bratich, J. Packer, & C. McCarthy (Eds.), *Foucault, cultural studies, and governmentality* (pp. 273-292). New York: State University of New York Press.

Dodson, D. (2002, August 8). Back to school: Securing the future. *The Houston Chronicle*, p. 01.

Duncan-Andrade, J. (2004). Towards teacher development fot the urban in urban teaching. *Teaching Education*, *15*(4), 339-350.

Ericson, R., & Haggerty, K. (1997). *Policing the risk society.* Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Ericson, R., & Haggerty, K. (2000). The surveillance assemblage. *British Journal of Sociology, 51*(4), 605-622.

Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and punish*. New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1990). *History of sexuality: Volume I*. New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1997). *Ethics, subjectivity, and truth*. New York: New York Press.

Freire, P. (2001). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Giroux, H. (2001). *Public spaces, private lives: Beyond the culture of cynicism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Haraway, D. (2003). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. In S. Harding (Ed.), *The feminist standpoint reader* (pp. 81-101). New York and London: Routledge.

James, J. (1996). *Resisting state violence: Radicalism, gender, and race in U.S. culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Janmohamed, A. (1995). Refiguring values, power, knowledge, or Foucault's disavowal of Marx. In B. Magnus & S. Cullenberg (Eds.), *Whither Marxism?* (pp. 31-64). New York and London: Routledge.

Jay, M. (1994). *Downcast eyes: The denigration of vision in twentieth century French thought*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lewis, T. (2003). The surveillance economy of contemporary schooling. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy and Cultural Studies*, *25*(4), 335-355.

Lewis, T. (in press). The school as an exceptional space: Rethinking education from the perspective of the biopedagogical. *Educational Theory.*

Lyon, D. (1994). *The electronic eye: The rise of surveillance society.* Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Lyon, D. (2003). *Surveillance after September 11*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Marsden, R. (1999). *The nature of capital*. New York and London: Routledge.

May, T. (1994). *The political philosophy of poststructuralist anarchism*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Milchman, A. (2003). Marxism and the Holocaust. *Historical Materialism: Research in Critical Marxist Theory, 11*(3), 97-120.

Portner, J. (2000, March 15). Girl's slaying elicits calls for metal detectors. *Education Week on the WEB*. Available from www.edweek.org

Poster, M. (1990). *The mode of information: Poststructuralism and social context*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Robins, K., & Webster, F. (1999). *Times of the technoculture*. New York: Routledge.

Saltman, K. (2003). Introduction. In K. Saltman & D. Gebbard (Eds.), *Education as enforcement* (pp. 1-24). New York: Routledge/Falmer.

Sandoval, C. (2000). *Methodology of the oppressed*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Shapiro, G. (2003). *Archaeologies of vision: Foucault and Nietzsche on seeing and saying*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

To cope with violence, schools divide and conquer. (2000, April 19). *USA Today*, p. 26A.

Vinson, K., & Ross, W. (2000). Education and the new disciplinarity: Surveillance, spectacle, and the case of SBER. *Cultural Logic*, *4*(1).

Webber, J. (2003). Post-Columbine reflections on youth violence as a (trans)national movement. In K. Saltman & D. Gabbard (Eds.), *Education as enforcement* (pp. 189-202). New York: Routledge/Falmer.

Yar, M. (2003). Panoptic power and the pathologisation of vision: Critical reflections on the Foucauldian thesis. *Surveillance and Society, 1*(3), 254-271.

Zavarzadeh, M., & Morton, D. (1994). *Theory as resistance*. New York: Guilford.

Zehr, M. A. (2003, February 26). Schools register for new INS tracking system. *Education Week on the WEB*. Available from www.edweek.org

Zhang, X. (1998). Marxism and the historicity of theory: An interview with Fredric Jameson. *New Literary History, 29*(3), 353-383.

Tyson Lewis is a graduate student in cultural studies in education at the University of California, Los Angeles. He has published on a wide variety of issues, including school surveillance, psychoanalysis, Frankfurt School critical theory and pedagogy, and the utopian potentials of subcultures.