Five Doors, Three Cameras, and A Dead Bolt

How Fear of Crime Is Filling Our Prisons and Consuming Personal Liberty

Alison Michelle Ireland

University of Massachusetts Boston
––
alisn.michelle@gmail.com

Abstract: In this paper, Ireland applies her sociological imagination to the examination of a personal problem in relation to a broader social issue that affects society at large. After careful introspection and self-monitoring, she finds that her own "fear of crime," and resulting loss of privacy, has much to do with racial profiling and mass imprisonment. This conclusion is supported throughout with scientific literature, and theories such as symbolic interactionism, phenomenology, exchange theory, structural functionalism, critical theory, and poststructuralism. Future research into linking these two concepts empirically would further shed light on the hypotheses presented.

I. INTRODUCTION

C. Wright Mills encourages us to use our **sociological imagination** when attempting to interpret the social world in which we live. In order to understand yourself, it is necessary to consider three questions concerned with structure, historical period, and the prevailing type of human nature in your society (Mills 1959).

For instance, in the United States, we live in a modern capitalist society, stratified by class and further by race. Many of our norms, values, and effectively, institutions are based on the *Protestant ethic,* individualism, and a religious devotion to the dollar. As citizens, we are socialized to encounter our world in terms of good and evil, right and wrong. This dichotomous thinking forces us to see our fellow citizens in terms of lazy versus hardworking, black versus white, male versus female, and so on.

Our current sociopolitical milieu is one of turmoil and uncertainty. In the past ten years we experienced a fall from grace unparalleled in our nation's short history, marked by the terrorist attacks of 9/11, two prolonged and unpopular wars, and a devastating economic collapse that sent our unemployment levels skyrocketing and forced many hardworking families out of their homes. Generalized fear is rampant.

Yet, throughout all of this, the prevailing human nature that exists in our society

Alison Michelle Ireland is currently pursuing a Masters Degree in Applied Sociology from the University of Massachusetts in Boston. Previously, she graduated Magna Cum Laude with a Bachelor of Social Work from Elms College in Chicopee, Massachusetts. She intends to work in a research/development field upon graduation. Ireland wrote this paper while enrolled in the course Soc. 605: "Applied Sociological Theory," instructed by Mohammad H. Tamdgidi (Associate Professor of Sociology at UMass Boston) during the Fall 2010 semester.

is one of savage individualism, protection- ism, and a strong adherence to the principal of "survival of the fittest" (Appelrouth and Edles, 2008, 151).

Mills says the sociological imagination "enables its possessor to understand the larger historical scene in terms of its mean- ing for the inner life and the external career of a variety of individuals" (Lemert, 2009, 348). In other words, it "enables us to grasp history and biography and the relations between the two within society" (Lemert, 2009, 349). This can be accomplished in two ways. An inquisitive mind can start at the macro level by examining a social **issue** in hopes of finding the underlying personal **troubles** that comprise it. Or, they can start at the micro level, piecing together personal troubles that together form a social issue plaguing a particular society.

It is my hope that, throughout the course of composing this paper, I might be able to relate a personal trouble of my own to a social issue affecting our society. It is important to note that by personal trouble Mills meant "a private matter: values cher- ished by an individual are felt by him to be threatened" (Lemert, 2009, 350). An issue, on the other hand, "is a public matter: some value cherished by publics is felt to be threatened" (Lemert, 2009, 350). For this particular inquiry, the personal trouble I hope to unravel is that of fear of crime and the ensuing loss of privacy I experience because of it. The social issue that my personal trouble relates to is that of prison overcrowding in general, racial profiling specifically, and the dehumanizing prac- tices of the criminal justice industry.

II. PERSONAL TROUBLES

I am going to start by fleshing out my personal trouble. From the time I wake up in the morning, until I go to bed at night, everything I do is recorded and potentially monitored. I sometimes wonder how much

of my life might be pieced together from the endless hours of footage that consist of my everyday actions. The websites I visit are recorded. My children and I are recorded in the elevator in our building and then again in the parking garage as we load into our car. If we decide to go into the library we are taped and the books we borrow are logged. At the grocery store, gas station, recreation center, and school, we are recorded.

In addition to this constant external monitoring, there is a vigilant internal monitoring that goes on as well. If you find yourself in my apartment, it means you have gone through five locked doors, and passed on average three video cameras. While I would like to think that I find this a nuisance, some of this barricading is self- imposed. The door to our apartment is locked, and we added a chain lock for extra safety. I am always certain to lock the doors to my car, hold my five year old's hand in public, follow her around the playground, check for strangers, watch out for would be rapists, creeps or other criminal types. I do not consider myself to be the hyper vigilant type, and I even go out of my way to be aware of the way I am interacting with the world based on whatever mistruths have been funneled into my brain. But, I still have a moderate level of preoccupation with safety.

In this county, citizens are the recipi- ents of fear evoking propaganda from our national government on down to our parents. Fear of crime not only leads to a loss of anonymity and privacy for the indi- vidual, but an overcrowded prison system for society, bringing to mind the famed Ouroboros. We fear crime and pay a hefty price for "safety": personal privacy. In turn, we need to see the fruits of our sacrifice: criminals being punished. Young men of color have the highest rates of victimiza- tion; yet, ironically, young white women are taught to fear crime the most (Western, 2006).

I am constantly inundated with propaganda telling me I should fear victimization. An envelope provided by one of my credit cards for return of payment was donned with an ad for pepper spray. It came in a hot pink "lipstick" container, something that is supposed to pique my interest as a young woman. People, especially women, in our society fall prey to this fear mongering. I once saw a woman reconsider entering SeaWorld with her two small children and husband because a security guard told her she had to check her pepper spray at the door. We are not only fearful of back alleys and poorly lit parking garages, we must be alert and ready to defend ourselves 24/7, even in the most benign of situations.

III. MICRO THEORETICAL INSIGHTS

How did we get to this point? Phenomenology offers a framework within which to explore this question.

Every one of us is born into a specific **lifeworld**, mainly distinguishable by the factors offered by Mills mentioned earlier; a society's structure, historical orientation, and prevailing human nature. Alfred Schutz, a prominent phenomenologist, says: "I find myself in my everyday life within a world not of my own making… I was born into a pre-organized social world which will survive me, a world shared form the outset with fellow-men who are organized into groups" (Appelrouth and Edles, 2008, 539).

I was born into a lifeworld that, among other things, is in the business of marketing not only tangible commodities, but also sensations such as security, happiness, and fulfillment. Fear has become an industry. You can buy your sense of security and justice. Prisons have been privatized; they are for profit entities. In order for them to be profitable, they must be full. The victim/criminal dichotomy turns out to be a money maker. The victims have a small price to pay: privacy, while the criminals lose not only their freedom, but their basic civil liberties, their families, and any ***social capital*** they may have gathered along the way (Graffam, et. al., 2004; Miller, 2007; Pager, 2003).

Lifeworlds are perpetuated through a socialization process. In **primary socialization** a child becomes a member of society through a crash course in civility put on by their parents and close family members. The social world becomes apparent to the small child through the lens of their immediate family's values. As a young child, my parents, undoubtably influenced by the media and other social messages, taught me about 'stranger danger' and called my attention to potentially unsafe locations and situations. "Stay safe and sound," was a message I heard often, and I was given a toolkit with which to accomplish this. With my own children, I avoid teaching them to fear the world. Through **secondary socialization** they may integrate this message to some degree, but this is out of my control for the most part. I have made an effort to monitor the messages my children come in contact with by not having television, for instance; but no one lives in a bubble.

Ann Marie Moler, a former UMass Boston student, wrote this passage while working out her fear of a wasted life, but it is applicable in this instance as well:

> I can help myself not to be overly influenced by society if I limit the amount of messages coming in. This is not easy to do, especially since there is no way to escape from constant advertising messages in this culture. However, I can be intentional about who and what I surround myself with. Conflict Theorist Randall Collins uses the idea of ***social density*** to explore "how society creates loyalty and identification among its members"

(Wallace and Wolf 151). An aspect of this is ***mutual surveillance*** which says that "the more that people are in the physical presence of others—the more they accept the culture of the group and expect precise conformity in others" (Wallace and Wolf 151). Since I know that the things and people I spent the most time with will impact me, I can do a few different things to protect myself. For example I can limit the amount of time (or types of programs) I watch on television. I can also screen the information I choose to read and stay away from material that I know will only encourage me to conform; for example I can stay away from women's magazines which will pressure me to conform to society's ideals of beauty and success. (Moler, 2009, 145)

In addition to censoring what messages one is exposed to, a person also has the capacity to seek out the truth. After taking courses in racial and ethnic relations, social structure, and the nature of crime and punishment, I have pieced together a more enlightened knowledge base, but my primary socialization is a strong force. Habits formed at a young age are hard to overcome, especially when they are reinforced by your particular lifeworld.

In the documentary *Multiple Personalities*, an individual with dissociative disorder describes how different personalities emerge to deal with varying situations. John is a police officer, and he often becomes involved in high-speed chases and has to confront would be criminals in dangerous situations. John's case is an exaggerated instance of **bracketing**. We interact with people and situations in typical ways. For instance, we identify a particular person or situation as a **type**, and then using bracketing we bring out our best self

to deal with that scenario. Note that this process may have no basis in empirical reality, rather it is a product of our primary and secondary socialization. We find ourselves in a dark parking lot and label it as dangerous. Now we are locking the car, scanning the landscape, listening for footsteps, and taking other precautions to protect ourselves from an assailant, that will most likely never materialize. Yet we are gripped with fear. This system we have may not be logical, but it allows us to **define the situation** and react to our surroundings. "Behavior or reaction is constructed on the basis of the meanings that are attributed to the situation" (Appelrouth and Edles, 481). It works as long as it is not challenged. When someone helps you change a flat tire in a dimly lit parking lot, your classification of a dark parking lot as dangerous may change, although it would take more than one instance to undo years of socialization to fear dark deserted places. For women, this fear is even more paralyzing and ingrained, as noted by another UMass Boston student, Jacquelyn Knoblock:

> Feminists say that men gain from this culture of violence because it "leaves women in a constant state of fear" (Marchbank and Letherby, 2007:272). They say that this fear can come either from experiencing beatings or harassment, or from a general anxiety of incurring the former or sexual assaults. Women cannot know which male is a potential attacker. (Knoblock, 2008, 99)

When considering types, we **take the attitude of the other** in order to evaluate how we should act in a given situation. This happens through an internal conversation in which the individual takes on the role of another and tries to imagine how that person might judge him or her. We

have been told as women, that if we dress provocatively, train our children to be too friendly, carry valuable personal items within view, or walk alone at night in certain neighborhoods, we will surely be victims of certain crimes. We know this to be true because we have learned through film, family, friends, and teachers, how a criminal mind thinks. We take on that mind and behave in opposition to it. We want to extinguish criminal urges in others, not enflame them. During primary socialization we take on the role of the other during the **play stage**, where we act out scenes between cops and robbers, the distressed princess and the evil witch. These roles are disjointed and immature, but as we grow, so too do the various roles, becoming integrated and more serious. As an adult, in the **game stage**, we switch seamlessly from role to role in order to play by the rules of the game set by the generalized other.

Objective reality acts upon us through institutions we ourselves create by the process of **habitualization**. All of the precautions we take, locking our doors, installing call boxes on college campuses, giving undergraduates rape whistles, issuing color coded terrorist threat levels, body scans at airports, and carrying pepper sprays contribute to the objective reality that the world is a dangerous place, a fearful place. We see our front door as a vulnerable portal to our personal world, but we forget that by aiming a video camera at it, we are trading a very real sense of privacy for a hollow sense of security. The **institution** of prison is thusly legitimated. Furthermore, it seems as though the more we buy products and act out behaviors surely to keep us from being victimized, the more our prisons fill up. The more our prisons fill up, the more we feel justified in acting out these semi-neurotic behaviors such as hiding our GPS devices under our car seats, being sure to wipe the windshield clean of the faint circle the suction cup may have left behind. The process described—

using concepts introduced by Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann—is one of **externalization, objectivation, internalization,** followed by **reification**. We have come to accept crime as a natural fact, not as something that is socially constructed.

If you are not afraid, you are not intelligent. When my friends and family members found out I was accepted to UMass Boston, they often had one thing to say: "But that is in Dorchester, aren't you worried about being on campus at night?" Although I was not worried about being safe, I tried to assuage the concerned individuals' fear by telling them I was going to take all of the necessary precautions to keep myself "safe and sound." I would lock my car, carry a cell phone, walk with a friend, have my keys fisted and ready to use as a weapon, scan the parking lot, and so on, until I felt they thought I had listed all the things a "smart girl" would do.

One component of fear of crime, is acting it out in front of others. The others might be your mom, or a **generalized other**. But the point is, acting out the fear of crime is one way we partake in **impression management**, as suggested by symbolic interactionists. This involves "the verbal and non-verbal practices we employ in an attempt to present an acceptable image of ourselves to others" (Appelrouth and Edles, 480). One can see the male lead in the film *The Girl in the Cafe* engaging in impression management as he checks and rechecks his tie en route to meet his date Gina for the first time since their initial meeting. He takes his tie off and puts it back on many times before deciding that the impression he wants to give is more in line with wearing the tie. When he enters the restaurant to greet her, he acts as if he has not given his appearance, let alone the small detail of a tie, a second thought. That is part of the trick of impression management, making it look effortless even if you have been agonizing over minute details.

The level of safety-mindedness we

have to put off varies by region, usually contingent upon the amount of perceived crime in an area, roughly distinguishable by the class and race of its inhabitants. Closely related to impression management are the concepts of **demeanor** (conduct) and **deference** (respect), which are accomplished through a variety of avoidance and presentational rituals (Chiricos, et. al., 2001). These rituals are heavily gendered. Judith Butler discusses the concept of ***performativity***, which is relevant here. By relaying to my friends and family what a "smart girl" would do in Dorchester at night, I tapped into a "sustained set of acts" that respectfully represent my gender (Butler, 1999:xv).

Let's look at a real world example of this system of demeanor and deference at work. Reporter and mom Lenore Skenazy became semi-famous for putting her nine year old son on the subway in New York, unaccompanied. The subway conductor alerted the authorities and she was referred to child protective services for endangering her child. Her demeanor communicated that she was not concerned with impression management; she did not fear that her son would be abducted or molested. The generalized other, namely subway passengers, the train operator, and the authorities found her behavior ignorant and neglectful, and treated her with a complete lack of deference—in fact, one of the most damning shows of lack of deference around: doubting her parental capabilities. She has since written a book, based in fact, *Free-Range Kids*, that looks at how the 24 hour news cycle (and other sources) distort reality to the point where parents fear their own backyard is not safe enough for their child to play unmonitored. The fact is that we (mostly) have nothing to fear, but we let fear run our lives and the lives of our children.

When we think about the cost and benefit of hyper vigilance we can look at the **distributive justice** occurring between the individual and those that sell safety. The merchants of safety, in certain situations, are providing security, and the individual is often giving up a bit of privacy. For instance, when we go through security at the airport, the security guards there (by questioning everyone, scanning us, and possibly searching us) are providing the individual with security, but the individual is giving up a certain amount of privacy on an increasing scale. Some do not find the distributive justice to be equitable, as in the case of a woman whom I witnessed refusing to submit to a body scan. The cost (her personal privacy) was too high to allow for the supposed benefit (general security). She was visibly angry at the suggestion of such an inequitable deal.

IV. MACRO THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Through the course of writing this paper, I have examined a personal trouble of my own, fear of crime and loss of privacy, as it relates to a public issue, prison overcrowding and racial profiling. C. Wright Mills offers a justification for this method. Using wisdom from phenomenology, symbolic interactionism, and exchange theory, the micro aspects of this inquiry were explored. Main inroads to understanding the construction of my personal trouble included a conversation around concepts such as lifeworld, socialization, bracketing, types, attitude of the other, reification and impression management, to name a few.

Now, turning to the macro side of this discussion, what we do to "protect" ourselves from the maladies of the human spirit varies by country and further by regions within a country. Structural functionalist Talcott Parsons makes the point, through his concept of a ***cultural system***, that we do not have much individual say in the choices we make. We do make deci-

sions, but they are from a predefined set of options, not an infinite set of choices, as we may naively believe. A cultural system is made of the "values, norms and symbols which guide the choices made by actors and which limit the type of interaction which may occur among actors" (Appelrouth and Edles, 2008, 353). When considering fear of crime and its effects, we can make comparisons between the United States and Britain. In this country it is perfectly legal to put someone to death if a jury finds him or her guilt of a crime worthy of that punishment. Many of our citizens could not imagine justice without this option. In Britain, capital punishment is not an option, and jurors choose from a different set of punishments for a crime that in America would call for death.

Regardless of variation in punishment across societies, for nearly all groups, crime serves a purpose. Robert Merton emphasized this point. **Deviance**, occurring when a society's values are out of sync with the means for achieving them, has **manifest** and **latent functions**. Below is a quote from Merton citing Mead as he discussed the functional aspect of crime.

> … that attitude of hostility toward the law-breaker has the unique advantage [read: latent function] of uniting all members of the community in the emotional solidarity of aggression. While the most admirable of humanitarian efforts are sure to run counter to the individual interest of very many in the community, or fail to touch the interest and imagination of the multitude and to leave the community divided or indifferent, the cry of thief or murderer is attuned to profound complexes, lying below the surface of competing individual efforts, and citizens who have [been] separated by divergent interest stand together against the common ene-

my. (Merton, 1949)

This model would appear at first as **dysfunctional**, and it can be said to be so. As structural functionalists point out: dysfunction for some can be function for others. For instance, a major institution such as the criminal justice system can be dysfunctional for society, but still functional for those with the most power; thus, it lives on. This is an important point to consider when musing about the longevity of such an institution. Drawing on Emile Durkheim regarding the functional aspect of crime from a different angle Applerouth and Edles write:

> "A society exempt from [crime] is utterly impossible" because crime affirms and reaffirms the collective sentiments upon which it is founded and which are necessary for its existence. In other words, "It is impossible for all to be alike…there cannot be a society in which the individuals do not differ more or less from the collective type." As a result, social mechanisms compelling conformity to existing or new laws inevitably appear. (2008, 94)

Here, the **collective conscience** reigns supreme, and all those who do not conform are identified and sanctioned. Furthermore, society, as a collective, acts in parallel to the way in which corporations are described in the film *The Corporation*. Prisons are now privatized, acting as a corporation might, ruthlessly pursuing its main interest: profit. In the same way that it is difficult to fault one person working for a major corporation for its misdeeds, it is nearly impossible to fault one person in the criminal justice system for its injustices. Also, in the film *Awakenings,* Dr. Sayer had to go against the collective conscience of the hospital when he suggested new treatment and diagnoses for the patients there.

He met with much resistance and was nearly ostracized after going against the group mentality.

The way in which we see the process of crime control is methodical; if I deadbolt my door, I will not be the victim of a break in. If we place cameras in every store, on every street corner, and parking garage, everyone will be safer, less free, but safer. As a society, we try to develop formulas (through ***technological rationality***) for crime control, but we have lost the ability to ***negate*** when we see that the promised benefits don't materialize. Individuals have lost the power to challenge objective truths, making it impossible to resist the status quo. If I asked my apartment complex to remove the cameras in the parking garage because they are an invasion of my personal liberty, I would be considered insane—regardless of the fact that break-ins routinely occur even with the cameras in place.

It is well documented that pregnant women do not get special treatment in prison. In the biography, *Freeing Tammy*, there is a detailed account of how prisoners in Illinois are shackled to the bed by one foot and one hand during labor and delivery in addition to being denied anesthesia or other pain-killers. Logan (1999) recounts how one woman testing positive for illicit substances in the hospital after birth was sent to prison within hours after delivering, and "...arrived at the jail still bleeding from the delivery; she was told to sit on a towel" (Gaines, 2003, p373). These are two examples of how inhumane the prison system can be, and an evidence of this age of ***subjective reason***. Where ***objective reason***, as described by critical theorists, considers the value of the ends, and is concerned with what is just and right, subjective reason is concerned with means and ends, not ethics; it is employed by the technician, the bureaucrat. Critical theorists posit that before the industrial revolution and the rise of capitalism, ***individualistic rationality***

was possible. The individual was capable of transcending the status quo and thinking creatively. As described above, we are now in an era of narrow thinking (technological rationality) where we execute formulas aimed at efficiency in order to feed corporate and industrial capitalism. The prison system has not taken into account the needs of pregnant and laboring women, they are treated as everyone else is—whether they wrote a bad check or killed a man.

Two glaring examples of the ***culture industry*** at work in relation to this discussion are the political propaganda associated with the civil rights movement and the war on drugs in the 1980s. Bruce Western (2006) notes that the upheaval caused by 1960s race relations in combination with the labor market collapse for unskilled urban workers led to an acerbic sociopolitical environment—one in which white voters were drawn to a new type of Republican message linking race to violent crime rates, effectively driving a wedge between white working class folks and black folks, two groups that once made up a solid democratic base. This is one of the ways in which the Republican party was able to win elections and spread a tough-on-crime ideology (Western, 2006, 4). As the tough on crime message became more popular among voters, there was a dramatic increase in the population of incarcerated individuals. Minority groups became disproportionately targeted through coded racist rhetoric. Vast numbers of young black men were imprisoned during campaigns such as the war on drugs. This situation has

> … created a collective experience for young black men that is wholly different from the rest of American society. No other group, as a group, routinely contends with long terms of forced confinement and bears the stigma of official criminality in all subsequent

spheres of social life, as citizens, workers, and spouses. (Western, 2006, 6)

Partly due to propaganda emphasizing the ills of drug use in minority communities, specifically the much publicized "crack babies," welfare queens, and violent gang bangers, African American and Hispanics involved with drugs and alcohol suffer serious life course interruptions that may contribute to high rates of recidivism (Vischer, 2003). All of these effects would not have been possible without the use of television, film, radio, and newspapers ads hammering the public with partisan messages.

Emile Durkheim wrote:

When society undergoes suffering, it feels the need to find someone whom it can hold responsible for its sickness, on whom it can avenge its misfortunes; and those against whom public opinion already discriminates are naturally designed for this role. These are the pariahs who serve as expiatory victims. (Durkheim, 1899)

This statement acts as a proper introduction to Edward Said's concept of **orientalism.** Roughly defined, orientalism is the way in which Europe, and the United States in present day, studied and defined the Middle East and Asia as a contrasting, inferior Other. This took place when institutions such as the sciences, politics, and the media studied and labeled the Middle East and Asia. In this way, whites have defined themselves as superior.

Much of our current fear of crime (especially after 9/11) has to do with terrorism, and fear of the Other, as described by Said. We now have body scans and terror alerts at airports that are supposed to make us safer, but seem to solely succeed at invading our privacy. We have a unique

situation in America, where the colonized people, African Americans, were dislocated from their country, and colonized in a new land. I would argue that the tactics of colonization have occurred here in America in the same way they have occurred in Africa. African Americans are the colonized population here and characterized as "inherently inferior, weak, and evil. This understanding of the native population allows for the implementation of brutal and repressive tactics as a means for 'civilizing the savages'" (Appelrouth and Edles, 2008, 817). This is justified unjustly through a corrupt and racist criminal justice empire that stretches from the deadbolt on your front door to the deadbolt on the prison cell door.

In her book, *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness* and conferences on the same topic (one can be viewed here: http://video.pbs.org/video/1446311197/), Michelle Alexander describes how Jim Crow laws have been replaced by mass incarceration as a means of social control. She looks at the racist ideology of the war on drugs and how the African American community, after being targeted through the media and public policy, was (and still is) discriminated against. While imprisoned, inmates are forced to work for pennies, some in cotton fields. Is this the new slave-labor? After imprisonment, felons are disenfranchised in many of the same ways they were during Jim Crow, losing the right to vote, secure employment and proper housing, access to education, and often times, welfare benefits.

We have passed through two of Michel Foucault's three phases of discipline in society. Where once punishment was meted through public spectacle, it, until recently, took on what he describes as the **panopticon**. In the panopticon, the threat of surveillance keeps prisoners in line, for it is impossible to know if they are being watched. In this age of technological ratio-

nality, we find ourselves under the control of a ***disciplinary society.*** We are potentially always being watched, in prison or out, whereever we are, be it at the grocery store, or in our own apartment building. "The intimidation created by possible surveillance tends to normalize human activity and create a self-induced complicity with the rules" (Appelrouth and Edles, 2008, 644).

Structural functionalism, critical theory, and poststructuralism provide a framework within which to consider the macro aspects of my personal issue. Through this discussion we can see crime as functional despite the dysfunction of crime control. Critical theory allows us to look at our present day social circumstances and how they relate to the rationale behind the prison system. Discussion around orientalism and the new Jim Crow provide some insight into the racial aspect of mass imprisonment. Finally, Foucault offers us a big picture look at the surveilled world in which we live, where we are monitored so extensively externally that internal monitoring results.

V. CONCLUSION

After having gone through the micro and macro exploration of this topic, a forward thinking individual would offer some concrete steps to take in order to resolve some of the issues presented in the paper. The concerns mentioned are serious, involving privacy, safety, discrimination, exploitation, and abuse. It is hard to imagine how one person may be able to make changes that would *resolve* any of these long standing issues. In spite of that, some initial steps can be proposed.

I can work on being more discerning about and conscious of the culture industry, being sure not to buy into items and ideologies that I do not need, or do not fit my life. This would involve screening out certain advertisements I am exposed to in popular media though television, magazines, mailings, etc. In addition, I can be aware of my actions, and how my children are internalizing them. I can try to send the message to them to not fear the world, fear crime. In this age where privacy is becoming less and less valuable, I can hold on tight to mine, and caution my children to do the same. If we do not buy into the culture industry and do not buy the products that are typically purchased out of fear, eventually a message will be sent to the manufacturers that we are not going to hand over our money and liberty for a product we do not need. Instead of taking part in impression management and worrying about demeanor and deference, I can be more honest about my thoughts and understanding to my friends and family. Also, I can base my opinions about the safety of certain situations not on what I have "learned" through political propaganda, but instead on fact. In reference to the macro issues, I can continue to become more aware of the injustices committed by the criminal justice system against minorities and females. In conclusion, I am hoping to do my master's paper work investigating the way pregnant women are treated in prison across the country.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexander, Michelle (2010) *The New Jim Crow.* New York: New Press

Appelrouth, Scott, and Laura Desfor Edles (2008) *Classical and Contemporary Sociological Theory* Pineforge Press, Los Angeles, CA

Chiricos, Ted, Ranee McEntire and Marc Gertz (2001) "Perceived Racial and Ethnic Composition of Neighborhoods and Perceived Risk of Crime." *Social Problems* 48(3): 322-340

Gaines, Larry K., and Peter B. Kraska (2003) *Drugs Crime and Justice*, Waveland Press, Long Grove, Illinois.

Graffam, Joe, Alison Shinkfield, Barbara Lavelle, and Wenda Mcpherson (2004) "Variables Affecting Successful Reintegration as Perceived be Offenders and Professionals." *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation* 40:147-171

Knoblock, Jacquelyn (2008) "Gender and Violence: A Reflective Sociology of How Gender Ideologies and Practices Contribute to Gender Based Violence." Human Architecture VI(2): 91-102

Lemert, Charles (2009) *Social Theory: The Multicultural and Classic Readings* Waterview Press, Boulder, CO.

Marchbank, Jennifer and Gayle Letherby.(2007) *Introduction To Gender: Social Science Perspectives.* Harlow, England:Pearson Longman.

Miller, Joshua and Ann Marie Garran (2007) "The Web of Institutional Racism." *Smith College Studies in Social Work* 77(1): 33-67

Moler, Ann Marie (2009) "Dying to Live: Exploring the Fear of an Unlived Life Using the Sociological Imagination." Human Architecture VII(3):137-46

Pager, Devah (2003) "The mark of a criminal record." *American Journal of Sociology* 108(5): 937-975.

Raphael, Jody (2007) *Freeing Tammy,* Northeastern University Press, Boston, MA.

Stewart, Eric A., Eric P. Baumer, Rod K. Brunson and Ronald L. Simons (2009) "Neighborhood Racial Context and Perceptions of Police Based Racial Discrimination among Black Youth." *Criminology* 47(3): 847-887

Visher, Christy A. and Jeremy Travis (2003) "Transitions from Prison to Community: Understanding Individual Pathways." *The Urban Institute, Washington DC Annual Review of Sociology* 29:89-113.

Wallace, Ruth and Alison Wolf. (2006) *Contemporary Sociological Theory: Expanding the Classical Tradition.* 6th Ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Western, Bruce (2006) *Punishment and Inequality in America* Russell Sage Foundation, New York

Films:

Awakenings. (1990). Columbia Pictures.

The Corporation. (2004). Big Picture Media Corporation.

The Girl in the Cafe. (2005). Home Box Office.

Multiple Personalities. (1993). Home Box Office.