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ABSTRACT

The nexus of crime and politics has its historical roots in the Jamaican society long before the 1970s. The ‘badness-honour’, which permeates the nation currently, can be ascribed to the 1970s even though its genesis is before this time period. The crime phenomenon in Jamaica, nay, the Caribbean, cannot be comprehensively examined without a reference to politics. The crime phenomenon has reached a pandemic status, and the marriage between politics and crime must commence with a review of the theoretical frameworks underpinning the interpretation of the data, which have for decades guided the policy frameworks in the region. The reality is that the crime phenomenon continues to elude policy planners as they have not to date effectively designed any programmes that have significantly impacted positively on the crime pandemic. The problems with policy implementation in the Caribbean are etched within the plethora of benefits to be derived from criminality, political exclusion, and economic marginalization, compounded by links to gain political power. The case of solving the crime problem in the Caribbean is not hinged on the choice of theoretical frameworks used or unused, but rather it is the unwillingness of politicians to implement the recommendations, which emerge from the empirical evidence.
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INTRODUCTION

The crime problem in Jamaica is the number one leading national problem and has resulted in heightened fear and victimization. A cross-national probability survey, which was conducted, by Powell, Bourne, and Waller (2007), found that 11 out of every 25 Jamaicans indicated that crime and violence was the leading national problem, followed by unemployment (15 in every 50 Jamaicans), and education (3 in every 50 Jamaicans).

Using secondary national data on inflation, unemployment, exchange rate, and murder for Jamaica, Bourne (2011) stated that the gross domestic product (GDP) and the exchange rate are strong predictors of violent crimes in Jamaica.
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Embedded in Bourne’s finding is the association between politics and crime, which goes back to the 1970s. The rationale for this study contextualized from the 1970s, is based on the period 1970-2009, which is captured in Bourne’s work. However, the phenomenon of crime and politics dates back to the 1940s (Sives, 2003), or even before. It can be extrapolated from a keen examination of the work of Simmonds (2004) that the harbinger for a nexus between politics and crime can be traced to the early nineteenth century, when ex-slaves established a community in Western Kingston and demanded particular rights. This was in response to the neglect associated with the political structure at the time. Simmonds argued that:

The granting of civil rights to the members of the freed population in the 1830s might be viewed as more than the consequence of political demands made by the more privileged coloureds. It can be seen as an attempt to create an ‘aristocracy’ in the community, thereby inserting a wedge between the slaves and some of their more mobile and influential free collaborators (Simmonds, 2004, 31).

The nexus of crime and politics, therefore, has its historical roots in the Jamaican society long before the 1970s (Simmonds, 2004; Sives, 2003, 1997). The ‘Badness-honour’, which permeates the nation currently, can be ascribed to the 1970s (Gray, 2003a), although it began even before this time period (Sives, 2003). In an article entitled ‘The historical roots of violence in Jamaica: The Hearne Report 1949’ Sives (2003) contended that “strong-arm politics” was used in the 1940s by the two political institutions (namely, the Jamaica Labour Party [JLP] and the People’s National Party [PNP]) to gain and maintain governance of the nation.

She noted that the rivalry was intense and that many people lost their lives in the process, particularly political followers. This continued and became even more intense in the 1970s (Gray, 2003a). According to Gray (2003), both political parties (JLP and PNP) had political enforcers and killers, and political patronage was introduced into the society, with ‘badness’ as a badge of honour that became a part of the Jamaican culture. Within the context of the intense political rivalry among members of the two traditional political parties (PNP and JLP), the confrontation of the members to protect resource allocation led to violent crimes (Sives, 2003; Gray, 2003a, 2003b) including electoral crimes (Figueroa and Sives, 2003). The economic climate in Jamaica contributed to the proliferation and continuation of the political division among the people, which supported ‘badness’ and killings. Gray (2003b) aptly captured this when he stated that “The failure of economic policies, near-weekly accounts of human rights abuses, and recurrent disclosures of the corruption of power, the political bosses have retained their predominance, and the political apparatus that supports them has remained largely unchanged...” (Gray, 2003, 73).

Even prior to Gray’s declaration, discourses on the scourge of violence to Jamaica’s socio-economic health have been narrated. The Library of Congress (1987) identified the foundations that accounted for violence, particularly political violence by indicating that “the nation’s political violence derives from the socioeconomic structure of Jamaican politics, that is, social stratification along racial and economic class lines. Increasing political, social, and economic polarization in Jamaica has contributed to both political and criminal violence” (Library of Congress, 1987, chap. 2.).

Both Obika Gray and the Library of Congress suggested that politics account for some aspects of violent crimes in Jamaica, including murders. This is in keeping with the political rivalry between hardliners of the two main political parties, in pursuit of political power and patronage. Studies have established the interrelation between politics and crime in
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Jamaica (Harriott, 2003a, 2003b, 2004a, 2004b; Robotham, 2003). The current reality in Jamaica is well documented by Boxill et al. (2007) who posits that “The murder rate moved from 19.2 per 100,000 to 39 per 100,000 in the same period [1977 and 2000]. In 2004, Jamaica was ranked as a country with one of the highest murder rates in the Caribbean (Boxill et al., 2007, 117)

The murder phenomenon identified by Boxill et al. (2007) has worsened between 2004 and 2009, which increased by 14.2 percentage points (March and Bourne, 2011). The current crime problem that rose to epidemic proportion in Jamaica was compared to crimes statistics in New York, a high crime city (Bourne, et al., 2015a, 2015b, 2016; Harriott, 2004). Even though Harriott(2008)highlighted the nexus of crime and politics in Jamaica, this has never been empirically established. It has, however, been widely spoken of by many scholars including renown sociologist Don Robotham (2004). The crime figures revealed a serious problem that required the immediate divorce of politics and crime, particularly from the perspective of Amanda Sives’ work (2003). The World Bank noted that:

Between 1998 and 2000, according to police report, drug and gang related murder accounted on average for 22 percent of total murders, while domestic violence represented about 30 percent of total murders. The rising severity of the murder problem is highlighted by comparison with New York, a high crime city-while both Jamaica and New York experienced similar rates of murder in 1970, Jamaica’s murder rate had increased to almost seven times that of New York’s by year 2000 (World Bank, 2003, 121)

The empirical evidence from the World Bank, coupled with the aforementioned studies on the crime problem in Jamaica explained the societal consciousness and call for the divorce of crime and politics. Don Robotham, a sociologist, opined that “probably the most intractable factor contribution to violent crime in Jamaica is the interconnecting network of criminal gangs, drug running, politics, and the police” (Robotham, 2003, 215). A rationale which supports an examination of the theoretical framework of the relationship between crime and politics in Jamaica is embedded in this postulation made by Robotham that “…the political parties, they rely on party ‘soldiers’ [political enforcers] to deliver the vote during elections or, as recent events vividly demonstrated, to keep the peace during civil disturbances” (Robotham, 2003, 217).While a plethora of studies exist on the association between crime and politics in Jamaica (Robotham, 2003; Harriott, 2003a, 2003b; Gray, 2003a, 2003b; Sives, 2003; Clarke, 2006; Leslie, 2010), the general experiences are similarly the case across many other nations in the Caribbean (Brathwaite, 2004; United Nations and World Bank, 2007; Lashin, 2006), reflecting how the police force supports the politics of crimes (Mars, 2004). Harriott (2004) aptly contextualized the crime phenomenon in the Caribbean when he postulated that “The problem of crime in the Caribbean-its causes, its consequences, and its control-emerged as a major concern during the 1990s” (Harriott, 2004, 1). He went on to say that “The Caribbean Community (CARICOM) Heads of Government Conference, at its Twenty-Second Meeting held in Nassau, the Bahamas, in July 2001, expressed disquiet with regard to this problem and the threats that it poses to public safety and to the social and economic well-being of the people of the region” (Harriott, 2004, 1).

On examination of the literature, no study emerged which evaluates the theoretical frameworks used in interpreting ‘The nexus of crime and politics in the Caribbean’. The aim of the current study is to comprehensively examine the two main theoretical frameworks, which are used to empirically study crime, and crime and politics in the Caribbean. The work will also be used to recommend how the problem of crime and politics maybe divorced in the Caribbean in...
the interest of development-national and regional. The issue of leadership must play a critical role in setting a platform for addressing the crime monster in Jamaica.

BACKGROUND TO THE PROBLEM

The crime phenomenon in the Caribbean, particularly Jamaica, cannot be comprehensively examined without politics as a point of reference. (Harriott, 2003b). Loyal supporters of political parties are generally rewarded with “free housing” within strict borders protected by politically linked thugs (Sharpe, 2017). Such spaces are referred to as garrison communities. Figueroa and Sives (2003) provided an account of the relationship between crime and politics within the context of the garrison phenomenon in Jamaica. They (2003) reported that the garrison phenomenon is a critical factor in explaining the high rate of violent crimes in Jamaica.

The 1997 election represented a significant shift in garrison-type voting but the garrison remained a site for extensive electoral crime. In addition, the shift that took place must be seen as primarily an electoral phenomenon and not a foundation for a concomitant decline in violent crime and intercommunity conflicts (p. 84).

Studies have shown that politics, particularly political garrisonization of areas, have 1) caused reduced political freedom, 2) resulted in murders, 3) seen political victimization, 4) trampled on democratic freedom, 5) resulted in economic marginalization, and 6) explain a part of the crisis in the Caribbean as well as Latin America (Robotham, 2001; Boxill et al., 2007; Powell, Bourne and Waller, 2007; Gray, 2003a 2003b; Harriott, 2003; Sives, 2003; Figueroa and Sives, 2003; Simmonds, 2004; Leslie, 2010; United Nations and World Bank, 2007; Robotham, 2003; Moser and Holland, 1997; Moser, 1999; Griffith, 2004a, 2004b; Ellis, 1991, 1992).

Another scholar contended that “On the side of the gang and gang leader: priority access to government contracts, enhanced authority over the various (fractions) and ‘corners’ in the constituency, and most important of all, police protection and cover” (Robotham, 2003, 217), are afforded. Garrison politics have claimed the lives of many people in the Caribbean, and Figueroa and Sives (2003) empirically established the association between political garrisonization and crime, political polarization and economic marginalization, the escalating crimes in Jamaica, and the long standing union that has existed between politics and crime. Munroe (2002) argued that, if crime and violence continues, and personal freedom has to be sacrificed in order to address the problem, then the need would arise for analysis of the political culture (p. 11) and by extension, this study is advocating for an inquiry into the ‘theoretical frameworks’ used to interpret crime data and create the pathway to facilitate the divorce between politics and crime.

Though necessary, it is not sufficient for these frameworks to provide empirical basis to fashion, implement, and redesign policies that address current realities as the crime phenomenon has reached a pandemic status in the island. To gain an understanding, therefore, of the marriage between politics and crime, one must commence with a review of the theoretical frameworks underpinning the interpretation of the data, which have been used for decades to guide the numerous policy frameworks in the Caribbean. In reality, the crime phenomenon continues to elude policy planners as they have not to date effectively designed any programmes that have a significant impact on the crime pandemic. Harriott contended that the “Traditional law enforcement methods have similarly proved to be ineffective. The criminal justice system needs to be reformed and modernized” (Harriott, 2004, p. 262), suggesting that it is of critical importance for us to examine the underlying assumptions.
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and theoretical frameworks utilized to interpret
the data and guide policy formulation.

If traditional methods of crime prevention have
not worked over the years, then the answer may
be in the theoretical frameworks, which have
been used. The current research is not
forwarding the notion that there is inherent error
embedded within the theoretical frameworks
utilized to interpret crime in the Caribbean,
especially in Jamaica. However, within the
context of Harriott’s postulation that the
traditional methods of crime fighting have been
ineffective, one of the questions that must attract
attention is the theoretical frameworks. Over the
decades, many of the studies in the Caribbean on
crime and politics, crime and poverty, and crime
general have utilized positivistic theoretical
framework (Francis, et. al., 2001; Harriott, 2003a,
2003b, 2004; Boxill et al., 2007; Bourne, 2011;
March and Bourne, 2011; Ellis, Figueroa and
Sives, 2003; Brathwaite, 2004; Brathwaite and
Harriott, 2004)and some have used
constructionism (Robotham, 2003; Simmonds,
2004; Mars, 2004; Barnes, 2004). In spite of the
approach used by scholars and/or researchers,
there is a consensus that crime and politics are
related in the Caribbean, and that this nexus
must be broken in order for the societies to have
real development (Wilson, 2016).

Much emphasis has been placed on survey
research methodology in the study of crime in
the Caribbean, as leading criminologists and
scholars such as Professor Anthony Harriott
advocated for effective crime policies to be
driven by empirical evidence. There is no denial
that empiricism provides invaluable insights into
the understanding of the crime phenomenon that
can be generalizable and precise in measurement
and, therefore, used to forecast relatively
accurately. Still there is no harm in examining the
theoretical frameworks used and findings
presented aimed at distilling how an
understanding of these can provide a guideline
for future research, policy framework, and more
empirical inquiries.

**RATIONALE OF THIS STUDY**

Gary Becker (1968) as well as Francis et al. (2001)
opined that the involvement in crime is an
economic phenomenon. It follows then that the
current difficult economic hardship in Jamaica, as
expressed in the general downturn in the
economy, coupled with the decline in remittance
inflows (Ramocan, 2011) will instigate a rise in
criminal activity as people continue to experience
socio-economic and political marginalization.

In an ethnographic study by Horace Levy,
Chevannes who wrote the ‘Forward’ stated that,
“Jamaica is a scene of escalating violence. 1980,
the year when political violence claimed the lives
of 600 combatants and innocents, and other
violence added another 289, appeared as unique”
(Levy, 1996, x). However, this was more of the
beginning of a trend which incidentally is seen
within the Caribbean region (United Nations and
World Bank, 2007).

For example, there is a long history of political
tribalism and crime in Haiti dating back to “Papa
Doc” Duvalier (1957-71). Other Caribbean nations
in which the marriage between politics and
criminality exist include Trinidad and Tobago, St.
Lucia, and Dominic Republic (Ryan, 1997; United
Nations and Economic Commission for Latin
American and the Caribbean, 2008; United
Nations and World Bank, 2007).

According to the World Bank (2003), the crime
problem in Jamaica (murder rate) was about the
same as that in New York in 1970 and by 2000,
murders in Jamaica had exceeded that in New
York seven times. As advised by Munroe (2002)
the political culture needs to be analyzed across
the Region. It can be extrapolated from Munroe’s
theorizing that understanding the crime problem
is based on examining the politics, power
structure (politics), political values and cultures of Caribbean nations.

The seriousness of the crime problem in the Caribbean, which resulted in a conference in the 1990s, echoes a call for the understanding of this phenomenon. One of the leading criminologists in the Caribbean opined that traditional approaches to the crime issues, especially crime reduction practices by policy makers as well as the police have been ineffective. Such a perspective demands an examination of not only the policies but also the theoretical frameworks that have been utilized to interpret the data. The rationale for such an inquiry is based primarily on the premise that many studies in the Caribbean region have been used to formulate and implement policies.

This research will evaluate the theoretical frameworks used by researchers to interpret the crime data and the nexus between crime and politics and will serve as a guideline for future policy frameworks. It will also provide empirical evidence to better guide policy implementation. Are the assumptions guiding the theoretical frameworks faulty and as such, the underlying principles for implementation have also been faulty? Hence, the rationale for the present study that aims to critically examine the theoretical frameworks used in the past to evaluate crime data, establish the preposition of the relationship between crime and politics and provide a review that will allow for assessment into why there is a problem with an effective crime policy in the Caribbean.

In addition, the study will provide a platform for the justification of why the two main theoretical approaches can be used to create better development for the region. Another rationale is the value of research in policy implementation as the underpinnings of the crime phenomenon in the Caribbean must be attributable to some issue that is currently missed by policy makers, and research seeks to examine the theoretical perspectives as one such contribution.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A theoretical framework is a self-conscious set of (a) fundamental principles or axioms (ethical, political, philosophical) and (b) a set of rules for combining and applying them (e.g. induction, deduction, contradiction, and extrapolation). A theoretical framework defines the objects of a discourse, the permissible ways of thinking about those objects, and so determines the kinds of knowledge about the objects that can be produced legitimately within the framework” (Cubitt, S, personal communication, October 6, 2005 in Waller, 2006, 25).

The science of research is, therefore, not only expressed in natural (or pure) sciences like chemistry, physics, medicine, mathematics and metaphysics; but it is in the theoretical framework and the methodology that are applied to the investigation. For centuries, Positivism, which is a theoretical framework has been used to guide methodologies that were primarily quantitative (Kuhn, 1996; Balashov and Rosenberg, 2002) and accounts for discoveries like Newton’s Law “F=ma” (Force is equal to product of mass and acceleration). This theoretical framework guided scientific attitude as science was embodied in proof, verification, validation and objectification. This explains the preponderance of inquiries that utilize the positivist and post-positivist theoretical framework and methodologies to examine crime in the Caribbean.

Crotty (2005) remarked that:

we describe the philosophical stance that lies behind our chosen methodology. We attempt to explain how it provides a context for the process and grounds its logic and criteria... (and) this is precisely what we do when we elaborate our theoretical perspective (Crotty, 2005, 7)
Such an elaboration is a statement of the assumptions brought to the research task. It is driven by a particular theoretical thinking, which is reflected in the methodology (Crotty, 2005, 7). With the purpose of this work, there had to be a classification of the main works on crime in the Caribbean within some theoretical framework. On review of the literature, theoretical frameworks (perspectives, theories or models) that explain the underpinnings of many works on crimes in the Caribbean region are 1) positivist and/ or post-positivist, and 2) social constructionism.

**POSITIVISM**

Owing to the issues of 1) generalizability, 2) falsification (or proof), 3) reliability, 4) repeatability, and 5) objectivity (Balashov and Rosenberg, 2002) studies, which seek to examine associations and/or causation have used a positivist theoretical framework. Using a positivist theoretical framework to study crime dates back decades. Becker (1968), using econometric analysis-regression technique-a tool in objectivism, established factors that influenced an individual’s choice to engage in criminality. Becker’s seminal work empirically establishes what is widely known as the economics of crime. Becker’s ‘utility maximization crime’ framework expresses crime as a function of many variables. This is encapsulated in Equation [1], below:

\[ y = f(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6, x_7) \]  
\[ \text{where } y = \text{hours spent in criminal activities,} \]
\[ x_1 = \text{wage for an hour spent in criminal activity,} \]
\[ x_2 = \text{hourly wage in legal employment,} \]
\[ x_3 = \text{income other than from crime or employment} \]
\[ x_4 = \text{probability of getting caught,} \]
\[ x_5 = \text{probability of being convicted if caught,} \]
\[ x_6 = \text{expected sentence if convicted, and} \]
\[ x_7 = \text{age} \]

One can understand Arnone and Borlini’s (2010) conclusion that “... harmful economic implications play a central role in orienting criminal policy” (p. 230). It can be extrapolated from the works of Becker (1968) and Arnone and Borlini (2010) that the economics of criminalization explains how marginalized people become engaged in crime. Within the context of association between crime and economics, econometrics techniques (quantitative techniques) can accommodate a plethora of factors reduced to a single dependent variable (crime). Many scholars have utilized this approach in an attempt to understand the myriads of issues that lead to crime. In order to effectively address the social phenomenon (crime), many researchers have utilized survey research methodology, which emanated from positivism as this provided an objective assessment of the issues from the perspective of association and/or causation. In addition, positivistic theoretical framework is in keeping with traditions of the pure sciences like physics, mathematics, and chemistry (Kuhn, 1996; Balashov and Rosenberg, 2002), rather than the non-hard science traditions.

Arnone and Borline aptly summarize the economics of crime when they opined that:

As extensively shown by economists, criminalization of ML [money laundering] rests upon legitimate economic, social and public interests of countries, and on the damage caused to these interests by the predicate crimes. The primary social consequence of the laundering action consists of the consolidation of economic power of criminal organizations, enabling them to penetrate the legitimate economy, to bribe officials, and, in turn, to create an environment where criminal activity permeates a country’s political system (Arnone and Borlini, 2010, 230)

Like Becker postulated, people will take the risk of becoming engaged into criminal activity based on the probability of being caught and convicted.
as well as other factors. Based on the principle of rationality, people will evaluate the cost of the price against the price of conviction before an action is taken for or against committing a crime. Hence, in the economics of crime is the critical component of risk assessment, which to be effective must be an ongoing process. Risk levels may change as new products are offered, as new markets are entered, as high-risk customers open or close accounts, or as financial institutions create or lose products, services, policies, or procedures change. Hence, the use of positivistic theoretical framework allows for the capturing of many issues, using objectivity, predictability, generalization, and statistical analysis (Crotty, 2005, 6).

SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIONISM

Crime is a social construct; as such it should be studied within this context. Using Weber’s (1949, 1974, 1981) perspective, social issues cannot only be studied from an objectivistic perspective (or positivistic theoretical perspective) as human soperate from a social perspective within their meaning systems. Hence, there are studies that have investigated the crime phenomenon from a constructionist perspective. This means that research construct meaning in order to understand issues in a society (Crotty, 2005).

Wortley (2004) used both quantitative and qualitative methodologies in the examination of ‘Images of Dispute’. For the qualitative aspect of the study, he employed construction and deconstruction of stories on ‘race and crime in the Toronto area’ (Wortley, 2004, 134). In this research, the theoretical perspectives to interpret other studies are 1) positivism-survey research, and 2) constructionism-construction and deconstruction of meanings.

The phenomenological perspective (theoretical framework) for this study is ‘Social Control Theory’. Social Control Theory forwards that crime is a natural part of human existence, which was echoed by Durkheim (1979). It is this social construction, which allows for the usage of econometric techniques in the analysis of the crime data. Using multiple regression techniques, Ellis (1991) found a nexus between crime and unemployment, Bourne (2011) found a strong direct association between crime and annual exchange rate, and a negative relationship between violent crimes and gross domestic product. Hence, the construction of meaning allows for utilization of quantitative and/or qualitative methodologies. Some of the various issues in the crime-politics phenomenon are comprehensively examined in the conceptual framework.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

For years, Caribbean criminologists have used econometric analyses to identify factors associated with crimes in order to understand the crime problem because of the rationale of wanting to institute policy measures that can combat the problem. Poverty has been identified and widely studied as causal factor of crime (Robotham, 2003; Ellis, 1991; Tremblay, 1995), and those who have not used the term causality have employed association (Harriott, 2004a, 2004b; Ellis, 1992’ Levy, 2001) as the discourses have centred on crime, crime and poverty, and crime and politics.

Tremblay (1995) and Ellis (1991, 1992) have used multiple regression techniques to determine factors that predict crime. Long before Tremblay (1995), the use of econometric were introduced and used in the examination of crime and it correlates (Becker, 1968). All the aforementioned scholars had used survey questionnaires to collect data on crime. Using survey data from Jamaica for 1950 to 1984, Ellis (1992) empirically establishes factors that account for crimes. The empirical model by Ellis (1992) identified socio-economic correlate of crime.
In a book edited by Harriott, Brathwaite and Wortley (2004) entitled ‘Crime and Criminal Justice in the Caribbean,’ the entire nine chapter studied used a positivistic theoretical perspective and/or a combination of quantitative and qualitative methodology. Another book by the title ‘Understanding Crime in Jamaica: New Challenges for Public Policy’ edited by Harriott (2003), eight of the ten chapters studied employed a quantitative methodology (or survey research). Even in articles such as ‘Fear of Criminal Victimization in Reputedly Violent Environment’ (Harriott, 2003a), ‘The Jamaican Lumpenproletariat: Rogue Culture or Avatar of Liberation?’ (Gray, 2003a), ‘Fear of Crime and the Risk of Victimization: An Ethnic Comparison’ (Chadee, 2003), two used quantitative methodology. In fact, both Harriott’s and Chadee’s work employed multivariate statistical techniques, logistic regression, and multiple regression analysis. Chadee went further when he used path analysis to establish factors, direction and inter-correlation between factors in a path model of fear of crime in three major ethnic groups in Trinidad.

Among the factors that have been empirically established as associated with crime in the Caribbean are 1) age, 2) area of residence, 3) subjective social class, 4) poverty, and 5) politics, (Ellis, 1992; United Nations and the World Bank, 2002; Bourne, 2011). One anthropologist, using established empirical work on the association between crime and poverty as well as other factors (Tremblay, 1997), contended that poverty (or material deprivation and marginalization) is exploited by the political arena in Jamaica and has produced the violence society that exists today (Robotham, 2003). Unlike other studies that utilized survey research methodology and advanced statistical techniques, Robotham (2003) used various social constructions to argue his perspective about the marriage between crime and politics in Jamaica.

In addition to poverty, other factors that influence crimes can be classified under the heading of social, cultural, economical and political conditions (Robotham, 2003; Tremblay, 1995; Ellis, 1992; Bourne 2010). Policy makers continue to rely on empirical inquiry to implement policies in the Caribbean, because of the validity of utilizing positivistic theoretical perspectives. Harriott aptly summarized the failure of conventional theorizing, when he opined that “Traditional law enforcement methods have similarly proved to be ineffective” (Harriott, 2004a, 262), which would include the long-established factors of crime. Using secondary data, Bourne (2011) employed multiple regression technique and found that long established association between poverty and crime was a spurious correlation. When other factors such as 1) gross domestic product, 2) exchange rate, 3) unemployment and 4) inflation were placed in a single model with poverty, poverty was not statistically associated with violent crime rates in Jamaica. However, when poverty was the only independent variable it was moderately related to the violent crime rates.

Using econometric analysis, Nobel prize winner Becker (1968) established that involvement in crime activities can be explained by income received from criminal activities, legal employment, probability of being caught, probability of being convicted, duration of sentencing if caught, age and income from non-criminal engagements. It can be deduced from Becker’s work that crime is predominantly an economic phenomenon, which was supported by Alfred Francis and his colleagues (2001), using data for Jamaica. Although Francis et al. did not include politics among the independent variables; they found that the economic factors contributed significantly to involvement in criminality, which does not eliminate the political factor as well as socio-demographic correlates. If the economic factor accounts for the crime-problem in Jamaica,
then why did the murders increased by 17.5% in 2007 over 2006? In this time poverty declined by 30.8% and mortality rise by 8.2% (PIOJ, 2006, 2007; PIOJ and STATIN, 2006, 2007; see also Appendix I). Such a finding highlights the paradoxes in the crime-poverty paradigm, and demands another explanation.

For decades, researchers in the Caribbean have contended that poverty is statistically associated with crime (Harriott, 2003, 2004; Ellis, 1992; Robotham, 2003), but recently, using positivistic theoretical perspective, Bourne (2011) disagreed with the traditional perspective. Despite the aforementioned issue, the use of quantitative methodology allows Boxill and his colleagues to make the statement that:

Crime and violence have been a problem in the Caribbean for many years. While it would have been helpful to present accurate crime data for each territory, studies suggest that crime and violence have been severely under reported. However, the problem of escalating crime, its causes, consequences and curtailment have emerged as a primary cause of public outcry and a major area of concern for the region's administrations since the 1990s (Boxill, et al., 2007, 113).

The general perspective of crime and politics is not limited to 1) political victimization, 2) political garrisonization of areas and the conflict which arises among different communities’ political preference, and 3) badness honour, politics and violence; but it is also about authority, decision, power, policies, and the socio-economic marginalization of people within a society.

“Political crimes and crime-politics relationships may be most sharply manifested in the garrisons, but are evident in political activities outside of them” (Harriott, 2003b, xi). He went on to say that “Much has been said about the crime-politics nexus in popular discourse, and some of this is shared by authors in this volume” (Harriott, 2003b, xiii). It can be extrapolated from Harriott’s perspective that political mobilization is pivotal to the social roots of crime in the Caribbean, especially in Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago and Guyana. According to Sives (2003) reporting a respondent that “When the JLP declared war on the PNP in 1942, JLP ruffians began to attack PNP meetings” (p. 54). She went on to say that:

The Battle of Rose Town demonstrated that the PNP had developed an ability to match the JLP on the streets of Kingston. ... The PNP were not attacking anybody but they would defend themselves now that they were powerful and strong, they would match the Labourites (Sives, 2003, 56).

This suggests that politics in Jamaica was accounting for violent crimes. It should be noted here that the nexus between politics and crime is typical in the Caribbean. A statement by United Nations and World Bank (2007) highlights the crime-politics paradigm in the Caribbean:

Political violence is not a novelty in Haiti’s history, and it neither started nor ended with the Duvalier regime, although this regime’s violent record was unprecedented. “Papa Doc” Duvalier (1957-71) began to institutionalize political violence soon after he was elected in 1957, by establishing a force of cagoulards (“hooded men”) charged with silencing supporters of rival candidates (who challenged the election results), as well as other dissidents, which gradually developed into a more extensive network of spies for the Duvalier regime (United Nations and World Bank, 2007, 28)

The report went on to say that:

Gun ownership is an outgrowth of the drug trade and, in some countries, a legacy of party politics and associated garrison communities. Within these environments, which promote the demand for weapons, reducing gun ownership is a difficult undertaking. At the regional level, coordination between law enforcement agencies on
intelligence and interdiction are important. At the national level or sub-regional level, better gun registries, marking and tracking can help, as can be improved gun interdiction in ports. Long run and sustained reduction in the demand for guns, however, will hinge on progress in combating drugs and on changing the cultural factors, which increase the demand of young men for weapons (United Nations and World Bank, 2007, 153).

Hence, the outcry that “The nexus between garrison communities and political parties must be broken” (Harriott, 2003a, 233) should be expected as the crime phenomenon can only be effectively addressed by a crime and politics solution. Whether crime is analysed from the perspective of positivism or constructionism, it is a complex social phenomenon, which cannot be solved by way of a single variable. Not because the issue is studied from an objectivist perspective means that its causes are comprehensively understood, and policies must be implemented within a holistic paradigm in order to grasp other meanings and explanations outside of a positivist theoretical perspective. Jones (2000) warned that “The idea of a cause of violence must be treated with care” (p. xiii) as even in quantitative analyses care must be taken in the interpretation of data.

METHODOLOGY

The current study undertakes to examine ‘The main theoretical frameworks used to interpret data on crime in the Caribbean’, and in order to do this the researchers adopted a phenomenological theoretical perspective. For this study, data were used from different government agencies (i.e., Economic and Social Survey of Jamaica, 1970-2015), document reviews and archival records.

Different researchers have carried out scientific inquiries on social issues and some methodologists have joined the discourse to provide an understanding of how the process can be accommodated (Crotty 2005; Neuman 2006; Boxill, Chambers and Wint 1997; Babbie 2007; Gubrium and Holstein, 2001; Goel, 1988; Berg, 2001; Balashov and Rosenberg, 2002; Bryman, 2001). Of all the methodologists and social researchers who have sought to examine social phenomena, Michael Crotty’s work summarized the research process in a simple diagrammatic and systematic manner, as well as provides a comprehensive description of each component (Crotty, 2005). He noted that the research process can be classified into four schema (i.e. four questions which must be answered in examining social phenomena), namely (1) methods, (2) methodology, (3) theoretical perspective and (4) epistemology (see 1).

RESEARCH PROCESS

Many scholars, for example, (Crotty 2005; Neuman 2006; Boxill, Chambers and Wint 1997; Babbie 2007; Bryman and Cramer 2005) have written on social research methods but the researchers has found Michael Crotty’s monograph aptly fitting for this paper as it summarized the research process in a diagrammatic and systematic manner while providing elaborate details of each component. In the text titled ‘The Foundations of Social Research: Meaning and Perspective in the Research Process’, Crotty (2005) aggregated the research process in four schema (i.e. four questions which must be answered in examining social phenomena), namely (1) methods, (2) methodology, (3) theoretical perspective, and (4) epistemology.

The four schema of the research process according to Crotty (2005, 2-4) are encapsulated into a flow chart (See 1).
Michael Crotty, a lecturer in education and research study at the Flinders University of South Australia, contended that a research is guided by the choice of a methodology and method. Of which, the chosen methodology and method clearly depicts the set of assumptions the researcher has about reality (Crotty 2005, 2) (i.e. what [he/she] brings to the work?). The schema of the research process is simply not a unidirectional model (Crotty 2005, 2-4). Crotty (2005) pointed out that the research process begins with an epistemology followed by a theoretical perspective, methodology and method. Embedded in this schema is the process of carrying out a research and there is stringency to the direction that must be followed.

Empiricism is responsible for a plethora of germane and critical discoveries that have aided humans’ existence; even so, it fails to explore potent things about people, which emerged using qualitative methodologies. People are social beings, which means that their behaviours are unpredictable, fluid, and while some generalizability exist therein, the ‘whys’ (meanings) are still unasked with the use of empirical inquiry (or objectivity and measurability). Qualitative inquiry lessens some of the inadequacies of objectivity, provides rich data on humans’ experiences, and aids in a comprehensive understanding of people, their actions and meanings system (Balashov and Rosenberg, 2002; Silverman, 2005; Neuman, 2003; Kuhn, 1996; Berg 2001; Burnham, et al., 2004; Goel, 1988). Thus, qualitative inquiry should not, therefore, be seen as an alternate paradigm to quantitative inquiry, but as a member of the understanding apparatus.

This supports the argument of Schlick (1979) that researchers cannot know the truth without knowing the meaning (p.15), suggesting a mixed methods approach is best for human inquiry. For this study, therefore, a mixed methods approach was applied, as it would provide a more comprehensive understanding of any single social phenomenon. In keeping with the scientific research methodologies, this work utilized documentary analysis of the phenomenon of crime and politics in the Caribbean.

**DOCUMENT REVIEWS**

The researchers reviewed written documents including books, journal articles, and scholarly articles online. The review was to determine 1) theoretical framework, 2) items for instrument, 3) epistemological framework for the study, and 4) how to interpret the statistical analysis as well
as study. A major reason for the document review was to assist in triangulating (Sevigny, 1977) and validating information obtained in the interview, given that interviews “rarely constitute the sole source of data in research” (Johnson, 2001 in Gubrium and Holstein; 104: Bryman, 2001; 274: Hertz and Imber, 1995; ix), as well as framing the study.

**ETHICAL CONCERNS AND INFORMED CONSENT**

Like Kuhn noted, science is so because of the approaches taken, the rigours followed, objectivity, measurement, and gradual development. The social science is an inquiry into social phenomena, meaning peoples’ attitudes, behaviours, and perceptions. Because social science is about people, care must be taken in how the information is gathered (Babbie, 2007; Neuman, 2006). To comprehend the seriousness of ethical issues, in Neuman’s book entitled “Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches’ chapter 5 reads ‘The Literature Review and Ethical Concerns’, suggesting that document analysis which provides the context for scientific investigation must take into consideration ethical standards that hold true throughout the research process.

He opined that “Researchers need to prepare themselves and consider ethical concerns as they design a study so that sound ethical practices is built into the study design” (Neuman, 2006, 116). He noted further that “Ethics define what is or is not legitimate to do, or what “moral; research procedure involves” (Neuman, 2006, 110).

In keeping with Neuman’s perspective, this study is a review of existing studies and, therefore, has no ethical issues.

**VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

Kuhn, who has a doctorate in physics argued extensively on the validity and verifiability of qualitative inquiry despite its seemingly non-objectivism. Knowing how things operate was not singly embedded in empiricism, objective measurability and statistical analyses (Kuhn, 1996; Balashov and Rosenberg, 2002), as meaning accounts for actions that are sometimes outside of the realm of objectivism. It can be extrapolated from Kuhn’s perspectives that validity and reliability is equally important in all scientific inquiry, and the issues of conceptualization and measurement must include an aspect of validity and verification.

For any research project to be credible, its reliability and validity have to be clearly established (Wiersman, 2000). As such, the necessary steps taken to ensure that the proposed project has both internal and external validity and internal and external reliability on the instrument used are outlined. According to Wiersman, reliability is concerned with the consistency of the methods, conditions, and results while validity deals with the accurate interpretability of the results and the generalizability of the results.

The reliability and validity of this study is embedded in those of the primary study. Many of the primary studies reviewed herein were scholarly works and published papers by established and reputable institutions like the 1) United Nations, 2) World Bank, and 3) ECLAC.

**LIMITATIONS TO THE STUDY**

This study relies on the accuracy of previous researched works and did examine the studies for validity and reliability of instrument, sample design, and measurement. Another limitation of the study is the extensive usage of studies on Jamaica, and the rationale is simply because of the published works on the areas instead of other geopolitical localities.

**DISCUSSION**

Harriott postulated that “The seeds of the crime-politics phenomenon in Jamaica were planted
and nurtured over decades of competitive party politics” (Harriott, 2003, xiii), which was extensively reviewed by Sives (2003). In evaluating the historical roots of violence in Jamaica from ‘Historic Records’, Sives noted that both the Jamaica Labour Party (JLP) and the People’s National Party (PNP) supporters or sympathizers committed crimes in the 1940s, and that political tension dates back to pre-independence. There is enough evidence that exists to show that the socio-economic situation as well as the politics provides an explanation for the crime pandemic in the Caribbean.

The dismantling of marriage between politics and crime in Western Kingston (Jamaica), especially Tivoli Gardens, was reached because the influence of the situation constrained the tactics in the execution of the threat analysis. Clearly the threat, which once existed in Western Kingston, has been lowered and this has changed the perception of Jamaicans outside of Kingston on the physical harm, crime and violence, and protection. People are not expressing confidence in the police being able to man the streets; with fear, political interference, favour, apprehension, and many of the basic features of security have been addressed in a single act.

For years the security process and decision of the Jamaica Constabulary Force (JCF) have not been a rational one. The very police were afraid to venture into Tivoli Gardens because of the synergy and relationship between politics and crime. On the part of the police, there were fear, anxiety, terror, and apprehension on venturing into a discourse, much more a visit to the area in Jamaica. There was self-interest that prevented the free movement of police and the military from entering that physical site, and fear more than terror accounts for the non-responsiveness of people, away from breaking the twin phenomenon, crime-and-politics, that made the crimes continue without the ease with which to stop the problems.

Many Jamaicans wanted a separation between crime and politics, especially in Tivoli Gardens, but that reality seemed far-fetched. Robotham argued that there was an association among criminality, politics, and area of residence (Robotham, 2003, 216). Robotham continued to say that:

Extensive involvements in protection and extortion rackets in business districts adjacent to inner-city areas represent another major activity for criminal gangs. Indeed, many informants stated that the basis of the much-lauded peace was the desire on the part of two gang leaders with opposing political affiliations to have an organized sharing of the protection rackets in downtown Kingston [Tivoli Gardens-Jamaica Labour Party, JLP and Matthews Lane-People’s National Party, PNP (p. 216).

The marriage between crime and politics in Jamaica goes back to the 1940s (Sives, 2003), and beyond Western Kingston, particularly Tivoli Gardens (Levy, 2001). It is safe to say that poverty should not be ascribed as the rationale for the badness-honour society that had emerged over time (Gray, 2003).

Based on the dictates of the ‘macro-economic climate’ in Jamaica, threat continuance, terrorism alert, and strong correlation between crimes, particularly murders, and self-interest, the then JLP administration, headed by the Right Honourable, Prime Minister Mr. Bruce Golding, realised there was no ‘peace of mind’ for police, the government, and ultimately the security of the society. Security was under threat; fear had gripped the psyche of the people (Harriott, 2004b), the reality of Jamaica being among the ten most murderous places on earth denoted that economic pay-off of allowing Tivoli Gardens to continue unabated meant that the whole nation would be under threat, fear, and the feeling of crime and victimization, and justified why the government had to fight for a separation between crime and politics.
There would be no ‘peace of mind’ with the marriage between politics and crimes in garrison communities in Jamaica as the society was paying too high a price in the forms of loss of lives (murders), economics (lowered GDP, productivity, production, and tourism arrivals), and security, which in feature of all modern society had become elusive. Fear had replaced the overarching concept of safety and human rights. Security is good and increasingly Jamaicans had been left out of this basic human right, and so a divorce of crime and politics holds the key to unlocking the garrisonization of the all-embracing concept of polization of the society.

One of the aspects by which the marriage of crime and politics can be lowered, if not eradicated in the Caribbean (in Jamaica, Haiti, Trinidad and Tobago, St. Lucia and Guyana) is by significantly reducing economic vulnerability. Politicians are among the populace who are at risk of harm or danger, with the twinning of politics and crime. Roy McGhan was a politician (Member of Parliament in Jamaica) who was killed along with his police agent in 1979. According to the United Nations and World Bank:

The Dominican Republic, while one of the few civil law countries in the Caribbean, is a quintessential example of the broader Latin American justice reforms. Trujillo’s thirty-one years dictatorship (1930-1961) was accompanied by a centralized, ad hoc domination of all governance institutions, including those in the justice sector. With the advent of democracy, this system was quickly replaced by party-based, patronage politics in which governmental elites used public employment as a means of consolidating coalitions and rewarding followers. Low official salaries and massive turnovers at the end of every administration increased the incentives to seek irregular supplements and to dedicate little effort or time to one’s official job. (United Nations and World Bank, 2008, 108)

The report went on to say that:

Gun ownership is an outgrowth of the drug trade and, in some countries, a legacy of party politics and associated garrison communities. Within these environments, which promote the demand for weapons, reducing gun ownership is a difficult undertaking. At the regional level, coordination between law enforcement agencies on intelligence and interdiction are important. At the national level or sub-regional level, better gun registries, marking and tracking can help, as can improved gun interdiction in ports. Long run and sustained reduction in the demand for guns, however, will hinge on progress in combating drugs and on changing the cultural factors, which increase the demand of young men for weapons (United Nations and World Bank, 2008, 153).

The crime problem in the Caribbean therefore is knotted at the navel of politics, political patronage, political ideology, and political segregation. The perspectives of the United Nations and the World Bank went to the crux of the crime pandemic, politics. Owing to economic marginalization of many peoples in the Caribbean, party politics and loyalty have been used to distribute scare resources (United Nations and ECLAC, 2008; Gray, 2003a, 2003b; Sives, 2003; Figueroa and Sives, 2003; Robotham, 2003; Harriott, 2003a, 2003b, 2004). The use of Control Theory to study crime, explains why many researchers in the Caribbean have used positivistic theoretical perspective and social constructionism to gather, control, and interpret data. With crime being a social and complex phenomenon, which is influenced by many issues, the vulnerability of resources can account for peoples’ involvement (Ellis, 1991; Becker, 1968).

Manunta (1998) commented that “The vulnerability of the asset relates to the possibility of the damage; that of Protector and Situation is an opening to the opportunity of provoking a damage”(p. 67), suggesting that, if politicians recognize the likelihood of being harmed, especially killed, self-interest is likely to see them
lowering if not eradicating the marriage between crime and politics as this favours their existence. The vulnerability and threat level will not only see politicians requesting special agents (VIP agents), but considering dismantling the linkages between the two aforementioned phenomena as this would lower risk, damage, and increase opportunities for ‘favourable occasions’.

If politicians consider that they have something to lose, particularly their own lives they were more likely to institute measures to dismantle the marriage between politics and crimes. Their self-interest means that they will protect themselves from personal harm. The winning of political seats in an election is an opportunity to serve the people of a specified geo-political area. The reduction of this opportunity through any vulnerability is likely to encourage a willingness to divorce crime and politics, and even more so would definitely stimulate a justification, if the safety of the individual politician were compromised.

The high probability of losing one’s life is a positive reinforcement for politicians to see the need to disconnect crime from politics. Self-preservation is critical in human existence, and if politicians assume that they are highly likely to be vulnerable, be killed, or miss opportunities, then the deterrent to protect life will translate into separation between the two phenomena because of self-interest.

The general elections of 1980 was a conflict of sort over political ideology between socialism and capitalism and this heightened the violence and murders as the two political parties [the People’s National Party (PNP) and the Jamaica Labour Party (JLP)] caused division among the people (Sives, 2003). The violent crimes and murders statistics embodied the tension, political divide, ideology conflict, and how socialistic and capitalistic ideology accounted for the leadership of the nation. Political identity had divided the nation, people chose political sides and this resulted in the formation of a certain kind of attitude and behaviour toward each other.

Many of the murders were based on the premise of political values and attitude as one side of the divide saw the other as traitor, and the national identity was reduced to political values. The political rivalry was intense, people of different political values had fundamental problems with his neighbour on political ideology, and threat alert grew for heads of the two political parties at the time; former Prime ministers’ Michael Manley and Edward Seaga.

In the 2007 report on Haiti, the United Nations and World Bank posited that:

More recently, Haiti’s democratic experience has failed to provide capable and stable governance. Initially, democracy was brutally repressed by the army and their supporters, using armed paramilitary groups that have been a feature of Haitian politics since Duvalier’s macoutes. From Aristide’s return in 1994, democracy was undermined by deep conflicts among erstwhile democratic allies, resulting in a political stalemate that lasted almost from Aristide’s return in 1994 until his departure in 2004, and which undermined economic growth and state building alike. Moreover, it transformed important parts of the democratic movement, the urban popular organizations, into agents for the Lavalas party, using brutal violence in struggles over territorial control and state favors. With Aristide’s departure, some of these groups are bent on undermining the political process, in collusion with some former political leaders. Their area of operation and influence is in the slums and “popular areas” that provide a rich reservoir of potential recruits. Violence and insecurity in these areas is pervasive and these “entrepreneurs of violence” are capable and willing to engineer violence for political or other purposes, as the line between political and criminal violence has become increasingly blurred (United Nations and World Bank, 2007, 38)
Professor Trevor Munroe (2002) extensively explained how political culture drives political behaviour, which would account for the action (or inactions) of people during the 1970s leading up to the 1980 general elections in Jamaica and what happens in Haiti between 1993 and 2005. Despite the number of murders, only one Member of Parliament was ever killed in the history of Jamaica, which means that, although the threat level for the populace was high, it was lower for the politicians. This could explain the low tendency by politicians to effectively address crime, particularly the murder problem. Based on Manunta’s theory, vulnerability among politicians was low. This speaks for a low risk, which could justify a low motivation by politicians to eradicate the crime and politics paradigm because self-preservation was intact. Neither the existing situation demanded it nor was policy makers pressed to divorce both phenomena.

The rationale for the exponential increase in violent crimes, especially murders in the 1980, can be traced to armed criminal gangs. This began operating at the start of the 1970s, which aided the political parties (Gray, 2003; Sives, 2003). The politicians, therefore, had a vested interest in allowing the marriage of crime and politics to continue, as it was a personal benefit and not a cause for concern. Historically, at the end of the decade of the 1980s, murders had increased by 85.3% compared to the decade of the 1970s, but this had contributed to the election of a political party that used the gangs to its benefit (Sives, 2003; Figueroa and Sives, 2003). The decade of the 1990s saw a 54.6% increase in murder over the 1980s, and at the end of decade of 2000, murders grew by 76.4% compared to the previous decade (see Table 1 in the Appendix).

These 1970s and 1980s pale in significance to the number of murders in 2000, and although Gray postulated that “...the period of the 1970s, a time of great upheaval, political violence, and social polarization in Jamaica” (Gray, 2003, 3), the demands for close protection by the police grew as more people express feeling of fear of physical harm. The 'micro-environment' was changing and people began demanding a solution to the crime problem as well as the eradication of synergy between politics and crime.

Statistics revealed that the 1980s marked a transition in wanton murders, although its genesis began in the 1970s. Gray opined the following: 1) “…unforgiving ghetto during the party civil wars in the 1970s” (Gray, 2003, 2) “…the period of the 1970s, a time of great upheaval, political violence, and social polarization in Jamaica” (Gray, 2003, 3), 3) “Activists during the 1970s reported that Barth [criminal] was familiar with former CIA agent Philip Agee’s critique of U.S. imperialism...” (Gray, 2003, 28), and 4) by the late 1970s urban gangster for both the political and criminal underworlds were becoming a growing source of patronage with which politicians had to compete” (Gray, 2003, 30).

These issues highlighted the emergence of intense criminality, the informal industry which existed because of the failure of the formal economy to adequately provide for the needs of the people and the populace was now tired of the vulnerability, wanton killing of people, including the wealth and self-interest lead to a new consciousness. Harriott (2003) postulated that “Between 1977 and 2000, the rate of violent crime has increased from 254.6 incidents per 100,000 citizens to 633.4/100,000, and the murder rate from 19.2/100,000 to 39/100,000” (p. 35). This suggests that the risk of criminal victimization was high for all which eventually spurred the willingness of politicians, in a bid to protect self-interest, to divorce crime and politics as they worry about the likelihood of being physically harmed.

The types and degree of criminal activities in the Caribbean, particularly Haiti and Jamaica, have of necessity, occasioned a shift in emphasis and resources to major incidents such as murder,
shootings, guns for drugs trade, and gang related activities as the threat level among the politicians was growing and the ‘macro-climate’ was demanding a solution to the problem. The volumes of calls from the public to the police and other bodies have helped to set the organizational priorities people seek to protect their assets and life. The perceived fear factors demand a separation of crime and politics as this is believe to accounts for the high rate of criminality. And, while the mere volume of calls may be an important prescription for action, the types of calls were critical for action.

Within the ambits of the mandates of the police force as well as the political administration, decisions are made primarily based on perception, interpretation, and the expectations from outside bodies such as Amnesty International and the United Nations. Individuals, therefore, will weigh the cost and benefit of participating in legitimate or illegitimate activities, with punishment serving as the primary cost to determine the extent of their participation in each domain or venture.

Guns, violent crimes, and the volume of unsolved serious crimes were now well known. These had reached the international arena, fear and victimization had become rampant, and the police were increasingly placed under pressure to address these issues.

The wired media had headlines which read ‘Jamaica’s murder rate continues to soar’ in 2008 and ‘Jamaica record the highest murder rate in 2009’, and Jamaica was now among the 10 top countries with the most murders in the world. Crime, violence, and drugs in the Caribbean had become so much of an issue internationally that it caught the attention of the United Nations and the World Bank. The United Nations and World Bank (2007) conduct a study on ‘Crime, violence, and development: Trends, Costs, and Policy Options in the Caribbean’ which reveals:

The Governments of the Caribbean countries recognize the seriousness of the problem and are exploring innovative policy responses at both the national and regional levels. Civil society organizations are doing their part as well by designing and implementing violence prevention programs targeting youth violence, violence against women, and other important forms of violence (United Nations and World Bank, 2007, 8)

The seriousness of the crime problem in the Caribbean, particularly Jamaica, means that peoples’ fear of crime and victimization had reached an alarming level that they were now willing to circumvent the time that the police would take to solve the cases and the justice system would pronounce guilt on the criminals. This was reported by Harriott (2003), when he says that “In response to a series of incidents of violent crime, citizens mobilized themselves as vigilante groups and rioted and attacked a police station in an effort to “lynch” three men whom they erroneously thought were criminals and who had sought refuge in the police station” (p. 3).

Such a response from the citizenry is the value they now place on asset of life, property, and their psychological wellbeing, and that these are worthy of protection. Based on Manunta’s postulations that “The term ‘Asset’ is anything that can be threatened and damaged, and is consequently defended by the Protector” (Manunta, 1998, 54), it accounted for their willingness to see an end of the marriage between politics and crime as this twin-phenomenon threatened the very existence of life and property.

There is extensive empirical evidence that the Caribbean is experiencing a period of terrorism that emerged from narcotic transhipment and gun smuggling and that this does not serve the interest of politicians (Griffith, 2004a, 2004b). As the gang members (or underground traders) are not serving the interest of politicians as in the
1940s, 1970s and beyond, it follows that the macroeconomic climate as well as the microclimate are causing the gradual eradication of the crime and politics paradigm. Within the context of Robotham’s perspective that “Probably the most intractable factor contributing to violent crime in Jamaica is the interconnecting network of criminal gangs, drug running, politics, and the police” (Robotham, 2003, 215), Munroe’s comment (Munroe, 2002) offers an understanding of the pressing demand of publics (international and local) for the ‘breaking of the back’ of the crime and politics marriage which must extend to all types of crimes.

Poverty which incapacitates and individual choices (Sen, 1979, 1981; Levy, 1991; Robotham, 2003; Bourne, 2009, 2011; Senate Community Affairs Reference Committee, 2004) provides an explanation for the economics in the rise of the Lottery Scam based on the works of Becker (1968) and Francis et al. (2001). The Lottery Scam Business is a way out of poverty and despite the good or bad to this reality, it must be considered as an attempt to escape from poverty like some of the other ways identified by the Inter-American Development Bank (1998). It is not only a means to an end; the Scam is a gateway to other crime activities, and security management becomes a problematic issue therein and thereafter.

Despite the reduction in violent crimes in Jamaica (see Table 1 in the Appendix), the Lottery Scam which has become widespread in Jamaica, includes other crimes, and is a transnational business (Jamaica Gleaner, 2011c; Jamaica Observer, 2012; Jamaica Star, 2011). On examination of documentary evidence and reports in the media (Jamaica Observer, 2012; Jamaica Gleaner, 2011a, 2011b), Lottery scamming has resulted in economic downturn of businesses as they cease operations because they are unable to absorb sustained losses (Jamaica Gleaner, 2011a) and continuous threats to staffers. The lottery scam has even infiltrated the psyche of some members of the Jamaica Constabulary Force (JCF) and some have been charged for their involvement (Jamaica Observer, 2012). Despite the interconnectivity between lottery scamming and other criminal activities including murder, politics have aided its continuity as well as economic marginalization, which is a political matter in the Caribbean region. The United Nations and World Bank (2007) study entitled ‘Crime, Violence, and Development: Trends, Costs, and Policy Options in the Caribbean’ noted that:

[t]he Governments of the Caribbean countries recognize the seriousness of the problem and are exploring innovative policy responses at both the national and regional levels. Civil society organizations are doing their part as well by designing and implementing violence prevention programs targeting youth violence, violence against women, and other important forms of violence (United Nations and World Bank, 2007, 8)

Given the serious crime problem in the Caribbean, particularly Jamaica and Haiti, and the perceived unresponsiveness of the police (Levy, 2001; 4), peoples’ fear of crime and victimization had reached an alarming level. This has created a willingness to circumvent the formal system of justice and digress into vigilantism and or violent reprisals. The cumulative effect is the emergence of a culture of crime in the Caribbean. The socio-economic marginalization of the Caribbean people is a part of the rationale for political patronage. The fight for scarce resources, violence, continued political separation, and the political hierarchy supports the divisiveness as it fashions their governance of the society.

**CONCLUSION**

The utilization of ‘Control Theory’ has provided extensive literature and information for policy makers to address the crime problem in the
Caribbean region. Control Theory has given rise to causal and/or associational factors of crime (Ellis, 1991; Bourne, 2011; Harriott, 2003; Harriott, 2004; Tremblay, 1995; Becker, 1968). This theory has provided the social meaning underpinning the application of 1) positivistic theoretical framework and 2) social constructionism in the examination of crime data, the establishment of the marriage between crime-and-politics. The various studies in the Caribbean have not only been embedded in positivism and social constructionism, they have provided factors influencing crime and violence, which are the crux of many policy formulation and implementation.

The problems with policy implementation in the Caribbean are the benefit derived from criminality, political exclusion, and economic marginalization and how these can be used to gain political power. Hence, the marriage between crime-and-politics supports the political structure, which has been evident in Jamaica, Haiti, Trinidad and Tobago, St. Lucia, and Guyana. The case of solving the crime problem in the Caribbean is not hinged on the choice of theoretical frameworks used; it is the unwillingness of politicians to implement the recommendations, which emerge from the empirical evidence. The utilization of positivistic theoretical framework have provided an array of factors that influence crime, established the marriage of crime and politics, and provided the significant influence of particular factors; yet, many politicians select to implement those factors that are in keeping with their general benefits and self-interest than the full recommendation of the findings of the studies.

In summary, the association between crime, politics, and development (Ayres, 1998) mean that the high level of criminality in the Caribbean, particularly Haiti, Jamaica, and Guyana, has significantly retarded economic development. Other issues which have aided high levels of crime and violence in the Caribbean region are 1) inequality, 2) exclusion (economic, social and political) and 3) economic marginalization (Boullion and Buvinic, 2003). It is those inherent disparities in the societies which continue to be exploited by politicians as, if properly exploited, will provide political power.

The theoretical frameworks used by the various scholars in and outside the Caribbean on crime and politics in the region provide enough information for an effective solution to the crime problem; but this is barred by politics. Because crime is a natural part of human existence (Control Theory), some people may want to believe that there is no solution in sight, and that nothing should be done to curtail it in the society. Such a position violates human rights. Therefore, the utilization of positivistic theoretical perspective, as well as social constructionism has provided the framework for interpreting and understanding the crime phenomenon; the failure is the type of politics and the lack of political will to listen to the findings and implement the recommendations.
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APPENDIX I

Table 1. Number of Murders and violent crime, 1970-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Murder</th>
<th>Violent crime</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Murder</th>
<th>Violent crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>20698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>18522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>20173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>21275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>22403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>266</td>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>23083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>367</td>
<td></td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>24617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>15893</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1037</td>
<td>22053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>16640</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>19781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>351</td>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>17056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>24201</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>16469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>490</td>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1191</td>
<td>14929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>19867</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>14047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>424</td>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>13611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>21186</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>15306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1674</td>
<td>14920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>19228</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>13136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>442</td>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1574</td>
<td>14219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>19456</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1601</td>
<td>11432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>19886</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>11939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1428</td>
<td>11062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Planning Institute of Jamaica, various years