



The Correctional Facility: The Environment Today and in the Future

EDITH ELISABETH FLYNN

IN SEVERAL WAYS, the forthcoming chapters will examine the current state of the art of the correctional facility library service—its history, environment, standards, training of professional personnel, research—and analyze the patterns of correctional library services as they exist across the country. Utilizing the perspective of criminology, this chapter is intended as a springboard for these discussions. It must be said at the outset that correctional institutions—prisons and jails—have few friends. Dissatisfaction with them is widespread, in spite of their extensive use in the United States.

A brief review of the history of prison development reveals that the practice of imprisoning convicted offenders is a relatively recent phenomenon. Until about 200 years ago, most convicted offenders were fined, banished, mutilated, branded, tortured, or killed. Jails and prisons existed only as places where persons were held pending ransom or sentencing. In the second half of the eighteenth century, social philosophers and scientists—among them Montesquieu, Beccaria, Rousseau, and Blackstone—rejected the prevalent system of brutal punishments and bloodshed on the grounds of humanitarian concerns and social reform. Gradually, a new theory of criminal punishment evolved which advocated reform of the criminal through a regime of solitary imprisonment.¹ In 1787, Benjamin Franklin, Dr. Benjamin Rush and other like-minded reformers organized the Philadelphia Society for Alleviating the Miseries of Public Prisons. The society declared its belief that “solitary confinement to hard labor and total abstinence” would prove the most effective means in reforming criminals and prodded the Pennsylvania General Assembly to enact legislation providing such confinement by 1790.² Thus, the course of penal history was changed and the penitentiary system was

Edith Elisabeth Flynn is Associate Professor of Criminal Justice, Northeastern University, Boston.

born. As new institutions were built, the concept of solitary confinement—known as the Pennsylvania system—changed gradually to congregate confinement, where prisoners would be confined to solitary cells at night and work together during the day, under a strict rule of silence. As the new congregate or Auburn system gained in popularity, it was copied by many other states, because it supplied an inexpensive and convenient source of labor in the early years of the Industrial Revolution. A scant four decades later, Alexis de Tocqueville and Gustave de Beaumont, who had studied and admired early American prisons, observed that while some of the penitentiaries they had visited might serve as models for other countries to emulate, other facilities represented “everything which ought to be avoided.”³ The uneven quality of prisons and jails in the United States noted by Tocqueville and Beaumont prevails to this very day, along with many other problems.

A brief review of contemporary correctional practice reveals that the traditional prison, with its emphasis on the punishment, segregation and isolation of the offender from the community, is once again being superseded by newly emerging standards of human decency and new insights concerning the structure and purpose of corrections. Current innovations in correctional practice are based on the recognition that prisons have been highly effective in serving the goals of retribution and punishment but have failed in serving the goals of rehabilitation and offender reform. The search is on for new models of imprisonment and corrections which protect the fundamental principles of justice in a democratic society and which provide for the legitimate exercise of society’s power over the convicted offender. Any discussion of the future of the American correctional environment, however, would be remiss, and indeed seriously misleading, if it did not first examine the fundamental issues and problems in which criminal justice and the corrections system are embroiled today and which will have to be resolved before substantial progress can be made in improving society’s response to crime control and the treatment of offenders.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE, CORRECTIONS AND THE PREVAILING SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

Today, the American criminal justice system is buffeted by strong winds of public discontent and is in great turmoil concerning its purposes, objectives and methods. Changes in crime control policy are now being advocated which distinctively reflect a “hard-line” philoso-

Correctional Facility: Environment Today

phy as far as societal response to the offender is concerned.⁴ There are calls for increased police effectiveness, in view of the fact that the majority of offenders who commit crimes against persons and property escape apprehension. There are efforts to reform the judiciary, through the imposition of mandatory sentencing and the reduction or removal of the judges' discretionary powers by means of legislative fiat. Concomitantly, there is a drive to reduce the use of alternatives to incarceration (such as probation or the imposition of fines), in favor of prison sentences designed to lock away more offenders than ever before and for longer periods of time.

The impact of these efforts and changes has been to reverse a trend in criminal justice during which a greater selectivity and sophistication in the use of crime control and correctional methods were advocated. This trend probably reached its zenith with the publication of the report of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, which stressed that the great powers of the criminal justice system be reserved for controlling those persons who seriously threaten the safety of others, and which viewed the criminal justice system as the agency of last resort for social problems and the correctional institution as the last resort for correctional problems.⁵ Since the publication of that report, many court systems in the United States have assumed a more standardized and punitive function, judicial discretion has frequently been subjected to restraints, and the widespread use of alternatives to incarceration of the past has been supplanted by extended prison and jail terms. Statistics indicate that 1976 saw the highest prison population in the history of this country.⁶ The growth of prison and jail populations has now reached crisis proportion, and states are reopening old institutions that had been deemed unsuitable for human habitation in an earlier day. Tents, trailers, airport hangars and even old battleships are now being used to accommodate the onslaught of prisoners. Across the nation, inmates are reported to be crammed into every conceivable space and prison conditions are deteriorating fast.

The reasons for this far-reaching trend reversal are many. Philosophically, the return to the simplicities of punitive action against the criminal is politically attractive, and has been hastened by the writings of such conservative academicians as James Q. Wilson and Ernest van den Haag.⁷ There are many within, and without, the criminal justice system who prefer the uncomplicated processes of retribution to the discretionary latitude of social welfare-oriented decisions. From a practical perspective, it is incontestable that the criminal justice sys-

tem has been incapable of stemming the spiraling crime rate. Recidivism rates—the rates at which prisoners return to institutions because of new convictions—are unacceptably and notoriously high. There is widespread disenchantment with the rehabilitation model used by most correctional institutions because of its inherent coercive nature and its failure to achieve an acceptable degree of success. As a result, such liberals as David Fogel, Robert Martinson and Andrew von Hirsch have joined in the call for the swift and certain punishment of criminals to deter crime and for viewing punishment itself as intrinsically just and beneficial.⁸

What lies behind the failure of criminal justice and this general state of discontent? Unquestionably, the inability of criminal justice to reduce crime and the failure of corrections to correct have been due in part to public neglect in providing the system with sufficient financial and manpower resources. More significant in inhibiting change toward greater effectiveness, however, has been the way in which criminal justice has perceived its task and mission. The definition of *corrections* as society's official reaction to convicted adult and adjudicated juvenile offenders neither states nor implies what corrections should try to achieve. Such a statement is critical if realism is to replace current ideology and rhetoric in this troubled field. Corrections has many purposes, of which rehabilitation is only one. It could be argued that if correctional processes were truly rehabilitative, they should be extended to all who need them and not be restricted to the convicted adult or adjudicated juvenile. Corrections is limited to the convicted and adjudicated offender because there are other justifications for coercively intervening in their lives in addition to helping them. Among these justifications are the protection of the community from the depredations of those who cannot otherwise be controlled, special and general deterrence, the upholding and confirmation of the validity of society's laws, and the punishment of offenders who deliberately break the law.⁹ Clearly, correctional purposes must differ for various types of offenders. When a person is sentenced for murder, corrections serves a punitive and deterrent function. When a socially deprived, undereducated, vocationally incompetent youth is adjudicated delinquent, corrections should seek to rehabilitate and reintegrate that youngster into the mainstream of society.

There is no doubt that corrections can contribute more than it does to the reduction of crime. To the extent that recidivist crime contributes significantly to all crime, corrections should be able to reduce

Correctional Facility: Environment Today

crime; but it should be abundantly clear at this point that the pursuit of a single purpose for corrections—whether it be rehabilitation or punishment—is doomed to failure. Yesteryear's exclusive focus on the rehabilitation of offenders has failed incontestably. Insofar as the word *rehabilitation* suggests compulsory treatment or coercive programs, there is a growing body of opinion in criminal justice, supported by an impressive amount of scholarly research, that such a purpose is a mistake. Human beings inherently resist coercion, and correctional coercion elicits failure more often than success.¹⁰ The current return in corrections to neoclassical concepts of punishment and "just deserts for evil deeds" will, however, also fail. Despite the intuitive attraction and appealing simplicity of these concepts, it must be recognized that they too are built on faulty premises which deny the complexity of human behavior and ignore the multiplicity of purposes served by criminal justice and corrections. Most importantly, the advocates of greater punitiveness toward offenders and of higher rates of incarceration fail to consider the social and political costs of their recommendations. Rising jail and prison populations have exacerbated conditions under which inmates must live to intolerable levels. Too often, correctional institutions are characterized by inhumane conditions, crippling idleness, anonymous brutality, lawlessness, discrimination, and arbitrary decisions concerning the disposition and lives of offenders. An increasing number of judicial interpretations of offenders' rights reflect the plight of the corrections system and the belief that such practices are unlawful and counterproductive to instilling respect for the law in offenders. Yet, in spite of these developments, state legislatures and the public continue to deny the criminal justice system the tools and facilities it needs to develop a swift and effective criminal justice system that is respectful of due process and equity. Finally, it is essential to remember that in a democracy there is a need to maintain a delicate balance between the will of the majority and the rights and liberty of the individual. Because the defense of the rights of social misfits and criminals is unappreciated by most and odious to many, a society's willingness to grant these rights is probably the most sensitive indicator of the degree to which that society is willing to uphold the rights of all of its citizens. President Madison stated the issue well:

It is of great importance in a republic, not only to guard the society against the oppression of its rulers, but to guard one part of the society against the injustice of the other part. . . . Justice is the end

of government. It is the end of civil society. It ever has been and ever will be pursued until it be obtained, or until liberty be lost in the pursuit.¹¹

Even a cursory examination of the public attitude and the prevailing political climate concerning crime control in this country reveals that individual liberty is in distinct danger. Whenever the rights of society are deemed more important than the rights of individuals, and whenever there are some who are willing to sacrifice these rights in the name of law and order, or the safety of the streets, the very fabric of our society is threatened.¹²

CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS AND INNOVATIONS IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND CORRECTIONS

The discussion to this point has sketched the prevailing social environment of criminal justice in this country and has outlined some of the fundamental difficulties and problems that face corrections today. What follows is an examination and analysis of current developments and innovations in the field, followed by a discussion of the correctional institution of the future.

The most recent efforts to improve criminal justice and corrections have proceeded on the recognition that piecemeal reform and similar ameliorative undertakings will never suffice. If imprisonment of offenders is indeed to be used as an alternative of last resort and limited to offenders who represent a serious threat to the safety of others, the dangers of a piecemeal approach become even more apparent. As a result, a "total system approach" to reform is not being advocated by reformers who view criminal justice as a system comprised of the subsystems of the police, the courts and corrections.¹³ "System" is defined as a group of related and interdependent activities, actions, or events organized to achieve a common purpose—in this instance, the reduction and control of crime. Total system planning is a process that defines, analyzes, and develops responses to problems of a specific catchment (or service) area. The total system planning process is open-ended and describes the interactions between activities or components of one system (such as corrections) and those of another (law enforcement or courts). Changes in any single component will affect all the other components. For example, delays in arraignment scheduling of accused offenders will directly affect the number of persons awaiting trial and consequently the detention capacity of local jails. Basic to total system planning is the service area

Correctional Facility: Environment Today

concept. Service areas are demarcated by the scope of a particular problem that frequently crosses jurisdictions. Underlying this concept is the realization that social problems such as crime do not confine themselves to geopolitical boundaries. While each service area, such as a city or county, may have distinct problems as well as unique resources, there will always exist sufficient commonality to warrant subsystem coordination. In view of the characteristic fragmentation of criminal justice agencies in the United States, total system planning requires interjurisdictional cooperation, as well as functional integration of all subsystems (i.e. law enforcement, courts, corrections), and other related health and social welfare services.

When the foregoing concepts and considerations are applied to correctional institution planning, the new facility must now be viewed as but one element in a network of many service delivery components. The service delivery system network approach recognizes that a diversity of program responses is required to accommodate the varied and individual needs of the criminal justice system client. For example, within a given catchment area—whether it is a county, city-county combination, a major metropolitan area, or a state—a corrections program can now be developed on the basis of a network of dispersed services and facilities, geographically located to perform their functions best. The range of services, programs and facilities would differ considerably from existing corrections resources. Whereas present resources are generally confined to suspended sentences, probation, and jail or prison dispositions, the new system would provide a plethora of programs and services: diversion programs, community treatment approaches, intensive community supervision programs, halfway houses, a wide range of residential programs (with different degrees of structure and supervision), an extended use of fines based on an offender's ability to pay, partial incarceration (such as weekend incarceration, work-, and education-release), probation and parole programs, and ultimately some minimum-, medium- and high-security residential facilities for those offenders who represent a serious threat to the safety of the community. The overall perspective in the choice of disposition options would be the pursuit of the least restrictive assignments of offenders that is consistent with the protection of the public.

Within less than a decade, criminal justice planning has reached a relatively high level of sophistication. Assisted by computer simulation, special emphasis is now being placed on the early assessment and evaluation of individual offender needs, not only in terms of their

specific program requirements but also in terms of the levels of custody needed to protect society from those who are dangerous. To assure maximum effectiveness, such an assessment should logically occur at the point when an accused offender first enters the criminal justice system. Following that line of reasoning, the generic concept of an "Intake Service Center" has recently been developed, which plays a key role in making recommendations to the judiciary concerning a broad variety of dispositional alternatives in relation to individual cases.¹⁴ Among its many important functions are: (1) short-term intake screening that emphasizes the diversion of an individual to alternatives to incarceration; (2) development of presentence investigations for misdemeanants and felons alike, and subsequent recommendations to the courts concerning optimal dispositions; (3) diagnostic services relating to voluntary pretrial programs, presentence investigations, and correctional programs for sentenced offenders; (4) ongoing evaluation of offender adjustment to given programs; and (5) coordination and referral services related to in-house and community-based services. To wit, the Intake Service Center assumes the responsibility for the systematic coordination of the criminal justice system, including the diversion from the system to alternatives to incarceration, detention, and after-care programs for those offenders who receive prison sentences.

In the ideal situation, the Intake Service Center replaces the jail. Because the jail has long been recognized by scholars and administrators as the most neglected and most damaging "correctional" institution in the country in terms of human and social costs, and because the jail has always been impervious to change, its passing should leave few mourners. In less than optimal situations, the Intake Service Center augments jail operations. The concept of the center is now being adopted in many jurisdictions in the United States and has diverted many socio-medical problem cases from criminal justice or shunted offenders into programs that are of real help to them. Recommended by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, it is clearly an idea whose time has come and which will, in due time, change the face of corrections.¹⁵

THE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION TODAY AND IN THE FUTURE

One of the basic functions of a correctional institution is to protect the public by incarcerating individuals judged to be a threat to society. Historically, this function has dictated the fundamental design and

Correctional Facility: Environment Today

programs of penal institutions. But persistent widespread disturbances (punctuated periodically by outbursts of great violence and bloody riots), unacceptably high recidivism rates, and a general reassessment of correctional institutions by the general public have led to questioning of the adequacy of traditional program and design concepts in providing secure detention.

In the past, corrections facility security has been the predominant concern of administrators and has come almost solely under the purview of the custodial staff of institutions. As a result, traditional security procedures have been perpetuated, while programmatic innovations lagged. Conceptually, two types of security can be differentiated within any correctional institution: perimeter security and internal security.¹⁶ Perimeter security refers to the ability of a correctional institution to confine its inmates within the limits of a given area by means of walls and fences. Internal security refers to the ability of an institution to control the behavior of inmates within the facility in a manner consistent with the safety of prisoners and staff alike. This is usually accomplished by means of personnel and equipment (closed-circuit television) deployment and strict adherence to procedural policies. As a general rule, correctional facilities tend to concentrate their efforts on maintaining perimeter security and neglect to provide for internal safety. Layer upon layer of security devices (such as walls topped with concertina wire, razor blades and barbed wire; multiple chain-link fences supplemented by high-intensity lighting; sensing devices, radar, and attack dogs placed between fences), as well as weapons, have traditionally served to keep the inmates in and the public out. It is not surprising that this formidable array of hardware has managed to serve its purpose well. While no existing correctional facility can consider itself impervious to escape—time, dedication, challenge, and ingenuity are always on the inmate's side—there are relatively few escapes from American correctional institutions. In comparison, Scandinavian prisons have significantly higher escape rates. The plethora of perimeter security, however, has done little to provide for the safety of inmates and staff. Correctional institutions such as penitentiaries, reformatories, and even juvenile detention homes have come to be recognized as dangerous and unsafe in a growing body of correctional law.¹⁷ The courts have stressed that government through the administration of the correctional institution must take responsibility for protecting the inmate from harm, even as society is protected from him. Nevertheless, few wardens and

superintendents can guarantee the physical safety of their charges or assure them that none will become a victim of brutal, homosexual attack.

Why do correctional institutions fail in so basic a task as the protection of inmates and staff? The answer lies in a number of interrelated reasons. First, the physical layout of traditional institutions hampers internal security. Second, short-range cost considerations have historically predominated all planning decisions in corrections. The majority of facilities have traditionally been planned and constructed on the principle of housing a maximum number of inmates in a minimum amount of space, at minimum cost. The intent is to allow a small number of staff to maintain perimeter and internal security in a facility containing the largest possible number of inmates. A fundamental error occurs when the concepts of perimeter security are applied internally, however. This results in the overuse of security hardware, such as maximum-security cell construction, steel bars, catwalks, iron grates, etc., all of which are designed to control and isolate inmates. Because the high-security construction is formidably expensive (the cost of one maximum-security cell unit fluctuates between \$40,000 and \$60,000, depending on the region of the United States in which it is built), the original goal of cost savings has never been achieved.

The typical cellblock is a good example of ineffective security construction. Long rows of cells stacked 4 to 6 floors high, housing as many as 600-700 men, are supposed to be supervised by one or two correctional officers at a time. Under such circumstances, it is impossible to protect individual inmates from assault or to identify individuals engaged in disruptive, coercive behavior. As a result, living areas in many correctional institutions have become breeding grounds for deviant, antisocial and criminal behavior; and correctional institutions are justifiably described as schools of crime.

While the overall construction form of prisons varies from one institution to another—there are radial, panopticon, telephone-pole, high-rise, courtyard and campus designs—security considerations and hardware determine all life processes within these facilities. The social environment is controlled, choiceless, repetitive, and destructive to the human spirit. The architectural context of facilities is explicit, predictable, regimented, and offers little choice for inmates and staff. All activities are scheduled; social contact is limited and mostly predetermined. All decisions, space allocation, movement and

Correctional Facility: Environment Today

responsibilities are narrowly defined and leave no room for individual self-determination or autonomy.

In the light of the above discussion, it is understandable that existing institutions, with few exceptions, are wholly unsatisfactory in providing effective environments for correctional programming, whether it be in the form of work programs, visiting, recreation, medical services, treatment, educational or vocational programs, or library services. A recent major study, directed at an appraisal of recently constructed correctional institutions of the United States failed to identify any improvement or innovation in correctional institutions.¹⁸ The study concluded reluctantly that under the new shining surfaces of the recently constructed facilities and behind the glowing new rhetoric that described their programs, the intrinsic nature of these facilities was largely unchanged from the legacy of the traditional correctional institution built over two hundred years ago: ". . . in our conversations with inmates and staff alike and in our observations, we heard and saw the old preoccupation—control. We also observed deep mutual suspicion, great cynicism, and pervasive hypocrisy as the kept and the keepers played old games with each other while using the new sophisticated language of today's behavioral sciences."¹⁹

In the beginning of this discussion it was noted that imprisonment has been consistently effective in punishing and isolating offenders. As an instrument of rehabilitation and reform, however, prisons have failed. One treatment concept after another has been developed and absorbed into the correctional system in a persistent effort to overcome the inherent weaknesses of incarceration. Thus, the original correctional treatment, consisting of solitary confinement, work, penitence and prayer, was replaced by industrial work, vocational training, social casework, academic education, religious counseling, recreation and visiting programs. Then came psychotherapy, pharmacological approaches and other medical services, individual and group counseling, etc. Among the more recent approaches are milieu therapy, reality therapy, behavior modification, transactional analysis, guided group interaction, transcendental meditation, and various forms of community involvement in the rehabilitation process. No doubt, other programs will follow.

There are few indications that the new programs will be any more effective than the past efforts. Nonetheless, it is safe to assume that prisons will continue to exist in American society for a long time to

come, in spite of persistent and often eloquent efforts to abolish them, or at least to abate their use.²⁰ This is because correctional institutions serve functions which are not presently filled by any other social institution: the sequestration and incapacitation of offenders who are dangerous to the safety and physical well-being of others, special and general deterrence, and the punishment of criminals who have committed unpardonable acts against society. Yet this likely continuance of imprisonment should not and cannot preclude a profound change in what constitutes prisons and other closed institutions. These changes must not necessarily be made out of sympathy for the convicted criminal or disregard of the threat of crime to society, but they must be made precisely because that threat is too serious today to be countered by a continuation of ineffective methods applied in dehumanizing institutions.

What will the future prison (or closed institution) be like? Clearly, new facilities will differ dramatically from the majority of today's correctional institutions. They will be based on rationally designed goals which will help inmates live a life without crime upon release. Closed institutions will seek to evoke in offenders a positive self-concept as law-abiding persons and to enhance their prospects of leading a productive and satisfying life when they rejoin the free community. The overall social and physical milieu of the new institutions will be directed to developing an environment conducive to the eventual successful reintegration of the offender into society. The social structure of the prison will cultivate a sense of solidarity and commitment to the goals of corrections that is shared by inmates and staff alike. The new correctional operation will be built on the principle of accountability, an element too long missing from the corrections scene. Inmates will be accountable not only to live within the predetermined rules of the institution, but they will be accountable for the demonstration of personal change and a willingness to contribute to the welfare of others. Staff will be accountable to the community for the offenders entrusted to them. They will not be able to resort to repressive physical restraints and traditional custodial procedures in maintaining institutional order and programming, but will be responsible for improving living conditions and control through social and psychological means. To accomplish this, staff will need to reduce the existing social gap between themselves and the offenders, develop equitable rules and procedures, and cultivate the trust and commitment of offenders. Overt signs of authority on the part of staff, such

Correctional Facility: Environment Today

as uniforms and badges, will disappear in favor of civilian-type clothing for all.

The prisons of the future will be located in the cities and communities from which most of the offenders come. This means that prisons will no longer be constructed in isolated rural areas, as has been the custom for 200 years, but within major metropolitan areas which produce most of the crime and therefore most of the inmates. New institutions will be small in size, featuring fewer than 150 residents. Young and intractable offenders will ideally be accommodated in even smaller programs, varying from twenty-five to one hundred residents each. Smaller-sized institutions will do much to reduce the anonymity, dehumanization and depersonalization of current prisons and jails. The present highly destructive inmate social structure would disappear and inmates would become persons, not numbers. Mass movement and regimentation would no longer be necessary for the running of an institution.

Architecturally, facilities would establish interior security perimeters with administrative and program support elements located outside, to create a "softer" edge and thereby integrate the facility into the fabric of the communities that surround them. When possible, community participation in program and reintegrative efforts would be encouraged by providing joint use spaces such as auditoriums and office space for representatives from human services agencies, crisis intervention centers and similar services. Advanced building technologies would be incorporated which would provide unobtrusive institutional physical controls so that security devices would no longer dominate the institutional character and undermine program efforts as they do now. New institutions would have flexibility as a principal design determinant in order to have the capability of being adapted to changing program needs. Design concepts would provide for individual occupancy and thus privacy, and would establish individual resident territories supportive of new program approaches. The need for privacy and respite from hostile and dangerous environments has come to be recognized in correctional research as a basic human necessity. Residential groupings of ten to fourteen individuals (called residential clusters or modules) will serve to provide more normative environments and facilitate differential programming. Program space will be ample and varied to provide appropriate settings for a wide range of small and large group activities. Staff will be in close proximity to residents to promote maximum staff-resident interac-

tion. Program spaces will be close to residential units so that supervision of inmate movement is reduced and inmate accessibility to programs increased. Differentiated interior security zones will be established so that the total resident population will not be subjected to the close supervision and control measures required generally by only a few.

Programmatically, the new institution would provide individualized services which will stress the development of positive social orientations, work skills, and behavioral patterns conducive to community reintegration. Every conceivable treatment modality, i.e. educative, vocational, clinical, and recreational, will be made available to the inmates. Increasingly, it is being suggested that inmate participation in treatment programs be strictly on a voluntary basis.²¹ While all inmates of future institutions will have to participate in a mandatory work program and in institutional maintenance on a daily basis, it is reasoned that treatment, if it is to be effective, should never be coerced. The range of programs offered will be great and range from elementary school education to professional training.

Once an inmate decides to participate in a particular program, he would have to come to an agreement with staff that the program would indeed be helpful to him and that he had the necessary prerequisites and abilities to pursue it. The inmates in each residential cluster, along with two to four staff members, would form small living groups. Within these basic units, inmates and staff would participate in daily group discussions. The problems of daily institutional life, difficulties in human encounters, and matters of institutional governance would be the subject of the discussions. In addition, discussion sessions would focus on the responsibilities of individual group members, on the particular problems of the inmates involved, on the crimes they have committed, and on the physical and social harm they have caused. Avenues for reconciliation with society (and possibly their victims) would be explored. Realistic plans would then be formulated which would assist in the development of a positive anticriminal self-image and which would help inmates lead a life without crime once they are released. Staff members would be front-line men and women and not necessarily have professional or clinical training.

Emphasis will be placed on self-governance to the degree to which this may be possible in correctional institutions. As time goes by, inmates will assume increased responsibility and autonomy over their lives. Gradual participation by inmates in work- and educational-

Correctional Facility: Environment Today

release programs and home furloughs will provide the necessary testing ground for the assumption of that responsibility.

The vocational and industrial opportunities of the new correctional institutions will also differ substantially from traditional approaches. Principally, prisons will operate industries comparable to those outside. Outmoded machinery, make-work, rampant idleness and slave wages will be replaced by modern equipment, challenging activity, regular work schedules and fair union wages. Inmates pursuing educational programs in lieu of industry work will also be compensated. Similar to outside practice, pay rates will differ according to performance and degree of responsibility. As a result, the work experience and its rewards will provide a sense of achievement and accomplishment. Financial counseling will be provided and wages apportioned in consultation with, and with the consent of, inmates for the following purposes: taxes, subsistence, family support, restitution, spending money for the inmate, and savings. In order to implement innovative prison industry programs, current legislative restrictions concerning inmate labor will have to be lifted.

Because the closed institution of the future will be located in the community, it will have extensive links with community organizations. Human service agencies, churches, social and fraternal organizations, service clubs, public libraries, volunteer groups, professional and trade associations, and organizations which have traditionally aided human beings in trouble (e.g., Alcoholics Anonymous) will participate in the correctional process.

To improve correctional policy, program planning and decision-making, it will be necessary to incorporate evaluative research components on a continuing basis into all new correctional experiments. Despite the expenditure of millions of dollars annually on efforts to incarcerate and change offenders, research and evaluation of such people-changing endeavors have generally been inconclusive and are rarely comparable. As a result, evaluative research in corrections has been called "an elusive paradise."²² It is likely to remain that way unless newly developed legislative restrictions pertaining to the protection of privacy of individual offenders are lifted.²³ While accused and convicted offenders have an inherent right to privacy, it is suggested that current restrictions concerning the conduct of research have done more harm than good. Restricted information legislation has saved many an administrator from acute embarrassment and permits the continuation of questionable correctional practices. The public and legislators must understand that if the new

approaches to corrections outlined above are to succeed, they will have to be evaluated to discover which categories of offenders are best served by what programs, and which categories of offenders are harmed by what approaches. Careful research designs using random assignment of inmates and experimental groups are the *sine qua non* of effective evaluation.

Even though the current state of prisons is in a crisis of major proportion, the rule of the day being overcrowding, separation, punishment and isolation of offenders, the closed institution and prison of the future described above is really not so far away. A number of progressive institutions already exist in the form of the handsomely designed, medium-security prison at Lessburg, New Jersey, and the federal Metropolitan Correctional Centers in New York, San Diego and Chicago. These facilities are outstanding models of architectural planning with single occupancy, ample program and recreation space, and an individualized approach to offenders. The South Central Regional Correctional Institution in Anchorage, Alaska, represents one of the best approaches yet to correctional programming and architecture in existence today. In this instance, master planning and correctional program development preceded—as it should—the architectural design and the facility construction. The Robert F. Kennedy Youth Center in Morgantown, West Virginia, has an attractive campus design, magnificent landscaping, and a sophisticated multimodality treatment approach, accompanied by rigorous research efforts.

Another remarkable institution exists at Vienna, Illinois. Its buildings look like garden apartments and are built around a town square complete with schools, shops, a church, and a library. Garden paths lead to individual houses which provide private rooms in small clusters. Academic, commercial and vocational education facilities equal those of many civilian schools of comparable rank. Extensive indoor and outdoor recreation is provided. Visiting privileges are extensive, and visitors are encouraged in the recognition of the positive function of inmate interaction with family members and friends. The correctional center at Fox Lake, Wisconsin, and the Michigan Training Center at Ionia are both designed so that widely spaced and attractive buildings are set on exceptionally well-landscaped acres. There are winding walks and undulating contours to relieve the monotony of the midwestern countryside.

The most recent effort to bring corrections into the twentieth century, however, is the new Federal Correctional Institution at

Correctional Facility: Environment Today

Butner, North Carolina. Because Butner is on the fringe of the "research triangle" of North Carolina (comprised of Duke University, the University of North Carolina and North Carolina State University), the correctional institution is accessible from all three of these university locations. Close working relationships have been developed with them. For example, medical services are provided under contract by the University of North Carolina. Duke University supplies all psychiatric services, and the Institute for Research in Social Science at the University of North Carolina is involved in an extensive evaluation of the new institution. Functionally, the new institution serves two purposes: the first is to test experimentally the Norval Morris-Eric Steele model for the imprisonment of the repetitively violent criminal;²⁴ the second purpose is to provide psychiatric and mental health services for mentally disturbed inmates from the federal prison system.

The physical plant of Butner has a campus design. In addition to the administration building, there is a village square, around which are built many storefront-type buildings serving an array of functions: commissary, cafeteria, infirmary, dining facility, library, gymnasium, theater, chapel, school, and vocational training center. Scattered around the site at some distance from the village square are the living units. Another complex of buildings serves the physical maintenance and operation of the institution and includes vehicle maintenance shops, the power plant and storehouses. The village square is attractively landscaped, and inmates located in that area are unable to see any security devices because no fences are visible. The visiting room is located in the community center. Even though it is completely within the security perimeter of the institution, it is large, comfortable and tastefully appointed. The auditorium is modern, has a capacity of about 180, is elevated, and features comfortable theater-type chairs. The attractive chapel accommodates between twenty and thirty people and serves all denominations. The dining room is bright and can hold not more than 130 persons at any one time. It has movable tables seating not more than four, and has comfortable, movable chairs. Staff members eat in the same dining room, going through the identical line that inmates do and consuming the same food. The atmosphere in the dining room is "normal" and pleasant because it is almost impossible to tell the inmates from the male members of the staff. It is not unusual to see staff and inmates sitting at the same tables. Staff members reflect a racial mix in keeping with the population of the institution. Women staff are involved in all operational

activities, from serving as line-staff correctional officers to conducting treatment programs. The school and library are modern, bright and flooded with natural light. All program facilities reflect comfort, flexibility, and feature modern equipment. Residential units feature individual rooms for inmates with solid doors. Each man has his own key. Rooms have a normal-sized window made from tempered glass. Each housing unit contains a music room, a reading room, a hobby-craft room, a video room, two television rooms, a large activity area for pool and other social games, and an officer's station. The entire institution is air conditioned. In spite of the fact that Butner holds the most intractable prisoners of the federal prison system, the total atmosphere at the institution is relaxed and exudes an air of confidence. Facility, program and staff are mindful that they are dealing with human beings who have rights in spite of the fact that they have been convicted of a vast array of crimes.

As can be seen from the foregoing discussion, Butner is an operational model of a new correctional approach that is being tested today. If Butner and the other new correctional programs and institutions discussed in this chapter prove their validity, they may well change the nature and face of corrections in this country. The facilities are the very antithesis of Attica, San Quentin, Trenton, and Lucasville, which have splashed across the public's conscience with violence and bloodshed. The new facilities are, however, expensive to build and expensive to operate. Butner, for example, cost more than \$11 million to build. Its operating budget is approximately \$5 million per year. At that rate, it costs approximately \$14,000 to keep one inmate in the institution for one year; and it is the taxpayer who supplies that money. With that kind of cost, there must be substantial doubt as to whether or not the less affluent states and jurisdictions will be willing to follow the Butner model, no matter how successful it may turn out to be.

In spite of this caveat, it is clear that a dramatic change in corrections is necessary. It is essential to abate the use of institutions, to plan comprehensively by looking at the entire criminal justice system. Offenders must be assigned to programs in accordance with their special needs and in keeping with the requirement of protecting the public from further harm. The crippling idleness, anonymity, and destructive impact of current prisons must yield to rationality, truth and enlightenment. To reiterate, these changes must not be made out of sympathy for the offender. They must be made precisely because

Correctional Facility: Environment Today

the threat of crime is too serious to be countered by a continued use of ineffective approaches, and because when all is said and done, it will be found that a humane, albeit strict, response to society's misfits and criminals will ultimately prove to be the best social defense against crime and the criminal.

References

1. Paley, William. "From Paley's 'Principles.'" In James Heath, ed. *Eighteenth Century Penal Theory*. New York, Oxford University Press, 1963, pp. 255-62.
2. Teeters, Negley K. *They Were in Prison*. Philadelphia, John C. Winston, 1937, p. 30.
3. Beaumont, Gustave de, and Tocqueville, Alexis de. *On the Penitentiary System in the United States and Its Application in France*. Francis Lieber, trans. Carbondale, Ill., Southern Illinois University Press, 1964, p. 48.
4. Van den Haag, Ernest. *Punishing Criminals*. New York, Basic Books, 1975. See also Wilson, James Q. *Thinking About Crime*. New York, Basic Books, 1975.
5. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. *Corrections*. Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., 1973.
6. Gettinger, Steve. "U.S. Prison Population Hits All-time High," *Corrections Magazine* 2:9-26, March 1976.
7. Wilson, op. cit.; and van den Haag, op. cit.
8. Martinson, Robert. "What Works? Questions and Answers about Prison Reform," *The Public Interest* no. 35, Spring 1974, pp. 22-54. See also Von Hirsch, Andrew. *Doing Justice*. New York, Hill and Wang, 1976.
9. In corrections one generally speaks of two forms of deterrence. General deterrence is the employment of a public notice that a given detriment will follow wrongdoing. Special deterrence pertains to the individual offender who has been convicted of a crime and who may be deprived of his freedom or suffer other negative consequences as a result of his wrongdoing.
10. There is much agreement in the field that correctional treatment programs should be administered on a voluntary basis and that coercion elicits failure. The issue of coercion in corrections is anything but simple, however. The line between voluntary and involuntary treatment is difficult to draw. Some pressure is bound to exist on individuals undergoing the correctional experience, no matter how benign and humane the program.
11. Madison, James, et al. *The Federalist*. Cambridge, Mass., Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1961, no. 51, pp. 57-58.
12. Van den Haag, op. cit., p. 50.
13. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, op. cit., p. 280.
14. The Intake Service Center concept was developed by the author in 1972. It is best described in the *Correctional Master Plan Summary, State of Hawaii*. Urbana, University of Illinois, National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture, 1973. See also National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, op. cit., p. 251.

15. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, *op. cit.*, pp. 247-310.
16. Benton, F. Warren, et al. *Prison and Jail Security*. Urbana, University of Illinois, National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture, 1973, p. 40.
17. South Carolina Department of Corrections. *The Emerging Rights of the Confined*. Columbia, S.C., Correctional Development Foundation, Inc., 1972, pp. 132-39.
18. Nagel, William G. *The New Red Barn; A Critical Look at the Modern American Prison*. New York, Walker and Co., 1973.
19. *Ibid.*, pp. 147-48.
20. American Friends Service Committee. *Struggle for Justice: A Report on Crime and Punishment in America*. New York, Hill and Wang, 1971. *See also* Hellerstein, William, et al. "Prisons on Trial: A Symposium on the Changing Laws of Corrections," *Buffalo Law Review* 21:643-996, Spring 1972; Mitford, Jessica. *Kind and Usual Punishment*. New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1973; and Sommer, Robert. *The End of Imprisonment*. New York, Oxford University Press, 1976.
21. Morris, Norval. *The Future of Imprisonment*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1974, p. 112.
22. Glaser, Daniel. "Correctional Research: An Elusive Paradise," *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 2:1-11, Jan. 1965.
23. Department of Justice. Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. *Criminal Justice Information Systems* (28 CFR Part 20). Washington, D.C., Federal Register (40 FR 22114), May 20, 1975. *See also* Nejelski, Paul, and Lerman, Lindsey M. "A Researcher-Subject Testimonial Privilege: What To Do Before the Subpoena Arrives," *Wisconsin Law Review* 1971:1085-148, 1971.
24. Morris, *op. cit.*, pp. 85-121.