

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. What has been the historic role of the jail in the criminal justice system and society at large? How will these roles affect the jail's future?
2. How will social conditions affect the types of jails in metropolitan areas? How likely is a bifurcated jail system in your own community?
3. Discuss the potential problems in both publicly run jails and privately financed facilities.
4. How does the Antoinette County jail system represent what you think your local jail will look like in the future? What local and national factors will influence the type of jail found in your community?
5. Discuss the relationship between economic conditions and jails in the future. What does this suggest about the ways in which current jail conditions have been influenced by the economy?



The "Pen" and the Pendulum:



Finding Our Way to the Future of Incarceration

LUCIEN X. LOMBARDO
Old Dominion University

The character and quality of life in correctional institutions (the "pen") has often found itself inextricably tied to the continuing shifts in political and public sentiment between retributive and humanitarian philosophies (the pendulum). My goals in this chapter are two: (1) to describe and analyze some of the forces and processes that have kept this pendulum in motion and which have created the correctional present, and (2) to offer suggestions for stopping the pendulum and developing dynamic penal practices that can bring penal life more under our control as we move toward the year 2010.

In trying to achieve these goals, I will identify some historical trends in the forces and processes that have shaped the evolution of institutional life and conditions. I will assess the current context, which will provide the baseline from which we will move toward the future. Finally, I will present two views of the future of incarcerative institutions and discuss ways of thinking about organizational change that might help us actively create the incarcerative life of the next century. In doing so, I assume that the correctional future is one that we as a

society and polity have the ability to shape by the choices we make between now and the year 2010.¹

As I look to the future from 1995, I look to other attempts to describe the penal future. I do this in the hope that by not ignoring the past, we can choose not to repeat it. In 1931, the American Academy of Political and Social Science published a volume entitled *Prisons of Tomorrow*. The foreword, written by editors Edwin H. Sutherland and Thorsten Sellin, is as timely now as it was sixty years ago:

The riots and disturbances which have in recent years occurred in our prisons have served to focus public attention on our methods of dealing with criminals. Many persons have come to wonder if we have not, after all, been pursuing false idols. We have begun to lose faith in the mighty citadels of impenetrable walls which once made our prisons showcases of civic architecture. We are realizing that they have failed us in their true task of protecting us against crime.

True enough, the prison has come to be the last resort of penal treatment when all other measures have proved wanting. This has made the prison's work a fearfully difficult one. Yet we are compelled to conclude that, since the vast majority of prisoners will be returned to normal social life at the expiration of their sentences, our prisons *must* be rationally adapted, in organizations and functions, to the complicated task that faces them. If this means the renunciation of vindictive theories and policies, let us renounce them. If it means more science in penal treatment, let us have more science. The fact is that our prisons must become effective and dynamic agencies of the social protection which, if humanely possible, will return prisoners to society better men than when they entered the institutions.

In my view, these words are as true now as they were then, and I write this essay in the hope that editors of a volume on "prisons of

tomorrow" written in 2010 need not introduce their work with the same observations. Indeed, it is hoped that in 1996 (the twenty-fifth anniversary of Attica) we are not again reminded of the folly of our American penal practices by the sight of state authorities extinguishing the lives of confined persons asserting what is left of their humanity.²

Between 1995 and 2010 there are fifteen years of history to be recorded. During this time there will be enormous social, political, and economic changes that will affect our society's place in the world and our individual places in society. At the same time, there will be calls for a return to the "good old days" and attempts to hide the future with symbols of a "glorious past." Today, as we see more and larger prisons being built, as we see more and more people being sent to prisons, we indeed should wonder: "What will be happening to those who live and work in these institutions? What is it that we are creating? What will be the human legacy of the correctional practices of the late 1970s and 1980s?"³ As we think about moving from 1995 to 2010, we must understand that the penal policies and practice of 1995 will be the "good old days" of penal practice twenty years from now. I hope that by then we will not want to return to what we have now!

HISTORICAL PROCESSES AND TRENDS

As we think about the future of life in correctional institutions, I believe there are a number of historical processes (I make no claim to originality here) that will shape the penal future. These are processes that should become part of the understanding and worldview of those who shape correctional policy and practice.

First, I believe it is important to understand that the substantive character of correctional change has been additive. That is, whenever changes occur, they are added on to existing systems. Nothing ever truly disappears. For example, when formal corporal punishment is banned and due-process protections extend to various aspects of prison

1. In 1969, the American Academy of Political and Social Science published a volume of the *Annals* entitled *The Future of Corrections*. The emphasis in this look into the correctional future was on the expansion and increased support for community-based alternatives to incarceration. In 1985, another edition of the *Annals*, discussed *Overcrowded Prisons*. Here the impact of crowding and strategies to relieve this condition was emphasized. In reviewing these volumes, one comes away with the perception that correctional change is indeed slow and often moves in directions that are difficult to predict. For other visions of the correctional future, see Leslie T. Wilkins's "Directions for Corrections," American Philosophical Society, Autumn Meeting, November 8 and 9, 1973; "In Place of Prisons: Some Things Already Done," *The World Tomorrow*, May, 1925, pp. 141-144.

2. During Attica I was employed by the State of New York's Department of Corrections as a full-time teacher at the Auburn Correctional Facility. This was my reaction as I heard about the reaking of the prison in which forty-three people were killed by state authorities (New York State Special Commission on Attica, 1972).

3. I might say that I am asking these questions out of intellectual curiosity. In today's humanely bankrupt climate, to say that I care what happens to those in prisons is to run the risk of being called "wimpyish" or "soft-hearted" or "liberal." However, I must say that I do not approach this question in a detached manner. I do worry when I observe the wanton and needless infliction of pain and suffering. I worry not only about the impact on the humanity of those upon whom the pain is inflicted, but also about the humanity of those who inflict it.

discipline, corporal punishment becomes informal, more indirect, and less visible (often shifting to inmates as control operatives). The introduction of treatment programs in the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s did not eliminate the coercive aspects of most penal institutions. In the 1980s and 1990s, the return to retribution did not totally eliminate the treatment programs that previously existed.

Prediction 1

Thus, in moving from 1995 to 2010, I believe it is safe to assume that whatever direction we choose will not replace existing practices, but will be grafted onto them in some fashion. The institutional structures that we construct today (and those that we have constructed in the past) will be with us for some time to come.

Second, the traditional dynamic of the correctional change process has been reactive and mechanistic. This means that change occurs only when problems become visible to such an extent that someone must react. It also means that courts, administrators, and politicians have attempted to respond to these visible problems by issuing orders that would change the conditions that are believed to have led to the problem. Relying on the myth that power relations in correctional institutions are hierarchical (courts to politicians to executives to administrators to supervisors to correctional officers to inmates), courts issue orders to correct defects, new policies and procedures are defined, and administrators are changed. To change the machine of corrections, we need only change the parts. Such reactive and often symbolic problem solving assumes that correctional philosophy can be translated into policy decrees and then into a bureaucratic procedure and administrative action. It also assumes that the activities in which the machine of corrections is engaged are indeed the correct activities for the machine to be performing. As we move toward the future, we should be aware that this need not necessarily be the case.

Prediction 2

As we move into the twenty-first century, I believe that more proactive approaches to prison organization and management that involve goal development, information processing and monitoring, and inmate and staff participation in decision making will need to be developed. I will not predict highly visible change-breeding events such as riots, since I hope that processes can be put in place to avoid them.

Third, correctional institutions have always maintained the coexistence of our most humanitarian intentions and our most savage behaviors. That is, practices that purposely inflict pain and suffering on inmates (whether organizationally or individually initiated) coexist with the efforts of some personnel to assist and help change inmates by instilling positive virtues (whether organizationally or individually determined). Our contradictory desires to help the downfallen and punish the wicked will continue to search for an appropriate balance as we move through the next twenty years. These contradictory desires and actions reflect the religious zeal that many in corrections used to (and in all likelihood, many still do) bring to their work. They also reflect the schizoid nature of the penal view of the relationship of the wrongdoer to the community. On the one hand, wrongdoers are seen as fallen members of the community who need assistance to be returned to the community better than they were before. Wrongdoers are also painted as the enemy of the community, outcasts of society, who should be treated harshly to pay for their sins. From this perspective, we feel that the various forms of humiliation, pain, and suffering that accompany confinement are deserved by those who have violated community standards.

This pair of contradictory impulses reflects a dialectic central to the historical evolution of our penal institutions. On the one hand, retribution breeds abuses, which come to the public attention and lead to calls for some corrective. On the other hand, too much humanity toward the evildoer and our response is tempered by reference to the "principle of least eligibility."

Prediction 3

During the next twenty years, we will see the consolidation of the retributive, "just deserts" perspective in the sentencing process and the growing recognition and development of programming and services to support inmate attempts at living lives free of further contacts with the law. These services will not be seen as a purpose of sentencing (that purpose will remain retribution). However, service provision will be seen as a necessary part of effective and efficient correctional management divorced from the sentencing function.

Fourth, penal policy and incarcerative life develop from an interaction with political, social, and economic conditions in the community that surrounds the walls and fences. Changes that will work their way into correctional institutions often have their genesis outside of prisons.

Past research has described the process by which penal concerns moved from the periphery to the center of public concern in the late 1960s and early 1970s. This movement was coupled with response to other newly "discovered" social problems such as the war on poverty and the due-process and civil rights revolutions. This interaction process reflects an open-systems view of correctional life. From this perspective, one comes to understand that the character and dynamics of prison life at any one point in time are shaped by the social, economic, and political contexts that surround them. Thus, in trying to shape the incarcerative institutions of the future, policy makers and administrators must be attuned to the world around them. They must be able to draw on those forces that support the directions in which they wish to move. In addition, they must facilitate the development of those forces that will help them go where they want to go.

Prediction 4

During the next twenty years, domestic problems will emerge as the top national political priority. Education, poverty, housing, health care, and unemployment problems (among others) will again focus attention on practical service provision and issues of fairness and equity in resource distribution. This will provide renewed impetus for giving attention to service provision in incarcerative institutions. By 2010, the fairness, equity, effectiveness and efficiency, and justice of the "crime control" policies of the 1980s and 1990s will be questioned. Links between crime, the questionable effectiveness of repressive techniques of crime control, and other social problems will once again be forged.

Fifth, history teaches us that the character of prison life and the behavior of prisoners and staff are at once responses to the conditions of confinement and reflections of the nonprison experiences of those confined and working in the prisons. In other words, both the importation and deprivation processes account for prison culture and behavior. There is certainly no reason to believe this will change. Prisoners of the 1930s brought their experiences of the economic depression and some experiences gained from coping with Prohibition. In the 1960s and 1970s, challenges to racism and to abusive and unchecked authority in communities brought a new dynamic to prison life. These forces empowered previously powerless prisoners. They engendered feelings of powerlessness in staffmembers who felt their control dissipating. In the 1980s and 1990s, the growth of the violent drug culture, gang behaviors

and identities, and the development of AIDS have all had an impact on the size of the prison population and on the nature of social relations and behavior within institutions.

During the next twenty years, the growing recognition of "multiculturalism and diversity" will result from the demographic restructuring of American society with the elimination of any majority group. This change will continue to be intellectually supported by the work of scholars in such areas as women's studies, African-American studies, and ethnic studies programs that give new interpretations and discover values that have been long associated with nonmainstream traditions.

Prediction 5

The changing demographics of crime and criminal justice processing will extend these changes into the correctional system. Inmates, staff, and administrators will bring new experiences of cultural self-definition into prisons. This will provide new self-definitions and needs to interact with conditions of confinement. As these perspectives find their way into public consciousness through the mass media, they will begin to raise questions about our long-standing approaches to power, social control (a consistent theme in these perspectives), and, by extension, the correctional system.

Finally, and most important, it should be noted that life as it is experienced and acted out in prison has both a private and a public character. It is here in the nexus of the symbolic and real world of the prisoners and staff that all of the historical forces and processes mentioned above create the "reality of the incarcerative experience." This is true for both prisoners and their keepers. The private life is determined by the interaction of individual needs and institutional resources. Research has identified many salient prisoner needs that interact with the prison environment: activity, freedom, social stimulation, support, emotional feedback, structure, and safety. For correctional officers, research has identified activity, autonomy, and a need to contribute to the workplace as motivational concerns. Breakdown, stress, and burnout are often seen as indications of a failure to achieve meaningful individual and environmental matches. On the public level, life is acted out and experienced in social groups, playing to the stereotypes of the contemporary prison environment. Officers play the "hack," "screw," and "bull" to the "right guy," "con-boss," "gang-leader," "tough," and "wolf." Here adherence to the "prisoner code" and to the norm of the

"guard subculture" shape inmate and staff behavior. Though individuals in their private worlds routinely violate the codes and norms of their group, these public expressions of appropriate behavior shape individual choices in the collective, conflict-laden context in which prison life is often acted out. Such conflict plays itself out in various forms of victimization: inmates of inmates, staff of inmates, and inmates of staff.

Two threads that run through the nexus of these public and private worlds are *authority* (the distribution of real and theoretical power between inmates and staff) and *social distance* (the existence of personal and helping relationships between inmates and staff). These two dimensions provide the "ground" against which both inmates and staff carry out and interpret their own and each other's behavior.

Research has shown us that the authority of the staff to control inmate behavior is a myth, and that the theoretical authority of staff is easily corrupted by the environment and social dynamics inherent in prison life. What has changed is not the nature of the authority relationships, but the context within which they are acted out. New contingencies shape these relationships in the 1990s. Arbitrary authority no longer has the support of a hands-off legal philosophy. Authority of the officer, administration, and the state needs to be legitimized, at least to the level of having formal written policies and procedures to govern the behavior of officers. These policies and procedures also provide inmates with support for appeals when they believe authority is being exercised wrongly. Though inmates' access to the courts may be decreasing (and may continue to be reduced by an increasingly conservative federal judiciary), the policy and procedures approach will be supported and enhanced by the work of professional correctional agencies. Interacting with this legal legitimacy is the personal legitimacy that individual officers gain by implementing the firm, fair, and consistent responses they are taught in training academies. Personal legitimacy is also enhanced when officers find ways to contribute to their workplace that involve service provisions to inmates. Here, attending to inmate stress in ways that alleviate stress-producing conditions and refraining from adding to these conditions allows officers to elicit rather than "maintain" order. This reflects individual officer behaviors that permit and encourage reduced social distance between inmate and staff.

Prediction 6

As we move through the next twenty years, officer legalistic authority and legitimacy will be clarified by the further development of professional correctional standards and the development of written policy and procedures to govern internal prison operations. In addition, officer problem-solving skills will be developed and applied to "victimization reduction," which will become a key indicator of effective correctional management.

CONTEXTS FOR PENAL POLICY AND PRACTICE IN 1995: A BASELINE FOR THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

As we think about the future, we must not only consider the processes and forces that have shaped prison life, but also make some assessment of the current state of correctional life. Recognizing the importance of generational change in corrections, we quickly recognize that the prison environment of the 1990s is the baseline against which those living and working in prisons of the future will measure their condition in 2010.

Policy Context

Today's correctional policy climate is one in which opposition to the dominant retributive philosophy is severely muted; strong spokespersons for corrections are absent; progressive state leadership in corrections has fallen victim to budget deficits and overcrowding; and federal and private funding of experimental correctional research not aimed at enhancing repression is severely limited.

Though I agree with these observations, I believe that ascendancy of the retributive philosophy and the process by which it came to ascendancy (having sentencing policy attacked by both liberals and conservatives) have provided an opportunity for the humanitarian impulses described above to surface. This allows service provision to be developed less as an oppositional force than as a supplementary philosophy that supports activities that sentencing is not meant to reflect or to accomplish.

Here I am not arguing that "treatment" will make a comeback as a purpose of criminal justice intervention. Rather, we will begin to

appreciate the wisdom of voluntary programming alternatives to supplement the punishment associated with the confinement alternative.

The attacks on the indeterminate sentence and the "medical model" with its uncontrolled discretion and expertise-based authority helped clear away the underbrush. It is now possible to see that "punishment" is indeed the purpose of the criminal-sentencing process. But it is equally possible to see that providing support services for those convicted of crimes and sentenced to periods of incarceration—not as a reason for their sentence, but as a necessary and, it is hoped, effective social policy, independent of the sentencing process—may reflect the less ideological and more practical correctional realism that has characterized the ideals of correctional professionals for decades.

Technological Context

With the rapid growth in the number of prisoners and the numbers of prisons, concerns with prison architecture and security technology have resurfaced, as they did during the Auburn–Pennsylvania system debates. But there is a difference. Whereas the earlier debates had a reform component associated with the architectural design, today's discussions revolve almost exclusively around security, control, cost, and mechanisms for dealing with crowding. Here, electronic monitoring, closed-circuit surveillance, video recording, and computerized data collection are enhancing the possibilities for increased safety and accountability for both inmates and staff. In addition, computerized data management is facilitating the possibility of monitoring various characteristics of the quality of life. Such capabilities may create the need to identify and define more specifically the goals of correctional management that can then be monitored with specific indicators.

Staff Context

Today's correctional staffs are more ethnically and sexually diverse than at any time in the past. Though it is clear that organizational, cultural, and legal barriers have surfaced during the process of integration, such integration will be the norm twenty years from now. It is hoped that the structural and interpersonal biases and constraints that have characterized this process of staff integration will be reduced by the year 2010 as diversity (gender and ethnic) in the workplace becomes the norm.

In some correctional institutions, staff roles are becoming more specialized. With the transfer of many of the human services functions to inmates and professional staff, correctional officer roles appear to be

becoming more security-oriented. Increasing institutional violence has also reinforced this tendency. However, it has only been ten to fifteen years since the human-services contributions and potential of correctional officers were first recognized. If, as I predict, service provision will be a focus of institutional activity as we approach 2010, then correctional officers will be key personnel (they are certainly plentiful) in providing services in cost-effective ways.

Prison Conditions Context

In 1982, John Conrad addressed the question, "What do the undeserving deserve?" In doing so, he observed that many of the pains of imprisonment that characterized prisons of the 1950s had been somewhat alleviated by the 1980s. Inmates received more access to goods and services, more autonomy with the "due-process revolution"; more freedom with the increase of medium- and minimum-security institutions close to inmates' home communities; and more heterosexual contact with the employment of women in positions with direct contact with the population. Where correctional institutions had failed, Conrad noted, was in providing for the safety of the inmates.

There is no doubt that during the 1980s the rapidly expanded prison populations had a retrogressive impact on the gains noted by Conrad. However, the exact nature of this impact has yet to be assessed. In addition, the conditions of confinement have been affected by the changing nature of the problems brought into institutions by the inmate population: drug and alcohol addiction, experience with the subculture of violence, and gang-related activity coupled with administrators' lack of attention to "treatment" programming have made previous gains less meaningful. It is possible that the nature of prison conditions and the problems stemming from crowding and the drug culture might be alleviated by changes in national strategies for dealing with the "drug problem." Decriminalization, the development of drug-treatment programs, or the addressing of social and personal conditions that lead to drug usage might substantially reduce prison populations in the future. In addition, the expansion of nonincarcerative alternative punishment might have a substantial impact on prison populations and, by extension, on the conditions of confinement during the next twenty years.

Legal Context

The law of corrections provides another source of potential conflict and change. With the 1950s as a baseline, there was indeed a due-process revolution in prison life during the 1960s and 1970s.

However, as we move through the 1990s, this revolution will have to some extent been consolidated in policies and procedures that form the baseline as we move to the twenty-first century. During the past ten years, we have seen a shift "back to the future" as courts have taken positions that rely on the expertise of correctional administrators to determine what is and is not appropriate correctional practice. This shift from a recognition of the abuse potential inherent in authority to a preference for expertise contains within it the seeds of change. When administrators are able to rely on the authority vested in their positions to justify penal practices, the legitimacy of that authority comes into question. This may become particularly problematic because the baseline of the arbitrary authority and hands-off approach of the 1950s was replaced by the activist policy-and-procedure bureaucratic approach of the 1970s and 1980s.

Though administrators may win the battle in court and have their expertise reaffirmed, they may lose the war as the censorious behavior of inmates challenges them to justify in person what they are not forced to justify in law. Such a process often leads to greater prisoner "class solidarity" and to increased inmate-staff conflict. It is possible that today's and tomorrow's correctional administrators are and will be more capable of overcoming the bureaucratic tendency to engage in "ritualistic behavior" and abuses of power than were those of the past. However, if history is any teacher, this is highly unlikely.

Cultural Context

As we move from the 1990s and into the 2000s, it is possible that we are beginning one of those periods in which quantum changes in the character of American society and culture are beginning to take place. Writers have referred to the 1960s as an "age of discontinuity." Drucker has identified four areas of discontinuity with the past: (1) new technologies, (2) the development of a world economy as opposed to an "international economy," (3) increasing social and political pluralism, and (4) the development of "knowledge" as a major form of capital.

Today, major discontinuities are again being discussed. Cultural commentators are beginning to question the adequacy of past formulas to solve the problems of the present and the future.

If this observation is correct and the repressively bankrupt correctional philosophies of the 1980s are losing their relevance and appeal just as the "liberal" prescriptions lost their support during the 1970s and 1980s, then it may be time that we think about developing new ways to understand and structure the change process that will lead us to the correctional life of the year 2010.

THE SHAPE OF PENAL ALTERNATIVES

There appears to be consensus among academic analysts, commentators, and correctional professionals about some of the basic characteristics that should be part of the correctional future. Some advocate a system in which fairness is institutionalized, communications are as open as possible for everyone, and the outside world is welcome to help maintain as natural a social order as possible in the penal environment. These commentators identify four essential goals of prison management: safety, lawfulness, industriousness, and hope. Others argue that to make prison programs relevant and useful, corrections must operate prisons in which stress remains within tolerable limits and is handled maturely, as well as offer a number of programs that enhance the prisoner's capacity to cope maturely with life stresses both in prison and later in the free world. Other critics suggest that real reform will involve relevant and realistic inmate-service programs suggested by inmates and a policy that opens prisons to the media. From a feminist perspective, administrative and academic critics suggest that our human commonality with the prisoner needs to be recognized; that harmony rather than competition and conflict and zero-sum lifestyles should be emphasized; and that the empathy and compassion that we strive to emphasize in our personal lives should also dominate our political views.

While some of these proposals require fundamental change and others are less demanding, they all have in common the advisability of reducing inmate victimization by both other inmates and prison staff. They all see the appropriateness of maintaining the rule of law in prisons. In addition, all desire to provide inmates with activities that will occupy their time and provide opportunities for responsible behavior. Where they sometimes differ, however, is in the strategies they propose for getting from here to there.

STRATEGIES FOR GETTING TO THE DESIRABLE FUTURE

"Back to the Future"

Some writers suggest using an essentially closed-system, mechanistic approach to correctional reform. Though noting the importance of supportive politicians, the media, and public opinion, the essential unit of analysis and attention is the prison itself. This view proposes that future prisons should contain order, the absence of prison violence in its myriad manifestations, amenity (e.g., food of appropriate quality and nutrition and clothing to keep out the elements), and service programs to support self-improvement. These elements are certainly worthwhile and reflect the goals of almost all reformers (at least partially). However, the techniques some writers propose to move from the present (a state characterized by increasing inmate-inmate victimization and a loss of staff control) to the future (where constitutional government controls both the keepers and the kept) imply a return to the "good old days" with a bureaucratically organized military regime for the keepers and the kept, charismatic leadership at the top, and supportive politicians, public opinion, and professors.

Unless we are entering a period in which increasingly docile inmates will be entering our correctional systems (and the available evidence suggests that we are not), then the "defects of total power" delineated by researchers forty years ago probably will emerge as they always have and abuses of power will occur as they always have. Future suggestions for improving the prison world by returning to the days when experienced wardens, supervisors, and correctional officers ran the prisons with paternalistic fairness seem to ignore the forces that shape the present and will shape the future.

This mechanistic view of organizations is a strength when (1) there is a straightforward task to perform, (2) the environment is stable enough to ensure that the products produced are appropriate, (3) one wishes to produce exactly the same product time and again, (4) precision is at a premium, and (5) the human "machine" parts are compliant and behave as they have been designed. Such organizations can function well when they are isolated from changing conditions. Such was the case to some extent with the "big house" prisons of the 1930s, '40s, and '50s and before the due-process and civil rights revolutions. When faced with change, however, mechanistic organizations either fail or become reactionary, living with the ritual present practice. They find it difficult to adapt.

If the above description and analysis of the current state of corrections and the historical forces and processes that go into the creation of prison life is at all relevant, then the mechanistic approach to prison change in moving to 2010 would seem to be fraught with problems.

As we have seen, mechanistic organizations respond to change in predictable ways: They have great difficulty adapting to changing circumstances; they result in mindless and unquestioning bureaucracy; they have unanticipated and undesirable consequences as the interests of those working in the organization take precedence over the goals the organization was designed to achieve; and they have dehumanizing effects on employees, especially those at the lower levels of the organizational hierarchy. All of these results have certainly occurred in relation to the substance and process of prison change during the past 200 years. And they were certainly evident during the turbulent years of the 1960s and 1970s as the previously isolated prisons were permeated by a wide variety of political and social forces.

If we assume that the nature and character of prison life at any one point in time are determined by more than management's ability and willingness to control inmates, the staff, and itself, then how can we think about moving from 1995 to 2010? What alternative processes are there for thinking about and managing the forces that shape the character of prison life?

Toward the Future:

A Proactive, Dynamic View

If we are to manage the next twenty years of change more successfully than we managed change during the 1960s and 1970s, then we need to think of prison organizations in more than mechanistic and militaristic ways. Morgan's description of organizations as brains and change as flux provides three concepts that we can apply to correctional change that may help us control and manage the changes of the next twenty years. By doing so, we might be able to avoid the reactionary and reactive approach that has led to so much conflict and suffering in the past.

Enfolding the Environment This view of the prison-change process recognizes that the factors and historical processes of prison change are interactive and dynamic. The environment in which prisons operate is shaped by what happens in prisons, and what happens in prisons is shaped by that environment.

From this perspective, the intervention of courts into the administrative activities of prisons would not be seen as something that must be resisted. Rather, court decisions become part of the environment that is expected to influence correctional behavior. The questions in moving toward the future thus become "How can we incorporate court mandates and still move toward the future state we desire? How can these decisions help us get there?" and not "How do they challenge and reduce correctional authority? How can we resist them?"

The same is true of demographic changes that will hit prisons and of the cultural, technological, and social changes that will come between the walls. If those who administer, manage, and live in correctional institutions can grasp and recognize the benefits of the new relationships with the environment implied by "unfolding," then correctional change as we move to the twenty-first century can be more proactive and positive.

Mutual Causality Another concept for more successfully managing change is "mutual causality." That is, we need to think of the relationships between factors as mutually reinforcing. We gain the ability to move toward the desirable goals described above by identifying the many forces that shape prison life and how they interact with the prison environment. We identify those that help us reach our goals and reinforce them; we identify those that are keeping us from our goals and attempt to find appropriate ways to minimize their impact. Thus we return again to the idea that the prison environment is part of the wider society and its culture.

Using the relationships between courts and prison change as an example, we can see that viewing the courts as "causing" prison change through edict ignores the contribution of correctional administrators to "causing" the courts' intervention by administrative practices that increase court scrutiny.

Organizational Learning Developing organizational learning capabilities is a third concept that will help us take a more proactive approach in reaching the year 2010. Organizations can learn to learn when they encourage and value openness and accept error and uncertainty as constants in a complex and changing environment; recognize the importance of exploring different viewpoints; avoid imposing structures of goals, objectives, and targets and allow intelligence and direction to emerge from ongoing organizational processes; and have organizational structures that encourage the above processes.

As applied to the life of correctional institutions, this means that administrators and policy makers need to be inquisitive about their success at achieving what they want to accomplish. If the goals set forth above become the goals for correctional administration, then it becomes necessary to monitor progress toward achieving these goals. It also means accepting the possibility that what we are doing and how we are doing it is not necessarily the "best way" to accomplish our tasks. Technological change and computerization of institutional data will certainly help facilitate this process. In addition, the recognition that there are valuable "data" resting in the individual and collective experience of correctional personnel will lead administrators to tap this data source in the development of policies and procedures designed to improve and successfully manage the quality of institutional life in the next century.

Examples of prisons where "learning" takes place can be found. In these organizations, employees are encouraged to learn from their (or the organization's) mistakes and to make adjustments in appropriate directions. Mechanisms that allow for this provide feedback loops, which characterize the brain.

For example, when courts mandate a new disciplinary procedure, they are acting as part of the environment that defines the boundaries of the prison. That is, courts are within the organizational boundaries of the prison. In implementing the changes, it is expected that mistakes will be made because of uncertainty. If the staff reviews disciplinary tickets that were not upheld with an eye to finding out what went wrong, then the action provides the feedback loop necessary for learning and adjustment to take place. When such learning processes become part of organizational culture, the likelihood of smoother organizational responses to changing conditions is enhanced.

INCARCERATION 2010: CONCLUSION

The only certainties I can offer as we move toward the year 2010 are (1) that the multilayered environment within which correctional facilities operate will not be the same as it is today, and (2) this new environment will have an impact on the character and quality of incarcerative life. I have tried to identify some of the processes and forces that I believe have shaped and will shape prison life as we move to the future. I described some "desirable" characteristics of prisons. Whether these environmental changes will have a positive or negative impact on the

quality of institutional life is up to us. Though we may have to change our ways of thinking about change to achieve positive results, the tools and concepts needed to do so are now available. The future is up to us to create.

FOR FURTHER READING

John Dilulio. *Governing Prisons: A Comparative Study of Correctional Management*. New York: The Free Press, 1987.

This book compares three distinct prison systems across the country and offers three models of prison management: consensual, responsibility, and control. The author's policy prescriptions have far-reaching implications for the future management of prison facilities.

Robert Johnson. *Hard Time: Understanding and Reforming the Prison*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole, 1987.

Johnson traces the historical development of prisons predicated on the notion that they are painful places. He also compares and contrasts two divergent views of prisons: the private and public cultures of prisoners and correctional officers. He concludes by examining the elements of a "nature" coping strategy for prisoner adjustment.

Lucien Lombardo. *Guards Imprisoned: Correctional Officers at Work* (2nd ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson, 1989.

This study of correctional officers' work setting stresses

the dynamic and complex nature of their work. The author's research emphasizes the importance of viewing correctional officer work within the realm of human service delivery and beyond the incarcerative approach.

Gareth Morgan. *Images of Organization*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1986.

Morgan's analysis uses metaphors in exploring organizations. From mechanistic models to more sophisticated views, the author highlights the diversity of organizations and the necessity of viewing them in multiple ways.

Hans Toch. *Living in Prison: The Ecology of Survival*. New York: The Free Press, 1977.

In this groundbreaking work, Toch describes the multiple needs and adjustment strategies found among prisoners. He shows how prisoners individually and collectively develop "niches" within the prison environment. He concludes with the importance of niche development in the adjustment of prisoners and the management of prisons.