

THE IN A HURRY SERIES

Prisons *in a Hurry*

What they are for, and whether it works

Max Brocklesby

BOOKSINAHURRY.COM

Contents

The Whole Thing in One Page 4

Why You Should Care 5

The Core Ideas 7

How It Actually Works 21

What People Get Wrong 30

Use It 35

Terms 40

Go Deeper 45

Notes and Sources 47

Bibliography 53

The Whole Thing in One Page

The public picture of a prison is a wall around dangerous people. The wall is real, but it hides the institution's larger act. Prison takes a person out of ordinary life and gives the state control over where that person lives, when the door opens, who may visit, what work is available, how medicine is obtained and how most hours are spent. Its distinctive product is controlled time.

Prison became a standard sentence surprisingly late. Earlier gaols often held people awaiting trial, payment or punishment. Eighteenth- and nineteenth-century reformers proposed the penitentiary as a cleaner, ordered substitute for public pain, transportation and chaotic confinement. They also built systems of silence, labour, classification and isolation whose harms soon exposed the contradiction: a humane reform can become a precise technology of control.

That product can do several jobs. It punishes through loss of liberty. It incapacitates by removing opportunities to offend outside. It declares that some conduct deserves public censure. It may deter people who expect to be caught and care about the threatened sanction. It can create a setting for education, treatment and preparation for release. It does little by itself to repair a victim's loss, and it can damage the housing, work, health and relationships that make later offending less likely.

So the question on the cover needs five additions. Work for what purpose, for which people, compared with which alternative, over which period and at what cost?

Prison's immediate effects are clearest. It deprives liberty and restricts action. That can be indispensable when wrongdoing is grave, danger is immediate or lesser sanctions cannot express proportionate censure. The later effects are conditional. Research does not reveal one universal treatment effect called imprisonment. A rehabilitation-oriented Norwegian system produced different results for some adults from those found among detained young people in one American city. Sentence length, prison

conditions, labour markets, welfare systems, supervision rules and the people selected for custody all change the answer.

Inside, order depends on more than locks. Officers must secure repeated compliance from people who cannot leave. Fair decisions, predictable routines, useful activity, health care, family contact and proportionate security affect violence, trust and the possibility of learning. A locked classroom teaches nothing when no teacher arrives. A release plan does not exist because a form says it does.

Scale changes the institution too. Admissions, remand, sentence length, parole and recall determine the number inside. Once population outruns safe cells, trained staff and purposeful time, the prison asked to reduce risk can become less capable of doing so. The relevant person is often the marginal prisoner, the next person admitted or the next month imposed, rather than the most frightening case in the system.

Most prisoners return. At the gate, total control gives way to transport, an address, medication, a licence, debts and relationships that may have survived or collapsed. The sentence may end there. Its consequences do not. A defensible prison system therefore reserves custody for work that needs custody, imposes no avoidable punishment beyond the sentence, uses controlled time purposefully and judges success after the door has opened as well as while it was shut.

That is the book.

Why You Should Care

At a prison gate, a person can pass in a few seconds from near-total control to ordinary responsibility. Inside, meals, movement, medication and contact were scheduled. Outside, the same person may need to find a bed, collect a prescription, report to supervision, reach work, repair a family relationship and avoid the people or places linked to earlier offending. The institution that controlled almost everything yesterday may control almost nothing useful today.

That handover is where the prison question stops being remote. You do not need to know anyone in custody to depend on the answer. A prison system determines which dangers are contained, which punishments are imposed in your name, how much public money is committed, what conditions state power may create and what risks return through the gate. About 11.5 million people are held in penal institutions worldwide. More than 3 million are estimated to be in pre-trial detention, many not convicted of the offence for which they are confined. Those figures join systems so different that they cannot supply one verdict, but they show the scale of the institution being judged.

Prison exposes a basic error in public reasoning. Extreme cases dominate imagination. The person who has killed repeatedly, organised serious violence or presents an immediate danger makes secure confinement easy to defend. Policy, however, changes at the edge. The relevant question is what happens when the next less dangerous person is imprisoned, the next sentence is extended, the next remand decision is made or the next licence breach produces recall. A system can be justified at its centre and wasteful or harmful at its margin.

The institution is intellectually revealing because its purposes do not share one unit of success. Retribution asks whether suffering is deserved and proportionate. Incapacitation asks which offences were prevented while the person was confined. Deterrence asks how threatened punishment changed other people's choices. Rehabilitation asks whether capability, opportunity and motivation changed. Reparation asks what was restored to the victim. A lower reoffending rate cannot prove that a sentence was deserved. A proportionate sentence cannot prove that it made society safer. Mixing those claims allows every failure to be defended by changing the purpose after the result is known.

Prison life matters for the same reason engineering matters to a bridge. Purpose does not overcome design. In 2024-25, inspectors in England and Wales judged purposeful activity poor or not sufficiently good in 28 of the 38 men's and women's prisons they inspected. That finding does not describe

every prison or every country. It shows how easily the promised day of work, education and treatment becomes long hours in a cell. When staffing, movement and safety fail, programmes listed on paper cease to be a regime.

Then there is the moral fact that conviction does not transfer ownership of a person to the state. The authorised punishment may be loss of liberty. Avoidable assault, untreated illness, arbitrary decisions, racial abuse, hunger or prolonged isolation are additional penalties unless law and necessity justify them. Safe custody is not indulgence. It is the minimum condition for punishment to remain public rather than becoming whatever happens behind a wall.

The strongest reason to care is less dramatic. Most people sent to prison will come back. The public therefore inherits the person the institution returns: older, perhaps safer, perhaps angrier, perhaps healthier, perhaps homeless, perhaps newly skilled, perhaps more deeply tied to crime. Prison cannot be judged by how completely it separates people from society. It must be judged by what the separation was for, what happened during it and what condition the person, victim and public face afterwards.

The Core Ideas

The Punishment Is Controlled Time

For much of history, a gaol was a place people waited. They waited for trial, payment of debt, transportation, execution or a corporal punishment carried out elsewhere. Confinement could be miserable and lengthy, but the locked room was often the container for the legal process rather than its final product. Modern imprisonment changed the grammar. The state no longer held a person until punishment. It punished by holding the person.

That shift was sold as reform. In the 1550s, London's Bridewell joined confinement to labour and correction. John Howard's survey of filthy, fee-ridden gaols in 1777 helped make regulated custody look more humane than disorder, disease and arbitrary extortion. Nineteenth-century

penitentiaries promised clean cells, work, reflection and moral change. Eastern State Penitentiary opened in Philadelphia in 1829 around separate confinement. Pentonville, opened in London in 1842, turned isolation, surveillance and routine into a model that could be copied.

The humane aspiration and the technology of control arrived together. Jeremy Bentham's unbuilt Panopticon gave the ambition a geometric form: arrange cells around an inspection point so observation might be possible at any moment, then let uncertainty do part of the governing. The design became more famous than its construction record because it captured the new logic. Punishment would work through organised visibility, routine and self-control rather than repeated public blows.

To make confinement measurable, administrators divided people by status, risk, sex and conduct; counted them; recorded them; set their movements; inspected their cells; rationed contact; and converted a sentence into days under rules. The result could be less bloody than the punishments it displaced. It could also reach further into a person's life.

Loss of liberty sounds like one subtraction. Institutionally, it is a transfer of decisions. Someone else decides the address, the key, the timetable, access to fresh air, the people nearby, the route to health care and whether a family visit can occur. The prisoner loses ordinary ways of escaping conflict, changing job, choosing company or spending an evening. These additional deprivations are partly inseparable from secure custody, partly products of design and partly failures.

This distinction sets the moral boundary. A lawful sentence may authorise confinement. It does not authorise every pain that confinement happens to produce. If violence, medical neglect, arbitrary discipline or months of useless idleness are avoidable, they cannot be smuggled into the sentence as though a court imposed them. International prison standards begin from that point: prisoners retain rights not lawfully taken away.

Pre-trial detention makes the distinction sharper. A remand prisoner is confined to secure attendance, protect a process or manage a stated risk,

not to receive punishment after conviction. Yet the daily machinery may look much the same. More than 3 million people are estimated to be held pre-trial worldwide, with important gaps in the data. The same door can therefore perform different legal acts. To understand prison, begin with what the door certainly does, then ask what authority and purpose justify each day behind it.

One Building Carries Several Purposes

A prison sentence can be defended in six different languages, and they do not translate cleanly into one another.

Retribution says serious wrongdoing deserves a proportionate deprivation. This is a moral claim about desert, not a prediction about crime rates. Denunciation says public punishment expresses a boundary and recognises the wrong done. Incapacitation says confinement prevents at least some offending outside while it lasts. Deterrence says the threat or experience of punishment changes future choices. Rehabilitation says the person can leave better able and more willing to live lawfully. Reparation says responsibility should help restore what can be restored to a victim or community.

Only the first three follow directly, and even they need limits. Confinement imposes deprivation, so it can punish. A public sentence can communicate censure, though what the public hears may differ from what the court intended. A locked person has fewer opportunities to offend in the community, though harm can occur inside and another person may replace them in a market or group. Deterrence, rehabilitation and reparation require mechanisms beyond the wall.

The purposes can support each other. A proportionate sentence administered fairly may be easier to regard as legitimate. Education or addiction care can use time that would otherwise be empty. A restorative process may give a victim information and acknowledgement while the person remains in custody. They can also collide. A regime made deliberately frightening for deterrence can damage mental health, trust and

learning. Indefinite confinement might maximise short-term incapacitation while violating proportionality. Distance from home may aid security yet weaken family contact. A victim may want safety and information rather than a longer sentence that offers neither.

No common score settles the six purposes. A prison can be secure and degrading, proportionate and ineffective, rehabilitative for one group and disruptive for another. It can meet a victim's wish for protection while failing their need for explanation, compensation or participation. A policy that reports only the measure on which it performs best is not evaluation. It is selection after the event.

The phrase "prison works" conceals these differences. A reoffending study cannot establish deserved punishment. A deserved punishment cannot establish deterrence. A safe year inside cannot show what happens after release. An individual success cannot prove a population policy, and an average effect cannot decide the fate of one person without further evidence.

Purposes create opportunities for retrospective defence. When crime does not fall, a policy can be called retributive. When conditions are criticised, it can be called deterrent. When costs rise, it can be called protective. This is purpose laundering: the standard changes after the result is known. The remedy is to state the job before choosing the instrument and to name the evidence that would count against it.

A mature prison policy begins with a purpose ledger. Which goals are moral, which are causal, which are immediate and which require later outcomes? What burden is the prisoner authorised to bear? What does the victim need? What would a fine, community order, treatment requirement, monitored restriction or restorative process do instead? Custody may survive that comparison. For murder, organised violence, coercive abuse or repeated serious harm, the moral and protective case may remain strong even when rehabilitation evidence is uncertain. Empirical findings cannot decide every value. The discipline is to say which claim is carrying the decision and what limit still applies.

The Prison Population Is Selected

A prison population is not a sample of everyone who causes harm, or even everyone who commits an offence. It is the residue of a sequence. Conduct must be criminalised, noticed, reported, recorded, investigated, charged, proved or admitted, sentenced and implemented. At each stage, institutions select. The resulting population reflects offending, but it also reflects law, enforcement priorities, evidence, money, geography, plea practice, bail rules, sentencing options and political tolerance for different risks.

That is why prison statistics cannot answer moral questions on their own. A high share of people with addiction does not show that addiction naturally leads to prison. It may show which offences are criminalised, what treatment exists outside, who is policed and which defendants can offer a stable address. A high share of people with mental illness does not mean prison is an appropriate hospital. It may show the failure of community care, housing and crisis services. Over-representation of racial, ethnic or Indigenous groups can arise through several linked mechanisms; the disparity is real even when one number cannot identify all causes.

Remand adds a population whose legal status differs from sentenced prisoners. Some present serious risks. Others remain because bail conditions, legal delay, poverty or lack of an accepted address make release difficult. They can be confined for longer than any eventual sentence or acquitted after months inside. Treating remand as an administrative detail hides a major route into overcrowding and disruption.

The selection has a human shape. Where women's estates are small, distance from home can be greater, and many prison systems report substantial trauma and caring responsibilities among those they hold. Children are still developing and can lose education at a decisive stage. Older and disabled prisoners may face stairs, queues and health regimes designed for younger bodies. Foreign nationals can lose contact through language and distance. These patterns do not define every person in a category. They show why identical rules can produce unequal burdens.

Within the wall, classification selects again. Security category, age, sex, legal status, health, vulnerability, offence, gang affiliation, language and sentence stage affect allocation. Good classification prevents predictable harm and places people where the regime fits. Bad classification can put a vulnerable person beside a predator, send a low-risk person into a high-control environment or confuse disability with defiance. Categories help only when staff still see the person.

The crucial policy figure is the marginal prisoner. The most dangerous person in a maximum-security unit tells you why some prison exists. The next person admitted tells you whether expansion is useful. As custody widens, it tends to reach people with lower expected offending, shorter sentences, greater responsiveness to community measures or more to lose from disruption. The average prisoner can remain high risk while the marginal return from another cell falls.

This also explains why one country's result will not travel automatically. A study of people sent to a rehabilitation-oriented Norwegian prison estimates the effect of that system on cases near its sentencing margin. A study of juveniles detained in one American city estimates something else. Neither supplies the essence of prison. Each shows what happened when a particular population crossed a particular institutional threshold.

Selection does not excuse wrongdoing or erase agency. It resists two convenient stories. The population is neither a collection of monsters who reveal nothing about public institutions nor a collection of passive victims without responsibility. People can have caused serious harm and also arrive through unequal systems, damaged health and failed services. Policy has to hold both facts because prison has to manage both. The honest counterfactual is prison versus the sanction, treatment, restriction or unmanaged risk that would otherwise occur for this group.

Order Is an Achievement

A wall prevents easy departure. It does not produce a stable social order. Prisons contain people placed there against their will, living close to strangers, under scarcity, surveillance and rules they did not choose. Staff are outnumbered. Most daily instructions cannot be enforced through physical force without making ordinary life impossible. The institution therefore depends on repeated, largely voluntary compliance.

Three kinds of security make that possible. Physical security uses walls, doors, locks, alarms and controlled perimeters. Procedural security uses searches, counts, permissions, records and rules about movement. Dynamic security uses staff knowledge, communication and working relationships to notice tension, understand routines and distinguish an unusual silence from an ordinary one. The three are complements. A strong door cannot tell an officer why a debt on one landing is about to become a fight.

Authority matters at the smallest scale. People are more likely to comply when rules are understandable, decisions have reasons, officers act consistently and complaints can be heard without retaliation. Fairness does not remove conflict, and some people remain violent or manipulative. It changes the amount of force needed to govern everyone. An officer who keeps a promise and explains a refusal builds information as well as legitimacy. A regime that humiliates people teaches them to hide, perform and retaliate.

The officer-prisoner encounter is the smallest unit of the institution. A door opened on time, a medical request passed on, a search conducted without humiliation and a refusal explained can look trivial beside towers and fences. Repeated thousands of times, such acts determine whether information travels and whether rules appear predictable. Small arbitrary acts accumulate too. They teach people that formal channels are useless and private leverage is safer.

The informal prison grows wherever the formal one leaves gaps. Food,

tobacco, drugs, phones, protection, favours and information acquire prices. Debts create power. Prisoners develop codes for status and safety. Staff can neither abolish this social world nor safely ignore it. Empty time strengthens it. Purposeful work, education, exercise and association compete with boredom, illicit markets and the search for identity.

Health care and family contact belong in the same operating account. Untreated pain can appear as aggression or withdrawal. A missed psychiatric appointment can become a security incident. Visits can steady identity and planning, while cancelled or distant visits transfer punishment to children and relatives. Security may require restrictions, but a system that treats every constructive relationship as a risk eventually creates the isolation it then has to manage.

Conditions alter the institution's capacity. In 2024-25, inspectors judged purposeful activity poor or not sufficiently good in 28 of 38 men's and women's prisons they inspected in England and Wales. That is one jurisdiction and one inspection period, not a global rate. It demonstrates a general mechanism: a programme exists only when staffing, safety, movement and attendance allow it to happen. A classroom behind a locked door is inventory.

Isolation shows the limit of control. Separating someone may stop an immediate assault or protect them from others. Extended isolation can impair thought, mood and behaviour, with observational research consistently linking it to psychological harm and self-harm. The Nelson Mandela Rules define more than 15 consecutive days as prolonged solitary confinement and restrict its use. The standard does not abolish every emergency separation. It demands necessity, review, human contact and a route out.

Staff live inside the consequences too. Chronic understaffing, fear, mandatory overtime, moral injury and inconsistent leadership narrow their choices until withdrawal or coercion feels safer than engagement. Professional prison work is neither social work with keys nor guard labour alone. It is the skilled maintenance of lawful authority under pressure. Order

is not what remains when nothing happens. It is something people produce, shift by shift.

Crime Prevention Runs on Three Clocks

Prison can affect crime on three clocks, and a result on one can conceal a loss on another.

The first clock runs during custody. A confined person cannot commit many offences in the community. This is incapacitation's strongest claim. Its size depends on what that person would otherwise have done, how long the risk would have lasted and whether someone else takes the opportunity. Incapacitation is large when a high-rate, hard-to-manage offender is confined during a period of serious danger. It shrinks when low-risk people are added, sentences continue beyond the risk period or illicit organisations replace removed members. Age matters because offending is concentrated unevenly across the life course, though serious risk does not disappear on one birthday. Review is needed because a sentence fixed at conviction can outlast the risk profile it was meant to manage.

The second clock starts after release. Prison may discourage future offending, connect someone to treatment and education, or interrupt a violent network. It may also sever work, housing and family ties, expose the person to coercion, deepen criminal relationships and add a record that blocks lawful options. These mechanisms run in opposite directions. The question is not whether prison is inherently rehabilitative or criminogenic. It is which mechanisms dominated for the people, regime and comparison being studied.

Causal studies make the variation visible. A random-judge study in Norway found lower reoffending and better employment for people who had not been working before imprisonment, within a system strongly oriented towards rehabilitation. Previously employed people experienced employment losses. A random-judge study of more than 35,000 juvenile cases in one large American county found detention reduced high-school completion and increased later adult incarceration. These are not

contradictory estimates of one universal treatment. They are warnings against pretending there is one.

The third clock is population-wide. A larger prison system changes budgets, families, neighbourhoods, labour markets, criminal networks and institutional legitimacy. It may deter some conduct through the threat of custody. Here the evidence is often compressed into a slogan. The stronger finding is that perceived certainty of apprehension has more consistent deterrent support than added sentence severity. That does not mean severity never matters. A credible sanction can matter, and some planned offences respond to it. It means that adding years to an already severe sentence is often a weak way to change people who discount the future, expect not to be caught or do not know the tariff.

Specific deterrence is equally uncertain. The experience of prison may make one person avoid return and make another less able to avoid it. Rearrest, reconviction and reimprisonment measure different combinations of conduct, enforcement and supervision. Research in Michigan found that later imprisonment could rise through technical supervision violations without a corresponding rise in new felony convictions. Calling both outcomes recidivism would conceal the mechanism.

These clocks require a counterfactual. Offences prevented during custody must be weighed against offences displaced, replacement, later effects and what another sanction would have achieved. The first year imposed on a dangerous person is not evidentially equivalent to the twentieth year, and the first secure bed is not equivalent to the last bed added to an overcrowded system.

This framework prevents a common accounting trick. Governments can announce offences prevented during custody while leaving later offending, prison violence, replacement and opportunity cost outside the ledger. Critics can point to damaging prisons while ignoring the serious harm prevented by confining a particular person. Both select one clock. Public safety is a time series, not a photograph of a locked gate, and no honest evaluation can stop the clock at the result it prefers.

Rehabilitation Is Delivered, Not Contained

A prison can compel attendance. It cannot compel learning, insight, sobriety or a different life. Rehabilitation is not a property of the building. It is a set of interventions and relationships delivered inside a setting that may help or obstruct them.

The best-supported approaches are specific. Cognitive-behavioural work can help people recognise patterns, rehearse alternative responses and solve problems differently. Education can improve skills and qualifications. Treatment for substance dependence can reduce use and stabilise health. Work can build routine and competence when it resembles lawful work rather than pointless labour. Violence and sexual-offending programmes can address relevant patterns for selected participants. None is a universal cure, and a long list of programmes says little about who receives them or how well.

Risk, need and responsivity provide a useful discipline. Intensity should broadly match risk; interventions should address factors linked to offending; and teaching should fit ability, motivation, language, disability and learning style. The model is imperfect and prediction can become overconfident, but it prevents two common errors: giving intensive correctional treatment to people unlikely to need it, and offering generic activity to those whose main barriers remain untouched.

Allocation matters before delivery. Waiting lists often favour people with enough sentence left to complete a course, while short-sentence prisoners may receive almost no structured help despite rapid return to the community. People assessed as too high risk, too unstable, too unwell or insufficiently motivated may be excluded from the service that could change those conditions. A risk tool can guide scarce resources, but it can also turn uncertainty into a queue with moral consequences.

Implementation separates a programme from its name. Trained staff, clear manuals, supervision, dosage, attendance, safety, group composition and quality control alter outcomes. Cognitive-behavioural programmes have

reduced reoffending on average in systematic reviews, but stronger effects are tied to competent delivery. Correctional education is likewise associated with better outcomes across reviewed studies, yet much of the evidence comes from the United States and programmes vary. A certificate is not a causal mechanism.

The surrounding regime can cancel the lesson. A person taught emotional regulation in the morning and humiliated by arbitrary power in the afternoon receives two curricula. Addiction treatment interrupted at transfer or release can leave tolerance reduced while exposure to drugs resumes, increasing overdose risk. A workshop that bears no relation to the labour market may fill hours without building a route into work.

Change extends beyond treatment. Desistance often involves age, relationships, identity, opportunity and the gradual accumulation of ordinary commitments. People can decide to stop offending before they have the housing, money or trust needed to sustain that decision. Staff, families, employers, peers and community organisations can reinforce a new identity; rules and stigma can pull the other way.

Coercion complicates participation. A person may attend because parole depends on it, say what the programme rewards and learn little. Another may begin instrumentally and still change. Motivation is neither a fixed trait nor a reason to abandon standards. Good practice creates repeated chances to engage, uses observable work rather than performance alone and separates honest difficulty from calculated disruption.

Prison can support rehabilitation when it supplies an intervention unavailable outside, creates enough safety and stability for participation, preserves constructive ties and connects the work to release. It can damage rehabilitation when separation destroys more than the programme builds. The honest comparison is that programme in custody against credible treatment, supervision and support in the community for the same person.

The Gate Tests the Sentence

A release date or review point is built into most prison sentences. That fact should govern the institution from the first day, but systems often behave as though release were an administrative event at the end. The gate then reveals what controlled time preserved, changed or destroyed.

The handover can be abrupt. Inside, medication, food and location were institutionally managed. Outside, a person may receive property, licence conditions and a short supply of medicine, then need transport, identification, a phone, an address and money within hours. Research from several countries finds mortality concentrated soon after release, especially from overdose and other preventable causes. The exact risk differs by place, period and population. The recurring timing shows a failure of continuity, not an unlucky coincidence.

The release bag is a revealing object. It contains whatever property survived reception and transfer, perhaps identification, clothes and papers. It does not contain a tenancy, a waiting employer or a repaired relationship. The contrast exposes the limit of total institutions: they can store possessions and schedule behaviour, but ordinary life depends on reciprocal arrangements that cannot be issued at a desk.

Housing is the first platform. Without it, keeping appointments, storing medication, sleeping safely and seeking work become harder. Employment provides income and routine, but a record, lost skills, disclosure rules and long absence narrow access. Family contact may supply care, identity and accountability, yet imprisonment can also leave fear, debt and exhausted relatives. Release plans that assume a family will absorb every cost transfer public responsibility to the people least able to refuse.

Supervision can support the transition and manage risk. It can also create a back door to prison. Recall is necessary when danger escalates or someone disappears from oversight. Technical conditions that multiply failure without distinguishing risk can cycle people through short returns, causing fresh loss of housing, treatment and work without a new conviction. The measured

reimprisonment rate then reflects licence design as well as offending.

Zoom out and the same mechanism becomes arithmetic. The prison population is yesterday's stock plus admissions and returns, minus releases and deaths. Longer sentences slow the outflow for years. Remand delay increases the stock even if sentencing law does not change. Recall adds an inflow. Building a cell treats capacity as a construction problem, while staffing, health care, visits, education, transport and release services may remain fixed.

Crowding changes the treatment being evaluated. More people share cells, movement slows, officers know less, appointments are missed and purposeful hours contract. A sentence imposed to protect the public enters an institution less able to maintain safety or prepare release. Emergency early-release schemes may relieve pressure but create another risk if accommodation and supervision are not ready. Closing beds without building community capacity can fail for the same reason.

Collateral consequences extend the sentence without appearing on the warrant. Disclosure rules, licence restrictions, debt, exclusion from housing, lost immigration status and damaged credit can remain after formal punishment. Some restrictions protect others and are justified. Others persist by habit, with no clear link to present risk. When every route back is closed, the system converts past conviction into a continuing obstacle and then treats failure as fresh evidence about character.

This is the causal repayment. Prison begins by taking control of a person's time. It ends by handing time back. The final public-safety result depends on what happened in between and on the conditions of that transfer. A defensible system uses custody where separation is necessary, keeps only the restrictions necessary for that purpose, makes the day lawful and demanding, and designs the whole sentence backwards from the gate.

How It Actually Works

Reception

A person enters prison through a sequence of removals and records. Identity and legal authority are checked. Property is listed, stored, allowed or withheld. The person may be searched, photographed, issued clothing and assigned a number. Health staff ask about medication, withdrawal, injury, pregnancy, disability, mental distress and suicide risk. Officers need to know who may be harmed, who may harm others, who requires an interpreter and who cannot safely be placed alone.

This work can look bureaucratic because bureaucracy is one of custody's safety systems. A missing prescription, wrong legal status or unrecorded threat can become an emergency within hours. Reception also carries a conflict. Staff need information quickly, while the person may be frightened, intoxicated, ashamed, distrustful or exhausted after court and transport. A form completed under those conditions is not the person. Good reception repeats important questions, checks records and makes the first night a period of active observation rather than passive storage.

Withdrawal can accelerate, a court outcome can produce despair, and an old conflict may reappear when names are recognised on a wing. Safe reception therefore depends on communication between escort, court, health staff and officers rather than one perfect screening form. It also depends on basic explanation. Uncertainty about calls, medication, property and the next hearing can turn fear into panic or aggression.

Legal status matters from the start. A remand prisoner may be awaiting trial or sentence and is not serving punishment after conviction. A sentenced prisoner may have a fixed release date, a minimum term before review, or a sentence whose end depends on law and risk decisions. Immigration, extradition or civil detention can place other legal statuses in prison-like conditions. The institution must know which powers apply. A uniform and locked door do not make legal differences disappear.

Allocation and classification

The first placement decision balances security, safety, health, family contact and access to a useful regime. High walls are wasted on a person who can be managed safely in lower security. Low security is reckless for someone who presents a credible escape or violence risk. The difficulty is that prediction is uncertain and the costs of error are unequal. One serious failure can dominate public memory; thousands of unnecessarily restrictive placements remain mostly invisible.

Classification usually considers offence, sentence, behaviour, previous custody, escape history, gang links, vulnerability and clinical needs. It should change when evidence changes. A person can become less risky, more unwell, more vulnerable or more dangerous. Static labels turn an early judgement into an identity. Regular review is part of security rather than a relaxation of it.

Risk assessment combines records, structured tools and professional judgement. Each can fail differently. Records preserve earlier behaviour but may omit context. Tools improve consistency but can reproduce the patterns in their data and give false precision. Judgement can notice change but is exposed to bias and institutional pressure. A defensible decision records uncertainty and the consequence of both over-classification and under-classification.

Placement affects more than the perimeter. Distance from home changes visits. A specialist unit may provide health care while weakening family contact. A protective placement can prevent assault but produce isolation close to solitary confinement. In jurisdictions with small women's and children's estates, geography narrows choice. Disabled and older people may need cells, showers and movement plans designed around bodies that the standard prison quietly assumes away. A security decision distributes opportunity as well as restriction. Transfers can reset the process. Records follow imperfectly, prescriptions may need reauthorisation, programmes can be interrupted and a prisoner must learn a new informal order. Movement between establishments is sometimes necessary for safety, court access or

specialist care. Each move still has a cost that should appear in the decision rather than vanish as logistics.

Count, keys and movement

The count is the institution's pulse. Staff establish that every person is where records say they should be. Doors open and close in sequences. Groups move to meals, exercise, health appointments, visits, work, worship, education and legal meetings. One delayed movement can spread through the day because routes, officers and rooms are shared. A prison timetable is less like a school schedule than an air-traffic system with locked gates.

Courts, hospitals, lawyers and visitors add external deadlines. A late escort can waste a clinical appointment or delay a hearing. A security incident in one area can trigger restricted movement across the establishment. The official day may still show education and exercise while most people remain behind doors. Regime data need to measure delivery, not aspiration.

Physical security limits escape and separates incompatible groups. Procedural security decides who moves, when and with what authorisation. Dynamic security supplies the knowledge that rules cannot contain. Officers learn who is unusually withdrawn, which friendship has become coercive, why a prisoner refuses a cell and whether a request is routine, manipulative or urgent. That knowledge is created through presence. When staffing falls, officers retreat to essential movements and paperwork; the information system degrades before the wall does.

Force remains available. It may be necessary to stop violence, move someone who presents immediate danger or search an area where weapons are suspected. Its legitimacy depends on necessity, proportionality, recording, medical attention and review. Routine humiliation is operationally expensive. It produces grievance, concealment and group solidarity against staff. A prison can win each physical encounter and lose control of the social environment. Too little enforcement privatises coercion; too much teaches that force is the institution's first language.

The cell and the landing

The cell is bedroom, waiting room, dining space, toilet, refuge and punishment site, sometimes shared with a stranger. Its meaning depends on hours unlocked, sanitation, temperature, noise, privacy and safety. A small room used for sleep is different from the same room used for most of the day. Official capacity figures often miss that distinction.

Shared accommodation can be safe in a room designed for it and degrading where a single cell receives a second bed beside an unscreened toilet. Light, ventilation, drinking water, bedding and the ability to summon help are mundane until one fails. Noise also travels. A person may be locked alone yet unable to sleep because doors, alarms, shouting and televisions make privacy impossible. The cell controls the body even when nobody enters it.

On the landing, prison society develops around scarcity and dependence. People trade food, toiletries, drugs, phones, services, information and protection. Some exchanges are ordinary mutual aid. Others create debt and coercion. Status can follow offence, reputation, toughness, money, outside connections or access to staff. The informal system becomes stronger when legitimate routes are slow, inconsistent or distrusted.

Staff must work within this social order without accepting its violence. Searches may find weapons or contraband, but supply can enter through staff corruption, visitors, mail, drones, contractors and procedural weaknesses. Demand matters as much as supply. Boredom, untreated addiction, fear and the need to communicate can sustain a market under severe controls. Illicit phones can be used for intimidation and crime, while their value also reveals unmet demand for affordable contact.

The regime

A prison regime is the pattern of daily life, not the list of services in a brochure. It includes hours out of cell, work, education, treatment, exercise, association, worship, visits, meals, showers, health care and legal help. Its quality depends on delivery. A workshop cancelled for lack of officers is not work. A waiting list is not treatment. A course completed under pressure is not proof of learning.

Purposeful time has several functions. It reduces the pressure of idleness, supplies skills, creates contact with staff and allows behaviour to be observed under ordinary demands. Work can teach reliability and competence, but repetitive labour with no market relevance may do little beyond occupy hours. Education can repair earlier exclusion, though classes must accommodate different literacy, language and learning needs. Exercise affects health and tension. None of these activities removes the punishment. They determine what kind of time the punishment contains.

Health care has to operate inside security without becoming subordinate to it. People arrive with chronic disease, injury, addiction, trauma, mental illness and unmet dental needs. Confinement can make treatment easier to start because the person is locatable and routines are controlled. It can make care harder through restricted movement, distrust, transfer, clinical staff shortages and fear of being labelled weak. Confidentiality is difficult where an officer may be needed nearby.

Equivalence with community care is a minimum principle, but equal provision may require extra effort because need is concentrated and autonomy is reduced. Clinical independence matters when health findings conflict with operational convenience. A doctor should not certify punitive conditions as safe because there is nowhere else to place someone. Officers need enough information to manage immediate risk without receiving clinical detail they do not require.

Family contact is both a right subject to necessary restrictions and an operational resource. Calls and visits can maintain identity, share

information and prepare housing or care. They can also enable intimidation, criminal coordination or abuse, so restrictions may be justified. The task is discrimination rather than blanket suspicion. Distance, cost, search procedures and cancelled visits affect relatives who have not been sentenced, especially children. Contact can also be unsafe for victims or relatives; preservation is not an unconditional good.

Discipline, separation and complaint

Prisons have rules within rules. Alleged misconduct may lead to an internal hearing, loss of privileges, extra restrictions or referral for criminal investigation. Because the institution controls evidence, witnesses, movement and daily conditions, procedural safeguards matter. The person should know the allegation, have a chance to answer it, receive reasons and have access to review. An unexplained punishment teaches that power, rather than conduct, determines outcomes.

Separation is used for different purposes: discipline, protection, investigation, medical need or immediate control. Those purposes should not be collapsed. A person isolated for their own protection can experience conditions as severe as someone punished for violence. Time, human contact, exercise, health review and a plan for return matter whatever label is attached. The Mandela Rules use an operational threshold of 22 hours or more a day without meaningful human contact and call more than 15 consecutive days prolonged solitary confinement. A different unit name does not remove the condition.

Complaints, independent inspection and legal access are part of how a closed institution corrects itself. Prisoners cannot change provider, leave the building or expose conditions easily. Informal resolution can solve small problems quickly, but it cannot replace an independent route for serious abuse. Staff also need reporting systems that do not punish them for identifying unsafe practice.

Deaths, serious injuries, allegations of abuse and major uses of force require investigation independent enough to command confidence. Closed

institutions are prone to normalisation: repeated failure begins to look ordinary to the people who see it daily. External scrutiny interrupts that adaptation, while internal candour supplies detail an occasional inspection cannot capture.

Progression

A sentence should contain movement. Security can reduce, responsibilities can increase and contact with ordinary life can become less artificial as risk is tested. Open prisons, work release, temporary release and supervised community access allow behaviour to be observed under conditions closer to those after the gate. They carry risk. Keeping everyone in maximum control until the final morning carries a different risk: release without rehearsal.

Parole or conditional release separates the total sentence from the period spent inside. Decisions may consider conduct, completed work, risk evidence, release plans and the nature of the original offence. Good behaviour in a controlled setting is informative but incomplete. A person can comply under surveillance and struggle with money, relationships or temptation outside. A difficult prisoner may present less future danger than someone skilled at institutional performance. Review needs evidence, reasons and humility about prediction.

Risk is not the same as blame. A person may deserve a long proportionate sentence while presenting little current danger, or present serious risk near the end of a shorter sentence. Systems that merge punishment and prediction can keep people confined because every denied release prevents the institution from observing success outside. Graduated testing creates information that total control cannot.

Preparation for release should begin early because documents, benefits, housing, health transfers and employment cannot reliably be assembled in the final week. Short sentences create a particular problem: they can be long enough to lose a room, job or treatment place and too short to receive meaningful work inside. Repeated short custody can function as disruption

without development.

The gate and supervision

Release reverses the institution's basic act in one moment. The door opens, but obligations may continue through licence, parole or probation. The person needs to travel, eat, sleep, report, obtain medication and avoid prohibited contact or places. These requirements can conflict. A reporting appointment far from temporary housing may consume the money needed for food. A curfew may clash with available work. Conditions that cannot be followed safely are defective.

Release timing can worsen the problem when offices, pharmacies or housing services are closed or transport is limited. The remedy is operational coordination, not a speech about personal responsibility. Responsibility becomes meaningful when a person has a feasible route to comply and consequences are tied to choices within their control.

The early health risk is acute. Reduced drug tolerance, interrupted treatment, stress and renewed access make the period after release unusually dangerous. Large studies across several countries find deaths concentrated in the first days and weeks, though the magnitude varies. Continuity of medication, overdose prevention, a confirmed appointment and a real address are public-safety measures as well as health care.

Supervision combines help and surveillance. It can connect people to housing, treatment and work, monitor restrictions and respond when risk rises. It can also convert missed appointments, unstable housing or administrative failure into recall. Graduated responses are appropriate where safety permits. Swift return is necessary in some cases. The distinction should turn on risk and conduct, not institutional convenience.

A missed appointment caused by deliberate evasion is different from one caused by hospitalisation, homelessness or an impossible timetable. Recording both as non-compliance simplifies administration while destroying useful information. Recall data must separate new offences, serious risk escalation and technical breaches if they are to say anything

about public safety.

Capacity and flow

A prison population changes through inflow and outflow. Courts send sentenced and remand prisoners in. Transfers and recalls add movement. Releases, acquittals, sentence completion and parole move people out. A small change in average duration accumulates across years because people remain in the stock while new admissions continue.

Consider an explicitly illustrative steady system receiving 1,000 sentenced admissions a year. If average time served rises from two years to three while admissions stay constant, the long-run sentenced stock moves from about 2,000 to about 3,000. No judge has ordered a thousand extra people into prison on one day. Duration has created them in the count.

Capacity is a relationship, not a bed count. Safe cells, trained officers, health appointments, visits, classrooms, workshops, transport, legal access and release planning must expand together. Adding temporary beds while keeping the rest fixed can reduce the effective regime for everyone. Overcrowding appears in shared cells, but its mechanism runs through queues and lost attention.

It reduces the time an officer can spend resolving a problem, delays health care, increases competition for phones and showers, weakens classification choices and turns routine movement into a security calculation. It can make recruitment and retention harder, feeding the original shortage. The number over capacity is less informative than which functions have stopped working.

Population pressure encourages emergency measures: police-cell use, delayed transfers, temporary accommodation, accelerated release or restricted activity. Some may be necessary. Chronic emergency means admission and duration policy have exceeded institutional capacity. The same is true in reverse. Reducing custody without credible community sanctions, treatment, housing and probation creates failure outside and invites a rapid political return to prison.

How we know

Prisons generate extensive records because they count people, movements, incidents, programmes and releases. Those data are strong for administrative flows and weak for unreported violence, fear, informal power and the quality of an interaction. Inspection, interviews and ethnography reveal the lived regime but cover particular places and can be affected by access and candour. Reoffending measures are especially incompatible: rearrest, reconviction and reimprisonment use different events, follow-up periods and enforcement systems.

Causal research often uses random assignment to judges or abrupt policy changes to compare similar cases near a decision threshold. Such studies can be powerful, but they estimate a local effect for the people whose outcome changed because of that judge or rule. They do not identify a universal prison effect. Programme reviews combine more settings, while variation in delivery can make the average hard to apply.

The sound method is triangulation: administrative data for scale, inspection and prison sociology for conditions, causal studies for specific policy margins, systematic reviews for recurring patterns, and legal standards for limits that outcomes alone cannot set.

What People Get Wrong

“Prison is a single punishment”

The sentence is described in one number, so the institution looks like one dose. Twelve months appears to mean the same thing wherever it is served. It does not. The authorised deprivation is time in custody, but the experienced burden also depends on safety, cell occupancy, distance from family, health care, activity, uncertainty and isolation. Two equal terms can contain radically different lives. The same prison can change over time: a staffed regime with daily work can contract into repeated lockdown after vacancies, violence or overcrowding.

This does not mean courts must individualise every discomfort or that punishment can be made pleasant. Secure custody creates unavoidable restrictions. The correction is narrower: avoidable violence, neglect and arbitrary power are not automatically justified because a sentence exists. Otherwise deterioration can be defended as extra deterrence without ever being authorised, measured or acknowledged. A state that cannot say what punishment it intended cannot know when its institution has exceeded it. This matters to victims too. A sentence that appears definite at court but depends on chance conditions behind the wall is neither transparent nor equal. Public punishment should be severe where law makes it severe, not where administration happens to fail.

“The prison population is a list of the most dangerous people”

The image persists because serious violent cases are memorable and prison is the most severe routine sanction. Yet the population includes remand prisoners, people serving short terms, people recalled for breaches, people convicted of non-violent offences and people whose risk has changed over a long sentence. It also excludes many harmful people who were never detected, charged or convicted.

No single description fits every jurisdiction. The correction is to see selection. Law, policing, resources, bail, plea practice, sentencing and available alternatives shape who arrives. This does not erase responsibility. It prevents the frightening centre of the population from being used to justify every marginal admission. Offence, blame and present risk overlap without becoming interchangeable. Some people require secure confinement. Others may be punished and managed more effectively outside. Expansion is judged by the next case affected, not by the worst case already inside. The mistaken image also conceals change within people. Someone sentenced for a grave offence may age, become ill or disengage from a violent group. Someone convicted of a less serious offence may present complex immediate risks. Classification must respond without rewriting blame.

“A longer sentence always buys more safety”

The idea follows directly from incapacitation: if one year prevents outside offending, two years should prevent more. Sometimes it does. The error lies in assuming equal return from every added year. Risk changes with age, health, relationships and circumstance. The person may have stopped offending during the added period, or another person may replace them in an illicit market. Longer confinement can weaken later housing, work and family ties.

The evidence therefore supports a curve, not a slogan. Early confinement of a person posing serious danger may produce large gains. Later extensions and wider use can yield less, especially when they reach lower-risk people or crowd the institution. Review does not deny the original offence. It asks whether continuing restraint still performs the claimed protective job and whether proportionate punishment sets a different limit. Refusing to examine change is not the same as finding continuing danger. The same logic applies to mandatory minimums and automatic sentence extensions. They trade individual review for predictability and denunciation. That trade may sometimes be chosen openly, but it should not be misdescribed as a precise risk calculation.

“A harsher prison is a stronger deterrent”

Severity is visible to politicians and easy to legislate. Perceived detection is harder: it depends on reporting, investigation, clearance and what potential offenders believe. That makes longer sentences an attractive symbol of action. Deterrence research gives a less convenient result. Evidence is more consistent for the perceived probability of apprehension than for adding severity to an existing sanction.

The correction is not that punishment has no deterrent effect. A credible threat can matter, particularly for planned conduct and people who know the rules. The problem is marginal severity. Someone acting impulsively, intoxicated, under emotional pressure or expecting not to be caught may respond little to an extra year. Potential offenders rarely know the detailed

conditions of a prison or the sentence increment added by a new law. The threshold can matter while the exact tariff does not. Cruelty is an inefficient message when its intended audience cannot see or calculate it. It can also weaken legitimacy among people whose cooperation helps detection. A punishment policy may therefore increase severity while reducing the willingness to report, testify or comply. Deterrence depends on the whole enforcement chain, not the final room in it.

“Rehabilitation is either a success or a fraud”

Political argument often treats rehabilitation as one wager. A programme produces a headline result and becomes proof that people change, or one scandal makes the whole idea naive. The category is too broad. Education, cognitive-behavioural work, addiction treatment, health care, employment preparation and violence programmes use different mechanisms for different people.

Systematic reviews show that some well-delivered interventions reduce reoffending on average. They also show variation. Staff skill, attendance, dosage, group safety, selection and continuity matter. Prison may help one person through structure and harm another through disruption. Success need not mean perfection: offending may become less frequent or less serious before it stops. Personal testimony still cannot replace comparison. The relevant unit is the intervention as delivered within a regime, compared with a credible alternative. A programme name should not protect an institution that cancels classes, moves participants and releases them without continuity. Nor should a negative average become a verdict on every participant. Heterogeneous results are a reason to improve targeting and delivery, then test them, rather than to turn rehabilitation into faith or ridicule.

“A reoffending rate tells you whether a prison worked”

One percentage appears objective, which makes it tempting to rank prisons or countries. The denominator and event often differ. Rearrest captures police action as well as conduct. Reconviction requires detection, prosecution and proof. Reimprisonment can include technical licence breaches. Follow-up may begin at release or sentence, last one year or several, and exclude people who die or move.

Selection adds another problem. A prison receiving high-risk, long-sentence or unstable cases should not be compared raw with an open prison preparing lower-risk people for release. Country comparisons add incompatible laws and enforcement. One system may release earlier and observe failure in the community; another may keep similar people confined through the follow-up period. The first can appear worse while testing reintegration more honestly. Reoffending remains important, but it needs a specification: event, period, population and comparator. Measurement choices can reverse an apparent ranking without any underlying change in conduct. Safety inside, health, employment, housing, victim outcomes and lawful treatment answer other questions. A system can lower reconviction while producing more prison violence, or improve health while showing no short-term crime effect. No one indicator carries every purpose.

“An alternative to prison is an alternative to punishment”

The wall has become the public symbol of seriousness, so anything outside it can look like release without consequence. Community orders can restrict time, movement, association and activity; require unpaid work, treatment or reporting; impose monitoring; and expose breach to further sanction. Fines can be substantial when adjusted to means. Restorative processes can demand direct responsibility that passive confinement avoids.

Alternatives are not automatically better. Electronic monitoring can become surveillance without support. Treatment courts can coerce people or punish

relapse. Weak probation can leave risk unmanaged. New sanctions can widen the net by controlling people who would otherwise have received a warning or fine while prison numbers remain unchanged. Randomised studies of consented face-to-face restorative conferences found benefits for participating victims and modest average reductions in repeat offending, but that evidence concerns one structured model. The correction is comparative design: which sanction can impose proportionate censure, protect others and support compliance for this case? The alternative must also replace custody rather than sit beside it. If electronic monitoring is added to cases that once received a fine while prison use remains unchanged, technology has expanded punishment without solving the prison problem.

Use It

Name the job before judging the prison

Whenever someone says prison is working or failing, ask for the verb. Punishing, containing, deterring, changing, condemning and repairing require different evidence. Then ask whether the claim is moral or causal. “This offence deserves custody” cannot be disproved by a reoffending study. “This sentence will prevent crime” cannot be established by desert.

This lens exposes purpose laundering. A government may justify expansion as deterrence, defend weak crime effects as retribution and answer bad conditions with a rehabilitation programme. State the primary purpose before the policy begins, identify secondary purposes and specify what result would count against the choice. The exercise does not eliminate disagreement. It prevents disagreement from moving each time evidence arrives. It also clarifies duration. A sentence justified by proportionate desert has a different stopping rule from confinement justified by current risk. Mixing the two can make punishment indefinite without saying so, or make risk disappear merely because a tariff has expired. Name the rule that controls the end as well as the reason for the start.

Find the marginal prisoner

Do not test a prison policy against the person everyone agrees must be confined. Test it against the next person whose outcome changes. For an expansion, that may be someone with lower risk, a shorter sentence or a viable community plan. For a reduction, it may be someone whose risk is higher than the average person already diverted.

The marginal-prisoner lens also changes budget questions. The first secure unit may prevent severe harm. The next overcrowded wing may reduce staff attention and purposeful time across the estate. The next sentence extension may add years after risk has declined. Ask who enters, who stays longer, what would happen otherwise and which existing prisoners bear the capacity cost. Average descriptions are poor guides to decisions made at the edge. The lens works in reverse during reform. Closing a low-security unit may save fewer resources than expected if its residents move to more expensive custody. Diverting a carefully selected low-risk group may succeed while broader eligibility would not. Margins move, so yesterday's result should not be extended beyond the people and capacity that produced it.

Run the three clocks

Separate safety during custody, conduct after release and effects across the population. Incapacitation belongs mainly to the first clock. Specific deterrence, disruption, stigma, treatment and re-entry belong to the second. General deterrence, budgets, neighbourhood concentration and legitimacy belong to the third.

A claim can then be placed rather than accepted whole. "Crime fell while more people were imprisoned" may contain incapacitation, deterrence, demographic change, policing and other causes. "Released prisoners reoffended" says nothing causal without a comparator. "Long sentences protect the public" may be strong for an early high-risk period and weak later. A policy should not stop its measurement when the preferred clock gives the desired result. Put costs on the same timeline. A longer sentence

may postpone offences, postpone treatment, increase ageing and health costs, and reduce later employment. A community sanction may preserve work while exposing the public to some risk during supervision. Time does not remove trade-offs. It locates them.

Inspect the regime, not the brochure

Translate institutional promises into delivered hours and completed sequences. How many people reached the classroom, workshop, treatment group, exercise yard, health appointment and family visit? How often were movements cancelled? Did the same trained staff remain long enough to know the wing? Was the course followed by continuity after transfer and release?

This lens applies beyond rehabilitation. A prison described as secure may have high violence, coercive debt and staff who know little about the people they supervise. A prison described as humane may avoid necessary enforcement and leave vulnerable people controlled by others. Look for the mechanism: staffing, relationships, routines, information, proportional force, review and usable time. A label is not an operating condition. Ask the same question of exceptional events. One escape, assault or successful rehabilitation can dominate discussion, but an institution is a repeated process. Incident reviews should identify the chain that failed without allowing a rare case to erase ordinary performance. Daily reliability, rather than institutional advertising or one dramatic episode, is the better guide to capacity.

Design backwards from the gate

Begin with the morning after release and move backwards. Where will the person sleep? How will medication continue? What identification, phone, transport and money are needed? Which contact is prohibited, which relationship is protective and who knows the difference? When must supervision occur, and can the requirements be met together?

Then ask what must happen one month, six months and a year before release to make that morning possible. Documents need applications.

Housing needs referrals and realistic supply. Treatment needs records, appointments and consent. Work needs skills, disclosure planning and employers. Lower-security testing may need time. Designing backwards exposes why a final-week resettlement interview cannot repair years of institutional separation. It also makes release conditions testable. Each condition should have a stated risk mechanism, a feasible route to compliance and a response proportionate to breach. If nobody can explain how a restriction improves safety, or if compliance requires services that do not exist, the plan is performing control rather than managing risk.

Compare a portfolio, not a favourite

The useful choice is rarely prison or kindness. It is a portfolio of proportionate sanctions and controls. A fine can punish financially. A community order can structure time and require work or treatment. Electronic monitoring can verify location. Restorative justice can provide information, participation and reparation where parties consent and safety permits. Custody can contain risks that cannot be managed outside.

Judge each component by the job it can perform and the failures it introduces. Monitoring may detect breach without changing the reason for it. Treatment may be effective but unavailable. A fine can be crushing for one person and trivial for another. Community supervision can become a route to custody through excessive conditions. Alternatives count only when they replace a more restrictive sanction for comparable cases. Otherwise the portfolio has grown, not improved. A useful test is displacement: which people would have received custody without this option, and what did they receive instead? If the answer is nobody, the measure may still have value, but it is not reducing imprisonment. Track admissions and sentence severity after introduction, not merely the completion rate of the new programme.

The limits

These lenses do not sentence individuals. Courts and release bodies must apply local law, examine evidence and hear victims, defendants and professionals. Risk cannot be reduced to a group average, and a low estimated probability may still concern catastrophic harm. The same intervention can operate differently across prison systems, welfare states and labour markets.

Nor does better evidence remove moral conflict. People can agree about likely effects and disagree about desert, mercy, equality or how much risk the public should bear. Some information will remain unavailable because randomised sentencing is rare, prison violence is underreported and long-term outcomes take years. The aim is disciplined judgement under uncertainty, not a formula that makes responsibility disappear. These lenses also do not supply a universal prison rate. Geography, crime patterns, legal traditions, public services and political values differ. They offer questions that travel better than national models do.

The one thing to keep

Keep the gate in the picture.

The wall creates a visual error. It makes the confined period look complete and the outside consequences look separate. In fact, every ordinary prison sentence is a temporary transfer of control. The state receives a person from society, governs part of their life and returns them. The public inherits the result.

That changes the permanent question. Do not ask whether prison works in the abstract. Ask whether this use of controlled time is necessary for the stated job, whether the institution imposes only the additional restrictions that safety and law require, and what condition the person, victim and public will face when the key turns the other way. A prison policy that cannot answer at the gate has not finished its account. The person who returns is neither the person who entered nor a product made by prison alone. Responsibility remains personal, but the state remains responsible for the

powers it exercised and the conditions it created. Keeping both responsibilities visible is harder than choosing a slogan. It is also the only serious way to judge the institution.

Terms

Custody

Lawful physical control that prevents a person leaving. It can include prison, jail or another secure setting. The legal authority, purpose and safeguards differ across forms of custody. The word describes control, not whether that control is justified.

Remand or pre-trial detention

Confinement before conviction or sentence, commonly to secure attendance, protect proceedings or manage risk. It is not punishment after conviction, though daily conditions may be similar. Time on remand can still disrupt work, housing, health and defence preparation.

Sentence

The legally authorised consequence imposed after conviction. A custodial sentence may include time inside and a later period under licence, depending on the jurisdiction and sentence type.

Tariff or minimum term

The period that must normally be served before release can be considered under some indeterminate or life sentences. Completing it may permit review, not automatic release.

Parole or conditional release

Release before the total sentence ends, subject to conditions and supervision. Terminology and decision-makers vary. It transfers some risk management from a closed institution to the community. Conditions need a clear purpose and a feasible route to compliance.

Recall

Return to custody during a period of conditional release. Recall may follow a new offence, serious risk escalation or a technical breach, distinctions that matter when outcomes are measured.

Retribution

Punishment justified because wrongdoing deserves a proportionate response. It concerns blame and desert. Evidence about future crime can inform consequences but cannot prove the moral judgement.

Denunciation

The public expression that conduct is wrong and serious. Imprisonment can communicate censure, although routine or unequal use can blur the message and weaken its authority.

Incapacitation

Prevention through restricting opportunity. Prison incapacitates outside the institution while custody lasts, but the gain depends on counterfactual offending, replacement, sentence length and conduct inside.

General deterrence

The effect of threatened punishment on people other than the person punished. It depends on awareness, perceived apprehension, expected consequence and how choices are made.

Specific deterrence

The effect of punishment on the future behaviour of the person who experienced it. Prison may discourage return, while disruption, stigma or criminal contact can pull the other way.

Rehabilitation

Work intended to increase the capability and motivation to live lawfully. It includes specific interventions and supportive conditions. Confinement itself is neither a programme nor an outcome.

Reparation

An attempt to repair harm through restitution, compensation, work, acknowledgement or another response. Prison may express seriousness but often limits earning, participation and direct restoration.

Restorative justice

A structured process addressing harm, responsibility and possible repair, often involving victims, responsible persons and community members. Consent, safety, preparation and skilled facilitation are central safeguards.

Reoffending or recidivism

Later recorded offending after a defined event. Measures may use arrest, conviction or return to custody over different periods. Rates are meaningless without the event, cohort and comparator. Publication date, observation period and data vintage must also be kept separate.

Desistance

The process through which offending reduces and may cease. It can involve age, identity, relationships, opportunity and repeated effort, rather than one treatment moment or permanent transformation.

Criminogenic

Capable of increasing crime or conditions linked to it. The word can describe needs, environments or sanctions, but it should identify a mechanism rather than function as a label.

Risk-need-responsivity

A correctional model proposing that intervention intensity should fit risk, target needs linked to offending and match the person's abilities and learning style. Application still requires judgement and review. A score should inform a decision rather than become a permanent description of the person.

Dynamic security

Safety produced through professional staff presence, knowledge and communication. It complements physical barriers and procedures by detecting changes, resolving tensions and improving the information available for decisions.

Procedural justice

The perceived fairness of decision-making, including voice, neutrality, respectful treatment and trustworthy motives. It matters because lawful authority depends partly on cooperation, especially where staff are outnumbered.

Prisonisation

Adaptation to prison's formal and informal culture. It can include habits useful for safety inside that become obstructive outside, though experiences differ by person, regime and duration.

Solitary confinement

Confinement for 22 hours or more a day without meaningful human contact under the Mandela Rules. More than 15 consecutive days is classified there as prolonged solitary confinement.

Overcrowding

A population exceeding usable capacity. The mechanism reaches beyond shared cells to staffing ratios, queues, health care, movement, visits, safety and access to purposeful activity.

Normalisation

The principle that prison life should resemble positive community life except where restrictions are necessary for lawful custody. It prepares release and limits punishment by administrative habit.

Open prison

A lower-security institution relying less on physical barriers and often allowing work or temporary release. It permits graduated testing but is suitable only for selected people and stages.

Community sentence

A court-ordered sanction served outside prison, potentially involving supervision, unpaid work, treatment, restrictions or monitoring. It can punish and manage risk without total separation.

Electronic monitoring

Technology that records location, presence or another condition, often through a tag. It can improve information and enforce boundaries, but it does not supply treatment, housing or judgement. Effects depend on who would otherwise receive which sanction.

Net-widening

Expansion of penal control when a new alternative is imposed on people who previously received a lighter response rather than replacing custody. Admission and sentence data reveal whether substitution occurred.

Collateral consequences

Legal, economic and social restrictions that follow conviction beyond the stated sentence, such as disclosure, exclusion or immigration effects. Some protect others; others persist without a current-risk rationale.

Resettlement or through-the-gate work

Preparation and support linking custody to life after release. Housing, identification, health care, benefits, work, family and supervision require continuity before and after the gate.

Go Deeper

David Scott, *Why Prison?* (Cambridge University Press, 2013)

Start here for an accessible critical overview of imprisonment's purposes, history and harms. Scott asks whether prison's dominance follows from evidence or political habit and gives clear routes into abolitionist and reform arguments. His standpoint is openly critical, so read him as a disciplined challenge rather than a neutral survey. The book is especially useful after this one because it presses the question that follows comparative failure: if an institution repeatedly misses its declared purposes, how much should be repaired and how much replaced? Its compact chapters make it the most inviting of these four choices, though readers should notice how its normative position shapes its selection of evidence.

Gresham M. Sykes, *The Society of Captives: A Study of a Maximum Security Prison* (Princeton University Press, 1958; 2007 reissue)

Sykes's study of a New Jersey prison gave prison sociology some of its enduring language, including the pains of imprisonment and the negotiated character of order. Read it for close observation of how a formal regime produces an informal society. Its limits matter: it concerns one mid-twentieth-century men's maximum-security prison, and later prisons differ in population, technology and power. The 2007 reissue helps place the classic in its intellectual setting without making it timeless. Notice how many later debates about legitimacy, scarcity and adaptation begin from problems already visible in this one institution.

Shadd Maruna, Making Good: How Ex-Convicts Reform and Rebuild Their Lives (American Psychological Association, 2001)

Maruna examines desistance through the stories people tell about responsibility, identity and change. The book is valuable because it moves beyond programme completion and asks how lawful lives are sustained after formal control recedes. It is qualitative, setting-specific and centred on people who can narrate their experience, so it should not be treated as an effect estimate. Read it for the human mechanism that reoffending tables struggle to show: a person needs a credible way to understand the past without being permanently trapped by it. It pairs well with quantitative evaluation because it shows what the outcome called desistance may feel like from inside the process.

National Research Council, The Growth of Incarceration in the United States: Exploring Causes and Consequences (National Academies Press, 2014)

This large multidisciplinary report is the strongest next step for evidence, policy margins and scale. It examines why United States incarceration expanded, what that expansion contributed to crime reduction and what it cost prisoners, families and communities. The report is long and country-specific, but its method travels: separate mechanisms, ask about the marginal use of custody and refuse to infer causation from parallel trends. Its age means current figures need updating; its analytical framework remains unusually useful. Readers outside the United States should transfer the questions, not the national conclusions, and update the report with current local data before applying it.

Notes and Sources

The Whole Thing in One Page

Global variation. The claim that there is no universal treatment effect called imprisonment is a synthesis of the causal literature, not a quotation from one source. Nagin, Cullen and Jonson survey competing mechanisms; the National Research Council examines how effects change at different levels of United States incarceration; Villettaz, Gillieron and Killias compare custodial and non-custodial sanctions; Bhuller and colleagues and Aizer and Doyle show sharply different local effects in Norway and a United States juvenile setting. The contrast is used to establish heterogeneity, not to rank countries.

Rights boundary. The statement that a sentence authorises loss of liberty rather than every hardship produced by custody follows the Nelson Mandela Rules and the revised European Prison Rules. Those texts are minimum standards and regional rules respectively. Their legal force differs by jurisdiction.

Why You Should Care

World prison population. Helen Fair and Roy Walmsley's *World Prison Population List*, fourteenth edition, was published by the Institute for Crime & Justice Policy Research in May 2024. Published national totals summed to about 10.99 million. The authors estimated that the world total exceeded 11.5 million after allowing for people held in countries whose complete figures were unavailable, notably China and North Korea. National observation dates differ, so the figure is an informed global estimate rather than a synchronous census.

Pre-trial detention. Fair and Walmsley's fifth *World Pre-trial/Remand Imprisonment List*, published in December 2025, reported that more than 3 million people were held in pre-trial detention. The estimate excludes several unavailable national populations and people held in police facilities. It should not be divided mechanically by the 2024 world total because the

lists have different dates and coverage.

Purposeful activity. The figure of 28 out of 38 men's and women's prisons comes uniquely from HM Chief Inspector of Prisons' *Annual Report 2024-25*, published on 8 July 2025. It covers establishments inspected in England and Wales during that reporting year. It is retained as a bounded example of the gap between a listed regime and delivered time, not as an estimate for all prisons.

The Core Ideas

Origins of imprisonment. The historical account uses Howard's 1777 survey, Bentham's 1791 *Panopticon* letters, Ignatieff's study of the English penitentiary and the collection edited by Morris and Rothman. Bridewell developed as a house of correction in the 1550s; Eastern State Penitentiary opened in 1829; Pentonville opened in 1842. These landmarks belong mainly to British and United States history. They do not establish a single global origin, and the book does not imply that custodial institutions elsewhere followed the same path.

Purposes of punishment. Retribution and denunciation are normative claims. Incapacitation, deterrence and rehabilitation contain empirical claims. Reparation has both normative and practical elements. The distinction draws on standard punishment theory but is used only to examine custody, leaving the wider justice-system treatment to *Crime and Justice in a Hurry*.

Selection into prison. The pipeline account is an institutional inference supported by official prison statistics, remand data and the wider sentencing literature. Over-representation does not identify one cause. The text therefore names several mechanisms and avoids treating disparity, addiction or illness as proof of a single causal route.

Different populations. The discussion of women, children, disability, ageing and foreign nationality is mechanism-based rather than prevalence-based. The United Nations Bangkok Rules and rules concerning juveniles support differentiated provision, while the European Prison Rules

support individual assessment. No group description is presented as universal.

Order and legitimacy. The account of order draws from Sykes, Sparks, Bottoms and Hay, Liebling, Crewe, and the UNODC handbook on dynamic security. These works use different methods and settings. Their common contribution is that prison order depends on relationships, information and perceived fairness alongside barriers and procedures.

Solitary confinement. Rule 44 of the Nelson Mandela Rules defines solitary confinement as 22 hours or more a day without meaningful human contact and prolonged solitary confinement as more than 15 consecutive days. Luigi and colleagues reviewed thirteen observational studies and found associations with adverse psychological effects, self-harm and mortality. The text describes association and risk, not a universal causal magnitude.

Incapacitation and diminishing returns. The National Research Council's 2014 report supplies the main synthesis for marginal incapacitation, sentence severity and United States expansion. Incapacitation is a direct mechanism, but its quantity depends on counterfactual offending, age, duration and replacement. The book does not assign one portable number to offences prevented per prison year.

Deterrence. Nagin's 2013 review is the principal support for the distinction between certainty and severity. The evidence is more consistent for the perceived probability of apprehension than for marginal increases in sentence severity. This does not establish that severity never deters, that swiftness always improves outcomes or that any arrest practice is justified. Chalfin and McCrary provide a later economic review consistent with caution about simple severity claims.

Custody compared with community sanctions. Villettaz, Gillieron and Killias reviewed higher-quality studies and found no consistent reoffending advantage for custodial sanctions over non-custodial sanctions. Petrich, Pratt, Jonson and Cullen's 2021 meta-analysis of 116 studies likewise found

a null or slightly adverse average association for custody relative to non-custodial sanctions. Both evidence bases combine varied populations, designs and policy margins. The conclusion is therefore used against a presumption of custodial superiority, not as proof that every person should receive a community sentence.

Norway. Bhuller, Dahl, Loken and Mogstad used random allocation to judges in Norway. They found lower reoffending and improved employment effects concentrated among people who had not been working before imprisonment; previously employed people experienced employment losses. The book names the rehabilitation-oriented Norwegian setting and uses the study to show interaction between institution and prior position, not a general effect of incarceration.

Juvenile detention. Aizer and Doyle used randomly assigned judges in more than 35,000 juvenile cases from one large urban county in the United States. Their estimates linked detention to lower high-school completion and higher adult incarceration. The finding is not extended to adults, other jurisdictions or every form of youth custody.

Supervision and outcome definitions. Harding, Morenoff, Nguyen and Bushway studied people sentenced for felonies in Michigan. Their 2017 analysis found that higher later imprisonment among those initially sent to prison was driven mainly by technical supervision violations rather than new felony convictions. The text uses this result to show that reimprisonment and new offending are not interchangeable.

Cognitive-behavioural programmes. Lipsey, Landenberger and Wilson's Campbell review supports a conditional average reduction in recidivism, with programme integrity, staff preparation and participant risk among the important moderators. The manuscript avoids a headline percentage because study design, population and delivery vary.

Correctional education. Davis and colleagues' RAND review and Bozick and colleagues' later meta-analysis support the claim that correctional education can improve post-release outcomes. The evidence base is largely

from the United States and contains selection and implementation limits. The text treats education as a delivered intervention rather than a property of custody.

Desistance. Maruna and McNeill support the account of change as a process involving identity, relationships and opportunity. These works illuminate mechanism and lived experience rather than supply a universal treatment effect.

Mortality after release. Binswanger and colleagues documented a steep mortality risk after release in Washington State. Borschmann and the Mortality After Release from Incarceration Consortium later pooled individual data for 1,471,526 people released in eight countries and found mortality highest in the first week. The text retains the recurring timing pattern and avoids presenting one risk ratio as universal.

Population stock and flow. The equation is accounting rather than a contested empirical result: population changes through admissions and returns minus releases and deaths. The numerical example involving 1,000 annual admissions is explicitly illustrative and assumes a steady system. It is not a description of a real jurisdiction.

Operating section

Operating sequence. Reception, classification, movement, regime, discipline, progression and release are common functions, but names and legal procedures vary. The account combines the Nelson Mandela Rules, European Prison Rules, UNODC operational guidance, inspection practice and prison sociology. It is a model of recurring functions rather than a manual for one national service.

Risk assessment. Structured tools can improve consistency while remaining vulnerable to data bias, calibration error and false precision. Professional judgement can recognise change while remaining vulnerable to bias. The manuscript therefore treats classification as revisable evidence under uncertainty rather than a permanent identity.

Health care. The principle of equivalence and continuity draws from the Nelson Mandela Rules, European Prison Rules and World Health Organization prison-health guidance. The manuscript makes no claim that equivalent care is achieved everywhere. The post-release overdose mechanism is supported by the mortality research noted above.

External scrutiny. The need for inspection, complaint and independent investigation follows from the information asymmetry of closed institutions and from international standards. Inspection evidence establishes conditions in inspected places and periods, not the prevalence of every hidden event.

What People Get Wrong

Comparing reoffending rates. Arrest, conviction and return to custody are different outcomes. Follow-up periods, cohort entry, exclusions and supervision intensity can alter rates. Raw international league tables are therefore excluded. A country's publication date, the observation period and the dataset vintage should be recorded separately.

Restorative justice. Strang, Sherman, Mayo-Wilson, Woods and Ariel reviewed ten randomised experiments of consented face-to-face conferences. They found benefits for victim satisfaction and a modest average reduction in repeat offending. The finding is limited to that structured model and does not show that every victim should participate or that conferencing is safe for every offence.

Electronic monitoring. Belur and colleagues' systematic review found effects varied by population, setting and programme design. Monitoring can restrict or verify location during use, but it does not deliver housing, treatment or employment. The text avoids treating a device as a complete sanction.

Net-widening. Aebi, Delgrande and Marguet examined 29 European countries from 1990 or 1991 to 2010. Community sanctions often grew alongside imprisonment rather than replacing it. This establishes a risk of institutional expansion, not an inevitable effect of every alternative.

Use It

Purpose, margin and clocks. These are analytical lenses derived from the evidence above. They are not validated prediction tools. Purpose separates moral and causal claims; the margin identifies the population whose treatment changes; the three clocks separate effects during custody, after release and across the population.

Backward design. The release lens is a practical inference from continuity-of-care research, re-entry scholarship and prison operations. It does not imply that every risk can be managed through planning or that personal agency disappears. It asks whether state-created barriers and conflicting conditions are avoidable.

Terms

Definitions use international or cross-jurisdictional meanings where possible. “Tariff”, “parole”, “licence”, “recall” and “community sentence” vary in law and should be checked against the jurisdiction in which they are used. The solitary-confinement thresholds are those of the Nelson Mandela Rules.

Go Deeper

Publication details were checked against publisher or institutional records on 2 September 2026. The four works were chosen for different jobs: a critical introduction, a classic institutional study, original qualitative work on desistance and a major evidence synthesis. Their viewpoints and setting limits are stated with each recommendation.

Bibliography

Standards, official data and inspection

Council of Europe. *Recommendation Rec(2006)2-rev of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on the European Prison Rules*. Revised 1 July 2020.

Fair, Helen, and Roy Walmsley. *World Prison Population List*. 14th edition.

London: Institute for Crime & Justice Policy Research, 2024.

Fair, Helen, and Roy Walmsley. *World Pre-trial/Remand Imprisonment List*. 5th edition. London: Institute for Crime & Justice Policy Research, 2025.

HM Chief Inspector of Prisons. *Annual Report 2024-25*. London: His Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons, 2025.

United Nations General Assembly. *United Nations Rules for the Treatment of Women Prisoners and Non-custodial Measures for Women Offenders: The Bangkok Rules*. Resolution 65/229, 2010.

United Nations General Assembly. *United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners: The Nelson Mandela Rules*. Resolution 70/175, 2015.

United Nations General Assembly. *United Nations Rules for the Protection of Juveniles Deprived of their Liberty*. Resolution 45/113, 1990.

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. *Handbook on Dynamic Security and Prison Intelligence*. New York: United Nations, 2015.

World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe. *Status Report on Prison Health in the WHO European Region 2022*. Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe, 2023.

Historical and original works

Bentham, Jeremy. *Panopticon; or, The Inspection-House*. 1791.

Howard, John. *The State of the Prisons in England and Wales*. Warrington: William Eyres, 1777.

Sykes, Gresham M. *The Society of Captives: A Study of a Maximum Security Prison*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958. Reissued 2007.

Prison history, life and legitimacy

Bottoms, Anthony, and Justice Tankebe. "Beyond Procedural Justice: A Dialogic Approach to Legitimacy in Criminal Justice." *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 102, no. 1 (2012): 119-170.

Crewe, Ben. *The Prisoner Society: Power, Adaptation and Social Life in an English Prison*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Ignatieff, Michael. *A Just Measure of Pain: The Penitentiary in the Industrial Revolution, 1750-1850*. London: Macmillan, 1978.

Liebling, Alison, assisted by Helen Arnold. *Prisons and Their Moral Performance: A Study of Values, Quality, and Prison Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Morris, Norval, and David J. Rothman, editors. *The Oxford History of the Prison: The Practice of Punishment in Western Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Sparks, Richard, Anthony Bottoms, and Will Hay. *Prisons and the Problem of Order*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Deterrence, incapacitation and imprisonment effects

Aizer, Anna, and Joseph J. Doyle Jr. "Juvenile Incarceration, Human Capital, and Future Crime: Evidence from Randomly Assigned Judges." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 130, no. 2 (2015): 759-803.

Bhuller, Manudeep, Gordon B. Dahl, Katrine V. Loken, and Magne Mogstad. "Incarceration, Recidivism, and Employment." *Journal of Political Economy* 128, no. 4 (2020): 1269-1324.

Chalfin, Aaron, and Justin McCrary. "Criminal Deterrence: A Review of the Literature." *Journal of Economic Literature* 55, no. 1 (2017): 5-48.

Harding, David J., Jeffrey D. Morenoff, Anh P. Nguyen, and Shawn D. Bushway. "Short- and Long-Term Effects of Imprisonment on Future Felony

Convictions and Prison Admissions.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 114, no. 42 (2017): 11103-11108.

Nagin, Daniel S. “Deterrence in the Twenty-First Century.” *Crime and Justice* 42, no. 1 (2013): 199-263.

Nagin, Daniel S., Francis T. Cullen, and Cheryl Lero Jonson. “Imprisonment and Reoffending.” *Crime and Justice* 38, no. 1 (2009): 115-200.

National Research Council. *The Growth of Incarceration in the United States: Exploring Causes and Consequences*. Edited by Jeremy Travis, Bruce Western, and Steve Redburn. Washington, DC: National Academies Press, 2014.

Petrich, Damon M., Travis C. Pratt, Cheryl Lero Jonson, and Francis T. Cullen. “Custodial Sanctions and Reoffending: A Meta-Analytic Review.” *Crime and Justice* 50 (2021): 353-424.

Villettaz, Patrice, Gwladys Gillieron, and Martin Killias. “The Effects on Re-offending of Custodial versus Non-custodial Sanctions: An Updated Systematic Review of the State of Knowledge.” *Campbell Systematic Reviews* 11, no. 1 (2015): 1-92.

Rehabilitation, desistance and release

Binswanger, Ingrid A., Marc F. Stern, Richard A. Deyo, Patrick J. Heagerty, Allen Cheadle, Joann G. Elmore, and Thomas D. Koepsell. “Release from Prison: A High Risk of Death for Former Inmates.” *New England Journal of Medicine* 356, no. 2 (2007): 157-165.

Borschmann, Rohan, et al., for the Mortality After Release from Incarceration Consortium. “Rates and Causes of Death after Release from Incarceration among 1,471,526 People in Eight High-income and Middle-income Countries: An Individual Participant Data Meta-analysis.” *The Lancet* 403 (2024): 1779-1788.

Bozick, Robert, Jennifer Steele, Lois Davis, and Susan Turner. “Does Providing Inmates with Education Improve Postrelease Outcomes? A

Meta-analysis of Correctional Education Programs in the United States.” *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 14 (2018): 389-428.

Davis, Lois M., Robert Bozick, Jennifer L. Steele, Jessica Saunders, and Jeremy N. V. Miles. *Evaluating the Effectiveness of Correctional Education: A Meta-analysis of Programs That Provide Education to Incarcerated Adults*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2013.

Lipsey, Mark W., Nana A. Landenberger, and Sandra J. Wilson. “Effects of Cognitive-Behavioral Programs for Criminal Offenders.” *Campbell Systematic Reviews* 3, no. 1 (2007): 1-27.

Luigi, Mimosa, Laura Dellazizzo, Charles-Édouard Giguère, Marie-Hélène Goulet, and Alexandre Dumais. “Shedding Light on the Hole: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis on Adverse Psychological Effects and Mortality Following Solitary Confinement in Correctional Settings.” *Frontiers in Psychiatry* 11 (2020): 840.

Maruna, Shadd. *Making Good: How Ex-Convicts Reform and Rebuild Their Lives*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 2001.

McNeill, Fergus. “A Desistance Paradigm for Offender Management.” *Criminology & Criminal Justice* 6, no. 1 (2006): 39-62.

Alternatives

Aebi, Marcelo F., Natalia Delgrande, and Yann Marguet. “Have Community Sanctions and Measures Widened the Net of the European Criminal Justice Systems?” *Punishment & Society* 17, no. 5 (2015): 575-597.

Belur, Jyoti, Amy Thornton, Lisa Thompson, Matthew Manning, Aiden Sidebottom, and Kate Bowers. “A Systematic Review of the Effectiveness of the Electronic Monitoring of Offenders.” *Journal of Criminal Justice* 68 (2020): 101686.

Strang, Heather, Lawrence W. Sherman, Evan Mayo-Wilson, Daniel Woods, and Barak Ariel. “Restorative Justice Conferencing Using Face-to-Face Meetings of Offenders and Victims: Effects on Offender Recidivism and

Victim Satisfaction.” *Campbell Systematic Reviews* 9, no. 1 (2013): 1-59.

Further interpretation

Scott, David. *Why Prison?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

End of manuscript