

Georgia State University
ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University

Anthropology Theses

Department of Anthropology

Fall 12-16-2015

The Others: Self-Perception And Social Stratification Amongst Incarcerated United States Citizens

Hannah Spadafora

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/anthro_theses

Recommended Citation

Spadafora, Hannah, "The Others: Self-Perception And Social Stratification Amongst Incarcerated United States Citizens." Thesis, Georgia State University, 2015.
https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/anthro_theses/102

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Anthropology at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Anthropology Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gsu.edu.

THE OTHERS: SELF-PERCEPTION AND SOCIAL STRATIFICATION AMONGST
INCARCERATED UNITED STATES CITIZENS

By

HANNAH SPADAFORA

Under the Direction of Kathryn A. Kozaitis, PhD

ABSTRACT

This research examines how the experiences of incarceration affects the identity and social stratification within jailed/imprisoned populations. To this end, the focus of this project is on how retributive justice ideologies within correctional facilities affect the treatment and labeling of people in a method which turns them into an “Other” through means of dehumanization, maltreatment and deviantization. The focus is on the nature of the problem, and on the ways variation shows reform taking place at certain correctional institutions. Sources consulted for this research include first hand perspectives and memories of those who have experienced incarceration. Interview questions and on completed surveys completed by eight previously incarcerated participants stemmed from 115 letters written by currently imprisoned individuals. These were read and coded during a one year internship that I completed with the Incarcerated Voices Project. This research was conducted over an 8 week time-span and included 60-90 minute

semi-structured interviews with eight participants. These participants are between the ages of 21 and 50 years of age, and served time in the United States correctional facilities within the last 15 years ranging from one day to 4 years. Conclusions feature data analysis of perspectives which reinforce dominant-power ideology, social stratification on which retributive justice is built, and identity effects experienced by persons who have previously been incarcerated.

INDEX WORDS: Incarceration, Ethnography, Criminology, Justice.

THE OTHERS: SELF-PERCEPTION AND SOCIAL STRATIFICATION AMONGST
INCARCERATED UNITED STATES CITIZENS

By

HANNAH SPADAFORA

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Masters of Arts

In the College of Arts and Sciences

Georgia State University

2015

Copyright by
Ashley Marie Spadafora
2015

THE OTHERS: SELF-PERCEPTION AND SOCIAL STRATIFICATION AMONGST
INCARCERATED UNITED STATES CITIZENS

By

HANNAH SPADAFORA

Committee Chair: Kathryn A. Kozaitis

Committee: Emanuela Guano

Cassandra White

Electronic Version Approved:

Office of Graduate Studies

College of Arts and Sciences

Georgia State University

August 2015

DEDICATION

I would not be where I am today were it not for a number of people to whom my gratitude cannot be expressed adequately in words. My mom made education a priority in our house, instilling in me a love of reading as well as loving values; the ways in which she taught me how to dream and her encouragement for my aspirations persist long after her passing. Genuine friendship is a gift during both the darkest and most shining of times, and I am glad to have experienced such in my life; I thus also have gratitude deeper than I can convey here for Marie, Donald, Daniel, Lauren, Alex, Uncle Frankie, the rest of the Clay household (Debbie, Andy, Don), as well as other close siblings, friends and family whom I've shared experiences of depth or joy with over the years. Finally, to keep this succinct, I likewise wish great thanks to the many individuals in my biological, adopted, step, and socially-formed families who have supported my dreams, inspired me, and/or offered compassion during my struggles: I apologize if I did not put you here by name, but you know who you are!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not be at its completion were it not for the wonderful help of my committee members. My advisor for this project, Dr. Kathryn Kozaitis, offered solid and practical advice on how to make an ambitious idea into a feasible project reality. Further, she assisted greatly with edit suggestions that I was blind to, due to the closeness I had with this project; this was invaluable when attempting to re-polish draft versions of this work. My next committee member, Dr. Emanuela Guano, also offered great feedback on earlier drafts of this project and hosted a writing workshop class that I hope continues far into the future for thesis-writing graduate students. Finally, my other committee member Dr. Cassandra White, likewise offered valuable feedback as well as particular assistance with the first and most indomitably frustrating step of research (the internal review board application!).

Beyond these specificities related to my thesis, these professors amongst others have been incredibly supportive over my graduate school career. I feel this would likewise be the appropriate place to thank some of the many other professors who challenged me to be a better scholar and encouraged my pursuit of wisdom and skill, including: All of the anthropology professors whom I've had class with at Georgia State (Dr. Jennifer Patico; Dr. Faidra Papavasiliou; Dr. Bethany Turner; Dr. Steven Black), as well as: Dr. David Bell; Kenny Smith; Kate Daley; Dr. Sandra Dwyer; Dr. Christie Hartley; Josh Russell; Dr. Louis Ruprecht; and many others whom I'm sure I'm forgetting but to whom I owe much gratitude—again, you probably know who you are! Besides professors, I likewise am incredibly appreciative of all the wonderful help of peer edit review conducted with fellow Anthropology scholars: Kelsey Barber, Malone Walker, Stephen McMasters, Jessie Burnette-Griggs, Sarah Goss, Liz Barnett, etc. This

list is in actuality quite extensive, and I must extend my apologies if I've missed someone who should be here—my thanks to you as well!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	Background.....	1
2	LITERATURE REVIEW	4
2.1	Constructing the Criminal Other	4
2.2	Deconstructing United States Incarceration.....	9
2.3	Incarceration and oppositional identity formation	11
2.4	Racism	14
2.5	Wrongful Conviction, False Imprisonment, and Exonerating Evidence	16
2.6	Prison Ethnography and Research Inaccessibility.....	17
3	METHODOLOGY	20
3.1	Project Description.....	20
3.1.1	<i>Contributor Letters [The Incarcerated Voices Project]</i>	21
3.1.2	<i>Interview Recruitment</i>	23
3.2	Research Framework.....	25
3.3	Ethics	25
4	ETHNOGRAPHY.....	26
4.1	Auto ethnographic Reflections.....	26

4.1.1	<i>Mid-2000s: Georgia County jail</i>	26
4.2	Participant Arrests	34
4.2.1	<i>Susan</i>	35
4.2.2	<i>Oliver</i>	37
4.2.3	<i>Ramon</i>	38
4.2.4	<i>Caroline</i>	39
4.2.5	<i>Carl</i>	40
4.2.6	<i>Fyn</i>	41
4.2.7	<i>Emily</i>	41
4.2.8	<i>Derek</i>	44
4.3	The Prison Setting	44
4.3.1	<i>Scheduling and Control</i>	44
4.3.2	<i>Cells and Living Space</i>	46
4.3.3	<i>Food and Nutrition</i>	49
4.3.4	<i>Hygeine and Sanitation</i>	51
4.3.5	<i>Health Care</i>	55
4.3.6	<i>Accessibility to Opportunity: Education, Vocation, and Books</i>	56
4.4	Economics of Imprisonment	59
4.5	Technology	63
4.5.1	<i>Communication: Phones</i>	63

4.5.2	<i>Media</i>	64
4.5.3	<i>Social Media</i>	65
4.6	Maintaining Loving Bonds or Feeling Alienated	67
4.6.1	<i>Family</i>	67
4.6.2	<i>Friendship</i>	70
4.7	Prisoner-Guard Interactions	74
4.7.1	<i>Deviantization</i>	74
4.7.2	<i>Dehumanization</i>	75
4.7.3	<i>Maltreatment</i>	81
4.8	Social Stratification: Others within the Others	88
4.8.1	<i>Privilege</i>	90
4.8.2	<i>Action and Identity</i>	94
4.8.3	<i>The Prison as Criminal University</i>	97
4.8.4	<i>Traumatic effects of interment</i>	100
4.8.5	<i>Dangerous People</i>	101
4.8.6	<i>Incarceration and Personal Transformation</i>	104
4.9	Reform	107
5	CONCLUSIONS	109
6	EPILOGUE	111
	REFERENCES	113

APPENDICES	124
Appendix A: Survey.....	124
Appendix B: Interview Questions.....	128

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

‘Criminal’ is a word which represents a stigmatizing identity category, a label which injures the lives of an estimated more than 2.3 million people currently or previously incarcerated within United States correctional facilities (Reiter 2014: 423). The negative connotations of the word criminal trace back to the early 1900s, when self-proclaimed anthropologist Cesare Lombroso stated that the ‘criminal’ represented a different kind of human: inferior, dangerous, and distinguishable by physical, mental and personality-based traits (Lombroso 1911). These traits have often been disproportionately mischaracterized as representative of race and ethnicity, despite the fact that biological anthropologists and other physical scientists have shown that there is more phenotypic biological diversity within a group of people than between groups of people (LeWontin 1972; Brown and Armelagos 2001; Lieberman, Kirk and Corcoran 2003). As of 2015 in the United States, incarceration is still used as a state-sanctioned tool that primarily hurts communities with low levels of social, economic and political power (Aguilar et al 2013; Ryburg 2010). Disproportionate incarceration rates are a significant fact for non-white communities in the United States particularly. It is exceedingly troubling that less than a century after integration, and less than two centuries following slavery of African Americans, non-white individuals have high statistical likelihood of imprisonment at some point in life—imprisonment which is shown to often entail exploitation of labor and personal abuse (Aguilar et al 2013; Simon 2007: 36; Wacquant 2005). Worsening the problem, a dearth of correctional center transparency since the 1980s has ensured that corrupt practices may be more easily hidden from outsider oversight such as government or community regulation (Balko 2014; Dyer 2000; Simon 2007; Taibbi 2014).

Further, retributive justice, the ideological strategy of offender punishment which is primarily focused on public risk and security, is often criticized as a short-sighted, dehumanizing practice which neglects the rights of the suspected and fails to promote long-term community safety (Bastian, Brock and Haslan 2011; Reiter 2014). Prominent in relation to incarceration, there is evidence which shows that those who enter jail for minor charges may ultimately be hardened or broken by being inside the prison system, which can affect an individual's mental state and self-conceived identity in profound ways and make recidivism more likely (Chen and Shapiro 2004).

While contemporary anthropologists and other scientists have likewise disproved the damaging idea that those who are marginalized as the Other represent a separate type of human being, the research for this thesis shows that United States retribution-based correctional facilities often still promote and reinforce the image of the criminal as someone wholly Other (Gould 1996; James 2007; LeWontin 1972; Brown and Armelagos 2001; Lieberman, Kirk and Corcoran 2003). In light of a momentous amount of contemporary criticism (See "Reform" chapter), social movements have emerged in support of restorative justice and prisoner rights (JusticeFellowship 2015). It is alongside these movements that this thesis advocates for a more compassionate, practical and well-researched system of justice. Praxis anthropologists have previously utilized humanizing research methods in analysis of education and other fields [Kozaitis 2000, 2014; Field and Fox 2007]. This thesis uses praxis anthropology to examine the impact of retributive incarceration practices through analysis of the first hand incarceration experiences of men and women in the United States. The narratives collected here also present a reality that was unpredicted: that processes which serve to stigmatize individuals as Others, also are enacted within incarcerated populations, often related back to privilege and effectively creating a more nuanced social stratification than has been shown in previous studies in the field. The goal of this thesis is

to contribute practical knowledge and anthropological perspective on the effects of incarceration on persons with direct experience in United States Correctional facilities.

This project consulted two sources. Data has been collected from one-hundred-and-fifteen written letters and eight interview-sessions; the letters were written by currently incarcerated adults while the interviews were held with previously incarcerated individuals. The letters consulted for this project are submitted contributions to The Incarcerated Voices Project, a non-profit media project run by the FreeForm Radio Initiative. This organization is dedicated to bringing the stories of incarcerated persons to public audiences through the platform of radio, with the hope that these stories will reach the ears of policy makers who have the power to enact prisoner laws that protect human rights. Letters from Incarcerated Voices Project contributors assisted the conceptualization of the eight semi-structured interviews shared in the ethnography section of this thesis. For this project I will refer to respondents who wrote letters to the Incarcerated Voices Project as 'contributors'. Respondents who were interviewed, on the other hand, will be referred to as 'participants' or 'ethnography participants'. In cases where I need to refer to both groups, I will use the word 'respondents'. This project had many limits due to duration, field site, and research boundaries. Despite research barriers, this thesis aims to be a valuable contribution to humane policy reform discussions by offering increased scholarly understanding of how incarceration practices affect identity in ways that effectively transform a person and construct social structures within a marginalized population.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Constructing the Criminal Other

Informally they are dubbed “mad dogs, animals, predators, offenders” (Ellis 2007: 1). Formally they are labeled criminal, or, “inmates, convicts, prisoners, and felons” (Ellis 2007: 1). The connection between these terms is an association with dangerous individuals who must be contained. Internalization of stereotypes, and an effect on one’s judgement of others due to prejudices which arise from such, have been documented to be present in varying levels across employment groups in society (Park 2009). These labels stigmatize incarcerated adults through perceived connections back to the socially-crafted identity category of the criminal, and ultimately serve as a component in a process which transforms this population into an Other. Creating the Other is a practice within group dynamics inherent to community establishment of definitions of deviance. The creation of the criminal as Other can be traced back to two major schools of thought that dominated criminology discourse from 1700 to 1930: the modern school of penal jurisprudence and the classical school of penal jurisprudence (Lombroso 1911). The classical school of penal jurisprudence deemed law breakers to be normal persons committing crime due to intentional malice (Lombroso 1911: 14). On the other hand, the modern school of penal jurisprudence considered lawbreakers “criminals”, a word that at the time was defined as a separate type of human (Lombroso 1911: 14).

Criminals were seen as having personal traits which 'normal' people lacked (Lombroso 1911). The normal person was defined vaguely as whatever was “average” within the country the accused individual was born in, while the criminal is defined at length as someone who is different in many ways from this rather unspecific norm (Lombroso 1911). These early 'criminal' traits were often attributes that seem arbitrary today. Traits defined during this era which clearly demonstrate

the subjectivity of the construction of the criminal Other identity category include : abnormal skull size and dentition; non-human/animal brain tumors leading the criminal to be either very intelligent or very stupid; parents who are themselves criminals, insane, neurotic or epileptic or of 'illegitimate' birth; insensitivity to pain, with the ability to heal wounds quickly, and maintain agility into old age; and a potential cleft palette (Lombroso 1911: 14-32). Further distinguishing features include: being left-handed, having long arms, being lightweight, having wrinkled skin and acne, gazing out shiftily from underneath a 'scanty beard', and/or having a hairstyle of the opposite-sex while standing on flat feet (Lombroso 1911: 35; 71). Also, different traits were associated with different types of criminals: dark hair and tattoos indicates a murderer, while a curly haired person with abnormal sleep patterns characterizes swindlers (Lombroso 1911: 14-32). Further, hobbies of the Criminal are claimed here to include the liking of games; visual-artistic 'pictograph' activities (that often display their crimes-goodbye artistic freedom) and are just a step away from archaic hieroglyphics; and the use of 'primitive' slang language which reminds the modern reader of critiques of Ebonics in modern American street slang (Lombroso 1911: 101-112). Finally, the criminal's weaknesses were said to consist of magnets, extreme temperatures, bad handwriting, less-acute hearing, smell and taste, average strength, this or past life illnesses/afflictions, and colorblindness despite general good sight (Lombroso 1911).

By contemporary standards, these particular trait associations seem arbitrary and nonsensical, but perceptions of incarcerated persons as criminals persist through metaphor and treatment of this group as if they were less than human or wholly Other. This is perhaps due to other 'criminal' traits listed which linger in discussions about crime policy today. Included in this category are links provided by early theorists between criminal nature and drug or sex-related indulgences. Also included is the continued popular image of the psychopath, defined through:

lack of remorse or guilt for actions committed; lack of sense of right and wrong; proneness to betray confidantes; passion for vengeance; incapability of feeling the pain of others; a desire to destroy things; and no real emotions of love and affection towards family or others (Lombroso 1911:39). These images persist alongside practices of deviantization, maltreatment and dehumanization, processes which reinforce public fears of the criminal as Other. The stigmatization of criminal as an identity and as an Other is often applied to individuals with histories of incarceration, regardless of particular circumstances or time since having been successful societal reintegration.

Deviantizing, the process of deeming something deviant is often used as a tool of power (Schur 1980). For this thesis, it will be considered a process which labels a group of people as deterring from the norm in a way that unarguably stigmatizes them as an Other to dominant groups. Deviantization thus serves as an essential component in the construction of the Other identity category of the criminal. This process is evident in criminology discourse, which has throughout United States history categorized law-breaking persons as something not human (Lombroso 1911). The Other can be defined loosely as an outside individual or group set in opposition to the self or one's own community, often idealized, feared, and/or marginalized due to differences in appearance, language, religion, or custom (see: Abu-Lughod 1991; Behar 1995; Trouillot 2003, Wolf 1982). Contemporary anthropologists have renounced practices which view marginalized groups as the Other, critiquing colonialism and denial of power to women through history (see: Abu-Lughod 1991; Behar 1995; Trouillot 2003, Wolf 1982). In this thesis, the Other is defined as an identity status which results from deviantization, dehumanization, and maltreatment of incarcerated persons within U.S. correctional practices.

The negative perceptions of incarcerated individuals have been shown to be present in

individuals throughout the contemporary United States (Park 2009). The level of stigmatization attached to this group is also shown to vary between college majors, religions, political affiliations, races, genders, and occupations of the questioned populations (Park 2009). Other findings show differences in perceptions of personality traits depending on who holds them; specifically, how the reality of being a good liar may be perceived positively for white non-incarcerated businessmen while the assumption of character tied to deception leads to incarcerated persons to be treated more harshly by prison guards (Rhodes 2004: 181). Further, for those who are released from prison back into the world, deviantization of their pasts often continues through stigmatized selves and tarnished reputations (Khan 2015). Research such as this unfortunately illustrates that the idea of criminal as less than human still remains potent in discourse about crime and incarceration policies. Exemplifying this continued deviantization of the criminal are media productions which promote inaccurate presentations of both crime laws, leading to increased public fear of crime and support for tough-on-crime laws.

A prominent factor leading to misleading impressions of crime is a media fascination with the figure of the psychopath, seen in shows that focus repeatedly on serial killers such as *Criminal Minds* 2006-2015 and *Dexter* 2006-2013. Imprecise perceptions of law are promoted on television shows which primarily focus on law enforcement agencies utilization of cops to primarily investigate and apprehend violent individuals, (e.g., *Dexter* 2006-2013). These do not quite match the facts, as in reality, violent crime is most often between persons who know each other, and there is a statistically higher likelihood of police officers to seek out and respond to suspicious activity that often turns out to be nonviolent (Balko 2014; Taibbi 2014; Dyer 2000). Real or not, these representations reinforce the link created between the punishment of incarceration and crime acts that qualify as horrifying or unthinkable. The record created by incarceration for a person ensures

that this goes beyond a linking of actions, however, and is instead a statement on identity. As so often happens between art and reality, the spectacle is not a looking-glass, though audiences are taught to forget such.

Persons whose reputations have been deviantized often experience this marginalization acutely in instances when they find themselves dehumanized. Dehumanization is characterized by a transformation into a 'loveless human' who needs to be regulated, punished and obviated for their deviance (Aguilar 2013: 43-44). In prison and jail settings, human bodies are forced into compliance under threat of potentially fatal violence, with affects somewhat akin to humanitarian crises in developing nations with psychosocial effects (see Lykes 2013). Additional features of dehumanization of incarcerated persons often includes language and treatment that infantilize or compare a person to an animal (Bastian and Haslam 2011; Rhodes 2004:32; Reighmen 2010: 35; Terry in Thompson 2003). In the contemporary era, assumptions of a person suspected of crime being less than human can be seen in decisions to use technological instruments such as the lie-detector test or psychological evaluations to determine if an inmate has a personality disorder such as psychopathy (Galatzar Levy 2012). The latter continues despite criticism that gender or racist bias may affect potential diagnosis (Gondles 1999 in Rhodes 2004:179-181). Critical research into this bias has shown an effect of men and women with the same symptoms being categorized alternately as antisocial (men) or borderline (women) (Gondles 1999 in Rhodes 2004:179-181). Further, dehumanization of accused persons occurs in both interrogation and court rhetoric (Galatzar-Levy 2012; Goff et al 2008). In legal cases, dehumanizing language is shown to lead third-party juries to assign accused persons to more severe punishment (Goff et al 2008).

The deviantized and dehumanized stereotype of the criminal hampers efforts towards

restorative justice for previously incarcerated persons, and often serves as justification for cases of maltreatment. Maltreatment can range from neglect to outright abuse, and result in physical and psychological damage or fatality for the mistreated incarcerated person (Bastian, Brock and Haslam 2011). Serious cases of maltreatment have included cases of incarcerated persons being shackled while giving birth, being forcibly sterilized against their will, or dying from outright guard disregard for the care of these persons basic needs (Adams 2015; Dusenbery 2015; King 2015). This is particularly troubling since the present two-prong test used to determine if confinement conditions constitute maltreatment has been shown to fail incarcerated populations; difficulty proving malicious intent of accused guards often leads to charge dismissal—when charges are brought up at all (Glidden 2012). Due to the limited oversight and transparency in prison settings, incarcerated populations and abuse they may endure may remain invisible or be internally covered up (Dyer 2000; Glidden 2012; Reiter 2014). Maltreatment is thus the most threatening aspect of the Other creating process, though the ethnography of this thesis shows to some extent the ways that deviantization and dehumanization also accrue damage to incarcerated persons sense of identity and life potential.

2.2 Deconstructing United States Incarceration

The professionalization of police work began in the 1930s with the intent to clean up corrupt practices and inefficient assistance to communities (Balko 2014; Galatzar-Levy 2012). This shift involved an adoption of power symbols used to represent technical knowledge and training such as officer uniforms and marked cars (Galatzar-Levy 2012). These symbols are intended to indicate moral responsibility to protect citizens' safety as well as license to special police privileges not held by non-professionals, such as the carrying of guns and the use of

authority to interrogate suspects (Balko 2014; Galatzar-Levy 2012). Professionalization of the police force also led to an increase for need of physical evidence seen as scientific to convict the guilty; this included the 'technology' of polygraph tests, and later, the commonly used Reid method of interrogation (Galatzar-Levy 2012). From 1980-2015, these special privileges have been extended. In cities such as New York, police presence is ubiquitous and for less wealthy communities, often invasive (Balko 2014; Taibbi 2014). Arguments have been presented that SWAT-team house raids violate the fourth and thirteenth constitutional amendments, clauses which protect against unreasonable search and seizure as well as against quartering of officials in private homes (Balko 2014:11-15). The invasive nature of the practice of using SWAT teams even for cases of non-violent drug-use and sale has been intensified in numerous mistaken shootings that have occurred over the last 25 years, both by police and by citizens (Balko 2014; Dyer 2000). This is increasingly worrisome, given the militarization of police weapons (Balko 2014; James 2007; Rubin 2015). A devotion of resources to street policing is further argued to contribute to a neglect of investigation into white collar crimes which can affect millions despite its 'invisible' setting (Balko 2014; Taibbi 2014; 2014; Dyer 2000). In recent years, prisons have downsized (Dyer 2000). Unfortunately, this has been due to necessary budget cuts from the economic recession rather than an increase in humane incarceration policies (Dyer 2000).

The reduction of ethical problems to technical issues leads to the phenomena of false confessions being explained by law enforcement as lack of skill or mishap of the interrogator in what is seen as an ideal process (Galatzar-Levy 2012). This is despite the wealth of evidence that dehumanizing practices and rhetoric in police interrogation have been shown to promote false confessions from innocent suspects (Balko 2014; Galatzar-Levy 2012). Despite being unethical, ineffective at determining guilt, in conflict with the law's spirit, undermining of law enforcement

investigations, and demoralizing for the community, these practices persist (Galatzar-Levy 2012).

The invisible nature of power abuses related to interrogation is couched in rhetoric which makes the process seem 'ordinary' in comparison to torture (Galatzar-Levy 2012; Simon 2007: 266-267). Interrogation practices may include: Ambiguously-construed Miranda warnings seen as mere words rather than meaningful informing of rights, invasions of personal space, intimidating staring, implying that the suspect has to be there/can't leave, using deception through words, props and implied promises at reduction in harm faced by the accused if they confess (Galatzar-Levy 2012). All of these critiques are disturbing enough without considerations of false conviction. These methods continue to be seen as a sign of professionalization despite being shown to be ineffective at garnering truth from a person (Galatzar-Levy 2012). Police are told in training they should be able to determine guilt within a 15 minute assessment of the suspect (Galatzar-Levy 2012). The requirements for the confession to be voluntary and rational have been shown to be insufficient to prevent the admission of false information (Galatzar-Levy 2012). Research has shown that persons, being emotional beings, often do not act rationally, and especially do not do so when placed under intense duress, such as being trapped, lied to, and intimidated (Galatzar-Levy 2012). In the stressful interrogation process, anyone suspected of a crime is often treated as a potential criminal, too often leading to false confession (Galatzar-Levy et al 2012).

2.3 Incarceration and oppositional identity formation

The status of what is legal or not differs by time and place, but is often determined by individuals with backgrounds that reflect the dominant structural powers of the ruling group. In court this can be seen most clearly as the defendants are portrayed as wholly Other by the prosecutors (Simon 2007; Taibbi 2014: 15-17). During arrest and incarceration this treatment as

Other may continue by law enforcement and correctional staff (Dyer 2000: 149, 203, 220; Flatow 2014; Galatzer-Levy 2012; Ugelvik 2014). Research indicates that prisoners and correctional officers inside prisons and jails define themselves in relation to a “demarcation line” that metaphorically sits between them, a symbol indicative of, at best, strained relationships, and at worst, a line marking identities seen to be oppositional (Ugelvik 2014: 475, 478). This often reflects a line on the outside between law enforcement and the heavily patrolled, often less wealthy, communities which are more frequently subjected to invasive methods of policing (Balko 2014; Craen 2013; Murphy et al. 2014). Just as on the outside, where low community trust in police obscures investigations into violent crimes by law enforcement, inside correctional facilities exists cultural practices which embody the construction of identities seen as opposing forces, with loyalties divided on each side (Balko 2014; Craen 2013; Murphy et al. 2014).

Rhodes (2004) points out that “intensified strength of will is a frequent theme of staff as well as prisoners.” Law enforcement is state-sanctioned with the power to control the daily lives of incarcerated persons in ways which affect their future, and prisoners are state-condemned to be under this thumb of control. However, despite opposition to each other both groups' practices often reflect an association with a particular type of masculinity rooted in 'toughness' as seen by intimidation or actual use of violence (Crewe 2014; Rhodes 2004; Ugelvik 2014). Further, individuals sharing these separate group identities often develop a pseudo-familial loyalty with other members as a substitute or built family (Crewe 2014; Ugelvik 2014). Also shared between both groups is a perception that they represent danger, both to particular outside communities as well as to each other (James 2007: 134, 264; Rhodes 2014). This is about where the similarities start to make less of a difference than the disparity of power between guards and the incarcerated.

To this end, a significant question presented in the literature is “how institutional constraint

is related to individual choice” (Rhodes 2004: 63). This asks to what extent officers are culpable for their actions while serving as a guard within a prison or jail (Rhodes 2004: 63-64). It also asks how disciplinary practices proscribed during correctional guard training might limit choices of action available (Rhodes 2004: 63-64). This leads to a further exploration of whether it is ethically right to use aggressive methods such as the use of guns to regulate the social sector, as well as if it is necessary (Rhodes 2004:64). Deterrence’s ultimate aim is not to just confine prisoners’ bodies but to re-condition their wills (Rhodes 2004:92). Prisons which sit “at the unstable edge of legitimacy,” experience particular devastation due to the writing off of ethical concerns for what occurs inside (Rhodes 2004: 92).

Questions about officer actions somewhat mirror debates about how potential transformation of an incarcerated person might happen, a discourse which is framed in the language of obedience, choice and enforcement versus will (Rhodes 2004: 95). The question of whether prisoner actions are intentional choices of rational thinking or due to mental illness has deep implications for whether blame will be placed on the prisoner for actions while incarcerated (Rhodes 2004:100; 104). One way an incarcerated person may complete a willful action of rebellion while incarcerated is to refuse to return a food tray through the slot of his cell (Rhodes 2004:41). The choice of whether to return a food tray or to keep it, from the point of view of the incarcerated, is seen to be a choice between agreeing and being reduced to “a debilitating visible anonymity” or refusing and being sanctioned by a cell-invasion by a forcible swat team (Rhodes 2004:41). Stun belts control prisoners through psychological fear (Rhodes 2004: 91). Their use fuels the debate about what is considered torture (Rhodes 2004). Questions of what counts as legitimate versus illegitimate force are brought up by the stun-gun debate (Rhodes 2004:62), as well as by scandals about prisoner abuse.

2.4 Racism

It has been suggested by critical researchers on inequality that the US Department of Justice (DOJ) is emblematic of a coercive institution descended from 1700s racist values (Aguilar et al 2013: 41-50, 42; James 2007). From this perspective, the DOJ is seen as a tool utilized by dominant white populations to undermine the status and power of non-white communities (Aguilar et al 2013; Gaskin 2009: 56; James 2007). The often quoted statistic that one in every three black males will spend some time in a correctional facility is just a tip of an iceberg of practices which often have racial bias (Dyer 2000: 6; Simon 2007:141). Racism employs different selective criteria for perceived connections between skin pigmentation and various personal traits that can be physical, behavioral, intelligence-related, or other arbitrary stereotype-fueled categorization which are used to justify exclusion practices (Brown and Armelagos 2001).

The role of racism in decisions made by state power fuels the use of dehumanizing methods of control by state-actors in the United States correctional system. The question of whether race corresponds to a biological reality or is a construction of history has significant consequence for the ways in which actions and identity are linked in public discourse. Race is continually used as a polemical category despite the fact that only 6-10% of genetic variance has been shown to be accountable by race (Brown and Armelagos 2001). Around the same time that Cesare Lombroso was classifying criminals and criminaloids as different types of humans, classification systems ranking humans based on race were being promoted by tainted science (Brown and Armelagos 2001; Lombroso 1911; Marks 1994; Wolf 1982; Trouilliot 2003). In 1919, it was declared that there were three 'types' within the human species: Asio-African, European and Intermediate, each 'race' of which had polygenic lineages traceable back to multiple origins (Brown and Armelagos

2001; Marks 1994). In 1925, early scientists expanded and altered this list, delineating seven blood-based categorizations which were then looked at as being real despite: Australian, Pacific-American, Africo-Malaysian, Indo-Manchurian, Intermediate, and European (Marks 1994). Seven groups turned into twenty five by 1930, including categories that returned to have more direct racial/ethnic connotations, such as Caucasoid, Negroid, and Papuan, eventually undermined but still with leftover interpretations of human variation between groups as being race-related and significant (Marks 1994). A strong contemporary argument can be made that, to the contrary, race is an arbitrary construction, rooted in post-colonialist ideologies. This led to a hierarchical schema being constructed where the European community's Self was raised while the colonized communities were marginalized as Other (Aguilar et al 2013; James 2007).

Racism is unfortunately a continuing presence in many representations and realities of the United States criminal justice system (Aguilar et al 2013; James 2007). While not as overt as 18th century laws such as the Fugitive Slave Act, Jim Crow Laws and Black Codes, evidence uncovered by modern social sciences shows that racism is still a prominent problem that affects law (Aguilar et al 2013; Balko 2014; James 2007; Simon 2007:142). Those who end up in the prison system are disproportionately made up of economically disadvantaged, physically/sexually abused, and culturally oppressed persons (Aguilar et al 2013). It has been noted in scholarly accounts that the legal treatment of felons today is comparable to legal segregation-era practices of discrimination against African Americans, including denials to housing, voting rights, and the opportunity to serve on Jury duty (Aguilar et al 2013). Further, the low wages and dehumanizing treatment prisoners face inside the prison industrial complex have roots in state policies as well as corporate profiting off punishment, practices that are sometimes critiqued as being a modern day form of slavery (Aguilar et al 2013; Dyer 2000; Wilderson in James 2007). Incidents which reflect racism have

also been reported in a number of law enforcement agencies across the United States (Bolton 2004). In these workplaces, black officers frequently face barriers to success ranging from hierarchical biased treatment to hostile actions (Bolton 2004). This biased treatment is even more widespread when police approach suspects; evidence of such exists in the startling fact that the number of African American men currently incarcerated is nearly equivalent to estimates of men enslaved only a couple of centuries ago (Aguilar 2013; Bolton 2004; Dyer 2000). Racism is thus an important factor in unequal and marginalizing policing and incarceration policies.

2.5 Wrongful Conviction, False Imprisonment, and Exonerating Evidence

Recently, a number of cases have arisen of physical evidence exonerating persons for crimes that they were wrongfully convicted of and spent most of their lives serving out jail sentences for (Editorial Board 2015). In this project, I had no way of ascertaining whether claims of false conviction, wrongful imprisonment, and innocence to action accused were true. I can report, however, that while not every respondent made the claim—many owned up to having done the action for which they were placed in jail—there was a worrisome number of Incarcerated Voices contributors who proclaimed wrongful conviction and a noticeable number of respondents overall who did not feel their sentence was fair. Many interview participants [Caroline, Ramon, Carl, Susan] adamantly disagreed with their sentence, feeling as if it was not fair for what they were arrested for. On this subject, Caroline said she had not met another person inside with the same crime, continuing onto say that “Most of the DUI manslaughter there were people who weren't doing the same amount of time as me, and I had internal injuries, two injuries equaling a death, so I had a hard time wrapping my head around that.” On the subject of wrongful conviction and how it can lead to disastrous results, Fyn was the only participant to specifically comment.

Fyn related to the matter quite poignantly, ruminating that, “It’s a bitter truth that I and many others did lots of criminal stuff in the same neighborhood where Kathryn Johnston was killed in her home by the APD. Innocence is dangerous.” The woman he referred to, Kathryn Johnston, was an elderly woman from Atlanta who died as the result of a police shooting in 2006. The shooting was an obvious mistake, the result of a botched SWAT team looking for a drug bust (Ruprecht 2012). This is emblematic of a major pitfall in our current justice system.

2.6 Prison Ethnography and Research Inaccessibility

Ethnography serves to gather stories and present diverse, complex perspectives. Severe curtailment of access to social science research in correctional facilities limit potentially valuable methodological contributions to an informed system of change being applied to both criminal law and humanitarian reform (Earle 2014; Reiter 2014). Since the 1980s, researchers in the United Kingdom have conducted a wealth of prison ethnographies while the United States, in its age of mass incarceration, has ironically seen a deficiency of the same genre (Earle 2014; Reiter 2014). While prisons are still a significant setting to study power dynamics, lack of oversight leads to a dearth of public and legal accountability of prison activities which is most troubling for human rights considerations (Earle 2014; Reiter 2014). This lack of sight is noted to constitute a 'pixelization' of the prison system similar to an unclear television, occurring due to: a) a shift from rehabilitative goals to risk management strategies; b) skyrocketing US incarceration rates and c) increased 'emotional challenges' due to prison environmental factors (Reiter 2014).

Limitations on allowed prison research have shaped many studies that have been conducted within prisons. In the United States, the sole types of research that prisoners are allowed to participate in are : "(a) research about the effects of incarceration; (b) research about prisons as

institutions; (c) research about conditions particularly affecting prisoners, or (d) research about practices expected to improve the health of individual subjects"(Reiter 2014). These rules were originally designed to ensure medical research on incarcerated persons was ethically sound, but social scientists have since been declared subject to them as well, despite the inapplicability of this framework to the cultural, non-invasive research being conducted (Reiter 2014). The work that has been conducted has focused on gender norms of performed masculinity, power dynamics of internal segregation and racism amongst incarcerated populations as well as law enforcement, and health care within prisons (Aguilar 2013; Bolton 2004; Crewe 2014; Gaskin 2009).

In 1997, a criminology sub-discipline called "convict criminology" began using ethnography to fill a void of prison scholarship which occurred after the 1970s in the United States (Earle 2014; Ross 2002; Lenza et al. 2014; Reiter 2014). Convict criminology is one quintessential example of resistance of prisoners in the form of challenges to dehumanizing correctional practices waged from the inside of prison culture. This field is made up of previously incarcerated persons and former correctional staff members who also are academics (Earle 2014; Ross 2002; Lenza et al. 2014; Reiter 2014). Further, convict criminology serves as a primary tool for these groups to directly contribute first hand experiential knowledge to the goals of justice reform (Ross 2002; Lenza et al. 2014; Reiter 2014). Despite the existence of this field, however, scholarly ethnography within United States prisons, especially by prisoners, remains relatively scant (Earle 2014; Reiter 2014; note this is not necessarily true outside of the United States). The limited number of prison ethnographies conducted in recent years in the United States say much, however. Evidence has surfaced showing that persons placed in higher level facilities are at an increased likeliness to suffer ill-conditions during incarceration and recidivate after release from initial sentence (Chen and Shapiro 2014). This does vary depending on nature of first crime to an extent, but persons also

are altered—reportedly emotionally hardened—in response to poor conditions of higher level facilities (Chen and Shapiro 2014). This research undercuts support for "specific deterrence" policies, showing that harsher punishments do not make incarcerated persons less likely to re-offend upon release, but instead leads to increased likelihood of post-release crime (Chen and Shapiro 2014). This risk factor is exacerbated by a lack of plentiful jobs on the outside for those with criminal records, as well as through a person using time during incarceration to develop new illicit skills and form additional bonds based in criminal activity (Chen and Shapiro 2014; Crewe 2014; Lombroso 1911).

Lack of research says just as much. Hard information concerning numbers of prisoners who are involved in gangs, assaults (either being attacked or committing such), or who even are placed in segregated solitary confinement, is either not collected, not gathered with regularity, or kept hidden from public disclosure by a private-prison argument that corporations do not have to submit to the Freedom of Information Act because it would require them "to reveal trade secrets" (Reiter 2014: 421). Further, research obstacles exist in abundance, including bureaucratic hurdles, informal changes in prison culture, geographic distance of researchers from rural prison locations, restrictions on recording devices (even pen and paper sometimes), and limited communication resources (Reiter 2014). Further, difficulties with the personal, emotional and social investments required by prison research include : teasing-humor as prisoner resistance practice (Ugelvik 2014); discomfort of the sheltered researcher being placed in a site meant to destroy the 'self' (Ugelvik 2014); masculinity tests as defined by toughness and sexist jokes, that may first intimidate them as an outsider (Crewe 2014; Ugelvik 2014); and attempts by both officers and prisoners to 'recruit' him as a researcher to their 'side' (Ugelvik 2014). Another research barrier is the decision on how to present a coherent narrative given the broad setting of the US Department of Justice (DOJ).

Both prisoners and correctional professionals are groups which contain diversity of opinions and realities faced. The scholar Ugelvik in particular has cited concerns of ethnographers' "problematic tendency to "tidy up" the finished research reports and make it more of a "monologue," when it is inherently a "messy" project (Ugelvik 2014: 472). More practical obstacles for one to be concerned about include gaining access to a relatively backstage site of research.

3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Project Description

This ethnography is based on two sources of information: a) 115 letters written by currently incarcerated in state and private prisons across the United States (letters contributed to the Incarcerated Voices Project, described in section 2.); and, b) eight semi-structured interviews with individuals who have previously been incarcerated but who are now reintegrated into society. The literature review for this project consists of a mix of scholarly and reputable popular sources as well as news reports. Letters reviewed for this project were placed under narrative analysis for data indicating themes of significance for currently incarcerated men and women in United States correctional facilities. This thematic data is shared in this research, although direct quotes are prohibited due to privacy concerns of the program director. Interviews were semi-structured in plan by identified themes in contributor letters, as well as preceded or at times accompanied by written surveys intended to further direct the conversation to relevant topics. The written surveys turned out to be guides to gain detail of greater value in interviews related to the particular research inquiry at hand, but are only limited sources of data for inclusion in ethnographic analysis of this thesis. I conducted these sessions in libraries and restaurants in Atlanta, GA, and by phone with participants for whom distance was a factor. Participants were surveyed and interviewed over a 10 week time frame in the winter of early 2015.

In order to be able to pull general, thematic material from the Incarcerated Voices Letter Submissions I had to gain authorization through a permission letter to analyze these letters, created for the organization's operational purposes, for research purposes instead. Convincing an organization that is not research oriented to agree to even minimal contribution to research endeavors required my sworn declaration that mission wise, we are advocating for the same goals, and for agreement through writing that I would not infringe upon copyright by direct quoting from the letters in this thesis, store or misuse the information in any way.

Obstacles included difficulties with recruitment and willingness of volunteers to participate, as well as with scheduling the sessions. The research process required the need to trust participant's integrity, as lack of direct prison observation technically implies an inability to verify participants' narratives as truthful. A distrust of respondents narratives would however serve to participate in the process which turns this population into an Other, however, and, as in much qualitative research, narratives told say much about the experiential interpretation. Methods to curb these obstacles included: the utmost assurance of anonymity and confidentiality; attempts to bridge the gap by explaining my interest in this project as being to the benefit of the participants; granting respect to all participants; and upholding all ethical principles in both the collection and analysis of data included with this research.

3.1.1 Contributor Letters [The Incarcerated Voices Project]

The 115 letters utilized for thematic data of this research were written by men and women contributors from prisons across the United States who submitted letters to the Incarcerated Voices Project. I read and analyzed these letters during a year I spent working as an intern with the program. The number of letters I read are few in comparison to the number of letters submitted to

the Incarcerated Voices Project overall; however, those selected for analysis in this work assist greatly to paint a better picture of the background to incarcerated persons' prison experiences. I did not participate in the recruitment process for the contributor letters.

The Incarcerated Voices Project is an organization with a central mission to resist dehumanized representations of incarcerated persons. This goal manifests achievement by instead showing humanity, in the way that it is best shown, through personal narratives. Men and women in state and federal prisons across the United States serve as contributors who are sent lists of questions on a variety of subjects related to incarceration. Letters sent into the Incarcerated Voices Project contain personal stories and invaluable perspectives of first-hand witnesses to the conditions of correctional facilities. Submission Reviewers respond with: a reply letter; an attempt to connect in a personal and meaningful way to contributors' stories; and writing advice for contributors. In the final step, selected reviewed letters are recorded by volunteer voice actors, and then put on the radio program currently in production. Other activities the Incarcerated Voices Project is involved with include the publishing of a newsletter created collectively between contributors and volunteers and distributed every three months into participating prisons. This is a prime example of an organization working to provide an avenue for marginalized and misrepresented populations to speak through, an avenue which increases transparency to this rather closed off or 'backstage' prison setting.

The amount of knowledge I have gained while working for this organization is staggering, as are the times my heart has been torn by stories of separation, dehumanization, and occasionally of renewal on life shared. I cannot repeat the exact questions asked due to privacy agreements between me as a researcher and the director of the Incarcerated Voices Project, but I am allowed to analyze the letters for their themes. To some extent, the themes of the letters I

have reviewed have been dictated by the questions posed to the contributors by the project. Themes include: private prison system evaluations; personal stories of family disruption; possibilities of friendship while incarcerated; and detachment experienced due to incarceration. Other themes include: popular media depictions of incarceration; whether the contributor felt substance abuse contributed to their incarceration; what advice the contributor would give on a 'newbie' to prison for survival and avoidance of detrimental activities (gang life, etc.) once incarcerated; personal stories of their first week in prison and any time spent in solitary confinement; and whether there is truth to the perception that some prisoners target attacks on child-abuse offenders. Also discussed in letters are responses to questions about what programs are most helpful to incarcerated persons, and about wisdom the person can offer from their experiences which are normally well-hidden from outside eyes.

3.1.2 Interview Recruitment

This research project included collaboration from research participants as they shared their stories, opinions and ideas through both qualitative interview and written survey. Recruitment for eight semi-structured interviews which form the main basis of qualitative data in this ethnography was respondent driven in response to word of mouth through personal networks. Five men and three women volunteered as participants for the interview section of this ethnography. Seven out of these eight individual participants were within the organic network of the principle student researcher, and knew the researcher for 2-13 years prior to this project due to other shared networks. Additionally, paper fliers were posted in the downtown Atlanta area and an electronic advertisement was placed on the website Craigslist.com. Data analysis included compilation, cleaning, and coding of the data from interview transcriptions and survey results. It

further featured thematic as well as statistical analysis on notes taken on Incarcerated Voices Letter Submissions. The conceptual context used as a framework of research analysis is based in anthropological praxis analysis of how the Other connects to the contemporary justice system of the United States. This can be seen through the concepts of dehumanization, maltreatment and marginalization, all which often connect back to broader situations of racism as well as power struggles between state and individual in the United States. The evaluation of these themes is conducted with the emancipatory goal of illuminating oppression. Further, it is the intention of this project to make participants into collaborators in a dialogue about reform advocacy. Analyzed data is included in the accessible ethnography of this thesis, including conclusions that are intended to be respectful yet honest assessments of respondent narratives.

The questions interview participants respond to in this ethnography include inquiries into their experiences and opinions of the United States Justice System. These questions fall into the following three categories: 1) Questions meant to gain data about the experiences of incarcerated persons; 2) Questions meant to gain data on the opinions of incarcerated persons and 3) Questions meant to gain data on the impact incarceration has had on their identities and subsequent lives post-incarceration. Other questions may include voluntary inclusion of demographic information concerning country of origin, cultural or "race" affiliation, if the person self-describes using such categories, age, and gender. The aim of these inquiries are to garner information about both the concrete events shared as well as the narrative framework that incarcerated persons interpret their experiences under.

3.2 Research Framework

This research aims to offer a humanizing portrait of persons who have been incarcerated and of the experiences they faced while inside as well as contribute to an empathetic, practical and well-researched praxis discussion of incarceration reform in the United States. I chose anthropological praxis as the research method for this project due to its association with “transformative action and egalitarian participation guided consciousness-raising in considering the sociological and historical roots...to empower the oppressed.” (Lather 1986). Praxis is well suited for discussions on human rights and reform in correctional setting as it is connected deeply with emancipatory theory (Kozaitis 2000; 2013; Field and Fox 2007; Lather 1986). Praxis further connects theory and practice, denying claims of division between theory and practice (Kozaitis 2000:47; Lather 1986). Kozaitis (2000) argues further that praxis anthropology is a socially active, inherently ethical and political practice (Kozaitis 2000:51). The aims of praxis are to: “(1) illuminate and emancipate humanity at large, (2) construct and demonstrate intersections between intellectual, ethical, and technical work, (3) add compassion to our existing repertoire of qualities (e.g. holism, meaning, relativism, and universality), (4) participate empathetically and responsibly in dialogue and partnerships across historically and structurally constructed divisions, and (5) remain reflective in the face of empiricism and conscience.” (Kozaitis 2000:62). This project aims to participate in praxis by using academic research to address a dilemma in community ethics, contributing to emancipatory activist education, as well as applying compassion and collaboration through the research process (Kozaitis 2000; 2013; Field and Fox 2007).

3.3 Ethics

The concern of anthropological praxis as an “intellectually mediated, ethically sound and socially responsible work that transcends classification, rank, or context of engagement” (Kozaitis

2000: 46). Praxis mandates cautionary steps in the research methods used. As a researcher, I am ethically bound to treat participants with respect for their person, their privacy interests, and their time. A vital aim in assistance to this goal is to ensure that finished research is communicated in accessible language and formats to participants, scholars and policy-makers. Further I intend to adhere to the conditions of use of thematic material from Incarcerated Voices Submission letters as set out in an agreement between myself and the program director, as a way of ensuring local voices are respected. Standards of voluntary participation, informed consent, confidentiality, and anonymity are strictly adhered to in this study. Along this line, all participant names have been changed to protect anonymity. Further, the value of compassion was employed during interviews during discussions of topics with a sensitive nature; this was done through assurances that individuals need not share anything that makes them uncomfortable.

4 ETHNOGRAPHY

4.1 Auto ethnographic Reflections

4.1.1 Mid-2000s: Georgia County jail

Concrete walls: formidable, intimidating, symbols of containment which jails and prisons across the United States use in a way that virtually ensures imprisonment and strikes fear.

Research access to prison settings for this thesis was limited, but about a decade ago, two friends and I found ourselves crossing past these walls as visitors. To enter the building where my friend, Tom, was incarcerated, Tom's girlfriend was required to gain confirmation ahead of time that each of our names were on the list for particular visitation day. Our identification cards checked, sometimes the wait would be extensive hours before we were called to enter. Being patted down has always been a fairly uncomfortable procedure; nonetheless so when you've passed a security

checkpoint in a place where the strong hand of the law is paradoxically present and hidden. Visitors hold a luxury that the incarcerated do not, of being in that ambiguous place between potentially guilty by association, but also potentially being an innocent, just what you seem—someone devastated that someone they care about has been removed from the world and/or worried about what exactly the experience is like for that person. Nonetheless, you are still under suspicion. Boots and belts occasionally produced a heart-stopping moment when the walk-through metal detector rang; when this happened a hand-held metal detector was scanned over each limb and body, and occasionally offending items were required to be removed and stored until our departure.

On these visits, the symbolism of security and isolation was always reinforced by the glass barrier dividing visitor and incarcerated. Families and friends of incarcerated individuals do not get to physically touch, hug, kiss, or even breathe the same air as their missed loved one. Sitting on the opposite side of Tom, all would be silent, a strange human zoo, were it not for a phone on each side allowing communication. Talk during visits always felt heavy, marred by the potential of guard eavesdropping and fear of misconstrued stray words. It's good to see your friend as you talk to them, however; as Tom would speak in visits, his expressions and gestures carried a comfort to me, something familiar within the out-of-place, contained space that the jail represents. Conversations, however halted they may have been out of occasional fear of wrongly-took overheard word, were also normalizing events in a rather abnormal situation. I recall his eagerness to catch up on news, to know more about what was happening outside, more of what he had such infuriatingly little glimpse of, at the time. This echoed with a few other friends over the years who experienced incarceration and who relished written letters sent which connected them back to the world which they had left behind. Joking interspersed itself at times

with venting when we would make the trip to Tom, but overall he stayed strong and positive. Occasionally my other friend and I respectfully shrank our presence back so Tom and his girlfriend could speak intimately with each other, presumably an alteration of sweet nothings with challenging conversations about the difficulties faced at maintaining a romantic relationship disrupted by internment.

A decade later, I can't recall exactly how long the session of trying to connect through glass lasted, but upon leaving the jail, visitation always felt too short—much more so, I'm sure, for Tom's long-time girlfriend/future child's mother. Phone calls were made to shorten the time between visits. Unfortunately, they were short in themselves and cut slightly more by the prerecorded message announcing that you were receiving communication from an inmate and requiring you to accept collect charges. Despite the glass barrier and security restrictions, there was something good about meeting each other in person that the short phone calls never held.

Tom and I remained good friends for a couple of years following this time in his life. Ultimately we drifted however. I gained new friends as college started. Tom fell in a pattern of repeat-incarceration for various drug or probation violation-related offenses. I had been hoping this project might reconnect us, or at least that I might find that his luck and dalliances had changed. Unfortunately, I was not able to find updated contact information for Tom to ask him to participate in this research project or reconnect. Nonetheless, this remains the most striking memory I have associated with a jail building.

That being said, while it may be my most striking memory, paying visits to Tom was not actually the first time I entered a correctional facility, nor the first time I had experience with the law or resembling practices of law. As a child, I took a 1st grade class field trip to a local police station with its own tiny jail. As far as I recall, the building was small, with four to five holding

cells. We as children took turns individually being locked into for about five minutes at a time, while a pacing officer on the other side of the bars lectured us on being good boys and girls, or else. It goes without saying what the or-else was, a long stay in a bathroom-sized cell.

At about the same age, I went through an experience at school that seems to have a funny-sad parallel to the unfortunate experience of wrongful conviction. One day, after being taken off my table-washing duty, I was brought into an office and yelled at for hours. Repeatedly I was told, "You know what you've done." Much later, after honest protests that I had no clue what they were talking about, I was finally told that a boy had claimed I poured milk on top of his head. After the pressure being on for most of the day, besides being about five years old at the time and terrified, I finally said the words they put into my mouth. Common sense makes it seem absurd a person will confess to something they did not do, but this early event showed me just how emotional stress and manipulation by authority figures can affect the choices one makes. Days later the boy apologized and confessed the truth to his parents; he had poured milk on himself as a dare and passed the blame to escape trouble. His honest confession meant my freedom from unfair blame, but this did little to ease the impression the experience left upon me.

Eight years later however, at the still-early age of thirteen years old, I found trouble that was of my own doing; this time the consequence included a direct confrontation with the police, rather than just a mimic of interrogation practices. After a knock at my bedroom window one night, I snuck out with neighborhood friends who promised a party at another house if I accompanied them. Once I was out the window and walking down the street with them, though, I ended up being surrounded, and told I could not go home until I participated in a game of ding-dong-ditch, the classic rebellious game that rude teenagers wake the neighbors with by ringing doorbells and galloping away before the person reaches the door. I gave in, playing this ruse at

two houses, but then, a bit freaked out, insisted on turning back for home.

Being called something along the line of a 'wuss', the friends I was with refused to walk me back, leaving me to stride home alone at around 2:00 in the morning. Halfway to my house, a cop car was parked in front of one of the houses that I had rang the doorbell to and ditched—a house of a friend I had chosen in hopes that if his parents caught me, I could make some excuse for being there. Walking down a road perpendicular to their corner house and the cop car, I slunk into the bushes, moving slowly and cautiously. I remember hoping dearly that my movement would not attract notice or produce noise, and that the street lights would not cast my shadow far enough to draw eyes. I slipped past, thinking I was unnoticed, but about halfway down the next perpendicular road I had turned onto, just blocks prior to my own corner house, bright lights slowed behind me, blinding me and making me afraid. Even though I had seen the cop car, my first thought as I froze with terror was actually of the danger of a creepy guy seeing a girl walking alone at night.

This fear was quickly replaced however, as a voice boomed, “Stop where you are!” A flashlight joined the headlights, as if I was not already illuminated enough. This blocked my vision with the harshness of the glare. As my eyes eventually adjusted to the ghastly light, I was able to confirm that these were cops. A woman officer got out and asked for my identification. I explained to her that I was only 13 years old, and thus did not have ID card, as persons under 15 years old were not given such.

Immediately, the cops offered doubt to my age, and acted as if I was lying to get out of showing identification. Their skepticism shone through their questions and invasive pat down, followed by my being handcuffed and detained in the back of their police vehicle. I was warned that the doors didn't open from the inside, and admonished about the consequences I would face

should they find out that I was lying—at the very least, time locked in a jail cell until identification could be provided. They did me a courtesy, due to my claim of age and the short distance from my home, to knock on my mother's door to check my story before skipping to this step. My mom tried to turn them away at first, insisting I was asleep in my bed as I should be, but luckily when they insisted she discovered my subterfuge—an arrangement of blankets made to resemble the silhouette of a sleeping body. I was released into her custody, but this set the first early tone of direct intimidation in the presence of cops.

During the years since these events, I have had a handful of additional experiences with fruitless searches and police interrogation, always for what seemed like arbitrary reasons. During one of these encounters, during a car-search, I once found myself explaining details about a friend's bipolar mental illness to an officer; my companion was acting strange due to this but the officer assumed it related to drug-involvement. On another occasion, in my first year of college, an interrogation by campus police about reported smells in my shared four bedroom campus apartment (cigarettes were banned alongside illegal drugs) particularly unsettled me; I was not cited, reported to the campus, nor arrested, but the anxiety of having someone intimidate me to my face produced in me my first full blown panic attack in my entire life. During this encounter, my panic was secured by a young man who seemed fresh to the job and ready with an over-eager and intimidating attitude. Thankfully, while the other, older cop followed a script of formality, he seemed happy to back off when I mentioned lack of reasonable suspicion; my guess is that he knew he had more pressing matters of public safety to occupy his time.

The most startling negative event with law enforcement was at 23 years old, however, when I was flat out arrested. The offense was having entered a Marta station without paying for use of the subway transit in Atlanta, GA. After having left my student-pass at home, and paying

extra fare all day for doing so, I followed someone through the gate. Past the barrier, I picked up my pace to catch the train I could hear arriving. Before I could descend more than one of the stairs however, a janitor blocked my way, startling me out of my narrow-focused mission to make the train and alerting me that a woman was calling after me. With a deep breath of air, I turned around. Before I could form a response, the woman—an officer—swiftly grabbed me and had me in handcuffs. It was not quite a violent action, her cuffing me, but it definitely was not gentle either. Looking back, what I did wasn't honest or admirable, but the sensation of being physically seized before I could process or respond to what was happening jarred me deeply.

Dragged by my linked arms, I was hauled to a police facility close to the Marta station. Once inside, I was thoroughly searched in a pat-down of a similar caliber of slight roughness to the handcuffing. The police officer was an African-American woman who repeatedly asked me if I thought I was 'above the law'. Something about her approach to our encounter had me wondering later about why she assumed I would feel privileged in this way. I tried to explain that I was protesting the arrest because no one should be hassled with arrest, rather than perhaps a fine written on the spot, for small offenses. It occurred to me, however, that perhaps disparities in the prison system affected her perception of me: namely, the unfair distribution of arrests that usually affect black men but less commonly incarcerates Caucasian women.

During the arrest, I was interrupted frequently by her aggressive questioning as I stammered out my apologies. For three hours after my pat down, I was handcuffed to a wall in a holding cell while my backpack was searched outside of my sight; this fact did nothing to quell my uneasiness. The wall I was stuck to in the cell was only inches away, allowing very little range of body movement and no access to the toilet in the cell. Despite a full bladder, I eventually felt thankful that they hadn't let me free to use the toilet; about an hour in, random

officers began to sporadically startle me by peering through the small cell window in the shut door, seeming to appraise me, for what I wasn't sure.

Eventually I was released and given an arrest citation. I was being charged with a type of fraud. It seemed absurd to me that jumping a Marta gate somehow constituted fraud, but at the time, Marta was on a mission to crack down on fare-jumpers, blaming them rather than inadequate funding for lack of resources to expand the system. I felt panicked the whole month prior to my court appearance, the word fraud and its potential consequences of jail time or a fine of up to \$1000 hanging over my head. When the day finally came, I had gone through extensive lengths to document that I had purchased a month-long student Marta/transit pass weeks prior to this incident. During court, I waited for my turn amongst a succession of black men who all seemed to be homeless and who were arrested for minor charges and public indecency/urinating on the sidewalk. At the call of my name, the public defender pulled me outside to stress the gravity of the charge. Thoroughly freaked out, I poured out the story to her and presented the evidence I gathered about my previously bought Marta card. Thankfully, she recommended to the judge a dismissal of all charges, which was granted. I felt incredibly grateful, after a month of fearfully imagining the ways my future would be affected and the terrors jail might incur.

As of the writing of this thesis, I plan to take advantage of a Georgia law which was set into place in summer 2013. This law permits expungement of dismissed and juvenile charges upon arrest (**cite law**). I humbly acknowledge that my experience is quite limited in comparison to that undergone by research respondents, as well as incarcerated men and women across the country. Nonetheless, I will be more than happy to no longer click that little box on job applications requesting you submit information about prior arrests—information sometimes required even when charges are dismissed.

4.2 Participant Arrests

Most of the interview participants and a few of the Incarcerated Voices contributors shared information about their initial arrest or arrests that preceded the time they spent in a correctional facility. An arrest does not always equal incarceration, as it may be turned over or dismissed in court. Unless it is expunged however, it always yields a record behind, information which must be disclosed on employment applications and which can affect sentencing in potential later arrests, even if charges are unrelated. Interview participants frequently shared both their charges and their initial arrest experiences, which are detailed in the next section (Interview Participants) in addition to further introduction to the individuals I was lucky enough to have the chance to speak with for this project.

The limited information shared by Incarcerated Voices Project contributors about arrests often was related back to a question asking how much substance abuse factored into the specific events leading to their incarceration. In the letters, the causes attributed to their arrests were often interpreted as more directly linked to mental illness, patterns of desperation or regretful decisions, while drug or alcohol use was cited as secondary or at most indirectly related (such as, drug use making mental illness worse, but mental illness being the primary cause the writer attributed to actions leading to arrest). In these numbers, I am leaving out persons who spoke about charges that were directly drug-related such as possession as well as the high number of letters which did not mention the contributors arrest at all.

The arrest is the first place that differential power status between law enforcement and suspect is enacted. This inequality of power particularly affects communities subject to intimidating, if not outright violent, interrogation practices, which often result in poor group-trust

levels of police (Craen 2013; Murphy et al. 2014). As seen in the literature review of this thesis, investigation procedures have been reported to dehumanize both the accused suspect as well as the law enforcement interrogator, while frequently leading to false confessions (Galatzer-Levy et al 2012). This is thus the On the other hand, for law enforcement, interrogation is shown to coerce personnel to detach from their moral center in order to perform actions which dehumanize the accused person (Galatzer-Levy 2012).

Methods in this project consistently attempted to apply respect as an act which humanizes. Every participant in the project offered detailed insights to what they experienced and witnessed during their incarceration sentences, narratives which I try my best to convey here accurate to their intention. This section has served as an introduction intended to remind readers that people who previously have been incarcerated are foremost human beings. I introduce participants in this fashion as an act of resistance to the way they are stigmatized by an imperfect system through the label of 'inmates'.

4.2.1 Susan

Susan, a woman in her late 20s, works as a restaurant server and caretaker for her grandmother. We met for the interview at The Landmark Diner, one of the only restaurants in downtown Atlanta which remains open on Sunday. Susan was witty throughout the interview, cracking politically informed jokes, and humorously imitating people she knew in her life [“Do you want Susan to take you outside?” imitation of her grandmother asking the dogs about what she wants Susan to do]. Through our hanging out, I also learned that she relishes babysitting her friends’ kids and is a proud dog-lover. The life she knew, one where she was actively connected

to the world around her, was interrupted when she was incarcerated in Cherokee County jail in the state of Georgia for a total of 3 months (two arrests combined).

Susan's first arrest occurred at night, sitting in a car with four friends in a parking lot outside a suburban park at 2AM. An officer swiftly and stealthily pulled in to the lot, approaching the car on foot. Before anyone in the car realized this, the cop was at the window, directly staring at a guy in the car who was in the process of 'hitting a bowl', or more plainly, smoking marijuana out of a glass pipe. Panicked, Susan quickly threw her bag of weed out of the car window. In her reflections, she relates a fantasy she had in this moment before her arrest, "I thought it would like, hit underneath; hit the slide and roll off. Maybe a bird would come...anything! Stoner-ass hawk, be merry my friend." she jokes, "A deer just runs up. Deer's love weed. I don't know if you knew that." Unfortunately, neither bird nor deer showed up. Instead, the officer picked it off the ground and immediately linked it to the person it was physically closest to, the guy who has already been seen smoking out of the pipe. Susan tells me about her internal reaction to this, sharing that she felt compelled to step up and admit it to be her own stash, rather than allow her friend to go down for an extra charge: "My heart sank. It sank. He's already going to jail, that's going to be an extra charge. So in my mind, do the right thing. It's not his in the first place, everyone knows it's mine...It's the right thing to do. So I say, No sir, it's not his, its' mine, and took responsibility for it."

Susan talks about taking responsibility for a bag of marijuana during her first arrest, even though the bag had been attributed to somebody who already was caught for possession. She mentions having held a slim hope that her honorable action would offer leniency for her charge: "I didn't expect magic, but yeah, there was nothing about, like uh, ya know. [Deeper voice:] Maybe I can write you a ticket for simple possession. Maybe I can...! [Regular voice:] Nothing like that."

She mentions further feeling “shocked” and like that was “the moment, when everything in my idea of police changed. Absolutely...” The loss of trust in police following an arrest is a repeated theme seen in other participants’ responses, as will be seen throughout this ethnography.

In the interview, Susan also recounted events around her later arrest for violation of probation. At this point, she and her 7-year boyfriend were placed under a no-contact order due to having been arrested together in the aforementioned car-bust. Given the length and depth of their relationship, this proved difficult. After the strain of a lengthy separation, Susan set up a plan to see him, surreptitiously meeting her long-time boyfriend at a concert of a band they were both fans of [AFI]. All might have gone well, were it not for her boyfriend’s father discovering evidence of their meeting that was left up on a computer due to a remaining logged-in I-cloud account and snooping through an iPhone app. He promptly reported both Susan and his own son for violation of the no-contact order, while, at the concert, unbeknownst to their betrayal, Susan and her boyfriend accepted free marijuana and cocaine passed on by a fellow concert goer. The next day, Susan was brought in for a drug test; after getting back the result of having failed, she was arrested on the spot and ultimately incarcerated again, this time for violation of probation.

4.2.2 Oliver

Oliver, a 29 year old man, works alternately in the fields of restaurant service and construction. Our interview was conducted via phone; during the research process he was in Kansas City, as his living arrangement shifts from Georgia to Missouri. As we talk, Oliver's sense of humor is a bit offbeat, often including puns. On more serious topics, he recurrently mentions a wish to 'follow the rules' as well as to do the right thing. He sees this change as having emerged over time, alongside a stylistic shift from punk clothes and a Mohawk to plain t-shirts and simple-

to-maintain short hair. Oliver's combined time spent incarcerated for five arrests equaled nearly 11 months (318 days), served from 2003-2007. Throughout the interview, he stresses that his goal is to not return to incarceration, and that this aim is influenced by his desire to find romance as well as start a family.

Oliver mentions seven arrests in total; some charges he chose not to share with the project, though he does choose to share information about his charges for check forgery, breaking and entering, and trespassing. The arrest that Oliver comments upon the most is the one which resulted in the charges for breaking and entering/trespassing. He had been wandering the streets, no place to sleep, on a cold night. He happened upon a church and decided to take the risk to break into it for shelter from the wind and any other dangers the night might hold. While Oliver expressed that he did not personally feel that he experienced disrespect during his actual incarceration, he did feel in this instance that the arresting officers were rude in the way they conducted their interrogation. He speaks about how they kept asking whether or not he stole anything from the church, in a way that made him feel "oppressed by authority, you know, that kind of thing" (Oliver Interview). He was talking on a cellphone trying to find a place to spend the next night when officers entered the church and found him huddled in a corner pew.

4.2.3 *Ramon*

Ramon, a 30 year old man, manages an electronic repair store by day and promotes concerts for an underground rap-rock music label by night. Ramon recently moved to Michigan from Georgia (United States) although he is originally from Colombia. Ramon shared that he has been arrested three times total, although his 9-month stint of incarceration occurred during the year 2004. Ramon's arrest for this offense is what he shared; one which was comparable to the others in its atypical and simple nature: no handcuffs utilized. One day at the Texas army base he was

stationed at, military police approached him, told him calmly that he was being arrested, and quietly escorted him to a jail holding unit. During the interview Ramon suggested that perhaps he had a nontraditional story of arrest due to his placement in a military jail. The implication through our conversation was that he felt his incarceration was more straightforward and respectful due to the adherence to strict regimen and protocol promoted in the military. The difference he experienced in arrest due to placement within the army continued with his 9 months incarceration.

4.2.4 *Caroline*

Caroline, a woman in her 30s, works at a non-profit organization in Texas dedicated to assisting men with the post-incarceration adjustment back into society. Prior to a four-year incarceration at a Florida state-level prison, Caroline was a practicing lawyer who graduated from Harvard University, an ivy-league North American college. Despite her educational and vocational background, Caroline experienced difficulty finding employment for a years' time after being released from incarceration. For this and other reasons, Caroline made clear throughout the interview that she found both the experience of incarceration and the problems it caused after distasteful and dehumanizing.

Caroline was recruited through respondent-driven practices and interviewed by phone. She was also the one person in this study who was not previously associated with the personal networks of the principle student investigator. Caroline was arrested after what were perhaps the most chaotic of circumstances. An unintended middle of the night car crash resulted in the fatal injuries of another person. Both Caroline and the other driver had been intoxicated. Shortly after waking

up in the hospital, while still recovering from the accident, she was arrested for DUI and involuntary manslaughter. Caroline experienced a time lapse between her arrest and incarceration but eventually served four years in a Florida State Prison. In her interview, she detailed the jokes that officers made about her likely sentence, stating that: “They laughed and joked that I was going to be charged with DUI manslaughter and that my life was over, and they were like high fiving...” Further she explains, “They were, I guess, making fun of me the whole time—they were extremely rude...I just remember telling my dad that they were treating me like an animal--which they were--so very, very unpleasant experience with them.” According to Caroline, this unprofessional treatment continued with law enforcement guards at the Florida prison she spent time in; these details are included in later sections of this ethnography.

4.2.5 Carl

Carl, a youthful looking 49 year old man originally from Ohio, works as an adjunct professor for universities in North Carolina and Georgia as well as a musician in his spare time. His interview was conducted at ParkGrounds coffee shop in Atlanta, GA. His educational background consists of both a Bachelors and a Masters, both in humanities fields, earned respectfully in Ohio and Georgia. The interview with Carl revealed that he held a unique vantage point for the project, having been incarcerated in a county jail and having also worked as a guard in an Ohio state prison. Meeting one person with these two opposing perspectives, and the ability to see each side, was invaluable to this research discussion.

The charge which landed Carl in an Ohio County Jail for about a month was failure to pay child support—or, more specifically, failure to make enough money to continue paying the same

amount of child support he had been previously, before having lost a job. In his interview he focused more on providing details of his incarceration rather than sharing details on his arrest.

4.2.6 Fyn

Fyn, a man in his 40s, manages a production company, plays as a musician in spare time, and at the time of his interview was recently married and expecting a child. Fyn's educational background includes a Bachelor's degree in a humanities related field from a Georgia university. Fyn spent a total of six to seven months combined incarcerated; following various arrests, he spent this time alternately in Fulton county jail and Atlanta city jail during the years of 2004-2006. Fyn was also a participant whose interview was conducted via phone. His intelligence, political wit and concern for kindness frame the retellings of his incarceration experiences. Through the interview, I learn that his life journey has included overcoming drug use and making it a priority to achieve goals after incarceration. Fyn lists his estimated four to six arrests as having been for felony possession of cocaine, subsequent failures to appear in court, and having failed to appear in a Fulton county drug court program in Georgia. Fyn did not go into great detail about the arrest itself, and throughout the interview seemed careful to differentiate between what he could recall firmly and what had become more ambiguous with time elapsed since his experiences became memories.

4.2.7 Emily

Emily, a woman in her late 20s, works as a restaurant server as well as an undergraduate student majoring in Public Policy at a university in Georgia. Between the time of the interview and

the time of the final writing of this research, she has additionally gained work at a non-profit related to justice and suffrage rights. Emily's interview was conducted in a separated study-room at a library in downtown Atlanta. In the interview, Emily made clear that she has qualms with certain aspects of contemporary incarceration practices. Despite her feelings about this, a theme of Emily's recount of her arrest and incarceration is her positive attitude throughout the ordeal. Emily shared further that while her interest in public policy preceded her incarceration, her specific focus within the field was shaped by these experiences.

Emily recounted two separate arrests she has experienced during her interview. Both of these incidents took place during daylight hours and on the road. In the first arrest, she was driving with her mom in the car when they got into a small fender-bender type accident. As she had always been taught to do in the event of an accident, she called the cops. When they arrived, however, instead of just citing the driver of the other car, they also arrested Emily. Prior to the arrest, she had no idea that she was driving with invalid credentials. Days after the arrest, she received a letter telling her about the temporarily revoked license being an extra condition of a previous school suspension. Emily luckily did not serve time for this first incident, and eventually had her license re-established. The fact that it occurred and left a mark, however, was the first negative instance she had with the law.

The second time Emily was arrested, she was pulled over for running a stop sign while driving into the city for school one morning. The officer smelled a joint she had been smoking and gave her tests of sobriety. This started with the walk and turn test on the street. At this point, she made a choice to be honest. Following an immediate formal drug test at a local hospital, this choice resulted in her being arrested. The charges consisted of driving under the influence and possession of marijuana, although they were later truncated. Emily stated in the interview that

she did feel like the arresting officer was respectful to her, although she equivocated a bit that it perhaps was a mirrored response to her attempts to be pleasant and cooperative through the event: “He was respectful...um,...I was very nice to him (laughs). That's one thing that he said to me kind of threw him off, because I was being so nice to him, like after he placed me under arrest I was like 'SO, have you seen any good movies lately?' or...uh, just, not what he was used to...” Specifically, she relates that little things about the arrest showed that he gave her respect: “he cuffed me in front and everything, so I think that he, he was trying to be respectful”, but she does not feel that he necessarily went easy on her concerning the charge, saying, “he was a newbie and he wanted to really stick it to me in court.” When I asked about why she tried to be so nice to the cop who was arresting her, M mentioned that her brother in law had worked as a police officer and told her stories about the reactions he was used to getting during arrests, and that she wanted to do something different. She remarked, “I just wanted to make an impression on him; 'I'm not the scum of the earth you're used to. We could have a conversation if we just met somewhere random.' ”

4.2.8 *Derek*

Derek, a man in his 30s, works at a technology/internet-related company. Derek volunteered for this research project, but only fulfilled the written survey due to time constraints of a busy work schedule preventing interview. Outside of work, Derek enjoys the local punk scene, attending concerts, and participating in a moped-club based in Atlanta, GA. Further, he frequently delights in the company of his two adorable small black dogs who often trail behind him as he walks, and has an open relationship with a girlfriend whom he has passion for. Data analyzed from Derek consists of his submitted questionnaire-survey and consent form; it is thus somewhat briefer than the data provided by other participants who partook in longer interviews.

Derek was arrested four times: once just for possession of marijuana; once for driving without insurance and possessing marijuana; once for failure to appear in court; and once for driving under a suspended license and having had a warrant out for a previous offense. This last arrest landed him in Randolph County jail in Georgia [United States]. Despite this litany of arrests, Derek reported on his survey that his total time spent incarcerated equaled just 3 days, during the year of 2009. As he was not able to be reached for interview, further details about his arrest were unfortunately not available to this project.

4.3 The Prison Setting

4.3.1 *Scheduling and Control*

It is through the recollections shared for this project that descriptions of the field site were gathered. Each correctional setting depicted by respondents was described as a place where each aspect of daily life, barely thought about on the outside, is blown into the proportion of major life concern or annoyance. Sleeping, showering, eating meals, and technology use are basic quotidian

rituals that are taken out of the hands of incarcerated individuals, indicating control over body and agency. This highly reflected the literature, showing a pattern of incarceration practice which has not yet been reformed. The setting of correctional facilities is intended to tame the person into a prisoner by making him or her more easy to control, and thus often provokes a feeling of de-realization in the incarcerated person (Rhodes 2004:43). Worlds inside prisons are thus often characterized as ‘distorting the senses of incarcerated persons’, a function which seems central to the design of current correctional architecture (Rhodes 2004:32).

The beginning of a day in jail starts with a count. One of the participants in the research, Oliver, mentioned the practice of showing ID bracelets in the morning which are scanned electronically. This is done in different ways at different facilities, but happens multiple times throughout the day, ever-the-reminder for incarcerated persons of being a number in a system. Meals are likewise scheduled, as is a narrow window for ‘free time’, a limited amount of outside time held in inner courts, for taking 2-minute showers and making 15 minute phone calls. Many respondents (Oliver, Susan) commented that the lights were fully or partially left on throughout the night, making it difficult to sleep.

Particular other things recalled by participants were mattresses equivalent to gym mats in sometimes overcrowded cells, taking two minute showers with little privacy, being told which direction to walk, when you can talk, when to eat, and when to let your body be counted as a number, were all features of everyday life that were mentioned as being taken away from them during incarceration. The conditions that men and women contend within the jail setting facilitate the control of their bodies and behaviors in ways that infantilize and thus dehumanize. A feeling of being off-the-map, or past accountability, while guards local to the prison employ practices far from much-needed federal oversight was also expressed by some contributors.

The higher level of security at the facility a person was placed in, the gloomier the picture became. Language that indicates feelings of IV contributors about state and private prison sites, especially when they were asked about solitary confinement, included words such as: depression; abuse; animal; barbaric; resentment; hatred; captors; punishment; atrocities; and captivity. Concerns for adaptability and physical as well as mental health stability were also brought up. More directly tied to the experience of being in prison were complaints about dangerous and/or unsanitary conditions such as: lack of AC during hot summers; animals in the ceiling, roof leaks, broken fire escapes, overcrowding, unappetizing and inadequate food supply, and cold showers.

4.3.2 Cells and Living Space

Prisons are notable for reflecting the goal of turning prisoners into bodies to be controlled (see: Foucault 1977). Participants' reports showed variation in the setup for incarcerated person's living spaces. Contributors (Incarcerated Voices Project) either did not mention the set up in so much detail or reported sharing a cell with one other person. Participants spoke either about being placed in a cell with 1-3 other people or being placed within a sleeping room similar to a hostel, with many beds in one large 'pod' room. It may be a fair criticism to argue that jail is not supposed to be a palace, but the extent of neglect or extreme conditions individuals incarcerated at certain facilities represents a failure in structuring correctional facilities for the mental and physical health of the individuals incarcerated inside. This becomes problematic when extreme conditions affect health in ways which make it impossible for rehabilitation or restoration to occur. The goals of retributive justice are echoed in the narratives recalling the layouts of correctional facilities that respondents were trapped within.

Not all reports were wholly glum, thankfully. Fyn's comparison account of City jail [being much nicer] to county jail shows in itself that poor conditions are not uniform across correctional facilities, nor need they be the norm. Ramon, Susan and Oliver also all stated in the positive affirmative that there was temperature control at the jail they were in. Oliver added that the private jail he spent time in even additionally offered fans for each cell. Carl stated that he felt the buildings of the county jail he was placed in were well maintained, not recalling any major negative conditions of the edifice or its interior livability. That being said, many of the related accounts heard during this research process were troubling.

Overcrowding made jail uncomfortable for a number of participants. Susan indicated that the 107 women in her pod were divided into just 31 cells. These rooms, described as the size of a bathroom, were meant to accommodate only two people, but instead were packed with four adults. Each cell had only two beds attached to the walls; the remaining two women had to sleep in "boats" which are "like a big form of plastic canoe looking thing" that contain as mattresses, "P.E. mats—like gym mats from when you were in Elementary School" on which Susan slept for 2.5 months during her first incarceration. These loosely-termed 'mattresses' were described by many participants (Susan; Oliver; Emily), though at times they were assembled differently; either put on metal bed frames attached to the wall (Emily, Susan); put in plastic/metal-frame bunk beds (Oliver); or put in containers called 'boats'(Susan). Susan mentioned the scant amount of personal belongings she owned while in jail being able to fit in "a huge Tupperware bucket thing" which she had to bring with her in and out of the showers—when she was lucky to get one.

Other areas concerning living conditions which were pointed out as problems by respondents include reports on building conditions that include issues with safety and temperature-control. Caroline stated that "there was a lot of buildings, a lot of them were like coming apart,

like the roofs were caving in and stuff... One of the prisons I was in did get condemned and they shut it down... It was in Fort Lauderdale but it's no longer active, I guess you could say.” She continued on with details; “But yeah the standards, they're probably not up to the building code. Um. The--the temperature control—there's no air conditioning, so that was very difficult in the middle of summer. The middle of south Florida—that was a bit of a challenge; summer time was always really hard for everybody because of the heat.” Fyn shared a similar memory, declaring that while there was temperature control in the jails he spent time in, “We certainly had no access to the controls.” Ramon, Susan, Fyn and Derek all also had qualms about the upkeep of the buildings they were housed in. Oliver, Susan and Fyn in particular were also bothered by extreme overcrowding. In his interview, Fyn shared memories of a toilet without a seat, complaints of the lack of privacy for use of such in his cell, one out of only two shower stalls being broken, and of severe overcrowding. On the last subject he says, “We were packed in like sardines. There was a 3rd bunk tacked onto the wall of every cell”. Fyn estimated the cells of this county jail to be, size-wise, about 7.5 x 14 feet; further he stated there were 90 people stacked in 30 of these cells. In showing consistency with the theme of variation between facilities that emerged during this project, he proclaimed in comparison that, “City jail was MUCH nicer.” In addition to participant accounts, during my one year internship reading letters contributed to the Incarcerated Voices Project the letters also at times related stories of prisons as falling apart, having inadequate temperature control, and in a startling case, having animals living in the walls.

The harrowing descriptions are striking. Justifications for neglect are often rooted in this yet do not stand up when placed under humanitarian scrutiny. Being denied adequate shelter, as well as forced to live with little recourse from extreme temperatures and losing out on the chance to get restful sleep were all the negative results in the accounts shared about living conditions

within the jails and prisons they were assigned to. Conditions such as these have a negative effect on the overall potential well-being of individuals who are a vulnerable population under law (as described as a special category to the Internal Review Board whom approve research). These issues are the tip of the iceberg in relation to treatment of incarcerated persons. Even more significant than the structure of the institution are the practices which are employed both at an organizational level and by staff on-the-ground or inside the facility. This is explored throughout the rest of the sections within this chapter.

4.3.3 Food and Nutrition

Food, one of the few things in life that doubles as necessity and pleasure, was recounted by participants as being mediocre and frequently delivered cold from a far-off kitchen. Both the quality and quantity of food is mentioned by various participants as being insufficient. According to Oliver, the warmness of your meal directly correlated to your pods distance from the kitchen. This was in addition to the amount of time it took for the guards to divide the food into individual portions and slide the serving tray into the rectangular opening in the cell door. Oliver and Derek both expressed that the food offered was somewhat less than enough, quantitatively, to satiate basic hunger. Fyn also disagreed about there being enough to eat, saying he was “always hungry” during his stay. Carl, Ramon and Susan were contrary to the other participants in feeling that the correctional facility they were each in offered adequate food [or, at least, mostly adequate, in Carl’s case]. Caroline responded to an inquiry about food served, elaborating that, “No. We never got fruits or vegetables ever. Fruits—fruits could be made into Hooch-you know alcohol (Yeah) but it's really expensive. Vegetables, we very rarely got them, it's mostly like cabbage mostly that was

something cheap to provide for all of us.” She continued, “Everything was artificial. The meat was artificial; the butter, cheese-- you actually couldn't eat it, because it would destroy your insides. Thankfully we had a canteen, like a commissary, and those with money could afford snacks. But without the canteen you would starve.”

The canteen she refers to is a nickname for the only alternative to the jail-served gruel: snacks from the commissary. The struggle to taste something better seems to be a commonality amongst incarcerated populations, often fed meager portions of what was described as unappetizing and repetitive food such as nightly ham sandwiches (Susan). Squirreled- away and smashed-together commissary food would be used to create odd meals; strange recipes mixing up foods equivalent to about what you would find at a gas station, according to Susan. Commissary items were cited however by many respondents to be difficult to access for those who could not surmount price barriers. Indeed, in correctional center commissary stores, items are commonly sold at nearly triple the cost for what they are in an average store. Being unable to afford food and other items from the commissary is reported to result in deprivation of needed items for those living in jail without family support. Despite the high costs of commissary items, however, the practice mentioned above of creating unique recipes out of food from the commissary was reported by nearly every interview participant in the study. This practice is quite understandable in light of respondent answers about food options, freshness and nutritional value—namely, comments concerning the low priority these factors rate by correctional facilities.

This low priority is unfortunately reflected—and extended—in recent news literature on prisons, relating to the public ghastly true stories of incarcerated individuals having been served literal trash or maggot ridden food (Townes 2015; Flatow 2014). From an outside perspective, the poor quality of prison meals and tasty but gas-station level food from the commissary seems

particularly devastating considering how nutrient deficiencies affect the human body. An example of one such effect is the deprivation of Vitamin B, often found in fruit, which promotes stability for those with mood disorders; these conditions are statistically more prevalent in populations who experience incarceration (Ley 2010). This is relevant: as mentioned, certain participants (Caroline and Susan) reported that fruit was rarely included in meals, explained to be prevention of the potential use of fruit for fermentation into alcohol. This seems less of a random fact when one considers the law of Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs: essentially that one needs to have their physical self [hunger, thirst, and shelter] satiated before one can build a platform for self-fulfillment. Self-fulfillment in itself is not the goal of prison, but it seems reasonable to assume that the same would be true for prisoner rehabilitation or, more ideally, restoration [as in restorative justice; see: Justice Fellowship 2015].

4.3.4 Hygiene and Sanitation

Poor nutrition is not the only way that health is affected during incarceration. Being able to maintain one's own hygiene is a matter of bodily integrity which is removed from the person when forced into cramped conditions bound to be unsanitary and having one's personal grooming habits regulated. Respondents had startling concerns about cleanliness, particularly the ways bathrooms and showers were controlled in ways that at times made it difficult to satisfactorily clean themselves. Participants noted that despite daily morning and evening cleaning, unsanitary conditions could pop up throughout the day. This is not surprising given the hundreds of people using the same showers—showers which were, at times, scheduled as mandatory, and at other times prohibited, especially to those who were placed in isolation. This directly exhibits a central

problem to prisons; one that sounded to me as a researcher to be akin to conditions present in supposedly-historical internment camps.

For Susan, there was only one day a week when showering was mandatory, and showers were limited to two minute sessions. Those placed in segregation were often prevented from showering altogether. Further Susan recalled that there were only four showers for the 107 women in her pod. These were cleaned by an assigned team granted special privilege to be outside their cells at the beginning and end of each day. Caroline stated similarly, “There were—some places there were community showers—just depending on what dorm you're in.” She continues, “There'd be one big community shower, and then some dorms have individual showers, there would be 4 on each side of the dorm, 8 for 100 people, that's pretty good actually.” I sat stunned at that statement during our interview. Caroline told me a bit more of how her Florida state-level prison limited the chances of individuals to clean themselves, relaying that, “You just have to take turns. You could only shower in the evening. So you have a finite time. Phones and showers shut off at 10—so you have five hours to hurry...” Caroline further noted that she'd witnessed other women “fighting over first shower, because there wouldn't be enough hot water to last”. Time limits, sparse units and even sparser hot water were common issues complained about during interview sessions.

The bathroom was also a site mentioned by participants to entail particularly disturbing sanitation problems. Susan reported that in her county level Georgia correctional facility, messes which arose during the day fell on the shoulders of whoever was unlucky enough to inform a guard about the issue. On this subject, she stated that no less than five times during her incarceration she came across a pile of feces unceremoniously dumped and left in the shared showers by another incarcerated woman. On this subject, she mimics the on-duty officers response of denying her gloves after she notified one of them about the problem, stating that he told her simply, “[imitation

of deep voice:] ‘I’m not touching that, go clean it up’ ”. Switching back to her normal voice, Susan includes her response back, “Like, I’m not touching it, I don’t know who did it, I don’t want to get a disease or anything.” This illustrates a dangerous problem of potential neglect to a vulnerable population—a denial of adequate sanitary measures even as the incarcerated person is made to clean something which is itself a health hazard.

More on the subject of personal hygiene regulation that harms incarcerated individuals was a gross account of denials of feminine products. Susan related a story about her pod of 107 women being denied sanitary napkins for a week, during which an officer called them “bleeding, disgusting fish.” She said this officer responded to jailed-person requests for more toilet paper by saying “No, I’m sick of that. You guys have plenty, use from another pod, use from somebody else’s cell.” To this, Susan recalled arguing back, “No. You’ve got 4 women and one roll of toilet paper in each cell, no one’s going to share!” Oliver likewise declared that the state of sanitation was questionable, with the problem of overcrowding contributing to the issue. He indicated that these conditions played a contributory role to an incident where he witnessed another jailed-person be bitten by a brown recluse spider. Related to overcrowding, he also brought up cases of men forced to sleep in plastic bedding receptacles laid down on the floor due to shortages of proper bedding provisions and overages of people confined to his pod.

Only a bare minimum of toiletries were reported to be provided by the jails and prisons most participants served time in. Oliver, Fyn, Derek, and Ramon all agreed or somewhat agreed that goods such as toilet paper and toothpaste were available in adequate amount for a person’s use—but not much more was reported, and in the remaining cases, there was less agreement to that statement. Oliver described provisions as “the minimum necessities, as in hygiene. Toothpaste toothbrush, think it was like 4-6 letters a week you were able to mail without stamps, one pen and

a small pad of paper, a pad of paper like one of those cardboard pack paper to write on.” He related back that, “I would sometimes get money on my books. And money, things sent to me from my mom or my dad. But not very much. And there was plenty of times I was indigent, that I was able to apply for the indigent kit.” Susan’s report that essentials like sanitary napkins were denied at one point was accompanied by statements about how items beyond the most basic were either not available or only able to be obtained through expensive commissary purchase. Susan further indicated that those who faced administrative segregation-- a time within prison when an individual is isolated to a cell by themselves, away from social contact with general population— were denied for up to a weeks’ time.

Themes of poor sanitation or building conditions were echoed in accounts by Incarcerated Voices Project contributors. Aside from limitations on showering and access to personal hygiene items such as sanitary napkins, at least one participant indicated they were prohibited from changing clothes more than once a week. Susan went on to say, “Trust me on that. You're in it 24/7. It's nothing nice...” It is at this point that she goes onto comment on how her experience led her to enthusiastically wish to be a part of this research project, stating, “This is why I wanted to participate, because there are a lot of things that I saw, like, this is not, what it should be. It's not supposed to be the Hilton, but...” She trails off there, but the descriptions she gave throughout her interview displayed her strong feelings that jail settings need reform.

The narratives here reflect the literature. On the subject of being denied agency to maintain regular rituals of personal cleanliness, individuals who have the privilege of money or supportive families hold a few benefits against those who do not. Money seems to be the big resource, both lining the pockets of those who own the prisons and emptying the pockets of the families who are well-off and kind enough to support their loved one during their time of lost-normal work. No

matter the status of wealth-privilege a person inside has, however, as an author of another prison ethnography centrally put it, “their (incarcerated individuals) fragile bodies are not just evidence of poor hygiene; they also represent a descent into radical otherness” (Rhodes 2004:114, parenthesis mine). All individuals made to live in an overcrowded, inadequately-heated or –cooled, and unsanitary building are being told by their measure of treatment that they are categorically an Other—the inferior status used as justification for neglect or abuse.

4.3.5 Health Care

Following meager food and inadequate sanitation, a few respondents spoke about the health care at the correctional facility they were in. Held in a Florida state prison for four years, Caroline commented at length about this subject, “Thankfully, I was very lucky that I didn't get sick in there. I caught a few colds, but, um.” She hesitated, but then continued, “The. – the amount of people with interminable diseases in there is very high– a lot of people with HIV, especially Hep C, because they're drug addicts-there's shingles, mercer, staff, etc. and it's really contagious, because you're all showering together, and you're sharing bed sheets (and) you don't know if they were washed properly. So, healthcare no, not ideal.” She persisted on to describe the required Pap smear, which she implied was dehumanizing in its roughness stating that, “Those are really sick. They go to this thing called Outside Medical. It was a hospital-I never went there. They had to be treated by a professional. And they were chained to the bed the whole time just like complete Hannibal Lecter.” She mentioned further that pregnant women were shackled during birth; this is another issue reflected in the news literature (Adams 2015; Dusenbery 2015). Her relief was palpable in her voice when talking about her luck at not having had to risk what she clearly saw as an unsafe and inadequate healthcare center.

Susan likewise had worries about the healthcare in at least one of the jails she spent time in. She recalled having been screened for diseases such as HIV and Hep C at one correctional facility, but not at a later one she attended. This concerned her, making her nervous as to the rest of the untested population. She realized after some time that there was testing held at her location—only, it was a perk of the work system, a safety measure awarded only to a few lucky individuals. Emily also commented upon the healthcare, or what she knew of it from her brief jail stay. Emily recalled visiting the nurse upon her entrance to the facility, but related that, “Aside from taking blood pressure tested I wasn't tested for anything like that.” She pauses, “I do recall the nurse asked me if I had HIV...She may have asked me questions”. I could tell in the interview she was searching her memory in vain for some shred of evidence that wasn't there concerning what was to some participants a pressing health concern. Incarcerated Voices contributor letters also frequently reflected the inadequacy of facilities on site, the expense of ‘visiting medical’ for the prisoner, the low money put into medical facilities by the prison—and the critical need for such by individuals with serious physical or mental issues. Similar to issues of sanitation, this reflects a population that is seen as undeserving of quality health care and protection—yet another marker reflecting justifications for dehumanization and maltreatment based on logic that a deviantized group of individuals do not merit being treated humanely and as if they were people first and offenders second.

4.3.6 Accessibility to Opportunity: Education, Vocation, and Books

Many participants felt the libraries provided were inadequate, at least one individual indicating that the selections were held in a mere “book cart” (Susan). Ramon did have access to a library and vocational training during his incarceration, but not to educational programs. Derek

reported that he did not have access to a library, educational programs or vocational programs, though this could be due to his short stay while incarcerated. Fyn stated emphatically [and with obvious frustration] that he did not have access to a regular library during his incarceration stays, nor did they offer educational or vocational training at the facilities he was at. Fyn was a participant lucky enough to have family—estranged as they were—willing to put money down for his commissary and who paid for books to be shipped to him. Oliver recalled there only being a law library in the county jail he was at, though he said the private jail he spent separate time in did offer a more-regular library with non-law book selections.

Emily added to this picture by relaying in her interview a rule which limits the freedom of which books are read by incarcerated individuals: No book with passages about sex being allowed, even when books with violent passages were not to her knowledge prohibited. Susan, on the other hand, mentioned that she read most of a book famous for being erotic, *50 shades of Grey*—all but about 50 pages cut out. I wondered if the pages were missing due to the prohibition against books with sexual passages and how this book passed the censor to begin with, or if the rules simply differed at the jail in which she was placed. Also on the subject of literature, Oliver reported there being five books distributed per dorm. Caroline particularly took advantage of the policy allowing family to send books in and found books to be an escape to her surroundings during incarceration. Carl had a friend who was an ordained minister (off the internet, he later admits) bring him books on Daoism and Buddhism. Emily donated a portion of books she had to Kennesaw jail after her incarceration to improve the selection offered, in sympathy for her fellow incarcerated persons she met while inside. Law libraries are mentioned as being helpful for those who understand the content they contain; some contributors (Incarcerated Voices Project) reported prohibitions against

incarcerated individuals from assisting those who have not been taught how to interpret legal documents in evaluating them for their case.

Access to more formal education as well as vocational programs also varied from one facility to the next. Educational options were sometimes reported to be limited to a General Education Degree (GED) although some contributors did earn a degree while imprisoned. On the subject of educational programs, the one participant to be in a state level prison rather than a county level jail commented, “They provide stuff like that, state run classes...” Caroline pauses, and then says, “classes that [are] just an embarrassment. They don't do anything.” Oliver, on the other hand, took advantage of a GED program offered at the private facility he was interred in, receiving his GED three weeks following his admittance to the program. The difference in perspective of how beneficial education programs within the facilities participants were in seems likely to be attributable to the previous educational background of each of these individuals upon entering the prison—Caroline, with the privilege of having already earned a college degree, and Oliver having never completed high school.

Vocational programs were often stated to be inadequate. Complaints regarding job trainings include that mostly prepared individuals for jobs that is not a great need for in outside society, such as manufacturing that is often either replaced by machines, or completed by labor sources abroad-or, in prison. The accessibility of these tools for the future is based on state or private ownership as well as security level of unit. While there was no job-training at either of the jails that Oliver spent time in, though he did participate in work programs—one which allowed him to serve food, do laundry, and clean for the jail, another which offered him day passes under a work-release program for him to continue working at a local fast food restaurant during part of one of his sentences.

These reports are upsetting. As the subject-literature notes how prisoners often feel that books, whether they showcase a fictional story, general knowledge or religious material, help them “to become an individual” (Rhodes 2004: 82). While additional books are available if a friend or loved one ships them directly from the publisher or a Barnes and Noble bookstore, this is only an option to those with privilege of resource and considerate kin. This also represents yet another area where corporations benefit from monopolizing commodities consumed by individuals during incarceration for profit. It also represents another area where their right to be an ‘individual’ rather than an Other is taken from those who have the least means to begin with. It is not a far stretch that educational and vocational opportunities also have the potential to spark a journey of unique, healthy and non-crime related purpose in life. The limitation of this, alongside the stigma of a record, restricts life opportunities for people who are placed into this Other-ed ex-/prisoner or criminal category. The failure to invest resources into these areas is another trait of retributive justice which represents the idea that the ways jail and prison enact corrections is punishment; that people will behave or forever be sequestered for their deviance in a place where they will no longer be seen (dehumanization) or treated (maltreatment) as people.

4.4 Economics of Imprisonment

Privately owned prisons are particularly criticized for turning punishment into a business (Dyer 2000). Some respondents professed to like privatized prisons better than state due to certain private prisons being cleaner, offering better food and provisions. Other individuals regarded this as a rouse and lamented the lack of professional and educational programs, among other factors such as sentence length and oversight often a factor in these facilities. Minimum occupancy rules are particularly troubling, requiring privatized prisons to keep 90 percent of their beds filled (Black

2015). Some common criticisms of the correctional facilities reported by both respondents and the literature can be seen across the board however; this went beyond divisions such as federal, state, county or private jails/prison designations. It is in this situation that, in different ways, capitalism flourishes and dies within the correctional setting. On the one hand, there is exploitation of a labor force of inmates who are forced or given the option to work for miniscule-pay of less than \$1 per hour (Dyer 2000). This seen as especially unjust given the current federal minimum wage is \$7.25 an hour, which is also contested by many to be too low for reasonable survival outside the prison, in the land of cheap goods [but admittedly high rent] (Hirsch 2015). Labor done by prisoners is often associated with the Corrections Corporation of America /CCA and Federal Prisons Industry [FPI], organizations created specifically for the prison industrial complex. Besides being exploited as a cheap labor force, incarcerated populations also constitute a specific consumer group. Some of this work is to make uniforms or other items which are then sold back to other prisons' incarcerated populations for high prices. Further, regardless of whether the items were produced inside or outside of prison, incarcerated adults are seen as customers, required to pay triple the market-rate price for all items obtained through commissary purchase. This grossly capitalist venture of production and consumption is also however ideologically not in tune with the economic system of outside United States society, in that prison labor ventures hold an unfairly high profit margin for companies lucky enough to have contracts with correctional facilities. Due to this, incarcerated individuals are limited to buying things which have already been pre-selected, and free-market competition is nowhere to be found. In this way, practices of production and consumption within the prison represent rather a monopoly, owned by a few major corporate entities who exploit this population's labor and benefit off of their limited purchase-rights (See: Black 2015).

The feeling of money being placed over people was reported by all respondents who participated in or who mentioned work programs within the prisons/jails they were placed in. Many contributors were well aware of the politics behind this, criticizing the organizations for treating them as a commodity. It was unclear if respondents used specific language describing prison as a warehouse storing bodies due to a previous familiarity with literature about prisons, or if this conclusion independently reached. Regardless, they affirmed that this idea resonated with the experiences they had during incarceration. State prison systems such as Texas were mentioned to be a part of the 'Southern Chain-gang': a particular region of the U.S. known for its low pay [$> \$1$] and hard manual labor assigned to prisoners. Many respondents interpret this forced prison labor as a form of modern-day slavery, and weren't shy about saying so.

Other individuals indicated that they do not oppose to the idea of work within prisons if it teaches marketable skills for post-release and/or if they can earn a wage that is worth the work. As it stands now, benefits of workforce were told by respondents to include: getting a double mat to sleep on—four rather than two inches thick (Susan); getting better food (Susan), partially due to proximity if you worked in or near the kitchen (Oliver), getting one day knocked off your sentence for every three (R) or four (Susan) days worked, and getting a guaranteed blood health screening for diseases such as hepatitis C (Susan). While many do join for these purposes, other individuals refuse when such is an option. Susan admits enthusiastically that she did not join a work force, saying “I didn't, b/c I have something like, Fuck you guys, I'm not going to give you more services for free... In county you don't get nothing.” Acknowledging variation, she finished, “At least in Cherokee county, I don't know how it goes with the others.” Despite her strong refusals to join the work force, she brought up that she did recognize the value of reasons others have for signing on, explaining, “If you have an 8 month sentence, do it all on workforce, only two months served. So

that's a massive benefit and the biggest reason to join.” About other motivations, she adds, “Honestly, they try out for workforce because of the blood test you're given—it's healthy-I want to know what I got since the last time I was here so this is the free service to see what's it like.”

Additional respondents also described their relationship to the inside-workforce and opportunities given during their jail time. Oliver spoke of a work-release program which allowed him to leave the jail for shifts at his job as a benefit he was very grateful for. He was lucky enough to have firm ties at a restaurant which continued to employ him during and after his incarceration. Other participants didn't have such good fortune. In Carl's case, “The only benefit it offered was...every three days of work, you got one day taken off.” He claimed his schedule was 7am-7pm, seven days a week, working in a laundry room alternately with being told to wash police cars, explaining that, “Big bags of laundry would go through. Every now and then a buzzer would go off and I'd have to go out and wash cruisers...” Caroline did not have the luxury of making a choice whether to work or not, reporting that the main Florida prison she was held in required all incarcerated persons to work; “Yeah, county jail's not like that, there you kind of just lay around and not do anything. But prison, you're expected to work.” When I asked what kind of jobs there were, she stated, “Oh gosh, so many...um, you could work in the kitchen, you could work inside grounds, which is kind of like laboring outside, you know, weeding, and lifting dirt...um, there's, more advanced ones, like I was a GED instructor for Creek house.” When I inquired further as to whether they paid her for the work done, she replied emphatically, “Oh God, absolutely no! Not at all!” I pushed a bit more, asking if there was any benefit whatsoever. She told me, “In Florida you basically work for your good behavior days...the most, or the least you can do off your sentence is 85%, so you have to work extremely hard to get those days off. Most people max out and do 100% of the sentence.” She points out that there are arbitrary restrictions placed on this

benefit as well, “If there's a wrinkle in your blouse? They'll take four days off. Or if your shoe's not lined up properly...It's pretty hardcore.”

The descriptions of the correctional facilities each respondent spent time in echoed the common theme of economic exploitation. This is evident in participant descriptions of work programs which taxed an enormous amount of their time and energies but gave back nil in the way of tangible resources. It is further apparent in the reported high commissary costs for items ranging from toiletries to gas-station-level food, creating a consumer base that is locked into providing profits for companies monopolizing on the market of goods for prisoners. This system only works so long as these populations are deviantized in a way that dehumanization and maltreatment are brushed off. Denying the chance at a healthy livelihood is a question of dignity and social control. So long as this group is denied opportunity, they will be easier to control—not in ways that actually make it likely they will be transformed into a contributing member of society, but in ways that keep them chained into a system that allows private entities to utilize incarcerated individuals for their own purposes. These goals often stand at great cross-purposes with aims that could help to remove the stigma and the negative repercussions of incarceration itself for the individual who faces such.

4.5 Technology

4.5.1 Communication: Phones

Phones are the most common technology that most incarcerated adults in the United States have access to. Limitations on phone calls and in-person visits with loved ones, sometimes revoked for arbitrary reasons, were thus also a significant theme mentioned in relation to lack of control. Susan describes difficulties with this, namely the small number of phones available and the time

limits placed on calls, stating, “The phones are numbered, 1-4. All tables have a corresponding number...[and] you're [only] given 30-45 minutes of free time...I can't tell you how many times I'd sit and wait the entire time—not get to go outside.” When asked about technology access, Fyn said that there were two phones per pod—but they were often broken, he presumed by, “frustrated men [who] often slammed the handsets into brick walls.” This was for those who had loved ones on the outside willing to pick up—Fyn pointed out “Receiving a collect call from a jail-phone is very expensive [and] many had no one they could call.” Further on technology, Fyn said there were no computers at either jail he spent time in. Fyn said when football was put on television it turned into a social event. At the military jail Ramon was placed in, they did have computers but did not have internet; the sole purpose these were used for was typing up documents. Ramon also said phone privileges were lamentably expensive. This further reflects the theme of correctional centers turning prison into a business rather than a useful social institution, and doing so at the expense of the vulnerable populations forced to live inside.

4.5.2 *Media*

Access to media such as television and music is limited to varying degrees in jails and prisons. Interview participants (with the exception of Caroline) mention a television in a common room of the county jails they spent time in, but often being denied the power to choose what was watched by other incarcerated individuals. As to music, in the Incarcerated Voices Project contributor letters, a program called Jpay that at least exists in Ohio is brought up, allowing mp3 players and tablets into prisons—so long as incarcerated persons pay highly for the service. This arguably shows how a policy of prohibition based on security concerns is transformed as soon as the chance to make profit arises. Similar to commissary, the profit is phenomenal at that; special

file types are sold per song at prices equal to a full CD (compact disc) outside correctional walls. This was another area where making profit off individuals—and their families—who are already disadvantaged has won over any semblance of human dignity. Entertainment is not a need. But it should not be an exploitation, either.

4.5.3 Social Media

A subject of particular concern to Incarcerated Voices Project contributors featured social media access. While also not a necessity of living, social media has taken over so many lives in the contemporary U.S. that its absence is strongly felt by those prevented from utilizing such. Facebook and other platforms were less missed by individuals who held shorter jail/prison sentences, and speculated on by those who indicated having been in a correctional facility since before these websites gained such widespread popular usage. For some individuals familiar with the platform, it was indicated that the denial of accessibility to social media added an extra degree of separation between themselves and their loved ones. Other letter-writers, however, saw this prohibition as reasonable, and brought up concerns that computers might be used to commit crimes or as a means by certain individuals to continue harassment of persons they had victimized from behind bars. These individuals expressed the view that only certain individuals should be able to use social media. Distinctions were made by writers between one type of people and another—in this case, those expected to only use social media only for educational and family-connection purposes, and Others who are seen as likely to abuse the technological connection to further hurt prior victims to their crimes. Further on this subject, different opinions were offered on the likelihood of anything changing. Many offered doubt that the prison budget would include money to develop secure social media apps. More cynical contributors also doubted it would happen, for

different reasons: their claim being that it would not be beneficial for prisons to allow social media because it would expose prison staff to scrutiny that would reveal mistreatment and poor conditions of living.

Analyzing the narratives concerning access to technology showed conclusions at tension with each other. On the one hand, as some Incarcerated Voices contributors pointed out in their letters, there is a very real worry about the power that could be abused with open-internet privileges. Victims of prior crimes could be potentially further targeted or taunted, or ways could be found for individuals not set on renunciation or restoration to direct crimes from inside the jail easier if social media were expanded. On the other hand, prevention and limitation of using certain technologies inhibit an otherwise sequestered person from reaching out to loved ones and keeping a strong outside support system. This seems counterproductive to giving someone the hope and necessary support if restoration of the individual to society without recidivism is to occur. All of that being said, we live in a technological era of innovation; it does not seem ludicrous to wonder if there could not be a special application which could allow (likely highly monitored) family contact and ability to go to informational resources online while preventing most foreseeable potential crime which could result from communication.

The suggestions provided by Incarcerated Voices Project contributors often showed the length to which they thought about this subject. Answers which included criteria about making decisions on who could use social media and who could not reflected back a theme which was noticeably common in the interviews. This theme, intra-group social stratification by incarcerated individuals about other jailed-persons, is explored later in this thesis. Overall the impression I got from reading these letters though was a narrative of wanting to be on social media to remain in contact with loved ones. This was balanced by an implied fear that the writer might be considered

a part of the presumably violent or dangerous group that was reasoned to adamantly not be allowed to access sites such as Facebook. The implication of fear was in the stress of the letter and the insistence, if not directly, that the individual was on the good side. What I heard, between the lines of these readings, was, 'I agree with you, some people shouldn't be allowed social media access. I am on the side of order being applied to determine worthiness. Can I be considered worthy now? I'd really like to talk to my daughter.'

4.6 Maintaining Loving Bonds or Feeling Alienated

4.6.1 Family

Narratives about the struggle to maintain family bonds and develop friendships while incarcerated were also significant themes to many project respondents. Many IV contributors had families who turned away from them, or spouses who prevented their children from having contact with the incarcerated parent; those for whom this was not the case described in great detail the lengths gone through to keep contact frequent (through letters, phone calls, and when lucky, visitation). Some recipients also spoke of the difficulty in giving up roles of authority in family, due to age or placement [i.e.-older sibling or parent]. Ethnographic participants were often in for shorter sentences than the IV contributors, but still expressed deep regret at having missed out on certain events involving family. Family dynamics sometimes changed drastically due to one member disappearing during a correctional sentence, and at other times remained the same only because respondents did not inform their families about the event.

Ramon said more simply that his relationships with his family 'endured' the hardship, but that other personal relationships suffered. Nearly all respondents who commented on this subject

had equally heartrending tales of how incarceration affected their personal relationships. Fyn on the other hand was unique in his feelings, expressing that, “My relationships were vastly improved as a result of my jail time. I HAVE relationships since then”. On this he elaborates illustratively, “Before Rice Street (jail) I lived in very reduced circumstances: homeless and addicted. All human relations were ancillary to my dope habit. I hadn’t seen my family in more than 15 years.” Others didn’t have stories which ended so inspiringly. Many also regretted missing significant life events of their loved ones. These significant life occasions missed out on ranged from the heart surgery of a grandmother that Susan was a caretaker for to Oliver’s regret at having missed his dad’s wedding.

Being a caretaker for her grandmother after her heart surgery is an important role for Susan. Through the course of the interview, she lamented the months she was unable to take care of her grandma due to the interruption by her incarceration. When asked if she maintained contact with any loved ones on the outside, she notes that she used extra writing paper to keep in contact with her grandma due to her bad vision. On the subject she commented, “Yeah. I wrote, wrote my mom, wrote my friends a lot. Wrote my grandma a couple of times. Her eyes are pretty bad, so it took like three pieces of paper for one—large font for that one.” In our more informal conversations around the interview, Susan continually showed deep caring toward her family; over the course of coffee she explained just how involved she is with them—and how much it truly cost her during their jail-based time of separation.

Oliver also stressed that writing to the outside, and phone calls when he could escape to make them, were highly important for his staying sane while inside. He worried that missing the wedding of his father and stepmother created distance in his family relationships, though he also was grateful for the few times his father was able to contact him while inside. On this subject he

said, “The biggest part is that it changed me and my dad's relationship because of being ... to visit to him. Because him, going to his family to start his new life.” He continues, “Since I was in jail, I wasn't there to keep the bond that we had, and he ended up creating a greater bond with my stepmom.” He finished by commenting on how this compares to the rest of his family; “I feel it did [change things]. Me and my dad's relationship. As for my other blood relatives, it didn't affect our relationship because we'd already lived apart for so long before that.” This narrative of strained relationships was significant to most respondents who commented on this topic; —those who did not experience it themselves indicated having witnessed it with great sympathy to those who did.

Participants who had luck with supportive families or continued work opportunities despite their incarceration often humbly acknowledged how fortunate they were in these respects. Susan exudes gratefulness to her parents for having bailed her out, and comments on how her father somewhat understood due to overcoming drug-related struggles of his own. Later, during her longer incarceration, she comments on how blessed she is that her family gave her plenty of money for the 'store', the commissary. Fyn mentioned being estranged from his family for many years due to his involvement with drugs, with exceptions for when he called to tell them he was in jail—but when questioned about the ease of maintaining contact during incarceration, stated that, “they don't make it easy to connect with your folks... it's very difficult.” This idea was widespread in the recounted respondent perspectives—gratefulness for the family and friends who remained, but frustration with the system which prevented their regular contact. Given the importance of a social network in the time of crisis, disconnection from family and/or friends can be highly problematic and non-conducive to calls for restorative or humanizing justice.

4.6.2 Friendship

Aside from the effect on family bonds, another connection that many respondents feel is limited by incarceration is the ability to develop friendship. Indeed, making friends inside prison was expressed by respondents to be a rare and sketchy thing. This is said to be the state of things because everyone is on their guard. It is expressed in different ways in both letters and interviews that if an individual cares, rather than becomes emotionally disconnected, they may end up being taken advantage of. Respondents reported the need to be suspicious of a person's potential to be deceitful or a liar, words used often to describe a potential Other, and which ironically echo warnings given to prison staff during guard training. Qualities that were listed as being desirable for friendship or association inside included qualities that were practical and a bit utilitarian from my perspective, consisting of: someone who will fight for/with you; someone who is devoted to loyalty; and someone who will keep secrets. Incarcerated Voices contributors in particular mentioned difficulty making friends due to informal rules concerning fraternizing outside ones group based on race, ethnicity, or gang. Associations across these unfortunate constructed lines sometimes form around activities such as business, sports or religion; association is however often distinguished from friendship as containing less depth and loyalty.

Participant responses on this subject were varied but still generally conformed to the themes seen in responses by Incarcerated Voices Project contributors. While Fyn did feel he forged some real bonds with other incarcerated persons, he admitted this was not an easy thing for him to do. Ramon likewise agreed that he felt suspicious of fellow jailed persons and affirmed that he found it difficult to connect to others inside. He further affirmed that he felt somewhat similar towards law enforcement and that during incarceration he felt emotionally detached for these reasons. Derek somewhat agreed that he was suspicious of other inmates, and wholly agreed that

he was fearful of law enforcement guards during incarceration. Like other participants, he remained neutral as to whether real friendship could be created inside, and affirmed that it was difficult to keep in contact with outside friends and family during his short time inside. All of this likely contributed to his agreement that he felt a sense of emotional detachment during and/or after incarceration, though, again, he was the one participant to return a survey but was not interviewed. Unlike many of the other respondents, Oliver did not feel very suspicious, paranoid, or fearful of either law enforcement or other jailed persons during his incarceration. Nonetheless, when I asked whether he felt that real friendships could be created while incarcerated with others inside, he remained ambivalent with his answer. On other subjects of connection, he did find it somewhat difficult to remain connected to his family and friends outside of jail while he served his time. Altogether, he did agree that he felt a sense of emotional detachment during his stay in the correctional facility. On the subject of whether friendship could be cultivated, Ramon replied, “Hard to say. You just do the best you can until they let you go.”

The few persons who did make a close friend while in prison often described it as a rare but treasured gift—a fragile relationship difficult to maintain during facility transfer or release of either person. Interview participants reflected Incarcerated Voices Project contributor responses in separating the concept of friendship from something lesser; rather than 'association', the most common word used in the interviews was 'comradery'. This comradery was based on shared experience, and knowledge that all individuals on the other side of the demarcation line, all in the same situation. Susan explains it as, “Not real friendships, but...this is something that can distract me, for now.” She talks about how this comes about, “Everybody in there, will tell you, all the time, whether you want to hear it or not, about their case, about their kids, about their friends, about this one time, about everybody. 'So, do you think they'll keep you in probation for that?'

'How long do they usually keep you for that?' ” Susan's response to bonding over these activities was indicated further; “It's like, well, I'm wearing orange to, so, ya know?” When I asked her in reply,” So it’s kind of a camaraderie?” she excitedly replied, “It is, absolutely! I made that joke when I was in there, come to find out this is summer camp, and it is –there were times where it definitely had that feel. I mean, um, it's us-versus them—there's a lot of that mindset.” The “Us-Versus-Them” mindset is significant to note not just for the camaraderie created between incarcerated men and women, but for the ways in which relationships between incarcerated individuals and law enforcement guards affect social stratification and identity within interred populations.

Caroline was unique to the study—both participants and contributors—to say that she became friends with many individuals while in jail, though she did still frame her friendships in a similar way as those who mentioned camaraderie. On this topic, she remarked, “Oh yeah, for sure. I had a lot of friends, um, not—uh--on the outside, you wouldn't think-- you really don't have a lot in common with them—I certainly didn't.” She illustrates this point by pointing to her privileged background again, continuing in a way that implied comparison: “At the state prison, the educational level is really low, it's like 5th grade, 6th grade...--a lot of people cannot read or write, so at first glance, you don't think you have a lot in common with them.” The use of the secondary 'you' here, being meant to include myself the researcher in the separate categorization of the educated—on she spoke, “But, you kind of bond, the experience you're going through, because it's such a terrible situation and it's so badly—you're basically fighting to survive in there—so the bonds just develop because you're going through it together.” Caroline thus definitely described the cementing of her friendships with other incarcerated individuals as being based on shared experience; this was something similar to those who stressed comradeship. She continued

distinctively though, speaking of enduring friendship due to this experience and other friendships which suffered for the same reason. On this subject she added, “I have a lot of friends that I still talk to and, um, that I really care about, and to be honest, whenever you get out, whenever you're released, I couldn't really identify with my old friends because they just have no idea what I've been through”. She continued, “I still talk with my friends met in prison, because they understand. It's a very big shock once you get out, and, the transitioning out, when you're in the big society...” As far as the cessation of certain outside friendships went, Caroline told me that, “There wasn't really any judgment to my face. It's just, I can't relate to a lot of my friends anymore. They don't really-- A lot of my friends have been super privileged and haven't really experienced any hardships.” Given her lengthy experience in a state level prison for what was an accident [albeit a highly tragic and emotionally charged one], it is not surprising that she no longer includes herself amongst this group.

The theme of disconnection from others and association rather than friendship was originally identified in the Incarcerated Voices contributor letters; indeed the significance of response in the letters inspired part of the content of the inquiries featured in the interview stages of this research project. Caroline found true friendship inside with people who she still is in contact with today. She stands out as notable here because of the difference in her response to the other respondents. Despite her proclamations of friendships with some of the women she met while incarcerated, Caroline's description of the population inside the state facility were mixed. At one point, Caroline describes her view of other individuals inside, stating how “the educational level is really low, it's like 5th grade, 6th grade; a lot of people cannot read or write” as well as that “Most of these women are—have had these horrific childhoods—they've been molested, they've been raped, all through growing up, and they have zero self-esteem, that's kind of like the common

denominator.” Here I will state that may be true that incarcerated populations are less likely to have completed a diploma or degree [Dillon 2009; Harlow 2003]. This is not the whole picture however, as generalizations of ‘all’ or ‘none’ generally are misleading, and seem to be a part of the process of deviantizing itself in the characterization of another in a stereotypical role [in these examples, uneducated or victimized]. Deviantization is itself a process of Othering, and in this case exemplary of a social stratification system within incarcerated individuals that denotes privilege to some but not others.

4.7 Prisoner-Guard Interactions

4.7.1 *Deviantization*

Interpersonal dynamics in correctional settings can affect identity in profound ways. Inside correctional facilities, guards are coached to view prisoners as a wholly deviant population. This is seen in training sessions which teach staff to automatically assume that the people they are holding captive are manipulative or liars (Aguilar et al 2013; Rhodes 2004). This means that incarcerated persons are immediately treated with distrust, a practice which notably “destabilizes the very idea of a real or truthful self” (Rhodes 2004: 171). Incarcerated persons likewise do not trust the correctional officers, for the same reasoning of assumed manipulation (Rhodes 2004: 174). Deviantization also holds a prime role for correctional facilities outside their walls, in society where individuals emerge from and return to. Prior to incarceration, contributors from communities where trust in police was more tender, individuals may be deviantized by stigma of identity-factors related back to race or other factors. Deviantization after prison in the form of job-discrimination was for all respondents recognized as a problem in hindsight or feared as a potential problem during incarceration. On this topic, Caroline said, “People'd always be whispering about me. I felt alienated. Um. Nobody would hire me for a full time job for the first 18 months, or like,

16 months, um I just had trouble-I had to find a part time job as a waitress.” With a reaction that shows how unaccustomed a lawyer is to the service industry, she went on a bit with incredulity stating, “*Yeah*, as a waitress, which is. [Mumbles noise of discontent; laughs].” She sums it up as having been like an extension to her sentence, “Once you have that felon stamp, it's like a life sentence. Like something, like my transition in society was so much harder, it was like another year in prison.” This is a barrier of deviantization that becomes a great obstacle for previously incarcerated persons upon release.

4.7.2 *Dehumanization*

Interactions which occur between guards and incarcerated persons in correctional facilities are often tense. The complications of these events are often deeply reflective of the inequality of power that informs the interpersonal dynamic between the two groups. The fact that human rights are being violated in cases of maltreatment does not escape the note of many incarcerated individuals. When titled a ‘vulnerable population’, it is not because of a likelihood the population does not know that maltreatment, dehumanization, and lingering deviantization are practices which harm them [as might be the case with vulnerable populations of children]. No, incarcerated adults are a vulnerable population specifically because their voices on the matter of what happens to them are silenced, the control over their lives removed, with restraint enforced physically and by prospects of violence. Guards in correctional facilities are the most proximal and interactive symbol of restraints placed on life that incarcerated persons have contact with. What prisoners represent to guards can only be speculated at this point. Are they representative of dangers needed to be controlled, the elements that they’ve been charged with subduing and prohibiting, for the safety of the supposed good and innocent? Are they being charged with inflicting punishment upon

those whose actions have stigmatized their selves as deviant? Or are they employed with the mission of assisting in the rehabilitation of sick souls? Or rather is it an assistance role in what needs to be the persons' decision to seek restoration into society, a helping hand for someone who made a mistake but who is seen as both fully culpable and fully capable of entering back into society?

For prisoners, "Being broken" through coercion threatens the possibility of coherency within the self, as well as 'manhood' and freedom (Rhodes 2004: 65-68). The prison itself can be set up to cut dignity, but the practices of guards within prisons are the clincher for oppositional identity formation. A tremendously notable deviantizing and dehumanizing practice within correctional settings is the use of animal idioms within prisons (Rhodes 2004:32; Reighmen 2010: 35; Terry in Thompson 2003). Incarceration is frequently argued to resemble the "experience of being a dog on a chain" (Rhodes 2004: 171). The participants in this ethnographic research also at times used this language to describe how the experience felt, or referred to instances when officers used non-human referents directly to refer to incarcerated persons. Emily notes in her account how an officer directly used the word dog to refer to the man who evoked the guard's wrath by not walking towards them in the direction commanded. Susan relates that the "bad deputy" used similar speech: "Forum [officer] called us fish. Bleeding, disgusting fish. And that was when they were denying us sanitary napkins." Caroline immediately felt like she was being treated like 'an animal' by the officers who arrested her. Caroline also used the word animal to describe how she felt she was being treated when having to undergo a mandatory pap smear, relating horrifically that, "You were required to have a pap smear every two years. And the way that, that mine went down, I felt like I was getting raped. They just treat you, they treat you like an animal—like, worse than an animal really." Listening to the descriptions of correctional settings as described by

respondents evokes imagery of a human zoo, with human beings placed in cages and controlled by physical means; the use of animal idioms reinforced this picture in my mind throughout the projects timespan.

Further on the topic of dehumanization, to Susan it felt like the attitude of some of the guards was personally about vendetta against her as a type of person. Susan remarks that, “It's a very cowboy mentality, it really is. It's like, [deeper voice, with exaggerated emphasis:] 'I'll show you.' [Normal voice:] A lot of them it's, [deeper voice:] 'How dare you do this in my city?' [Normal voice:] It's very much that type of attitude.” Susan further tells me about a particular deputy at the correctional facility who left a lasting negative impression in her mind; “Every day she would come in and scream at everyone before breakfast. Other deputies didn't always do that. She would choose to do that.” Susan illustrated further, “She would always stir up things, say like, ‘Well you stupid bitches’, or ‘you idiots’ or you know, something mean.” Name-calling is an essential form of deviantization that is often dehumanizing, although it is not the only practice which falls into that category.

Susan also noted the tendency of certain guards to take away things for what she saw as arbitrary reasons, recounting a story of how she was “denied visitation one time because she guard) said I didn't walk quickly enough to the windows.” She spoke with her hands during the interview, illustrating, “It's a U shaped pod and the visitation windows are here, my room is all at the end, so I have to go across a tier, run on a tier and you get seg.” Getting back to the story details, she said, “I could see my parents walk up to the window so I started to go and uh and,” she slips into a deep voice imitation again, “You know what? Really Susan*? You don't want your visitation? You're not going to hurry? Then you're locked down you don't get visitation.” Using her own voice again to recall her frustrated response of “you've gotta be kidding me” and replying [or wanting to reply,

it's unclear], "Really, my parents are right there. They're not in jail; they didn't do anything wrong." She continues, "This is inconveniencing them; they came all the way up here." Providing more details on what visitation is like, Susan said, "You have to make an appointment for visitation so they made an appointment and then sat there and waited maybe an hour until whenever visitation was available because the next one which is available is always full by then. So they sat there waiting that whole time just to get to this point." Her protestations were fruitless, however; she was denied visitation rights until another day—though she mentioned feeling lucky that her parents lived four exits down, instead of out of state.

On the subject of dehumanization, Caroline in particular felt like she was a target for guards' ire while incarcerated, and likewise mentioned certain power-plays which would result from the dynamic between the groups. When asked if she felt intimidated either by other incarcerated persons or guards, she replied, "Some were cool. Some were ok and left me alone. I had the worst trouble with guards." Elaborating further, she continued, "I didn't have a lot of trouble with inmates, but I had a lot of trouble with women guards. Especially ones that knew I had a law license—they're I guess, jealous, and resentful, so I'd kind of be a target for them." I asked her in response what they would do, and she replied promptly, "Take things away. They would take things away that they knew you valued. Your visits, your phone calls, just stuff like that. They would learn what makes you tick and then they would take it away." I asked her what the official reason they would give to her for these actions was. She thoughtfully paused, and then continued, "Um. Like one time, like, my pillow, my pillow wasn't in the center of the bed, it was more to the right. So I lost like, some privileges for a week. They have the complete discretion to do that. They can make up stuff. So. Yeah." At this point in the interview, she sounded pretty defeated. I asked her why she thought her background in law made her a target, to which she

related that, “They would make comments about it, call me, like, Harvard, inmate Barbie, stuff like that... I mean, if I worked for a prison and looked like they did I'd be miserable too” (laughs). At another point in the interview, as mentioned she noted more specifically how appearance standards could count against the days one earned off their sentence by working.

Not everyone in the study disagreed with the use of non-human language by guards, however. Fyn was unique to the study in seeming to see a point in officers using animal language, stating that, “He wasn't wrong about this; he'd be talking to us like, how do you want to live? If you don't want to be treated like animals, don't act like it.” In his interview, he went on to claim, “I think he was more appreciative of our humanity than a lot of guards who would use respectful language...” Fyn seemed to interpret this as constituting straightforwardness. The implications of this interpretation from my perspective as a researcher is that Other creating processes occur not just between guards and prisoners, but also between incarcerated persons. Further, Fyn felt it was only about 25% of the time that law enforcement used dehumanizing speech, though the officer who arrested him definitely fell into that category. On this subject he mentions that he was never ‘mirandized’ [read his rights]. Fyn did not feel that his treatment prior to incarceration included the rights and respect that is supposed to be afforded to the innocent prior to a 'guilty' verdict being ruled in court. On the subject he states, “Rights, maybe: not respect. Public defenders and jail advocates were all terribly over-worked and far too busy to really engage with us. We were numbers in a system.” Further, on the survey Fyn put down that he felt that guards were dehumanizing 75% of the time. In the interview, where I got to hear his voice in a more personal way, he stated aptly that, “They [the guards] seemed pretty dehumanized themselves, too.” This reflects literature which shows that dehumanizing practices within correctional facilities affect both prisoners and law enforcement (Bolton 2004; Ryburg 2010).

The dehumanization mentioned here within correctional centers is not one sided to officers. As a response to being called names and at times mistreated or neglected, those who are incarcerated likewise turn the practice around—if only in informal conversations or backtalk. This can be seen in Caroline’s statement, “If I worked for a prison and looked like they did I'd be miserable too.” It can also be seen in a conversation I had with Susan, when in the interview she countered dehumanizing depictions of prisoners with animal [and cartoon-animal] metaphors of her own applied to law enforcement guards. Also illustrating that characterizations using non-human metaphors can go both directions, at another point Susan compares two officers to cartoon characters from popular Disney channel and Nickelodeon channel children cartoons : “She looks just like Tweety-Bird's grandma-You remember Tweety-Bird's grandma?...It was freakish. I'm telling ya.” She continues, “There was another deputy, a female, who looked just like Squidward... Yeah, just like Squidward, and nobody knew who the hell that is.” Susan furthered this view by expressing her surprise that the “bad deputy” she referred to throughout the interview was formerly employed taking care of children, Susan exclaimed at one point, “She was a daycare teacher! That's what floors me!” She elaborates on why this is so startling, mentioning her views on proper education professionals for that age in comparison to the deputy, “The quintessential kindergarten teacher, that's what it should be. Anything but that is just...mind-blowing to me that you could ever be allowed to be put around children.” This was another instance where a participant used comparison to emphatically stress non-membership to a group of individuals dehumanized in the imagination. At this point in the interview, Susan spoke about how, despite the ways her record has deviantized her image, she actually loves kids and is quite responsible when babysitting: “I love kids. I don't know why, but they always love me. I'm a mess for them. If you look at my record, you could never let me around your children, ever, but trust me, you'd want me around

your children.” She further elaborates why this is; “I will play games with them, fun little stuff, and, I can't talk inappropriate around them, I don't think that's correct to do...I find different adjectives I can use instead of expletives and such. Like, Oh, Sugar. That's so frrrreeekin— (laughs).” She uses this depiction to show a clear oppositional difference between herself and the officer who she saw behave so grievously and inappropriately.

4.7.3 *Maltreatment*

When I asked respondents if they had witnessed any violence or intimidation while incarcerated, the responses were varied. At one point Caroline replied that, State prison is a very violent place. There is violence everywhere, but, you-- um--You kind of learn, how to become a non-target, and, um. Yeah, I've gotten a couple—not physical fights, but, um. You get in some altercations, and also for, for state prison, I don't really know how it is for federal.” At another point on this direct subject, Caroline replied, “Officers, um... No, most of it was actually consensual, I knew a lot of people who were sleeping with them, but...um. [More sure voice:] I know that it happens.” Other respondents gave more in-detail accounts of violence witnessed. Respondents brought up cases where violence was committed over reasons which seemed trivial on the outside but which were blown up to great proportion inside-including as mentioned elsewhere in this thesis, use of phones, showers and ownership of food. These accounts were always most troubling.

Aside from actual violence was extreme intimidation through violations of personal space, property and intense interaction. Ramon said that there was no dehumanizing, disrespectful or racist speech used where he was placed but admitted that it is not always the case that arresting officers did their job right by honestly explaining things to individuals or trying to

be helpful. Further, at another point, he does bring up one particular guard who he felt stood holding a rifle in a purposefully menacing way while supervising outside time for the inmates, though this is the only instance he brings up.

Susan discussed witnessing a particularly troubling instance of extreme intimidation when an officer got in the face of a possibly-mentally ill, elderly woman and berated her excessively on the day the woman was released from jail: “Deputy Forum [name changed here], the bad deputy...picked on her...this poor old woman, she barely had hair on her head. Shuffled, and talked to herself, no teeth in her mouth...” She illustrates one particular occasion of being berated by the officer to this woman on the day of the woman’s release, “Forum gets the paper and reads it...like “get your shit together. Hurry up...Forum's yelling at her and all I hear is, [deepens voice:] 'no you have to turn in your fucking toilet paper in too. You-turn your fucking—you know this Tibbson [*name change], how long have you been here? Are you fucking retarded? Go back in your room and get your fucking toilet paper! What do you think, that I'd just let you leave it? Leave it with your bunkies, you gonna will it to somebody?” Continuing on about the woman’s reaction and how she, Susan, interpreted it, “[imitates older woman’s voice]: ‘Ok, – Ok, alright, I can get it for you, yes mam’. [Normal voice: Just, just like, very respectful and like, flustered, and also, not completely understanding what’s going on, I got the vibe of that.” The story goes on, “So she sets her stuff down on the floor, her Swiss cake roll. Goes back to her cell, gets her toilet paper and on the way back, Forum is just still berating her...she's shuffling and Forum's just yelling at her, cursing at her, screaming at her, calling her a dumb-ass, idiot, retard. All these just awful names.”

Susan goes on to describe the experience further and her assessment of it; “she (the deputy) goes in the cell with her and she's getting the TP out—which she's not supposed to do, she's not supposed to go inside the cell, and not with the inmate too.” Susan summarized this more

succinctly and aptly than I could, stating in finishing, “So she broke the rules just to get that power. Which I thought was pretty telling about her personality and character.” Continuing on with yet another imitation, she illustrated the imagined mindset of the law enforcement officer, “[Deeper voice:] I will literally risk my job for a write up just to make you feel like nothing.” This was a turning point, she says, returning to normal voice, “That was when I stopped giving her the benefit of the doubt, [that] maybe this is [just] what she was taught.” The story doesn’t end there. Unable to stand watching this, Susan challenged the officer—receiving time in isolation for doing so. This shows the power disparity and recognition of it in clear light, as Susan assessed it, “It’s a bully situation, I’m not going to let that pass by, it’s my moral fiber, if you want to put me in seg, put me in seg.” She recalls telling the officer, “Stop being a fucking bully man! Just chill out. You need to stop being a bully, she’s on her way out”. The officers reaction, being to ask her what her name is, and put her in seg—a reaction she expected, “I know what’s coming you’re going to give me seg, take away, phone , mail. And I ended up getting seg for a week for that.”

On the subject of racism-based violence, most participants did not have many stories, but acknowledged their privilege was likely the factor in that. Caroline was the one participant to agree that racism was rampant, rather than at the margins, stating that, “Well other than, other than the lesbianism, then, racism is probably the most, second, then most abundant, way of life, it’s prison is all about racism... It was a huge, huge deal, it’s very racist in there, but it’s just a way of life you become used to. It’s really irritating...” On this subject, however, she did not bring up the unfairness of the unequal number of African Americans in prison. Instead her narrative showed that she felt singled out for being the minority in an arena that was mostly non-white, thus making claims of reverse-discrimination. On this subject she stated that, “You are discriminated against. Blacks are the revered, preferential, they’re given preferential treatment and this isn’t just in

Florida... I work with a bunch of ex-cons in male prison and it was just like this, from what they told me.” When I asked her to elaborate on this, she replied, “In my experience, all the guards were black, so the black girls got whatever they wanted. We [white women] were discriminated against on a daily basis, all the time, made fun of, punished... that was the first time I'd ever been discriminated against based on what I'd look like. It's weird.” In recounting Caroline's tale, I use the words reverse-discrimination rather than reverse-racism. While racism implies a systematic favoring of one group over another based on perceived physical characteristic of skin color, discrimination is more appropriate for a local disfavoring of an individual based on prejudices surrounding race.

It is notable that I did not hear similar tales from other individuals on facing racism in this project. On the contrary, Fyn and Oliver both stated they did not experience racism first hand, but also admitted it could be due to their position as white men or from their position in a lower level facility. Susan likewise mused upon the subject, commenting that, “The one thing I was shocked, that I, I didn't get any racism from guards—didn't see that. Inmates were very, very different. [But] didn't see any kind of racism from the guards.” She continued, “But, of course I'm a young, semi-attractive white female, so, I mean, you'd expect sexual advances which also did not happen.” Fyn indicated that the racism he witnessed was more subtle than overt, stating that, “Violent crimes were on higher floor. Most racism I saw was... Stick to their own”. This acknowledgement of the privilege of social status or lower security level placement was more common than Caroline's experience of reverse discrimination, though, again, experiences were varied among respondents for many reasons.

Trust, Interrupted

Many of my participants noted a loss of trust in police officers after their arrests and sentences of incarceration. Emily feels that the little trust she had in law enforcement prior to her arrest evaporated during her incarceration experience: “I mean. I guess I trusted a little bit. Now, pretty much every time I ever see the flashing lights, I think to myself, let them go.” She continues, “I mean. I don't know what they did, I don't care. Let them go. Chances are you're arresting a nonviolent person.” She explains a bit further, “So definitely. I think if somebody came in here with a gun right now I'd call 911--but I'd hesitate over something small.” Illustrating this, she goes on, “Like if I were rear ended again, I would be like, let's just trade insurance information. We don't need to have either of us issued a ticket, we can just handle this ourselves. So definitely less trust and less likely to contact the police.” Oliver had a somewhat different perspective. Oliver felt like the line of questioning during his arrest for trespassing into the church was too much, but was neutral on the subject of law enforcement using animal comparisons to refer to incarcerated persons, only rarely finding speech used by officers to be dehumanizing. He did not experience roughness or violence during his initial arrest or subsequent incarceration, and said that he felt like at least 75% of the officers he encountered during these experiences were respectful.

Fyn likewise did not feel that the officers were rough when handcuffing him nor directly experienced physical harm from officer violence. Nonetheless, while he stated that he wished he could say otherwise, he did not feel that the law enforcement was respectful during his arrest processes. Further, he did witness a few incidents of violence committed by guards, “Once every two or three day[s], maybe,” as well as dehumanizing remarks (including comparisons of incarcerated persons to animals) and/or disrespect that he rated as occurring during 75% of his time inside. Likewise to Caroline's account, Fyn stated that, “The officer took joy in catching me. Positively gleeful.” Fyn acknowledges that his experiences were not able to be categorized

homogenously as good or bad, saying that he “experienced a broad range of treatment and [had] a broad range of personal responses to it.” On the subject of altered trust in law enforcement, Fyn said the following, “I appreciate more than I ever have the need for a decent police force. That said, I don’t trust the police we have. They scare me. In a very different way than when I was a criminal.” He goes well into specifics with his response, saying, “The low pay and low standards/expectations of police and “correction officers,” the polarization in society between police and policed, and a general sense of Murphy’s law lead me to believe I’m in equal danger from police now that I’m above board and law abiding as when I was a criminal.”

Some participants did not feel they had much trust or distrust for the police to begin with. In Caroline’s case, coming from an upper socioeconomic background, she goes on to say that she didn’t have much contact with the police to think about such: “I’ve never had any contact with police, before, I guess you could say—I was intimidated by them, just because—you know, you have that stereotype of them that they’re all on power trips, which, uh, which is pretty much the case in my experience! But uh, I didn’t have any negative dispositions about them—I just hoped to never come across them.” Carl has a similar story of non-trust to begin with. The account he has of his pre-incarceration attitude traces back to his childhood and reflects the limited trust certain communities have in police due to their often threatening presence to certain neighborhoods: “Well I never had a trust in police officers, even as a kid...Even just the environment I grew up in—my parents never once said, ‘You can trust the police’...” His view has been complicated since adulthood, however, as working as a guard has also influenced his current perspective: “I was a military policeman in the army, and I saw the way some of them acted, as a guard later. So yeah, I never had a trust. But I don’t have an automatic distrust.” He clarifies his moderate view, “I just...if I’m in the presence of law enforcement I just pay close attention, because some are ok and

some are not, and you can't assume one way or the other.”

The events which led to distrust in many respondents included either experiencing or witnessing dehumanizing behavior of guards towards incarcerated individuals. Out of the participants, Susan was fairly elaborate on this, saying that she felt like two officers out of ten to twelve that she recalls being on the unit “were good people—they were respectful and they understood that authority wasn't based in fear and demeaning a person” and (as Susan noticeably alters her voice to inflect a calm serenity, “pleasant.” The others, however, “went off that.”

Concerning his faith in police officers, Ramon stated outright, “I do not trust them if they are on the clock and want something to do with me.” He does say however, that, “Besides that, I would treat them with the same respect as I would anyone else.” This is an interesting statement which seems to divide the on-duty law-enforcement from the humanized self it is easier to see when they approach citizens off duty. Ramon wholly disagreed to the idea that the system as it is works, though he did feel that he was treated properly prior to being ruled guilty and that it was rare he experienced or witnessed dehumanizing treatment during his incarceration, and that he saw no violence towards incarcerated populations by guards. He perhaps felt most of the respondents that the law enforcement he encountered inside were respectful, which he attributed in his interview to be due perhaps to their military training. Ramon also felt like his trust in the Army to an extent changed, saying, “You know, it was just what I was trained to believe, that they'd have my back. Think they'd be there, like, maybe [he's] not a perfect soldier but I was a Good soldier and you'd think. But, it's like ok, never mind.”

4.8 Social Stratification: Others within the Others

In Oliver's county-level jail, violent crime offenders were separated from nonviolent offenders by segregation within the pod gym and by requirements for different color uniforms: orange for persons incarcerated for an event involving violence, blue for everyone else. Emily related that her jail was divided by felony and misdemeanor, this time by bracelet color: red for the felonies and a “whitish” one for the misdemeanors. These formal markers are symbolic to both officers and incarcerated persons, declaring a division of types of prisoners, and of types of treatment. Essentially it seemed a question of how Other to make someone, and for what reasons.

I first noticed that division was a prominent theme while reading contributor letters from currently incarcerated individuals who replied back to the Incarcerated Voices Project. In these letters, repeatedly, by separate authors, there was a stressed distinction between the truly dangerous and those who self-identify as not truly dangerous. Part of this idea rests also on the latter group's claim that they should not be incarcerated at the correctional facility or level they are in. It also rests on the emphasis that the writer shouldn't be associated with the negative stereotype of incarcerated individuals: criminal, prisoner, ex-prisoner. It seems an attempt to separate oneself from the Other category that has been applied by outside forces and regain agency over self-definition.

Within many jails and prisons respondents reported on, this division corresponds to a hierarchical strata of respect based upon crime type and personal habits. This reflects both the need to separate themselves, as well as at times showing pervasive ideologies based around heteronormative ideals. The latter is presented in cases where homophobia is shown, through admonitions against sexual acts with someone of the same gender or anything which creates in the eyes of fellow incarcerated persons, a perception based in fear of both real and perceived threats.

At one point, when Caroline mentioned lesbian-trade of favors for drugs, I asked if it was prevalent and she replied, “It's probably about 90%. It's all about being gay in there.” She continued unabashed, “I was one of the very few who didn't have a girlfriend. It's probably like the number one thing in women's prison—at least from my perspective.” I did not hear this from other responders, though many spent time in men's rather than women's prisons. Although this participant did not seem to affiliate with outright homophobia, the way she spoke about this phenomena was less than charitable; it was unclear if this was her intention or just my subjective reception of her words, however. Incarcerated Voices contributors were at times much more straightforward with their agreement to homophobic ideologies (such as in suggestions to prison ‘newbies’ to not involve themselves in ‘gay’ (same-gender sex-act) behavior), though this was not the case with every letter which brought such up. This is unfortunately one of the dividing criteria that create social stratification within correctional settings.

Another way divisions were made is in the hierarchical status of respect based upon crimes committed. This system implies a lowly status for those who commit sex crimes (molestation, rape) or who violate prisoner codes (such as not being a ‘rat’ or a ‘snitch’ by reporting other incarcerated persons for breaking rules). For Incarcerated Voices Project contributors who replied to a question concerning this subject, child abuse [especially of a sexual nature] is scorned as the most unforgivable crime, with elder abuse not falling far behind. Most respondents had very strong opinions on persons put away for pedophilia, and indicated they supported either violence or shunning for these individuals. A few letters did offer to the contrary ideas about pedophilia being associated with mental illness, or worried about the potential of innocent individuals wrongly convicted being assaulted due to these norms. This was however a rare viewpoint that expressed this consideration. Murder and rape are less mentioned as being a target for internal violence,

though in certain cases respondents expressed discomfort or fear at having to share a cell or be mixed into a pod with someone who was particularly intimidating to them due to having committed these specific crimes. Further, it should be noted that this was not brought up by interview participants, probably due to less likelihood of individuals convicted of more serious crimes being placed in a lower-level jail.

These hierarchical and dehumanizing views on other prisoners based on crime type also extended to perceived sexuality. Homophobia, or hatred against non-heteronormative sexualities, was prominent in many incarcerated individuals viewpoints as well, unfortunately. In a question sent out to contributors concerning advice to newcomers to correctional settings, a warning to not participate in homosexual activities, or appear to have the characteristics of stereotypes of what is 'gay' or 'feminine', was included in many responses. Within the replies I sent back to contributors during my internship with the Incarcerated Voices Project, I did my best to challenge these ideas. Nonetheless, distinctions between incarcerated persons persist, made on a variety of criteria that continually impact identity in ways that affect the perception of self and Other of incarcerated individuals, even as their self is Other-ed.

4.8.1 Privilege

Privilege affects identity, perspective and experience because it offers someone access to resources which others are denied. Identity in itself can hold privilege due to norms concerning social status which are often dictated by groups who hold power, to the expense of Others who are rendered powerless. A central role of correctional facilities is removal of an individual from society, an act which is often accompanied by a removal of both privilege and often rights from incarcerated populations. The effectiveness of this seems to vary by circumstances individuals face

and privilege held, including that of identity proscribed from the outside due to racism, sexism, and homophobia. In this project, I saw that the notion of privilege was markedly distinct for respondents; in the logic expressed basic rights were transformed into earned or deeply missed privileges. The main thing this project showed however was that privilege has an ambiguous meaning in correctional settings.

In some cases, participants noted that missed privilege eventually was what motivated them to effectively get out and stay out; Oliver indicated that this factored heavily in what eventually changed for him, replying to an inquiry on such that, “The taking away of freedoms, liberties that I had access to outside of being incarcerated. That I was unable to have access to them that I had to realize, to uh, to be able to maintain the lifestyle without being incarcerated more.” This internalized notion of behavior as a response to increased threat on personal freedom is explored more in the Action and Identity section of this thesis. Even when this dynamic did not seem to be present, all participants missed something that had once been essential to their lives but was now a luxury. Whether this was basic contact with family (Most respondents and participants who brought the subject up), freedom and privacy (Caroline), to the taste of a latte from a coffee shop [Carl], these longings characterized participant descriptions of their incarceration experiences with particular emotion. Other times privilege is notable are during the direct access to certain resources that some incarcerated persons have but others do not; as mentioned throughout this thesis, this includes the privilege those with supportive families have in having strong social support networks, the privilege of being able to afford extra food, hygiene items and occasionally media such as music from the commissary, and the privilege of both social support and money that allows some individuals a greater selection of books while incarcerated.

In other cases this notion is relevant as basic rights are transformed in the minds of those who have been incarcerated into something which constitutes not right, but privilege. This can be seen in narratives by respondents which discuss, often with tones of fear or despair, topics such as administrative segregation [isolation pods] and comparisons of maximum and minimum security prisons. In these narratives, the loss of quotidian parts of life outside are not spoken as if these were incidents of outrage, but as events where they lost privilege which sometimes but not always is correlated with shame. These privileges are often basic things like being granted a more than once-a-week shower (Susan), both electronic and physically present communication with other people (IV), the low-paid jobs available or benefits which came from them such as blood-tests for disease or a limited offering of commuted sentence. Even though I have singled out responses here on upper-security facilities and isolation cells, this echoes broader illustrations of reason about being incarcerated in general and all that is missed by the individual inside. Caroline also directly brought up the concept of privilege—in stating that she had lost some outside friendships because they no longer had as much in common, since she saw them as having not able to relate to experienced hardships.

An unexpected commonality amongst some participants seemed to indicate a difference in perspective concerning one's initial arrest and general belief that good behavior is rewarded—a notion which retributive based correctional systems are centrally based upon, in theory. In these retellings, I heard a common theme of privilege of faith in the system—and what it was like when that trust was lost. Part of this faith was displayed in an initial expectation by certain participants that consequences would be less or nonexistent for various reasons. An example of this is the feeling that being honest with the officer or going out of the way to be respectful would be rewarded with some type of leniency towards the actions they were being stopped for. Susan mused

on the matter, “Be honest. Don't lie. The police will help you. All those things you're hardwired from a child to think, and a lot of that's still there.” She goes on, “Yes I did something wrong. Personal responsibility—I take responsibility for that.” Elaborating through mimic of the arrest interaction, she continued, “[Deep voice imitation:] ‘Well stand up, I'm putting these cuffs on.’ — [normal voice, distressed:] But I was honest!” This was similar to Ramon’s loss of trust in the Army after his arrest—his feelings that having been a good soldier would mean that they would take care of him to an extent rather than sail him up the river. This also echoes Caroline’s surprise that she would have such consequence due to being, implied, an upstanding citizen—defined by previously not having been in trouble as well as elite educational and social backgrounds—also echoes this notion. The feeling of surprise that one is arrested, and that honesty didn’t help them indicates a level of privilege that individuals arrested in communities where police interrogation is commonplace [such as practices of stop and frisk in certain boroughs of New York] do not have.

Privilege indicates the holding of a luxury or right denied to Others. Notable variation amongst respondent narratives do indicate perspective differences which correlate with rankings of privilege within incarcerated populations. Differences are partially formed due to factors such as placement in a lower security level of correctional facility, preset social status associated with race, gender and class, and initial emotional fortitude those who have grown up with family and/or community stability seem more likely to have. Nonetheless, the idea of the imprisoned criminal Other is of someone stripped of all levels of privilege, and it largely lives up to that image—and then some. Examination of loss of privilege [of both rights and/or luxury] as a phenomena practiced in correctional settings could lead to breakthroughs in discovery about the value of removing privileges from an individual as a method of justice-based consequence. This is a vital question which asks research to find specifics of what methods serve as motivation to individual

reform or restoration and for whom specifically these methods work. This is essential as it also provokes the question, once again, of what crosses the line in prisoner-treatment and thus counts as abuse. Ultimately, as it now stands under correctional systems based upon retributive justice, the question of who most represents the criminal Other in prisons is akin to asking who is not worth human concern. Hopefully in the future everyone will be seen as deserving the chance to seek redemption through humane justice-based paths to restoration.

4.8.2 Action and Identity

Today, the terms of will, obedience, and choice frame the way participants speak of their time as well as the way others speak about their actions (Rhodes 2004:63). Effects on identity from Other-ing processes such as deviantization and dehumanization feature foremost the internalization of the view of the self as a problem (Aguilar et al 2013). For example, a person may see himself or herself as a body automatically being suspected of having committed a crime (Aguilar et al 2013). Beyond that, the responses in this project reflected this core idea in other ways. Oliver in particular seemed to have internalized an understanding of the system, and his treatment within it, as righteous. When asked if there was any part of his incarceration that he felt was not necessary, or was too much, or just was not helpful, he replied, “No, no. I believe it was all necessary to maintain the strict guidelines of what was necessary for the jailhouse to maintain those guidelines, to create the stern environment, so that people will understand, or will see a new perspective on how not to be in trouble, to live a better lifestyle.” He revealed he did not believe it was effective for everyone, but when questioned further as to why it is effective for some and not others, he replied, “Mainly certain people's ability to adapt and change to better themselves. Their ability to understand why change needs to happen. An understanding of perspectives.” In

this same line of thought, he continued, “It certainly has changed my perspective on how to live my own life. If people can't see for themselves, the same way I did, then, they need to be—they need to—they certainly need to!” Oliver was very emphatic on this point. When I asked him to clarify what he thought could happen to help them gain the perspective he stressed to be important, he gave a detailed response on what he thought the difference was, responding, “Mmm. Those people's inability to—they just want to be mad at the system instead of accepting that it was their choice to do what they did to get in trouble.” Continuing with this narrative of decision, he continued, “I mean, we all have choices to make and, depending on peoples’ choices, that's what makes us, makes people who they are.” Indeed, concepts of choice and fault may be internalized by some individuals in ways that make them seem essential to change. The way Oliver describes the necessity of this perspective leaves little room for alternate philosophies, despite self-admission by the participant that this system fails many.

Hearing a participant justify the dehumanizing practice of language by the guards subtly points to an internalization of a perspective rooted in retributive justice, even as the participant rejects this form when it is brought up more explicitly. This bore striking similarity to Oliver’s agreement post-incarceration to the necessity of the methods of retributive discipline despite realization in the same conversation the failures of these methods to reach every jailed-person. In Fyn’s case, the choice highlighted that incarcerated persons make is whether to act like humans or animals. In Oliver’s the idea of choice is broader—choose to change the ‘perspective’ to that which the correctional facility teaches. Both are stressing the choice to behave, and the idea that those who do not behave, choose the consequences they face. Both are also in these statements unable to fathom why other individuals do not see this or change in the same way—something which indicates a level of privilege and indoctrination into norms that not everyone shares.

Other factors play on identity and agency in the prison setting rather than two paths of 'choice', however. The true danger exists in transformation from minor offender to full 'criminal' due to an escalation in pursuance of serious drugs, illegal activity, or violent behavior in order to fit in or avoid conflict. Linking identity to action and placing a person in an arena full of people who are being judged on their actions and presumed identities has done nothing short of create intra-group dynamics that utilize the very same stigmatized categories and judgment based on skills at illegal behavior which are the reason for individuals incarceration to begin with. Further, in the prison setting, aggressiveness is implied to earn greater respect than empathy. In response to harsh atmospheres, a number of IV contributors mention cultivation of a separate self while incarcerated. This becomes a way to play into the role of Criminal Other, a practice which requires an employment of detachment and the maintenance of a facade of toughness. I was reminded of this subject of the cultivated separate self by something Ramon said, namely, "You have to change yourself to adapt to the population and your new situation. It's survival on a social and mental level. You can't really ever trust anyone." Caroline's reasons for detachment had more to do with the whole experience of being there, saying, "I don't know how to explain it. You have to put this guard up, and this shell, and can't really cry—I never really cried in there. I was very, very angry. I was given a pretty strict sentence for a first timer, and um. So I had a big problem with that." Even more terrifying, some individuals seem to lose the ability to trust themselves to make the decisions they would like to, because they are intimidated into making decisions that seem to ensure survival even though they may not correspond to the person's morals. Illustrating this is an Incarcerated Voices contributor who wrote about having felt torn when acting in alliance with prison values he did not inwardly share related back to racism, homophobia and sexism.

4.8.3 *The Prison as Criminal University*

This cultivation of a separate self seems to correlate back to a separation respondents reported between themselves and other incarcerated persons—division between themselves as a person who made a mistake they were trying to right, and others inside who they saw as dedicating themselves to a prison lifestyle where violence and criminality are ironically rewarded. This major division showed in cases where respondents spoke about differences between persons who make prison their lifestyle and individuals who use prison time for self-development in the name of avoiding recidivism. The variance of these two paths is described in the language of choice (Rhodes 2004).

The other course of action shows that certain contemporary correctional facilities still resemble the ‘criminal university’, described during the 1900s (Lombroso 1911). The idea of the criminal university depicted prison as a place where persons who have adopted the identity of the criminal Other (willingly or due to no other good option) often networked to improve their black market skills. IV contributors’ responses reflected this in survival advice given in responses to an imaginary ‘newbie’ in prison. More conservative answers reflected a need for avoidance of detrimental involvement with gang violence, gambling, drug use, illicit alcohol production, and rituals of violent hazing. These rituals are mentioned to include ‘heart checks’, or fights they are forced into by persons perceived to be of the same racial classification as themselves, as well as more general cases of someone ‘riding’ them, or intimidatingly harassing them to see if they can get favors [sexual, material or otherwise].

The possibility of being placed into jail or prison for a crime but then continuing on with illegal activity has not changed since a century ago. The continuation with illegal activity is noted prominently in both the Incarcerated Voices letters and occasionally with my participants. The

range of activities witnessed included: gambling; tattooing; drug use ranging from crack to smuggled-in cigarettes; and production of alcohol made from fermented fruit. These reports show a rather strange picture, considering that many individuals are placed into jails due to drug use to begin with. It also is interesting to note the ways that even legal activities on the outside, such as cigarettes and alcohol, are prohibited from certain correctional facilities—cigarette policies varying, whereas non-alcohol consumption being a prohibition across the board.

Showing that the jail doesn't deter from all illegal action—doesn't even influence certain individuals from activities they love and don't believe should be illegal—Ramon stated in a question to what he longed for the most while he was inside that, “I missed having my own space and life most of all but I was always craving little things like beer and cigarettes and marijuana.” Ramon saw the hypocrisy in banning cigarettes and beer from the jail when they were legal outside, saying that he missed those things while incarcerated and felt that at the very least cigarettes should have been permitted. Oliver talks about having observed use of smuggled-in crack/pills, gambling, tattooing, and, extensively, the process of making alcohol in the jail: “You make, you actually make the containers out of bags that your commissary comes in. Like you wrap a string around it and seal it off. To let the fermentation process build up. Then you release that fermentation process. Otherwise known as burping, burping the alcohol. To allow it to build up again. We had pins...soft pen. We'd take the ink out of it and grab the open container that we were fruit. Then just pull out the end and put it back in to burp the bag...Fermentation builds up, longer it does, stronger proof alcohol.” Oliver also brought up an occasion where a fellow incarcerated person smoked crack inside his cell, saying, “He showed it to me. I was definitely not interested.” When asked how he knew so much about the alcohol fermentation process, he implied that he may have been convinced into making some once, but he learned his lesson quickly—the penalties were too steep.

Many participants professed to not have partaken in the illegal activities themselves during incarceration but said they had witnessed others who had. As stated above, Oliver indicated that he may have participated in a round of alcohol processing, but did not do as repeatedly as there was too much to risk. It is mentioned by contributors as a phenomena which differs between those who have relatively short sentences or those serving lengthy amounts of time or life—namely, the latter group are more likely to engage in inside illicit activities due to having less (or virtually nothing) left to lose, nor to hope for.

Though most of the participants similarly abstained, this clearly wasn't the case for everyone they met while incarcerated. Susan reported illegal drugs being smuggled into her jail on two particularly notable occasions, replying, "Twice when I was there. And it was meth both time, b/c its Cherokee county." During the interview, we both laughed over this, despite the sadness of its reality—that methamphetamine use is a big problem in Georgia, as well as the United States at large. Susan shared further details on these instances, saying that a woman inside told her she entered the jail with the small bag of 'ice' she had by simply holding it in her hand during the strip search. Susan's response to the crafty and difficult-to-believe story was incredulous, but she witnessed the aftermath of this event quite clearly. The fact it was smuggled in was quickly found out, as it was hard to hide the effects of the drug on those who consumed it; Susan commented upon this, "But It's pretty obvious. They'd been there for a while they didn't have the tolerance they used to so it was glaringly apparent there was something wrong with this group. They were taking it into the shower where the cameras can't see, snorting it off the top of, uh--You're given a huge bucket, like a huge Tupperware bucket thing and it's got—that's where you keep all your belongings."

Caroline also commented upon drug use within the Florida prison she was in, stating, “I’ve never seen them actually doing it, but I’ve seen many people high and drunk.” On the subject of how it was brought in, she first stated, “It can be brought in through visitation”, but then shared further that, “Most of the time it’s brought in through prison guards.” Caroline stated that the guards often had deals with, according to her, up to eight “girlfriends”. These ‘girlfriends’ were women who would trade sex for the drugs they could bring in. This was the only direct statement given that accused guards of such from participants, though occasionally contributors insinuated other types of impropriety. In relation to drugs, this research project showed that the correctional facilities that these respondents were inside of failed to prevent the entrance of alcohol and drugs at times—an irony in cases where drugs were the cause of an individuals’ removal from society to begin with.

4.8.4 *Traumatic effects of interment*

There are other effects that were brought up by respondents that show that these were not the only two paths of positive transformation or continued criminality. These included foremost being traumatized by the experience of incarceration itself. Caroline mentioned in her interview that she had to go through therapy after her experience; having never been in trouble before, she implies in her descriptions that it shocked her system. Caroline absolutely felt that the officers treatment of individuals exacerbated this effect, saying, “I understand that it is a traumatic experience for anybody who has been to prison, who hasn’t experienced being arrested before, but I do think, looking back, they kind of took it out of control, just in terms of rudeness and disrespect. I don’t know if it’s just my experience– or what...” Caroline further stated, “The great thing about being incarcerated and being at rock bottom—you just gain a deeper perspective on life, gain a

much different perspective on what really matters. A lot of people don't really get that. I think a lot of people would agree with you that at least, if you have those you talked to being incarcerated is terrible. But it's also been a blessing for me, and made me so much a better person." When pressed further as to whether prison is the best thing to change people, however, Caroline replied, "No-No-definitely don't-- in general --I honestly think that you have to be a certain type of person to come out of it stronger." She continued, "I think it destroys a lot of people; it breaks a lot of people, um, but, criminals as a whole, they're very resilient and very determined people, they've been through a lot already." This is another place where it is funny to note an incarcerated person using a term [criminal] that is in some ways of-the-oppressor to characterize the people they are inside the jail with.

4.8.5 *Dangerous People*

A major socially stratifying division made by respondents is that between the incarcerated person who is transformed and the prisoner who can't be saved. Contributors especially put forth the view that, while they may have made mistakes, they do not fit into a very real category of individual psychopaths who deserve to be locked up--who they are clearly not. In certain cases, respondents expressed discomfort or fear at sharing a cell or being mixed into a pod with someone particularly intimidating. Caroline in particular related a story, "State prison is a very violent place. There is violence everywhere, but, you-- um-- You kind of learn, how to become a non-target, and, um. Yeah, I've gotten a couple—not physical fights, but, um. You get in some altercations, and also for, for state prison, I don't really know how it is for federal—they don't segregate you... You're all, you're all GP, and you're in general population. So, I had a few cell mates who were convicted murderers, child murderers, like people that are very—that you'd be very scared of... So, in the

beginning I was really scared. Um. But.” She continues, “You just kind of learn what makes—as long as you don't mess with anybody's girlfriend, you are pretty much ok. But there are a lot of scary people, a lot of mentally unstable people there, which are, which are typically the scariest.” Caroline maintained that “the violent criminals tend to get out way before the first time nonviolent offenders. And if society knew that, it's terrifying.” She talks about her own situation going into prison, and makes a comparison to the individuals she feels truly deserve to be in jail, “I had two injuries, and I would see like somebody that's been in prison like four times that, with paralysis. But then I would see, people that they're actually scared of, they're letting out very soon. The people who should be sequestered... that made me mad.”

On the subject of this division between types of incarcerated persons, and how he perceived their identities, Fyn stated, “I did meet some people who I'm glad are not free to interact with my wife and kids on the street, but I don't think they're fundamentally wrong or that incarceration should be our ideal for them... This is a very difficult question that I struggle with often.” Fyn reiterates this concern repeatedly; “I'm often troubled by the following dilemma: I met a number of men in jail who I must honestly say I'm glad are not free to interact with my loved ones in open society. Am I glad these kinda guys are incarcerated? No. Do I want them to be free? Well, no... not as they are. I truly wish I had an answer to the question[s of] where would you have them, [and] how would you treat them?” (His italics). This shows again the common practice of relating social structure to a hierarchical scale of ‘criminals’, divided by crime committed—and broad characterization of individuals with a certain profile.

Carl similarly showed a distinction made between types of prisoners. Carl discussed in his interview a conversation he had with protester neighbors who advocated for the abolishment of prisons. He recalled speaking to them, “I was like, have you guys ever been in a prison? Of course

no... There are some people that you don't want out here. They will break into your grandmother's house and beat and rape your grandma and go out and have a beer afterwards and not even think of it." He later illustrates his mental division between prisoners further, saying at one point about former times of prisoners, "Not even so much innocent, but there was a thing of a more-respectable prisoner, based on, ok, I've, like, some of them can maybe say I've robbed somebody or broke into a house and stole this or that. That was looked at as not being as bad as the sociopath, killer, rapist—that was looked at like, you know..." he trailed off. These strong descriptions continue the theme of deviantization. This is language I expected from conversations with officers potentially—it is easier to wield power in a way that shows strength to decharacterize those one is trained to do potential violence to. I would argue, however, that descriptions of a person by identity categorization that is wholly negative, that ties action to identity in ways that turn the individual into a monster, removes the possibility of that person's potential transformation and redemption. This is internalized deviantization: a buying-in to the idea of the Other yet an inability to see oneself as the Other, creating the need to proclaim one's identity as being not-Other despite one's placement in a situation which treated them as Other.

Fear of violence inside correctional facilities is not without warrant, though actual accounts of violence seemed to vary by jail. Some contributors proclaimed their prisons to be relatively violence-free and without gangs, but many others regaled tales of violence both between incarcerated persons and by guards to prisoners. The reasons for these perceptions both seemed to trace back to witnessed violent acts or more often to perceptions of others based on the crime they claimed to be the reason they were in jail or prison. Carl relates the following account that is unfortunately reminiscent of a number of narratives shared in Incarcerated Voices letters: "There was one instance where I saw someone – to death over a pair of headphones, a #12 cheap pair of

headphones, a guy who had only been locked up for a year and a half, had 6 years to go for receiving stolen property, but he took headphones from a guy who was locked up.”.

This drive to separate themselves from individuals described as truly dangerous is intensified in response to questions regarding child abuse offenders. This group is often particularly scorned or reported by contributors to be subject to a high level of intimidation and attack. Also targeted are those who are weak or even those who seem not in their right mind. As a sad commentary on respect for those with mental health issues, various Incarcerated Voices Project contributors stated that falsifying insanity will not necessarily prevent one from being taken advantage of. Always, the implication is that those who take advantage of the others are a that separate type of incarcerated person, seen as the ruthless violent Other within the Other, the person whom the contributor never identifies as. This is true despite admittances by certain individuals that survival in some prisons can require a cultivation of toughness to neither be identified as a victim—even though this leads to a circular process which then itself can produce aggressors.

From an outsiders perspective, evaluations like these illustrate an internalization of ideas about the criminal as Other even within those who themselves are somewhat Other-ed by being sentenced to incarceration. Imagistic stereotypes that provoke the core of human fear seem to highly inform categorizations of identity, as well as exclusionary or marginalizing practices. This is true both at the macro institutional level of law and correctional procedures as well as at the micro level of on-the-ground interpersonal behaviors and perceptions amongst incarcerated individuals.

4.8.6 Incarceration and Personal Transformation

At one point during the interview, Fyn declared on this subject that, “Something vital and important happened to me in there, and I remain humbly grateful for it.” He restates this more than

once, “Personally, the time I spent incarcerated was a crucial time in my life. It did, indeed, contribute to a substantial behavioral/emotional/ spiritual/etc. turnaround for me.” Elaborating he shares that, “Fulton County Drug Court was very instrumental in my turn-around. They saved me. Since then, they’ve stopped accepting opiate addicts into their program.” While feeling very grateful to this particular program, at other points, Fyn offered a more moderate opinion as to whether incarceration steads overall stopped him from future illegal activities. He hesitated, pointing out that most of the times he got out, he ended up back inside. At one point he emphatically states that one particular incarceration stint did not deter him—quite the opposite—though he did not elaborate further on such.

On his last incarceration however, he was not sure whether it itself sparked his stopping, stating, “I don’t know what conclusion to draw. I’ll say “Neutral.” At another point, Fyn said, “Personally, after missing heroin for several weeks, I lay there remembering, and missing terribly, everything... laying on that bunk, hungry, I longed desperately for Life. This was all for the good.”

Oliver likewise agreed that he felt somewhat changed for the better after incarceration. As mentioned previously, he did not profess to have evidence that the system necessarily works for everyone—but he had faith that ideally it should, and belief that the reason it did not boiled down to choice. For these opinions he used the example of his own changed behavior. On the distributed survey he disagreed that arrest and incarceration deterred him from future infractions, but in the interview he clarified that while early arrests did not deter him, his later incarceration was the reason for turning his life around. Despite this, Oliver’s views were not necessarily clear-cut in favor of the current legal system as a whole; he openly disagreed that policies deciding legality of certain offenses were fair, stating that he felt it was a questionable punishment for non-violent violations. On this subject, he stated, “In some ways, I believe that specific laws are “broken” due

to our human nature to explore the boundaries of life, health, death, and moral judgments.” He continues further, touching on many subjects related back to retributive justice, “In our individual upbringing, it is up to ourselves how we perceive criminal law, judgment, and punishment that will cause the occurrence of criminal consequence.” It seems that once again, even when transformation did occur as the result of a specific incarceration experience, the applicability of the parts do not necessarily correspond to a whole system.

Derek put down on his returned survey that he did not feel transformed for the better by his incarceration, and in our informal talks implied that the event was more of a hassle than anything else. Derek strongly felt that laws (or at least the policies which decide them) were unfair most of the time; on his survey, he stated only 25% of the time did he think they were indeed fair. Further, Derek disagreed that prisons were effective way to transform individuals.

While Ramon did agree prisons could be effective in transforming individuals, and somewhat agreed that incarceration deterred him from future illegal activities, Ramon did not think overall his incarceration experience was necessary to that goal. His characterization of having been changed for the better was much more cynical than other participants, stating simply that “I think it changed me for the better but only because it taught me about the world.” By this he seemed to be referring to having been taught a negative lesson concerning the unfairness he attributed to his sentence. Ramon estimated that laws on-the-books are fair about 75% of the time. Likewise to other respondents though, he did not feel laws which place drug and certain other non-violent offenders in jail were fair. When asked about what needs to be changed in US correctional systems, Ramon replied simply but eloquently, “I have no idea. Find a way to keep everyone happy.” As the next section shows, reform measures are in the works.

4.9 Reform

Reform discussions have occurred in response to human rights violations brought to public attention such as poor living conditions in prisons, inadequate social welfare, and the need for education/post-release reentry assistance programs (Adams 2015; Dusenbery 2015; King 2015; Novek 2014). While the news at times does exacerbate the perception of incarcerated individual as Other through negative stigmatization, news platforms have also served as a medium for public discussions about incidents of police violence, wrongful convictions, mistaken shootings, and prisoner abuse (Adams 2015; Dusenbery 2015; King 2015; Quah 2015; Rose 2015; Smith 2012; Soave 2014; Torres 2015). To the end of addressing these concerns, alternatives have been suggested to our current correctional system such as restorative justice, re-integrative shaming and peacemaking criminology (Dhami 2009; Fox et al 2009; JusticeFellowship 2014; Park 2009). Restorative justice is an alternate justice system suggested that holds at the core of its ideology that the harm done in criminal actions can only be rectified if three parties involved can communicate (Dhami 2009; Fox et al 2009; JusticeFellowship 2014; Park 2009). This includes practices such as in face to face "victim-offender mediation" between the offender, victim, and community members (Park 2009: 21), which for the victim can lead to "reduced fear of crime and an increased understanding of criminals through personal contacts with offenders" (Park 2009: 22). Peacemaking criminology, "calling for reformation of the current violence-based criminal justice system" and advocating for community involvement in solving crimes, as well as in assisting in rehabilitation of incarcerated individuals, has seen some modest success (Park 2009; 19). On the other hand, re-integrative shaming, referring to community efforts to engender genuine remorse in released previously jailed individuals is not seen as having a strong correlation with successful reintegration (Park 2009).

In addition to suggestions for alternate systems of justice are moderate first jumps already being taken within some United States prisons. Progressive programs such as victim sensitivity classes aim to guide incarcerated persons towards empathy for persons who have been hurt through their choices (Park 2009). Wild horse training programs connect prisoners to animals in Florida, Arizona, Colorado, Nevada and Kansas (Bammes 2015; Blm.gov 2015; ColoradoCi.com 2015; Kbrhorse.net 2015; Mitchell 2014; Ssi.nv.gov. 2015; Kansas Department of Corrections 2015). Other animal programs offer cats or dogs as companions to incarcerated men and women (Swartz 2015; Guarino 2015). Advocates for reform are also calling for changes to the rhetoric used when discussing people who have spent time in jails and prisons (Ellis 2007). The authors of the NuLeadership Policy Group implore for a stop to this marginalizing practice of name-calling incarcerated individuals (Ellis 2007). The letter calls for a secession of use of "all terms devoid of humanness which identify us as "things" rather than as people" (Ellis 2007:1, italics mine). Bringing up how the power of language has special significance in many faith traditions, especially in their naming ceremonies, the authors of this letter remind the reader how one of the most limiting negative effects of being named by another is the internalization of the feeling of not being able to escape who they are for "what I can be"(Ellis 2007: 1).

When prodded as to what he thought the aims of the criminal justice system are, versus what they should be, Ramon replied, "I think as a society we have a responsibility to ourselves to have a way to deal with different types of offenders [,] and there are people on the front lines who do a great job [,] but it's human nature to be greedy [,] and that's what you find the higher you climb the ladder." [Written supplementary account, parenthesis mine] Fyn's overall summary was that the correctional system "has become an industry, with the aim of perpetual expansion." and that "It SHOULD be the opposite: rehabilitation; education." This affirmed that he felt that at least

parts of his jail experience were necessary for positive change, but also showed his strong assertion of hope that there could be methods other than the current problematic correctional practices employed.

5 CONCLUSIONS

This project has shown that correctional practices affect the identity, life potential, and perspectives on state power for persons who have been incarcerated. Not all, but many respondents reported treatment that qualifies as deviantizing, dehumanizing or as maltreatment. Practices in these categories included: coerced confessions or lack of honesty during interrogation and arrest, poor standards of housing and food, abuses of power that constitute extreme disrespect or damaging behavior by guards, difficulties obtaining employment post-incarceration, and other results from stigmatization on the identity and selfhood of respondents. This ethnography connected incarceration to Other creating processes which create and justify treatment of incarcerated persons as the Criminal Other. These processes each related back to of practices of deviantization, dehumanization and maltreatment. This project had many limits due to duration, field site, and research boundaries, but it is hoped that it will contribute to an understanding of how incarceration practices affect person's identities in ways that effectively make them into an Other. It is further hoped that the narrative knowledge offered here will help contribute to literature on correctional reform.

There is no universal situation that is pervasive in every United States law enforcement local-branches prison facility. Respondents' narratives for this project, both through letter and interview, showed importantly, that a diverse range of practices exist within U.S. correctional facilities. Marked differences in experience often correlate with security level of the correctional

center as well as differing perspectives on respondents which connected back to their social status in outside society. Variation of experience tells much about the need to evaluate correctional facilities at the local level rather than attempt to make an evaluation of the state of the US Department of Justice as a whole. Commonalities of experience, however, allow us to recognize that retributive justice practices of Other-ing still exist in many US jails and prisons.

Beyond the conclusions that support much of the literature on prison operations and inequities, this thesis identified patterns of intragroup stratification that represented identity effects of a level of internalization of ideals of retributive justice, showing that current experiences of incarceration amount to an exercise of social control that is more pervasive than previously realized. While it may be prudent to have a criteria of differentiation assist in decisions concerning a just course of action that is fitting for the circumstances of the illegal action committed, our current retributive justice system holds in place social structures which are oppressive and marginalizing. The takeaway conclusion remains the following: In order to serve all of the citizens of the United States in fair and just ways, it is imperative that criminological practices which deviantize, dehumanize, and offer maltreatment end. Contemporary social movements aimed at transforming the US JS to a more humane institution would be well to recognize the need for a variety of well-researched measures of reform. Today, social stratification is informally used as criteria of who deserves extreme punishment, in the form of deviantization [naming, stereotyping], dehumanization [using non-human metaphors in speech; treating humans like monsters/like an abusive person treats animals], and maltreatment [neglect, abuse, torture]. Tomorrow, the criteria could instead be used to determine how to shape social justice institutional practices in ways that offer restoration of the individual from criminal Other to restored person and citizen.

6 EPILOGUE

During the year and a half I spent conceptualizing, researching, and writing this thesis project, advocacy-calls for correctional reform increased exponentially. About halfway through the timeline of this project, the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) announced it would focus its National Prison Program on the goal to significantly reduce incarceration rates and improve practices within correctional centers in the United States by the deadline year of 2020 (American Civil Liberties Union 2015: web). Very late in this project—nearly past its deadline—the 44th President of the United States, Barack Obama, gave a speech at the NAACP conference about the need to reform mass incarceration. I will end on promising and empowering notes from Obama’s speech:

“Virtually all of the people incarcerated in our prisons will eventually someday be released. And that’s why the third place we need reform is in the cell block. So on Thursday I will be the first sitting president to visit a federal prison. And I’m going to shine a spotlight on this issue, because while the people in our prisons have made some mistakes and sometimes big mistakes, they are also Americans. And we have to make sure that as they do their time, and pay back their debt to society that we are increasing the possibility that they can turn their lives around. That doesn’t mean we’ll turn everyone’s life around. That doesn’t mean there aren’t some hard cases. But it does mean we want to be in a position that if somebody in the midst of imprisonment recognizes the error of their ways, is in the process of reflecting about where they’ve been and where they should be going, we’ve got to make sure they are in a position to make the turn. And that’s why we should not tolerate conditions in prison that have no place in any civilized country. We should not be tolerating overcrowding in prison. We should not be tolerating gang activity in prison. We should not be tolerating rape in prison, and we shouldn’t be

making jokes about it in our popular culture—that's no joke, these things are unacceptable. What's more, I have asked my attorney general to start a review of the overuse of solitary confinement across American prisons. The social science shows that an environment like that is often more likely to make inmates more alienated, more hostile, potentially more violent. Do we really think it makes sense to lock so many people alone in tiny cells for twenty-three hours a day for months, sometimes for years at a time. That is not going to make us safer, that's not going to make us stronger. And if those people are ultimately released, how are they ever going to adapt? It's not smart...

“Let me tell you. My heart breaks. I spend time with those families and feel their grief. I see those young men in street corners and eventually in prisons, and I think to myself, they could be me. The main difference between them and me, is that I had a more forgiving environment, so when I slipped up, when I made a mistake, I had a second chance, and they've got no margin for error. I know--I know how hard things are for a lot of folks. But I also know that it takes steps, and if we have the courage to take that first step, then we take the second step. And if we have the courage to take the second step, then suddenly we've taken 10 steps. Next thing you know you've taken 100 steps. And that's true not just for us as individuals but that is true for us as a nation. We are not perfect, but we have the capacity to be more perfect. Mile after mile, step after step; they pile up one after the other and pretty soon that finish line is getting into sight, and pretty soon we are not where we were, we're in a better place, because we had the courage to move forward. So we cannot ignore the problems we have but we can't stop running the race. That's how you win the race, that's how you fix a broken system, that's how you change a country.”

REFERENCES

2015 Adams, Rosalind. Despite Anti-Shackling Law, Pregnant Prisoners Say Practice Persists | Al Jazeera America. Alj.Am.

2013 Aguilar, Ernesto and Chiprin Melissa. "The Criminalization of Culture and the Rise of Dissent." in the End of Prisons: Reflections from the Decarceration Movement, 41-57. New York: Rodopi.

- 2006 Appadurai, Arjun. *Fear of Small Numbers: An Essay on the Geography of Anger*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- 2015 'Arizona Correctional Industries - Wild Horse Program'. [Aci.az.gov](http://aci.az.gov).
- 2014 Arp, Don. "Forced Perspective: Police Officers' Personal Opinions and Racial Data Collection in Nebraska." *Police Journal: Theory, Practice and Principles* Volume 87: 195-200.
- 2011 Bastian, Brock, and Nick Haslam. "Experiencing Dehumanization: Cognitive and Emotional Effects of Everyday Dehumanization." *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 295-303.
- 2013 Bastian, Brock, Thomas F. Denson, Nick Haslam, and Frank Krueger. "The Roles of Dehumanization and Moral Outrage in Retributive Justice." *PLoS ONE* 8, no. 4.
- 2014 Balko, Radley. *Rise of the Warrior Cop: The Militarization of America's Police Forces*. New York: PublicAffairs.
- 2015 Bammes, Dan. 'Wild Horse Training Program Ending At Gunnison Prison'. [Kuer.org](http://kuer.org).
- 2015 Berger, Dan. OPINION: Malcolm X's Challenge to Mass Incarceration | Al Jazeera America. America.Aljazeera.Com.

- 2015 Binelli, Mark. Inside America's Toughest Federal Prison. NYtimes.com.
- 2015 Black, Ashley Nicole. Here Are Six Companies Who Get Rich off Prisoners. Attn.com.
- 2004 Bolton, Kenneth, and Joe Carl. Feagin. Black in Blue: African-American Police Officers and Racism. New York: Routledge.
- 2015 'Cci - Wild Horse Inmate Program'. Coloradoci.com.
- 2011 Chan, Janet. Racial Profiling and Police Subculture. University of New South Wales.
- 2015 Chakraborty, Ranjani. Imprisoned At 14, Illinois Inmate Gets Resentenced To Life Without Parole | Al Jazeera America. America.Aljazeera.Com.
- 2004 Chen, M. Keith, and Jesse M. Shapiro. 'Does Prison Harden Inmates? : A Discontinuity-based Approach'. Cowles Foundation for Research in Economics, discussion paper: 1450.
- 2015 Childress, Sarah. 'The Disturbing Sounds Of Solitary Confinement – Locked Up In America - FRONTLINE'. FRONTLINE.
- 2015 Citizen Times Contributor. 'WNC Woman Earns National Award For Her Prison Ministry'. Citizen Times.

2015 Cohen, Michael. How For-Profit Prisons Have Become The Biggest Lobby No One Is Talking About. Washington Post. WashingtonPost.com.

2015 Coker, Hillary. Why Can't Baltimore's Black Female Mayor Stop Saying 'Thug'? Jezebel. Jezebel.com.

2015 Corrections, State. 'Department Of Corrections'. Corrections.wy.gov.

2014 Costantini, Cristina. 'U.S. Is Locking Up Pregnant Moms despite Policy against It'. Fusion. Fusion.com.

2013 Craen, Maarten Van. "Explaining Majority and Minority Trust in the Police." Justice Quarterly 30, no. 6: 1042-067.

2006 *Criminal Minds*. Paramount Home Entertainment. Film.

2014 Crewe, B. "Not Looking Hard Enough: Masculinity, Emotion, and Prison Research." Qualitative Inquiry 20, no. 4: 392-403.

1994 Debord, Guy. *The Society of the Spectacle*. New York: Zone Books.

2007-2012 *Dexter*. Showtime. Film.

2009 Dhami, Mandeep et al. "Restorative Justice in Prisons" Contemporary Justice Review.
Vol 12. No. 4: 433-448.

2009 Dillon, Sam. "Study Finds High Rate of Imprisonment Among Dropouts."
NYTimes.com.

2015 Dusenbery, Maya. New Report Shows New York Prisons Are Still Illegally Shackling
Pregnant Inmates. Feministing.com.

2000 Dyer, Joel. The Perpetual Prisoner Machine: How America Profits from Crime. Boulder,
Colo: Westview Press.

2014 Earle, R. "Insider and Out: Making Sense of a Prison Experience and a Research
Experience." Qualitative Inquiry: 429-438.

2015 Editorial Board, The. 152 Innocents, Marked For Death - Nytimes.Com.
[http://mobile.nytimes.com/2015/04/13/opinion/152-innocents-marked-for-death.html?referrer=.](http://mobile.nytimes.com/2015/04/13/opinion/152-innocents-marked-for-death.html?referrer=)

2007 Ellis, Eddie. "An Open Letter to Our Friends." NuLeadership Policy Group of the Center
for Law and Social Justice.

2014 Flatow, Nicole. '1,000 Ohio Inmates Dump Their Lunches over Maggot Infestation'.
ThinkProgress.

1977 Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Pantheon Books.

2009 Fox, Darrell. Dhami, Mandeep. Mantle, Greg. "Restorative Justice in Prisons." *Contemporary Justice Review*. Vol.12 No. 4. 12/09: 433-448.

2012 Galatzer-Levy, Benjamin A., and Robert M. "Ordinary Police Interrogation in the United States: The Destruction of Meaning and Persons: A Psychoanalytic-Ethical Investigation." *American Imago* 69, no. 1: 57-106.

2009 Gaskin, Emily. "A Prison within a Prison: Segregation of HIV Positive Inmates and Double Stigma." *Anthropology Theses*. Department of Anthropology.

2012 Glidden, Brittany. "Necessary Suffering?: Weighing Government and Prisoner Interests in determining what is Cruel and Unusual." *American Criminal Law Review*.

2008 Goff, Phillip Atiba, Jennifer L. Eberhardt, Melissa J. Williams, and Matthew Christian Jackson. "Not Yet Human: Implicit Knowledge, Historical Dehumanization, and Contemporary Consequences." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 94, no. 2: 292-306.

1996 Gould SJ, 'The Mismeasure of Man.' W.W. Norton & Company, Chapter 2 (Abridged)

- 2015 Guarino, Ben. 'Rescue Dogs And Inmates Offer One Another New Hope'. The Dodo.
- 2003 Harlow, Caroline. "Education and Correctional Populations." Bureau of Justice Statistics.
www.bjs.gov.
- 2015 Hirsch, Mitchell. 'Raise the Wage Act Would Boost Pay for 15 Million in the 21 States Stuck at \$7.25'. www.Raisetheminimumwage.com.
- 2007 James, Joy. Warfare in the American Homeland. Duke University Press. Durham and London.
- 2015 Justicefellowship.org. 'Building Restorative Justice in Our Criminal Justice System | Justice Fellowship'.
- 2015 Kbrhorse.net, 'Inmate Wild Horse Training Programs'.
- 2015 Khan, Naureen. Years Out Of Prison, But Still Out Of Work | Al Jazeera America.
America.Aljazeera.Com.
- 2015 King, Shaun. Record 346 Inmates Die, Dozens of Guards Fired in Florida Prisons.
Dailykos.com.

2000 Kozaitis, Kathryn. "The Rise of Anthropological Praxis." *Napa Bulletin* Volume 18 no.1: 45-66.

2013 Kozaitis, Kathryn. "Anthropological Praxis in Higher Education." *Annals of Anthropological Practice*. 37 (1): 133-155.

2014 Lenza, M. "Prison Research from the Inside: The Role of Convict Autoethnography." *Qualitative Inquiry* 20 (4): 439-448.

1911 Lombroso, Gina. *Criminal Man According to the Classification of Cesare Lombroso* 1911; New York and London: The Knickerbocker Press.

2013 Lykes, M. Brinton. *Participatory and Action Research as a Transformative Praxis: Responding to Humanitarian Crises from the Margins*.

1994 Marks, J. *Blood Will Tell. (Won't it?): A century of molecular discourse in Anthropological Systematics. American Journal of Physical Anthropology. Volume 94 Issue 1: 59-79 (61-64)*.

2014 Mitchell, David. 'Colorado Prison Inmates Tame Wild Horses In Life-Changing Program'. FOX31 Denver.

- 2014 Murphy Kristina, Lorraine Mazerolle, and Sarah Bennett. "Promoting Trust in Police: Findings from a Randomized Experimental Field Trial of Procedural Justice Policing." *Policing and Society* 24, no. 4: 405-24.
- 2015 'NNCC Saddle Horse Training Program'. Blm.gov
- 2014 Novek, Eleanor. "Mass Culture and the American Taste for Prisons." *Peace Review*: 376-384.
- 2009 Park, Sunyoung. "College Students' Attitudes toward Prisoners and Prisoner Reentry." Indiana University of Pennsylvania.
- 2015 Quah, Nicholas. "Here's A Timeline Of Unarmed Black People Killed By Police Over Past Year." BuzzFeed. May 1, 2015.
- 2014 Reiter, K. "Making Windows in Walls: Strategies for Prison Research." *Qualitative Inquiry* 20 (4): 417-428.
- 2002 Ross, Jeffrey. *Convict Criminology*. Contemporary Issues in Crime and Justice Series ed. Cengage Learning.
- 2014 Rowe, A. "Situating the Self in Prison Research: Power, Identity, and Epistemology." *Qualitative Inquiry* 20 (4): 404-416.

2015 Rose, Rebecca. 'Ferguson Disgrace: Police Fire on Unarmed Crowds, Attack News Trucks'. Jezebel. 2015.

2015 Rubin, Lyle. 'A Former Marine Explains All The Weapons Of War Being Used By Police In Ferguson'. Truthout.

2013 Ruprecht, Louis. *Policing the State: Democratic Reflections on Police Power Gone Awry, in Memory of Kathryn Johnston (1914-2006)*. Cascade Books, an Imprint of Wipf and Stock Publishers.

2010 Ryburg, Jesper. "Racial Profiling and Criminal Justice." Springer Science+Business Media B.V.

2012 Smith, Kenny Paul. 'On Trayvon Martin, Perceived Identities, and Zombie Imaginaries'. Bulletin for the Study of Religion.

2014 Soave, Robby. 'Cop Hits Man In The Head 20 Times As Onlookers Plead 'Don't Punch Him No More''. Reason.com.

2007 Simon, Jonathan. *Governing through Crime How the War on Crime Transformed American Democracy and Created a Culture of Fear*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- 2015 Ssi.nv.gov. 'Silver State Industries ~ Horse Program ~ Home'.
- 2015 Swartz, Anna. 'Cats Seeking Forever Homes Find Unlikely Friends Within Prison Walls'.
The Dodo.
- 2014 Taibbi, Matt. *The Divide: American Injustice in the Age of the Wealth Gap*. Spiegel & Grau.
- 2015 Torres, Kristina. Effort to Eliminate Wrongful Convictions Moves Ahead. Myajc.Com.
- 2015 Townes, Carimah. Corporation Literally Served Inmates Trash. ThinkProgress.
ThinkProgress.org.
- 2003 Trouillot, Michel. *"Anthropology and the Savage Slot: The Poetics and Politics of Otherness."* In *Global Transformations: Anthropology and the Modern World*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- 2014 Ugelvik, T. "Prison Ethnography as Lived Experience: Notes from the Diaries of a Beginner Let Loose in Oslo Prison." *Qualitative Inquiry* 20 (4): 471-480.
- 2005 Wacquant, Loic. Race as Civil Felony. *International Social Science Journal*. Vol. 57. Issue 183.

2015 'Wild Horse Program — Kansas Department of Corrections'. Doc.ks.gov.

1982 Wolf, Eric R. *Europe and the People without History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Survey

Agree-Disagree Scale:

Agree- Somewhat Agree- Neutral - Somewhat disagree – Disagree

True/False: True or False

Percentage Scale: 0% of the time 25 % of the time 50% of the time 75 % of the time

100% of the time

Survey: Optional Demographic Information:

Please select your age group:

18-25

25-45

45-65

65+

Please write-in the ethnic population you most closely identify with:

Please write-in the country [-ies] you grew up in:

This is a qualitative research project. Feel free to write in wherever necessary.

Survey: Personal Background

1. How many times have you been arrested?
2. If you would like to share the specific action(s) or charge(s) that you were arrested and/or incarcerated for, please list below. [Optional]
3. Were you incarcerated subsequent to your initial arrest? [Specify if this was in a holding cell, jail or prison; and if it was at city, county, state, federal, or private facility]
4. How long did you spend incarcerated within the United States Justice System?
 ___days ___ months ___ years
5. During what calendar year(s) were you incarcerated? _____
6. What is your occupation now?

Survey: personal reflection

1. I feel that my sentence to incarceration was fair. Agree-Disagree Scale
2. I am self-conscious about negative perceptions other persons may have about previously incarcerated persons. Agree-Disagree Scale
3. I felt suspicious, paranoid, or fearful of other incarcerated persons during my incarceration. Agree-Disagree Scale
4. I felt suspicious, paranoid, or fearful of law enforcement officers during my incarceration. Agree-Disagree Scale
5. I found it easy to feel connected to other incarcerated persons while incarcerated; real friendships could be created. Agree-Disagree Scale
6. I found it easy to remain connected to loved ones on the outside while incarcerated. Agree-Disagree Scale

7. I was able to practice my religion or spiritual faith while incarcerated. Agree-Disagree Scale
8. I felt changed for the better after incarceration. Agree-Disagree Scale
9. I felt a sense of emotional detachment during and/or after incarceration.
10. I have faith that the system works. Agree-Disagree Scale
11. After being accused of an illegal action, I was treated as having the rights and respect that is afforded to the innocent prior to a 'guilty' verdict being ruled in court. Agree-Disagree Scale
12. I felt that the actions performed by officers I encountered were dehumanizing. Percentage Scale.
13. Arrest and/or incarceration deterred me from future participation in illegal actions. Agree-Disagree Scale
14. Most of the law enforcement professionals I encountered conducted their jobs with respect for my rights during the initial pat-down and handcuffing of the arrest process. Agree-Disagree Scale
15. In my initial arrest, the officer was rough when placing me in handcuffs. Agree-Disagree Scale
16. In my initial arrest there was violence committed by the law officer. Agree-Disagree Scale
17. In my subsequent incarceration, I saw or experienced violence committed by law enforcement working in the jail/prison. Percentage Scale.
18. The approximate number of law enforcement professionals I encountered who offered basic respect during my incarceration is ____ % of the total number of law enforcement professionals encountered during this time. For this question, offering basic respect includes not making remarks that are racist or otherwise dehumanizing, not participating in uncalled for/random intimidation, and not committing violence towards incarcerated persons]. Percentage Scale.

19. The food provided while I was incarcerated was of adequate amount to satiate basic hunger.

Agree-Disagree Scale

20. Toilet paper was available in adequate amount for a person's use. Agree-Disagree Scale

21. In the jail/prison I was in, toothpaste was accessible to anyone who needed it. Agree-

Disagree Scale

22. During my incarceration, I heard law enforcement professionals refer to incarcerated persons

in ways that made comparison to animals. Agree-Disagree Scale

23. I had access to a library during my incarceration. True False

24. The jail or prison that I was incarcerated in offered education programs for incarcerated

persons. True/False. These programs were helpful: Agree-Disagree Scale

25. The jail or prison that I was incarcerated in offered job training programs for incarcerated

persons. True False

These programs were helpful. Agree-Disagree Scale

26. There was temperature control in the jail/prison that I was incarcerated in. True False

27. The buildings of the jail/prison that I was incarcerated in were maintained to standard—no

significant problems that would be code-violations on a house or public building. True/false

28. I feel that the policies deciding what actions will be deemed illegal are fair. Agree-Disagree

Scale

29. I think prisons can be effective means to turn an incarcerated person away from committing

further criminal actions. Agree-Disagree Scale.

30. I felt that the speech used by officers was dehumanizing. Agree-Disagree Scale

31. The police officer who arrested me used respectful speech in interactions. Agree-Disagree

Scale

32. The police officer arresting me used racist speech in interactions. Agree-Disagree Scale

Appendix B: Interview Questions

1. What was it like to be arrested by the police? What happened, in terms of major details about the event you recall? What was said? What procedures were carried out? How were you treated?

What were you feeling?*

2. What was it like being incarcerated? What happened, in terms of major details about the event you recall? What was said? What procedures were carried out? How were you treated? What

were you feeling?*

3. How were your relationships affected by the experience of incarceration?

4. Were you able to find adequate social support systems, including developing friendship, while incarcerated?

5. What material or nonmaterial things did you not have that you missed the most during this time?

6. Was there anything in particular that you thought it was unfair to be deprived of? Was it difficult to obtain items from the commissary at the jail or prison you were in?

7. What types of access to technology (i.e.-computers, social media) and communication (phone?)

Privilege) did you have?

8. Were you ever placed in segregation?

9. Do you think your experience was necessary? Do you think it changed you for the better? Do you think there were other ways this could have been achieved?

10. What do you think the aims of the Criminal Justice system are? What should they be?

11 .Do you trust law enforcement agents? Have you always? Did your arrest and incarceration change your opinion about the police force?

12. Did you experience any mistreatment during your incarceration? Were there policy, speech used, or practice which you feel crossed the line of humane and fair treatment by law? Why do you feel the incident was inappropriate?

13. What do you think needs to be changed, based on your experience incarcerated in a US jail or prison by the court system?

14. Is there anything I've missed that you would like to comment upon?