Prison Architecture and Design: Perspectives from Criminology and Carceral Geography

Yvonne Jewkes, Research Professor in Criminology, University of Brighton

Dominique Moran, Reader in Carceral Geography, University of Birmingham

Abstract

This chapter seeks to convey why the architecture and design of prisons is pivotal to a full and nuanced understanding of 'prison studies'. Placing prison design in historical and geographical perspectives, we consider how evolving penal philosophies have been manifested in the form and fabric of prison buildings over the last two centuries. We discuss the current policy context in the UK, as new prisons have been built in Scotland and are being planned for England & Wales and Northern Ireland. We argue that this represents a rare opportunity, not only to build new facilities that are fit-for-purpose, but to re-assess how their aesthetic and spatial design might be mobilized to support a different model of criminal justice than that which has dominated since the last major wave of prison construction in the 1960s. Finally, we consider the relationship between prisons and the communities in which they are situated, and suggest that recently built prisons are no less a manifestation of society's attitudes to offenders than Pentonville was in the mid-1800s. We suggest that it may be more effective in the long term to influence public opinion through humane prison design than it is to build new prisons based on assumptions about public expectations.

Key terms

Prison architecture and design; carceral space; penal philosophies; legitimacy; rehabilitation

Introduction: Why architecture and design matter to our understanding of imprisonment

This is the sixth edition of the *Oxford Handbook of Criminology*, yet it is the first to include a chapter on prison design. Indeed, aside from the many historical accounts of the early evolution of prison architecture (*inter alia* Brodie *et al.* 1999, 2002; Evans 1982; Fairweather and McConville 2000; Grant and Jewkes, 2015; Jewkes and Johnston 2007; Johnston 2000; Spens 1994), the topic has received only fleeting or tangential mention in post-war criminological scholarship. One exception to this neglect by the academy came in 1961, when a special issue of the *British Journal of Criminology* (Volume 1; Issue 4) was devoted to 'prison architecture'. Compiled at the time of the 'largest [prison] building programme to be undertaken in this country for a century' ('Editorial', 1961: 305), at a cost of £12million (approximately £250million today), the idea that new prison buildings must reflect both the most up-to-date scholarship and the most progressive penal philosophies in currency is deeply embedded in these early *BJC* articles, written by Chairman of the Prison Commission, AW Petersen, sociologist John Madge, architect and professor of architecture Norman Johnston and architectural theorist Leslie Fairweather. We feel that theirs is an aspiration worth reviving and, with this in mind, we will pay close attention to the arguments put forward by these 'founding fathers' as this chapter unfolds.

When approaching the task of writing our contribution for this new edition of the *Oxford Handbook*, we have a few (perhaps obvious) questions at the forefront of our minds. Why is this topic important? Why now? Why us? And – after such a long absence from the mainstream of criminological discourse and debate –

how might we convince you, the reader, that prison architecture and design have meaning and relevance to scholars in criminology and related disciplines beyond the relatively small handful of people who study custodial buildings and carceral spaces? In communicating why we think the architecture and design of prisons is pivotal to 'prison studies', this chapter is divided into three sections, each of which takes a different approach to the question of why the topic of prison architecture and design matters. First, it will examine the extent to which penal philosophy and evolving penological ideas have been reflected in prison design through history. As Wener (2012) suggests, prison environments represent both an 'overt' agenda that seeks to provide adequate, measurable and reasonably consistent living and working conditions for those individuals sentenced to imprisonment; and a 'covert' agenda that reflects what or who prisoners 'are' in the minds of those who commission prisons and in the wider society. This first section of the chapter explores what this 'covert' agenda has been through the ages of punishment.

In the second section we turn our attention to the recent policy context. This is a rare (and potentially exciting) moment in the penal history of England and Wales as, at the time of writing, the Secretary of State for Justice has announced that nine new, modern facilities will be designed and built (in addition to HMP Berwyn, a 2,106 bed facility, which will open in Wrexham, North Wales in 2017). The announcement follows the closure of several old nineteenth century jails, including Shrewsbury, Gloucester and Reading, with more closures to come. Not since the middle of the nineteenth century, when 54 prisons were constructed on the same panoptic template as Pentonville, followed by a slightly less ambitious building programme in the 1960s in response to the problems of overcrowding, has such a wide-scale prison-building programme been contemplated. The current government plans thus represent a once-in-a-generation opportunity, not only to build facilities that are fit-for-purpose, but to re-assess what prisons are for and how their design might assist with the philosophies that underpin them.

Developing these ideas, the third and final section of the chapter discusses *society*'s relationship with the prison. We have argued elsewhere that prisons function simultaneously as technologies of control *and* systems of cultural symbolism (Jewkes, Moran and Slee, 2016). This section explains this idea further in relation to the ongoing prison modernisation programme. In a sense, this will bring us full circle, as we discuss why the public appear to want prisons to *feel* like 19th century places of severe and unremitting punishment, while *looking* like the kinds of buildings that populate 21st century business parks and modern industrial sites. Finally, we suggest that a novel approach to prison design in England & Wales (one that follows the Scandinavian model, for example) might open up new spaces for discussion concerning how (and how much) we choose to punish. In other words, far from being about creating 'softer' or 'prettier' prisons, a focus on designing humanising prison spaces that are focused on supporting rehabilitation and desistance could be a vital component in achieving radical justice reform, including de-carceration.

This volume is self-evidently aimed primarily at students and scholars of criminology, but throughout the chapter we will make reference to the influence of other disciplines on criminological understandings of prison architecture and design, including architectural research, environmental psychology and critical organization studies. Of particular importance in our discussion is carceral geography, a new and vibrant field of geographical research into practices of incarceration, which has in recent years made a significant contribution to criminological understandings of the prison. Its work is largely centred around three main themes: the nature and experience of carceral spaces, the geographies of carceral systems, and the relationship between the carceral and an increasingly punitive state (Moran 2013). Although the first geographical studies of spaces of

confinement were disparate works in diverse contexts and with different aims and theoretical framings, research in this field now reflects a growing dialogue with the work of Foucault (1979) on the development of the prison, surveillance, and the regulation of space and docility of bodies, and of Agamben (1998, 2005) on the notion of exception, where sovereign power suspends the law, producing a zone of abandonment.

Innovative analyses of incarceration from a carceral geography perspective include explorations of bed-space (Mitchelson, 2014); space and safety (Morin, 2013); spaces of flirtation (Dardel, 2013); visiting spaces (Moran, 2013); and personal space and the personalisation of cells (Sibley and van Hoven, 2009;). Meanwhile, scholars from criminology now routinely refer to the 'affective' dimensions of carceral space (Earle and Phillips, 2012), the 'emotional geography' of prisons (Crewe, Warr, Bennett and Smith 2013), the 'penal palimpsest' (Fiddler, 2007); prisons as 'non-places' for 'non-people' (Jewkes et al, 2016), and so on. In this chapter we are informed by carceral geographies of architecture (e.g. Moran, Turner and Jewkes, forthcoming), in which a longstanding representationalist focus on the symbolism of buildings as sites of meaning and 'texts' to be read (Cosgrove 1998; Pratt, 2002), has been displaced by consideration of the 'dynamic encounters' (Jacobs and Merriman, 2011) between buildings, their constituent elements and spaces, those involved in their planning and design, and those who encounter them in a range of different ways. In paying attention to both the architectural symbolism of incarceration (the ways in which prison buildings are manifestations of punitive philosophies) and the ways in which they may reflexively shape such philosophies through real, virtual or vicarious 'encounters', we seek to position prison architecture and design as a key site of negotiation of evolving penal philosophies. This, then, answers the question, 'why us?' as we are currently conducting the first major comparative international research study of prison architecture and design[1] and are bringing to the project our cross-disciplinary expertise in criminology and carceral geography respectively. As the authors in the *British Journal of Criminology* special issue understood, such interdisciplinary modes of inquiry are crucial to expanding our knowledge base and perceptions of the lived experience of imprisonment.

A brief history of the evolution of penal philosophies and prison architecture

As previously noted, relatively little has been written about prison design within criminology. Yet in the aforementioned special edition of *British Journal of Criminology* on prison architecture, several of the points made by Petersen, Madge, Fairweather and Johnston appear depressingly familiar because they remain unresolved over half-a-century later. To take just a few examples; all the *BJC* contributors emphasize the importance of enabling as many prisoners as possible to serve their sentences within a reasonable distance of their home; an argument still being made by contemporary desistance theorists (Farrall and Calverley, 2006; McNeill and Schinkel, 2016; Schinkel, 2015) and commentators on the 'collateral damage' inflicted on prisoners' families when a parent is incarcerated (Condry, Kotova and Minson, 2016; Scharff Smith, 2014). The question of why the use of small institutions should be 'economically prohibitive' (Madge, 1961: 364) is another concern that has become even more salient since the 1960s, when the maximum number of prisoners envisaged for any given establishment was 450 (Petersen, 1961). The proposition from both Johnston and Fairweather that small prisons are more operationally effective and more likely to result in rehabilitated prisoners is given added weight by recent research that finds that smaller prisons are better than larger facilities at housing prisoners in safe and

secure conditions, providing them with meaningful work, education and training, encouraging purposeful activity, and fostering healthy relationships between prisoners and prison staff (Liebling with Arnold, 2004; Liebling, 2008; Johnsen, Granheim and Helgesen, 2011).

The fallacy of creating standardized prison designs, with only minor differences applied (e.g. to strength of construction materials) depending on the level of security required is an issue raised by Fairweather and Johnston, anticipating current concerns about 'value engineering' and 'future proofing' prison designs, which will be explored below. Relatedly, the need (identified by Fairweather) to build custodial facilities that meet known demand, rather than future projections, speaks to actuarial assessments of risk at the heart of the 'new penology' (Feeley and Simon, 1992) and is a perennial concern to criminologists who write about the tendency of the media to exaggerate potential threats in times of particular sensitivity to risk (Jewkes, 2015). The 'moral panic' had not yet been named in 1961, but scaremongering news reports inflected political debates about how the prison estate should respond to the abolition of the death penalty in the early 1960s, just as, arguably, they continue to do today, with possible terrorist attacks uppermost on media and political agendas.

These four examples from the first volume of the *BJC* in 1961 (and there are many others) underline that the history of imprisonment is characterized by continuity and consistency. The question of why the field of criminology has not been able to exert more influence on challenging a form of punishment that, by almost any measure applied, emphatically does not work, is not a issue that can be dealt with here (but see Garland, 1990). Suffice to say that every major prison expansion programme of the last two hundred years has been a knee-jerk response to predictable problems – rising prisoner numbers, chronic overcrowding and buildings that become dangerously outdated. As Fairweather (1961) notes, we do not appear to learn from our mistakes.

'History repeats itself'

The suggestion that prisons represent a 'covert' agenda that reflects predominant attitudes towards offenders (Wener, 2012) has underpinned the design of penal institutions since the late eighteenth century, when the celebrated prison reformer and 'architects' mentor' John Howard was instrumental in forcing those legislating and managing the prison system to re-think their philosophy of criminal justice and its fulfilment in prison architecture. Following outbreaks of serious, contagious illnesses in many gaolhouses, it was recognised that the squalid and chaotic prisons of the day were not suitable environments for the containment of large numbers of people in very close confines (see Jewkes and Johnston, 2007, for an overview). Howard's reformist experience and his understanding of architecture made him the ideal candidate for an advisory role and in 1793, three years after his death, his principles for the construction of an 'ideal county gaol' were realised in the construction of Shrewsbury prison. The interior of Shrewsbury consisted of highly organised buildings that embodied the philosophy of reformation rather than retribution, with prison cells that were, for their day, comfortable and airy, including some that even commanded 'a beautiful view of the country' (Owen, 1808: 433, cited in Jewkes and Johnston, 2007). In many respects, then, Shrewsbury prison was ahead of its time – a very early exemplar of the 'healthy prison'[2] – and John Howard's mission to improve prison conditions underpinned radical changes in penal design globally; particularly in relation to ventilation, hygiene, segregation (to prevent contagion of criminality as well as disease) and religious servitude.

---

[2] A concept adopted by the World Health Organisation and developed as part of their inspection criteria by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/about-our-inspections/inspection-criteria/).

However, it must be remembered that Howard's prominence was largely because reform was urgently needed and, for all his good work, this was not an era of unmitigated enlightenment. Prison hulks and transportation were still being used and the site of the first national 'penitentiary' (so named because prisoners were to undergo a process of expiation and penance, and the emphasis was on hard but unproductive labour) was selected in 1799, the year of the Penitentiary Act, and established in 1816. The site chosen for the new Millbank penitentiary was boggy marshland on the banks of the river Thames, the unsuitability of which contributed to the enormous financial cost of the build (Johnston, 2015). At Millbank, a period of strict and severe seclusion was followed by a second, more moderate phase of confinement, whereby some association was permitted – by which time the initial period of solitary confinement had already caused many prisoners to go insane. Indeed, the regime was so brutal that over 30 prisoners died in the first few years of its operation, leading to critical newspaper reports and political intervention, which testify to the lack of legitimacy of the prison in this early period (ibid).

By 1842, when a 'new model prison' was deemed necessary to break the 'chain of [convicts'] former habits' prior to transporting them to the colonies (Sir John Graham, cited in Johnston, 2015: 109), the 'separate system' of total solitude had been established. The model prison was Pentonville and prisoners there were kept apart at all times and monitored from a central observation point, in line with Bentham's panoptic vision, conceived in 1791. In the six years following Pentonville's construction, 54 further prisons were built to the same radial template, with the exception of the anomalous Wormwood Scrubs, constructed between 1875 and 1891 to a 'telegraph-pole' design, which Shrewsbury prison replicated when it was substantially altered at around the same time to reflect a move away from reform to a new emphasis on deterrence (see further below). While there was nothing especially novel about the use of solitary confinement in prisons, Pentonville represented the first time that the design of the prison became unified with the enforcement of the regime; a grim harmonization that finds its modern form in many of the self-contained, supermax-style segregation units found in high-security facilities, where seclusion through architecture overcomes the need for physical punishment, but results in many prisoners experiencing extreme mental anguish. Even as the last bricks were being laid, social commentators of the day were expressing their views that the new prison would be 'unnecessarily cruel' and that 'madness will seize those whom death has spared' (*Times* 20 May 1841; cited in Johnston, 2015: 109). Moreover, observers of the new prison, standing on a six-acre site and encompassed by 25-foot-high walls, can have been left in little doubt about the uncompromising nature of criminal justice:

> To the inhabitants of Islington who daily look upon the high walls of Pentonville with its grim
> blackened cell houses, it is a visible sign of the most severe sanctions the law can impose – the
> deprivation of liberty and the possibility of death itself, for Pentonville is a 'hanging prison'. First and
> foremost the prison punishes, and there can be little doubt about this, for the physical apparatus of a
> maximum security prison is suggestive of little else beyond the curtailment of freedom. The
> architectural quality of the prison is not only functional but dramatic, part of the same body of
> symbolism which clothes the Judge of Assize in scarlet (Morris and Morris, 1963: 20).

Located in the very heart of the urban neighbourhood from which it drew its clientele, Pentonville heralded the collapse of the ideal of reformation and the emergence of new objectives – deterrence and repression. Its design also gave full expression to the Victorian obsession with discipline, certainty and systematic uniformity and, despite its foreboding appearance, it was one of the most advanced prisons of its time (indeed, one of the most cutting-edge buildings of its era). Nearly two hundred years later, many of these late 19th century gaols are

finally earmarked for closure[3], having been described by Prime Minister David Cameron, as 'ageing, ineffective, creaking, leaking and coming apart at the seams' (www.politics.co.uk). Nonetheless, we might speculate that the architect of Pentonville, Joshua Jebb, would be surprised that his prison remained in operation 175 years after it was built and that his influence is still to be seen in the radial wings, galleried landings, cellular compartments, and other design features of prisons constructed in the 21st century.

As the quote from Morris and Morris (1963) illustrates, just as John Howard's design principles based on the need for air and ventilation were abandoned in favour of cellular accommodation that was cramped and enclosed, the exteriors of prisons were becoming more expansive and formidable. For example, when Shrewsbury was redeveloped, the exterior was transformed into a façade of 'massive, strong and impressive character'; Anon, 1894: 14, cited in Jewkes and Johnston, 2007). These design strategies had parallel aims: the ostentatious, austere and dramatic external façades were intended to deter people in the community from offending; while the dark and claustrophobic interior spaces, sparse conditions and harsh regimes were aimed at deterring prisoners from future re-offending (Pratt, 2002; Hancock and Jewkes, 2011).

By the twentieth century, and especially in the immediate post-war period, when the prison population spiked and expansionism of the estate was once again on the political agenda, several prisons were, of necessity, opened in more rural locations. Converted from disused army camps, airfields, military hospitals, lunatic asylums and country houses, some prisoners are to this day still housed in former Nissan huts and other accommodation that was only ever intended to be a temporary solution to an immediate crisis. This was the period when penal philosophies began to embrace a more therapeutic discourse – a process that had reached its apogee at the time that the special issue of the *BJC* was published in 1961. By then, the bleak surroundings of the crumbling Victorian prison had become viewed as an obstacle to progressive penal thinking (Pratt, 2002) and the form and fabric of prison buildings was regarded as secondary to the therapeutic mission pursued within. 'Open' prisons, had also been established (the first started operating in the 1930s), allowing a relatively unrestricted degree of movement, including within the surrounding land, which was commonly used for farming and horticulture. Not only did the new open establishments bring flexibility to a system previously concerned only with uniformity, but they facilitated links between prisons and the communities in which they were located for the first time in over a century (Dunbar and Fairweather, 2000; Jewkes and Johnston, 2007).

New era, old ideas

The 1961 special issue of the *British Journal of Criminology* on 'prison architecture' was a response to the publication of the White Paper on Penal Practice in a Changing Society (HMSO, 1959). This landmark policy document outlined proposals to build 40 new prisons to ease the overcrowding that blighted prisons in the post-war years (the first of which was HMP Blundeston in Suffolk, opened in 1963). The contributors to the *BJC* were invited to 'express their views' ('Editorial', 1961: 305) and the narrative thread running through their articles is familiar to contemporary prison scholars, i.e. that the new prison-building programme was a chance to put right the mistakes of the past and build new prisons with a vision that went far beyond a straightforward solution to housing the inexorably rising prison population. In his contribution, Fairweather condemns the prison estate as

---

[3] Thirteen older prisons have been decommissioned so far with a further raft of closures expected imminently. Although no official announcement has yet been made regarding the closure of Pentonville, its demise is widely anticipated, not least because of the potential value of the site. It is worth noting, though that some of the smaller Victorian prisons are or were high-performing in relation to prisoner wellbeing.

'an embarrassing legacy of extremely permanent buildings expressing an outdated and outworn penal philosophy' (1961: 340). The new building programme thus represented a once-in-a-generation opportunity in an age of architectural experimentation, new modern methods and materials of construction (including pre-fabrication), and an as yet unwavering belief in prisons as places of human(e) experimentation. At this time, the predominant 'treatment model' resulted in criminal justice being influenced by a new raft of professional experts, including social workers, psychologists, health professionals and academics. The new emphasis on treatment and therapy also permeated discussions about what the new prisons should look like: Prison Commissioner Peterson proclaims, 'Changes in treatment may bring with them changes in architecture, and research into treatment methods is developing rapidly' (1961: 375).

Fairweather, however, expresses cynicism regarding what kinds of prison buildings would be realised, which might strike a chord with the views of sceptics anticipating the current government's plans for prison reform. Under the subtitle 'History repeats itself', Fairweather comments that it is 'hardly surprising...but bitterly disappointing, that the first new prison of major importance to be built in this century – at Everthorpe Hall, Yorkshire, in 1958 – should be a very close imitation of the type of prison erected during the previous century' (1961: 340). It was, he states, 'completely out of date before it even left the drawing board' and 'so far out of sympathy with current penal thought that it will very seriously hamper the use and development of more effective treatment methods' (ibid). Of course, with the benefit of hindsight, we know that the rehabilitative, treatment model had another decade in it, before it came to be seen as a further expression of the state's repressive disciplinary tendencies, involving excessive intervention, denying offenders their due rights and inappropriately using indeterminate sentencing whereby prisoners would be treated for as long as it took to make them 'better'. It was finally sunk by a doctrine that, in the 1970s, had a swift and profound impact on policy and practice – 'nothing works' (Martinson, 1974; see Jewkes, 2012; Cullen and Gendreau 2001 for overviews).

But even as 1950s austerity was giving way to 1960s optimism, Fairweather was calling for a re-think of the 'whole problem of prison design' to avoid building another Everthorpe which, he says, 'stands as a depressing reminder of the consequences of architectural stagnation' (1961: 340). Concurring with this view, President of the Prison Reform Trust, Lord Douglas Hurd denounced the prison designs of the post-war period as 'shoddy, expensive and just a little inhuman' (Hurd 2000: xiii-xiv). As Home Secretary (1985-89) Hurd said he was never asked to adjudicate on matters of prison design, nor was the subject raised in official reports or by pressure groups. This absence of public and policy discussion about prison design continued until very recently, when the opening of HMP Oakwood in 2012 reignited heated debate that recalls Fairweather's excoriation of Everthorpe and raises questions about the prison's perceived legitimacy. Following a series of well-documented problems that appear to have out-lived their dismissal by various interested parties as 'teething troubles'[4], there is now tacit acceptance on the part of key stakeholders, including government ministers and their advisers, that a more ambitious and innovative approach to prison design might help to achieve their desired outcomes of reform and rehabilitation. The next section of this chapter will explore this policy context.

Policy context in the 21st century: a focus on size and security

---

[4] Although the much-publicised problems besetting its operator, G4S (at the 2012 Olympics and concerning Medway Secure Training Centre, to name but two), may have contributed to intense press coverage, it is nevertheless the case that HMP Oakwood has been the subject of an unusually high number of newspaper articles. For a perspective on different political responses to Oakwood, see: http://tinyurl.com/h5gev55; http://tinyurl.com/zwlp8dx; http://tinyurl.com/hd33vz8

In recent years prisons in England and Wales have witnessed multiple ascending trends: more severe sentencing policies resulting in rising prisoner numbers and leading to further overcrowding; the growing prominence of security concerns within and outside the penal estate; the radicalization of prisoners to fundamentalist faiths; an influx of 'legal highs', mobile phones and other contraband; an unprecedented number of murders; and a dramatic rise in self-harm and suicide after periods of relative stability and/or decline. These pressing problems have all had an impact on the detail of prison design; for example, internal fixtures and fittings must be designed without ligature points to prevent suicide attempts, in-cell phones are being introduced in some prisons in a bid to reduce the number of illicit devices, and perimeter walls are usually double-skinned so that contraband thrown over the wall lands in the gap in between.

Amid the negative, 'upward' outcomes, one of the few measurable indices of performance to travel in the other direction has been escapes from prison, which have fallen by 75% since 2009 (Hansard, 2015). In part this decline can be explained by a hardening of penal architecture and design, which has accompanied, and arguably given material form to, the intensifying 'depth', 'weight' and 'tightness' of imprisonment that are achieved administratively (Crewe, 2009). Prison walls are higher, prison space is sequestered through zoning, prisoner movement is severely restricted, CCTV cameras and other (e.g. biometric) technologies proliferate, and fewer prisoners are housed in open conditions. This systemic and structural emphasis on surveillance, security, containment and control in pursuit of compliance is characteristic of the 'new penology' first identified by Feeley and Simon (1992), which has replaced the earlier therapeutic discourses that shaped the thoughts of the *BJC* contributors on prison architecture. And, at the turn of the current century, with the emergence of a dominant concern for managing aggregates of 'dangerous' groups as economically and as efficiently as possible (as opposed to focusing on individual clinical diagnosis and treatment, for example), the rationale for building bigger and cheaper prisons rapidly overtook discussions about imaginative prison design, humane treatment and attention to rehabilitation.

Of course, an important driver of these developments has been private investment which has, since the mid-1990s, had an undeniable impact on the design of prisons; partly because there is an expectation that the private sector will bring to the prison system quality improvement, cost reduction and innovation; but not least because private companies are subject to significant financial penalties for failure to meet government-set performance targets on the kinds of incidents highlighted above. Introduced by a Conservative administration in 1992, the Private Finance Initiative (PFI) enabled 'Public-Private Partnerships' (PPPs) to fund public infrastructure projects with private capital and two years later the 1994 Criminal Justice and Public Order Act allowed for the private *provision* as well as operation and maintenance of prisons[5]. Following a tendering process in which the public sector was barred from participating, Group 4 (now G4S) was awarded a contract to manage HMP Wolds, a newly-built remand prison that opened near Hull in April 1992. What started as an 'experiment', however, soon became routine policy and in 1997 the incoming New Labour government adopted PFI, with HMP Altcourse in Liverpool and HMP Parc, at Bridgend, being the first PFI builds under Labour in England and Wales respectively. There are currently 14 private prisons that are contractually managed by three companies: G4S, Sodexo and Serco.

---

[5] In a nutshell, under this initiative an integrated supply team is appointed to design, construct, manage and finance a development and then to operate it for a period of time. A special purpose vehicle (SPV), of which the integrated supply team is a part, finances the project and leases it to the government for an agreed period (usually 25 years) after which the development reverts to government ownership.

Assessments of privatization are mixed (see Metzger, 2003; Crewe, Liebling and Hulley, 2011). There can be little argument that private prisons are leading the way in innovation, e.g. regarding prisoners' access to personal technology, but many critics have lingering concerns that short-term innovation simply improves long-term efficiency by drastically reducing staffing costs. One of the most controversial outcomes of private sector involvement in the prison estate is the size of new correctional facilities. In 2009, the then Labour Government announced that it was shelving its plans to build so-called 'Titan' prisons and, a year later, the new Conservative Secretary of State for Justice, Kenneth Clarke promised a 'rehabilitation revolution', which led to some hope that money would be diverted instead into smaller prisons and community-based alternatives. But now the Titan has returned in all but name, and reform groups predict that shortly half of all prisoners will be warehoused in 'super-prisons' (PRT, 2014). Advised by the right-wing think tank Policy Exchange, successive ministers have been persuaded that not only do very large establishments on multi-prison sites offer much-needed economies of scale, they have the added benefit of providing jobs and financial growth in parts of the country that suffered during the economic downturn. Aside from the moral questions implicit in the idea of taking England and Wales down the same path of 'profit from punishment' as many US states, this political stance ignores the wealth of evidence to the contrary. For example, Genter, Hooks and Mosher (2013) found that not only did prisons *not* improve job prospects for inhabitants of host communities, but that the privatisation of prisons in the US has actually impeded local economic growth. In the UK there has been a great deal of opposition to super-sized prisons, on the grounds that 'effectiveness' and 'efficiencies' are incompatible goals (Owers, 2008; Liebling, 2008); and that 'effectiveness' must be measured in terms of the quality of life offered (Liebling with Arnold, 2004), as well as performance measures that prioritise prison security, offender risk management and local economic growth.

The other, less well-known, characteristic of the most recently built prisons in England & Wales, which also raises concerns that prisoners' quality of life and wellbeing fall a long way behind the drivers of 'effectiveness' and 'efficiency', is that the sites and buildings are 'future-proofed'. This means that, although they are Category C prisons – officially 'medium-security' facilities, holding those prisoners who are unlikely to try to escape – the prisons are constructed with all the security paraphernalia of (at least) a Category B institution, intended to house prisoners for whom the potential for escape should be made very difficult. The rationale is that, if at some point in the future, it needs to be used to accommodate high-security prisoners, it can do so without the need for expensive retro-fitting of enhanced situational security measures. Consequently, Category C prisoners, who would normally anticipate living in somewhat 'open' conditions (relatively speaking), as they are prepared for the minimum-security conditions of a Category D facility and/or release into the community, are accommodated within high fences and walls with locked gates every few metres inhibiting their movement.

HMP Berwyn (due to open in Wrexham, north Wales, in 2017) has been designed to the same template as HMP Oakwood in Wolverhampton (opened in 2012). Both have an over-securitized design for the category of prisoner they hold and both have 2,106 beds, making them among the largest prisons in Europe. Many criminologists view these prison warehouses as a retrograde step that runs counter to all the knowledge and evidence that has found that smaller institutions nurture the humanistic values (e.g. respect, trust and empathy) that are central to forging positive prisoner-staff relationships and successful outcomes (Drake, 2012; Liebling with Arnold, 2004; PRT, 2014; HMCIP, 2009; Jewkes and Moran, 2014; Johnsen et al, 2011; Madoc Jones, Williams, Hughes and Turley, forthcoming). Writing at a time when a prison holding in excess of 400 prisoners

was considered 'very large' (Liebling, 2008), Leslie Fairweather could not have anticipated just how vast prisons would become when he wrote in 1961:

> The internal arrangement of a building can influence the degree and quality of personal relationships within it to a remarkable degree. These relationships will not develop healthily in huge impersonal blocks of cells where the individual is dwarfed by the overpowering size of the structure. They can only be attempted in buildings which respect the quality of the individual by being attractive, as normal in appearance as possible, and suitable in scale (Fairweather, 1961: 340).

'Value-engineering' and the role of the architect

Fairweather would also not have been able to predict that the architects of these new super-size prisons have little creative input into the designs. The rise of the computer-aided, simulation-based software known as Building Information Modelling (BIM) has replaced the old-fashioned drawing board and introduced further standardisation of the penal estate, with arguably negative consequences both for the ways in which architects think about buildings representationally and creatively, and also in terms of the lived experience of those who occupy them. Reflecting on one of the current buzz-words in prison planning, 'value-engineering', one of the architects who worked on the plans for Oakwood lamented:

> I'm sorry, but with the Ministry of Justice it's just a cost-cutting exercise. And that's all it is. It's just reducing costs again and again and again ... [I]t's really sad but we've got to a stage where we're actually stripping back our designs (cited in Moran, Turner and Jewkes, forthcoming/under review).

The restriction of space for architectural creativity and the managerialist, regulatory and risk-averse context of prison procurement mean that even the most benign and well-intended design decisions can get vetoed at an early stage. For example, the planting of trees around prison sites is widely acknowledged (not least by architects) to 'soften' the environment and have 'therapeutic' benefits for prisoners, but proposals for landscaping in prison grounds are frequently thwarted by security minded officials who argue that trees interrupt sight-lines and gardens are expensive to keep tidy and can be used to hide contraband. Moreover, the emphasis on value-engineering means that, on the whole, prison buildings are constructed from 'hard' materials such as bricks and pre-fabricated concrete panels, while materials more commonly seen in 'signature buildings' such as arts centres, airport buildings, office blocks and specialist healthcare environments (wood, steel, huge glass panels etc.) are rejected on grounds of cost.

In other parts of Europe, however, there are prisons that can justifiably be described as signature buildings. Underpinned by a utopian vision, prison designers in Norway[6], Iceland and Denmark have focused on the rehabilitative function of imprisonment, and have experimented with progressive and highly stylised forms of penal architecture. Internal prison spaces exhibit soft furnishings, colour zoning, maximum exploitation of natural light, displays of art and sculpture, and views of nature through vista windows without bars, while

---

[6] Although Halden prison in southern Norway is commonly held up as an exemplar of humane prison design, and one that is 'effective' at meeting its 'quality-of-life' objectives, it is not regarded by the Norwegian prison authorities as being 'efficient' (partly because it occupies a large site that requires staff to spend much of their time escorting prisoners around the scattered buildings). As Norway plans its own prison modernization/expansion strategy (under a recently elected Conservative-led government), future 'closed' custodial facilities will be BIM-designed, standardized, modular units with relatively restricted movement – in other words, inexpensive to construct and operate. They will, however, remain small in size in comparison to prisons in the UK and will contain elements and amenities that are still considered 'controversial' in England & Wales.

outdoor space and encompassing landscape are utilized to maximum effect. For example, in designing a new prison in Greenland (its first 'closed' prison, in fact), the Danish architects Schmidt Hammer Lassen aim to design the 'world's most scenic prison'. Set within a stunning, rugged landscape, the prison will exploit the 'contrast between the rough and the beautiful':

> The whole idea behind the project is to add qualities to the complex that will enhance rehabilitation and diminish physical and psychological violence... The thought process behind this is that access to nature – watching the clouds, birds, daylight, weather and so on, can aid in rehabilitation (http://www.archdaily.com/375056/ny-anstalt-correctional-facility-winning-proposal-schmidt-hammer-lassen-architects/).

Carceral geographers regard such designs as generic expressions of 'affect' that evoke certain kinds of creative inhabitation (Kraftl and Adey, 2008). Characterized by openness, flexibility and 'humane' treatment, they may promote personal and intellectual growth, and even a lightness and vividness of being (Hancock and Jewkes 2011). This link between affect and creative, experiential inhabitation echoes parallel developments in organization studies and criminological research into architecture as 'technologies of (dis)enchantment' (Hancock and Jewkes, 2011; Jewkes 2013). In simple terms, it has been suggested that the purposeful incorporation into a building of an aesthetic code designed to blunt or depress the senses ('an-aesthetics') produces a non-cognitive reaction that enhances feelings of disenchantment, estrangement and banality on the part of all those who interact with it (Dale and Burrell, 2003; Jewkes, 2013); and possibly even limits the subjective growth of those confined, contributing to the pains of imprisonment ((Hancock and Jewkes, 2011).

The bland, unassuming and uniform exterior style that has been favoured in recent prison construction projects, with its vast expanses of brick, few, small windows, limited landscaping, visible surveillance and no unnecessary decoration, are arguably a manifestation of how architecture, design and technology contribute to the generation of an anaesthetized subjectivity, one perfectly suited to control from above and between (Dale and Burrell, 2003). While we would hesitate to claim that a prison in England & Wales could not, or will never be, a 'signature' building in the manner of Nuuk Prison in Greenland, or Halden Prison in Norway, the research we have conducted with architects, contractors, engineers and other buildings professionals, and with representatives of the MoJ, strongly suggests that within the dynamic encounters between these different parties, discussion of the logics and philosophies of imprisonment has barely featured at all. Regulations, schedules, structures and technologies that exist to standardise delivery, speed up build times and drive down build costs, all marginalise opportunities for design innovation; or even for discussion of what it is that the prison is intended to achieve beyond simply incapacitating offenders for a period of time.

Looking to the future: the 'biggest shake-up of prisons since the Victorian era'

Having said all of the above, there is, as this volume goes to press, a new chapter unfolding in the evolution of prison design in England & Wales. In a speech delivered at the Prisoner Learning Alliance (PLA) in July 2015, Secretary of State for Justice Michael Gove announced that nine new prisons would be built by 2020 and stated that his aim for these new facilities was 'to design out the dark corners which too often facilitate violence and drug-taking...[and] build a prison estate which allows prisoners to be rehabilitated' (www.gov.uk). In February 2016 Prime Minister David Cameron pledged to support his minister in the 'biggest shake-up of prisons since the Victorian era', and announced that in addition to the new facilities, a further six existing establishments would

become 'reform prisons' with governors given greater autonomy over the financial and operational management of their prisons. Conceiving of the new establishments as places of care, as well as punishment, both Gove and Cameron acknowledged the extent to which the buildings and spatial design of prisons are conducive to rehabilitating offenders and helping them 'find meaning in their lives' (www.politics.co.uk). The other side of the modernization plan, said Cameron, involves relinquishing the parts of the estate that are no longer fit-for-purpose. Such prisons, he commented, were barely fit for human habitation when they were built, and are 'much, much worse today' (ibid).

Looking forward, then, there is a possibility that the prison estate will look very different by 2020, as the proposed modernisation programme brings the opportunity not only to radically reform the prison landscape, but in doing so, to nurture a different philosophy of punishment in the minds of politicians, policy makers and the public at large. One aspect of this might be to look at examples of good practice in prison design in other parts of the world, especially those with lower rates of recidivism and lower numbers of suicides, self-harm and violent assaults than those that blight our own penal system. Once again, those who are sceptical about political will to embrace truly reformist ideas might point to Petersen's article in the special issue of the *BJC*, which notes that the Prison Commission had taken account of 'recent work in foreign countries...[including] several Scandinavian establishments' (1961: 374). Their influence is difficult to determine in the facilities that were built.

One of the most significant factors in not following the lead of our Scandinavian neighbours in applying to the design of new prisons architectural and aesthetic principles that encourage personal and intellectual creativity, is the perception – fuelled by the popular press – that there is no public appetite for it, and therefore no votes in it. Politicians habitually employ 'public opinion' and 'public interest' to justify Draconian policies and, while prison designers in Norway, Iceland and Denmark have experimented with progressive and highly stylized forms of architecture, and internal prison spaces that explore more open, flexible and normalized spatial planning, with comfortable furnishings, attractive colour schemes and a maximum exploitation of natural light, even tentative discussions about how to humanize prison environments in England & Wales have met with concerns from politicians and civil servants about whether they would pass the '*Daily Mail* test'[7].

Given the very particular brand of punitive populism that frames media reporting of anything relating to prison conditions, one might expect new prisons to look as stark and foreboding as their Victorian predecessors, but contemporary prison architecture is the material embodiment of prevailing expectations that prisons should be as inoffensive in outward appearance as possible, while being sufficiently punitive within to punish offenders and deter them from offending in future. The prototypical prison may be a constant reminder to society of the perils of transgression and a reassurance of the severe deprivations within, but it also generates disproportionate fears about diminished public safety, low 'civic pride', and a belief that the disrepute of the prison will cause property values to plummet[8]. For all these reasons, the 'Victorian' archetype has been submerged by a desire to disguise penal institutions so that they resemble countless other 'chillingly-blank', 'barn-like buildings' (Hatherley, 2010: 11). Supermarkets, schools, DIY outlets, Amazon warehouses, Premier

---

[7] An example related to us during our research illustrates the point: a discussion among prison planners about bars on cell windows concluded that horizontal bars (which permit a better view of the outside vista) would be acceptable in women's facilities and those holding children and young people, but that in adult male prisons, vertical bars were important signifiers of 'punishment'. The idea that windows could be installed *without* bars, as is common in other parts of the UK and Europe, has not yet penetrated planning discussions in England & Wales.

[8] The name as well as the appearance of a prison can be contentious. While welcoming the selection of a former Firestone industrial site in North Wales because of the jobs it might provide, the people of Wrexham nonetheless did not want their new prison to be named after, and thus associated with, the town; hence HMP Berwyn.

Inns, prisons and countless commercial, civic and institutional buildings all wear the same camouflage, forming a heterogeneous mass to merge seamlessly into the 'archi-texture' of the city (Davis, 1990: 256; Jewkes, et al, 2016).

Interestingly, both Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland are proposing a more progressive design agenda for future prison planning, while Scotland has three new prisons established since 2012 – HMP Low Moss, HMP Shotts and HMP Grampian – all of which are relatively striking in appearance (they are much closer to what might be described as 'signature buildings') and are viewed as a 'nod to Scandinavia' (Armstrong, 2014). Of course, the idea of a new prison simply being a bold design statement or architectural vanity project would be as unpalatable as the deliberate designing-in of bleakness or ugliness as a punitive aesthetic (Jewkes, 2013). But in the Scottish examples, their progressive, 'community-facing' designs signal an explicit commitment to the principles of desistance. Moving away from a traditional 'deficits-based' approach of identifying what's wrong with offenders and trying to fix it, towards an 'assets-based' model of identifying offenders' strengths and building on them (rhetoric which was echoed in David Cameron's speech in February 2016), HMP Grampian et al have been characterized as a statement of Scottish separatism – the ambition of a Nationalist government seeking to 'do punishment differently, and specifically, differently from England' (Armstrong, 2014: np)[9].

The characteristics of contemporary prison architecture described so far represent the overt agendas of penal design, reflecting a punitive turn from which, we might cautiously suggest, the prison services of the UK and Ireland appear to be in various stages of retreat. But what of the covert agendas that speak to underlying societal perceptions of offenders? The most recently built prisons in England & Wales may share a (relatively) inoffensive vernacular with retail warehouses or low-budget, chain hotels, but arguably they are no less scripted in their visual appearance than their turreted and curlicued Victorian cousins (Jewkes et al, 2016). And like their grandiose predecessors, the contemporary prison's visual reach of control and anaesthetization extends far beyond the prisoner, or even the staff and visitors who populate and move through carceral spaces, to the myriad of users and things that come into its contact in numerous, complex, planned, embodied, multi-sensory, spontaneous and unexpected ways, and are resonant of the power structures that exist both within and outwith the building (Jacobs and Merriman, 2011). The new architecture of incarceration thus provides a common (and 'common-sense') visual vocabulary for current political, economic, social, cultural and spatial understandings of incarceration (Schept, 2014), just as it did when Jebb designed the magnificent but maleficent Pentonville Prison.

So, if Pentonville stands as a statement of sovereign power and retribution, while Everthorpe is a manifestation of political timidity and architectural stagnation, and Grampian is a radical experiment (in its building if not yet in its culture) with a separatist intent, what do the unremarkable carceral buildings of the current age in England & Wales say? What are the aesthetic principles being mobilized – as technologies of control and as systems of cultural symbolism? We suggest that contemporary carceral aesthetics in England & Wales have a mimetic quality, sequestering offenders, sanitizing the pains of imprisonment, and eliciting ignorance and apathy in the spectator (Jewkes et al, 2016). The 'humming, fortress-like invincibility' (Schept, 2014: 200) of an edifice like that of Pentonville or Wormwood Scrubs elicits 'layers of questions' about 'the physical and symbolic place of incarceration...and about the role of the state and capital in structuring the future

---

[9] Whether or not they are succeeding in this aim is debatable; like all new prisons they have experienced some teething troubles and it is perhaps too early to say whether their design is positively affecting their operation and outcomes (although we plan to publish further on this in the future).

of communities' (ibid). It is a potent, challenging force. In contrast, the bland and indistinct presence of Oakwood or Berwyn serves to conceal the implications of its power. It barely raises any questions at all, except this; do we turn a blind eye to the plight of the confined and to the historical structures of power that support the carceral complex when we diminish the visibility of the buildings that contain them? The affective dimensions of spectatorship in relation to the prisons built in the nineteenth century are frequently rousing, sensate experiences, but the buildings that administer contemporary criminal justice are 'neither forbidding nor overly welcoming'...[but are] simply there, like everything else in the neighbourhood. (Davis, 1990: 168). It is arguable, then, that an anaesthetizing aesthetic extends beyond the affective power to deaden the senses of those who inhabit prison buildings and permeates the wider, collective conscience as well (Jewkes et al, 2016).

Concluding thoughts

This chapter has attempted to show how viewing the concepts and theories that have dominated the study of prisons over the last half-century through the lens of architecture and design generates a nuanced and sensate understanding of imprisonment. We have made reference to the negative effects of architecture and design which, as eloquently described in numerous prisoner biographies and testimonies (*inter alia* Boyle 1977, 1984; Hassine, 2010; Wayne, 1994; McWatters, 2013), give material context to the 'pains of imprisonment' (Sykes, 1958). Two-hundred-year-old discourses of legitimacy and non-legitimacy (Sparks and Bottoms, 1995) have resurfaced in criticism of modern prison warehouses that do little to rehabilitate the offender and arguably do even less to engage the public with questions about the purpose of imprisonment and the harms that prisons do. Their high-security architecture (to hold medium-security prisoners) might be regarded as a barometer for understanding the methods and parameters of state power, as security in prisons has run parallel to its rise in prominence in an increasingly risk-attuned and retributive society (Drake, 2012). Changes in penal architecture and design have reflected evolving penological ideas, from Howard's philosophies about reform and 'healthy' prisons, to a Victorian emphasis on order, discipline, deterrence and repression, through a faith in individually-tailored treatment and rehabilitation, to the challenge of an administrative focus known as the 'new penology' (Feeley and Simon 1992). As the aesthetics of carceral spaces have reformed and rationalized the delivery of punishment, resulting in 'deeper', 'heavier' and 'tighter' experiences of incarceration (Crewe, 2009), a resurgence of the doctrine of less eligibility has led to public acquiescence and apathy about the conditions that prisoners are held in.

Nonetheless, a growing recognition that our bloated penal system is unsustainable[10], and is failing in numerous respects, has precipitated a change in government rhetoric. The notions of 'reform' and 'healthy' prisons are once again in common currency, in ways that would be recognizable to John Howard. Moreover, for those who believe that advocating a more progressive prison design agenda – be it based on principles of normalization, humanization, human rights, therapy, well-being, or any number of other concerns – is actually about creating 'softer' or 'prettier' prisons, and/or that it is doing nothing to challenge the institution of the prison itself, we argue that a focus on designing prison spaces that support rehabilitation and desistance could be a vital component in achieving radical justice reform, including de-carceration. Put simply, prisons that are designed to be hard, ugly and either sensorially depriving or sensorially overloading (which prisons often are simultaneously; Wener 2012), support a view of the prisoner as deserving of such disenchanting environments.

---

[10] That is, unsustainable in both human and financial terms, arguments which are also germane in the USA where several states have experienced recent decreases in their prison populations.

However, when a prison communicates positive attributes (e.g. hope, trust, empathy, respect), the design challenges the cultural stereotype of what a prison is – and through this – who prisoners are, and it becomes considerably harder to hold the view that prisoners 'deserve' to be held in brutal conditions. Taking this a step further if, through design, the idea of housing people in a 'prison' is not significantly different from housing people in a well-designed hospital or student hall of residence, it may not be a huge conceptual leap to connect the prison to notions of justice that can be achieved while 'prisoners' remain in the community (Jewkes and Lulham, 2016).

As we contemplate the closure of more iconic Victorian prisons and the opening of ten new prisons (including Berwyn) by 2020, it is tempting to return to the parallels between the discussions published in the *British Journal of Criminology* more than half-a-century ago and current debates about what England & Wales' new prisons should look like, what they should be trying to achieve and how their design might assist these aims. Although carceral spaces, and the forms of inhabitation they encourage, have subtly altered over the decades, prison architecture has not evolved very much since the Pentonville model, with wings radiating from a central hall and cellular confinement remaining the norm. In 1961, Leslie Fairweather wrote of Everthorpe that, like its Victorian predecessors, it consists of 'long, noisy, open halls with banks of cells rising on each side' which are, he says, 'abhorrently familiar features of our prison system [that] need no further description' (1961: 340). This description might just as easily have been written about any of the prison houseblocks constructed in the last five years.

If prisons continue to be designed as they have been over the last 150 years, 'modern' prisons will continue to inherit 'Victorian' problems, as Fairweather predicted in 1961, and as has been documented by the Prisons Inspectorate numerous times since. For example, within a year of re-opening in 1983, the 'new' Holloway Prison was criticized by HMIP for engendering a form of torture that could result in acute mental illness (Home Office 1985), recalling criticism in the 1840s of the numbers of prisoners who became insane under the separate system (Johnston and Jewkes, 2007). A decade later, in December 1995, Chief Inspector David Ramsbotham walked out of an inspection of Holloway in disgust[11]. More recently, HMP Doncaster (built in 1994) has come under heavy criticism for its high rates of violent assaults, incidents of self-harm and deaths in custody; all of which may be a partial consequence of poor environmental conditions, including cells 'in a terrible state, with filth, graffiti and inadequate furniture' (HM Inspectorate, 2016: 5), stinking, unscreened toilets, broken windows, exposed wiring, dirty bedding and areas that were littered and contained vermin (ibid: 17). Meanwhile, reports that HMP Oakwood is expanding its capacity by 500, by converting single occupancy cells to double rooms, does little to alleviate the impression that the system is once again in crisis.

Given the wealth of evidence that has been accumulated since the last major wave of prison expansion, it is hoped that ministers will take notice of the opinions of experts with 'open, fertile and creative minds' (Madge, 1961: 371) and accept that our recent history of building 'huge impersonal blocks of cells where the individual is dwarfed by the overpowering size of the structure' (Fairweather, 1961:) has negative effects; and on staff, as well as prisoners[12]. Just as in 1961, when Madge warned of the futility of preserving established practice (given all the evidence that prison does not 'work') and appealed for a 'more adequate prison

---

[11] The 'inadequate and antiquated' Holloway is one of the prisons that will close to make way for '21st century solutions to criminality', according to Michael Gove in his speech in 2015 (www.gov.uk)
[12] In addition to the growing body of academic scholarship that finds that smaller prisons are more successful on a range of outcomes, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons has also reported that large prisons are not as effective as small ones (Madoc-Jones et al, forthcoming)

architecture' in a time of experimentation, the planners, architects and designers currently working on the template for the nine new facilities indisputably have a 'decisive influence on their success or failure' for at least a generation to come (1961: 371).

As long ago as 1931, Robert Davison, Director of Research for the Architectural Record, published a caustic article castigating both US prison commissioners and penologists for being 'surprisingly insensitive to the enormous importance of the building in the treatment of the prisoner' (1931: 39). Recognising that the design of prisons seemed to be a blind spot for the criminal justice system, he advocated that it was the job of the architect – even though they could 'scarcely be expected to be a penal expert' – to indicate the 'necessity for a prolonged and careful study of this problem', and for 'thorough research in [prison] building'[13] (ibid). Although the UK Government has eschewed proposals to hold an architectural design competition (for reasons of expediency), as is common in many European countries, the inclusion of 'designing-architects' in the planning process gives us some grounds for optimism. It is hoped, then, that the designers of the new prisons mobilize aesthetic and spatial values and practices to signify and support a different model of criminal justice than the one that has singularly failed to achieve any of the aims of imprisonment, other than (usually) temporary incapacitation. A new approach to prison architecture and design is at least 55 years overdue. Let us finally learn from the mistakes of the past.

Selected Further Reading

Although primarily focused on prisons in North America, Rich Wener's *The Environmental Psychology of Prisons and Jails: Creating Humane Spaces in Secure Settings* (2012, Cambridge University Press) discusses principles of architecture and environment that have universal application, and is an erudite yet accessible compilation of thirty years of research by one of the world's leading scholars of penal design and its effects. Iona Spens' *Architecture of Incarceration* (1994, Academy) remains a pictorially beautiful and informative collection, which includes an essay by Leslie Fairweather. The collection edited by Fairweather and McConville, *Prison Architecture: Policy, Design and Experience* (2000, Architectural Press), contains contributions from some of the leading experts in prison design from the worlds of architecture, the Prison Service, the Inspectorate, and academia. For more recent analyses, the authors of this chapter have written several contributions. Among them, Yvonne Jewkes has written 'The Aesthetics and Anaesthetics of Prison Architecture' in J. Simon, N. Temple and R. Tobe (2013) *Architecture and Justice* (Ashgate); and 'Penal aesthetics and the art of prison architecture', in Cheliotis, L. (2012) *The Arts of Imprisonment: Essays on Control, Resistance & Empowerment* (Ashgate). Dominique Moran has written 'Prison Buildings and the Design of Carceral Space' in Moran, D. (2015) *Carceral Geography: Spaces and Practices of Incarceration* (Ashgate). Collaboratively, they have written an overview of the topic: Moran, D., Jewkes, Y. and Turner, J. (2016) 'Prison design and carceral space' in Y. Jewkes, J. Bennett and B. Crewe (eds) *Handbook on Prisons 2nd edition* (Routledge); and a discussion of the subject from the perspective of visual criminology: Jewkes, Y., Slee, E. and Moran, D. (2016) 'The visual retreat of the prison: non-places for non-people', in M. Brown and E. Carrabine (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Visual Criminology* (Routledge). The special issue of the *British Journal of Criminology* (1961: 1, 4) devoted to 'prison architecture' is a fascinating snapshot of expert thinking about prison design at the time of the last major expansion programme, and is a pertinent reminder of the perils of not learning from past mistakes.

---

[13] That a group of architects working on early designs for the new prisons arrived at a meeting with us recently, armed with an impressive stack of criminology and carceral geography books, suggests that Davison's advice is being taken seriously!

Suggestions for essay questions

- To what extent does prison architecture and design help us to understand the criminological concepts of legitimacy, less eligibility and the 'new penology'?
- In his 1961 *BJC* article, Norman Johnston refers to 'the evils of large institutions'. What evidence is there to suggest that size matters in prison design?
- How, why, and with what consequences are punitive philosophies manifest in environments built for incarceration?
- Should the design of prisons for women differ from the design of prisons for men? To what degree are the differences in prison design shaped by gendered assumptions about masculinity and femininity?
- Is private sector competition a good thing or a bad thing (or both) for the design and construction of new prisons?

Annotated weblinks

www.prisonspaces.com The website of the project which underpins this chapter. It contains links to descriptions of new-build prisons in the UK and Europe.

www.carceralgeography.com This website presents some of the current work being undertaken in carceral geography, links to information about specific projects, and via the network page, to the growing number of researchers working in this field, and to information about new publications, conferences and events.

https://www.unops.org/SiteCollectionDocuments/Publications/TechnicalGuidance_PrisonPlanning.pdf New United Nations guidance for prison planning and design based on the Nelson Mandela Rules 2016.

https://theconversation.com/uk The academic 'news and views' site that contains articles on prison design written by the authors of this chapter and by Dr Sarah Armstrong (University of Glasgow), among others.

http://www.penalreform.org/blog/build-success-prison-design-infrastructure-tool-rehabilitation/ and http://www.penalreform.org/blog/10020/ Useful blogs by Penal Reform International on prison design.

References

Agamben, G. (1998) *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, Stanford University Press, Stanford

Agamben, G. (2005) *State of Exception*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago

Armstrong, S. (2014) 'Scotland's newest prison is another nod to Scandinavia', *The Conversation*, https://theconversation.com/scotlands-newest-prison-is-another-nod-to-scandinavia-24145

Boyle, J. (1977) *A Sense of Freedom*, London: Pan

Boyle, J. (1984) *The Pain of Confinement*, Edinburgh: Canongate

Brodie, A., Croom, J. and Davies, J. O. (1999) *Behind Bars: The Hidden Architecture of England's Prisons,* English Heritage: Swindon

Brodie, A. Croom, J. and Davies, J. O. (2002) *English Prisons: An Architectural History,* English Heritage: Swindon

Condry, R., Kotova, A. and Minson, S. (2016) 'Social Injustice and Collateral Damage: The Families and Children of Prisoners', in Y. Jewkes, J. Bennett and B. Crewe (eds) *Handbook on Prisons 2nd edition*, Abingdon: Routledge

Cosgrove, D. E. (1998) *Social Formation and Symbolic Landscape,* University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, WI

Crewe, B. (2009) *The Prisoner Society: Power, Adaption, and Social Life in an English Prison*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Crewe, B., Liebling, A., and Hulley, S. (2011) 'Staff culture, use of authority and prisoner quality of life in public and private sector prisons', *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 44(1), 94-115

Crewe, B., Warr, J., Bennett, P., and Smith, A. (2013) 'The emotional geography of prison life', *Theoretical Criminology* 18(1): 56-74

Cullen, F. T. and Gendreau, P. (2001) 'From nothing works to what works: Changing professional ideology in the 21st century', *The Prison Journal*, 81(3), 313-338

Dale, K. and Burrell, G. (2003) 'An-Aesthetics and Architecture', Carr, A. and Hancock, P. (eds.) *Art and Aesthetics at Work*, Basingstoke: Palgrave

Dardel, J. (2013) 'Resisting "Bare Life": Prisoners' Agency in the New Prison Culture Era in Colombia', in Moran, D., Gill, N. and Conlon, D. (eds) *Carceral Spaces: Mobility and Agency in Imprisonment and Migrant Detention,* Farnham: Ashgate

Davis, M. (1990) *City of Quartz*, London: Pimlico

Davison, R.L. (1931) 'Prison architecture', *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* 157: 33-39

Drake, D. (2012) *Prisons, Punishment and the Pursuit of Security*, London: Palgrave

Dunbar, I. and Fairweather, L. (2000) 'English prison design', in L. Fairweather and S. McConville (eds) Prison Architecture: Policy, Design and Experience. Oxford: Architectural Press

Earle, R. and Phillips, C. (2012) 'Digesting men? Ethnicity, gender and food: Perspectives from a "prison ethnography"', *Theoretical Criminology* 16(2): 141-156

'Editorial' (1961) *British Journal of Criminology* special issue on 'Prison Architecture' 1(4): 305-306

Evans R (1982) *The Fabrication of Virtue: English Prison Architecture, 1750-1840,* Cambridge University Press: Cambridge

Fairweather, L. and McConville, S. (eds) (2000) *Prison Architecture: Policy, Design, and Experience,* Elsevier: Oxford

Farrall, S. and Calverley, A. (2006) *Understanding Desistance from Crime*. Maidenhead: Open University Press

Feeley M. M. and Simon, J. (1992) 'The New Penology: Notes on the Emerging Strategy of Corrections and its Implications', *Criminology,* 30(4): 449-74

Fiddler, M. (2007) 'Projecting the prison: The depiction of the uncanny in The Shawshank Redemption', *Crime, Media, Culture: An International Journal* 3(2): 192-206

Foucault, M. (1979) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Vintage, New York

Garland, D. (1990). *Punishment and modern society*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Genter, S., Hooks, G. and Mosher, C. (2013) 'Prisons, jobs and privatization: The impact of prisons on employment growth in rural US counties, 1997–2004', *Social Science Research*. 42(3) 596-610

Grant, E. and Jewkes, Y. (2015) 'Designs on punishment: evolving models of spatial confinement in Australia and the USA', The Prison Journal 95(2): 223-243

Hancock, P. and Jewkes, Y. (2012) 'Penal aesthetics and the pains of imprisonment', *Punishment & Society*, 13(5) 611–629

Hansard (2015) 'Prison escapes: written question -9484' www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements

Hassine V. (2010) *Life Without Parole: Living and Dying in Prison Today,* New York: Oxford University Press

Hatherley, O. (2010) *A Guide to the New Ruins of Great Britain* London: Verso

HMSO (1959) Penal Practice in a Changing Society, Cmnd 645, London: HMSO

HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (2016) Report on an unannounced inspection of HMP Doncaster 5-16 October 2015, London: HMIP

Hurd, D. (2000) *Memoirs,* London: Little Brown

Independent (2016) 'Prison overcrowding: HMP Oakwood to convert single cells into doubles to make room for 500 extra inmates'. Available at http://ind.pn/10uKCf1

Jacobs J. M. and Merriman P. (2011) 'Practising architectures', *Social & Cultural Geography* 12(3) 211-22

Jewkes, Y. (2015) *Media and Crime,* revised 3rd edition, London: Sage

Jewkes, Y. (2013) 'The Aesthetics and Anaesthetics of Prison Architecture' in J. Simon, N. Temple and R. Tobe (eds) *Architecture and Justice*, Farnham: Ashgate

Jewkes, Y. (2012) 'Prisons' in M. Tonry (ed.) *Oxford Handbook Crime & Criminal Justice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Jewkes Y and Johnston H (2007) 'The evolution of prison architecture' in Y. Jewkes (ed) *Handbook on Prisons,* Willan: Cullompton

Jewkes and Lulham (2016) 'Provoking criminal justice reform: a presentation in the Empathy "Things" Workshop', 50th Anniversary Design Research Society Conference – "Future focused thinking", June 27-30, Brighton, UK

Jewkes, Y. and Moran, D. (2014) 'Bad design breeds violence in sterile megaprisons' *The Conversation,* https://theconversation.com/bad-design-breeds-violence-in-sterile-megaprisons-22424

Jewkes, Y., Slee, E. and Moran, D. (2016) 'The visual retreat of the prison: non-places for non-people', in M. Brown and E. Carrabine (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Visual Criminology*, Abingdon: Routledge

Johnsen, B., Granheim, P.K. and Helgesen, J. (2011) Exceptional prison conditions and the quality of prison life: prison size and prison culture in Norwegian closed prisons', in *European Journal of criminology* 8(6): 515-529

Johnston, N. (2000) *Forms of Constraint: A History of Prison Architecture,* University of Illinois Press: Chicago, IL

Johnston, H. (2015) *Crime in England, 1815-1880: Experiencing the Criminal Justice System*, Abingdon: Routledge

Kraftl, P. and Adey, P. (2008) 'Architecture/affect/inhabitation: geographies of being-in buildings', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 98(1) 213-31

Lefebvre, H. (1991) *The Production of Space*, Oxford: Blackwell

Liebling A. with Arnold, H. (2004) *Prisons and Their Moral Performance: A Study of Values, Quality, and Prison Life,* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Metzger, G. (2003) Privatization as Delegation. *Columbia Law Review* 103 (6): 1367–1502

McNeill, F. and Schinkel, M. (2016) 'Prisons and desistance', in Y. Jewkes, J. Bennett and B. Crewe (eds) *Handbook on Prisons 2nd edition*, Abingdon: Routledge

McWatters, M. (2013) 'Poetic testimonies of incarceration: towards a vision of prison as manifold space', in Moran, D., Gill, N. and Conlon, D. (eds) *Carceral Spaces: Mobility and Agency in Imprisonment and Migrant Detention,* Farnham: Ashgate.

Madge, J. (1961) 'Trends in prison design', *British Journal of Criminology* special issue on 'Prison Architecture' 1(4): 362-371

Madoc-Jones, I., Williams, E., Hughes, C. and Turley, J. (forthcoming) 'Prisons: "Does size still matter?', *Prison Service Journal*

Martinson, R. (1974) 'What Works? Questions and Answers About Prison Reform', *Public Interest* 35(Spring): 22-54

Mitchelson, M. L. (2014) 'The production of bedspace: prison privatization and abstract space', *Geographica Helvetica* 69(5) 325-33

Moran, D. (2015) *Carceral Geography: Spaces and Practices of Incarceration*, Farnham: Ashgate.

Moran D. (2013) Carceral geography and the spatialities of prison visiting: visitation, recidivism, and hyperincarceration *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 31(1) 174-90

Moran, D. and Jewkes, Y. (2015) Linking the carceral and the punitive state: A review of research on prison architecture, design, technology and the lived experience of carceral space *Annales de Géographie* 124 (702-703) 163-184

Moran, D., Turner, J. and Jewkes, Y. (forthcoming) 'Becoming big things: Building events and the architectural geographies of incarceration in England and Wales', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*

Morin K. M. (2013) 'Security here is not safe': violence, punishment, and space in the contemporary US penitentiary *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 31(3) 381-99

Morris, P. and Morris, T. (1963) Pentonville: A Sociological Study of an English Prison, London: Routledge

Petersen, A.W. (1961) 'The prison building programme' and 'The prison building programme: a postscript', *British Journal of Criminology* special issue on 'Prison Architecture' 1(4): 307- and 372-375

Commented [DM1]: R2 suggests that we reconsider the title of the paper (comment #5). Given the discussion below (re comment #2) and the position of the paper in relation to foregoing debates in human/architectural geographies, we feel that the terminology in the title is relevant and helpful in locating this paper in relation to these debates.

Further, in relation to the suggested title "Becoming prison…", the question of what it is that makes a building a prison is a thorny one (under current debate within criminology), and although very important, lies beyond the scope of this paper. We would, therefore, hesitate to signal in the title that we were going to address in this paper what it is that enables a building to *become a prison*.

For these reasons, we prefer to leave the title unchanged.

Pratt, J. (2002) *Punishment and Civilization*, London: Sage

Prison Reform Trust (2014) *Titan Prisons: A Gigantic Mistake,* PRT, London

Rothman, D. J. (1971) *The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order & Disorder in the New Republic*, Boston: Little, Brown

Scharff Smith, P. (2014) *When the Innocent are Punished: The Children of Imprisoned Parents,* London: Palgrave

Schept, J. (2014) '(Un)seeing like a prison: counter-visual ethnography of the carceral estate', *Theoretical Criminology* 18(2): 198-223

Schinkel, M. (2014) *Being Imprisoned: Punishment, Adaptation and Desistance,* London: Palgrave

Sibley D and Van Hoven B 2009 The contamination of personal space: boundary construction in a prison environment *Area* 41(2) 198-206

Sparks, R. and Bottoms, A.E. (1995) 'Legitimacy and Order in Prisons', British Journal of Sociology 46(1): 45-62

Spens I. (1994) *Architecture of Incarceration,* Academy: London

Sykes, G. (1958) *The Society of Captives: A Study of a Maximum Security Prison*, Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press

Wayne, P. (1994) 'Prison design in the twentieth century' in I. Spens (ed.) *Architecture of Incarceration*, London: Academy Editions

Wener, R.E. (2012) *The Environmental Psychology of Prisons and Jails: Creating Humane Spaces in Secure Settings*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.