

Theoretical Criminology

<http://tcr.sagepub.com/>

'A lockdown facility ... with the feel of a small, private college': Liberal politics, jail expansion, and the carceral habitus

Judah Schept

Theoretical Criminology 2013 17: 71 originally published online 23 January 2013

DOI: 10.1177/1362480612463113

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://tcr.sagepub.com/content/17/1/71>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

Additional services and information for *Theoretical Criminology* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://tcr.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://tcr.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations: <http://tcr.sagepub.com/content/17/1/71.refs.html>

>> [Version of Record](#) - Feb 12, 2013

[OnlineFirst Version of Record](#) - Jan 23, 2013

[What is This?](#)



'A lockdown facility ... with the feel of a small, private college': Liberal politics, jail expansion, and the carceral habitus

Theoretical Criminology

17(1) 71–88

© The Author(s) 2013

Reprints and permission:

sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/1362480612463113

tcr.sagepub.com



Judah Schept

Eastern Kentucky University, USA

Abstract

While scholarship has identified neoliberalism, punitive and racialized public policy, and a supportive culture of punishment as giving rise to mass incarceration in the United States, little work has examined how communities come to participate in the production of the carceral state. Using an ethnographic case study of a proposed 'justice campus', a carceral expansion project in a politically progressive Midwestern city, this article illuminates the capacity of mass incarceration to structure individual and community dispositions and, in doing so, to imbue even oppositional politics. At the same time, communities may adopt, reformulate, and rearticulate the symbolic work and material manifestations of mass incarceration in order to fit specific political-cultural contexts. As such, this article argues that mass incarceration is both more forceful and more subject to diverse and context-specific formulations than has been previously argued. The corporal and discursive inscription of carcerality into individual and community bodies suggests the presence of a carceral habitus and offers one way to comprehend not only mass incarceration's pervasive presence, but also its hegemonic operations even among and through people and communities who purport to reject it.

Keywords

County jails, ethnography, habitus, mass incarceration, punishment

Corresponding author:

Judah Schept, School of Justice Studies, Eastern Kentucky University, Stratton Building 467, Richmond, KY 40475, USA.

Email: Judah.schept@eku.edu

Introduction

Extensive carceral expansion in politically liberal communities would seem to contradict the extant literature on mass incarceration. The rich and compelling work examining the rise of the carceral state indicts punitive public policy and political ideologies (Clear, 1994; Currie, 1998; Garland, 2001), neoliberal globalization (Gilmore, 2007), the barrage of cultural representations of crime and punishment (Brown, 2009; Kappeler and Potter, 2004), and various combinations thereof (Donziger, 1996; Simon, 2007; Western, 2006) as instantiating an American hunger for more prisons.¹ Recent slight declines in the prison population notwithstanding, the implications of this oeuvre point toward a body politic responsive to punitive imprisonment discourses and practices and to continued carceral growth.

Some scholars have observed that liberal politicians have often advocated for continued prison expansion and harsh legislation in their efforts to match or outdo conservatives on punitive criminal justice policy. Alexander (2010: 7) and Gottschalk (2006: 10) offer historical perspectives on the complicity of liberals in both opening the door for and then actively championing penal growth. Feldman et al. (2001) offer a particular (and particularly poignant) focus on Bill Clinton as 'the Incarceration President'. Simon (2007: 59) also notes Clinton's strategy to match or outdo George HW Bush on punitiveness.² The role of liberal politicians, it would seem, has been to support carceral growth through endorsing the same rhetoric and policy as the Right.

Based on two years of ethnographic fieldwork in the Midwestern and politically liberal Lincoln County,³ this article examines one community's attempt at dramatic carceral expansion in the form of a 'justice campus'. In the county, which is home to the city of Springfield and the large University of Springfield, the liberal and leftist community leaders at the forefront of advocacy for the justice campus were also unabashed and informed critics of mass incarceration. In their words, the justice campus would express the distinct nature of local progressive politics, eschewing punishment for rehabilitation, and in the process, reduce recidivism, heal drug addiction, and provide much needed education. Indeed, in the very name 'justice campus', officials mapped the bucolic and collegiate identity of the community onto their proposal for the most drastic expansion of carceral control in county history. In their constructions of the campus and the population imagined to reside there, officials articulated that county carcerality existed outside of, and in resistance to, the practices of mass incarceration that they disdained.

Utilizing ethnographic content from my time in the field, this article theorizes the apparent discontinuities in politics and discourse between mass incarceration in the United States and local carceral expansion in Springfield and the surrounding Lincoln County. Borrowing from Carolyn Nordstrom's (2007) concept of *il/legal*, the term she employs to describe the permeable and even collapsed borders between legal and illegal channels through which commodities travel, I argue that local officials' abilities to advocate carceral expansion and simultaneously criticize the prison industrial complex demonstrate a *dis/juncture*: a disposition toward incarceration and punishment that is at once distinct and, crucially, bounded by and inscribed with the logics and practices of mass incarceration.

The dis/junctures from the field offer important points of departure for theorizing the operation of the carceral state in progressive communities. This article argues for the capacity of mass incarceration to structure individual and community dispositions and, in doing so, to imbue even oppositional politics. Such a claim suggests that existing scholarship perhaps underestimates both the hegemonic functioning of mass incarceration and the important roles that individual actors and communities play in adopting, reformulating and rearticulating carcerality to fit specific political-cultural contexts. As such, I argue that mass incarceration is both more forceful and more subject to diverse and context-specific formulations than has been articulated. This corporal and discursive inscription of carcerality into individual and community bodies—the *carceral habitus* as I refer to it below—is one way to make sense of mass incarceration’s pervasive presence even among and through the people and communities who purport to reject it.

Methods

Despite compelling scholarship on mass incarceration, there is an absence of research that examines how communities come to imagine the need for carcerality and its expansion, that is, the processes through which communities embrace the logics and practices of mass incarceration. Even in Loïc Wacquant’s (2002) observations of the ‘curious eclipse of prison ethnography’, his own call for renewed ethnographic engagement with the carceral state frames such scholarship rather narrowly as fieldwork in institutions.

The advocacy for the justice campus from Lincoln County’s liberal and progressive leadership suggests the need for ethno-methodological examinations of how the structural causes of mass incarceration, such as the rise of the neoliberal state and its punitive logics, shape—indeed, structure—the carceral practices of individual and community bodies. Ethnographic scholarship is well positioned to examine a phenomenon such as the promotion of carceral expansion through discourses of therapeutic justice, treatment, and education. As such, the present article takes up Rhodes’s (2001: 75) claim, which Wacquant (2002) dismisses, that ‘the most pressing need for the study of prisons is to challenge the terms of the discourse that frames and supports them’.

I first became active in the issues that this article examines in 2008, when, upon the release of the justice campus proposal by the county government, I co-founded an organization dedicated to jail reform. After a year as a community organizer with Decarcerate Lincoln County (DLC), I transitioned into a role as an ethnographer, while still remaining active with the organization. My prior involvement shaped my research focus; participation in meetings with local officials during that first year sharpened my sense of the dis/juncture between local and national discourses and politics of incarceration. Excavating the dis/junctures became a central part of the research. As such, I conducted 20 in-depth, semi-structured interviews with county and city politicians, civic leaders, criminal justice officials, corrections consultants, and community activists, many of whom were instrumental in shaping the local discourses of the justice campus. Interviews lasted between one and two hours. In addition, I conducted over 100 hours of field work at various gatherings in the community, including official public hearings about the justice campus, political forums for campaigning politicians, activist meetings, and cell block

visiting hours at the county jail. Finally, I collected numerous county reports and over 100 articles from local periodicals to historicize my inquiry and to examine the role of local media in establishing carceral habitus.

Fieldwork and analysis operated as semi-concurrent processes. Transcriptions of meetings and interviews often led to longer expositions; initial analyses of the field inevitably, and at times intentionally, affected subsequent interviews and observations. The central theoretical claim to emerge from my research—carceral habitus—was the product of an ongoing and iterative process of indexing data, exploring emergent themes, and reflecting on their ability to account for and explain the social world I was examining.⁴ In short, my process included the ‘grounded field research and critical ethnography’ advocated by Ferrell and Hamm (1998).

As a member of Decarcerate Lincoln County, I was intimately involved in the events this study examines and thus a brief discussion about positionality and research is warranted.⁵ In my fieldwork, I did not presuppose that different spaces were sites for unadulterated perspectives about the justice campus. On the contrary, I operated from the assumption that the research sites for this project would reveal spaces where meanings over carcerality were subject to contestation and conflation. With that said, there is ample support for engaged and politically committed ethnography from anthropology (Kirsch, 2002; Scheper-Hughes, 1992, 1995; Thomas, 1993) and impassioned if infrequent endorsement from within criminology (Ferrell and Hamm, 1998). Pierre Bourdieu has observed of scholars that, ‘those who have the good fortune to be able to devote their lives to the study of the social world cannot stand aside, neutral and indifferent, from the struggles in which the future of that world is at stake’ (Hillier and Rooksby, 2005: 7).

Studying the complex composition of mass incarceration in Lincoln County required ethnographic work acutely attuned to local process and trans-local context. As such, I examined carceral expansion in Lincoln County along the lines advocated by Smith (2001: 127, emphasis in the original) in his argument for ethnographies of the urban, that is, as ‘a crossroads ... for the interplay of diverse *localizing* practices of national, transnational, and even global-scale actors, as these wider networks of meaning and power come into contact with more locally configured networks, practices and identities’. Abu Lughod (1991: 150) has also called for a similar methodological lens in her argument for ‘ethnography of the particular’, suggesting that, ‘the effects of extralocal and long-term processes are only manifested locally and specifically, produced in the actions of individuals living their particular lives, inscribed in their bodies and their words’. As I explored these tensions, I saw the possibility for local political commitment alongside recognition and awareness of the multiple cultural contexts and social worlds in which the contest over the justice campus occurred.

Liberal carceral expansion: the Justice campus

In the fall of 2007, Lincoln County faced the threat of a lawsuit because of conditions at its jail due to overcrowding. Built in 1986 to house 126 prisoners and double bunked in 2006, the jail held well over 300 prisoners by the end of 2007 and the beginning of 2008. The jail suffered numerous health and safety problems that many in the community characterized as ‘human rights violations’. Reports from the county’s largest periodical,

The Lincoln News, noted that the overcrowding resulted in outbreaks of staph infections, in female prisoners sleeping in showers and male prisoners sleeping on cots in a large recreation room, and in shortages of necessary toiletries.

Through the leadership and advocacy of prominent local Democratic politicians, civic leaders, and criminal justice personnel, Lincoln County hired Project Administration Results, Inc. (PARI), a private firm specializing in corrections construction, to research, plan, and build the justice campus to alleviate the overcrowding and enlarge the county's carceral capacities. The complex would sit on an 85 acre lot purchased by the county in 2002 and would include a new jail with double the capacity of the current one (between 400 and 500 beds), a new 72 bed juvenile facility, a 100 bed work release center, and new offices for criminal justice professionals. Each individual facility would have exponentially expanded the county's capacities to incarcerate, detain, and monitor its residents. As one complex, the justice campus would have constituted the largest carceral growth in county history. Built into the proposal and the architectural rendering of the campus was the ability for each individual facility to double in size. The official cost of the complex was estimated to be between \$50 and \$75 million dollars.

Of course, municipal and state governments investing in carceral infrastructure is nothing new.⁶ What distinguished the descriptions of, and political investment in, the justice campus was the relative absence of, any rhetoric of punishment or law and order. Instead, advocates framed the justice campus as embodying a human rights solution to the human rights crisis of overcrowding and argued that the constitutive institutions would provide much needed rehabilitation and education. Importantly, many in the community juxtaposed the justice campus with mass incarceration. Community officials offered informed criticisms of the carceral state even as they passionately endorsed local carceral growth. The dis/juncture between their carceral politics writ nationally and locally was produced, in part, by an important misrecognition of history. The same forces that produced mass incarceration in the United States were, in fact, also structuring Lincoln County's exponential carceral growth.

Historicizing the justice campus reveals deep entrenchment in transnational neoliberal politics. The very site proposed for the complex, an 85-acre expanse of derelict land south of downtown Springfield, locates the justice campus in a larger story of globalization and migrations of industry, capital and jobs out of the community. Known colloquially in the county as 'The old TDA site', the 85 acres formerly housed a manufacturing plant owned by Technology Development of America, a well-known multinational corporation that makes household electronics. For decades during the 20th century the TDA plant was the largest employer in the county with 9000 county residents working there. During the last two decades of the 20th century, however, the plant slowly shed jobs, finally closing its doors in 1999, moving its operations to Mexico, and laying off the last 1200 workers in Springfield. The pattern of carceral growth replacing industry and job loss is not unique to Springfield and the county, and, in fact, connects the community to similar stories around the country (Gilmore, 2007; Hunter and Wagner, 2008; Williams, 2011).

Not a single informant spoke of this history as having any bearing on the contemporary debates about the justice campus. Important work in geography suggests that this silence isn't surprising. Don Mitchell (2000: 94) has written that landscapes should be

considered as both work—as in the product of labor and social contests over space—and as something that *does* work—as in a social agent that develops particular representations of places. Part of the work that landscape performs is the naturalization and even erasure of the relations of production and social struggles that created it (Mitchell, 2000: 103–104).

Despite the absence of the history of the TDA site from official publications and discourse, the migration of capital and jobs that followed TDA out of the county would seem to be a critical part of the justice campus story. First, officials imagined a pathologically poor jail(able) population, rendering local poverty, crime, and social control as ahistorical phenomena, the consequences of which are nothing short of the attribution of naturalized differences in populations sharing the same social space (Gupta and Ferguson, 1992). In omitting from their local understandings of the jail(able) population any discussion of the historical and transnational structuring of local poverty, officials revealed a fundamental part of the discursive power of carceral habitus; as Bourdieu (1990: 56) notes, habitus is ‘embodied history, internalized as a second nature and so forgotten as history’. In looking to build the justice campus at the very site from which 9000 jobs disappeared, local officials proposed an answer to the question of what is left for the children and grandchildren of the class of skilled (if narrowly so), un- or under-educated, and now jobless former workers in the wake of migrations of capital and industry out of the county: carceral futures.⁷

Second, the very ability to imagine a justice campus was predicated on the ways in which transnational structural forces have shaped the spatial-political possibilities in the county. That is, quite literally, the justice campus relied on TDA’s departure and the resulting loss of jobs and capital for its very material and spatial potentiality. Gilmore (2007: 11) has proposed that the view of prisons as sitting on the physical edge—at the margins of social spaces containing marginal people who are marginalized in fights for rights—belies the reality that prisons are interfaces of spaces, peoples, and issues and connect non-contiguous places into relationships. The justice campus enacted a similar place-making function, connecting (and collapsing) local, national and transnational histories and forces into a singular institutional complex. Understood as such, and in contrast to officials’ dislocations of the justice campus from the politics of mass incarceration, local discourse and politics actually point to the porous nature of the boundaries surrounding an imagined locality.

As Bourdieu (2005: 46) argues, habitus is the set of generative dispositions that are nonetheless bounded by structural forces that set and inscribe them. Neoliberal flows of capital and politics structured Lincoln County to lose the TDA plant. What remains to be asked, however, is how local officials came to see the derelict 85 acres as containing the spatial and social contours for a carceral complex.

Carceral habitus

The ability for local officials opposed to incarceration to reproduce its physical structures and practices required important intellectual shifts. Officials had to ignore or overlook the ways that the campus would complete a geographical and political-economic trajectory from industry to incarceration. That is, officials could not articulate locally

what they consistently offered nationally: a critique of neoliberalism and its structuring of poverty. This ‘forgetting’ of local transnational history was met by perhaps a greater intellectual feat: the dislocation of local carceral politics from the national history and contemporary circulations of mass incarceration. Bourdieu (1977: 78) notes that it is precisely this forgetting of history—‘history turned into nature’—that brings objective structures into a practical relationship with what he calls the conjuncture, or the place where habitus and its field reside. He writes that,

The ‘unconscious’ is never anything other than the forgetting of history which history itself produces by incorporating the objective structures it produces in the second natures of habitus ... It is because subjects do not, strictly speaking, know what they are doing that what they do has more meaning than they know. The habitus is the universalizing mediation which causes an individual agent’s practices, without either explicit reason or signifying intent, to be none the less ‘sensible’ and ‘reasonable’.

(Bourdieu, 1977: 78–79)

Habitus suggests that the logics and practices of mass incarceration reside not just ‘out there’—in media representations of crime and criminal justice, in the racialized ‘tough on crime’ rhetoric of politicians, and in the everyday operations of criminal justice systems—but also ‘in here’, that is, in our everyday negotiations and productions of the social world. Understood as such, officials’ proposals to produce a carceral ‘solution’—the justice campus—to an admitted carceral problem—jail overcrowding—carried an internal logic and could seem, as Bourdieu notes, ‘sensible’ and ‘reasonable’.

Empirical examples from the field illustrate the operations of carceral habitus. I have abstracted these examples into two categories in order to demonstrate two different emergent themes from my fieldwork: the construction of an exceptional institution and the construction of an imagined jail(able) population. Demonstrating these two thematic streams has required on occasion the breaking up of otherwise singular quotes. Both examples illuminate ways in which circulating national and transnational logics of criminality and incarceration structured local dispositions even as local officials also framed their support for carceral expansion in opposition to these logics and in relation to other ‘objective structures’, such as education and mental health.

‘If God came down’: the construction of an exceptional institution

Early in my fieldwork, I sat in the audience in a meeting room at the public library in the vibrant downtown center of Springfield. I was one of perhaps 45 community residents who had gathered to hear current and campaigning county politicians speak about the local criminal justice system and the recently announced plans for the justice campus. Long-time county politician Reuben Davison, an outspoken liberal Democrat who frequently spoke of his service in the Second World War as radicalizing his politics and turning him into a Quaker peace activist, was the first to speak to the public. He offered a line that I would hear him repeat in future meetings and in an interview: ‘The shame of this country in the 18th century was slavery. The shame of this country in the 19th and

20th centuries was Jim Crow. The shame of this country in the 21st century is the prison industrial complex'. On this and future evenings, Davison followed his oratory locating mass incarceration as part of a historical trajectory of racist and racializing institutions with a seemingly incongruous second point: an emphatic and passionate plea to build the justice campus, noting that: 'We've been talking and planning for too long. It's time to build the campus'. In a later interview, when asked about whether the racism of the prison industrial complex manifested in the county, Davison flatly said 'no' despite admitting similar disproportionate representation of people of color in the county jail.

A similar implicit invocation of a fortified boundary around the county that excluded national logics of mass incarceration surfaced in an interview with a local attorney named Tom Grady. Grady chaired a criminal justice advisory body called the Lincoln County Criminal Justice Advisory Board (LCCJAB). The LCCJAB was comprised of mostly criminal justice officials and had made the initial recommendation to the county to build the justice campus. Grady, like most members of the advisory body and the county political establishment, was both a Democrat and an outspoken critic of mass incarceration.

At one point during our interview as the subject turned from introductory formalities to the state of incarceration, Grady strongly criticized the war on drugs. Sitting in the conference room of his law office, he lowered his voice, leaned across the table, and put out his right hand holding his thumb and forefinger an inch apart. 'I am this close to embracing full on drug legalization', he said. He then offered his perspective on national imprisonment, saying,

On the one hand, I think we incarcerate way too many people for way too long a period of time in this country. I think it's ridiculous. All our politicians run on the platform of tough on crime. I have no sympathy for that.

Having offered this indictment of incarceration in the United States, Grady then turned his attention to the justice campus:

The exciting thing about the campus issue was the space for programs, a place for rehabilitation, and a place not just to warehouse more people but to get away from warehousing. So in a perfect world if God came down and said here's \$50 million dollars to build a justice campus, I think it would make us a better community.

Having just strongly condemned mass incarceration and advocated for ending the war on drugs, Grady offered what can best be described as a prayer for a local, new and large complex of carceral facilities. Indeed, Grady had played an integral role in the official political process promoting the justice campus, hiring a corrections consultant firm as part of his role on the LCCJAB and penning an op-ed in the county's largest periodical, *The Lincoln News*, urging local residents to get involved on behalf of the justice campus.

Even those county officials who criticized the ultimate rendering of the justice campus defended the initial concept. Former county council member Bridget Markham had run for office in 2008 on a platform of building the justice campus. In our interview she

rejected the massive nature of the final proposal but restated her support for a complex that featured,

a lockdown facility ... [with] a progressive and innovative educational component, alternative programming, and with the feel of a small, private college, where there could be school programs, programs related to other disciplines at the university, the kinds of initiatives that exist there—local food programs, things like that.

It would be inaccurate to conclude that incarceration was the only structuring processes forming local habitus. Bridget Markham's references to both education and local food in the context of articulating support for a jail are instructive. First, in the very terminology of 'justice campus' and the programs imagined for it, there are clear indications that local habituses formed in relationship to structuring processes from various fields. In campus advocates' descriptions of the imagined institutions through discourses from education, social service, mental health, religion and sustainable agriculture, it would seem that the school, the church, the asylum, the treatment center and even the small farm informed and structured the local carceral habitus alongside the penal institution.

Second, Markham's reference to local food programs reveals the rhetorical and conceptual influence of Lincoln County's strong and vibrant 'locavore' movement. Springfield boasted a nationally recognized farmers market and there were city, county and non-profit organizations dedicated to expanding sustainable agriculture, local cuisine and local economy. Many civic and political leaders articulated their support for the justice campus, in particular the juvenile facility component, through a refrain of 'keeping local kids local'. This slogan relied on the political-cultural capital generated by community support for local food. In a fascinating twist of logics and imbrication of movements, officials mapped the passion and energy around 'locavorism' onto a call for increased local 'punishment consumption' (Simon, 2010). Understanding habitus as situated among multiple fields further resolves a number of statements made by local officials that otherwise seem contradictory and irreconcilable.

Even as Bourdieu argues that multiple fields influence habitus, he also emphasizes that habitus is a generative principle; rather than a reproduction of objective structures, Bourdieu (2005: 46) argues that habitus 'generates inventions and improvisations but within limits'. In the meeting of habitus with the limits imposed by objective structures, there is an important confrontation where, Bourdieu (2005: 47) contends, 'habitus operates as a structuring structure able to selectively perceive and to transform the objective structure according to its own structure, while at the same time, being restructured, transformed in its makeup by the pressure of the objective structure'. This is a particularly helpful exposition on the dynamic relationship between habitus and 'objective structures'. In Lincoln County, the inevitable comparison local officials had to make to existing physical structures, such as prisons, juvenile facilities, and other existing carceral institutions, shaped their articulation of what was possible locally, both positively—'we have to lock up some people'—and negatively—'we are about treatment and education, not punishment'. That is, objective carceral structures offered officials both the physical template for what they envisioned and a symbolic template against

which they could critically position the justice campus. In both cases, however, officials failed to recognize the ways in which their dispositions toward incarceration were already structured by existing carceral paradigms. As such, much of what I found in Lincoln County confirms Schaeffer's (2004: 119) contention that 'hegemony operates at the level of human agency'. At the same time, the Lincoln County context affirms that agentive iterations of objective structures are possible. That is, habitus is hegemony embodied *and* reformulated and rearticulated to fit within local dispositions.

Integrating welfare and security logics

Perhaps the central expression of carceral habitus in Lincoln County was a specific vision of the justice campus that integrated security and welfare logics into one articulation of carcerality. Early in my fieldwork, Lincoln County Probation Director Carrie Donnelly sought a meeting with two community organizers from Decarcerate Lincoln County in order to clarify her position on the justice campus. She was interested in hearing DLC's perspective, but also believed that the organization was misinformed and overstating the problematic nature of the justice campus proposal. My field notes from our meeting convey Donnelly's vision for the campus:

During the meeting, Donnelly laid out her personal and more expansive vision of the campus: to erect on the 85 acre site a complex that would include not only adult and youth jails, but also centralized social services. She explained that the poor of the county could visit their loved ones in jail while also accessing the food pantries, housing and employment assistance, and social work offices that formed the important components of their safety net. In this vision, the justice campus would constitute a one-stop-shop for poor people, a bucolic strip mall of incarceration and social service.

At least one other official consequential to the justice campus proposal—a former judge named Bill Rusch who many officials credited as the campus's intellectual architect—articulated a similar expansive vision for the 85 acres. Both Rusch and Donnelly told me that they believed this vision would do a favor for the county poor by offering a streamlined and efficient experience of negotiating the social service bureaucracy. Of course, this vision also suggested a subsuming of the actual needs of people in favor of concerns about bureaucratic management and operations. In governing both poverty and criminal justice needs through integrating and co-locating welfare services and incarceration, Donnelly and others collapsed poverty and incarceration into one spatial-political articulation. While no doubt attempting to alleviate some of the burdens of travel for people accessing the community safety net, officials nonetheless envisioned a physical carceral continuum where the jail, juvenile facility and work release center ensnared food pantries, housing assistance, shelters, and other services into their domain. Indeed, Carrie Donnelly noted that the justice campus would help poor people by 'allowing them to visit their loved ones and then go get their food stamps'. This geography of poverty identified and attempted to instantiate the carceral facility as the central organizing mechanism of poor people's lives.

The justice campus archipelago (Foucault, 1977)—the three constitutive carceral components imagined alongside social services—reveals both the structured and structuring capacities of the carceral habitus.⁸ The justice campus would perform a clasping of the Left and Right hands of the local government, a linking of social welfare and penal policies, geographies, and individuals (Bourdieu, 1994; Wacquant, 2009, 2010). In remaking carceral expansion as a welfarist policy initiative, county officials conceptualized their project as operating outside of the logics of mass incarceration. Theorizing the local articulation of the justice campus as an attempted dis-articulation from the carceral state requires an examination of how various fields, including penal, education, and welfare, structured local individual and community bodies to endorse carceral growth while maintaining that they were, in fact, doing exactly the opposite.

The collapse of welfare and neoliberal state logics into one project produced a carceral model with a number of seeming contradictions. In consistently eschewing punishment for rehabilitation and insisting that the justice campus and its constitutive elements would be based on therapeutic justice, officials resurrected penal welfarist approaches to crime and delinquency, all the while implicitly positioning county carceral politics as distinct and exceptional. Moreover, in the visions of Carrie Donnelly, Bill Rusch and others, the justice campus would serve as a literal hub of welfare, a centralized location of incarceration and social service around which the lives of the county poor could orbit.

Of course, such a vision is complicated and co-opted not only by the problematic rendering of poverty and carcerality as interchangeable and co-locatable conditions, but also by the underlying neoliberal logic of creating large new exclusionary spaces that physically confine populations perceived as risky and subjects them to coerced treatment. Indeed, as Harcourt (2010: 80, emphasis in original) has noted, ‘the logic of neoliberal penalty facilitates contemporary punishment practices by encouraging the belief that the legitimate space for government intervention is in the penal sphere—*there and there alone*’. Wacquant (2010: 201) has written extensively on this idea, arguing in an article that his book *Punishing the Poor* ‘insert[s] the police, the courts, and the prison as core constituents of the “Right hand” of the state’ and suggests that scholars ‘need to bring penal policies from the periphery to the center’ in our analyses of neoliberal poverty. In shifting priorities, discourses and resources from the social to the penal wings of the State and also engaging in a ‘penalization of welfare’, the United States has enacted a ‘colonization of the welfare sector by the panoptic and punitive logic characteristic of the postrehabilitation penal bureaucracy’ (Wacquant, 2010: 201).

While the penalization of welfare to which Wacquant refers is the gradual erosion of public funding and the growing reliance on so-called workfare, the placement of a social service hub within a carceral complex suggests a similar phenomenon. While Donnelly and other officials may have intended to ease the burdens of people in need by co-locating carceral punishment and social service, they no doubt relied on a construction of ‘kindred problem populations’ requiring ‘people-processing institutions’ (Wacquant, 2010).

But the justice campus does not fit neatly into Wacquant’s (2010) reconceptualization of the relationship between the Left and Right hands of the State. He argues that the new government of social insecurity has changed the notion of ‘poor relief’ to mean relief

'from the poor' through punitive containment and 'by forcibly "disappearing" the most disruptive of them' (2010: 204).⁹ Dissecting the expansion of penal approaches to problems of poverty is certainly apposite. Yet framing this transition to penalty solely as a function of the ideological control of the neoliberal market misses the ways in which, in Lincoln County, the same institutional shifts were framed as an *expansion* of welfare. None of my respondents sought to minimize social services; on the contrary, many were critical of 'workfare' politics. The campus, they argued, would further instantiate a locally robust social service network and safety net while imbuing the neighboring carceral facilities with an ethos of therapeutic justice.

The justice campus, then, offered a carceral vision premised on welfarist promises but imagined through what Hallsworth and Lea (2011: 144) have called in this journal the 'post-welfare hegemonic project' of securitization. The vision offered a structure of hybrid carceral governance that resurrected welfare state logics but located them in a security state apparatus and thus literally confined treatment to the coercive and punitive institution.

'They have different values and different lifestyles': the construction of a jail(able) population

Lincoln County officials grounded their support for the justice campus in an imagined jail(able) population of county residents whom they often described in terms conflating economic and moral poverty. While many of these same respondents frequently identified the structural conditions of capitalism as the central problem underlying mass incarceration, they subscribed to the local construct of an individuated, unacculturated, and pathological actor and proposed solutions centered on individual, moralistic, and redemptive change. In constructing the county poor to be in not only fragile economic situations but also to possess a set of racialized and inferior behavioral and cultural practices, local leaders legitimated the need for a facility predicated on education, treatment, and acculturation to middle class status.

Officials based their determinations about the jail(able) population in part on their own experiences with the local jail population. As I describe below, officials cited certain behaviors, family arrangements, intergenerational recidivism rates, and other indicators of inferiority in their rationalizations for the justice campus. That is, officials justified their sweeping indictments of the population based on a sense of legibility; officials *knew* this population and thus their critiques could operate outside of the culture of poverty rhetoric they otherwise disdained. Of critical importance, however, is that such a sense of knowing indicates the operation of the carceral habitus. Schaeffer (2004: 104) notes that habitus,

becomes the site of the dominant social order ... and leads the individual social actor to misrecognize the power relations manifesting themselves through interpersonal interactions, that is interactions of habituses, as arbitrary, when in fact they are a direct result of the structuring of society.

In one example of local constructs of the jail(able) population, long-time county politician Reuben Davison offered his sense of who was in the current jail and whom the justice campus would serve:

They're mostly young men from 16–36, and about 80–90 percent are from the social economic lower part of society. Most of them didn't do well in school, didn't do well in sports. For whatever reason, they are basically a subculture. They don't have a stake in their culture. They have different values and different lifestyles ... I've heard it said more than once by people, you can generally tell by third grade which kids are going to wind up in the system ... One of the causes of the problem is that we simply don't deal with the issue that all these people come from the lower class.

Davison's comments reveal important ways that advocates of the justice campus made local poverty an issue of cultural pathology. Davison argued that incarceration is practically inevitable for the local poor since 'you can tell by third grade which kids are going to wind up in the system'. Such a sweeping statement interestingly integrated a narrow reading of life course theories of crime with the practices of some prison administrations to project institutional beds based on third grade test scores, in order to rationalize local expansion (Gillis, 2006; Piquero and Mazerolle, 2001).

Davison was not alone in offering such constructs. A jail and jailable population emerged in official county discourse that was 'anti-social' in their behavior and personality,¹⁰ 'red neck' in their romantic relationships,¹¹ 'unsocialized',¹² in their interactions with the community, governed by 'subcultural norms and values',¹³ and implicated in 'intergenerational recidivism'.¹⁴ Despite paying rhetorical attention to criticizing the structural constraints imposed by capitalism, officials and local media often naturalized poverty in the county, mapping various inferior behaviors onto the economic condition of being poor.

Frequently, officials predicated their support of the campus on notions of criminal free will and by using state law as an alibi. In the same interview with Tom Grady excerpted above, he observed of the local jail and local jail inmates that,

No one is up in the jail as a first time drug offender. Having said I think we incarcerate far too many people for far too long, I personally think our local justice system is working their butts off to try and keep the jail population as low as possible ... Cause those folks in the jail ... are going to continue their behavior that is criminal, and when they're on probation continuously, there's only so much the judges can do.

Curiously, constructions of the jail(able) population as anti-social, incorrigible, and morally impoverished contrasted sharply with the available evidence from the county. In the Lincoln County Sheriff's Office 2011 annual report, the data included a list of the top 10 jail admissions by offense. Of the 6178 people admitted to the jail in 2011, the most frequent charge was for public intoxication, with 1155 admissions, or 18.5 percent of the total for the year. Following public intoxication, the top 10 admissions by offense included drunk driving (486 or 7.8 percent), 'D' felony theft (291 or 4.7 percent),¹⁵ probation violation warrants (219 or 3.5 percent), resisting law enforcement (168 or 2.7 percent), illegal consumption (144 or 2.3 percent), writ of attachment (136 or 2.2 percent),¹⁶ 'A' misdemeanor battery (125 or 2 percent),¹⁷ marijuana possession (124 or 2 percent) and criminal trespass (106 or 1.7 percent). While it is neither the intention nor place of this article to minimize the potential harms of these actions, it is important to point out that at most two of these can be construed as potentially violent.

Moreover, by simply not incarcerating someone for being drunk in public, the county could have reduced the jail population by almost 20 percent, to say nothing of the potential diversion options for probation violations, writs of attachment, and illegal consumption. While local officials were correct in observing that the jail population consisted almost exclusively of the county's poor, it would seem that many students attending the University of Springfield, an institution consistently ranked as among the top party schools in the country, could probably be admitted to the jail for the same offenses.

In addition to the discontinuities between officials' explanations of poverty nationally and locally, their constructs of criminality expressed a subtler and more insidious dis/juncture: officials racialized criminality even as they spoke out against the racism of the prison industrial complex.¹⁸ Local racialization occurred in two distinct ways. Most obviously, officials racialized whiteness through invoking the 'red neck' and 'white trash' identities of the jail(able) population. These identity constructs collapse classism and racism into one term and enable two things, according to whiteness scholars Matt Wray and Anallee Newitz (1997: 172): 'naming actually existing white people who occupy the economic and social margins of American life, and [proposing] myths and stereotypes that justify their continued marginalization'. In this case, such constructions justified a facility designed for acculturation and moral education.

These constructions of the jail(able) population, and the type of facility imagined for them, also racialized a non-white criminal population. Census data reveal largely white populations in both the city of Springfield (87 percent) and the surrounding Lincoln County (88 percent). Informants often spoke of 'real crime' and 'real criminals' as products of other(ized) places, such as Chicago and other larger Midwestern urban centers.¹⁹ In one example from an interview, Carrie Donnelly, the head of Lincoln County probation, referred to local youth violence as being committed by a group of 'organized wannabees' rather than by 'real gangs', suggesting that the latter criminal designation could never apply to local (read: white) youth. This rhetorical racialization of crime supports the contention of scholars, such as Muhammad (2010), who suggest the presence of a 'glue' that binds crime to race such that white people can commit crime but black people are 'criminals'. Moreover, in the very premise of a largely white community creating a benevolent system of therapeutic justice, one must inquire as to whether such compassion would be extended to a jail(able) population of a darker hue. On this latter point, Geoff Ward (2009: 228) has noted of the Progressive era child savers that,

Rehabilitative efforts were often reserved for native-born and immigrant Anglo Americans in white-dominated juvenile court communities, where common European ancestry and white skin rendered them less threatening, distinctly 'salvageable,' and ultimately more assimilable—culturally, economically, and politically—than black and other nonwhite youth.

Given the largely white demographic of Lincoln County, it would seem that the very concept of the justice campus—as a benevolent carceral institution whose mission was the reformation, redemption, and reintegration of its inhabitants into the community—was predicated on a largely white jail(able) population and guided by the 'invisible hand

of racial nepotism that sets the limits of cruel and unusual punishment for white Americans' (Muhammad, 2011: 77).

Conclusion

The inconsistent carceral politics among Lincoln County officials are instructive for deeper theoretical engagement with mass incarceration. In advocating for the justice campus while deriding national prison growth and policy, officials demonstrated more than just contradiction or denial. Rather, their positions constituted a dis/juncture: an articulation of carcerality offering distinctions from punitive penalty and yet heavily inscribed with the logics and practices of mass incarceration. By tracing the history of the campus and the trajectory of the discourse and politics that supported it, this article has argued that these dis/junctures reveal the presence of a carceral habitus. This set of dispositions was structured on the one hand by the hegemony of mass incarceration and on the other by the influences of the specific community of Springfield, itself already structurally positioned to mold carceral expansion in the image of a progressive, welfarist, and even collegiate 'campus'.

As an iteration of mass incarceration, the justice campus raises important considerations for understanding 21st-century US carcerality. Support for carceral expansion by progressive and liberal community leaders who imagined benevolent local institutions reveals contours of mass incarceration that scholarship has yet to excavate. The present research suggests the need for examining the locally situated ways in which the logics and practices of hegemonic carcerality take shape, at times in contrast to its more familiar forms at the level of the State and nation.

Notes

1. Simon (2010) has proposed considering mass incarceration as a problem of consumption.
2. See Braz (2006) for a perspective on expansion that is similar to the one taken in this article.
3. All names of places and people have been changed to protect their identities.
4. Readers interested in these analytical processes should also see Bogazianos (2012: 149–154) and Thomas (1993: 47).
5. Compelling discussions of positionality and reflexivity abound in the anthropology literature, particularly among several feminist anthropology texts (see Behar and Gordon, 1995; Haraway (1991). These discussions of positionality often focus on race, class, gender, and sexual orientation. Thus, I consider them as suggesting accountability for my subject position as an activist rather than as authoritative claims. For a critique of this work and an articulation of an alternative reflexivity, see Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992: 72). For an examination of the nexus of activism and scholarship, see Sudbury and Okazawa-Rey (2009).
6. Since 1984, California, perhaps the bellwether state for carceral expansion, has built 24 new prisons, 13 smaller community corrections facilities, five prison camps, and five mother-prison centers (see Gilmore, 2007).
7. There is substantial scholarship on the connections between job loss, persistent joblessness and incarceration (see Simon, 1993; Wilson, 1997).
8. Foucault's (1977) concept of the carceral archipelago was an invaluable analytic during this study. Numerous other proposals that occurred during and after the justice campus offered a panoptic extension of control, surveillance, and punishment that the term so usefully signifies.

9. Wacquant (2010: 204) notes numerous legislative changes in California and at the federal level that signify the merging of welfare management into the penal realm.
10. Judge Allan Barrett in the LCCJAB-hosted justice campus meeting (November 2008).
11. Public defender Dan Little, also an opinion-editorial contributor to the *Lincoln News*, describing his own client.
12. County council member Reuben Davison in an interview.
13. County council member Reuben Davison in an interview.
14. County councilmember Brian Mulvaney and corrections consultant Victoria Krause in separate interviews.
15. Indiana Code 35-43-4-2, Theft, provides that theft is a 'D' felony if the property is under \$100,000, punishable by six months to three years in prison.
16. Indiana Code 34-47-4-2, Writ of attachment of the body of the person, provides for 'procuring personal jurisdiction' over a person who is in violation of a court order. This was often utilized to jail people for failure to pay child support. Decarcerate Lincoln County discovered substantial public opposition to this particular practice, notably from the spouses and partners of those incarcerated for a Writ. According to them, the back child support payments usually reflected low wage employment and a lack of ability (rather than a lack of desire) to pay.
17. Indiana Code 35-42-2-1, Battery, provides: (a) A person who knowingly or intentionally touches another person in a rude, insolent, or angry manner commits battery, a class B misdemeanor. However, the offense is a class A misdemeanor if it results in bodily injury to another person, or is committed against a law enforcement, correctional facility officer or firefighter who is lawfully engaged in the execution of his duties.
18. There is a rich literature examining mass incarceration as a racist and racializing institution, including work on the criminalization of blackness (Muhammad, 2010, 2011), the contemporary disproportionate imprisonment of people of color (Gilmore, 2007; James, 2002, 2007; Loury, 2008), and the collateral consequences of such racialized practices (Clear, 2007; Mauer and Chesney-Lind, 2002), including the extension of Jim Crow discrimination through incarceration (Alexander, 2010).
19. See Alexander (2010: 193) for a short discussion of the notion of 'real crime' as black crime.

References

- Abu Lughod L (1991) Writing against culture. In: Fox RG (ed.) *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present*. Santa Fe, NM: SAR Press, pp. 137–162.
- Alexander M (2010) *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness*. New York: The New Press.
- Behar R and Gordon DA (eds) (1995) *Women Writing Culture*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Bogazianos DA (2012) *5 Grams: Crack Cocaine, Rap Music, and the War on Drugs*. New York: New York University Press.
- Bourdieu P (1977) *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu P (1990) *The Logic of Practice*. New York: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu P (1994) Rethinking the state: On the genesis and structure of the bureaucratic field. *Sociological Theory* 12(1): 1–19.
- Bourdieu P (2005) Habitus. In: Hillier J and Rooksby E (eds) *Habitus: A Sense of Place*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, pp. 43–52.
- Bourdieu P and Wacquant LD (1992) *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Braz R (2006) Kindler, gentler, gender responsive cages: Prison expansion is not prison reform. *Women, Girls & Criminal Justice* October–November: 87–91.

- Brown M (2009) *The Culture of Punishment: Prison, Society and Spectacle*. New York: New York University Press.
- Clear TR (1994) *Harm in American Penology: Offenders, Victims, and Their Communities*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Clear TR (2007) *Imprisoning Communities: How Mass Incarceration Makes Disadvantaged Neighborhoods Worse*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Currie E (1998) *Crime and Punishment in America: Why the Solutions to America's Most Stubborn Social Crisis Have Not Worked—and What Will*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Donziger SR (ed.) (1996) *The Real War on Crime: The Report of the National Criminal Justice Commission*. New York: Harper Perennial.
- Feldman L, Schiraldi V and Ziedenberg J (2001) *Too Little Too Late: President Clinton's Prison Legacy*. Washington, DC: The Justice Policy Institute.
- Ferrell J and Hamm M (eds) (1998) *Ethnography at the Edge: Crime, Deviance and Field Research*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Foucault M (1977) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Random House Vintage.
- Garland D (2001) *Culture of Control: Crime and Social Order in Contemporary Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gillis M (2006) Hire that reading Czar. *New York Times*, 24 September. Available at: http://www.nytimes.com/2006/09/24/opinion/nyregionopinions/24CTgillis.html?_r=0.
- Gilmore R (2007) *Golden Gulag: Prisons, Surplus, Crisis, and Opposition in Globalizing California*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Gottschalk M (2006) *The Prison and the Gallows: The Politics of Mass Incarceration in America*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gupta A and Ferguson J (1992) Beyond 'culture': Space, identity and the politics of difference. *Cultural Anthropology* 7(1): 6–23.
- Hallsworth S and Lea J (2011) Reconstructing leviathan: Emerging contours of the security state. *Theoretical Criminology* 15(2): 141–157.
- Haraway D (1991) *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Routledge.
- Harcourt B (2010) Neoliberal penalty: A brief genealogy. *Theoretical Criminology* 14(1): 74–92.
- Hillier J and Rooksby E (eds) (2005) *Habitus: A Sense of Place*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Hunter G and Wagner P (2008) Prisons, politics and the census. In: Herivel T and Wright P (eds) *Prison Profiteers: Who Makes Money from Mass Incarceration*. New York: The New Press, pp. 80–89.
- James J (ed.) (2002) *States of Confinement: Policing, Detention, and Prisons*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- James J (ed.) (2007) *Warfare in the American Homeland: Policing and Prison in a Penal Democracy*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Kappeler VE and Potter GE (2004) *The Mythology of Crime and Criminal Justice*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- Kirsch S (2002) Anthropology and advocacy: A case study of the campaign against the Ok Tedi Mine. *Critique of Anthropology* 22: 175–200.
- Loury G (2008) *Race, Incarceration, and American Values*. Boston: MIT Press.
- Mauer M and Chesney-Lind M (eds) (2002) *Invisible Punishment: The Collateral Consequences of Mass Imprisonment*. New York: New Press.
- Mitchell D (2000) *Cultural Geography: A Critical Introduction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Muhammad KG (2010) *The Condemnation of Blackness: Race, Crime, and the Making of Modern Urban America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Muhammad KG (2011) Where did all the white criminals go? Reconfiguring race and crime on the road to mass incarceration. *Souls: A Critical Journal of Black Politics, Culture, and Society* 13(1): 72–90.
- Nordstrom C (2007) *Global Outlaws: Crime, Money and Power in the Contemporary World*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Piquero A and Mazerolle P (eds) (2001) *Life-Course Criminology: Contemporary and Classic Readings*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Rhodes L (2001) Towards an anthropology of prisons. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30: 65–83.
- Schaeffer S (2004) *Resisting Ethics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Scheper-Hughes N (1992) *Death without Weeping: The Violence of Everyday Life in Brazil*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Scheper-Hughes N (1995) The primacy of the ethical: Propositions for a militant anthropology. *Current Anthropologist* 36(3): 409–440.
- Simon J (1993) *Poor Discipline: Parole and the Social Control of the Underclass, 1890–1990*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Simon J (2007) *Governing through Crime: How the War on Crime Transformed American Democracy and Created a Culture of Fear*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Simon J (2010) Do these prisons make me look fat? Moderating the USA's consumption of punishment. *Theoretical Criminology* 14(3): 257–272.
- Smith MP (2001) *Transnational Urbanism: Locating Globalization*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Sudbury J and Okazawa-Rey M (2009) *Activist Scholarship: Antiracism, Feminism and Social Change*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Thomas J (1993) *Doing Critical Ethnography*. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Wacquant L (2002) The curious eclipse of prison ethnography in the age of mass incarceration. *Ethnography* 3(4): 371–397.
- Wacquant L (2009) *Punishing the Poor: The Neoliberal Government of Social Insecurity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Wacquant L (2010) Crafting the neoliberal state: Workfare, prisonfare, and social insecurity. *Sociological Forum* 25(2): 197–220.
- Ward G (2009) The 'other' child-savers: Racial politics of the parental state. In: Platt A *The Child Savers: The Invention of Delinquency* (40th Anniversary edn). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Western B (2006) *Punishment and Inequality in America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Williams EJ (2011) *The Big House in a Small Town: Prisons, Communities, and Economics in Rural America*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.
- Wilson WJ (1997) *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor*. New York: Random House.
- Wray M and Newitz A (1997) What is white trash? Stereotypes and economic conditions of poor whites in the United States. In: Hill M (ed.) *Whiteness: A Critical Reader*. New York: New York University Press.

Judah Schept is Assistant Professor of Justice Studies at Eastern Kentucky University. His research examines representations and contestations of mass incarceration.