

## Introduction

More judges and more “experts” for the courts, improved educational and therapeutic programs in penal institutions, more and better trained personnel at higher salaries, preventive surveillance of predelinquent children, greater use of probation, careful classification of inmates, preventive detention through indeterminate sentences, small “cottage” institutions, halfway houses, removal of broad classes of criminals (such as juveniles) from criminal and “nonpunitive” processes, the use of lay personnel in treatment—all this paraphernalia of the “new” criminology appears over and over in nineteenth-century reformist literature.

—American Friends Service Committee, *The Struggle for Justice*

It is in the nature of the calamitous situation existing today that even the most honorable reformer who recommends renewal in threadbare language reinforces the existing order he seeks to break by taking over its worn-out categorical apparatus and the pernicious power-philosophy lying behind it.

—Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno, *Dialectic of Enlightenment*

Thus, unconsciously, often incoherently, in thinking [about] the question of crime within the framework of common-sense ideas, the great majority of us have no other mental equipment or apparatus, no other social categories of thought, apart from those which have been constructed for us in other moments of time, in other spaces in the social formation. Each of the phases in the development of our social formation has thus transmitted a number of seminal ideas about crime *to* our generation; and these “sleeping forms” are made active again whenever common-sense

thinking about crime uncoils itself. The ideas and social images of crime which have thus been embodied in legal and political practices historically provide the present horizons of thought inside our consciousness; we continue to “think” crime *in them*—they continue to think crime *through us*.

—Stuart Hall et al., *Policing the Crisis*

The history of liberal law-and-order matters because the same proposals for better administration, proffered with the same good intentions, are likely to reproduce the same monstrous outcomes in the twenty-first century.

—Naomi Murakawa, *The First Civil Right*

## A Disorienting Moment

In the spring of 2008, just a few weeks before county Democratic primary elections, I sat in the audience in a meeting room at the public library in the vibrant center of downtown Bloomington, Indiana. I was one of perhaps forty-five community residents who had gathered on this evening to hear current and campaigning Democratic county politicians speak about the local criminal justice system and the recently announced plans for its expansion in the form of a so-called justice campus. Although firm details of the plan had yet to emerge, the general contours of the facility had been made available to the public. The justice campus would sit on eighty-five currently vacant acres and would consist of three institutions—a new jail, a juvenile facility, and a community corrections work release center—accompanied by new offices for the county sheriff’s department. The jail would more than double the capacity of the existing facility; the juvenile facility and work release center would create two entirely new institutions in the community. The justice campus would constitute the largest carceral expansion in the county’s history.

I had been puzzled by the proposal for expansion. I had been living in Bloomington for three years and had come to regard as well deserved its reputation as a progressive—and certainly a college—town. A small city

of 130,000 residents that is home to Indiana University, Bloomington had a lively local art and music scene, a downtown commercial district with a limited number of chain stores and thriving small businesses, and a strong network of community and nonprofit organizations. The governments of Bloomington and Monroe County boasted sustainability commissions, a peak oil task force, and a human rights commission. There was also a Bloomington City Council resolution condemning Arizona's anti-immigrant Senate Bill 1070 and symbolically boycotting the state. And there was an extensive, year-round farmers market and a strong local food movement. Dramatic carceral expansion seemed incongruous with this political and cultural identity.

The first official to speak that evening in the library was a long-time county politician named Reuben Davison, who was running for a seat on the Monroe County Council—the fiscal body of the county government. Davison had served in various political capacities in the county previously, including an earlier term as a council member and as a member of the Monroe County Board of Commissioners—the local executive leadership body. He was an outspoken liberal Democrat who frequently integrated his autobiography into his political speeches. Often, he invoked his military service in World War II and its radicalizing effect on his politics. He had returned to the United States from Germany and become a Quaker peace activist. On that night in the library, after introducing himself, he paused and then spoke again into the microphone positioned in front of him, offering a passionate condemnation of mass incarceration in the United States: “The shame of this country in the eighteenth century was slavery. The shame of this country in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries was Jim Crow. The shame of this country in the twenty-first century is the prison-industrial complex.”

Davison's use of the term “prison-industrial complex” to describe a historical trajectory of racializing and racist institutions would seem to clearly identify his views regarding incarceration. First introduced into the public lexicon by Mike Davis in a 1995 article for the *Nation*, the term has gained popularity among mainly leftist academics and activists who find it useful for analyzing the growth of mass incarceration; its relationship to changes in American capitalism, including its entanglements with private capital; and its location on a continuum of strategies used by the state for control, detention, and surveillance. Mass incarcer-

ation has recently become the province of debate and criticism among a wider swath of the American public, but the term “prison-industrial complex” still signifies a certain committed political view.<sup>1</sup>

Davison followed his politicized condemnation of mass incarceration with a seemingly incompatible second point: an emphatic and passionate plea to build the justice campus. He noted: “We’ve been talking and planning for too long. It is time to build the justice campus.” In fact, Davison was only the first speaker that evening to endorse Monroe County’s plan for exponential carceral expansion. Democratic candidates for county commissioner, county council, and judge repeated much the same points: The American criminal justice system, in particular its system of incarceration, was broken and corrupt. The war on drugs was a dismal failure. The local system, in stark contrast, was not only functional but also benevolent, rehabilitative, and *in need of significant expansion*. The justice campus, in their view, would greatly enhance the county’s abilities to provide therapeutic justice, education, and other treatment to its most needy citizens.

I felt disoriented. I had attended the event anticipating some degree of support for the justice campus proposal. But as a student of mass incarceration and as an activist against it, I entered the field in Monroe County inevitably mapping my prior experiences examining and fighting carceral expansion onto the local context. Most scholarly, journalistic, public policy, and activist accounts locate the exponential growth of imprisonment in the United States in the context of “tough on crime” public policy, corresponding cultural and ideological shifts to the Right, the neoliberal withdrawal of the welfare state and rise of the security state, the rural lobby for prison siting, and the criminalization of communities of color.<sup>2</sup> When this *oeuvre* does refer to liberal politics and politicians, it is usually to observe their competition with conservatives for who can be the most punitive in rhetoric and policy.<sup>3</sup>

I had mistakenly assumed that the justice campus proposal was at least partly the product of calls for punishment and the law and order politics I had come to associate with the rise of the carceral state. Sitting in the public library that evening, I was surrounded by liberal Democrats and civic leaders, many of whom I recognized as members of the energetic social service community and as outspoken progressives. I was confused by such stark and prevalent inconsistencies. More important

than my personal bewilderment was the fact that the people I expected to be allies in challenging incarceration all appeared to be passionately committed to ensuring its local expansion.

## A History of Expansion

As it turned out, dramatic jail expansion had substantial local precedent. In 1977, Monroe County employed a not-for-profit, nonpartisan national research company to study and assess the county's incarceration needs and project them into the twenty-first century. The jail at that time had a maximum of forty-four beds and, while not suffering from overcrowding, was universally denounced for its decrepit state. The company, the National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture (NCCJPA), found that a county jail with a capacity of 37–64 inmates would suffice through the year 2000. That is, the 1977 study found that a jail similar in size to the one in use at the time of the study would likely have met the community's needs through the next twenty-three years.<sup>4</sup> Yet throughout the first half of the 1980s, the county pushed for the construction of a new and larger facility. By 1986, after hiring a different consultant who proposed increased carceral capacity, the county had built a new jail with a capacity for 126 inmates—double the need identified in the NCCJPA study—and it was almost immediately overcrowded.<sup>5</sup> By 2008, the county had renovated the jail twice, double-bunking every cell, and the official capacity jumped to 267, although no additional space had been added. In the last several months of 2008 and the first months of 2009, the daily population was consistently over 300 individuals. In the early part of 2008, a jail inmate who had served time for a misdemeanor charge filed a lawsuit against the jail, citing unconstitutional overcrowding. A federal judge granted the lawsuit class action status. In the lawsuit, the plaintiff, Trevor Richardson, cited grievances that included “unsafe and hazardous conditions” resulting from overcrowding; tension; violence; “dirty showers and living conditions;” cold food; and “complete lack of recreation.”<sup>6</sup> The lawsuit itself animated local efforts to construct the justice campus. Indeed, it was the explicit intent of the lawsuit to force the county to build a bigger jail. “You always hope in litigation like this that everyone will agree to build a new facility to rectify the situation,” the state's legal director for

the American Civil Liberties Union told a reporter for the main county periodical, the *Bloomington Herald-Times*. “But the jail still seems to be seriously overcrowded” (quoted in Nolan 2008).

Toward the end of 2007, two decades after the new jail had opened its doors, its daily population had grown to over 300 with no added physical capacity. Under the threat of the lawsuit, the county hired Program Administration and Results, Inc. (PARI), a private firm based just outside Indianapolis that specialized in corrections construction, to research and plan the justice campus. Importantly, the county commissioners instructed PARI to consider only one site: an eighty-five-acre part of a larger plot that until 1999 had been home to an electronics production plant owned then by Thomson Electronics and before that by Radio Corporation of America (RCA). Following the rapid liquidation of the property, the county had bought the eighty-five acres at what county council member Tom Redmond, speaking at a hearing about the justice campus, called “a fire sale price,” for the express purpose of building a justice complex. PARI would proceed to propose the construction of a new jail with double the capacity of the current one (478 beds), a new 72-bed juvenile facility, a 100-bed work release center, and various new offices for criminal justice professionals. Built into the proposal and the architectural rendering of the campus was each facility’s ability to double in size (Nolan 2009d).

The growth of local incarceration, the pursuit of new carceral institutions, and the expansion of carceral strategies from 1977 through the present are by no means unique to Monroe County. In fact, it is precisely this pattern and its logics that connect Monroe County to the thousands of other stories of carceral growth that occurred during the same period. From the time of the NCCJPA study to the PARI proposal for the justice campus, the United States engaged in a massive expansion of incarceration, with the jail population alone jumping from 183,988 in 1980 to 748,728 in 2010, a growth rate of 324 percent (Clear and Frost 2014, 18). With a similar rate of growth in the prison population (from 319,598 in 1980 to 1,543,206 in 2010, a growth rate of 373 percent), the United States has become the global leader in incarceration in terms of both sheer numbers and per capita rates. As of this writing, the prison and jail population hovers at just under 2.3 million people, with 1,483,900 in state and federal prisons and 744,500 in local jails (Glaze and Herber-

man 2012), numbers that approximate the *combined* total of the next two largest incarcerating countries, China (with 1.5 million prisoners) and Russia (874,000).<sup>7</sup> In addition, and also directly relevant to carceral expansion in Monroe County, at the end of 2012 a total of 4,781,300 people were under some form of correctional supervision in American communities, including probation (3,942,800) and parole (851,200) (Glaze and Herberman 2012). Indeed, I was in the middle of research for this book when the Pew Center on the States released its report titled “One in 31: The Long Reach of American Corrections.” The report called attention to the fact that the rate of Americans under some form of correctional supervision, including probation and parole in addition to jail and prison, had doubled from 1 in 77 in 1982 to 1 in 31 in 2007; in Indiana, that rate had quadrupled from 1 in 106 to 1 in 26 (Pew Center on the States 2009).

### The Aim of This Book

The seemingly contradictory stances taken by local officials that evening in the library—one of my earlier fieldwork observations—would become the central phenomenon in need of examination. Indeed, as I illustrate throughout this book, county politicians, criminal justice officials, and civic leaders were quick to offer informed criticism and a denunciation of the prison-industrial complex. Carceral growth in Bloomington complicates the reigning explanations that cite explicitly conservative politics and punitive discourses as the engines of mass incarceration. Democratic politicians, civic leaders, and nonprofit workers who identified themselves publicly and in interviews with me as “progressive,” in the “liberal wing of the Democratic party,” and even as “anti-authoritarian” and “socialist” led the local movement for carceral expansion. These leaders expressed a vision for local incarceration that attempted to distinguish it from the national narrative of prison growth. Local officials spoke of the need for more carceral space in terms of therapeutic justice, rehabilitation and treatment, and education, concepts that resurrected Progressive era notions of “penal-social laboratories.”<sup>8</sup> In the name of the imagined facility—the justice campus—proponents of expansion harnessed the collegiate and bucolic image of the community to a call for the largest carceral growth in county history. Although the justice

campus would have increased the county's formal control systems at an estimated cost of \$50 million, it nonetheless had the support of the Democrat-dominated board of county commissioners and county council, the executive and fiscal bodies of county government.

In examining the logics, discourses, spatial dimensions, and historical contexts of the justice campus and other carceral expansion initiatives in Monroe County, this book has several objectives in its pursuit of a deeper understanding of incarceration in the United States. First, in centering the discourses of therapeutic justice, rehabilitation, and social justice in its critique, this book considers the role of liberal benevolence in the politics of carceral expansion. In a related vein, the book also examines how the carceral was constituted beyond the institutional formations of incarceration through so-called alternative sanctions that, in fact, extended carceral logics and practices into the spheres of social service and education. These revelations provide empirical support for several important concepts in criminology and the sociology of punishment that have been used in attempts to explain and theorize the extension of the carceral state beyond the prison: Michel Foucault's (1977) carceral archipelago, Stanley Cohen's (1991) net widening, and Katherine Beckett and Naomi Murakawa's (2012) plea to map the "shadow carceral state." In these respects, I hope the book contributes to the important projects of further theorizing the continued growth and transformation of incarceration and the constitutive complicity of liberals and progressives.<sup>9</sup> A second objective of the book is to insist on locating this story in two broader contexts and to examine them: the carceral state of which it is inevitably a part, and the global patterns of neoliberal capitalism that attempt to naturalize carceral expansion as part of the "common sense" of deindustrialized communities reeling from the departures of capital and industry.<sup>10</sup> The book aspires to present a multiscalar perspective, incorporating local, national, and global understandings of carceral regimes in a single case study while unpacking the political economy of incarceration at the "glocal" level. Here, the book pays particular attention to the relationship among economy, politics, and ideology. It was the economic relations of capital under what we refer to as neoliberalism that resulted in the closure of the RCA/Thomson plant, along with several other previously stable local industries, at the end of the twentieth century. Those economic changes operated locally also as political pro-

cesses in that they affected—by reproducing—class positions vis-à-vis the loss of about 10,000 working-class jobs and the subsequent proposal for exponential carceral growth that everyone agreed would ensnare almost exclusively poor and working-class residents. But these economic and political processes *required* ideological work to aestheticize—that is, normalize—the same patterns that many proponents of local expansion were quick to criticize elsewhere.<sup>11</sup>

A third objective of the book—perhaps the most important—is to examine and offer strategies of resistance and intervention undertaken to oppose the policies and practices of carceral expansion as well as to challenge the logics that provided important legitimacy to them. The material and discursive conflicts and contests between expansion and resistance in Bloomington highlight a particular theoretical tension, between the naturalization of carceral expansion and a trenchant abolitionist critique that circulated and articulated in the same community and among interacting groups. While I encounter, examine, and attempt to unpack that tension, I also admit that it will likely not be fully resolved in these pages.

More simply, *Progressive Punishment* concerns the roots and routes of carceral logics—their origins and their circulations—as they set the conditions for and animate continued growth in Bloomington and beyond. The book critically examines how neoliberal ideology naturalizes carceral expansion into the political common sense of communities reeling from crises of deindustrialization, urban decline, and the devolution of social welfare.<sup>12</sup> In addition, the book chronicles community activists' attempts to destabilize that common sense and shake the community's reliance on incarceration. Bloomington is simultaneously the community under study in this book and a heuristic for a broader consideration of the logics underlying and animating continued carceral growth.

### Theorizing Carceral Expansion

Over the course of my two years in the field, my experiences with such events as Reuben Davison's statements in the library accumulated, and my initial discomfort and confusion became a growing appreciation of the incongruities and an intellectual urge to appropriately contextualize and analyze them. At meetings of various county political bodies, in my

interviews with civic leaders and politicians, and at four hearings about the justice campus, local officials consistently presented the justice campus and other expansion initiatives as separate from the politics of the carceral state. I felt that this presented a formidable challenge to my own intellectual capacities and theoretical vocabularies. It became apparent that carceral expansion in Bloomington and Monroe County did not fit neatly into the frameworks offered by the rich and interdisciplinary literatures on incarceration. Officials seemed to filter dominant discourses and practices through local cultural and political logics that rendered those discourses and practices palatable in the progressive context of Bloomington and Monroe County. I needed an analytical scaffold that could accommodate both the general power of mass incarceration and its distinctive iterations in the community.

In her ethnography of transnational illicit trade routes, Carolyn Nordstrom (2007) introduces the concept of “il/legal” to describe the permeable borders between legal and illegal channels through which commodities travel. Following her conceptual lead and linguistic maneuver, I came to understand local officials’ simultaneous advocacy of carceral expansion and rejection of the prison-industrial complex as “dis/junctures”: dispositions toward incarceration and punishment at once distinct and, crucially, bounded by and inscribed with the logics and practices of mass incarceration.

Once I understood them in this way, a particular analytic emerged as a clear way to theorize and historicize the justice campus and subsequent expansion proposals: “carceral habitus,” or the corporal and discursive inscription of penal logics into individual and community bodies. In rhetorically rejecting mass incarceration but materially replicating it, local officials and others in the community demonstrated the capacity of carceral logics to structure individual, community, and institutional dispositions (Kramer, Rajah, and Sung 2013). The internalization of neoliberal responsabilization, racialized constructs of criminality, and cultural embraces of punishment can explain much of the way communities come to participate in the carceral state even as they purport to resist and reject it. Indeed, carceral expansion in Bloomington suggests that existing scholarship may underestimate both the hegemonic functioning of mass incarceration and the important roles that individual actors and communities play in adopting, reformulating, and

rearticulating hegemonic carcerality to fit the specific common sense of particular political and cultural contexts.

Importantly, original writing on the prison-industrial complex recognized its capacity to structure a “state of mind” (Schlosser 1998). Recent work by the leading criminologists Todd Clear and Natasha Frost has also observed the “structured intellectual economy” (2014, 45) brought about by the four decades of what they refer to as the “punishment imperative.” In addition to examining the political economic and cultural phenomena that gave rise to the justice campus in Bloomington, this book also examines the carceral logics that circulate in and through communities, structuring American subjectivities regarding crime and punishment. Indeed, carceral logics both framed and limited local responses to social issues, so that incarceration was simultaneously the problem and the solution.

Despite the power and scope of mass incarceration, little work has explored how communities acquiesce to or contest it. Certainly, there has been scant attention paid to the way that the logics we have come to ascribe to the carceral state may conceal themselves in distinctive discourses in different communities. By focusing on one unlikely node of the carceral state, this book examines the structuring power of carceral logics and maps some of the political, epistemological, and media routes through which they travel. My challenge has been to write the connective tissue that binds seemingly disconnected practices in one small and openly progressive community to the structuring logics of the carceral state. In the course of this ethnographic process, my hope is that carceral habitus emerges as a useful analytic to think through the work that mass incarceration performs in this country in structuring its own reproduction.

It is important to state here that habitus is not a concept predicated on objective reproduction of structures. Pierre Bourdieu, the French sociologist, is credited with developing the concept the furthest. He argues that habitus is best understood as a set of boundaries or limitations of consciousness or ability, within which an infinite number of iterations of given practices or institutions are possible, albeit constrained. He writes: “Habitus is never a mere principle of repetition. . . . As a dynamic system of dispositions that interact with one another, it has, as such, a generative capacity; it is a structured principle of invention, similar to a generative

capacity . . . or generative grammar able to produce an infinite number of new sentences according to determinate patterns and within determinate limits. . . . The habitus generates inventions and improvisations but within limits” (Bourdieu 2005, 46). The justice campus proposal was viable because it was articulated through a palatable discourse that was aligned with local politics. Yet to focus only on the local liberal logic of social control ignores the ways in which national hegemonic logics permeated and constructed the boundaries of local habitus. Local leaders and their governmental, private, and nonprofit organizations embodied both the distinct liberal logics of the community and the translocal practices of social control articulated more broadly in the contemporary politics of mass incarceration and clearly in circulation in the county (Garland 2001). Bourdieu writes of this “meeting” between habitus and what he calls “objective structures,” arguing that “in all the cases where dispositions encounter conditions different from those in which they were constructed and assembled, there is a *dialectical confrontation* between habitus, as structured structure, and objective structures. *In this confrontation, 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*” (2005, 47; my emphasis). In Bloomington, a broad array of structural forces—the hegemony of the institutional paradigm of the prison, the circulation of the neoliberal logic of individual responsibility, and the dominance of technocratic epistemologies—inscribed and constrained the range of possibilities.

Local liberal logics of social control were not ahistorical. Rather, the local carceral politics that respondents frequently positioned as exceptional were, in fact, a repository of penal logic from different historical periods. When local discourses of the correctional capabilities of the justice campus are placed in the historical context of penal welfarism or Progressive era “socializing” (Willrich 2003) of criminal justice, for example, they appear closely aligned with those (at one time) national hegemonic paradigms of social control. Anthony Platt notes that, “unlike earlier specialists in social control, [Progressive reformers] viewed the criminal justice apparatus as an institution for *preventing* disorder and *harmonizing* social conflicts, as well as simply *reacting* with brute force” (2009, xxvii). According to Platt, Progressive reformers were criti-

cal of the criminal justice system yet focused their efforts on “professionalizing the police and other agencies of social control, diversifying their methods of operation, and extending the coercive functions of the state into new areas of working-class life.”<sup>13</sup> When local politicians and civic leaders endorsed growth, they did so through a distinctly different discourse that usually rejected punitive rhetoric in favor of therapeutic justice, treatment, and education as the central concepts driving expansion. Moreover, local leaders actively championed the increasing encroachment of criminal justice into “working-class life.” Thus, it is imperative to note that the very construct of what I call “local liberal logics” and what county officials proudly claimed as exceptional politics related to incarceration were actually deeply embedded in historical and ideological ideas about crime, punishment, race, and poverty.

The ability for local officials opposed to incarceration to reproduce its physical structures and practices required them to make important intellectual shifts. With the departures of industry and jobs in the decades preceding the justice campus proposal, officials had to ignore or overlook the ways that the campus could complete a spatial and political trajectory from industry to incarceration. That is, officials could not articulate locally what they consistently offered nationally: a critique of capitalism and its structuring of poverty. This “forgetting” of local transnational history was accompanied by what was perhaps a greater intellectual feat: the dislocation of local carceral politics from the national history and contemporary circulations of mass incarceration. Bourdieu notes that it is precisely this forgetting of history—“history turned into nature” (1977, 78)—that brings objective structures into a practical relationship with what he calls the conjuncture, or the place where habitus and its field(s) reside. He writes: “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 nonetheless ‘sensible’ and ‘reasonable’” (1977, 78–79). Carceral 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). Put slightly differently, carceral habitus in Bloomington illuminates the hegemonic work that carceral logics perform at the level of personal dispositions. Understood in this way, officials’ proposals to produce a carceral solution (the justice campus) to admittedly carceral problems (jail overcrowding and sending young people out of the county for detention) had an internal logic and could seem, as Bourdieu notes, “sensible” and “reasonable.”

David Garland, a sociologist of punishment, has written: “The forms which punishments take, the symbols through which they claim legitimacy, the discourses in which they represent their meaning, the organizational forms and resources which they employ, all tend to depict a particular style of authority—a definite characterization of the power which punishes” (1990, 266). Officials such as Davison misunderstood their advocacy as somehow operating outside the techniques and logics of punishment. Through Garland’s historical lens, we can instead consider the officials’ advocacy for therapeutic justice and rehabilitation as a characterization of the local power that punishes. But how did that misunderstanding occur? How did officials who were acutely aware and critical of the carceral state arrive at a set of dispositions that allowed them to suspend their critique of the prison and embrace its dramatic expansion? It is obvious that their critique had less to do with the inherent qualities of the technology of the cage and more to do with an argument against the specific application and scope of its contemporary use. But that seemingly obvious observation is itself revealing, for it then becomes clear that officials believed that the same techniques could have been employed locally but animated by distinctive and principled ideas. In short, it becomes clear that officials believed that the carceral state stopped at the boundaries around the county; that its circulating logics could be rebuffed by a dynamic and progressive community; and that as a result, the community could engage in significant carceral expansion without replicating the same racialized and class-based results that they attributed to the carceral state. Such revelations give credence to Naomi Murakawa’s recent explanations for distrusting and discounting the intentions of individuals and policies in her study of what she calls

“the civil rights carceral state”: “the actual pain of punishment as experienced by individuals and groups . . . varies least by what the partisans value most: the ‘message’ of punishment. Stated interests in minimizing bias or increasing rehabilitation do not necessarily mitigate penal harm” (2014, 19). Indeed, connecting Murakawa back to Garland, Foucault noted in *Discipline and Punish* that it has become “useless to believe in the good or bad consciences of judges” since it is the “economy of power they exercise, and not that of their scruples or their humanism, that makes them pass ‘therapeutic’ sentences and recommend ‘rehabilitating’ periods of imprisonment” (1977, 304).

This book thus examines how the logics and forces keenly and brilliantly revealed by scholars of mass incarceration “trickle down” through communities and are strained through local discourses and practices that can transform their appearance to fit the locality. But make no mistake: while terms like “rehabilitation,” “therapeutic justice,” “treatment,” and “education” appear far more frequently in these pages than “punishment” and “law and order,” it is this book’s position that in the context of carceral expansion these seemingly distinct positions in fact articulate very similar, and very racialized and class-based, beliefs about responsibility, criminality, and social control.<sup>14</sup> This book cautions against the narrow focus on the punitive turn that characterizes much of Western criminology and sociology (Moore and Hannah-Moffat 2005) and instead attempts to illuminate the ideological and historical linkages between contemporary projects of carceral expansion in the name of treatment and earlier forms of paternalistic, racialized, and class-based coercive justice as well as the modern punitive carceral state.

Indeed, looking beyond Bloomington to the national landscape of incarceration in 2014 reveals the importance of critical carceral studies attuned to the connections between carceral expansion and constriction, as well as to the logics that may appear to support the latter while in fact producing the former. As public policy, media attention, and even political capital accrue around a changing discourse of incarceration, with politicians and think tanks on the Right supporting prison reform,<sup>15</sup> it seems especially appropriate for critical and activist scholarship to interrogate the carceral state’s ability to reconfigure itself. Couched in terms of fiscal conservatism and inflected with religious redemption, the political Right’s embrace of reform may indicate the next installment of neoliberal

withdrawal: carceral devolution (R. Miller 2014). Following the lead of California's Assembly Bills 109 and 117, collectively known widely as "Public Safety Realignment," the county jail may come to play an increasingly important role in solidifying the carceral state. An example from my time in the field illustrates the importance of a critique attuned to the political logics that support a carceral state in the process of reshaping itself. Late in the fall of 2010, the *Herald-Times* published an Associated Press story announcing that Indiana's Republican governor, Mitch Daniels, "strongly endorsed" a study proposing significant prison reform in the state, including diverting many offenders from incarceration (Associated Press 2010). In the context of the sweeping Republican victories in state and federal elections in November 2010, it would seem significant that a Republican governor of a traditionally Republican state was heralding the turn toward prison and sentencing reform. At a holiday party during the same week that the story appeared in the *Herald-Times*, Ian Ozymandias, a member of Decarcerate Monroe County (DMC), a local activist group challenging the justice campus, raised the topic of the study and observed that Daniels's reaction represented a great moment of intervention with the local municipal government. "We need to write something," he argued, "something to say to folks [such as local officials]: 'here is somebody to the far right of you initiating substantial change. And you're not only *not* saying the same things, you're arguing for *more* cages, a *larger* system. If Daniels is saying this, then [Monroe County officials] should be out in front!'"

It is tempting to view Daniels's embrace of reform as a victory for decarceration. But as I note above, such an assessment would be both premature and neglectful of the unpredictable ways that communities adopt and express the logics of incarceration. Indeed, Daniels's endorsement revealed the fact that a Republican governor of a conservative state had initiated a statewide partnership with a research firm to examine and propose reforms to the state prison system while that state's most politically progressive county had just come to the brink of the largest expansion of criminal justice in its history. With that said, Ozymandias was correct in pointing out the opportunity—and the urgency—for the Left to struggle over the framing of reform.

An important part of the scholarly project of examining carceral habitus is the study of resistance to it. In addition to its obvious political implications, that study covers rich, if difficult, theoretical terrain. The

question, of course, is how does or can resistance occur when there is such a heavily structured intellectual economy of responses to crises of neoliberalism and imprisonment, and when the solutions to those crises always seem to be more neoliberalism and more imprisonment?<sup>16</sup> If, as this book hopes to show, carceral habitus is deeply embedded in Monroe County, how are abolitionist interventions able to emerge and, according to my account, sever carceral habitus from its anchor to the hegemony of the cage? I engage these questions along the way, particularly in the final section of this book. It is worth noting here that because I consider carceral habitus to be a shifting and historically dynamic concept, it is by definition open to contestation. Constructed by material conditions as well as cultural frameworks and their discursive signifiers, carceral habitus can be vulnerable to campaigns that disrupt the sedimentation of its constitutive logics.<sup>17</sup> The questions to be asked, then, are what does it take, and what would it look like, for the disruption of carceral habitus to be followed by the inscription of an abolitionist habitus?

### A Note about Terminology

As indicated by Davison's comments at the forum in the library, the term "prison-industrial complex" was used in Monroe County by both supporters and opponents of the justice campus proposal. The term appears in this book because of its use by my informants, because I find it to be a useful analytic in connecting local to national and transnational practices of imprisonment, and because of the trenchant and activist critique inherent in it. I have chosen, however, to rely most heavily in these pages on the term "carceral." Indeed, I have already used this term to describe the local phenomenon of expansion and as a modifier for the theoretical analytic of habitus. I prefer "carceral" to "incarceration" or "imprisonment" because I find it to be a nuanced and powerful concept that can speak to the strategies and linkages that connect incarceration to other spheres of state punishment and social control.

As Foucault (1977) observed, strategies of social control and repression can and do extend beyond a formal institution and into other spheres of social life. In Monroe County, officials and other proponents of the justice campus worked hard to present its three constitutive institutions as distinct from each other, even suggesting that a work release

facility adjacent to a jail constituted a legitimate alternative to incarceration. Moreover, as this book discusses at length in chapters 1 and 2, one popular vision for the justice campus expressed to me by several officials would have moved all of the county's social services onto the site with the three institutions, spatially and conceptually collapsing welfare and criminal justice. Readers familiar with *Discipline and Punish* might recognize in this vision a modern version of Mettray, the penal colony that Foucault studied in that book's final chapter, "The Carceral," and about which he writes: "It is the disciplinary form at its most extreme, the model in which are concentrated all the coercive technologies of behavior. In it were to be found 'cloister, prison, school, regiment'" (1977, 293). The eventual defeat of the justice campus proposal led to new efforts to expand a youth shelter into a sort of juvenile facility, to create a truancy court alongside other existing problem-solving courts, to expand technological correctional so-called alternatives, and to substitute videoconferencing for in-person visitation at the current jail as part of a larger renovation. "Carceral" is the term that can best present both appreciation and critiques of the common punitive strategies and justifying logics that animate projects like the justice campus, as well as the archipelago of punishments and alternatives that surrounded it.

### (Counter) Carceral Ethnography

I became active in the issues that this book examines in 2008, when the Monroe County government first announced the possibility of the justice campus and a partnership with PARI. With other concerned residents, I cofounded an organization dedicated to jail reform. After a year as a community organizer with Decarcerate Monroe County, I transitioned into a role as an ethnographer, while remaining active with the organization. My prior involvement shaped my research focus; participating 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 and locating such contradictions within the implicating and structuring work of neoliberal capitalism and racialized mass incarceration was a task especially suited to an ethnographic approach acutely attuned to local process and to the structural patterns and structuring work of the carceral state.

This book is perhaps less a traditional ethnography than it is a study of the localizing effects of the neoliberal carceral state—that is, a study of the way Bloomington and its contests over carceral expansion were 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” (M. Smith 2001, 127). This is more than a semantic difference. Traditionally, ethnographies of particular communities include neighborhood descriptions, in-depth character development, and a substantial community history. While this book does describe particular microgeographies of the community, focuses on certain recurring figures, and describes selected local histories, I avoid some of the more traditional ethnographic descriptive and analytical terrain to focus on the circulating logics about capital, culture, and the carceral that, while contested, resulted in the justice campus proposal and subsequent attempts at expansion. Following Pierre Bourdieu and Loïc Wacquant (1992, 113), Stuart Hall and coauthors argue that their concern with mugging in the transcendent *Policing the Crisis* was “to use such a starting point—concrete events, practices, relationships, and cultures—to approach the structural configurations that cannot be reduced to the interactions and practices through which they express themselves” (2013, xi). My hope is that *Progressive Punishment* can be read similarly, both as a study of the politics of carceral expansion that is situated in a particular place and as a larger commentary about the political economic, spatial, and cultural work of carceral logics and how they shape, and are shaped by, American communities.<sup>18</sup> My methodological approach needed to approximate and appreciate the fluidity of capital, ideology, and logic in circulation in the community across time and space so that I could perceive and trace the routes and roots of local carceral expansion.

I conducted two dozen in-depth, semistructured interviews with county and city politicians, civic leaders, criminal justice officials, corrections consultants, and community activists. Most of these informants were instrumental in shaping the local discourses about the justice campus, either because they strongly supported it or because they were involved in DMC and its energetic opposition.

In addition, I conducted over a hundred hours of fieldwork at various gatherings in the community, including official public hearings about

the justice campus hosted by the Monroe County Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (MCCJCC), the bimonthly meetings of the MCCJCC, political forums for campaigning politicians, activist meetings, and visiting hours at the county jail. The fieldwork at community meetings provided important entries into the terrain of carceral habitus, as I was able to observe its work beyond the confounding contradictions of informants' orientations to incarceration that came out during the interviews. Officials, civic leaders, and community organizers were present at many of the meetings I attended. There were many times in the field when I observed officials present a vision of the justice campus, community organizers contest it, and officials then slightly alter either their original vision or what had just been offered by organizers to pacify them and alleviate their concerns. In these processes, participant observation sites also were meaningful to the project beyond what was said about carceral expansion. The meetings I attended also provided insights for examining the culture and geography of public spaces, the construction of knowledge and expertise, and the distinct organizational structures and decision-making processes between groups.

Finally, I collected numerous county reports and over a hundred articles from local periodicals to provide a historical context for my inquiry and to examine the role of local media in establishing carceral habitus. Articles covering the history of jail overcrowding, the decades-long discussion of a youth facility, the justice campus proposal, local resistance to it, and local crime provided important insights into how the media represented these issues and contributed to the larger discourse of carceral expansion.<sup>19</sup>

Stuart Hall (1982, 1996, and 1997; Hall et al. 2013) identifies representation as distinct from reflection in its role in creating meaning. Hall writes: "Representation . . . implies the active work of selecting and presenting, of structuring and shaping; not merely the transmitting of an already-existing meaning, but the more active labour of making things mean" (1982, 64). In *Policing the Crisis*, Hall and coauthors expand on the specific role of the media in representing dominant meanings: "[The media] are frequently not the 'primary definers' of news events at all; but their structured relationship to power has the effect of making them play a crucial but secondary role in *reproducing* the definitions of those who have privileged access, as of right, to the media's 'accredited

sources.’ From this point of view, in the moment of news production, the media stand in a position of structured subordination to the primary definers” (2013, 62). The *Herald-Times* played a key role in circulating and legitimating the justice campus vision. Over the years, the newspaper supported local officials’ carceral expansion projects, endorsing and representing the construction of local institutions as emblematic of county liberal benevolence. Hall and colleagues write of this relationship between media and criminal justice institutions, observing in their study that newspapers’ usage of terms from the police to describe mugging and muggers produced “a transformation into a public idiom [that] gives the item an external public reference and validity in images and connotations already sedimented in the stock of knowledge which the paper and its public share . . . the publicizing of an issue in the media can give it more ‘objective’ status as a real (valid) issue of public concern than would have been the case had it remained as merely a report made by experts and specialists. . . . This is part of the media’s agenda-setting function. Setting agendas also has a reality-confirming effect” (2013, 64–65).

The power of the media to construct meaning and set agendas was evident in the numerous articles and op-ed pieces that the *Herald-Times* published concerning carceral expansion. Articles frequently relied on the framing offered by local officials, and editorials reliably endorsed expansion. The tight circuit of authority between local media, politicians, civic leaders, and outside consultants effectively insulated and circulated a form of what Hall and coauthors have called “cultural power,” which they argue “awards command over the process of ‘definition’ within our society” (2013, 32).

My fieldwork and analysis operated as semiconcurrent processes. Transcriptions of meetings and interviews often led to longer expositions; initial analyses of the field inevitably affected subsequent interviews and observations, and sometimes I intended that they should do so. The central theoretical claim to emerge from my research—the existence of carceral habitus—was the product of an ongoing and iterative process of indexing data, exploring emerging themes, and reflecting on their ability to account for and explain the social world I was examining. In short, my process included the “grounded field research and critical ethnography” advocated by Ferrell and Hamm (1998b, 11) and

the “multilayered process of systematic brainstorming and intellectual bridge making” offered by Dimitri Bogazianos (2012, 150).

Conducting ethnographic fieldwork in a community in which I was already living and concerning issues in which I was already politically engaged certainly challenges the traditional anthropological and criminological traditions of objectively studying others. Indeed, many of the people I interviewed, observed, and spent time with in various meetings were people I already knew through my involvement with DMC. Thus, my fieldwork was certainly conducted among the familiar: I was with people I knew, was asking about issues with which I was already acquainted, and was based out of my own home. Yet, perhaps as a testament to the importance of such a close perspective, the research process destabilized the recognizable field site and the familiar became unfamiliar. The explanations of mass incarceration I was accustomed to employing did not fit the political and cultural contours of the discourse and politics of carceral growth in Monroe County. In addition, the community politics I had come to see as reliably leftist were incongruent with the proposal for such drastic expansion. The incongruities of the research raised methodological and personal challenges and imperatives.

My active role with DMC required a reflexive approach to the research that could account for my own positionality. In my fieldwork, I did not presuppose that different spaces were sites for unadulterated perspectives about carceral expansion. On the contrary, I operated from the assumption that the research sites for this project would reveal spaces where meanings of imprisonment were subject to contestation and conflation. With that said, there is ample support for engaged and politically committed ethnography in anthropology<sup>20</sup> and impassioned, if more sparse, endorsement of it in criminology.<sup>21</sup> 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.”<sup>22</sup> Jim Thomas, in explicating reflexivity in his work on critical ethnography, refers both to the impact of the researcher’s position on the study and the impact of the study on the social world. The first acknowledges the importance of the “truth quotient” (Thomas 1993, 47)—that is, the validity of a given study, which is fundamental to all research, including critical ethnography, and which involves interrogation

of the effects a researcher's priorities and politics may have on a given study. This is especially important in disaggregating, or at least being accountable to, the relationships between our findings and ourselves. The second asks what impact our work has on challenging injustice, furthering a counternarrative, hastening social change, or contributing to social justice. It was the more robust and socially accountable vision of both of these aspects of reflexivity to which I tried to adhere during my fieldwork and writing.<sup>23</sup>

Issues of reflexivity, accountability, and representation were also paramount after my fieldwork and during the writing of this book, especially since I needed to decide whether to name the city in which my research occurred. My decision to name Bloomington was made after years of thinking about the issue. In fact, earlier versions of this manuscript, as well as articles I have published on the material, use a pseudonym for the city. Ultimately, however, I arrived at my decision to use the name through several related conclusions.

First, informants and the institutional review board at Indiana University had given me permission to use the name of the community. Second, the role of RCA and Thomson as well as the material and cultural geography of its site in Bloomington was too rich to be presented with pseudonyms. There is an archival trove of articles about the plant, its closing, the site's redevelopment, and local flirtation with carceral expansion there, and I felt that the book would have suffered from too shallow an engagement with this material if I did not reveal the name of the community. At the same time, there were inevitably so many details that remained that I suspect most readers wouldn't have had trouble identifying the community anyway. Third, I name the community to think through with greater historical and regional specificity what carceral growth in liberal American communities means. Fourth, I have great respect for the tradition in ethnography, and certainly in ethnographies about incarceration, to maintain anonymity out of fear of both harming informants and hampering future access to conducting research.<sup>24</sup> But *Progressive Punishment* is not prison ethnography in any traditional sense. The book is not about prisoners' adaptation, acquiescence, or resistance. Many of my informants were elected officials who invited me to use their real names. I ultimately made the decision to use pseudonyms for all individuals and some organizations to preserve basic anonymity.

Ethnographic scholarship is uniquely positioned to examine a phenomenon such as the promotion of carceral expansion through discourses of therapeutic justice, treatment, and education. It was clear that in Bloomington the “organizing cultural framework” of incarceration was integral to the wide support the justice campus enjoyed among liberals and progressives, a testament to the symbolic work incarceration performs to regulate our abilities to perceive it (Garland 1990, 252). My approach needed a concurrent focus on the material and representational work of local social control efforts. In the latter effort, this book looks to “the ideological and cultural power to signify and thus give events a social meaning, and to win society to their ‘definition of the situation’” (Hall et al. 2013, xii). In line with critical scholarship that intervenes in the “common sense” of prisons,<sup>25</sup> this book follows calls by scholars such as Mariana Valverde (2010), who argues for more detailed case studies, and Lorna Rhodes, who claims that “the most pressing need for the study of prisons is to challenge the terms of the discourse that frames and supports them” (2001, 75). In tracing the way the “terms of the discourse” can change across time and space and yet produce remarkably similar policy, this book also follows recent calls to study “contexts that challenge traditional understandings of the penal realm” (Hannah-Moffat and Lynch 2012, 119).

### The Outline of the Book

There are a number of key entries into this examination of carceral expansion that reveal the ways carceral habitus is formulated, expressed, insulated, and at times contested and even reconfigured. This book is structured in such a way as to tell the story of the justice campus and other subsequent attempts at carceral expansion in Bloomington and, simultaneously, to interrogate carceral habitus, examine its contours, and consider attempts to disrupt and undo it.

The book is organized into four parts. Part 1, which contains chapters 1 and 2, examines the historical and material geographies of the justice campus proposal. Chapter 1 examines the eighty-five-acre site planned for the justice campus. The ideological work of incarceration (A. Davis 2003, 16) succeeded in part through its reliance on certain tropes resonating in the community that framed carceral expansion as inherently

a project of therapeutic justice and rehabilitation rather than of punishment. But this was only possible because of a particular historical geography that had produced a spatial and political landscape on which officials could project their visions. The eighty-five-acre space for the justice campus had been home to the largest television production facility in the world, first bought and run by RCA in the 1940s, owned briefly by General Electric, and then sold to the French company Thomson Electronics in 1984. Following that company's departure from the community in 1999, officials began to envision a carceral future for the derelict site.

In examining the trajectory from industry to incarceration that characterizes Bloomington and Monroe County, chapter 1 locates the community in the transnational neoliberal processes structuring post-Fordist American society, particularly around issues of poverty and security.<sup>26</sup> Locally, the county lost three major employers in the decades preceding the justice campus proposal. The Thomson site offers a particularly poignant illustration of the political economic and spatial connections—and contingencies—between capital departures and carceral arrivals. Indeed, mapped onto this specific history is a story that should sound familiar to those with a sense of the growth of mass incarceration: the exodus of manufacturing jobs, shady partnerships between private capital and public policy, and incarceration as the catchall solution to problems raised by capital's departure. Using testimonies of local planners and architects who spoke of seeing natural carceral contours in the eighty-five-acre site, this chapter examines the ability of carceral habitus to enable the forgetting of history and to structure the way that nature and space are perceived.

Chapter 2 builds on this history to further theorize carceral expansion beyond its most obvious institutional formations. Proposals for expansion did not stop at the three institutions that comprised the justice campus. Numerous visions and policy implementations offered dramatic restructurings of local practice. In one, several officials suggested locating county social services on the same site as the jail, juvenile facility, and work release center. In others, officials looked away from the jail and juvenile institutions and toward specialty courts and other so-called alternatives, proudly locating them and various programs on the same continuum on which they placed the justice campus. This chapter ex-

amines the spatial articulations of various logics that collapsed welfare and carceral into a singular vision and that imagined an archipelago of alternatives extending beyond the justice campus.

Part 2, which contains chapters 3 and 4, focuses narrowly on the logics of crime and punishment that constructed both a population in need of carceral treatment and a benevolent complex of facilities to provide it. Chapter 3 examines these logics as they gave shape and structure to the proposal for the new jail. The chapter looks at the ways supporters of the justice campus justified expansion through an imagined jail(able) population of county residents described in terms that conflated economic and moral poverty. While many of these same research informants frequently identified the structural conditions of capitalism as the central problem underlying mass incarceration, they constructed a local individuated, unacculturated, and pathological criminal and proposed solutions grounded in individual, moralistic, and redemptive change. In constructing the county poor as not only occupying fragile economic situations but also as possessing a set of racialized and inferior behavioral and cultural practices, local leaders justified a facility predicated on education, treatment, and acculturation to middle-class status. Importantly, this chapter contrasts ethnographic data with available local statistics on the jail population to interrogate the local construction of crime and criminality.

Chapter 3 also examines more closely the rehabilitative logics that officials positioned as endemic to the county and thus distinct from the logics of the carceral state. Using testimonies from local officials in interviews and county meetings, the chapter examines the structuring logics that guided discussions of jail expansion while also interrogating how such logics located the community as a nodal point in the diffuse articulation of mass incarceration.

Chapter 4 looks at the discourses and practices of juvenile justice policy in the county. A new and large juvenile facility enjoyed substantial and passionate support in the community, including from the few local leaders suspicious of or hesitant about the overall justice campus proposal. Through discourses of child saving, racialized notions of so-called real criminals inhabiting facilities outside of the city, and a belief in the capacity of the community to create benevolent institutions, local officials at once imagined an exceptional community capable of extraordinary incarceration and relied on racial and class tropes from prior eras

to justify increased detention of youth. This chapter looks at the expansion of both institutional and noninstitutional capacity for adjudicated youth as reflecting once again the work neoliberal punishment performs in structuring its own reproduction.

Part 3 moves away from the discourse and politics of expansion and focuses instead on the political and epistemological processes that made expansion possible. Chapters 5 and 6 examine the production of local knowledge about crime and incarceration to better account for the role of that knowledge in shaping the county's carceral politics. Chapter 5 looks at the circulation of technocratic discourses in and through local experts and media that restructured local knowledge into support for the campus. Chapter 6 is devoted entirely to a close examination of the substantial history of national and state corrections consultants in the county, paying particular attention to the two consultants whose work was instrumental in shaping the expansion projects I studied. Both chapters engage debates about exclusionary languages and practices of late modernity and map them onto ethnographic examples of policy discussions that abstracted human lives into penological concerns with management and control and that privileged experts at the expense of alternative—and very real—understandings of incarceration.<sup>27</sup> In examining consultants' official reports, practitioners' testimonies, and editorials and news stories in the media, these chapters trace the epistemological processes by which local carceral politics came to embrace and resemble the carceral state, even as many people in the community claimed a certain degree of knowledge about mass incarceration that absolved them of any complicity in its local replication.

Chapter 7 examines some of the governmental and nongovernmental bodies, processes, and relationships in the county to better understand the political contexts in which the production of carceral knowledge and conversations about expansion occurred. The production and articulation of knowledge, and the structuring of spaces to promote and insulate that knowledge, are two aspects of the same phenomenon of what Bourdieu (1991) calls symbolic power, in which agents justify and support the given social order through practices that assign it symbolic capital. In chapter 7, I focus on the structuring of political spaces and discourses so that narratives of expansion were reinforced and insulated while appearing to be open to contestation.

Most of the chapters in *Progressive Punishment* offer glimpses into how dominant discourses and practices of incarceration expansion were also planes of contestation. There are places in the book where I include the ways people intervened in and disrupted the would-be hegemonic discourses of carcerality. Part 4 ends the volume with a more robust examination of local resistance to liberal carceral expansion. Chapter 8 looks primarily, although not exclusively, at one group, DMC, and the resistance it articulated and engendered among other community members. Most accounts of activism against mass incarceration focus on the challenging of explicitly right-wing and punitive politics of carceral growth. DMC's work in Bloomington was considerably different, as the group's members found themselves at odds with would-be allies and needing to construct a critique that disrupted the local liberal narrative of exceptional incarceration. Chapter 8 includes examinations of DMC's internal politics and processes as well as the group's interventions into county carceral politics. In addition, the chapter includes a brief insurrectionary interlude to discuss some sabotage and other higher-risk activities undertaken in the city to halt incarceration.

With the conclusion, I have chosen to end the book by expanding on ideas generated by DMC during the course of my fieldwork. These alternatives are rooted in an abolitionist framework—that is, they are expressly committed to decarceration and to shrinking (and ultimately ending) our reliance on incarceration. There are several sources of inspiration for ending in such a way. First, in the context of the book, nonreformist reforms, or abolitionist alternatives, create a productive theoretical and political tension with the way expansion and reforms were often mutually constitutive in Bloomington. In other words, the alternatives move toward and perhaps begin to inscribe an abolitionist habitus. Second, my choice to end the book with this material was influenced by other scholars who have chosen to end their books with (or frame them entirely through) hopeful gestures toward radically different ways of engagement.<sup>28</sup> Following their lead, I hope that the conclusion and part 4 more broadly will contribute to the scholar-activist movement toward abolition.

At this point, I anticipate that some readers may question the foresight and strategy of a book that focuses its critique on approaches to imprisonment and social control grounded in well-meaning ideals and

intentions. After all, some might wonder, isn't a system with a conscience, steeped in progressive ideals and notions of therapeutic justice, qualitatively better than the alternative approaches that characterize most prisons and jails in the United States? As one response to such a question, I turn to the historian David Rothman, whose critical appraisal of Jacksonian and Progressive era reform cautions against the embrace of penal benevolence: "Let it be clear from the start that . . . Progressive reforms did not significantly improve inherited practices. To raise but one theme to which we will frequently return, innovations that appeared to be substitutes for incarceration became supplements to incarceration. Progressive innovations may well have done less to upgrade dismal conditions than they did to create nightmares of their own" (2002, 9).

As an iteration of mass incarceration, the justice campus raises important considerations for understanding twenty-first-century carcerality in the United States. 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. This book 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.