

CHAPTER 4

Movement in the Prison Landscape: Leisure Activities – Inside, Outside and In-between

Berit Johnsen

When I'm released, the first thing I'll do is to walk uphill.

Prisoner

This article discusses the arrangement and movement of bodies in the prison landscape. The focus is on closed prisons and the practice of leisure activities. The keeping of bodies 'in place' limits what a body can do in that the prisoners' possibility to affect, be affected and create relations with their surroundings becomes limited. This also concerns the practice of leisure activities, which mostly happen in places especially designed for this purpose. The principle of normalisation is concerned with bringing the outside into the inside. 'Too much' of the outside inside, in relation to facilities, the facilitation and the function of leisure activities, is often criticised in presentations of the inside, as too luxurious, or the prisoners having too good of a time in prison. However, leisure activities are supposed to be experienced as pleasurable and meaningful, and it is argued that this is how leisure activities should be for prisoners too. Efforts should therefore be made to use both time and space in facilitating such activities for the sake of the prisoners' wellbeing and health. To extend the limit of what a body can do will give prisoners the opportunity to affect, to be affected and to create new relations that could also have positive outcomes for the prisoners' rehabilitation.

Introduction

The physical environment in Norwegian prisons shows a great variety. On the one hand are the open prisons, like Hassel and Leira, where it is difficult to determine where the outside ends and the inside of the prison actually begins, because there are no walls or fences. On the other hand are the prisons with a high security level (closed prisons), like Halden Prison. These prisons are separated from their surroundings by walls and fences, and in order to enter the inside of the prison, one has to pass through a gate in the wall. Besides the wall, the most noticeable features in the physical environment of a closed prison are buildings, fences, exercise yards, electric pylons and paths; and common to most prisons, these are spread out on a comparatively flat piece of land. There may also be vegetation such as lawns and perhaps trees, flowers, rocks, heather and moss on this one piece of land. The vegetation might be inside the yards, but mostly in-between the facilities. Altogether, the composition of the walls, buildings, fences, vegetation and so on form a space (a discursive practice of a place [Conley, 2010]) – a *prison landscape* – which is an agent in itself.

In this article, I will discuss the arrangement and movement of bodies in the landscape of closed prisons, and I will focus especially on the practice of leisure activities. Literature on prison architecture and carceral geography has introduced me to the field of human geography (see e.g. Grant and Jewkes, 2015; Hancock and Jewkes, 2011; Jewkes and Moran, 2014, 2015; Moran, 2012, 2015; Moran and Jewkes, 2014). This literature has brought some of my experiences with prison research and visits to prisons into new contexts. These experiences constitute the empirical data in this exploration of movement and leisure activities in prison, and I will present observations of leisure activities and an excerpt from an interview with a prisoner about his experience with leisure activities, from a study of sports in prison (Johnsen, 2001). Examples from prison visits will also be presented, and several visits to Halden Prison have given me the opportunity to observe the landscape and discuss leisure activities with staff in this prison. I will also contrast my experiences from Halden Prison with how others have presented it, especially in documentary programs. Other excerpts from documentary programs and newspaper reportages will be presented as data as well. As well as existing literature on prison architecture and carceral geography, the

discussion is inspired by the work of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari (see e.g. Deleuze and Guattari, 1983, 1987, 1994). Their focus on not what a body *is*, but what a body can *do* and its relations and capacity to *affect* and be *affected*, are essential to this article. I will also use other central concepts from the work of Deleuze and Guattari, like *assemblage* and *territorialisation*, and follow Deleuze's advice to use them in a pragmatic way (Massumi, 1987). This means introducing new thoughts and perspectives on movement and leisure activities in prisons.

Bodies in place

[...] The newly arrived inmate is led down a hall [...]. Ahead of him lies another steel door and still another; and after the last of these has shut behind him does he stand within the prison proper. Before he leaves the outer hall he is taken to a room where he is stripped and searched. (Sykes, 1958, p. 4)

Sykes' description of the admittance of a prisoner is quite characteristic when entering a closed prison, also in Norway. After the procedures described above, the prisoner is typically taken to a reception unit – alternatively to a remand unit if a sentence has not been passed – where (s)he spends the first weeks or months. Thereafter (s)he is moved to an ordinary living unit or block. If the prisoner is considered to be difficult or unsuited to living in a regular unit, for example because of mental problems or illnesses, (s)he may be transferred to a segregation unit or to a unit for vulnerable prisoners. Towards the end of the sentence, the prisoner may be transferred to an open unit and later to a halfway house. This transfer between different living facilities with altered functions throughout the serving of the sentence is, especially when moving to more open facilities, built on trust and systems of privileges (Goffman, 1961; Liebling, 2004). This is a slow process, and with long sentences it may take months or years.

On a daily basis, prisoners attend school or workshops for the purpose of education, production or simply to keep them occupied. Exercise yards are areas designated for the purpose of sports or exercise outdoors, and indoors there may be fitness studios and gymnasiums for exercise and other cultural activities. There are churches or other facilities for spiritual activities, and there are facilities for providing health services where the prisoners can consult nurses, doctors, dentists, etc. There are also rooms, houses or areas where

prisoners can receive visits from family and friends. All these places are ‘functional sites’, which means they should be useful in some way (Foucault, 1977, p. 143; Philo, 2001). The daily movements between these sites are controlled by logistics and strict routines. These routines are repetitive with a time-based rhythm, and according to Sparks, Bottoms and Hay (1996, p. 350), “Time is a basic structuring dimension of prison life [...]”. However, just as important is the spatial arrangement of prisoners and the keeping of prisoners ‘in place’ (Philo, 2001, p. 478). At any time of the day or night, each prisoner should be at a specific place, and at certain times during the day, staff will count bodies in order to control that the prisoners are in the right place at the right time (Kantrowitz, 2012). There is then an integral relationship between time and space in prison, which is referred to as *carceral TimeSpace* (Moran, 2012, 2015).

The movement of bodies in the prison landscape follows spatial arrangements especially designed for this, like pathways, which may be surrounded by more or less visible and invisible borders. Walls, fences and locked doors are obvious borders, through which bodies cannot move without having a key or first being identified. Technological solutions may be installed in order to identify staff and prisoners, and in Rebibbia prison in Rome prisoners move quite freely around in the prison by the use of ID-cards. Different types of ID-cards permit access to different parts of the prison, and prisoners may move by themselves to places where they are granted access. The invisible borders are more subtle and harder to spot if one is not familiar with the logic of movement in a prison:

We (a group of Nordic prison researchers) visited a new prison in Jylland in Denmark in November 2008. The prison was spacious, and we could see a lot of the sky. Living blocks were spread around, and each of these had a yard separated from the rest of the prison by a fence. There were green lawns between the blocks, and pathways ran through the lawns connecting the blocks with each other and with the rest of the prison. Standing on a pathway looking at these flat and tempting green lawns I burst out: “What a fantastic football pitch!” “Oh, no”, replied the prison officer who followed us around, “It is forbidden to walk on the lawn”¹

1 See <http://www.ostjylland.info/AFDELINGER-3087.aspx>. On the picture of living block A, a football goal is actually standing on the lawn, which indicates that under certain circumstances it might after all be allowed to be on the lawn.

There are also visible borders that all bodies can pass, as, for example, marks on the floor or signs, ordering prisoners not to cross or move further (e.g. Ugelvik, 2014). There are also the invisible borders, which are impossible to relate to if you do not know they are there:

I was standing together with a prisoner in the exercise yard. The yard was a gravel field, but where we stood, right by the entrance, there was a little patch of grass as well. While talking to the prisoner, I was standing on the grass, and after a while, the prisoner made me aware that I was actually standing on the grass, which, he informed me, was not allowed. I wondered why, and he explained that the field of grass was close to the fence, and the staff did not tolerate prisoners being too near the fence. (Field notes 1997, cf. Johnsen, 2001)

‘Too near the fence’ is an interesting expression. I understood that being on the grass was defined as being ‘too near’ but what would be deemed ‘too near’ when there was no grass, only gravel? Most likely, this would be a discretionary decision made by staff guarding the exercise yard. Their definition of ‘too near’ could differ, which means that for the prisoners this is a fluctuating border.

One might ask, why all these borders in a closed prison? According to the [Norwegian] Regulations to the Execution of Sentences Act § 3-10, “Prisoners in a prison with a high security level must not be permitted to move freely around the prison’s buildings or other areas”.² Keeping bodies ‘in place’, also when they move in the prison landscape, is, then, a part of the safety and security regime and the maintenance of good order in a closed prison.

Bodies without organs (BwOs) in place

According to Fox (2011, p. 360) “The relations (inward and outward) that a body has with its physical and social context enable it to affect and be affected” (see also Deleuze and Guattari, 1987; Massumi, 1987). *Affect* is an independent thing, but it is a change or a variation that occurs prior to an idea or perception (Colman, 2010). The complex constellations of bodies,

2 «Innsatte i fengsel med høyt sikkerhetsnivå må ikke tillates å gå fritt omkring i fengselets bygninger eller områder for øvrig.»

things, expressions and qualities constitute what Deleuze and Guattari labelled *assemblages* (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987; Liversey, 2010). An assemblage functions on both horizontal and vertical axes. While horizontal axes constitute machinic assemblages, like a steady running prison machine, the vertical axes deal with forces that territorialise and deterritorialise the assemblages (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987). For example, safety and security considerations territorialise the prison landscape and define where the prisoners might move. Forces defining the distinct functions of different places in a prison give the activities in these places meaning and legitimacy. Deterritorialisation could for example entail more free movement within the landscape of a closed prison, or having looser or more open definitions of the function of a place.

For Deleuze, a body “[...] is defined by the relations of its parts (relations of relative motion and rest, speed and slowness), and by its actions and reactions with respect both to its environment or milieu and to its internal milieu” (Baugh, 2010, p. 35). How people respond to their surroundings is an expression of *desire* – “[...] the active, experimenting, engaged and engaging agency, [which] supplies the body with capacity and motivation to form new relations [...], but is shaped by the body’s relation toward particular objectives” (Fox, 2011, p. 360; see also Buchanan, 1997). A body is in constant interaction with the environment that surrounds it, creatively producing itself in a process of *becoming*. Such focus on the body is concerned with what a body can *do* – and not what a body *is* – and its relations and its capacity to affect and be affected (Fox, 2011). In this perspective, it is not only the material body that is of interest, but the organic/non-organic confluence of biology, culture and environment (Fox, 2011; Deleuze and Guattari, 1983, 1987). What emerges in this confluence of relations is *the body without organs* – shortened to *BwO* (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987; Buchanan, 1997; Fox, 2011; Zourabichvili, 2012). This means that a body, or more correctly, a BwO, is not either biological or social, it is both, where neither takes precedence.

According to this ‘Deleuzian’ perspective, each prisoner, at each site and at any time, creates their own relations, engages in different assemblages and creates BwOs. However, the strict control and surveillance of the movement of the bodies in order to keep them ‘in place’ imposes restrictions upon what *relations* a body can make and what it can do. Bodies ‘out of place’ are

considered a risk, because then there is no control on what it can do: It might escape from the prison, hide away drugs or other contraband goods, pass on messages, assault someone, and so on. This is the essence of safety and security in prison: to limit what the prisoners can do and thereby define their BwO and keeping them ‘in place’.

Leisure activities – bringing the outside inside

Running was the only thing that in a way provided continuity in my existence. In here, I ran in circles, around and around. Here I had, in my imagination, my trips through Frogner Park³ that was in my head.⁴

The text above is from a documentary television program, where Arne Treholt, a Norwegian diplomat convicted of espionage for the Soviet Union in 1985, is standing in the exercise cell of approximately 10 x 2,5 metres with a “roof” of wires in Drammen Prison. Before he was convicted, Treholt spent 17 months remanded in custody, mostly in this prison, which is located on the top floors of the courthouse in the city of Drammen. For Treholt the movement of the body while running in the tiny room brought about some affects, mainly because of inward relations and processes in his body, such as increased pulse, sweat, repetitive steps and so on. In this BwO, the ‘running man’ becomes Treholt, and for a moment, he manages to conjure a BwO where he is running through a park. On this trip, he conjures relations to green lawns, paths, trees, flowers, fountains, water, sculptures, and so on, and in his mind, the landscape becomes a part of his BwO. The outside/inside distinction, which is well known from the literature on total institutions (Goffman, 1961), becomes blurred, where the outside world blends in with the inside world of the prison (Baer and Ravneberg, 2008). This blending might appear as an experience, which is in constant flux, and ebbs and flows depending on the relations one creates. While Treholt experienced the outside while he ran, other relations – such as smelling particular food while cooking, reading a letter from a lover, listening

3 A sculpture park in Oslo.

4 “Løping, det var det eneste som på en måte skapte kontinuitet i min tilværelse. Her løp jeg da i ring, rundt i ring. Her hadde jeg da i fantasien mine turer gjennom Frognerparken, og det var oppe i hodet på meg.” <http://www.nrk.no/kultur/her-er-arne-treholt-tilbake-pa-cella-1.12735167> Treholt was sentenced to 20 years imprisonment, but was after 8,5 years pardoned for health reasons.

to a specific song, or watching a particular film on the TV – might be decisive for other prisoners in order to elicit the same experience.

To be affected and conjure up a BwO with the outside by running round and round in a place like a tiny cell cannot be easy. The desire to carry out leisure activities is related to the formations of different kinds of BwOs that vary from person to person. Some need to relate to other people and find that group activities can be most stimulating. Sometimes, special spaces designed for specific leisure activities are needed, such as football pitches, weight-training rooms, music studios, etc. Such spaces could be found in a prison as well, and sometimes prisoners have, for example, soccer teams that play in local leagues, where teams from the outside come into the prison and play matches. Other spaces, like yards, lawns, parks and forests, have a more multifunctional potential for different kinds of activities. Further, preserving some of the forest in the defined area constituting the inside of the prison while building it, like in Halden Prison, might be considered as bringing, or rather keeping, some of the outside inside. However, while people outside the prison can walk, run, play, and so on in green spaces like parks and forests, this is not necessarily so in a prison, as for example Halden Prison. An international news reportage, presented a picture of the rather extensive forest in this prison with the following comment: “Here the roughly 250 prisoners [...] take walks in the park [...]”⁵ – but they cannot. Prisoners in the park without being accompanied by staff, are BwOs ‘out of place’, which means that the park or the forest is primarily a pleasure for the eye. This reflects the prioritisation of the visual in Western societies (Baer, 2005; Urry, 2002). Just looking at green spaces and nature may give the impression of being in them. But actually being *in* them opens up quite another potential for creating relations and sensing the surroundings. By walking on a lawn, we can feel the soft grass; by running in a forest, we have to find our balance when our feet meet the uneven ground; and by leaning on a tree when catching our breath after running uphill, we can feel the texture of the rough bark against our backs. The movement in itself might create a sense of wellbeing (Atkinson and Scott, 2015), and the affect that occurs in the relationship with the environment might be of importance too. According to Andrews, Chen and Myers (2014) landscapes and spaces have an impact on the individual producing sensations and feelings.

5 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TgujwjiPwxo>

In Norwegian prisons, the concept ‘leisure’ is used to describe the time when the prisoners are not otherwise occupied with activities they are obliged to take part in during daytime, like school or work.⁶ The activities the prisoners occupy themselves with in the afternoons and weekends are called ‘leisure activities’. Translated to Norwegian the term ‘leisure’ becomes ‘fritid’, which in English is more like ‘spare time’ or literally ‘free time’, meaning that it is a specific time with no obligations; prisoners are, in principal, free to do what they like. The import and use of the concept in prisons raises an interesting philosophical question: Imprisonment is, by definition, the loss of freedom, so how can it be asserted that prisoners have any “free” time when their choices are restricted by the institution in which they are confined? It is far beyond the scope of this article to address this discussion here, but it is interesting to take a closer look at the concept ‘leisure’. ‘Leisure’ connotes ‘pleasure’, meaning that leisure activities are activities that one finds pleasurable (Elias and Dunning, 1986). According to Elias and Dunning (1986) a characteristic of leisure activities is that the activity is primarily for the benefit of the individual taking precedence over the interests of others. Standing in the exercise cell in Drammen prison, Treholt continued:

It would be an exaggeration to say that this [running in circles in the tiny exercise cell] was something I did with pleasure, but when I had done my trip, I had exactly the balance I needed to get through the next few hours and the next day.⁷

In the BwO Treholt creates while running, the ‘coping prisoner’ becomes Treholt, and he manages to survive an extremely difficult situation and ‘to sustain sanity in an insane place’ (Sabo, 2001, p. 62). Research shows that prisoners’ involvement in leisure activities, such as sports, is based on a desire to be affected and create BwOs that are experienced as meaningful (Gallant, Sherry and Nicholson, 2015; Johnsen, 2001; Martos-García, Devís-Devís and Sparkes, 2009; Robène and Bodin, 2014). Common to these affects and feelings is that they are processual; they are not attainable as an end (Buchanan, 1997), they ebb and flow through space and time (Andrews et.al., 2014). In order to create

6 In Norway, prisoners serving a sentence (not remand prisoners) are obliged to take part in work, education or other activities (Regulations to the Execution of Sentences Act § 1–4 cf. § 3–12.

7 “Det vil jo være en overdrivelse å si at dette var noe som jeg gikk til med lyst, men når jeg hadde vært igjennom det, da hadde jeg fått akkurat den lille balansen jeg trengte for å ta noen nye timer og en ny dag.”

these affects and feelings, the activities have to be repeated. For example, Treholt had to run every day to make it to the next day, and avoiding gaining weight in the sedentary life, which imprisonment in a closed prison may imply, requires a rather strict regime of working out for some prisoners (see e.g. Wahidin and Tate, 2005). This means that prisoners do involve themselves in leisure activities for the same reasons that people outside prison do, which is a desire to be affected, affect others and create BwOs that are valuable to oneself and in some sense create wellbeing. As well as for people outside prison, wellbeing might for some prisoners be related to health and healthcare. This can include avoiding weight gain, retaining sanity or may even be a kind of self-therapy, as running was for Treholt.

Bringing the outside inside is actually what ‘normalisation’ is about. The principle of normalisation is central in the Norwegian Correctional Service and “[...] implies that the way of life in prison as far as possible should be like the general way of life in society” (Meld. St. 12 [2014-2015], p. 32, cf. St meld. nr. 37 [2007-2008], p. 22).⁸ To facilitate leisure activities by constructing spaces where prisoners can create BwOs and experience wellbeing, can be interpreted as a way of complying with this principle.

Leisure activities – bringing the inside outside

Ahm, I'm having a hard time believing that I'm in a prison. I know there is a lot of different educational, vocational programming that is available to inmates to prepare them for work on the outside, but I must say that I have never seen anything like this. It's maybe a little over the top. [...] I'm trying to get my head around what type of employment we are preparing an individual for in this kind of environment. [...] This would appear to be preparing inmates for a career in music or music production.
(US Governor)

Well, I can understand your question, because this is probably the part of the facility that raises the most questions. This room is to a large extent used by the school as a part

8 “Normalitetsprinsippet innebærer at tilværelsen under straffegjennomføringen så langt som mulig skal være lik tilværelsen ellers i samfunnet.”

of music teaching and education. Do we achieve less crime? That's the interesting question down the road, really. (Assistant Governor Halden Prison)

This part of a conversation is from a documentary television program, where a retired US Prison Governor is visiting Halden Prison. The scene of the conversation is the music studio, and as a part of the scene, the US Governor is sitting on a chair in front of a large master control glancing at the music equipment in the room.⁹ The conversation is about the function of this place, and how the existence of such 'luxury' in a prison is to be legitimised. In a Deleuzian perspective, this conversation can be interpreted as a territorialisation of the music-assemblage by forces of education and rehabilitation. By doing so, the two Governors define the prisoners' BwOs by deciding the intentions of the relations they can create in this space. It would have been interesting to hear the reaction to the US Governor and the viewers of the program if the Assistant Governor had said that the music studio was for prisoners who were interested in music, and that this place made it possible for them to exercise their hobby or leisure activity for the sake of their own wellbeing.

Robène and Bodin (2014), in a discussion of sports activities in French prisons, refer to how public opinion (those on the outside) view life on the inside, and the prisoners' access to sports activities. They claim there is an ambiguity to sports in prison because it "[...] appears to the public at large as the intolerable indication of prison comfort, which is in total contradiction to the idea of punishment" (p. 2066). In Norway, punishment is defined as the infliction of an evil that should be experienced as an evil (Rt. 1997, p. 1209; Andenæs, 2016), or in Christie's words: To inflict pain (Christie, 1981). Imprisonment means loss of liberty, and prisoners should not lose the rights accorded those on the outside. This means that a person sentenced to imprisonment goes to prison *as* punishment, not *to be* punished. The Director General of the Norwegian Correctional Services states:

Sport and other recreational activities are an integral part of many people's everyday lives, and it is accepted as having a positive effect on physical and mental health, as well as increasing general well-being. Such activities could therefore help to make the punishment less burdensome. Since health is generally poorer among convicts than in the rest of society, leisure activities should have positive long-term effects. It is an aim that on release,

9 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2g56susrNQY>

prisoners should be offered work or schooling, but also have meaningful leisure time. This it is believed should help lower recidivism (the protection of society). (Vollan, 2016: 555)¹⁰

Initiatives aimed at wellbeing and comfort in order to ease the burden of imprisonment are justified by the fact that imprisonment hurts and are, at a policy level in Norway, legitimate reasons to offer sports and other activities for prisoners. This perspective is supported by soft law measures on ‘exercise and recreation.’¹¹ However, for the Norwegian public, these reasons seem to be legitimate if combined with usefulness in order to live a law-abiding life after release. For example, a prison in Norway brought horses into the prison because one of the prisoners, who was also known in the media, was very much interested in horses and wanted to follow up this interest in prison. When the local newspaper heard about this, they made a reportage with a photo of the prisoner riding on a horse with the headline: “Here rides the Nokas-robber in the exercise yard”.¹² In the reportage, the prisoner says: “I appreciate very much being together with horses, especially as my contact with other prisoners is very limited”.¹³ In a follow-up reportage, the Prison Governor is confronted with this activity, and she replies that following up prisoners’ interests may contribute to reducing the risk of reoffending. At the same time, when the reporter asks if the prisoner is having ‘too good of a time’ in prison, she answers: “We, who know what it means to be imprisoned, know that it is not ‘good’ living in a prison, even if you get visits from a horse.”¹⁴

10 “Sport og andre fritidsaktiviteter inngår som selvsagte elementer i manges hverdag, og antas å være positive for den fysiske og psykiske helsen, samt øke det generelle velværet. Aktivitetene kan dermed bidra til å gjøre straffen mindre tyngende. Siden helsen generelt er dårligere hos domfelte enn ellers i samfunnet, vil fritidsaktiviteter trolig også kunne gi effekt på sikt. Det er et mål at løslatte ikke bare skal ha arbeid eller skole å gå til, men også ha en meningsfylt fritid – som igjen antas å kunne bidra til lavere tilbakefall (samfunnsvern).”

11 Council of Europe, Committee of Ministers, Recommendation *Rec(2006)2* of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on the European Prison Rules para.27.1-27.7. https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?ObjectID=09000016805d8d25#P6_138; Commentary on Recommendation *Rec(2006)2* of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on the European Prison Rules. http://www.coe.int/t/dgi/criminallawcoop/Presentation/Documents/European-Prison-Rules_978-92-871-5982-3.pdf; European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment of Punishment: 2nd General Report on the CPT’s activities covering the period 1 January to 31 December 1991 <http://www.cpt.coe.int/en/annual/rep-02.htm>.

12 “Her rir Nokas-raneren i luftegården.” <http://www.adressa.no/nyheter/trondheim/article1393154.ece>

13 “Jeg setter stor pris på å få være sammen med hester, særlig fordi min kontakt med andre fanger er utrolig begrenset.”

14 “Vi som vet hva det innebærer å bli fratatt friheten, vi vet at det ikke er «bra» å bo i fengsel selv om du får besøk av en hest.” <http://www.adressa.no/nyheter/trondheim/article1393156.ece>

Media reportages that present the inside to the outside, appeal to the public sense of justice and punishment as deserved. Accepting that punishment is an initiative in the name of crime prevention (see Fridhov and Gröning, this volume), the public is also concerned about bringing people from the inside to the outside. It is in this perspective that rehabilitation is applicable, and rehabilitation in relation to leisure activities is perhaps easiest to understand and accept when the prisoners bring with them these activities from the inside to the outside when they are released. This could give them meaningful leisure time on the outside, which could contribute to a lowered risk of committing new crimes (c.f. the quotation of the General Director above). However, prisoners find it difficult to perceive the long-term effects of their involvement in sports activities beyond the period of imprisonment (Gallant et. al., 2015; Johnsen, 2001; Martos-García et. al., 2009). This is most likely because many prisoners do not have a clear idea of how life after imprisonment will be, and if they will manage to maintain an eventual exercise regime. Most prisoners have a here-and-now perspective of their involvement in sport, and as the Governor above also indicates, the here-and-now perspective might reduce the risk of reoffending too.

To ease the burden of imprisonment, to sustain sanity in an insane place, to avoid gaining weight also have importance for the kind of people that are released from prison. It is very likely that the more healthy and self-confident ex-prisoners are, the greater chance they have to create relationships and BwOs that would help them stay away from crime.

As leisure activities are easily accepted in assemblages of rehabilitation, there are leisure activities that are considered to have quite the opposite effect. Such an activity is weight training, which is one of the most popular leisure activities among (male) prisoners (Johnsen, 2001). The construction of a big and muscular body, the exposure of it, and the way it occupies and is held in space (Caputo-Levine, 2013; Moran, 2015), affect us and make us worry about that strength and power, which we read into this body, and which may be used for violence and domination (Johnsen, 2000). Studies of assemblages of masculinity and power in prison, have given insight into some of the dynamics in the hierarchy among prisoners (Johnsen, 2001; Martos-García et.al., 2009; Sabo, 1994, 2001). To avoid an exaggerated focus on the big and muscular body, there are limitations on how heavy the available weights are, and it is not possible to buy protein supplements in order to increase muscle mass. These

restrictions might also be interpreted as territorialisation of the weight-training assemblage by limiting how big a body the prisoner can build, and thereby give a sense of limiting what harm such a body could do both inside and outside of a prison.

In-between

I mean, if I were allowed to train with weights when I felt like it, for example, right after dinner when almost everybody else is sleeping, then I could train on my own and be left alone and train the way I want to. I wouldn't have to run for 10 minutes on the treadmill, or lift so and so much. I wouldn't have to compete with the others; that's what I don't feel like doing, you see? It doesn't suit me to carry out my training in front of the rest, and I think I'm not the only one that feels like this. ('Kim' [prisoner] in Johnsen, 2001, p. 155)

What 'Kim' in the quotation above asks for is a break in the structured time-based rhythm that organises prison life. He does not want to be a part of the BwOs that prisoners in the weight training room create when they exercise, because in these BwOs he is uncomfortable. His desire is to adapt this activity to his own rhythm where he could create the BwO that he wants. However, access to gym facilities and exercise yards in a closed prison mostly follows a schedule that regulates when the different units have access to which facility. If a prisoner wants to work out in the weight training room, (s)he has to follow the schedule and work out when his/her unit is set up for this facility, which could, for example, be on Monday, Wednesday and Friday from 5 pm to 7 pm. At these times, prisoners from the unit move to the gym, and most likely prison officers from the same unit will follow the prisoners to the sports facility and guard them during the exercise. With this arrangement, BwOs are kept 'in place', and the prison officers know the number of bodies in the gym, and the number of bodies remaining in the unit. In such a rigid routine, prisoners in the gym when they want to exercise for themselves are BwOs 'out of place' and a risk to the maintenance of safety and security in the prison.

However, as stated by 'Kim', in between the daily chores in a prison, there is time available to carry out meaningful leisure activities. According to staff in Halden prison, prisoners, like 'Kim' have had the opportunity to use sports facilities in between the scheduled times, but this has stopped for some reason. During the day, it is understandable that prisoners have to conform to the

routine of working hours. It is, though, quite common for many employees (i.e. not prisoners) in Norway to have an hour or so of exercise included as part of their working week. My question is: Is it possible to include such an arrangement in prison and still keep the BwOs in place?

Leisure activities *in-between* can be discussed in relation to *time*, but it might also be discussed in relation to *space*. Above, I have presented both the prisons at Jylland and Halden as having extensive green spaces in-between the facilities, and we have seen that the function of these spaces first and foremost is as pleasure for the eye, but could they be more than that? Jewkes and Moran (2015) argue that trees and flora attract birds, insects and other wildlife (see also Jewkes, 2014). Of course listening to birds, smelling the landscape, scratching a mosquito bite and observing how the landscape changes throughout the year may stimulate senses and feelings. However, my point is that being *in* the green landscape opens quite another potential, that of enabling the body to be affected by the experience, which in turn induces new senses and feelings, because nature represents so much of what a prison is not. Nature is not neat and tidy, there are no straight lines, it is uneven and keeping one's balance when walking or running in this landscape can be challenging, especially going up and downhill. Nature has also an endless number of textures to be felt, and perhaps berries to be tasted. The smell is more intense when we are in nature and it is possible to just lie down and feel that we are part of it. Overall, nature can have an endless number of functions, because it can be what we want it to be.

Little (2015) argues that natural landscapes can have healing qualities by emphasising the presence of nature in the body. This applies to the actual practicing of a sport and to the spaces in between in which the bodies perform and activities are performed (see also Bell, Phoenix, Lovell and Wheeler, 2014). Also discussed is the extent to which prison buildings can perhaps 'heal' as well as harm (Moran, 2015), and this discussion should concern the landscape in-between the prison buildings as well. Why not create a track in the landscape, using the whole area of the prison, where the prisoners can run or walk, and perhaps also go skiing in wintertime? The clue – again – is to make arrangements so that the BwOs can be 'in place' when running/walking/skiing in the track. As 'Kim' also said in the interview, he did not mind CCTV cameras, if that made it possible for him to exercise on his own, and electronic equipment used in an ethical and careful manner, might be one solution to allow deterritorialisation and more unrestricted movement in the prison landscape.

Closing comments

In a discussion about the ‘green prison,’ prison architecture, design and space Moran and Jewkes (2014: 351) refer to Nordic prison architecture and design as providing environments which are intended to rehabilitate:

In both Iceland and Norway, these prisons are placed in stunning natural landscapes where the boundary between inside and outside can be blurred, with huge, bar-less windows, natural building materials and plenty of outdoor space available to prisoners. [...] Buildings have the potential to affect their inhabitants in certain ways, generate certain types of situations, and to engender certain forms of practice [...] [T]he thought that watching clouds, birds, daylight, weather and so on could enhance rehabilitation and diminish physical and psychological violence resonates strongly with notions of therapeutic landscapes in which environmental, societal and individual factors promote well-being, via a holistic approach to physical, emotional, spiritual, societal and environmental factors.

Yes, there is a focus on rehabilitation in Norwegian prisons. However, throughout this article I have problematised how restrictions in movement in the prison landscape and the territorialisation of spaces put limits on what the prisoners’ bodies can do and how they can be affected when practicing leisure activities. Even Halden Prison – which is one of the prisons Moran and Jewkes (ibid.) refer to – with its bar-less windows and plenty of outdoor space, *is* a closed prison with a heavy regime of order, safety and security. Its functionalistic approach to buildings and other facilities, and its numerous borders and rules governing how and where to move in and between different facilities, make this prison quite similar to many other closed prisons in Norway.

Norway is in the process of building a new prison in Agder in the southern part of Norway. Also for this prison, the “[...] design and construction are driven by the imperatives of (low) cost and (high) security [...]” (Jewkes and Moran, 2015, p. 9). As a closed prison, prisoners would not be allowed to move freely around. Thinking in a traditional way, safety and security measures will be established to territorialise the prison landscape and put limits on what a body can do in order to reduce the risk of unwanted behaviour and of disturbances in the regime of order. The problem is that these measures may, at the same time limit the body’s possibility to create relations and be affected in ways that support the rehabilitative process. But, is it possible to think safety and security along with rehabilitation in a new manner? Could bringing the outside inside and

normality be principles for the design and use of spaces in the prison landscape? Could the landscape be hillier than a traditional flat prison landscape, and is it possible to tear down both visible and invisible borders and make the prison landscape more open and accessible? To what extent could prisoners' BwOs be interpreted 'in place' instead of 'out of place' in relation to time and space? Technology used in careful and smart ways could open up new solutions for a creative use of the prison landscape in order to carry out leisure activities, but the main thing is to deterritorialise old ways of thinking about safety and security.

It is easier to recognise the value of green places, gym facilities, music rooms and so on, and the value of allowing extended use of these facilities if they are incorporated into assemblages of normalisation rather than assemblages of learning. It is not only the notion 'normalisation' that is of importance here, but also the concept 'assemblage', because this encourages the idea of the relational aspect of rehabilitation and the prisoners possibility to construct BwOs. For example, a music studio might be used to record music, like a lullaby, and sent to the prisoners' children so they can hear dad or mum singing before they go asleep. In this way, the relationship between the parent and child becomes more lively, and it can make the parent more present in the child's BwO. To interpret leisure activities in assemblages of normalisation also means to deterritorialise the function of these activities. The legitimacy of these activities is then to be found in the idea that prisoners engage in leisure activities for the same reasons that people outside the prison do. Just as other people outside do, prisoners exercise, play music and so on for their own benefit or pleasure. They do this in order to affect and be affected and experience wellbeing and health outcomes, which for many prisoners also will have a positive impact on life after imprisonment. Without applying this meaning of the term 'leisure activities' in prison, it could be questioned whether the prisoners really have the opportunity of leisure activities at all.

References

- Andenæs, J. (2016), *Alminnelig strafferett*, 6th edition by Rieber-Mohn, G. F. and Sæther, K. E., Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Andrews, G. J., Chen, S. and Myers, S. (2014), "The 'Taking Place' of Health and Wellbeing: Towards Non-representational Theory", *Social Science & Medicine*, Vol. 108, pp. 210–222.

- Atkinson, S. and Scott, K. (2015), "Stable and Destabilised States of Subjective Well-being: Dance and Movement as Catalysts of Transition", *Social & Cultural Geography*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 75–94.
- Baer, L. D. (2005), "Visual Imprints on the Prison Landscape: A Study on the Decorations in Prison Cells", *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, Vol. 96 No. 2, pp. 209–217.
- Baer, L. D. and Ravneberg, B. (2008), "The Outside and Inside in Norwegian and English Prisons", *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, Vol. 90 No. 2, pp. 205–216.
- Baugh, B. (2010), "Body", in Parr, A. (Ed.), *The Deleuze Dictionary: Revised Edition*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp. 35–37.
- Bell, S. L., Phoenix, C., Lovell, R. and Wheeler, B. W. (2014), "Green Space, Health and Wellbeing: Making Space for Individual Agency", *Health & Place*, Vol. 30, pp. 287–292.
- Buchanan, I. (1997), "The Problem of the Body in Deleuze and Guattari, or, What Can a Body Do?", *Body & Society*, Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 73–91.
- Caputo-Levine, D. D. (2013), "The Yard Face: The Contribution of Inmate Interpersonal Violence to the Carceral Habitus", *Ethnography*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 165–185.
- Christie, N. (1981), *Pinens begrensning*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Colman, F. J. (2010), "Affect", in Parr, A. (Ed.), *The Deleuze Dictionary: Revised Edition*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp. 11–14.
- Commentary on Recommendation Rec(2006)2 of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on the European Prison Rules.
- Conley, T. (2010), "Space", in Parr, A. (Ed.), *The Deleuze Dictionary: Revised Edition*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp. 260–262.
- Council of Europe, Committee of Ministers, Recommendation Rec(2006)2 of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on the European Prison Rules.
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1983), *A Thousand Plateaus*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1987), *Anti-oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1994), *What is Philosophy?*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Elias, N. and Dunning, E. (1986), *Quest for Excitement: Sport and Leisure in the Civilizing Process*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment of Punishment: 2nd General Report on the CPT's Activities Covering the Period 1 January to 31 December 1991.
- Foucault, M. (1977), *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, Middlesex: Penguin Books.
- Fridhov, I. M. and Gröning, L. (2017), "Penal Ideology and Prison Architecture", in Fransson, E., Giofrè, F. and Johnsen, B. (Eds.), *Prison Architecture and Humans – PriArch*, Oslo: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.

- Fox, N. J. (2011), "The Ill-health Assemblage: Beyond the Body-with-organs", *Health Sociology Review*, Vol. 20 No. 4, pp. 359–371.
- Gallant, D., Sherry, E. and Nicholson, M. (2015), "Recreation or Rehabilitation? Managing Sport for Development Programs with Prison Populations", *Sport Management Review*, Vol. 18, pp. 45–56.
- Goffman, E. (1961), *Asylums*, New York: Anchor Books.
- Grant, E. and Jewkes, Y. (2015), "Finally Fit for Purpose: The Evolution of Australian Architecture", *The Prison Journal*, Vol. 95 No. 2, pp. 223–243.
- Hancock, P. and Jewkes, Y. (2011), "Architectures of Incarceration: The Spatial Pains of Imprisonment", *Punishment & Society*, Vol. 13 No. 5, pp. 611–629.
- Jewkes, Y. (2014), "Prison Contradiction in an Age of Expansion: Size Matters, but Does 'New' Equal 'Better' in Prison Design?", *Prison Service Journal*, Issue 211, pp. 31–36.
- Jewkes, Y. and Moran, D. (2014), "Should Prison Architecture Be Brutal, Bland or Beautiful?", *Scottish Justice Matters*, March 2014.
- Jewkes, Y. and Moran, D. (2015), "The Paradox of the 'Green' Prison: Sustaining the Environmental or Sustaining the Penal Complex?", *Theoretical Criminology*, Vol. 19 No. 4, pp. 451–469.
- Johnsen, B. (2000), "Kan kroppen være kriminelle? Vekttrening, kropp og maskulinitet i fengsel", *Sosiologi i dag*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 5–24.
- Johnsen, B. (2001), *Sport, Masculinities and Power Relations in Prison*, PhD Thesis, Norges idrettshøgskole, Oslo.
- Kantrowitz, N. (2012), *Close Control: Managing a Maximum Security Prison. The Story of Ragen's Stateville Penitentiary*, New York: Harrow and Heston Publishers.
- Liebling, A., assisted by Arnold, H. (2004), *Prisons and Their Moral Performance: A Study of Values, Quality and Prison Life*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Little, J. (2015), "Nature, Wellbeing and the Transformational Self", *The Geographical Journal*, Vol. 181 No. 2, pp. 121–128.
- Liversey, G. (2010), "Assemblage", in Parr, A. (Ed.), *The Deleuze Dictionary: Revised Edition*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp. 18–19.
- Martos-García, D., Devis-Devis, J. and Sparkes, A. C. (2009), "Sport and Physical Activity in a High Security Spanish Prison: An Ethnographic Study of Multiple Meanings", *Sport, Education and Society*, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 77–96.
- Massumi, B. (1987), "Translator's Foreword: Pleasures of Philosophy", in Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. *A Thousand Plateaus*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, pp. ix–xv.
- Meld. St. 12 (2014–2015), *Utviklingsplan for kapasitet i kriminalomsorgen*, Det kongelige justis- og beredskapsdepartement, Oslo.
- Moran, D. (2012), "'Doing Time' in Carceral Space: Timespace and Carceral Geography", *Geografiska Annaler: Series B. Human Geography*, Vol. 94 No. 4, pp. 305–316.
- Moran, D. (2015), *Carceral Geography: Spaces and Practices of Incarceration*, Surrey: Ashgate.

- Moran, D. and Jewkes, Y. (2014), “Green’ Prisons: Rethinking the ‘Sustainability’ of the Carceral Estate”, *Geographica Helvetica*, Vol. 69, pp. 345–353.
- Philo, C. (2001), “Accumulating Populations: Bodies, Institutions and Space”, *International Journal of Population Geography*, Vol. 7, pp. 473–490.
- Regulations to the Execution of Sentences Act. Laid down by the Crown Prince Regent’s Decree of 22 February 2002 Pursuant to Act of 18 May 2001 No. 21 Relating to the Execution of Sentences etc. (the Execution of Sentences Act) Section 5. Issued by the Ministry of Justice and the Police.
- Robène, L. and Bodin, D. (2014), “Sport, Prison, Violence: On Imprisonment and Confinement Conditions – ‘French Prison Sport’ and the Instruments of the World’s Good Conscience”, *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, Vol. 31 No. 16, pp. 2059–2078.
- Rt. 1997, p. 1209 – Supreme Court Sentence.
- Sabo, D. F. (1994), “Doing Time, Doing Masculinity: Sports and Prison”, in Messner, M. A. and Sabo, D. F. (Eds.), *Sex, Violence and Power in Sports: Rethinking Masculinity*, The Crossing Press, Freedom CA, pp. 161–170.
- Sabo, D. (2001), “Doing Time, Doing Masculinity: Sports and Prison”, in Sabo, D., Kupers, T.A. and London, W. (Eds.), *Prison Masculinities*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, pp. 61–66.
- Sparks, R. A., Bottoms, A. and Hay, W. (1996), *Prisons and the Problem of Order*, Oxford: Clarendon press.
- St meld. nr. 37 (2007–2008), *Straff som virker – mindre kriminalitet – tryggere samfunn*, Det kongelige justis- og politidepartement, Oslo.
- Sykes, G. M. (1958), *The Society of Captives: A Study of a Maximum Security Prison*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Ugelvik, T. (2014), *Power and Resistance in Prison: Doing Time, Doing Freedom*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, Macmillan.
- Urry, J. (2002), *The Tourist Gaze*, 2nd ed., London: Sage.
- Vollan, M. (2016), “Mot normalt? Normalitetsprinsippet i norsk straffegjennomføring”, in Bugge, H. C., Indreberg, H., Syse, A. and Tveberg, A. (Eds.), *Lov, liv og lære: Inge Lorange Backer 70 år*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, pp. 548–560.
- Wahidin, A. and Tate, S. (2005), “Prison (E)scapes and Body Tropes: Older Women in the Prison Time Machine”, *Body & Society*, Vol. 11 No. 2, pp. 59–79.
- Zourabichvili, F. (2012), *Deleuze: A Philosophy of the Event – Together with the Vocabulary of Deleuze*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

URLs

<http://www.ostjylland.info/AFDELINGER-3087.aspx>

<http://www.nrk.no/kultur/her-er-arne-treholt-tilbake-pa-cella-1.12735167>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TgujwijPwxo>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2g56susrNQY>

https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?ObjectID=09000016805d8d25#P6_138

http://www.coe.int/t/dgi/criminallawcoop/Presentation/Documents/European-Prison-Rules_978-92-871-5982-3.pdf

<http://www.cpt.coe.int/en/annual/rep-02.htm>

<http://www.adressa.no/nyheter/trondheim/article1393154.ece>

<http://www.adressa.no/nyheter/trondheim/article1393156.ece>