

CHAPTER 9

The Lunch Table. Prison Architecture, Action-forces and the Young Imprisoned Body

Elisabeth Fransson

What do a lunch table, a battle and a mirror have to do with prison architecture and the young imprisoned body? Through a close reading of three different events, the article analyzes action-forces in play in Youth Units¹ in Norway. Action-forces spotlight the power and energies that are produced in meetings between objects, people and subsequent discourses. The article draws attention to how architecture becomes through meetings between people, things and the way people talk. All this affects the young imprisoned body. The lunch table, the battle and the mirror are all events played out in various spaces within the prison illustrating various connections between prison architecture, action-forces and the imprisoned young body. The article is a contribution to methodological and analytical reflections regarding prison architecture illustrated through examples from an ongoing study of Youth Units in Norway².

-
- 1 Youth Units is the classification used by the Norwegian Correctional Services. A discussion of whether “Youth Units” is a proper classification will be discussed in a later report (Fransson & Hammerlin 2018). In this article I have chosen to use the formal classification and I refer to the prisoners as mostly young prisoners include; youths, children or inmates or in a more analytical sense as the young imprisoned body.
 - 2 The research project is a critical study of the Youth Units in Norway on behalf of The Ministry of Correctional Care. The research is conducted together with Yngve Hammerlin, KRUS. A deep thank to Yngve Hammerlin for reading the article with critical eyes.

Prison architecture, children and youths

We have all experienced how we, when we enter a prison as researchers, more or less consciously glide into energies, atmospheres, tempos and ways of talking. One of my clearest memories of architecture was when I, some years ago, walked within Rebibbia Prison in Rome. This is a big prison with over two thousand inmates. The open windows in the corridors, the breeze from outside, a strong smell of clean floors and an atrium filled with prisoners and family struck me as different with respect to many Norwegian prisons, and made me interested in how prison architecture affects the imprisoned body.

Prison architecture, in this article, refers to buildings, interiors and other physical installations, as well as to a place that evolves through meetings between people, things and the way people talk. Prison architecture conditions social relationships, at the same time as the people inside react and make their mark on the materiality of the prison. This socio – material understanding (Østerberg, 1998) of prison architecture draws attention to how architecture is experienced, how it communicates with the people inside, makes people relate and talk, and in this way affects the young imprisoned body. Architecture, prison artefacts and people melt together and create forces, producing energies and atmospheres in the prison (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987; Frichot and Loo, 2013). Looking at prison architecture in this way, as open and dynamic, we are able to notice how staff and young prisoners use the prison space, how prisoners indicate their will to belong or not belong, and use their time, identifying or not identifying with the place. Understanding the new prisons for children in Norway as a social-material construct, as places in the process of becoming, could provide analytical tools for understanding what kind of places these prisons are.

My starting point is that prison architecture is not neutral. It is at all times and places involved in exerting power: constructed as a place for torment, where punishment takes place (Christie, 1982). Prison architecture keeps people inside and separates the prisoners from people outside. It is also the result of certain standards and specific needs such as shelter, security, privacy, control, status, identity and reputation (Dovey, 2013:133-134). The prison should also be a safe place and help prisoners back into society.

The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, Article 37 (c) states:

Every child deprived of freedom shall be treated with humanity and respect for the dignity of man and in a manner that takes into account the needs of the child in relation to its age. In particular, any child deprived of his freedom must be kept separate from adults unless the opposite is considered to be the best for the child (...)

The UN Special Rapporteur on Torture emphasizes that children and young people are particularly vulnerable in terms of human rights violations and child vulnerability, making the threshold for treatment, punishment torture or ill-treatment lower than for adults (Mendez, 2015). This makes it particularly important to study children's and young people's processes of becoming within particular prisons.

To approach how prison architecture affects prisoners we have to use other methods than asking people. As researchers we have to put ourselves in situations where we become affected, we have to look for and search in hidden places and allow ourselves to transcend the knowledge that is often taken for granted. In this article I shall attempt to look beyond how the prison looks and what the staff say that they do and instead, inspired by a Deleuzian approach, focus on events that can help develop an understanding of relationships between prison architecture, action-forces and the young imprisoned body in the Youth Units. Before I go further, I will give a short overview of the historical, ideological and political background for the creation of the Youth Units in Norway.

From working schools and youth prisons to Youth Units

The discussion for or against putting children in prison is not new. Neither is the idea of individual correctional care based on the therapeutic community (Hammerlin, 2008). In 1965 Berg, the old concentration camp and work school in Norway became a youth prison for criminal children between 14 – 21 years old. Its focus was prevention and the prison could keep the children for an indefinite period: until they were seen to behave as desired (Hammerlin, 2008:123; Bødal, 1969, 1976). Like today, this was in a period where ideas about treating and educating children were prominent.

Massive criticism against putting children in prison came in the 1960s and 1970s both in Norway and Europe. The criticism was not simply directed at children's prisons, but the use of institutions for treating people in general, such as public childcare institutions, psychiatric institutions and special schools (Basaglia, 1968). History had shown that when these institutions did not succeed, the children often ended up in prison. Unlimited time for treatment or rehabilitation resulted, for many children, in a very long sentence (Hammerlin, 2008:250-251). Based on these experiences, one may ask why the idea of prisons for children has resurfaced in Norway.

The development of prisons for children, can be understood as a response to three major challenges. Firstly, how the society should react towards children who commit serious crimes, often repeatedly. Secondly, how Norway should conform to the regulation in The United Nations Convention on The Rights of the Child (UNCR, 20. November 1989) stating that children should not be imprisoned. Thirdly, how Norway should respond to The European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment of Punishment from 1991 (ECPT) that has criticized Norway for placing children in prison together with adults, and for the use of isolation and remanding children in custody.

The Youth Units could be read both as an answer and a solution to the problems mentioned above. It satisfied society's need for punishment and security; it was a political and juridical solution to meeting the principles in the UNCR and the ECPT; and made it possible to secure a broad majority among different political parties in Parliament regarding the security problem related to the Youth Reaction³. Today there are two Youth Units in Norway, each of them with room for four children. The staff consists of two groups; half of them are prison officers and the other half are social workers, childcare workers or similar pedagogic personnel.

Prison architecture for children and youths from an immanent perspective

In this article prison architecture is studied from an immanent perspective. This means approaching the field in a broad sense, asking what architecture can

³ Youth Reaction is an alternative to prison for children under 18 years.

do to our bodies (Frichot and Loo, 2013). Focus is on the fluidity and always changing events that take place in everyday prison life. An everyday life that consists of materiality, various physical installations, structure, happenings, routines, events, bodies and talk. I regard this as an important approach in the study of prisons, where we find various displays of power, discipline and repression (Sykes, 1958; Christie, 1982; Mathiesen, 1995; Hammerlin, 2008), and where things can change quickly.

Immanence refers here, to a *process of becoming* (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987). The process of becoming is, in a Deleuzian sense, not something that occurs in nature and comes forward as something already in existence. It is not something that can be predicted, such as the probability for something to happen. Deleuze focuses instead on *what happens on the way*. Playing with this Deleuzian imagery opens our capacity to focus on what happens in situations like at the lunch table, in a battle or in front of a mirror. All these events are socio-material and characterized by being in the process of becoming. We cannot always know what happens, but after an event something has changed (Žižek, 2014).

It is not the young man who steals that is the prisoner, Deleuze says, it is the becoming prisoner that produces a universal prisoner (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987:277). This means that what happens to the child and youth in everyday prison life is part of his or her becoming. The process of becoming is a particularly powerful concept when we study children and youths who, literally, are in a process of growing. The Deleuzian approach thus facilitates a focus on what happens on the way with children, within the prison as a socio-material space.

With every child coming into the prison, with every staff member coming to work, constellations are created, collapse and are created anew; not just between people but between people and artefacts like keys, tables, clothes, visitation, television etc. Human relations are rooted in such material things (Østerberg 1998). Deleuze and Guattari (1987) refer to social relationships between people and objects as *bodies without organs*. The concept is a critique of the modernist conceptualization of the body, in which the body is understood as separated from the world and external to the world defined by age, sex and gender. 'Bodies without organs' takes the focus away from the individual human body to the space in between bodies. It enables us to focus on how our bodies intertwine and interconnect with other bodies,

such as prison walls, tables, uniforms, keys and various coercive measures, sounds and smells. The concept 'body without organs' could be read as a reaction to phenomenological approaches concerned with what happens within the individual body. The concept 'body without organs' draws our attention to relations between bodies and material objects; where things and bodies melt together.

While a Foucauldian perspective would imply a focus on power relations (Foucault, 1980), Deleuze focuses on desire (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987). Energy becomes crucial. Power and desire are not two different and isolated concepts, but require a somewhat different scrutiny. While the concept of power grasps how the staff rule and have power over imprisoned children – or vice versa, the concept of desire draws attention to how human and non-human bodies affect each other.

To ask what a body can do is to ask what sort of relationships a body is capable of constructing with other human and non – human bodies; "(...) its capacity to affect and be affected by other bodies, both organic and material (...)" (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987: 260-263)

By moving the focus from the subject as personalized and separate, we come in contact with desires where machineries of intensity, tempo and action-forces become visible as we will see in the three following events: the lunch table, the battle and the mirror. All these three events have a force within them: the force to affect and produce effects in bodies.

Affects could be understood as potentialities with the possibility of bringing action-forces into play, but are not the same as feelings. Feelings are, for Deleuze, more the effects of affects (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987). Action-forces can be extended or reduced depending on what happens in the situation. The presence of staff, the other prisoners, the temperature outside, the atmosphere, the words being used - all could have an affect and effect people in various ways. This we cannot know beforehand, and cannot predict because situations can change quickly and over time. The meeting of different action-forces creates machineries. According to Deleuze and Guattari (2002:13) there is, in every machinery, an interaction that has enough power to be influential. This affects the types of new machineries that can be produced, and highlights the importance of studying particular prison spaces and events.

To study prison architecture - methodological considerations

The article is based on material from an ongoing research project regarding the establishing of and the practices within the Youth Units in Norway⁴. The material is gathered through prison ethnography (Drake, Earle and Sloan, 2015) consisting of participant observations, conversations with staff and youths, and the first studies of incident reports within the prisons. Until now, we have visited the prisons eight times. During this period, we have spoken to more than thirty staff including leaders on various levels, and six youths. We have had meetings, focus groups, individual interviews and sometimes eaten with staff and the youths. These various types of data together with incident reports have been important in order to create the opportunity for theory and empirics to work together (Olson, 2009:98).

There is no singular insider or outsider position researchers occupy during fieldwork, rather myriads of figures and positions (Young, 2004:192). My way of doing prison ethnography could be defined as a form of in-depth study that includes the systematic and impressionistic recording of human cultural and social life within the prison (Fransson and Johnsen, 2015). It includes observing and interacting with people. It means coming back, continuing the visits and the discussions and using “thick” descriptive accounts (Drake, Earle and Sloan, 2015:3). My way of doing prison research is more characterized by the art of depiction than the science of discovery (Wolcott, 1990:47).

Going back and forth between empirics and theory, I have in this article chosen three events that have a power within them (Sandvik, 2013), in the way that they illustrate how architecture is experienced and affects the young imprisoned body. I have tried to free myself from how prison research should be, and worked to develop my own viewpoint influenced by scientific theory (Åkerstrøm, 2003; Redding Jones, 2008), philosophy (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987), carceral geography (Moran, 2015) and methodology that brings the researcher inside the research project (Summerville, 2008; Rossholt, 2014; Sandvik, 2013; Drake, Earl and Sloan, 2015). Starting with the concrete,

4 It is important to emphasize that the article is “a work in progress”. It is not the story of the Youth Units, neither a final analysis – but contributes to methodology and the analytical understanding of the Youth Units from an architectural and social-material point of view. The collection of data continues in the autumn of 2017 and a report will be produced in the spring of 2018.

with my own body as researcher, being affected, and using these affects in my research has enabled me to delve deeper and wider into architecture, action-forces and the young imprisoned body.

The research project follows the ethical rules approved by the Norwegian Centre for Research Data together with an avowed intention to not be unaware of what happens to me on the way. As part of this, communication with staff about this article has been important⁵. The challenge in an article like this is how to secure the anonymity of the people involved and at the same time to be able to go deeply into an analysis of social-material conditions expressed in various events. I have tried to balance this: anonymize as much as possible without losing the ability to develop an analytical understanding of prison architecture, action-forces and the young imprisoned body.

The lunch table

I am doing field work in one of the Youth Units. Lunchtime is coming up and I am invited to eat at the long table in the open kitchen area. There are nine people around the table, of which six are staff or teachers. I take a seat beside one of the youths. When he starts to serve himself, one of the staff reminds him that I am a guest and with humor he asks him to be a gentleman and serve me! After this and throughout the meal, I am taken care of. Along with the staff, I enter into the friendly tone around the table. I sense it as a kind, caring but also normative tone; giving compliments to the youths and asking questions about the food and school. I take part in it, but with a feeling of discomfort. This feeling gets more intense during the afternoon, when I talk to another young prisoner. Talking to him is like being introduced to a different prison landscape. He tells me that he feels stressed during meal situations. That it is expected of him to be polite, sit together and eat, and that he is not used to this. (From field notes)

The lunch table is placed centrally, in the open space area in the prison. Big windows without bars, colorful textiles, make an open and minimalist impression. The central position of the table marks this space as particularly important. It is a place to cook, a place where youths and staff eat and a place to meet. The open space tells something important about what kind of prison space this

5 A deep thank you to the staff for their involvement and their protection of “their youths” and for important comments on the article. I hope the discussions will continue.

is meant to be. Here you can be part of something in a non-demanding way. It is possible to hang around when somebody cooks, read or look out, curl up in the window post and be alone, but still remain social.

One of the staff members tells us that he eats together with the youths as often as he can. This is a way to show interest, a way to develop his relationship with the youths and also a way of taking the pulse of the atmosphere. Within Deleuzian terms we could say that he uses the forces present in the architecture, in the material, and in this way continues the architect's idea of the kitchen as an informal and "natural" place to meet. The table is the central prison artefact, and the staff know that the table situation can be used for something productive; that it can affect and produce effects in bodies.

How it affects and produces effects cannot be predicted. What has happened the day before, a difficult telephone call, the temperature outside, the aromas from the kitchen, the light, sounds, tempo and energies melt together and affect the body and its capacity to affect and be affected by other bodies, both organic and material. All these elements can, according to Deleuze (1994), be seen as performative agents through their action-forces, with a capacity to drive themselves through. The open and inviting room, the people, flavors and laughter could make youths and staff want to come to the table, sit down and talk but also cause some prisoners or staff to avoid the table. As I wrote earlier, also I, as researcher, was taken by the situation and became part of the forces around the table. I did not really notice the facticity; more the situational freedom (Sartre in Østerberg, 1998). One of the youths, on the other hand, says that he feels stressed when he sits there by the table. From his position as prisoner he noticed the forced action and his lack of freedom.

Becoming a part of it, I played along with the very phenomenon that I was studying (Sandvik, 2013:15). The energy and the atmosphere were so powerful that I, for a moment, was led into it, embraced by it and wanted to be part of it. There was not just control, but desire around the table (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987). By recognizing this desire, I became aware of the specific action-forces taking place within this particular type of prison. This together with my further conversations with staff and youths made me aware that these action-forces could not be reduced simply to the people around the table, but comprised something much wider. This encompassed the people, the table, the voices, the food, the time, the aromas, the particular space,

the way of conversing and how these elements were connected. All this melting together, the connectedness without referring exclusively to architecture or people's actions, makes action-forces difficult to study because they have no end:

Sensations, affects and intensities, while not readily identifiable are clearly closely connected with forces, and particularly body forces and their qualitative transformations. What differentiates them from experiences, or from any phenomenological framework, is the fact that they link the lived or phenomenological body to the cosmological forces, forces of the outside, that the body itself can never experience directly. (Grosz 2008:2, note 2)

The lunch table event illustrates a situation where different forces are at work and where it is difficult to isolate one thing from another. By moving the focus from the subject as personalized and separate, we come in touch with personal desires where machineries of intensities, tempo and action-forces become visible (Deleuze, 1994). Seen in this way the room becomes more than its architectonic shape and materials. The table too becomes something else than the wooden material it is made of, more than its architectonic shape and expression. The room and the piece of wood become intertwined with the bodies around: bodies talking, using their hands, mimicking, being silent or protesting while connecting to the others and the table. People standing up, going to fetch something, coming back again, sitting there but feeling bad, or leaving the table pull energy away from it and thereby into it. Things, processes and relations float together and create bodies without organs (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987).

The architecture represented in the Youth Units, in one more than the other, has parallels to what Hancock and Jewkes (2011:621) refer to as “the new generation of prisons”. They are often identified by their modern architecture and often likened to concepts like humane prisons. The prisons are often well planned with spaces designated for specific purposes, and built within penal, architectonic, and correctional discourses encouraging a human rights focus. Open spaces, some design details and often big tables are all aesthetic details that we also might find in a well-furnished upper middle class home, often far away from the children's class and ethnic background. Could the aesthetic details be read both as a way to show respect, putting the youths' best interest in focus, and also maybe to indicate social

aspirations? For instance, what can you gain if you finish school and get a higher education?

The youths have their own cells, sometimes referred to as rooms by the staff. The prison space is meant to communicate an informal, aesthetic and caring atmosphere reflecting the ethical values of the Norwegian penal system based on humanistic principles, normalization, citizens' rights, rehabilitation, help and care, and with the best interests of the child at its core (White paper 37). Seen as examples of new generation prisons, they are meant to reflect progress, humanism and lead one to think that prisons could be something more than just repressive institutions⁶. When the staff present the prison, they present it as different from other prisons since its methods are built on other principles such as milieu work.

Milieu work

In Norway, milieu work has for many years been a central part of the two year prison staff education. The concept milieu work should not be confused with milieu therapy, but is closely connected to dynamic safety⁷ and relational work with the inmates. Milieu work is a principal element of professional methods applied in the prison. When staff describe what this concept means in everyday prison life in the units they use concepts like "care", "meeting the needs of each individual child", "being a reference point from which the children can stop and reflect" and "a place with a friendly atmosphere". Working on interpersonal relationships is one of the key concepts. The staff talk a lot about the importance of building a good relationship with the youths. In practice, this means talking to, listening to, being aware of underlying issues, participating in activities together, and simply being there. It also means having a broader time perspective, accepting the fact that the children might return. On the other hand, the staff fill a double position because they also have to report, do visitation and control. Because of this, concepts like trust and good relations

6 The Youth Units in Norway are not equal regarding architecture, or characteristics. In one of the units the staff for instance use uniforms while in the other they do not. This will be followed up in the final report (Fransson and Hammerlin 2018).

7 Dynamic safety refers to a way of behaving (talk, body language etc.) that keeps things calm and does not provoke. It demands social skills and an ability to read social situations.

are complicated and must be understood differently than in a therapeutic institution or in residential child care (Fransson 2009).

Milieu work is often organized so that each youth has a member of staff or a team around who is responsible for their individual plan. The teams and the staff in general have various ways of working according to the child's individual needs and its best interests. There is not one single understanding of the concept milieu work or what it entails. It may be understood as a product of the various actors within the field. The prison staff (such as prison officers and social workers etc.) usually use the concept milieu work, while the therapists who come from the imported services⁸ usually use the concept milieu therapy. What staff call the method they use is important and has implications for the understanding of other concepts such as care and security. What is referred to as dynamic safety by prison officers is often called care in childcare institutions (Fransson, 2009), and treatment within child psychiatry. Since we are talking about a prison space it is important to remember that we are dealing with milieu work within spaces of security and control⁹.

The Battle

This becomes clearer when we turn our focus backstage (Goffman, 1961) within the Youth Units. Here, away from the youths, is where we find control rooms with monitors where the staff can follow the activity in the open spaces. There are also belts with restraining equipment and other safety equipment. Moving further into other zones, we find security cells and isolation rooms. Both of the Youth Units have or plan on having a visiting apartment. The Youth Units take both children and youths remanded in custody, those serving a sentence and preventive detention. The security and control within the prison system become visible when we look at the system's boundaries and what happens when they are transgressed.

One way of doing this is by studying when and what happens when the tolerance limits are contravened or threatened, when routines are broken, talk

8 Both of the Youth Units have psychologists as part of the imported services in prisons.

9 A thank you to Tom Disney who organized the session "Care in Spaces of Control" at the Royal Geographers' Conference in London in 2016.

becomes a source of concern, dynamic security becomes threatened and staff bodies cannot keep the boys in place - as in the following event¹⁰:

During the morning session, it was decided that only supervised association for the prisoners would be imposed. The reason for this was persistent negative behavior in the communal area. When one of the inmates was informed of this decision he reacted with frustration and had no understanding for the decision. A few minutes later, when he discovered that another inmate had the same reaction, he began to kick in the door. He got angrier and his aggression escalated. The two inmates shouted repeatedly to each other through the cell door, about which of them would trash most of their room. Attempts were made to communicate, without result. He shouted that he would "get" and assault one of the prison staff.

One of the prison officers took command. He was assisted by four officers from a nearby prison, and formed an action group, suitably attired and ready a short time afterwards. It was decided to concentrate on one of the inmates first, and supervise the other through the window from the outside of the building.

From the outside they could see that the inmate tore off his shirt and then shattered his wardrobe and cupboard. Then he used the doorjamb to destroy the flushing module on the lavatory. While this was happening a prison staff member stood outside the window trying to calm him down. The prisoner used the doorjamb apparatus on the window, and struck with great force dozens of times. The window cracked but without any risk of him escaping. Next, he smashed the air vent and tried to force himself through, without success. During this time of destruction, it was, for periods, possible to talk to him.

One of the prison officers had observed that the inmate had a small screwdriver. He asked him if he planned to assault him and why. The inmate said that he had no need to, but that he would hand over the screwdriver. The prison officers continued to talk to the inmate, and when he, the inmate, saw that the other prisoner voluntarily allowed himself to be conducted out to the car for transport to a nearby prison, he lost motivation to continue acting out.

10 This event is from an incident report. This is a report written by the staff after an incident. The incident is anonymized as much as possible. The important thing here is not to say how things are in Youth Units but to use the event as input to a better understanding of the social-material conditions and action-forces in Youth Units.

The prison officer made a deal; that the inmate would be given a portion of snus or sucking tobacco through the door, and two cigarettes that he could smoke before being transferred to another prison. He accepted and handed over the screwdriver and doorjamb through the cell door. He calmed down quickly and the dialogue improved while they waited for the car to return from the nearby prison. The inmate was concerned that the goats had not received milk in the morning due to the incident, and after consultation with the staff, it was decided that he could feed the goats together with one of the prison officers. He fed the goats, and responded politely to what was said. There was no sign that he was still angry. Afterwards, he went back to his room to pack his clothes and a toilet bag. He was informed that he was to be transferred to the nearby prison, and that he would be handcuffed while in the car. He remained calm during transit. (Incident report in one of the Youth Units)

The event is used as input to develop an analytical understanding of prison materiality, action-forces and various other forces in different spaces within the Youth Units. The space, that during the lunch table event seemed open, became during the battle event more limited. The space becomes more and more narrow before it opens up a bit again when things calm down. Unlike the lunch table event where a body without organs is created between staff and the youths around the table, the constellations here are different. In the battle situation the youths unite and create a body without organs between the two of them. Suddenly there is another atmosphere, interpreted as negative behavior by the staff. This body without organs continues beyond the youths' different cell doors. We see how the cell door both separates and unites. Even with the cell door closed and the youths inside their own cells, they are, in this event, united - being integral parts of the same socio-material situation. The staff, on the other hand, are separated from the youths but united through their role as action force. So, the primary relationship in this event is between the youths on one hand, and the staff on the other. Being locked up inside the cell, having walls, doors and staff around, we see how the open architecture turns into a closed prison space and how the materiality, the cell, and staff bodies in this event create another type of social relationship than around the lunch table.

The event illustrates the tolerance limit present in this situation, what it is about and what happens when the limit is reached. In this situation punishment, in the form of supervised association, is imposed and makes security the major task. We see how criminal ideology, with rigid controls and security

systems embodied by material, social, administrative, technological and symbolic measures, comes into play (Hammerlin, 2008). When the youths do not obey, they are informed; an order is given and in a few minutes, a kitted out action group arrives from the prison nearby, and we see how controlled and efficient this kind of prison machine works. Words of protest and the appearance of an action group connote the police or army, with clear instructions on how to behave. In this case, there is little room for discussion, a limited possibility of considering what is “in the best interest of the child” nor what this event would mean in a progression, rehabilitation perspective, for the return to society or relapse into prison. In this situation, it is security, raw power and physical body work that matter.

But this is not the whole picture. We also notice how the prison staff bring milieu work into play by keeping the youths informed, not leaving their sight, and in the end giving one of them snus and cigarettes and the chance to feed the goats – in fact together with the staff member that the youth had initially threatened. Here we see glimpses of another prison machinery: milieu work where soft power (Rose, 1999; Crewe, 2011) or dynamic safety is used, and where the continuity of the social relationship is the key issue. In other words, we see the way in which security and controlling action-forces work together with soft power action-forces. The incident report is a revelation showing how punishment, security, control and care are intertwined. As we see from the examples, an act of care can easily become a security issue, while security and control can also have strong elements of care. In either case, we see how power and desire work together and how architecture, prison artefacts and people melt together and create forces producing energies within the prisons. Furthermore, we see how this affects and produces effects in the imprisoned body.

The Mirror

From the cell as a socio-material physical battlefield, I will now concentrate on action forces and the process of becoming within the smallest prison space, the cell. Several of the young prisoners talk about their cell and conversations they have with themselves about life, their situation and the future:

(...) Every day I am here, the more I wish to take my life. Every day, I look in the mirror, I see where I am and I think, “Should I do it today? What am I waiting for? (...)”

The prison cell here becomes a narrow space. While we, in a seemingly free and happy action, do not notice the facticity of the situation, a body that is sick or forced notices the facticity (Østerberg 1989:28). Behind the locked cell door, this young inmate creates a body without organs with the mirror. As in the Brothers Grimm story or the more well-known Walt Disney version of Snow White, the mirror becomes more than an object, more than a thing: rather it becomes a body without organs that he can talk to. He uses this mirror-body, talks to it and asks questions.

Looking at architecture in an open and dynamic way, we can notice if the youths want or do not want to belong, identify or do not identify with the place. As this youth formulates:

P: I don't feel that I fit in here.

E: When you say that you don't feel that you fit in – what do you mean?

P: It's heavy.

E: Hm. Do you get stressed?

P: Yes, a lot of stress. More here than in the other prison.

P: It's not the people working here because it's not they who decided that I should be here, understand? That's just how the building is, how the system works and things like that. I can't handle it.

E: Can you say something more, so I can understand what you mean? For instance, when you say that it has to do with how the building is...

P: It is how it is, how the rules are.... One tiny little thing and you get locked inside. If you don't show up, you have to be in your room. Then I could have stayed there the whole day, but I don't want to do that because then I get reported.

The rules, being locked up and the fear of getting reported stress the inmates. What they say gives us a better understanding of the action-forces at play. To show up and participate is crucial in this prison space. The youths are expected to participate in activities during the day. They sense these action-forces in a very precise way, as expectations with the underlying threat of sanctions. If they do what the staff expect, the atmosphere becomes calm and pleasant. It is only when they do not behave as expected, when they do not participate or withdraw from activities or from contact with the others, that the action-forces manifest themselves.

If attempts at motivating fail, then gentle pressure will be applied. If the softer approach does not have the desired effect, then the consequences of unwanted behavior will be explained. Being “reported” is, within the prison system, a serious matter as it could have important implications, and may influence decisions regarding various benefits such as leave or the possibility of going outside the prison with the staff. Cooperating and participating is often interpreted by staff as a positive sign of change (Fransson and Brottveit, 2016).

Sometimes the youths talk of the prison system, as a machine that transcends themselves and the staff members. As one of the youths says, these are not rules made by those that work in the unit, but rules that the prison and the prison staff have to follow. One of the discussions about and in the Youth Units is the use of uniforms. One of the units uses uniforms, the other does not. One of the youths answers my question about using or not using uniforms in this way:

E: Do you notice a difference between the staff working here and those in other prisons? Here for instance, they aren't in uniform and many of them are social workers?

P: No, it's the same.

E: Is it the same?

P: There are all the same rules all the time. So I don't notice any difference¹¹.

No matter how the Youth Unit and staff would like to present themselves, as being different from other prisons, many of the youths we have spoken to still clearly see the Youth Unit as a prison. One explanation for this could be that, even if the prison intends to be different, it is the same prison machinery and action-forces working within this system as within other prison systems. The system works and creates intensities and an atmosphere that, for inmates, create an effect that for them is the same as any other prison. Even if the prison staff insist that their ways of working are action-forces born of a desire to care, it seems to many youths that the action-forces relating to security and control are the most noticeable.

Could this be because the power underlying the mild milieu-work machinery, backed up by dynamic security, is subtler, and less clear? Or does this softer

¹¹ It is too soon in the analysis to say if this is a common view. Here I use it to stress an analytical point.

approach effect their body just as much as a more stringent regime? This we do not know. We could also ask if “soft power” can be felt as more threatening than “hard power”, given the youths’ street capital? These are complicated matters important when discussing care in spaces of control for youths. To get even closer to the issue of action-forces within Youth Units, I asked one of the youths what is expected. What sort of young people does the unit want them to become?

P: They want us to be kind to everybody, to follow the rules that we have to follow, follow the things we must follow.

E: Mm.

P: They want us to follow the time schedule they give us and do the small things that we have to do.

“To follow” is a concept: follow rules, follow things, follow time schedules. The verb connotes orders or plans that other people have made for the youths without their involvement. But what about all the existential questions, questions that some of the youths ask in front of the mirror? How, and in what part of the prison space are they taken care of or allowed? Through talking to youths we become acquainted with the details of the particular action-forces at work; the desire to make a change by giving the youths alternatives, different experiences and maybe also contributing to social aspiration and social mobility. We see here how different action-forces, power and desire are linked together. The youths are affected by having to follow up something that others have decided for them; a machinery where the staff motivate and they are expected to follow.

Faking a smile

The rules, the expectations and the idea of following are ongoing themes in several of the young prisoners’ descriptions of how prison action-forces affect and produce effects in their bodies. According to some of the youths the feeling of being in a prison varies according to the prison space, as this youth says:

E: How do you feel when you get locked in?

P: It is hard. The feeling that I am in a prison gets stronger.

E: Is there anything you can do about it?

P: I cannot scream. I cannot do anything. The only thing I can do is to get bitter. You become bitter. And afterwards I have to fake a smile... Just so people won't think so much about it.

E: Mm.

P: It is hard.

E: Yes, you describe it as hard, as intense.

P: For me it is (...) when I am alone my brain is racing all the time. I don't know what to think, what to look at. Because of that I go to the mirror in the shower and ask if should live or die, all the time. I am quite sick of myself, sick of being here (...) I don't know if I bother to look anymore or breathe any longer. Because I don't have anything that relaxes me.

Action-forces, either driven by power or desire, affect and create effects in young prisoners' bodies and tell us something important about their *processes of becoming* within the Youth Units. The expectations are felt as being high and the prisoners do not know how to cope with them. What strikes me is that milieu work seems to operate in a limited socio-material space within the units; when things are calm and usually in the open spaces of the prison. When the youths are alone in their cells they are left with their own thoughts. One critical question could be, why the mirror? Do young prisoners talk to the mirror instead of talking to people around them? Why are the cell doors closed? Could the staff open them if needed - for instance during the night when the problematic thoughts often come? Another question is how the youths are affected by various events that have taken place when they are back there, alone in their cells? Can the cell, for instance, become a secure place for them after a battle event?

The process of becoming within prisons

Social relations between prison staff and young prisoners do not develop in a vacuum. Human relations are always connected to materiality (Østerberg, 1998), and one important aspect of socio-materiality is architecture; not in its purest form as a building with shape, structures and material, but as processed materiality that involves social relationships to people and things. The three

different events - *the lunch table, the action battle and the mirror* - illustrate various types of materiality, both human and not human, and connections between prison architecture, action-forces and the body.

The lunch table is situated in the central common space and is an invitation to participate and communicate. Desire is the leading principle. The staff want to share something with the youths, they are interested, they show respect and care and give the boys different experiences. Soft power is a way of governing (Rose, 1999, Crewe, 2011), and dynamic security is the logic of safety. In the battle, another type of action force comes into play. The battle becomes reality when milieu work is not enough. The staff need to control the situation and recreate security. Hard power is the way to govern, and static security¹² is the logic of safety. The mirror event is located within the cell. Here we see glimpses of a third prison machinery; self work (Fransson, 2009). This is the prison space where the young prisoners are alone with themselves and their problematic situation, asking existential questions – sometimes to the mirror. The cell brings them in contact with their body in another way. Their various ways of reading the situation and their thinking become crucial to how they feel and, as a consequence, how they feel about the future. They are in a *process of becoming*. Affected by the action-forces in the prison and the various prison machineries they feel a strong desire to become - alive or dead or both.

Closing comments so far

In this analysis prison architecture has been understood as socio-material. It conditions people's actions, as well as allowing the people within to react. This understanding of prison architecture draws attention to how architecture is experienced, how it communicates to people inside and affects the young imprisoned body. Architecture, prison artefacts and people melt together and create forces, producing energies and atmospheres. Through the various events we become aware of different prison spaces inside the Youth Units, supporting various processes of becoming. This raises important questions related to the understanding of what particular prison spaces contribute to youths' processes of becoming within prisons in general, within particular prisons such as the Youth Units, as well as in various spaces within the units. By moving the focus

12 Static security is to use body force or equipment like body-cuffs to secure and control the situation.

from staff and youths as subjects, and instead focusing on events, I have tried out some analytical ideas regarding the relationship between prison architecture, action-forces and the imprisoned young body. My methodological approach has been to come into contact with various forms of desire - where machineries of intensities, tempo and action-forces have become visible. The prison space is supposed to affect. It is not just a place to complete the sentence or avoid relapse. The prison should be and should do something more. In this article, this “more” has been studied as action-forces producing different kinds of machineries that affect the process of becoming young men and women within the Youth Units. The article is meant as a work in progress and as input to methodological and analytical reflections regarding prison architecture, illustrated through examples from an ongoing study of the Youth Units in Norway. I use the opportunity to thank the youths and staff in the Youth Units, and hope we can continue the important discussions about finding out what kind of places the Youth Units are.

References

- Bødal, K. (1969), *Fra arbeidsskole til ungdomsfengsel*. Universitetsforlaget: Oslo.
- Bødal, K. (1976), *Tenåringer i fengsel*. Justisdepartementet: Oslo.
- Basaglia, F. (1968), *Listuzione negata*, Einaudi:Torino.
- Christie, N. (1982), *Pinens begrensning*. Universitetsforlaget: Oslo.
- Crewe, B. (2011), “Soft Power in Prison: Implications for Staff- prisoner Relationships, Liberty and Legitimacy”. *European Journal of Criminality* 8(6) 455–468.
- Deleuze, G. (1990), *The Logic of Sense*. Athlone Press: London.
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1994), *What Is Philosophy?* Colombia University Press: New York.
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1987), *A Thousand Plateaus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis.
- Deleuze, G., and Guattari, F. (2002), *Anti-Ødipus: kapitalisme og schizofreni*. Spartacus: Oslo.
- Dowey, K. (2013) *Assembling Architecture*. In Frichot, H. and Loo, S. *Deleuze and Architecture*. Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh.
- Drake, D., Earle, R. and Sloan, J. (2015) *The Palegrave Handbook of Prison Ethnography*. Palgrave Handbooks: London.
- 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. (1980), *Power/Knowledge. Selected interviews and other writings 1972–1977*. Pantheon Books: New York.
- Fransson, E. (2009), *Fortidens tyngde. Om selvarbeid under opphold og utflytting fra ungdomshjem* (PhD thesis). Institutt for sosiologi og samfunnsgeografi, Universitetet: Oslo.
- Fransson, E. and Johnsen, B. (2015), “The Perfume of Sweat”. In Drake, D. H., Earle, R. and Sloan, J. *Handbook of Prison Ethnography*. Palgrave: London.
- Fransson, E. and Brottveit, G. (2015), “Rådsmøtet som Event. Lokale progresjons- og tilbakeføringspraksiser i et norsk høysikkerhetsfengsel inspirert av et deleuziansk blikk”. *Psyke & Logos*, 2015, 36, 111–128.
- Fransson, E. and Hammerlin, Y. (2018), Barn og unge i fengsel. En internstudie av prosesser knyttet til etableringen av - og status for ungdomsenhetene i Norge. Rapport til Kriminalomsorgsdirektoratet, KDI.
- Frichot, H. and Loo, S. (2013), *Deleuze and Architecture*. Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh.
- Goffman, E. (1961), *Asylums*. Anchor Books; New York.
- Grosz, E. (2008). *Chaos, Territory, Art: Deleuze and the Framing of the Earth*. Columbia University Press: New York.
- Hancock, P. and Jewkes, Y. (2011), “Architectures of Incarceration: The Spatial Pains of Imprisonment.” *Punishment & Society* 13(5) 611–629.
- Hammerlin, Y. (2008), *Om fangebehandling, fange- og menneskesyn i Norsk kriminalomsorg i anstalt 1970 – 2007*. Dr. philosavhandling ved institutt for kriminologi og rettssosiologi. Oslo: Universitetet i Oslo.
- Olsson, L. M. (2009), *Movement and Experimentation in Young Children’s Learning: Deleuze and Guattari in Early Childhood Education*. Routledge: London.
- Mathiesen, T (1995): *Kan fengsel forsvares?* Pax forlag: Oslo.
- Mendez, Julian (2015): A/HRC/28/68ez.
- Moran, D. (2015), *Carceral Geography: Spaces and Practices of Incarceration*. Ashgate: Surrey.
- Rhedding-Jones, J. (2005), *What is research? Methodological practices and new approaches*. Universitetsforlaget: Oslo.
- Rose, N. (1999), *Governing the Soul: The Shaping of the Private Self*. 2nd ed. Free Association Books: London.
- Rossholt, N. (2012), *Kroppers tilblivelse i tid og rom. Analyser av materielle-diskursive hendelser u barnehagen*. PhD thesis, NTNU/Norges teknisknaturvitenskapelige universitet: Trondheim.
- Røe, P.G. (2010), Hvordan forstå et sted? Om en sosiokulturell stedsanalyse. In Album, D., Nordli Hansen, M. and Widerberg, K. *Metodene våre. Eksempler på samfunnsvitenskapelig forskning*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Sandvik, N. (2013), *Medvirkning og handlingskraft i småbarnspedagogiske praksiser. Horisontalt forhandlet innflytelse*. Avhandling for graden philosophiae doctor, Norges

- teknisk-naturvitenskapelige universitet. Fakultetet for samfunnsvitenskap og teknologiledelse. Norsk senter for barnehageforskning: Trondheim.
- Sykes, G. M. (1958), *The Society of Captives: A study of a Maximum Security Prison*. Princeton University Press: Princeton.
- Somerville, M. (2008), "Waiting in the chaotic place of unknowing": Articulating postmodern emergence. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 21(3), pp. 209–220.
- Young, A.A. (2004) Experiences in Ethnographic Interviewing about Race, in M. Bulmer and J. Solomos (eds.) *Researching Race and Racism*, pp. 187–202. Routledge: London.
- UNCR 20 nv. 89.
- White Paper, no 37, 2007–2008: Straff som virker (Punishment that Works), Ministry of Justice: Oslo.
- Wolcott, H. F. (1990) Making a study "More Ethnographic", *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 19,1,44–72.
- Žižek, S. (2014), *Event, Philosophy in Transit*. Penguin Books: London.
- Østerberg, D. (1998), *Arkitektur og sosiologi i Oslo*, Pax: Oslo.
- Åkerstrøm Andersen, N. (2003), *Discursive Analytical Strategies: Understanding Foucault, Koselleck, Laclau, Luhmann*. Policy Press: Bristol.