

B – Contextual information

March 2007
Update 4/2008

B1 - GENERAL STATISTICS

Non-professional prison visitors should be prudent with both general and comparative statistics published by official institutions, in enquiries and even more by newspapers. Some of the reasons are

- Crime figures are reported by the national police who act under the authority of governments driven at times by electoral and other considerations. The methodology varies from one country to another too. A common system of measuring and reporting by the European countries on criminal statistics will be in place by 2010 for the “Space 1 statistics” and Eurostat.
- Reporting on prison data is not unified on the European level and even less world-wide, because national data may include (or not), for example, detainees in psychiatric, juvenile and detoxification institutions, detention centres for foreigners, those in police custody and those followed by electronic supervision.

Therefore, statistics for the same country are more likely to be exact, whereas data comparing different countries can be “indicative” only.

On European level, the “Space 1” statistics of the Council of Europe, survey 2005, published in 2007 (Stat1) are the most dependable data and should be consulted for detailed numbers. Taking into account the above reservations, 3 tables were composed in this section:

TABLE A - is a survey of crime figures in 2005 and the evolution since 1995.

TABLE B - details the prison population in Western Europe with the evolution between 1995 and 2006.

TABLE C - shows the latest update in 12/2007 with the evolution between 1998 and 2007.

1. However the details may be, it is a fact that the prison population has grown much quicker than the number of reported crimes:

<u>in %</u>	<u>Variation of total crimes</u>		<u>Variation of Prison Population</u>	
	<u>1991-2001</u>	<u>1995-2005</u>	<u>1991-2001</u>	<u>1995-2006</u>
England/Wales	-11	+ 9	+ 45	+57
Scotland	-27	-12	+27	+26
France	+8	+3	- 3	+1
Italy	-18	+13	+70	+24
Holland	+13	+/- 0	+105	+105
Spain	+3	+34	+28	+60
Switzerland	-28	+2	+13	+8
Norway		+3		+27
Sweden		+8		+29
Finland		-12		+31
Denmark		-20		+22
Ireland		-1		+50
Belgium		-6		+27
Germany		-4		+19
Luxembourg		-11		+64
Austria		+24		+42
Portugal		+20		+4
		-----		-----
	Average increase	+ 3,5 %		+ 34,9 %

« Der Spiegel » reports on 21.4.08 that between 1993 and 2006, the total number of reported crimes in Germany has diminished by 7 % (of which burglary – 53% and theft of cars - 83%), but violence with bodily injury has increased by + 83%. 46% of the population feel less secure today than in the past (in England the comparative figure is 83 %).

2. In 11/2007 and on the basis of “Space 1”, EUROSTAT reports for 14 EU member states the following tendencies per year between 1995 and 2005 :
 - The average yearly increase for all crimes is 0,6 % with a peak in 2002,
 - Types of crime which *increased*: robbery +4,9 %, drug trafficking + 4,2 %, violent crime +4,1%,
 - Types of crime which *decreased*: domestic burglary -3%, homicide -3,2%, theft of motor vehicles -4,8 %.

3. On the basis of the same 2005 statistics of “Space 1”, the French CESDIP (Centre de Recherche Sociologique sur le droit et les institutions pénales) published in 3/2007 an analysis on « Entrées en prison et durées de détention – la diversité pénitentiaire en Europe » (Stat3). Extract of the average values :
 - a) Rate of prison population :
 - Lowest – Denmark, Finland, Slovenia between 56 and 76 per 100.000 people
 - Average – Germany, Italy between 91 and 102 “
 - Highest – the 3 Baltic states between 233 and 327 “
 - b) Variation per year of the rate of prison population between 2000 and 2005:
 - Decrease: Czech Republic, Rumania, Lithuania -2,8 % to - 5,2%
 - Stagnant: Hungary, Germany, Switzerland - 0,1% to + 0,2 %
 - Increase: Holland, Luxembourg, England +7,9 % to +12,4%
 - c) Average length of detention
 - Less than 5 months: Luxembourg, Holland, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Slovenia, England,
 - More than 12 months: Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Spain, Portugal.

4. A research report (Stat4) sponsored by the European Commission and carried out by public opinion institutes such as Gallup, Max-Planck Gesellschaft and the Italian INICRI, was published in 1/2007 under the title “The burden of crime in the EU – a comparative analysis of the European crime safety survey EUICS – 2005”. The aim was to determine statistically several aspects; for example:
 - general crime rates (highest: England, Ireland, Estonia, Netherlands;
lowest: Spain, Hungary, Portugal),
 - the crime rates for assault (highest: England, Ireland, Netherlands;
lowest: Italy, Portugal, Hungary),
 - sexual violence (highest: Ireland, Sweden, Germany;
lowest: Hungary, Spain, France),
 - “hate crimes against minorities” (highest: France, Denmark, England;
lowest: Italy, Portugal, Greece), etc.

But Europeans were asked as well about their fears of such crimes, the reporting of them to the police (average 40-50%) and the perception of the police supposed to combat crime (the most critical were the Poles and Estonians; the most positive the Finns, Danes and Austrians).

5. National Statistics are available from, for example
 - the website of the UK Home Office “crimereduction” (Stat5)
 - Kriminalstatistik of the “Bundeskriminalamt”, Wiesbaden (Germany)
 - Polizeiliche Kriminalstatistik, Bundesamt für Polizei (Fedpol), Switzerland

- ISTAT – le statistiche dell’amministrazione penitenziaria e della Giustizia,
- CESDIP and INSEE in France.

6. “Re-offending/recidivism – Strafrückfälligkeit – récidivisme – la recidiva/ricaduta – la reincidencia – recidivegevaar” is no doubt one of the most controversial subjects in the whole penal system, among criminologists and in the media, because it has been generally on the increase everywhere for some time, it is costly and no traditional means of combating it, no extra money for additional programs and no harsher punishment seem to have made much difference. The invariably high re-offending rates must of course be seen in the context of more reporting of crime to the police, more arrests carried out, more remand prisoners, more and longer prison sentences.

The 111-page document of 3/2008 published by the UK Tory party, which aims at cutting re-offending by 20 % by 2016 through a “rehabilitation revolution”, is the most recent attempt by politicians to deal with this ill-defined and apparently insoluble problem. A number of studies have been conducted world-wide on the subject with different approaches so that their figures are difficult to compare; for example:

- “Adult Reconviction in Northern Ireland in 2003” published in 8/2007 (Stat6) states that
 - 2 years after release from prison 19 % of the non-custodial people re-offended, but 51 % of those who were imprisoned,
 - Of the 18-20-year-old incarcerated delinquents 69 % re-offended, but of the non-custodial group only 31%,
 - People who were in jail for theft 66% re-offended, but of those sentenced for sexual crimes only 13%,
 - Of the non-custodial reconvictions those for robbery were highest (48%), those for sexual offences lowest (2%),
 - The more reconvictions a person has had, whether spent in prison or on probation, the more likely the probability was that he would fall back into crime again.
- The so-called Halliday-Report of 2001 for Scotland indicates the following key figures for re-offences within 2 years of release:
 - 60 % of incarcerated people were reconvicted and
 - 58 % of those who had served a probation order,
 - 42 % who were serving a community service,
 - 40 % who had received fines,
 - 55 % of the under 21s.
- A German study by Heinz/Jehle/Sutterer covering the period 1994-98 and involving 947.348 convictions was published in 2005 by the Ministry of Justice (Stat7). It specifies that within 5 years after release
 - 45% of those who had benefited from a suspended sentence re-offended, but 56% of those who were incarcerated,
 - 78 % of young delinquents with a firm prison sentence fell back into crime.
 - 73 % of those sentenced for homicide did not re-offend whatever the offence,
 - 70 % of those condemned to paying a fine did not re-offend.
- A study by the Finnish Criminal Sanction Agency (Rikosseuraamusvirasto) for prisoners of the years 1993-2001 (the details of which are on internet), sums up as follows (Stat8):
 - over 50 % returned to prison within 5 years,
 - the proportion of recidivists is increasing,
 - the majority of first-timers did non re-offended,
 - 80/90% of young offenders return to prison at least once,

- people sentenced for homicide and sexual delinquency re-offend less frequently than those who commit other crimes.
- e) General re-offending rates talk of 67 to 70 % for the USA, 60/65 % for England, 58 % for New Zealand, 46% to 60 % for Sweden, 58 % for Scotland and 27 % Denmark. In the USA and after 3 years of release, the recidivism rates are supposed to be 70% for robbers, 78 % for motor cycle thieves, 70% for possessing and selling arms illegally.
- f) In France 56% of ex-prisoners re-offend within 5 years; but such general, accumulated figures do not make much sense, according to Professor Tournier, because the differences among the categories are too important. Following his analysis of people freed in 1996-97 (Stat9), he says that
- incarcerated underage people had a close to 100% probability of returning to prison,
 - as had 81% of the jobless people under 30, sentenced previously for violence,
 - but the probability fell close to zero for people without a previous conviction, who were over the age of 30 and with a steady job. For murder the probability of falling back into the same crime was 2 per 1000.
 - Overall, those who were incarcerated re-offended more frequently than those who benefited from a suspended prison sentence and community work.
- g) The “Howard League” asked in 5/2006 delinquents what would help them NOT to re-offend. The replies were (Stat10):
- having a steady job - 55 %,
 - having stable accommodation – 26 %,
 - having stable friendships – 24 %,
 - having a child – 20 %,
 - having a family-like relation – 20 %,
 - managing their drug (ab)use – 17 %,
 - managing their alcohol (ab)use – 15 %.

In 2005 Professor Tournier (CNRS, Paris University I) and Patrick Colin of Strasburg University founded the GERE (Groupe d’étude de la récidive en Europe) with the aim of collecting scientific data on the subject which should be the basis for less opinionated and more factual decision making in future. Criminologists from Switzerland, Germany, Netherlands, Belgium and Italy are also part of this group . During 2006/7 several conferences took place on the subject (Stat11) .

There are other studies on “Recidivism”, such as

- in German: Stefan Harendorf, Univeristy Göttingen, 2007 “Rückfalligkeit und kriminelle Karrieren von Gewalttätern“,
- in Spanish: „Penas alternativas y Reincidencia – un estudio empirico“, 2006, Editorial Aranzadi,
- in Italian: “Indulto e recidiva” tries to assess re-offending further to the release of 22.000 prisoners in July 2006, an event which stirred up Italy at the time.
- in French: “Evaluation de la récidive. Questions de méthode » (Tournier). The Magistrate Serge Portelli published in 2005 “La Récidive – mobiliser l’intelligence, non la peur” and in 2008 “Récidivistes” (Editions Grasset).
- in English : « Unemployment and Reoffending », Apex Scotland, 4/2007 and “Why’s and How’s of measuring jail recidivism”, 6/2006, Urban Institute (USA).

7. Who are the people in prison?

In a report of 7/2004 by the French Parliament (rapport Léonard), the following percentages are mentioned (Stat12):

- 60 % of all prisoners have an educational level equivalent to the end of elementary schooling (études primaires),
- 30 % have reading problems,
- 20 % are illiterate (the rate is 3 times higher than for people outside prison),
- 65 % have no profession,
- 15 % have no permanent home or are homeless,
- 16 % are “indigent” which means that they have less than Euro 45,- per month at their disposal for general expenses,
- 20 % of the detainees had less than Euro 8,- remaining from their earnings in prison when they were released (enquiry 1997),
- 40 % of the incoming detainees have had no medical help 12 months prior to their detention,
- 33 % of the newcomers have had an accumulated consumption of alcohol, tobacco, drugs and antipsychotic treatment,
- 27 % of the minors took drugs regularly prior to imprisonment,
- 50 % of the detainees suffer from a mental handicap,
- 10 % say that they had regular psychological treatment 12 months before incarceration.

It is likely that these percentages apply in other European countries too.

	Total Crimes reported 2005	1995	+/- %	rate variation 2000-2005	homicide completed number	completed rate 100.000	country's capital	violent crime	robbery	drug trafficking
Norway	275.684	267.925	+ 3	+2,9	33	0,87	1,79	21.381	1.448	17.118
Sweden	1.241.843	1.145.945	+ 8	+4,6	83	1,0	?	97.485	9.398	4.670
Finland	339.715	381.612	- 12	+6,0	114	2,3	2,32	37.105	1.814	5.177
Denmark	432.704	538.963	- 20	+4,8	70	1,31	2.0	19.135	5.199	961
England/Wales	5.556.513	5.100.241	+ 9	+3,0	766	1,59	2,64	1.220.198	98.204	25.279
Scotland	417.785	475.697	- 12	+3,0	101	2,31	2,41	28.407	3.553	6.913
Ireland	101.659	102.484	- 1	-	58	1,28	2,26	8.790	1.146	2.674
Netherlands	1.228.271	1.226.700	+/- 0	+8,5	198	1,37	4,43	110.509	15.463	15.305
Belgium	989.153	1.015.011	- 6	-	173	1,85	3,28	99.800	21.234	12.408
			(2000)							
Germany	6.391.715	6.668.715	- 4	+0,1	804	0,98	1,92	212.832	54.841	72.002
Luxembourg	25.32	28.380	- 11	-	4	0,66	0,87	2.367	351	1.326
Austria	605.272	486.433	+ 24	-	54	0,67	1,13	148.748	4.770	2.337
Switzerland	352.723	346.634	+ 2	+0,1	75	1,03	1,36	11.544	2.595	7.076
Italy	2.579.124	2.267.488	+ 13	+1,6	601	1,13	1,12	135.681	65.724	32.059
Spain	2.230.906	1.659.026	+ 34	+5,1	518	1,34	1,82	112.426	90.104	11.968
Portugal	392.174	326.829	+ 20	- 1,8	133	1,36	0,60	23.241	20.183	3.535
France	3.775.838	3.665.320	+ 3	+3,6	976	1,63	1,71	307.501	124.600	6.108
For comparison:										
Russia (2001)						22,05	18,38			
USA (2001)						5,56	42,87			
Columbia						61,78				
South Africa						49,60				

“Prison Population in Western Europe”

TABLE B

March 2007

Source: Prison Brief - International Centre for Prison Studies, London (update 10/2006)

/2008

Country	Prison population		+/- in %	prison pop. rate per 100.000		Remand prisoners in %	Women %	Youths %	foreigners %	Occupation rate %
	Total 2006	1995		2006	1995					
Norway	3048	2398	+27	66	55	15,9	4,8	0,3	17,2	92,1
Sweden	7450	5764	+29	82	65	20,3	5,2	0,2	26,2	102,7
Finland	3954	3018	+31	75	59	11,6	6,3	0,1	8,0	112,4
Denmark	4198	3438	+22	77	66	25,2	4,6	0,6	17,5	95,3
England/ Wales	79861	50962	+57	148	99	16,6	5,6	3,2	12,5	112,8
Scotland	7131	5657	+26	139	111	21,7	4,5	2,6	1,3	111,5
Ireland	3080	2054	+50	72	57	15,9	3,5	1,7	9,0	98,5
Netherlands	21013	10249	+105	128	66	30,0	8,7	9,7	31,7	95,6
Belgium	9597	7561	+27	91	75	73,2	4,2	0,2	42,0	110,6
Germany	78581	66146	+19	95	81	18,6	5,2	4,0	28,2	98,0
Luxemburg	768	469	+64	167	114	41,8	4,9	1,4	75,0	110,3
Austria	8766	6180	+42	105	77	22,6	5,3	2,3	45,1	107,2
Switzerland	6111	5655	+8	83	80	39,0	5,4	0,8	70,5	93,4
Italy	61721	49641	+24	104	87	35,9	4,8	0,7	33,2	131,5
Spain	64215	40157	+60	145	102	24,2	7,9	0	29,7	129,5
Portugal	12870	12343	+4	121	124	22,1	7,1	1,1	18,5	104,3
France	52009	51623	+1	85	89	31,5	3,6	1,1	21,4	109,9
Russia	869.814	920.685	-6	611	622	16,9	6,7	2,5	1,7	79,5
USA	2.186.230	1.585.586	+38	738	600	21,2	8,9	0,4	6,4	107,9
Turkey	65.458	49.895	+31	91	82	47,7	3,3	2,7	2,3	77,4
Poland	87.901	62.719	+40	230	163	16,9	2,9	1,3	0,7	122,1

PRISON POPULATION IN WESTERN EUROPE

TABLE C

4/2008

Source: European Council,
Space Survey - 2005

Source: Prison Brief – International Centre for Prison Studies, London (update 10.12.2007)

Country	Prison population Total		Prison pop. Rate per 100.000		Remand prisoners in %	Women in %	Youth in %	Foreigners in %	Occupation rate in %	detention time in months	evasion per 10.000 prisoners
	1998	2007	1998	2007							
Norway	2519	3533	57	75	19,8	5,5	0,3	19,5	96,8	3,3	33,6
Sweden	5290	7175	60	79	22,2	4,1	0,2	27,5	106,3	3,6	49,1
Finland	2569	3595	50	68	14,0	7,0	0,1	8,5	100,2	6,5	55,1
Denmark	3413	3626	64	67	27,0	5,4	0,1	22,6	90,4	2,8	63,8
England + Wales	65298	80229	126	148	16,1	5,4	3,0	13,9	112,2	5,8	5,8
Scotland	6082	7261	120	142	22,1	4,8	2,6	1,3	114,1	2,1	4,6
Ireland	2648	3080	71	72	15,9	3,5	1,7	9,0	98,5	0	7,7
Netherlands	13333	21013	85	128	30,0	8,7	9,7	31,7	95,6	3,9	3,5
Belgium	8264	9597	81	91	37,2	4,2	0,2	42,0	110,6	7,3	32,5
Germany	78592	76629	96	93	17,4	5,3	4,5	28,2	95,8	7,4	
Austria	6962	8991	87	108	23,3	4,9	1,8	43,1	104,3	6,8	
Luxembourg	392	744	92	160	41,5	4,0	1,1	72,7	106,9		
Switzerland	6041	5888	85	79	39,1	5,7	0,9	69,0	87,3	1,2	
Italy	49050	39348	85	67	57,1	4,3	0,7	33,9	138,9	8,2	3,2
Spain	44763	66129	114	147	23,2	8,3	0	32,7	133,7	16,7	2,2
Portugal	14598	12803	146	120	22,7	7,0	1,1	20,2	103,1	28,7	20,6
France (1.1.07)	50744	58402	86	95	30,6	3,7	1,1	19,7	115,4	8,1	3,9
Russia	1009863	889598	688	628	16,5	7,1	2,5	2,7	86,2		
USA	1816931	2245189	669	750	21,2	9,1	0,4	6,2	106,9		
Canada	37401	34244	126	107	31,5	5,0	6,2	?	106,9		
Poland	57382	89805	148	236	14,8	3,1	1,3	0,7	119,1		
Turkey	64907	82742	102	112	61,5	3,7	3,4	2,3	77,4		

B – Contextual Information :

March 2007
Update 4/2008

B2 - International Organisations working in a Prison Environment

1. The most universal Confederation seems to be the “INTERNATIONAL CORRECTION AND PRISON ASSOCIATION – ICPA “ (Org1) with headquarters in Canada. Its members, amongst others, are
 - all the major North-American Organisations such as:
 - + APPA (American Probation and Parole Association),
 - + APAI (Association of Paroling Authorities International)
 - + ATTIC (Supervision, Wisconsin)

 - European Organisations such as:
 - + the “Conférence Européenne de la probation – CEP”,
 - + Eurochips – European Committee of imprisoned parents
 - + European Forum for Victim-offender Mediation and Restorative Justice
 - + International Centre for the Prevention of Crime
 - + the “International Red Cross” – Prison Visitors section
 - + EPEA (European Prison Education Association),
 - + International Centre for Prison Studies (ICPS), London,
 - + Avocats sans Frontière,

 - Prison visiting organisations such as:
 - + “International Prison Fellowship” (American)
 - + “International Prison Chaplains Association - IPCA,
 - + “Volunteers for Prison Inmates (VPI)”, Canadian, founded in 1997,
 - + “Volunteers of America (VOA)”, spiritually based,
 - + “Association of Elisabeth Fry Societies” with their 25 member associations across Canada.

 - the Governments of 70 countries and their Prison Administrations.

2. The intergovernmental EUROPEAN COUNCIL (Org1A) is the highest European institution which works towards “a European identity based on national diversity and common values”. With regard to prison reforms, it is active in the following areas:
 - on the basis of the United Nations minimal Rules for the treatment of prisoners of 1955, the European Council conformed to them in a resolution of 1973. In 1987 specific “European Prison Rules” were developed and approved by 25 member states. Following the progression of European integration and the change of social patterns, the “108 New European Prison Rules” were approved in 2006 by the 46 member states.
 - the « European Committee for the prevention of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment - CPT », the “European Court of Human Rights” and the “Human Rights Commissioner” all work for the protection of the fundamental rights, including those of the prisoners.
 - The “Conferences of Prison Directors – CDAP” assemble every 2 years prison governors, representatives of prison administrations and ministries, governmental organisations and NGOs, to discuss “prison administration in an increasingly complex environment” (theme of the last meeting in 2007 in Vienna).

- “Penal systems and sanctions concerning delinquent youths” is in preparation and will be published in 2008 in form of “Rules – Recommendations”. In view of the unsatisfactory development of recidivism, a common European initiative on Probation work is in preparation by the “Council of penological co-operation - PC-CP”.
 - The “SPACE 1” statistics contain the essential figures on crime and detention. As the methods of reporting diverge from one country to another, the numbers of the past require reinterpretation. A unification of methodology is being discussed and should be introduced by 2010.
3. The “CONFERENCE PERMANENTE EUROPEENNE DE LA PROBATION – CEP” (Org2) comprises the Official Social Services of 33 European countries and a number of voluntary organisations involved in Prison and Probation work, such as the French “Service Pénitentiaire d’Insertion et de Probation – SPIP”, « Reclasseur Nederland”, the Swedish Kriminalvården, the “National Probation Service for England and Wales”, the “Schweizerische Vereinigung der Bewährungshilfe”, the French FNARS, the Commission Royale des Patronages, Belgium, the Dutch Stichting Verslavingsreclasseur, the Institut de Reinserciò Social, Barcelona, the Deutsche Bewährungs-, Gerichts- und Straffälligenhilfe (DBH), Köln, the Salvation Army, Holland, the Austrian „Verein Neustart“ and others.
 4. There is a list of about 300 NGOs approved by the Council of Europe (OR3), among them
 - + The “European Prison Education Association (EPEA),
 - + Caritas International
 - + The European Council of Quakers
 - + The international Movement of ATD Quart Monde,
 but no known organisation of prison volunteers is mentioned. The approval conditions for NGOs by the European Council appear to be rather stringent (ORG3A).
 5. INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS involved in prison life are, for example:
 - a) “The Quakers” started prison visiting around 1776 in Pennsylvania, where their headquarters still are today. Through Quakers, such as Elizabeth Fry and Sarah Smith, the idea of Prison Visiting was introduced in the UK at the beginning of the 19th century. The “Quaker Council of European Affairs”, which organises their multiple activities in Europe, was founded in 1979 and is located in Brussels. The description of the “Quaker Chaplain” and “Prison Visitor” is defined in document (Org4). The Quakers are very active in the debate on prison reforms and have published reports, as for example, on the Danish Penal System in 2006 (Org5), a 112- page assessment on “Women in prison – Review of the conditions in Member States of the Council of Europe” in 2/2007 and “a Gender Critique of the European Prison Rules” of 56 pages in 3/2006 (Org6).
 - b) The association “Saint Vincent de Paul” (Org7) goes back to the saint who worked in the Paris area in around 1600 for the poor and needy (rather like the recently deceased Abbé Pierre). The Association was founded in 1833 in Paris. 590.000 volunteers are working today in 131 countries, many of them in a prison environment.

- c) The “International Red Cross” started its humanitarian action in 1863 to alleviate the consequences of war and imprisonment. Thanks to its fiercely defended status of neutrality, the ICRC (+ red Crescent today) is today a recognized moral authority worldwide and enters prisons in Myanmar, the Central African Republic, Uzbekistan and Cuba. 12.000 members work in 80 countries. In 2006, 480.000 visits were carried out in 2600 prisons. It was up to the ICRC to denounce the inhuman treatment at the Abou Graib Prison in Baghdad and finance the changes, to oppose the detention conditions at Guantanamo Bay and work for human rights in Afghan Prisons (Org8) which are all highly sensitive and dangerous assignments. The joint Conference of the Red Cross and the Red Crescent in 5/2007 in Istanbul reaffirmed the convergent views of their actions in favour of Health, Social matters and Migration, including prisoners. The very deep involvement of the ICRC in prison matters can be gathered on Internet by articles such as “prisoners and visitors” (Org9) or “Health and human rights in prisons”(Org10).
- d) “The International Prison Fellowship” (Fraternité Internationale des Prisons). (Org11). This organisation was founded in 1979 by one of the ex-counsellors of President Nixon, Chuck Colson, after serving a prison sentence following the Watergate affair. The IPF defines itself as “faith-based”. Messages published on the internet concerning their prison activities, for example in Norway and the Ukraine, reflect their evangelical spirit. In Ethiopia, 20 new preachers were consecrated recently in the presence of the American Ambassador. In New Zealand, the IPF is participating actively in the forthcoming penal reform (Org12).
The “IPF” is a very dynamic and unconventional organisation which specializes in prison visiting. It follows its former detainees who, after having left prison, often find their place within the evangelical communities (a form of “lasting probation”). Beyond the main activity which is the support of prison chaplaincy (“the work of the church behind bars”), there are programs such as the “Angel Tree” which deals with the children of prisoners, the promotion of faith-based prisons (APAC), the medical “Global Assistance Program”, the “Sycamore Tree Project” which tries to reconcile groups of victims with offenders and the “Week of prayer and transformation”. The IPF is active worldwide with 100.000 volunteers in 110 countries (another source talks of 50.000 prison volunteers in 88 countries). In Europe they are present in Bulgaria, England, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Lithuania, Malta, Holland, Ireland, Norway, Poland, Russia, Romania, Scotland, Slovakia, Spain, Portugal, Switzerland, Ukraine. The last congress was held in 7/2007 in Toronto under the theme “Where love and justice meet”.
- e) “Alpha for prison” (Org13) is basically a 10-week, 15-session introductory course to Christian faith for non-Christians or non-church goers. The key person of this “effective evangelism through the local church” is Rev. Paul Cowley, ex-offender and ex-professional soldier who says that he knows that his message works, because it made him find the right way. He was ordained by the Anglican Church in 2002. In the last 25 years, the Alpha courses have been introduced and taught by the prison chaplains in 80 % of British prisons and in 75 countries. Apart from “Alpha for Prisons” there are on offer courses for the Young, the Campus, the Military, the Catholics, future couples, follow-up and challenging life-style courses. In addition, there are more than 100 different titles of books, cassettes, videos, kits and songbooks in about 30

languages. The “Caring for ex-offenders” movement has grown out of the “Alpha for Prisons” courses. As they are complementary, the “Prison Fellowship” and “Alpha” work frequently together. In their evangelical keenness, these organisations meet frequently with opposition from secular prison administrations, as for example, in the Dartmoor prison (UK) in 2006, when the Alpha courses were suspended (Org14).

- f) The “International prison Chaplains Association - IPCA” (Org15) was founded in Switzerland in 1985 and is active today in 70 countries divided into 6 regions. The headquarters are in Sweden, the President is Mrs. Britta Winberg. Mainly ordained Ministers are working in this ecumenical Christian organisation which is funded predominantly by the protestant Churches. Amicable co-operation with the “Prison Fellowship” and the catholic ICCPPC. On their website, IPCA explains the “spirit of Bossey” which means the awareness of the prison chaplains in their often lonely task, their internationalism and their wish for a world-wide movement. The message is somewhat “evangelical”, because they describe their mission as “Uniting, encouraging and equipping a global network of prison chaplains as they share God’s love, and restoring justice”. The 2005 conference took place in Cornwall, Ont. and gathered 326 prison chaplains. The motto of the conference was “We are not alone” (Org16).
- g) The “ICCPCC” (International Commission for Catholic Prison Pastoral Care) is the International Organisation of Catholic Prison Chaplains (headquarters in the Netherlands). Founded in 1950, this organisation counts today 105 member countries and has a consultative status at the United Nations and elsewhere. Its aim is “to contribute to prison life on every level”. (Org17)
- h) The “Church of Scientology” (Org18) says on its website that their members visit 45.000 prisoners worldwide. According to “Prison.eu.Org”, the Scientologists have been working since 1996 in and around prisons through organisations such as Le Chemin du Bonheur, Applied Scholastics, Able International and Narconon. Criminon has a Prison Rehabilitation Program called “Second Chance” which is introduced in a number of American Prisons. Its efficiency is hotly disputed by conventional psychologists, criminologists and administrations. Narconon says (Org19) that in parts of Sweden, Denmark, Holland and Switzerland the Narconon method has received official recognition as a drug rehabilitation program. Therefore it became eligible for government and local funding.
- i) The “European Prison Education Association – EPEA” (Org20) goes back to a Scandinavian initiative for the promotion of education in prison “following the spirit of the recommendations published by the Council of Europe”. Members are prison educators, administrators and other professionals. Initially there were only 3 national organisations: FOKO, Norway, IPEA, Ireland and IPEA, France. Today there are 850 members in 41 countries. Their last Congress took place in Dublin in July 2007. Their present project is the “Virtual European Prison School” which should encourage prisoners to “lifelong learning with the aim of a lasting reintegration into society”.

- j) EUROCHIPS (European Committee for children of imprisoned parents) is a European-wide initiative to boost awareness of the precarious situation of children whose parents are imprisoned (Org21). Initiated and funded by the Dutch Foundation Bernard van Leer, Eurochips has member organisations today in most European countries, such as the Relais Parents-Enfants in France and Belgium, Action for Prisoners' Families in GB or "Bambini senza sbarre" in Italy. The organisation is very active at the Council of Europe. Its latest project is the publication of a "Handbook of Practice and Experience for children with imprisoned parents". 700.000 children in the European Union are separated from their incarcerated parents. Eurochips acts in accordance with the UN Convention of 1989 and the "Charter of Fundamental Rights of Children" within the European Union of 2000.
- k) The "European Forum for Victim-Offender Mediation and Restorative Justice" with headquarters in Belgium unites individuals, professional and voluntary organisations of 25 European countries who work for the promotion and best practice in this field (Org22).
Some of the member organisations are CRISI and Istituto Don Calabria (Italy), Sunnmoek Rad and Telemark Median Service (Norway), Victim Support and Sacro (Scotland), Mikkeli Median Service (Finland), Le Radian and Mediante (Belgium), Fairmittlung (Germany), An Garda Siochana (Ireland), Victim Support Nederland, Neustart (Austria), etc.
- l) EMNA – European Mutual-help Network for alcohol-related problems – (Org23) unites most of the national organisations specialized in this field, such as Vie Libre (France), Länkernas Riksforbund (Sweden), Freundeskreise für Suchtkrankenhilfe, Kreuzbund and Blaues Kreuz (Germany), IOGT (Denmark), Tactus and InTact (Netherlands), Rio (Norway), Associazione Italiana Club Alcolisti di trattamento AICAT (Italy), Federación de Alcohólicos Rehabilitados de España – FARE, etc.
- m) The "International Prison Dharma Group" (Buddhist) works in French, German, Irish, Dutch and British Prisons (Org24). They say that they visit 25.000 prisoners in 900 prisons. The "International Association of Yoga Therapists" is very much linked with Buddhism. "Yoga in Prison" is a 66-page document published in April 2006. (Org25). "Mahayana" is a Buddhist Prison Organisation of Tibetan tradition, founded in 1996. They says that it has taught 12.000 prisoners worldwide so far.
- n) On Google, one can find 31 international Organisations (Org26) involved in prison work.
- o) The "Foreign Prisoner Support Service – FPSS – Save a life" publishes (Org27) on internet 4 pages of organisations working for incarcerated people both at home and abroad (Sweden, Holland, Middle East, Cambodia, Cuba, Australia, Thailand, Angola, etc).

B – Contextual Information :

March 2007
Update 4/2008

B3 - The Privatisation of Prisons and Prison Services

The link between “Prison Volunteers” and the privatisation of prisons does not seem evident at first sight. But it is real:

- Many prisons are overpopulated and old,
- The media, the public and populist politicians think that more incarcerations and for longer periods are the only effective means of combating criminality and re-offending. Therefore, new prisons and more efficient prison administrations seem to be needed,
- But the money available for social projects in government budgets diminishes everywhere due to the rising cost of energy, the ever-more-aging population, etc.,
- With the growing fear of Muslim fundamentalism, the fight against illegal immigration from the Middle East, Africa and Eastern Europe, the increase of violence and delinquency amongst young people and drug offenders, the rise of the prison population seems a logical consequence (Standard & Poor’s foresees a global growth of 3 to 5 % per year),
- The civil servants who predominantly run the prisons today, are generally considered as inefficient, too expensive, having too many privileges and too little motivation – therefore, private companies offer their services and are welcomed by governments always short of money.

The solution to these problems is the “PPP” (Public Private Partnership) which means that the private sector

- a) finances and builds the prisons and/or provides the general services, such as food, laundry, general maintenance. Only the core activities (management and surveillance of the detainees) remain in the hands of the state, or
- b) private companies build the prisons and afterwards not only manage all the services, but also become responsible for security, administration of the detainees, social services, education, leisure activities, prison visitors, transfer and re-socialisation of the prisoners.

The University of Greenwich (GB) seems to have specialized in the observation of the “Public Private Partnership” sector. It publishes on internet 6 times a year a fairly detailed study on the global development of PPPs.

PPPs represent a very convenient solution for indebted national states, because these do not need to spend up-front large sums of money on the construction of new prisons, and they have to pay only after the private companies have actually carried out the agreed services (Priv1). Many prison administrations, experts and politicians observe with scepticism this trend towards the privatisation of a domain which is so closely linked with the fundamental human rights of freedom and justice. The usual ethical and legal reproach is that the state condemns people through the verdicts of judges and then gets rid of its responsibility by transferring the expiation of the punishment to a private company.

In the USA, one frequently encounters the term “PRISON INDUSTRY”. In 2003, 6,3 % (= 94.360) of all prisoners (some 1.500.000 at the time), were incarcerated in “private prisons”. According to a Texan official, the services by private companies (Priv2) are 20 % less expensive (\$ 40 to 50 per detainee per day), which is half of the cost in France, GB and

Germany where the daily rate was Euro 80,- to 100,- in 2006. Per Prison Fellowship the rate for State-run prisons in the USA is \$ 20.000 per year/detainee = \$ 55,- per day. In addition, it seems, that the private companies offer more attractive educational and leisure programs (including “military drill-type ones” for the young) and are reputed to be more effective with re-offenders too. The “private” prisons dealt proportionately with twice as many re-offenders (the “real” criminals) as the public sector. In Texas, 40 prisons are privately run with a capacity of 30.000 inmates which house about 12 % of the total prison population of 152.000. In Florida with its 84.000 inmates in 2005, the increase of the prison population was 3,6 % in one year (2005), 19,2 % in 5 years and 37 % in 10 years. Behind the “Prison Industry” stand powerful private companies such as the Correction Corporation of America with 63 prisons, the Cornell Correction Corp with 55 prisons in 12 States in 2000, the Prison Reality Trust with 50 prisons, the Wackenhut Corrections, etc. According to “Business Week”, the stocks of “Correction Corp. of America” rose by 26 % in the first 2 months of 2006. Business prospects are excellent nationally and internationally. .

In Germany, the construction company Bilfinger has built privately financed prisons at Burg and Chemnitz (Priv3). Serco is involved in the Hünefeld and “Kötter-Justizleistungen” in the Offenburg prison.

The French Parliament changed the law in 2004 allowing the outsourcing of services not directly linked with security. In 2006, the Bouygues consortium Themis obtained authorisation for the construction of 3 new prisons. Shareholders: Dexia/Royal Bank of Scotland 40 % each, Bouygues 19 %; 1700 beds, opening 2009 (Priv 4). In 2/2008, Bouygues (the French civil engineering giant) obtained a contract for building before 2011 and managing entirely 3 more prisons with 3500 places in Nantes, Lille, and Réan. The buildings will be transferred into state property after 27 years of operation. According to ICPS, France is very advanced with regard to the “Public Private Partnership” in which the prison administration keeps the core activity (surveillance, administration of the detainees, social services), and the remainder is managed by private companies. In this “dual-management” set-up, the construction of 13.000 places was launched in 1986 (Chalandon) and an additional 13200 in 1994 (Programme Méhaignerie). Apart from Bouygues, the French civil engineering company, SODEXHO is also very active in this field. They run “restaurant services and facilities management” (Priv3A) in 6 Spanish prisons, 14 in France, 16 in Italy, 38 in Holland, 8 in Portugal, 7 in Scotland, etc. Sodexo provides work and professional formation to the detainees through their restaurant services and gets involved in professional formation, such as the SIGES project (horticulture, vegetable gardening) at the Liancourt prison in France.

In Belgium, the market will become lucrative soon, because most of the 33 prisons are more than 100 years old.

Since 1997, 18 of the 140 English prisons have been built or are managed by Falck, Premier Prison Ltd (a partnership of the American Wackenhut and SERCO), UKDS (subsidiary of the American CCA), Onley, Global Solutions, Moreton Prison Services and Group 4 (a subsidiary of the Swedish Securitas International).

At Nottingham prison, 30 % of the private staff changed in one year. The problems concerning “private prisons” are frequently brought up in Parliament and even the Archbishop of Canterbury has condemned these privatisations, but the Blair government decided that all new prisons would be privately built or run (Priv4). It appears that for Voluntary Prison Visitors, there is little difference between state and privately run prisons,

because the personnel dealing with “social” activities in prison, is often recruited from the “social” services of the state.

The former communist countries of eastern Europe represent an ideal clientele for the PPP sector, because most of their prisons are run down and the conditions of incarceration are frequently criticized by the “European Committee for the Prevention of Torture”, the United Nations and Amnesty International. These “new European” countries in transition from post-communism to a liberal economy, offer excellent perspectives for investors in the “prison industry”.

In a study of 2004, the ICPS (Priv5) thought that the privatisation of prison services would be a passing phenomenon. The information provided by Greenwich University seems to indicate the contrary.

NEUSTART, a private Austrian company, has carried out not only probation work for many years in Austria, but is also involved in associate activities (see section Switzerland/Austria). In 2006, it extended its activities to Baden-Wurtemberg (Germany) which provoked strong resistance from the unions of the civil servants working for the prison administration (see report by the “Deutschlandradio” in section “Germany” – Priv 6). For Neustart, to be successful and competitive, it

- must limit the employment of civil servants,
- involve more volunteer workers by granting them more freedom of action, responsibility and general “work satisfaction” (significant cost reduction, because voluntary workers are paid expenses only) and
- work in an “unbureaucratic” fashion as private companies do.

In view of the additional effort since 1999 to reduce re-offending in England (which, in fact, resulted in a steady increase), the British Government proposed in 1/2007 a complete overhaul of the State Probation Services, with part of the funding going to private companies and voluntary associations (Priv7).

In England, Germany, Austria, the USA, Australia and New Zealand, voluntary prison visitors already work under the authority of private companies. In future years, it is likely that many more prisons will be completely privatized and that probation and education work will be carried out more by private companies and the voluntary sector, which will increase, no doubt, the already existing tensions with the prison administration. Only time will tell whether this tendency will contribute to improving the principal goal of incarceration: the re-socialisation of the delinquents.

In France, “Les Prisons de la misère” (Priv8) was published in 1999 by a well-known writer on prison matters, Loïc Wacquant (Professor at Berkely) . Prison.Eu.Org contributes a comparative study with the title “La privatisation des prisons – 3 enjeux” (Priv9).

“Against repression, against prisons”, a Berlin-based association, sums up the situation with the conclusion “je mehr Eingesperrete , desto mehr Gewinn – the more detainees, the more profit” (Priv10).

B – Contextual Information :

March 2007
Update 4/2008

B4 - The situation in the USA

Although this enquiry deals with Western Europe, looking briefly at the situation in the USA is useful, because often “what happens in the USA today may well happen in Europe tomorrow”. Example: “Prison visiting” was an idea of the East-coast Quakers and the electronic bracelet was invented in the US in 1985.

The “broken-window principle” (called also “zero tolerance”) promoted in the early 1990s by the former Mayor of New York, Mr. Giuliani and his very media-aware Chief of Police, Mr. Bratton (US1), has had a great impact in the USA and partly in Europe too. It basically means that, if a window is knocked in, it must be repaired at once, because otherwise, thugs will feel encouraged to destroy the others too. With regard to legal matters, it pushes Police, Judges and normal citizens to report and go after ALL offences and punish their authors. As a consequence, due to more and longer sentences, the prisons have filled up steadily in the last 20 years . This policy was successful, at least on paper (US2), because the crimes and offences registered by the police seem to have dropped in the USA between 1991 and 2001 from 15.000.000 to 12.000.000 (although it is also true to say that in Canada, which had not followed the American example, the crime rate fell in the same proportions). The European crime rate remained fairly static over the same period.

There does not seem to exist any in-depth study which proves that this repressive policy has had a beneficial effects on re-offending, the percentages of which cited by the press and organisations, such as ALPHA and Prison Fellowship, vary between 67 to 70 % within 3 years of release. “Strike 3 and you are out” seems to apply not only to baseball, but to sentencing too.

In the US, the prison population rate per 100.000 (US3) has risen from 140 in 1980 to over 750 at the end of 2007 and is hence about 7 to 8 times higher than the Western European average. Between 1980 and 2003, the convictions (US4) for offences against the public order, drugs and theft, have increased only slightly, whereas those for violence have trebled (52 % of all sentences in 2002 compared with France = 14 %). Evolution (US5):

	1980	2005
	-----	-----
- total number of condemnations	2.000.000	7.000.000
- People in prison (prison + jail)	600.000	2.200.000
- People on probation	1.100.000	4.200.000
- Conditional Release	300.000	800.000
- Young offenders		100.000

This means that 7.300.000 people (or 2,4 % of the total population) live in the USA under legal supervision (in Western Europe 0,2 to 0,4%).

By detailing the ratios of the prisoners according to ethnic groups, the US Authorities publish statistics which are, from a French point of view, “politically incorrect” (but they apply undoubtedly to some European countries too).

Here is an analysis of the US prison population on 30.6.06 (always per 100.000 - (US6) :

	Whites -----	Latinos -----	Blacks -----
Total number incarcerated	409	1038	2468
Total number of Males	737	1862	4789
Males 25-29 years only	1685	3912	11695
Males 25-29 years (% of total population)	1,6 %	3,9 %	11,7 %

This means that 6 times more blacks are incarcerated than whites and 11,7 % of the total black 25-29 year olds were behind bars in 2006.

“Human Rights Watch” publishes a thorough analysis of the situation in 2003 under the title “Incarcerated America” (US7). “The Sentencing Project” of 7/2007 on “Racial, ethnic prison disparity” (US7A) states in detail not only the broad variations in racial disparity among the 50 states, but details the “uneven justice” to which the minorities are exposed.

In federal America, each state has its own prison administration. According to the ICPS, out of a total of 5049 prisons in 2000, 3365 were “local jails”, 1558 state and 146 federal prisons.

The “Ohio Dept of Rehabilitation and Correction” (US8) explains the functioning of their prisons and the conditions for visiting inmates. “Befrienders or volunteer visitors” are mentioned once in 6 pages. Already on arrival, each detainee has to establish a list of visitors he wants to see: “family, friends, lawyer, chaplain”. The word “voluntary prison visitor” is not mentioned.

The North Carolina Dept of Corrections publishes comprehensive guide-lines on “Volunteers in Prison”. Among sensible generalities it is suggested that “Volunteers are useful to ease workloads of prison staff members” (US9).

Jack Cowley of the “Alpha USA-Office of Prisons and Re-Entry” made a statement of testimony in 2005 in front of the “Commission on Safety and Abuse of America’s Prisons” which reflects some essential problems (US11). He said:

- 70 % of the released detainees re-offend, 93 % return to the community.
- We lock up people with whom we are angry rather than of whom we are scared, because they are dangerous.
- The crime rate and the number of prison staff go down; the prison population goes up.
- There are more and more prisoners with mental health problems.
- Offenders stay in prison longer and have given up hope of a normal life outside.
- Staff treat re-offenders as “worst-of-the-worst”. Security by force is more prevalent than measures of re-entry. Increased tension between prisoners and staff due to confined and violent environment. Rumours/lies circulate and damage re-socialisation efforts.
- Nobody is accountable for the judicial failure to correct the detainees.
- Once the detainee leaves prison, he meets with so many obligations (family, underpaid job, bad accommodation, compensation for the victim, parole fees) that he has problems overcoming them. He starts feeling that prison was not that bad, because everything was provided. Prison is no longer a scare, but an acceptable alternative to freedom.
- Ex-inmates who do NOT re-offend do so despite their negative prison experience. The scare does not work.
- Imagine what would happen, if the actors of the juridical/penal system were personally held responsible for reducing the re-offending rate. They would start to implement the most efficient ways of imprisonment and probation instead of catching the detainee in administrative “do’s and don’ts”. Example: currently in most US-States a volunteer is not allowed to contact the prisoner’s family and see him after release, although the mentoring relationship after release plays a major role in his success or failure of re-entry”.

IPCA indicates for the USA that (US12):

- 66 % of all offenders are rearrested within 3 years,
- 54 % have no high-school diploma,
- Recidivism is 20 to 60% lower for those participating in educational, vocational or work programs,
- 8 to 16 % have a serious mental disorder and 70 % a substance abuse problem (dual diagnosis), but most prisons are not equipped for treatment of such cases,
- 20 % of the prisoners are released with Community Supervision,
- Appropriate co-ordinated treatment can reduce recidivism by 30 %,
- 45 % of the 200.000 parolees return to prison for parole violations.

There is ample evidence (Andrews and Bonta, Harrison, Walmsley etc) in about 200 enquiries with statistically relevant sampling that “non-residential sanctions” compared with imprisonment produce between 3 and 23 % less re-offending. Rehabilitation according to the “risk, needs and responsivity principles” produces, if combined, between a 26 to 32 % reduction of re-offending compared with imprisoned people without help. Cognitive-behavioural methods (change in behaviour, thinking and relationships) yielded a reduction of 23% in re-offending compared with those prisoners who entered and left prison with no rehabilitation effort. Prison + half-way houses resulted in a 17 % reduction of re-offending. All these facts are documented in detail and are widely publicised.

Although the USA represent only 5 % of the world population (US12A), 25 % of all prisoners worldwide are incarcerated in America. The disproportionately high US prison population is bewildering all the more as 90 % of the Americans say that they are religious. A possible explanation might be a very narrow interpretation of Hebrews 12:6 “For whom the Lord loves he chastens/punishes and whips every son whom he receives” (?).

Volunteer prison visitors are mainly part of Religious Organisations:

- “the American Correction Chaplains” ACCA – The chaplains are paid by the Prison Administration to insure that all prisoners are given spiritual assistance in their own faith. They recruit their own volunteers according to need.
- “the American Catholic Chaplains Association” - ACCCA. The number of prison chaplains dwindles. Whereas in 1980 virtually all Prison Chaplains were priests, in 2001 only half of the 183 Chaplains were ordained. Therefore, essential services such as saying mass, hearing confession or anointing the sick cannot be performed. .
- the protestants from IPCA and the Quakers,
- the Prison Fellowship and “Alpha for prison” (evangelists),
- The Kairos Prison Ministry (US13) is an ecumenical organisation, based in Florida, which is an offspring of the Cursillo movement. 20.000 volunteers work world-wide They offer courses of initiation to Christianity and “lasting re-entry of prisoners into society”,
- the Patriots of the “Volunteers of America” (US14)
- the Scientologists have a “second chance rehabilitation program” within their Criminon Organisation which runs in several US prisons; hotly disputed,
- local associations such as the “Prison Padres” or the “Chicagoland Prison Outreach”.

Most Evangelical Churches (or movements) are united in the umbrella organisation COPE which is in turn part of the “International Network of Prison Ministries”. The INPM has a website with more than 3000 entries. Many of the churches have resounding names such as Jesus Inside, the Lord loseth the prisoner, Exodus Ministries, Gone Fishing, Jesus is the way, Faith Fellowship, General Council of God, First Assembly of God, Good New Prison Ministry, World-wide Voice in the Wilderness, Whispering Hills Church of Christ or “Brothers Keeper”, a Massachusetts church which goes back to 1980 and Frank Catania, a former prisoner who had become an evangelist, etc.

The Prison Fellowship (Slogan: Changing Lives, Minds and communities through Jesus Christ) with its dynamic organisation is omnipresent on Internet with job offers, documents of faith, projects such as contacting individually 14.000 detainees in Southern California in April 2007 to reduce recidivism, the recruiting of volunteers “how to help” (US15) and the very factual “do’s and don’ts” for prison volunteers (US16).

With less money available for State “Re-entry programs”, faith-based organisations, such the Prison Fellowship, offer Christian Rehabilitation Programs in prisons which caused considerable upheaval last year in the USA. Per a CNN report, the “InnerChange Freedom Initiative” (US17) is available on a voluntary basis theoretically to all detainees with less than 2 years before release, except for sex offenders and inmates with a bad disciplinary record. The “Carol Vance Unit” in Texas was founded in 1997 and is one of the faith-based prison facilities where the chosen inmates spend their days studying, working and praying, helped by evangelical volunteers. The “Correction Corporation of America” which runs 63 private prisons has accommodated 1700 inmates in 24 prisons enabling them to follow these programs. The State subsidized these courses with 3 million \$.

A lawsuit by the “Americans United for Separation of Church and State” contended that state funds were used for the purpose of religious indoctrination. As, in addition, only 6 % of the catholic prisoners (compared with the 20% Catholics of the total prison population) and probably no Muslims took part, a federal judge in Iowa agreed with the complaint and ordered the halt of the program and repayment of 1,5 Million \$ to the State. The Prison Fellowship appealed affirming that the InnerChange program produced far better re-offending results (apparently only 10 % re-offended in Florida). An independent study showed, however, that released inmates with a similarly favourable personal background, achieved the same low re-offending rates.

One characteristic of the faith-based re-entry programs is that the assigned volunteer mentor provides counselling during incarceration and after release, assists with job hunting, housing, administration, family problems etc. whereas normal inmates leave prison with only \$ 50,- from the administration and “the directions to the nearest bus station”.

The Florida Dept. of Correction created the first faith-based residential program of re-education in 1999 in a max. security prison. The Kairos Prison Ministry (US18) which was founded in 1976 and employs 12.000 volunteers who work largely with the Community sector, runs the program. To participate in it, the prisoner has no other obligation than to dedicate the evenings and weekends to study and group activities, to renounce bad behaviour, such as viewing pornography, bullying, swearing and smoking. Participants can be agnostics or of no Christian faith. Key to the course is Anger Management, working for a daily living, the experience of relationships, parenting, victim awareness and learning to be tolerant. The participants live in separate dormitories, but eat and work with the other inmates. Usually a volunteer from the local church accompanies the participants with visits once a week for 6 months (Godparent).

A 3-year pilot program “Ready 4 work” by the Government and private groups resulted, it appears, 3 years after release in a re-offending rate of only 30 %.

There are religious lobby and information groups such as the “Religious Intelligence” and the “DeMoss Group”. Among the 24 faith-based movements of the “Alpha links” (US19) are, for example:

- “Child Evangelism Fellowship” which promotes correspondence between imprisoned parents and their children. It appears that the “Mailbox Club” operates in 150 countries and involves 5 Million children each year.
- “Fellowship (Motorbike) Riders” provide prison ministry through their church based affiliates.

- The “Morning Star Ministry” deals mainly with the indigenous Native American inmates for education, bible study and cross-cultural issues
- “Youth direct Ministries” conducts in-prison events in youth facilities.
- “Epiphany Ministry” provides small group and one-on-one follow-up in juvenile prisons and promotes the involvement of volunteers. Etc.

There are about 40 non-confessional organisations (US20) mentioned on the Website “The real cost of prison”. This blog gathers information and comments on the prison situation in the USA. The language is most direct and crude. Subjects: bigots, drugs, difficult visiting, rape, living conditions, repression, physical and mental health problems, prison industry, etc.

Under “American Voluntary Prison Visitors” one can find associations such as

- AIM – Incarcerated mothers are helped to maintain the mother-child link,
- California Moratorium Project – Stop all private and public construction of Prisons for 5 years. Use money for alternatives to imprisonment.
- Castle of Hope for lost souls – founded in 2002, this is an addict support group, former alcoholics, ex-convicts, abused children, all lost souls,
- Critical Resistance Organisation – against prison industry complex. They say that the more prisons there are, the quicker they will be filled.
- FAMM (Families against Mandatory Minimums), lobby for fair sentencing,
- AMICUS, Minneapolis – help to inmates, ex-offenders, juvenile offenders,
- All of us or none – combat life-long discrimination, help prisoners, ex-prisoners,
- Inside Out – exploring issues of crime and justice in prison,
- The Prison Foundation, Washington – promotes Arts and education, alternatives to prison,
- California Prison Focus – Regular visits to 2 prisons, militate in favour of better treatment of the inmates, (US21),
- AmeriCorps VISTA Re-entry Initiative – 40 members work in 15 urban areas with ex-prisoners to facilitate housing, education, life skills to lower the recidivism rate(US22)
- “Think outside the Cage” (US23) is a Colorado Criminal Justice Reform Coalition of 112 organisations involved in a drug policy reform, women in prison, recidivism, etc.
- The Hancock County Jail looks from the outside like a country mansion. Instead of going to large prisons, volunteers assist inmates in these pleasant surroundings.
- PARC – wants to abolish all prisons. They present the cases of 40 political prisoners.
- AFSC – The “American Friend Service Committee” provides advocacy, prisoner and family support, grass roots education and is against the industrial prison complex,
- Books not Bars – is an association which aims at transforming the entire criminal justice system,
- California Coalition of Political and Women Prisoners –
- AICAP/AIFAP – help for incarcerated foreign prisoners in America,
- Families of Prisoners – exchange of information and consolation,
- and finally, there are several websites for “Pen Pals”.

The “Family and Correction Network - FCN” (US24) is a large organisation specializing in the support of more than 150.000 families of prisoners per year.

The “Women’s Prison Association – WPA” in New York (US25) represented some 98.000 female prisoners in 2003. Their annual report is very analytical and militant. We learn that in 2006, 112.000 (or 134 per 100.000) women were imprisoned, that women represent 7,2 % of the total prison population, that 66 % of them had children and that there are 3 times as many black women in prison as whites. Such a nation-wide association does not appear to exist for incarcerated MEN.

Crime.org is part of the big “grassroots” organisation. After a rather long analysis (US26) of the social problems of criminality, the violent character of American society, too many and too long condemnations and the problem of fire arms, the article comes, nevertheless, to the conclusion, that there are few alternatives. There seems to exist a general consensus among Americans that the present tough policy of “zero tolerance” and the resulting high prison population is “regrettable, but just and unavoidable”.

The Probation Services (US27) in the USA are usually attached to the Circuit Courts (as for example the one in Cook near Chicago) and are separate for youths and adults. One probation officer usually deals with 60 clients. Volunteers account for about 30 % of the probation service and come from 350 associations. The big difference from Europe is that 90 % of the convictions involve fire arms. The Probation officers supervise the community service, work in mediation, reinforced supervision and offer programs such as “Juvenile Drug treatment”, Family Reunification, Juvenile Sex Offending, Anti-violence, “Street Dreams Employment” for 16/18 year old youths with good prospects of successfully overcoming the probation period (from workshop: Bewährungshilfe, Bayern).

Extracts from a private prison trip report in 3/2008:

The author was surprised

- * about the “banalisation” of crime and imprisonment being perceived as part of normal life (particularly true for low-class black and latin Americans),
 - * that violence is presented as “nothing more than reflecting American society”.
 - * Children from 12 years onwards can find themselves implicated in the prison/probation system for futile reasons,
 - * Low-paid jobs of \$ 5,- to 8,- per hour for the unskilled worker, do not permit people to life on. They need a second job or additional income (from drugs for example), to compensate the victim, pay for parole fees and feed the family.
-
- The “points system” for young inmates is based on “losing” points, and therefore favours, whereas striving for improvement is not rewarded through “winning” points.
 - Someone living under probation has to pay \$ 85,- for the cost of the probation officer which means that on a low-paid income level, he has little proper income.
 - Although drugs in prison are heavily penalised, they are frequent. Big business in prison are cigarettes at \$ 25,- a piece with no penal consequences.
 - Prison food is free, but served only until 4 pm. After that, the detainee can order additional food up to \$ 75,- per month by means of a central touch panel.
 - In spite of the heavy implication of fire arm in crime, the second amendment of the American constitution is frequently cited, because “people kill people, not fire arms kill people”, “I would fail in my role as a father, if I could not defend my family with a gun” and “the central government, knowing that the people are armed, would not dare to go against them” (?).
 - One prison place costs between 12.000 and 40.000 \$ per year. Prison Guards can retire at the age of 52 with a pension of more than 50 % of their last salary.

Anyone involved in prisons and the relationship between the guards and detainees should know about Professor Philip Zimbardo’s “Stanford Prison Experiment” of 1971. It concludes that, given the right environment, the readiness to fulfil the expectations of the superiors and the unlimited power of the authorities over the prisoners, the human species is capable of the worst. Although this “experiment” is still hotly disputed, the Abou Graib prison scandal is considered as a proof of the professor’s troubling theory.

B5 - Miscellaneous Documents and Information

1. The 108 European Prison Rules (Div1) published by the European Council
 - a) mention only once the Voluntary Workers (para 89.2): “Competent Volunteers should be encouraged, whenever possible, to contribute to the activities of the detainee”.
 - b) Chapters 7 and 90.2 says that “civil society should be encouraged to participate in prison life, whenever appropriate”.
 - c) Chapter 21.1 specifies that “the prisoners should be authorized to communicate as frequently as possible with outside organisations, and receive visits from their members (“outside organisations” = prison volunteers?)
A large part is reserved for the importance of education in prison (Chapter 28 and 206.2), religion (Chapter 29) and purpose and training of prison staff (72.2), etc.

Even if the term “prison visitor” never appears and the contribution of the volunteers goes largely unmentioned, these “prison rules” which in fact are “recommendations to be incorporated into the national legislations” are immensely important, because “re-socialisation” is clearly defined as the aim of incarceration and, for example, an educational and reconciliatory role is attributed to prison staff beyond their security attributions. Had united “prison voluntary associations” spoken to their national governments (preferably even linked on a European level), it is likely that a more proactive part would have been attributed to their work.

Nevertheless, these “prison rules”, although not binding, will influence greatly the European Prison Administrations for many years to come. Comments on their significance are available, for example, in English written by the Quakers, in German by Prof. Dünkel of the University of Greifswald (Div1A) and in French on the OIP and Prison.eu.org websites. At least in France, the RPE (Règles pénitentiaires européennes) are considered as firm guide lines by the French Prison Administration and not only “vague recommendations”.

2. In his “Contextual Report” (Div2) on the new 108 European Prison Rules, Professor Andrew Coyle of the ICPS gives an overview of the situation in European prisons. He reflects on the aim of imprisonment and advocates a change in the role prison staff plays today, etc.. He also talks about the NGOs (Page 22), but only in the context of education (example Génèpi) and the families of prisoners. Anybody who wants to understand the essence of the 108 “prison rules” should read this report. Andrew Coyle, a former Prison Governor, also wrote in 2002 a very detailed manual on “Human Rights Approach to Prison Management” (Div3). In 2001, he gave a presentation on the occasion of the congress of the “International Prison Chaplains Association Europe” on “Restorative Justice in a Prison setting” (Div4).
3. In their “Guidance Note No.12” (Div5) with the title “Encouraging the Involvement of Civil Society”, the IPCS estimates that a penitentiary reform is not possible without the strong support of civil society and defines the main actors: organisations for penal reform and women’s rights, religious institutions, lawyers, the media, the NGOs and the “befrienders”. The message is that prisons need to be “demilitarized” and considered as “democratic and human” institutions which are a normal part of society.

4. The “Dissel Report” (Div 6) written by a South-African delegation, analyses the penal systems in Denmark, Holland and the UK after touring these countries in 1995. Although this report is now somehow dated, it is interesting, because the facts are observed by non-Europeans in need of urgent solutions. Immediately following the abolition of apartheid, South Africa is in quest of national reconciliation; it lives in a violent, multiracial society, is of course aware of the apparently very successful American “broken-window/zero tolerance” theory, but also wants to learn from European experiences.

5. PRIMA (DIV7) – Policies and Strategies for Prison Management – is a group of prison administrators within the Council of Europe which reflects on prison matters and works in favour of the adaptation of prisons to the new European Rules.

6. In 2006, Dr Preusker (Germany) gave a presentation (Div8) in Switzerland on the subject of “Tensions between the media and the justice system”. Some of the main points were:
 - The principal aim of the German Federal law of 1977 was the “re-socialisation” of the detainee instead of punishment and repression. Unfortunately, the support of the public for this humanitarian law is diminishing today. Former Chancellor Schröder remarked for example that “a sexual delinquent ought to stay in prison forever”.
 - Incarceration does NOT improve a detainee and make him fit for life outside prison. On the contrary, it destroys his life and considerably increases the risk of re-offending.
 - In the tabloid press, Springer with the “Bildzeitung” and other newspapers, has a market share of 81 % of the German “popular” press and represents, thus, a formidable force in the manipulation of public opinion.
 - The press insinuates that more and longer prison sentences could resolve the problems of criminality, and in particular those of re-offending.
 - Prisons are described as “luxury hotels” and “dolce vita behind bars”. Everybody who has access to prisons, knows that the contrary is true.
 - The influence of the press on sentencing is evident: in the 1960s, rape offenders were sentenced to 2 to 5 years imprisonment. In the 1990s only 40 % of the pronounced sentences corresponded to that time span. Against their better judgement, Conditional Release is rarely granted by the authorities concerned (psychologists, judges, administration) for fear of possible re-offending and the reaction of the press.
 - The media stimulate violence amongst the wider population (kick boxing, faits-divers, news, films, TV, computer games, etc.). Violence and crime have become commonplace in the perception particularly of young people.
 - The media are not interested in the facts which prove that detainees and people with suspended sentences re-offend less.

Finally, Dr. Preusker appealed to prison directors to co-operate with the press by regularly supplying factual information to journalists instead of excluding them from prison life (the detainees are part of society and not hidden away!).

The tense relationship between public-image-sensitive politicians and the tabloid press on one side and many actors of the Justice System on the other, is illustrated in England by the epic battle Lord Justice Woolf fought courageously for many years (Div9) .

As an example of the popular wish for “more and longer punishments”, one could take the Daily Mail article “What planet are judges living on” of January 2008 (Div10) or the “Broken Britain Campaign” by the SUN in February 2008 kindled by the Conservative Party leader (Div11).

7. An example of political manipulation of penal matters was the regional elections of Jan 2008 in Hessen/Germany, in which Prime Minister Koch, introduced as his principal argument against the opposition the stiffening of the Youth Penal Legislation when he realized that he risked losing. He used as a pretext the aggression of an elderly gentleman in the Munich underground by 2 youths “with a migrant background”. An extensive discussion followed in the media all over Germany. According to “Der Spiegel” (Div12) 52 to 65 % of the German population favour tougher actions against juvenile offenders (max prison sentence to be increased from 10 to 15 years), although 79 % of the people say that they do not fear foreign youths. 70 % said that they considered US-style boot camps as unfit for the re-socialisation of youth offenders. Mr. Koch’s populist style provoked rejection not only in his own party (the Christian CDU), but among the population too. He lost 12 % of his voters compared with 5 years ago.
8. The report (Div13) of a congress in 2004 at Ceske Budejovice (Tchechia) is interesting mainly because experts from Western and Eastern Europe came together to exchange their experiences. The theme was “Concerns of the soul – tensions between offence, guilt, human dignity and security”. Marie-Christine ter Harkd’Ursuel (chaplain in Brussels) formulated the very pertinent “wish for a (wiedergutmachenden, versöhnenden) repairing and conciliatory justice system”.
9. In 2006, Anne-Marie Klopp (Düsseldorf) gave a presentation in Munich on “The families of detainees in a European context” (Div14). She demonstrates working habits in different European countries, the different ways of helping families and children in Germany, France and Switzerland. The European countries are certainly closer today in certain areas, but each country is jealously preserving the sovereignty over its judiciary. Examples are the refusal of the highest German jurisdiction (Bundesgerichtshof) for the automatic extradition of German nationals to other European countries and the establishment of a so-called “common EU terror list” There is still a lot of co-ordination work to be done amongst the European countries.
10. In 2006, the “Minister of Corrections” of New Zealand undertook an information journey to Holland, Finland and the UK . Kim Workman, director of “Prison Fellowship”, New Zealand, was part of the official delegation. The findings in his published trip report (DIV15) confirm the wish of his organisation to contribute effectively to the penal reform in preparation in his country. The direct language of this report is far from the silence and tacit conformity of most European voluntary prison organisations in the ongoing battle for a more efficient and modern prison system.
11. Relatively few women are incarcerated (see section “Statistics”). In Holland they count for 8,7 % of the whole prison population, 5,2 % in Germany, 3,6 % in France and 8,7 % in the USA. In 2004, “Les Pénélopes” (Div 16) published a study on “Women in European prisons” detailing their main types of offences (which are proportionately rather different from those of the men): murder, drug trafficking, violence against children, financial offences and, naturally, residence permits in the context of illegal prostitution. The conditions of detention, the separation from their children, 3 to 4 times more cases of aids compared with men, quickly rising drug dependence, lack of education and acts of violence within the family make a prison

stay particularly tough for women. The author, Dominique Foufelle, discusses several books on the subject.

“Female Prisons in Europe” is a series of reports on the conditions of detention in 16 countries published on internet . The report for Belgium (Div 17), for example, comprises 5 pages.

The Quakers have published an international study on “Women in prison” and so has Prof. Dünkler of Greifswald University (Germany) in 2005.

Many associations of voluntary prison visitors are working in Europe to help women in prison and after their release, for example: Women in Prison (UK), Acope (Spain), Hope (Scotland), Parcours de Femmes (France) – see “Conclusions”.

12. « International Centre for Prison Studies - ICPS» which is part of King’s College, London, is no doubt the most competent institution on prison matters in the world. The numerous contributions by Andrew Coyle, Baroness Stern, Rob Allen and others as well as the up-to-date statistics not only show what the present situation is, but also what a more equitable judiciary and a more modern, just and efficient prison system ought to look like in the future.
13. The Catalan theologian, chemist and prison visitor Edison Fañanás-Lanau is working at present on a doctorate which has as the subject the ethical predispositions (Div18) a volunteer should have for his work in prison. Based on research in several European and foreign prisons, he tries to define different models according to the predominant ethos of the social environment. Such an analysis focused on Voluntary Prison Visitors does not seem to exist so far. In 10/2007 he presented a summary of his work on the occasion of a seminar at Rottenburg/Germany.
14. The “European Committee on Crime Problems – CDPC” – “Council for Penological Co-operation – PC-CP” at Strasburg is the focal organisation for all European prison matters. It was this committee which negotiated the “108 Prison Rules” and published them in 1/2006. Projects in preparation cover recommendations on remand detention, sentencing delinquent youth and probation/reintegration into society (Div19).
15. The European Commission (SANCO) published in 10/2007 a 300-page Study on “Mentally disordered persons in European Prisons” carried out by the “Institute of Mental Health”, Mannheim (Germany) – (Div20). Depending on the assessment method, 30 to 70 % of the prisoners in European jails have a mental handicap. The prison as an institution is largely ignored by society, and the mentally ill who have become criminal, are considered even less. The authors call the lack of reliable data, of assessment methods agreed in common and of qualified personnel working in European prisons “nothing less than dramatic”. This intentional ignoring of the blatant facts results in increased re-offending, less safety for the public and increased cost for the tax payer. Screening processes at entry, during incarceration and before release are not in place in most countries to decide on the most adequate types of treatment. The confined and rough living conditions in prison frequently provoke mental disorder. The vast majority of European prisons are not equipped for the mentally fragile and ill which causes great problems to the prison administration. Fascinating reading not only for the professionals, but for prison volunteers too who are in frequent touch with these detainees.
16. In 1987 the “European Convention for the Prevention of Torture” (Div21) was signed by more than 40 member countries of the Council of Europe. The aim was to prevent degrading treatment of people deprived of their civil liberties in prisons, detained in police stations, in psychiatric hospitals or in youth re-education centres. The convention stipulates that at least 2 members of the delegation are allowed to visit any place and are allowed to talk to anyone in order to assess the treatment of the

detainees. On an average, 6 countries are visited per year. The average length per report is 100 pages. These visits by independent commissioners and their subsequent reports have usually a considerable impact on the national authorities and the public, as, for example, the one in 2004 on Danish, in 2005 on Norwegian prison conditions and the one by Gil-Robles in September 2005 on France. The new “108 Prison Rules” will be an important basis against which the inspectors will be able to check whether the actual detention conditions are in conformance with the new legislation.

17. Three rather original Studies were published in the USA:

- “Returning Home: Understanding the Challenges of Prisoner Re-entry”, a Maryland Pilot Study with findings from Baltimore which involved a sample of 235 males and 89 females. The complete report is available on the website of the “Urban Institute” (Div22).
- “The Culture of Prison Sexual Violence” dated 11/2006 is a 300-page Report (Div23) sponsored by the Federal Department of Justice. The sample of participants involved 564 inmates in 30 prisons. 70 % of the women and 42 % of the men were perceived to engage in homosexual conduct. Some 65 % of the prisoners said that they were aware of inmate-staff mutual sex relationships. 28/35 % of the interviewed people knew of rape among inmates reported to the staff. 9 % of the women and 21% of the men said that they lived in permanent threat of rape. Very detailed study. There does not seem to exist a similar report on the subject in Europe.
- “Prison and Punishment – Rethinking of Prison Sex Life: Self expression and Safety” by the Columbia Journal of Gender and Law which covers the same subject(Div24).

18. The University of Lausanne undertook in 2006 a 73-page study on a most controversial subject in penal matters, “the effects of custodial vs non-custodial sentences on re-offending” (Div25). A systematic “review of the state of knowledge”. The evaluation is based on 3000 abstracts, 23 general studies, 5 studies with controlled design and 27 comparisons. In broad terms, the result is that in 11 of 13 significant comparisons re-offending is lower after non-custodial sentences. However, in 14 of 27 comparisons there is little difference between the 2 types of sanctions. In contrast to the majority of results, 2 out of 27 comparisons are in favour of custodial sentences, because they apparently resulted in less re-offending. A rather rigorous summary to bring some light into a crucial and hotly disputed subject.

19. On the website of the “Conférence Européenne de Probation – CEP” (Div26) one can find “brief” and “full” reports of seminars and workshops going back to 1996 on a variety of themes such as

- “Volunteers in the Criminal Justice System” – 1999,
- “Co-operation to reduce re-offending”, situation in 2002 in 11 countries (Div27),
- “Electronic Monitoring in Europe” – 2003
- “Preventing Sex Offending” – 2006.

There is ample information on almost all subjects covering prison administration, probation and their actors on a European level.

20. “Changing Futures: The Potential Role for Volunteering in the Rehabilitation of Offenders” compounded in 2007 by Joanna Machin and Nick Ockenden of the British Institute of Volunteering Research, is a 6-page summary (Div28). It is written in the context of the UK government’s intention to grant the voluntary sector a central role in its frantic effort to reduce re-offending. Although the background of this study is English/Welsh with the creation of the “National Offender Management Service –

NOMS” and the “Offender Management Bill”, many aspects are similar in other European countries. In conjunction with the employers, communities and the faith-based associations, the volunteers and monitors are now put at the centre of the project for a durable integration of offenders into the community. With an “end-to-end” follow-up by a single Offender Manager for one delinquent, which starts during incarceration and lasts at least one year after release, the government tries to inverse the tendency in re-offending.

The study estimates that there are at least 6000 volunteers of faith-based organisations working in English/Welsh prisons, 800 as members of the “Independent Monitoring Boards”, and 7 % of the inmates are supporting their peers in various ways (Samaritan listener scheme, mentoring, sports, “first night project”, advice on education, work and prison rules). Suitable inmates are recruited by Chaplains and the administration, a system not without problems, but which represents a huge potential both for the “prisoners as volunteers”, their fellow detainees - and the Government, because of cost reduction. .

The lack of comprehensive evidence of the effect of volunteering in prison is mentioned in the study as well as the difficulty of quantifying volunteer work. 7 “pathways” are prioritized to reduce re-offending, self-assessment and motivation by the voluntary prison visitors and the sometimes conflicting relationship with the staff are discussed. Interesting reading for all prison volunteers!

21. The British Home Office published in 1998 a 4-part comparative “Study on Prison and Probation Administrations” (Div29) in the UK, Denmark, Norway, the Netherlands, Germany, Scotland and other countries. Although this comparison is in parts obsolete now, it shows the divergent concepts of “all-state” administration and probation models via a state-funded “private sector” (Netherlands), to fully private probation as in Austria.
22. Prison volunteers are involved in many sectors such as the help for families and children, education, legal aid, job hunting, fighting dependence, giving moral and administrative support, supporting foreigners, supervision of community services and probation etc. The Arts in Jail and their positive effects on the detainees for their re-socialisation are getting more and more popular. Taken at random there are
 - SMALL GROUPS, such as
 - . the “Association Pulsart” whose volunteers teach adult delinquents at the Villepinte prison (exhibition in 12/2006),
 - . “Les Ateliers créatifs des Femmes – ACFE” at the Swiss Champ-Dollon prison (exhibition of Ceramics in Mai 2007),
 - . The “Art-ig – Kunst im Gefängnis”-Initiative at the womens’ prison at Vechta/Germany with yearly exhibitions since 1993;
 - . The “Prison Arts Foundation” started in 1996 which functions in 3 Northern Ireland prisons,
 - . The volunteers around the artist Arno Lindenberg who initiates women detainees of the Köln-Ossendorf prison into fine art with the slogan “everyone can paint” The result was a well-frequented exhibition with 100 paintings in 2006.
 - . “Kunst kennt geen Tralies” – See Belgium.
 - LARGE groups and Federations such as
 - . The “Koestler Trust” (Arts by Offenders) in London which goes back to the author Arthur Koestler and which organises awards and exhibitions in 49 art forms. It had in 2007 4802 entries for competition and sold 2000 art works. Such a huge organisation can only be run thanks to a string of sponsors, donors, partners, experts and volunteers,

- . “Escape Artists – UK” is a charity which tries to rehabilitate ex-prisoners and marginalized people through art-based activities.
- . The “Ann Peaker Centre” regroups artistic activities in a prison environment all over the UK (Joining the dots, Arts on the out),
- . The “Prison Arts Network – PAN” has 170 members throughout Europe, is sponsored by the EU Socrates Project and linked with the “Prison Arts education Network”.
- . EPEA has a similar Art teaching program called “Grundtvig Actions”.

23. Theatre in prison is probably the most advanced way of self-affirmation for a detainee. Such theatre activities have sprung up everywhere in Europe in the last 20 years such as:

- “Compagnia della Fortezza” at Volterra (Italy) and the “Centro Nazionale teatro e carcere”, the Ticvin Teatro in Milano and CETEC in Rome. NEWO is a private company which has mainly an advisory function for private companies and it is part of the European Social Fund.
- The “Théâtre de l’Opprimé” in France works generally with disadvantaged people, including prisoners. Participation in International Theatre Festivals.
- Riksteatern is a NGO which works on local level throughout Sweden,
- In the UK there are theatre companies such as GEESE, GRAEae, CARDBOARD CITIZIENS (the homeless), CLEAN BREAK (for women whose lives have been affected by the criminal justice system) and CHICKEN SHED of South Gate (London) which produces ballets, musicals, plays and mime performances. A group of volunteers sponsors the company within the youth prevention and re-socialisation program.
- “Teatro Yeses” was founded in 1985 and plays regularly in Madrid.
- “Aufbruch” at the Berlin-Tegel prison is a very dynamic theatre company which has performed 20 plays in the last 10 years. The last performances were “Ikarus – Abflug Tegel”, “Atriden” with texts by Sophocles, Sartre, Anouilh and Gerhard Hauptmann and “Räuber – Götz” with reference to Goethe’s “Götz von Berlechingen”. “Aufbruch” is a very militant company which tries to spread the awareness of criminality and prison among the public throughout Germany.

This paragraph on Art and Theatre in prison would not be complete without mentioning the dissertation written in 2004 by Michael D. McCamish with the unusual title “The Theatre of Prison: Power and Resistance, family and the production of illegality, starring the California Department of Corrections”(Div30). On 180 pages he describes the failure of the prison system, the “implication of the media, politicians, the private sector and a fearfully uninformed public”. He describes his volunteer work at San Quentin state prison and his European visiting tour of most of the above Prison Theatre Companies. He talks of Foucault and Power, the race, gender, age, mental and general health problems, segregation and prisoners’ hierarchies, etc. Most interesting reading for anyone interested in the subject.

24. Migration is a hotly disputed phenomenon. The massive influx of North Africans and Albanians into Italy, black Africans and Asians from former French and British colonies into Western Europe, the disproportionate rate of “young delinquents with a migrant background” and the “Russlanddeutschen” in Germany, and the accelerated arrival of Eastern Europeans in search of work in the West, have resulted in high proportions of foreigners in Western European jails (43% in Austria, 69 % in Switzerland, 73 % in Luxembourg).

Going one step further into the ethnic composition of the prison population, American reports say (see section USA), that there are at least 6 times more blacks in prison than whites. English statistics (Div32) indicate that black and Asian people are liable 10

times more to racially motivated offences than whites and that 12 to 15% of the prisoners in English jails are black although they represent only 1,8 % of the total population. In London blacks are 8 times more likely to be stopped and searched by the police than whites and the increase of these police moves from one year to the next was only +8% for whites, but +30% for blacks and even +40% for Asians (Indians, Pakistanis).

A 200-page report on “Securitisation and religious divides in Europe – Muslims in Western Europe after 9/11” presented by European scholars to the European Commission in 2006 and published in 4/2007 (Div33) tries to shed light into this highly complex problem.

Jean-Yves Henry confirms on the ANVP website (Div34) in an article with the title “The easily blamed foreigners and immigrants in Europe’s prisons”, the visible evidence that at least 2/3 of the French prison population is “coloured”. If French statistics specify only 19,7% foreigners in their prisons, then this has to do with the “right to citizenship by virtue of birth of all migrant children – droit du sol – Recht des Bodens”) which somehow embellishes the French statistics. England has 13,9% and Scotland only 1,3% (!) foreigners in jail, although the proportion of “coloured” British citizens is far higher.

How well are white Western European prison visitors informed and trained to cope with the problem of ethnicity and faith, as Muslim, black and foreign volunteers are extremely rare?

25. Between May 22nd and 24th 2008, a convention, organised by the “Europäisches Forum für angewandte Kriminalpolitik – applied criminal politics”, Düsseldorf, took place in Strasbourg on “Les Citoyens européens acteurs de la paix – politiques criminelles et engagements bénévoles en Europe – voluntary commitment in European criminal policies”. Participants came from Belo-Russia, the Czech Republic, Belgium, Switzerland, France and Germany. Essential contributions were:

- During a visit to the “European Court of Human Rights”, Judge Françoise Tulkens explained the origins of this institution, its proceedings, the important articles of the “European Convention on Human Rights” (Div 35) and the latest cases (on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the “Human Rights Charter”, Amnesty International demanded on 28.5.08 that all national governments should apologize to its citizens for failing to implement the agreed fundamental rights).
- Wolfgang Krell, Augsburg developed the idea of a “Europe going towards a common civil society” on the basis of the “Strachwitz triangle” with the different roles of the State, the economy and civil society as the main actors in democracy. He advocated intervention from civil society (Selbstermächtigung = self entitlement) by civil society every time the state failed to do so; the learning from other countries, the creation of a European legal framework for NGOs and the promotion of Europhile popular media” (Div36).
- Prof. Dr. Günter Rieger, Stuttgart spoke on the “commitment of the citizens within criminal policy” and the “Putman-theory”, according to which delinquency develops slower in closer-knit societies (social capital). He developed his ideas along 5 subjects (contribution of civil society to security and social peace, the historic right and need for a strong voluntary sector, its possibilities of intervention on many levels, the complementarity of the professional and voluntary sector in “joint ventures”). The “professionalisation” of assistance to detainees started after 1945 and diminished the role of volunteer organisations. He said that professionals could never fulfil the multiple needs of the detainees. Volunteers, he added, were not obliged to be “efficient in an economic sense”, but, due to their conciliatory

role, indispensable for the integration of detainees; this all the more as social workers could be active only 30 % of their time due to heavy administrative requirements (Div37).

- ACCORD (penal and family mediation, Franco-German co-operation in penal matters), UFRAMA (prison visitors centres) and CARITAS (children of prisoners), all active in Alsace, presented their ways of working, their successes and problems.
- Then followed the presentation of prison volunteer work in 5 countries:
 - * Claire Capron, a prison visitor for 13 years in Belgium (Div38) talked about the working conditions in Brussels jails, her book which describes types of detainees and problems all prison visitors encounter and the ongoing enquiry she launched among her fellow-prison visitors about “what works and what frustrates”.
 - * Gabriela Imhof of the Probation Service, Bern, discussed the lack of cohesion in Swiss prison services due to the federal structure of the country; the way the 215 prison visitors co-operate with 25 officers within her service; the 54 hours of initial courses that volunteers have to undergo before approval and the valuable role they play within the whole penitentiary system.
 - * Raphael Bonte (ANVP), France stressed the importance for the detainee to keep in touch with a person from “outside”, the commitment of the prison visitor to sustain this service and of the ANVP to accomplish its role within society (projet associatif). In spite of the sometimes uneasy co-operation with the authorities largely ignored by the media, the work of the prison volunteers is valuable for the re-socialisation of detainees and, therefore, for society as a whole. Surprisingly the French prison administration is trying to conform to the “108 prison rules”, for example with the recent nomination of the “Independent Controller” who will cover the task of the English “Monitoring Boards” and the German “Anstaltsbeiräte” (Div39).
 - * Dr Vaclav Jiricka (psychologist) who works in the Czech prison of Liberec then talked about the ambiguous situation of volunteering in his country before 1989, the slowly developing ONGs (example Hestia) which were 57 in 2004 and are 312 in 2008. However, there is no voluntary prison visiting as in the West. Since 1994 Chaplains, mainly from the Catholic Church, operate in most prisons (Div40) largely in the way they do in Western Europe.
 - * Christa Brinckmann of the “Katholischer Gefängnisverein”, Düsseldorf gave a moving account of her work by opposing the points of view of prison officers and detainees. Compared with traditional prison visiting in France or in England, the very free and varied activities in and outside prison are typical of the German way of prison volunteering. The slogan of her association is “supporting instead of locking away; reintegrating instead of excluding” (Div41). Details see “section Germany”.

The convention ended with two workshops on prison conditions and prevention. The next congress will take place in 2009 in Prag. Most of the above presentations can be consulted in French and German under www.europaforum-kriminalpolitik.org.