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Abstract
This project examined the problem with America’s food sources, criminal behavior and recidivism by use of Adlerian Individual Psychology and the Sustainable Prison Project. Brief explanations of prison and sentencing reform provoked further thought about how America came to be the country with the largest population of prisoners in the world and the widely accepted theories aimed to prove a system that is broken and attempting to problem-solve past efforts to cut populations. Several examples were provided from Adler’s theory of personality and the impact of personality on criminal behavior. Sustainability in prisons supports what Adler believed to be the most important goal of mankind; social interest. In providing these examples, a common goal surfaced and with it, purposeful behavior occurred with social interest in organic gardening purposeful to both inmates and the greater society. For Adler, it took encouragement to live with others in a communal way, which is the basis for a healthy life both mentally and physically. This project proposed a way to encourage a population, who have not been encouraged or sought courageous ways to become members of the greater world. This project proposed that by teaching valuable skills and training for the green movement, prisoners will become leaders in the sustainability of America.
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Introduction

The purpose of criminal law is to justify social condemnation, diminish incidence of major injuries to individuals and institutions, define rehabilitation versus punishment, to promote efficiency so as to validate cost, and to define objectives of what is unjustifiable and inexcusable with public interest in mind (Weaver, Abramson, Burkoff, & Hancock, 2002). Today, prisons are the primary resource for punishment of serious crimes, but this was not always the case. In colonial Massachusetts, fines, public shaming, and execution were primary forms of punishment; prisons existed merely to hold a defendant before trial (Volokh, 2002). In 1785, the first prison was devoted to holding prisoners. According to Fitzgerald (2011), this was largely informed by Jeremy Bentham, who believed that criminal behavior was the product of rational choice and that pleasure and pain could moderate these choices. Thus, in his view, reform must begin by shaping a prisoner’s behavior to societal norms by use of public opinion toward crime and by embracing the positive tenets of a curative-rehabilitative process.

Alfred Adler believed that criminal behavior stemmed from an individual striving for superiority through the use of his private logic. Adler stated: “Crime is a coward’s imitation of heroism” (Ansbacher & Ansbacher, 1964, p. 414). In criminal movement, Adler saw inferiority and a lack of common sense. To solve the problem of criminal behavior, Adler would like to restore social interest in an individual and replace inferiority with a common sense goal to the larger community; this would begin with parenting education and in childhood about how to meet the tasks of life in a socially appropriate way. Both Adler and Bentham (Fitzgerald, 2011) spoke about choices for criminal activity and society’s role in reshaping of criminal behavior.
Adler spoke more clearly about the individual and would aim to explain criminal activity in a more useful way.

One way to solve criminal behavior, in Adler’s view, is to find a socially interest. In this we will find a community effort inside of the prison. The Sustainable Prison Project is one such way. To move backward in history to when prisons were sustainable and the prison garden was a source of discipline, affordability, and rehabilitation would seem futile, however when we look backward we also see less recidivism and healthier inmates (Lyons, 2012). This paper sets to prove how sustainability in prisons is a socially useful way for inmates to contribute usefully to others both in the smaller prison society and outside of it in the real world.

Rehabilitation & Reform

In the mid-twentieth century, American lawmakers began to discuss options for rehabilitation and reform by designing moral training programs to prevent recidivism (Volokh, 2002). Specialists were employed with the task of restoring a prisoner’s moral and social standards to increase the likelihood of success when paroled. Prison specialists decided when training was complete and when parole was necessary. The training and subsequent parole were rarely lengthy and success was hardly measured at this time in history. Consequently, public outcry for stiffer punishments was often the case and Congress began to listen. In the 1970s, Congress enacted sixty laws for stiffer penalties, which meant longer punishment. Congress turned to the theory of deterrence to design punishments.

Deterrence theory, covered more in depth later in this work, can be traced back to early philosophers, Thomas Hobbes (1588-1578), Cesare Beccaria (1738-1794), and Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832). The theory of deterrence has two basic types—general and specific. General deterrence prevents crime in the general population by making examples of offenders in hopes
that the punishments are severe enough to deter others from making the same mistakes (Ondwudiwe, Odo, & Onyeozili, n.d.). Specific deterrence is designed for those already being punished from committing further crimes. Thus, in the 1970s came the supermax prison, which was designed to control inmate behavior by segregation and restriction of movement from staff and other inmates (Volokh, 2002). In 1984 there was one such prison. By 1997, thirty states had adopted supermax prisons and segregation as the major form of punishment; however, this left little room for rehabilitation as inmates lacked movement in the prisons. In a word, rehabilitation was halted. The lack of rehabilitation brought rises in recidivism; inmates were not learning the necessary skills to reenter society. According to Weaver, et al. (2002) deterrence seems a futile attempt as some crimes are undeterrable when one can justify the crime as an ends to a means. Congress, lawmakers, and prison representatives were forced to find ways to make education, rehabilitation, and alternatives to incarceration a priority.

Deterrence theory is not the only theory that has been tried when governing prisons, however it is the most widely known and widely adopted today and is adaptable to prisoners. Alfred Adler spoke about criminals in a different way. Adler suggested that criminals have lower social interest (Highland, Kern, and Curlette, 2010). For Adler, there was no distinction between Individual Psychology and social psychology although others attempted to find one; Adler believed that Individual Psychology was better defined as social adjustment (Adler, 1930). Attention is paid further to this later in this paper as well as how we got to this point in prison reform beginning with the Sentencing Reform Act (SRA), how government branches have been unable to balance reform, other theories that have impacted the reform act, and how the use of Adler’s holism and social interest are powerful in advocating for sustainability and social interest in prison reform.
**Sentencing Reform Act (SRA)**

Many different reform acts have defined inmate procedure, each with its own agenda. It is outside the scope of this paper to consider these acts in detail; however, with the rise in rates of recidivism among paroled persons and the increased level of crime, the Sentencing Reform Act (SRA) deserves closer look as it applies to prison reform. Largely, sentencing is based on opinions from a variety of sources including members of Congress, judges, and legislators who speak to public opinion. The SRA is imperfect and has been re-written several times to include stronger sentences, only to remove these penalties and then return to stronger sentencing again. From 1984 to present, many changes to the SRA have been made based on criminal activity, Congress’s perception of crime, and public opinion.

Prior to 1984, Judge Marvin E. Frankl published his book *Criminal Sentencing: Law Without Order* to describe the federal sentencing system in which federal judges imposed sentences of imprisonment without uniform standards and with little transparency (Sessions, 2011). In his book, Frankl spoke to the wide range of sentences handed down from many different judges and the inequality to defendants. Frankl proposed three key reforms: a) creation of a sentencing committee made up of experts in the field, b) creation by such a committee to detail profiles and factors including a numerical grading system of offense and offender characteristics, and c) meaningful appellate review to ensure consistency. Frankl’s proposal reached Capitol Hill, and with the help of Senators Edward Kennedy and Strom Thurmond, led to the passing of the 1984 Sentencing Reform Act.

The SRA included the reduction of unwarranted sentencing disparities, truth in sentencing by removing parole, and transparency in sentencing by including a detailed and rational process for determining sentencing (Session, 2011). The original Sentencing
Commission was formed and in 1987 they submitted, to Congress, guidelines that would go into effect in November of that year. The guidelines reflected a mandatory and presumptive scale system that would guide sentencing authority. They considered many factors, chief among them a level system that took aggravating or mitigating factors into account. In the process of conviction, past criminal behavior was the most important characteristic. At the time, judges pushed back, criticizing the guidelines as too complex, harsh, and rigid. The inflexibility of the formula for sentencing seemed to exclude a judge’s opinion of what was just. The terms of the SRA did reduce inequality in sentencing and because of this, tensions between inmates decreased. With criticism from judges, a well-defined way to delegate responsibility from one branch of the government to the next was needed, with each branch having a particular interest in executing the law.

**Branches of Government**

Each branch of government has particular interest in enacting just sentencing; the Legislative Branch passes laws, the Executive is responsible for executing the law including just punishments for criminals, and the Judiciary (judges) see to it that justice is done by imposing sentences (Sessions, 2011). The Commission works at the intersection of these three government branches and is an agency of the Judiciary; its members are elected by the Executive and confirmed by the Legislature. From 1984 to 1986 Congress began to look at mandatory minimum sentencing, which started to shift policy from the Commission back to Congress and in essence negated the Commission’s authority. Original guidelines in sentencing have shifted as Congress gave directives to the Commission for twenty-five years. Because of these shifts, the Commission continues to increase guidelines in order to ward off minimum sentencing. As a
consequence of the strained relationship between Congress and the Commission, in 1998 there were no commissioners.

From 1996 to 2003 the turmoil continued to build between Judiciary powers and Congress. One case in particular, *Koon vs. the United States*, gave judges the power to use more discretion in sentences and departures from guidelines to what judges felt was just; the number of sentencing discretions increased from 8.4 % in 1995 to 15.8 % in 1998 (Sessions, 2011). Congress answered back by enacting PROTECT in 2003, which took more power from the judiciary. The Supreme Court responded in *Blakely v. Washington* by giving power to the jury, not judge, to justify sentencing while keeping reasonable doubt in mind (Sessions, 2011). *Booker v. the United States* soon followed and applied the *Blakely* decision to federal guidelines by adding that a sentencing court would violate the Constitution by sentencing above the guidelines based on aggravating facts not found beyond a reasonable doubt by a jury. The SRA was then rewritten to make guidelines advisory.

In 2007, two subsequent decisions reinforced *Booker* and as a consequence district courts must give the Commission’s policy respectful consideration, but are free to reject policy directives from Congress and the Commission when appropriate (Session, 2011). No further amendments have been made to *Booker* and judges are increasingly moving away from guideline ranges. Fixes to *Booker* appear to be on the horizon as the government calls for more mandatory minimum sentencing. In 2010, a survey given to judges revealed that 75% preferred post-*Booker* guidelines to pre-*Booker* and 78% agreed to a decrease in disparity and an increase in fairness to sentencing; overall, judges do not disagree with the severity of the Guideline offense levels. The problem is not with the mandatory minimums for lesser offenses, but for lengthy imprisonment. The most important take-away from policy changes, minimum sentencing, and the Commission
versus Congress is that Congress fosters disrespect for the Commission by disallowing it appropriate and empirical research opportunities. According to Sessions (2011), most of Congress’s role has been to negate the Commission without thought from either side as to the consequences of lack of testing on the population of imprisoned persons.

In the past few years, the Commission has sought the input of judges across the United States about penalties for non-violent, low-level alternatives to imprisonment (Sessions, 2011). Questions have been raised about treatment versus imprisonment and about the original SRA’s lack of consideration for the criminal’s age, mental health status, physical condition, and time in the military among other characteristics. The past years have seen more revisions that use offender characteristics as part of the guideline system. The Commission is expanding the use of offender characteristics and educating judges on social science research related to these characteristics (Sessions, 2011).

Looking forward, the Sentencing Commission and Congress seek to achieve balance in guidelines. There are three important and competing considerations in rational, humane, and cost-effective sentencing system:

1. Avoid sentencing disparities among similarly situated defendants;
2. Treat defendants as unique human beings with unique characteristics and unique criminal background; and
3. Protect the public from future crimes in a cost-effective manner (Sessions, 2011).

The failure to accept input from judges has been made obvious over the past two decades in these three objectives. Furthermore, Congress minimized judges’ competency in exercising discretion in sentencing defendants based on the unique characteristics of each. Thus,
complexity in the guidelines needs to strike a balance between minimum sentencing and defender characteristics. Sessions (2011) suggested the following:

- Consolidating offense levels and criminal history categories from 258 possible ranges to between 30-50 ranges; tying groups of ranges together by grouping numerically and applying offender scores to sentencing (lower scores lighter sentence, higher scores higher sentence and so forth); cutting current criminal history categories from six to four, which would still securely value recidivism based on empirical evidence, but reduce confusion;

- The resurrection of a guideline system for minimum sentencing based on offense level and aggravating facts and with jury involvement; and

- A sub-system to calculate mitigating or aggravating factors into two simple types; core factors that would need to be proved beyond a reasonable doubt and advisory factors for judges to exercise discretion in sentencing (speaking to the theory of deterrence). The benefit of this proposal is that it conserves judicial resources and is respectful of judges and jury. Furthermore, defendant status over a range of characteristics is taken into consideration including mental health status (Sessions, 2011).

Sessions’ suggestions make a case for sentencing review especially in consideration of the increasing population of prisoners with mental health problems.

The Shift in Inmate Population

At the same time sentence reform was beginning to shift, so too was the prison population. Homelessness, the deinstitutionalization of the mentally ill during the 1970s, and the reduction of low-income housing combined to produce a well-documented crisis: enormous
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numbers of disturbed persons roaming the streets without stable access to shelter and security (Shenson, Dubler, & Michaels, 1990). The closing of mental health facilities and the disappearance of community mental services accelerated the number of individuals from the street to penitentiaries. Moreover, persons who are mentally ill or homeless do not have a propensity toward crime and criminal behavior “rather the homeless lifestyle itself leads to victimization and criminal involvement” (Shenson, et al., 1990, p. 656). Consequently, this is a population in which deterrence theory does not provide adequate measures to ensure a lack of recidivism in this population.

In 1991, the Bureau of Prisons reported drastic increases in inmate populations as a result of the Sentencing Reform Act; at that time, the average term of incarceration for a robbery offense had risen from 44.8 months to 78.0 months (Luttrell, 1991). Today, the minimum sentence is 7 years or 84 months. According the Bureau of Criminal Justice (BCJ) 5.1 million people were incarcerated in prisons and jails or on parole in 1994 (Lutrell, 1991). Today that number totals 7,081,000.

In 1984, the SRA was enacted to help control length of sentencing disparity between persons who have committed similar crimes and to manage and plan for an individual’s time in prison and eventual release. Changes to the terms of sentencing have positively impacted predictability in the prison population by aiding staff with control of the inmates. Problems have occurred with the changes in inmate population, longer sentencing, and virtually no parole have, in turn, expanded the physical growth of prisons and caused increases in staff. The impact is that inmates have fewer resources for use in reform including education and alternative rehabilitation plans. With more and more people being incarcerated for criminal offenses, one can hardly argue that society fails to achieve deterrence in criminal acts. We can argue that community
security is not given by putting people in prison and then, after a length of time, returning them to society with little practical education or rehabilitation. The fact is we seek security for our communities by imprisoning people that are also poor or mentally ill.

The term *maximum security*, as used when speaking about the prison system is incongruous; imprisoning over seven million people, building more prisons, and criminalizing the poor does not increase security nor does it provide real security to communities, prison officials, or inmates under correctional care (Okazawa-Rey & Kirk, 2000). To achieve genuine security, we must begin to redefine what security means; not security based on protecting possessions by lock and physical force, but security that addresses major insecurity—economic, social, and political inequalities in our communities.

It is not the intent of this paper to make conclusions or criticisms about the SRA, but to use the SRA as an explanation to what seems a growing concern in corrections; recidivism and an increasing population that include those with mental health problems. Current theories of criminal behavior do not seem to help inmates adapt well to life outside of prison nor does it seek to help the growing population of mentally ill prisoners.

**Mental Illness and Imprisonment**

As of November 2014, 20% of people in jail and 15% of people in prison have a serious mental illness (Torrey, Zdanowicz & Kennard, 2014). Beginning in the early 1960s men wrote about incarceration and social exclusion. From Erving Goffman and Gerald Grob to David Rothman and finally Michael Foucault, the patterns and origins of the continuity of confinement have been traced to Medieval and Renaissance eras and the Hôpital Général in Paris—a enormous of confinement for the poor, the unemployed, the homeless, the criminal, and the insane (Harcourt, 2006). Surprisingly this literature never made it to empirical research on
incarceration in the twentieth-century. Conversely, research on confinement as an independent variable fails to include mental hospitalization in its measure of confinement. In other words, no study includes mental institutionalization as a measure of confinement. Harcourt (2006) argued that institutionalization became the “first resort, the preferred solution to solving the problems of poverty, crime, delinquency, and insanity” (p. 1758). In the 1820s Americans raised penitentiaries for criminals, almshouses for the poor, orphan asylums for homeless children, and reformatories for delinquent youth. These institutions are believed to have restored social cohesion in a new republic at a time of instability. Studying the many institutions of the time, without making side-by-side comparisons to penitentiaries, has implications. One natural implication is the populations—prisons and asylums—are so different (Harcourt, 2006).

William Tuke (1822) was credited with the York Asylum. Along with the Quakers, Tuke opened York Asylum with the thought of a caring, compassionate place for people with mental illnesses to find sanctuary (Chaimowitz, 2011); however, as the need grew so did asylums and many became less than hospitable; they became institutionalized and overcrowded. Later, in the 1950s and 1960s with the discovery of psychotropic drugs, people with mental illnesses began to be released from psychiatric hospitals. This deinstitutionalization had good intentions; people would live in the community with plenty of services and supports. As good as these intentions were, the side effect was insufficient management of people with mental illnesses who would later live in the street. Thus, by the 1970s, more people with mental health problems were entering the criminal justice system. One example is the closing of Agnews Hospital in Santa Clara County, California. Once the hospital closed, the population of people with mental illnesses in jail increased 300% (Chaimowitz, 2011). This coincided with an increase in all types
of prisoners, but the increase was not nearly the percentage of those with mental health diagnoses.

Between 1980 and 1995 the number of prisoners increased again from just over 500,000 to almost 1.6 million; an increase of 216% (Chaimowitz, 2011); this coincided with the closing of more psychiatric hospitals. Other studies, including the Epidemiological Catchment Area Survey, suggested that people with major mental health problems began to enter jails and prisons at a higher rate after the closing of mental health institutions. In 1999 the U.S. Department of Justice conducted a study that suggested that roughly 283,000 inmates had severe mental illnesses; in contrast only 70,000 people were living in mental health hospitals and 30% of those were forensic patients. In June of 2004 the number had risen again. Data from that time suggest that of 2.1 million inmates, 71,399 inmates in jail had severe mental illnesses; 223,386 in state prisons; and 27,099 in federal prisons for a grand total of 321,884 (Chaimowitz, 2011). As of 2012 over half of the 2.2 million people incarcerated experience mental health problems –both recent and already diagnosed (Honegger, 2015). To solve the problem of criminality among the mentally ill, mental health courts arose to divert individuals with mental health diagnoses from incarceration in return for an agreement that the individual would attend monitored mental health treatment. The goal was to reduce rates of recidivism and improve mental health functioning.

Prisons today operate largely on the Life Course Perspective, which is detailed later in this work, to help identify the causes of criminal behavior beginning in childhood experience. The Life Course Perspective is a somewhat new theory with many Adlerian characteristics, yet it does not attempt to help the prisoners gain perspective into their own mistaken beliefs developed in childhood—it does not speak to criminal line of movement. Other theories of criminal behavior also fail to find individual meaning in criminal activity and as such, fail to diminish
crime in mentally ill and poor populations. Next, past and current theories of criminal behavior will be assessed.

**Theories of Criminal Behavior**

**Deterrence Theory**

Historical theories of crime substantiate that criminal activity, crime, and criminal law depend upon a multitude of factors (Fitzgerald, 2011). Hobbes, Beccaria, and Bentham each protested against legal and spiritualistic beliefs and provided philosophical explanations for what is inherent to all people (Ondwudiwe et al., n.d.). The theory of deterrence, in modern criminology is, in part, owed to the ideas of these three men.

Hobbes (1678) viewed people as purposeful in pursuing their self-interests at the expense of others if necessary (Ondwudiwe et al., n.d.). Hobbes also asserted that human beings are rational enough to know that self-interested behavior may lead to crime and exclude them from general society. Accordingly, people enter into social contracts in which they are governed by laws that protect them from such things as war, crime, and conflict. Furthermore, he asserted that it is laws, government, and punishment that deter humans from committing crimes (Ondwudiwe et al., n.d.). Therefore, humans are deterred from crime by what they perceive in the punishment of another.

Beccaria (1794) agreed with Hobbes; however, he challenged the rights of the state to deem what is fair punishment for crimes committed (Ondwudiwe et al., n.d.). He thought that in judging crime government should “afford the greatest happiness shared by the greatest number [of people]” (Ondwudiwe et al., n.d. p. 234). Additionally, punishment, under this belief, would be unjust if it exceeded what is necessary to deter further like behavior in others. He too believed that human beings could rationalize right from wrong and that men are governed by
social contracts. Conversely, social contracts that are governed by man are united in society. Beccaria rejected capital punishment, torture, and secret accusations and wanted humane treatment of the incarcerated. He argued that punishment should fit crime based on the extent of harm to society and that the pain of punishment should outweigh the pleasure of the crime (Ondwudiwe et al., n.d.).

Bentham (1832), a Beccaria contemporary, largely accepted what Hobbes and Beccaria began and added only that the object of law should be to widen happiness by increasing pleasure and decreasing pain for the good of all society. The theory of deterrence developed based on the work of these three men. Deterrence relies on three components: severity, certainty, and celerity. The severity of the punishment is meant to stop men from criminal acts. Certainty of punishment simply means that punishment should be handed out whenever a crime is committed (Ondwudiwe, Odo, & Onyeozili, n.d.). People then know that crime equals punishment every time. Celerity recognizes the swiftness of punishment. Punishment should be carried out swiftly. The closer the application of punishment the more likely offenders are to recognize crime does not pay.

Empirical testing provides mostly positive results from severity and certainty and has determined that both offer a level of avoidance by people where crime is concerned. Celerity is rarely spoken of with the exception of the death penalty and how soon is it constitutionally appropriate to enact charges (Ondwudiwe et al., n.d.).

**Structuralism**

Structuralists apply social, economic, and political environments to explain crime and delinquency (Fitzgerald, 2011). Several factors explain the environmental view with the most prominent being urbanization. With urbanization and industrialism came destabilization in the
political and sociological arenas, which resulted in the loss of community and social order. Conversely, a lack of social constraint lends way to criminal ambiguity, which lends to the potentiality for crime.

Along with urbanization came industrialization in which crime went from those against others causing bodily harm or harm to property to white-collar crime (Fitzgerald, 2011). In recent years, the United States has seen crime from de-industrialization (companies being moved overseas causing lack of jobs) and crime related to the family structure such as crimes against children or those committed by children. Other factors that attribute to crime in the structural view include war, poverty, and the behavior of the law. Structuralism is not completely gone as a theory, however constructionism and post-structuralism have replaced this historical theory (Fitzgerald, 2011).

Constructionism

According to constructionism, crime is in the eye of the beholder and the beholder is the law (Fitzgerald, 2011). Thus, constructionists review changes in criminal law throughout history by acts that have been criminalized, then decriminalized, and recriminalized. Because society determines what is deviant, perceived threats of deviant behavior become coded into law. Additionally, laws that regulate criminal behavior represent society’s strongest response to deviant behavior. Three categories of constructionist theory follow: labeling theory, social control theory, and critical theory.

Labeling theory. Labeling theory maintains a neutral stance toward the criminal law-making process (Fitzgerald, 2011). Labeling theory upholds that the law is meant to support values consistent with the general public’s welfare. This theory is based on moral functionalism
and values consensus. Meaning both ascribe to a social contract in which people will give up some freedom and abide by the law for the common good.

**Social control theory.** Social control theory has its roots in a Marxist tradition and suggests that social, economic, and political elites use criminal law to maintain social, economic, and political order (Fitzgerald, 2011). In short, social control theory is based in urbanization and industrialization positing that as the population and cities grew, so did crime. Thus, lawmaking replaced family, church, and community as needed to maintain social order.

At its core, the social control theory is a political, democratic process by which lawmaking extends the control of conflict to criminal law. It is by this process that moral justification is given to those who live within the law; those who do not battle social norms and risk punishment. Thus, criminal laws serve as a tool to deal with norm violators without resorting to unjustifiable force (Fitzgerald, 2011).

Several historical accounts apply to social order theory. Reagan’s (1997) *When Abortion Was a Crime: Women, Medicine, and Law in the United States, 1867 to 1973*, Rothman’s (2002) *The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic*, and Musto’s (1973) *The American Disease: Origins of Narcotics Control* are among them (Fitzgerald, 2011). Each, in turn, confronted the social context of laws, why they were created, and why they were unjust.

**Critical theory.** Critical theory serves as a bridge between social control theory and post-structuralist theory (Fitzgerald, 2011). Critical theory constructs differently than social control theory in that it is not top down but rather focuses on the capacity of marginalized groups. Like other constructionist theories, critical theory claims that deviance is an act of resistance to the
power of the elite and suggests that oppressed persons use their will to buck elite-sanctioned norms.

**Post-Structuralism**

Foucault’s (1975/1977) work, *Discipline and Punishment: The Birth of the Prison*, focuses on power that he defines as diffuse and productive (Fitzgerald, 2011). To unearth diffusion, Foucault suggests genealogy can shift power-knowledge regimes wherein one power-knowledge regime can replace another when it comes to crime. Foucault argued that crime is not a matter of power but a matter of circulation. Therefore, power is not housed only in political and economic institutions, but also in everyday acts. Moreover, Foucault rejected theoretical explanations that rely solely on class struggle. Instead, he looked to the importance of feelings, love, conscious, and instinct (Fitzgerald, 2011).

**Adler’s Theory of Personality: Criminology**

Alfred Adler intersected all of these theories and spoke about the individual (not groups) in social context and adjustment to changing social situations. His theory posits that each individual is striving for superiority based on an innate inferiority complex. He believed that people adjust to social changes and that in adjusting one could do so usefully or uselessly based on mistaken beliefs from childhood experiences.

Several reasons exist for why the work of Adler deserves to be examined in criminology, but most noteworthy is that Adler has an actual theory of crime (Barton-Bellessa, Lee, & Shon, 2015). In recent years, the life course perspective has been given credibility with empirical research and testing (Hoffman, 2010). Yet, Adler discussed how life stages affect emotion and criminal behavior, delinquency, and neuroticism almost 100 years ago (Barton-Bellessa et al.,
Furthermore, Adler did not differentiate between neurotics and criminals; they were all explained by the lack of social interest, which is central to Adlerian individual psychology.

Adler described two ways in which people solve problems. One is through autonomy and flexibility, which allows for striving on the useful side of life and working well with others to complete tasks. The other is to adhere to a rigid way of binary thinking in which things are right or wrong, and in Adlerian terms, this leads to social uselessness (Barton-Bellessa et al., 2015). Adler believed that some changes to how one strives could be made throughout life; however, personality is almost always completely developed between the ages of five and seven.

Personality begins in infancy. At this time, the infant compares itself to caregivers and realizes that he is incapable of self-care, and that he is dependent on others to meet his basic needs (Barton-Bellessa et al., 2015). This feeling of inferiority is said to be as a felt “minus” situation. The infant, feeling inferior, will begin to strive for plus situations. He does so by observing others, mostly his caregivers, and emulating their movements. Adler posited that such strivings were largely done unconsciously, based on subjective interpretation, and that to overcome feelings of inferiority an individual would create an imagined ideal of perfection; Adler’s final fictional goal. Thus, Adler believed that neurosis was an outcome of striving in less optimal ways such as an individual using useless social adjustment in committing crime (Barton-Bellessa et al., 2015).

Adler theorized that an individual become neurotic as a result of a failure or inability to face new situations with a cooperative attitude. At the heart of the neurotic’s motivation is hypersensitivity to loss of prestige (Barton-Bellessa et al., 2015). Furthermore, neurotics will try to safeguard self-esteem through useless means rather than cooperation in a social way. Thus, neurosis and crime are nothing more than a lack of problem solving in cooperation that extends
the feeling of community and social interest. Additionally, most forms of mental health suffering begin in this way closely linking crime to most disorders. Hence, both conditions, neurosis and crime, are intertwined and originate from identical sources; feelings of inferiority and usefulness in responses to them based on private logic.

Adler ascribed three recurring sources of inferiority feelings: organ inferiority, social influence, and family dynamics (Adler, 1930). One suffering from an organ inferiority begins to strive for perfection in another way so as not to show others the effect the inferiority has on him or he will become what Adler called a “getter” putting others in his service. Societal influences include such things as race relations, socioeconomic status, and war. Adler was affected by war and spoke to the fear that cultivates a lack of prosocial attitudes. But, Adler’s biggest accomplishment was his work about family dynamics, parenting, and birth-order and in particular about pampered and neglected children.

Ansbacher (1992) wrote, “Pampered children expect their wishes to be treated as laws and to receive without giving” (p. 14). Adler’s pampered children are those who were raised without differentiating between how their primary caregiver performed in his/her duties as a parent and all others. For example, a pampered child would not begin school with the knowledge that others will not serve him rather he would have to, through cooperation with others, do things for himself. Adler believed that when confronted with difficulties, these children learned not to solve problems with cooperation, but would make demands on others to complete the task for him. Additionally, Adler suggested that pampered children lacked cooperation because they were given things without being encouraged to get them for themselves. These children grow to expect pleasure from others and that things should come easily for them (Highland et al., 2010). A pampered child is coddled in every way, and because
of this he does not acquire a sense of competence (Ansbacher, 1992). Thus, such children are not prepared to adjust to life and life changes adequately.

Neglected and hated children have a different view of life. These children have rarely known love (Ansbacher, 1992). As with pampered children, when neglected and hated children are faced with difficulties, they are not competent to meet them in cooperation; they have never been taught to work in such a way. Yet, unlike pampered children, neglected children are suspicious of others and distrustful of themselves; they have never found a trustworthy person in life. Adler included orphans and children out of wedlock in this category (Ansbacher, 1992).

To prevent delinquency was to teach social interest; how to be a member of society. To teach social interest was to teach courage. Adler went as far as to say that children should be taught courage and cooperation in school and that there should be “a law preventing a child from graduating until one could be sure that it would be useful in life, that his interest in others was sufficiently developed” (Ansbacher, 1992). With the idea of prevention in mind, Adler started education and counseling centers and an experimental school that would help teachers and children learn social interest. Adler advocated for social interest to prevent delinquency. He considered it the job of psychologists to take a stand on social issues. Adler taught teachers and counselors alike to introduce these ideas in the classroom and the community. The school was organized into five concepts, some of which were also school reform. Of interest to note in these five concepts is how they could apply to most institutions including prison. The five concepts are as follows (Ansbacher, 1992).

- **Work Community.** The teacher, in this case, was not the center of education, but the student or leader of a group was responsible for work, including individual work.

- **Administrative Community.** A form of student self-government.
- Experience Community. Was to use school to get children involved in community through group activities, excursions, and play.

- Discussion Community. This brought students and teachers together to discuss any problems of the week. Adler believed these discussions would create a community feeling, insight, and a humanizing effect.

- Mutual-Aid Community. A child who was having difficulty and needed help was supported by their classmates and assisted with academics or anything else that arose. The meaning of this was two-fold; it gave mentally healthy children the opportunity to fully develop empathy and gave the child who needed help a sense of trust in others.

The larger ideas of this type of prevention, in Adler’s view, would lead to advocacy of changing social conditions beneficial to mental health and would formulate a world philosophy based on social interest (Ansbacher, 1992). As we now know, the lack of social interest often leads to delinquency in childhood and criminal behavior in adulthood.

Adler more often spoke of neurotics in the same way as he would speak of criminals and alcoholics and believed that their lack in social interest is the explanation for life movement. Adler did not speak of mental illness in terms of diagnoses rather he spoke of adjusting to changing social demands.

**Life Course Perspective**

The life course perspective is used in a majority of prisons today. Accepted wisdom holds crime as committed disproportionately by adolescents ages 16-18; however, social psychology, has failed to use the theoretical significance of childhood characteristics and the link between early childhood behaviors and later adult outcomes (Sampson & Laub, 1992).
Additionally, sociological psychology has failed to address life-span implications of childhood behavior. This section seeks to find meaning in the life course perspective for criminal behavior.

Life course perspective has been defined as “pathways through the age differentiated life-span” where as age differentiation is “manifested in expectations and options that impinge on decision process and course of events that give shape to life stage, transitions, and turning points (Sampson & Laub, 1992, p. 65). Similar, to Adler’s perspective, the life course includes age appropriate transitions embedded in social institutions (i.e. schools). Additionally, the life course perspective offers the same concepts as Adler in that the development of criminal behavior is formulated from parenting and carried through life into work, love, and self-concept. The life course analyses are often characterized by a focus on major life events, their duration and timing, and their consequences for later social development. Adaption to life events is also included in the concept of life span analyses. Keeping in the framework of social development, the life course perspective encompasses three themes:

- A concern with social meaning throughout the life span;
- Intergenerational transmission of social patterns; and
- The effects of macro-level or significant events and structural location on individual life histories.

The field of developmental psychology is less intuitive in social development and responds to criminal and maladaptive behavior from an aggression standpoint. The point of life course perspectives is to prove that antisocial behavior is sustained over a lifetime (Sampson & Laub, 1992). This view is substantiated in evidence that aggressive and antisocial children often continue this behavior into adulthood. Studies on childhood aggression and later criminality average .68 with a general consensus in favor of a stability hypothesis that: “children who
initially display high rates of antisocial behavior are more likely to persist in this behavior…” (Sampson & Laub, 1992, p. 3). Much of criminology has concentrated on adolescent behavior or adult behavior as related to crime and developmental psychology. This seriously diminishes the effects of whole lifespan concerns and is a mistake. Adler, nearly 100 years ago, taught us to integrate whole lifespan. He also spoke about adapted and maladapted children and the root of the problem. The larger ideas of this type of prevention, in Adler’s view, would lead to advocacy of changing social conditions beneficial to mental health and would formulate a world philosophy based on social interest (Ansbacher, 1992). As we now know, the lack of social interest often leads to delinquency in childhood and criminal behavior in adulthood.

**Mental Health Courts (MHC)**

The first mental health court (MHC) was created in 1997 in Broward County, Florida (Hughes & Peak, 2012). Today, 250 MHCs exist across the nation. Mental health courts operate under the theoretical framework of therapeutic jurisprudence with clear treatment goals including mental health interventions that link individuals to community-based treatment services, motivate treatment compliance, and to improve the quality of life and functioning with individuals in hopes of reducing recidivism among the mentally ill. Mental health courts use a cooperative, team approach to motivate behavioral change, hold regular hearings in front of judges to monitor treatment compliance, and use the court to oversee community-based treatments. The foundation of which comes from the principles of therapeutic jurisprudence and therapeutic rehabilitation (Hughes & Peak, 2012).

**Therapeutic Jurisprudences & Rehabilitation**

Therapeutic jurisprudence, which is largely vague and underspecified, is the broad study of the role of the law as a therapeutic agent (Hughes & Peak, 2012). Therapeutic rehabilitation
uses the underlying assumption that mental illness is causally connected to criminality. Thus, improving mental health symptoms so to will there be reductions in criminal behavior. The assumption is that the two working together will decrease recidivism and improve the life of those with mental illnesses. Therapeutic rehabilitation is based on criteria including individual and group therapy, the use of psychotropic drug therapy, case management, and the societal goals of safety and security in the mental health population involved in criminal activity.

Despite the attractiveness of this hypothesis, research does not support a causal link between mental illness and crime; simply, it hypothesizes that individuals, whether diagnosed with mental illness or not, will commit crime for various reasons dependent largely upon human motivation (Hughes & Peak, 2012).

Honegger (2015) used several studies to evaluate the criteria employed in MHCs including the Addiction Severity Index (ASI), Behavior and Symptom Identification Scale (BASIS-32), Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale (BPRS), Colorado Symptom Index (CSI), and Global Assessment of Functioning (GAF). The studies conducted use both court participants and treatment as usual (TAU) groups. In each case, GAF and BASIS-32 scores improved over time; however, limitations in the areas of improved psychiatric symptoms, connection to services, quality of life, and recidivism do exist. For example, connection to behavioral services did increase by 17% for participants in MHCs as compared to the TAU group. Conversely, treatment episodes were increased for those in the MHC group, but treatment hours did not vary significantly by group and no statistical data was reported. Regardless, mental health court participants did receive more services than did the treatment as usual groups.
Recidivism Rates

Recidivism rates are operationalized as number of new arrests, number of new convictions, number of days in the community post-reentry, and number of days incarcerated after participation in MHCs (Honegger, 2015). In the 17 articles Honegger studied, she found largely positive outcomes in 15 as related to recidivism, however, one showed significantly poorer rates of recidivism in the MHC group than in the TAU; the other failed to find any significant data to support recidivism rates in either group. One criterion worth mentioning in these studies is that most were conducted on white males instead of randomized groups. Conversely, research identified that lower recidivism rates of MHC participants may be predicted by the following characteristics: graduation from a MHC program, being Hispanic as opposed to non-Hispanic, having a more serious offense upon entry into an MHC program, as well as having lower pre-MHC arrests and incarceration days, mental health treatment on intake, no substance abuse history, and a diagnosis of bipolar disorder rather than schizophrenia or depression. Additionally, those from the MHC group were less likely to be rearrested during the 18-month post-entry follow-up period and had fewer days incarcerated.

MHC Limitations

Limitations in these studies do exist. One, discussed early, is that participants are mostly White males in their mid-30s despite the large numbers of ethnic and racial minorities currently in prison (Honegger, 2015). In addition, most studies were conducted for less than one year. As it is, mental illness is often a lifetime problem and studies should assess long-term effects of MHC involvement. Despite the limitations of the studies Honegger used to completed her analysis, Hughes and Peak (2012) said that a study of two MHCs, in New York and Nevada, found that “over 90 percent of participants at both sites correctly used MHCs, regularly met with
judges, allowed court access to medical records, and met requirements with psychotropic medications could only name the benefits of mental health courts” (p. 26). When the participants were asked to name the advantages and disadvantages of MHCs nearly half could not cite any disadvantages of participation; however, these studies also concluded that persons with mental illness are more likely to be victims rather than the perpetrators of crime or violence. Human motivation is oversimplified and overlooked in both therapeutic jurisprudence and therapeutic rehabilitation. Historical theories of criminal behavior have good intentions, but have failed to solve the problem of criminality. Therefore, as discussed earlier, interventions would need to include discussions about how to better improve the state of homelessness and lower socioeconomic status in individuals with mental health problems.

The remainder of this project will speak to Adlerian psychology and a practical approach to all human behavior, and identify ways that all people, even criminals, can become communally healthy through social interest in Adler’s three major life tasks. The point of this project is to provide a realistic way to apply Adler’s work task and sustainable practices in correctional institutions through organic farming and environmental care. In this way, we solve the problem of prison reform by enlisting meaningful opportunities for inmates. Sustainable prison practices solve the problem of recidivism and the problem of social interest in the prison population. Alder’s five principles of school reform, if applied to prison reform, clearly adjust social hierarchies in the prison system today to those of Adlerian social interest.

Sustainability through therapeutic gardening and caring for other living things adjusts social interest, teaches empathy, and reduces recidivism in Adler’s concepts of sense of community and the work tasks. Furthermore, prisoners are able to reenter free society with a set
of skills in sustainable and green practices that help them to become employable, which leads to less crime and consequently less recidivism.

**Adlerian Individual Psychotherapy**

Adlerian psychotherapy uses individual constructs to determine psychopathology. Additionally, Adlerian theory is based in goal-oriented behavior of each individual relying on perception, thoughts, feelings, and beliefs about life, rooted in childhood, and grounded in social paradigms (Dreikurs-Ferguson, 2003). Adler stated it this way: “Without the sense of a goal individual activities would cease to have meaning” (Dreikurs-Ferguson, 2003, p. 137).

Adler’s emphasis was on self-direction, choice, and decision-making (Dreikurs-Ferguson, 2003). In that, we see that a person, with free will and self-determination makes choices to fit their ideal goal. For Adler, goal orientation was formed in the context of family life, within unique family patterns. The family served as the first social contract in which individuals start to understand social meaning; men as communal beings appropriate and give meaning to tasks based on their relationship to other men.

At first, Adler proposed three tasks in which men found inner meaning; love-intimacy, friendship-community, and work-occupation. Later the tasks were extended to include spirituality and leisure (taking care of inner self), expanding the life tasks to a holistic realm. To Adler, life tasks were fictitious designations accounting for human experiences being earth-born in a community made up of two sexes (Mansager & Gold, 2000). All individuals lived within the life tasks and gave them meaning in relation to individual perceptions based on experiences. Thus, the life tasks take a form in a goal-oriented and meaningful way only to the person engaging in them. Adler’s work task is the most important for this project. In many respects, the
work task defines adult life as comparable to that of the family of origin defining social interest in children.

**Work Task**

Adler wrote, “The neurotic strives toward personal superiority...while the normal person strives toward perfection which benefits all” (Stone, 2007, p. 97). In the work task, we can see how an individual has evolved his creative power to strive on the useless or useful side of life. How one begins to strive with creative power begins in childhood, as all striving does. According to Stone (2007) the key to this matter is to find how one strives for success without solving unanswered needs from childhood or compensate for feelings of inferiority. Individuals, who are taught to be courageous through parenting, address the problem via working with others. “They strive by using a community-based orientation while at work” (Stone, 2007, p. 97).

In 1933 Maria Jahoda, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, and Hans Zeisel published a classic study about the social consequences of unemployment (Silver, 2009). At that time, Jahoba came to the conclusion that work has social significance and provides people with structure, shared experiences, and goals beyond the relationship of the family. In addition, it provides status, identity, collective purpose, and offers opportunities for autonomy, control, the use of creative skills in daily activities, and provides material benefits. It is the first place, outside of the family, that individuals learn to behave in suitable ways with others in a common goal.

**Love & Intimacy**

In the *Science of Living* Adler (1930) said that, “All abilities, disabilities, and inclinations for love and marriage can be found in the prototype formed in the first years of life” (p. 231). Adler furthered this discussion by adding that love and marriage are the ultimate social task by saying that: “…these tasks must be accomplished with the interest of the other person always in
mind” (p. 232). Thus, a child who is not encouraged, through parenting, to work toward a goal of communal living in the family, will be ill prepared for the task of marriage (Adler, 1930).

Love by itself will not settle things and must have a proper foundation of total equality to be successful (Adler, 1930). It is with social feeling, social connectedness that we learn with courage and security to love another person.

**Social Interest & Friendship**

For Adler, it is the social aspect of life that is the most crucial (Dreikurs-Ferguson, 2003). The social aspect of humans is future-oriented; it allows us to develop human relationships that enable us to improve upon the future rather than living with past limitations. For Adler, we improve when we are encouraged to do so beginning with relationships from birth.

Encouragement refers to altering an individual’s appraisal of self in the larger context of social relationships (Dreikurs-Ferguson, 2003). Encouragement addresses changes in one’s expectations of others in family, school, work, and the community. With encouragement comes the courage to make mistakes, to induce relationships, and to except one’s self in the process. Without encouragement one can lack optimism and the courage to redirect inner goals to that which suit humankind. Dreikers-Ferguson (2003) states that: “…when individuals are optimistic and have positive expectations of self and others, they are not only happier, but they are healthier and more productive” (p. 138). As Adler posited, encouraged people are prepared for the problems of life.

Adler’s concept of social interest is complex. It drives motivation, contribution, and achievement and is the cornerstone for mental health. Ansbacher (1991) listed several points of noteworthiness for social interest to explain Adler’s original meaning and extend it to object relations: (a) social interest is innate, not inborn but consciously developed; (b) Adler’s
aggression drive does not mean hostility only, but it is seen in striving for success, superiority, and perfection; (c) social interest includes love except in the sense of sexual love; and (d) social interest extends to all objects of this world (p. 30-31). It means general connectedness (Ansbacher, 1991).

Psychological theories have attempted to provide a more comprehensive view of criminal behavior by focusing on the criminal’s personality, temperament, intelligence, and more recently lifestyle dynamics (Highland, Kern, & Curlette, 2010). The theory of Individual Psychology emphasizes the importance of the individual’s subjective perceptions in his goal of striving for importance and moving toward social cooperation. Adler used the word lifestyle to describe a view of life that a child uses to guide its movements in accordance with the way it thinks, feels, and acts with expected and unexpected contexts. That is, a child uses his creative power to form his world according to that of his first social connection.

Adler suggested that the lifestyle dynamics of the criminal include low social interest, high activity level, pampering from a parent, and a propensity to plan criminal acts (Highland, Kern, & Curlette, 2010). It is the criminal’s skewed perception of the world, his mistaken beliefs that perpetuate aggression in these four dynamics of lifestyle. Adler did not believe that criminal behavior was predictable by environment or heredity he believed it was overwhelming feelings of inferiority and striving to compensate that lead to criminal behavior(s). Criminal behavior can then be explained as a lack of social interest in the tasks of life.

Adler believed children that lacked social interest might develop passive or active lifestyles that lead to delinquency (Highland, Kern, & Curlette, 2010). Children with lower activity levels might believe that they are entitled to receive anything with little effort; those with
active levels might take what is not given to them voluntarily. Lost on them is social interest derived from working together with others to complete a goal.

The last part of Adler’s theory addressed behavior related to crime and planning. Adler believed that criminals took great pains in planning their acts and that they enlisted others to help carry them out (Highland, Kern, & Curlette, 2010). He thought that in planning crime, criminals overcome singular social interest in order to find justifications for committing such acts. Since Adler’s time, research has proved that this is true, however there is no actual research from Adler’s standpoint. Integration of Adler’s lifestyle, social interest and the life course perspective, could be the key to solving criminal behavior.

Sustainability through therapeutic gardening and caring for other living things adjusts social interest, teaches empathy, and reduces recidivism in Adler’s conceptualizations of sense of community and the work tasks. Furthermore, prisoners are able to reenter free society with a set of skills in sustainable and green practices that help them to become employable, which leads to less crime and consequently less recidivism.

**Organic Farming: The Therapeutic Nature of Gardening in Sustainable Prisons**

The United States was founded on the idea of social interest; as it is a nation that was founded by people wanting to escape religious persecution, gain property, and obtain an overall more secure life. As a result, farmers and homesteaders with democratic values and individualism founded the United States of America. Yet, the face of American agriculture has changed drastically since the days of our founding fathers (Lyons, 2012). Horticultural therapy, to that end, is not a new concept. Paula Diane Relf (1981) explored the benefits of horticultural therapy in an article titled “The Use of Horticulture in Vocational Rehabilitation.” The majority of programs using horticulture as vocational rehabilitation rested their hypotheses on helping the
handicap; however, the basis of these hypotheses—creating job opportunities, products, and services that provide community benefits, and therapeutic benefits—apply today to many people experiencing physical and mental health problems, including inmates who are currently incarcerated. The benefits, in these cases, may outweigh the cost of beginning programs. Moreover, as agribusiness and corporate de-regulation of trade polices of fostered agricultural big business that have consequences to humans and the environment. Agribusiness and de-regulation, indirectly have contributed to a rise in obesity, environmental de-gradation, and in the economic decline of rural communities. Thus, beginning with a living organism—the prison system—can give valuable lessons about the use of horticulture as therapy for larger populations in free society.

Horticultural therapy is the use of plant gardening and nature activities for the purpose of restoring physical and mental health (Rothert, 2007). Physically, horticulture therapy provides mild exercise, helps to strengthen weakened muscles, increases joint flexibility, and physical stamina for coordination and balance improvement. Mental health improvements include stress relief, calming, and restorative experiences through caring for plants. Moreover, while caring for another living thing, people put their worries aside and focus on what the need of the plant is instead of self-service. But, more than the mental and physical benefits of horticultural therapy, the value of it extends to the social side of life, Adler’s social interest. According to Rothert (2007) horticultural therapy “…fosters connections and strengthens social support systems” (p. 26) because plants are living organisms that facilitate connection to another living organism that encourages purposeful activity.

As a working model for prisoners, horticultural therapy has been discussed, but the full potential for the social, emotional, physical, and psychological health have not. Much of the
ambiguity about prison industry stems from a lack of clarity to its purpose (Mann, 1997).
Beginning in the 1980s there were significant shifts in attitudes about the prison industry with an integrated philosophy that vocational training and work skills aid prisoners in reentry to society with opportunities to become employed. The reintegration approach to correctional industries supports the rehabilitative value of work and providing inmate workers with the tools to reintegrate into society successfully. Logically, correctional industries do effectively train inmates occupationally, provide meaningful work experiences, balance or decrease prison costs, and reduce inmate idleness. Translated to horticultural therapy, inmate industries in organic gardening have many advantages (Mann, 1997).

The impact of horticulture and gardening on physical and mental health is significant. Research data collected theorizes that horticultural therapy benefits individuals in numerous ways including increased self-worth, increased self-mastery, interaction with peers and the public, mastery in academic areas, and development of work habits (Relf, 1981). Increased self-worth comes from the positive response of a plant that has been treated with care. The sense of pride and responsibility lends to increased self-concept and self-worth. Opportunities present themselves in a socially acceptable way by the pulling out and discarding of plants; anger, aggression, and negative emotions are discarded as well. The client, in this way, learns appropriate methods of dealing with love-hate relationships and developing methods of self-control. For inmates, learning the skill of horticulture leads to socialization in workshops and training. To that point, when working together interaction between workers takes place in a goal-directed way through planning, idea passing, and work related banter. Moreover, people develop work habits to become effective employees. Within real work settings, people also acquire academic skills. In the case of horticulture, mathematic learning is imperative; one must
measure correctly for fertilizer, measure the length between seeds for optimal growth, and learn new terms about plant and plant growth that lead to new and improved vocabulary and better communication skills. Beyond the benefits to the prison population, there are also lower rates of recidivism (Relf, 1981).

Correctional industries, using a re-integrative approach, establish the rehabilitative value of work (Mann, 1981). It suggests that correctional industries should replicate private sector businesses. In other words, inmates should be provided with practical work experience in a business-like environment that stresses performance standards and rewards like those found by employees in the real world. Correctional industries, when operated correctly, effectively give inmates occupational skills in three categories; offender-based goals, institutional-based goals, and society-based goals.

Offender-based goals stress the value of work and focus on elements of rehabilitation and preparation for reintegration into society. Institutional-based goals emphasize the contribution correctional industries make toward maintaining and supporting the inmate population and prison system. Goal directives are set to reduce idleness and to help keep order. Society-based goals contribute to reducing prison cost on the public, but it also focuses on how inmates can repay society for the cost generated by their criminal activity. Principles of the working model are twofold in nature; it helps build a work ethic for persons incarcerated who have been working on the useless side of life and it offers a chance for correction officers to become both operational staff and trainer (Mann, 1997). Applying this type of model to Adler’s work task and organic horticulture is conclusive in the benefits for inmates, correctional staff, and society.
Sustainable Prisons

So far this paper has proved that lawmaking alone will not solve the problem of criminal activity or what is considered criminal behavior. On the contrary, the SRA of 1984 has brought with it a rise in prisons as well as prison overcrowding. Prisons are unable to reform prisoners in part because lack of funding that was once used for programs and education is now being used to run daily operations (Sessions, 2011). Furthermore, suitable ways to aid prisoners in feeling useful in a community have not been taken as seriously in the political environment; lawmakers have failed to use psychology as a more powerful resource and ally when speaking about prison reform and tackling recidivism. In the past, reform used educational and rehabilitation programs to help prisoners reenter society; however, the lack of empathy and social interest in criminal populations still has a major effect on recidivism. Adler’s individual psychology suggests that a “communitarian-oriented Western theory of mental health and well-being [that] ultimately requires a sense of identification with the larger communities of which one is a part” (Sherrod, 2009, p. 380). Major life activities, which join human kind to one another and that link social interest and a sense of belonging in a community built on exclusion, has proved to be one such way prisons can help those incarcerated find a sense of belonging.

Because people must be included in social human relationships to feel a sense of belonging, social exclusions creates a primary problem to group belongingness in a legal context (Sherrod, 2009). With the primary goal of corrections being community safety, we must include, as part of community safety, the long-term effects of buildings, operations, the economy, and resource allocations that effect the environment and the communities where jails and prisons are and in which we all live (Thigpen, Beauclair, & Carroll, 2011). The greening of corrections provides extraordinary opportunities to create more efficient, sustainable, and resilient prisons
and jails that benefit human capital costs by reducing energy, resource consumption, and by giving prisoners a hands-on educational experience that, when returned to society, supports finding jobs in an emerging green economy. Conversely, providing prisoners with labor rooted in personal growth, education, or advancement in a skill or vocation empowers the prisoner to pursue his or her own path to rehabilitation (Lyons, 2012). Furthermore, greening in corrections introduces two of Adler’s tasks by exposing inmates to the both work task and social interest.

To assist corrections with heading into more holistic prison environments, the U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Prisons National Institute of Corrections, commissioned the Academy for Educational Development (AED) and its partners with the task of helping correctional professionals understand how to 1.) build or transform correctional agencies into self-sustaining facilities, 2.) identify green job training programs and jobs that provide viable employment opportunities upon entering society, and 3.) make prison industry products, jobs, and services more environmentally.

The green or sustainability movement has gained acceptance because it examines our activities and how they impact the natural world (Thigpen et al., 2011). Free men, outside of prison, are wasteful and depletive of the world; we knock our environment out of balance with little thought to the consequences. The initiative in corrections is meant to help reduce economic burden placed on society by making prisons a “living laboratory” environment for sustainability (Thigpen et al., 2011). Thus, increasing awareness throughout the larger community and empowers prisoners to build a sense of community from behind prison walls. This is done by the use of the “3 Es” (environment, economic, equity) to pursue balance in correctional facilities.

- **Environment** – reducing carbon footprints including pollution and waste-stream reduction of the buildings on the environment.
- **Economic** – reducing costs over the lifetime of a building. This might also include revenue generation.

- **Equity** – the redirecting or “correcting” the behavior of individuals whose activities have resulted in incarceration.

The 3 Es each have their own merit and benefit on society where corrections are concerned and for Individual Psychology, we can build on the work task and lay framework for a communal feeling in people who are incarcerated. The greening of buildings, for example, includes energy efficiency and conservation. The benefit to society and the environment are simple; green buildings consume less energy, creating less economic stress on society, and decrease overall stress on the environment. Correctional facilities going green consume fewer resources, create less waste, create less pollution, and provide healthier environments for its users—innates, visitors, and administration (Thigpen et al., 2011). Green buildings are those planned, designed, constructed, and operated in harmony with nature. Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) and Energy Star created practical designs to measure a buildings performance, monitor efficiency, and create goals for energy savings. They rate construction and evaluate existing detention centers to assess their relative greenness (Thigpen et al., 2011). The buildings are given scorecards, which are a measuring tool to define areas that can more effectively save energy. Correctional institutions like those in California, Colorado, and Washington have adopted LEED and Energy Star plans and in California, savings in 2009 were $3,189,214.73 (Thigpen et al., 2011). Washington State Department of Corrections (WSDOC) is the most intriguing because they turned their green project into one that uses prisoners to support and maintain a healthier environment both inside the facility and out on the grounds with the production of sustainable food systems.
Sustainable food systems mean farm-to-table, organic grown foods that are without environmental harms, public health burdens, and social disenfranchisement (Hinrichs, 2010). Hinrichs (2010) suggested that sustainable foods are a sociological issue because

Sociology, after all, examines an array of social practices, institutions and dynamic, ranging from consumption to culture to community to development to education to the family to the oppression of race, class and/or gender to social organization to social psychology to social stratification and to social movements. (p. 9)

Encouragement in the arena of sustainable foods is seen with large increases in organic farmland, the proliferation and popularity of farmers’ markets, community supported agricultural farms and farm-to-school and farm-to-college programs, which have encouraged growing public demand for fairly traded and ethical foods. In the advent of this new wave in sustainable food, productivity, and increase in organic farmland, we are lax in looking at the landmass of prisons and the use of inmates to build sustainable farm communities. Sociology has the potential to inspire more action in this arena. Discovering and applying social psychology and the use of therapeutic gardening in correctional settings might prove to be the answer for the problem of social inequality and social justice where sustainable food is concerned. Additionally, prison farmers serve a greater social function than merely housing deviants it “provides unique opportunities to empower, educate and rehabilitate prisoners by connecting them to local communities around issues of sustainability and food security to the benefit of all.” (Lyons, 2012, p. 17). At this time in history, and with the demand for more sustainable practices and fair food trade with those who may not afford less processed foods, prisons can be a good resource.

Adler described a world where social interest is at the core of mental health. Across time and space, the notion of social interest has no boundaries; it is just as important today in each
country with each culture as it was when Adler walked the streets of Vienna. At the core of social interest is cooperation and striving to overcome problems in a variety of contexts (Overholser, 2013). Adler’s ideas are inspirational to individuals, encouraging people to become more helpful with others. Gemeinschaftsgfühl, which translated means social interest or community feeling, is the apex of Adler’s Individual Psychology (Sherrod, 2009). Today the food industry (agriculture included), is the second largest in the world. Yet, the role of the individual farmer has diminished with the onset of corporate farms (Lyons, 2012). The benefits of farming in history extend past the quality of the food we eat and also encompasses Adler’s Gemeinschaftsgfühl; farmers as a community unto themselves. Cedar Creek Correctional Center in Washington State and San Quentin State Prison in California are breaking new ground in bring back small business farming.

While few prisons are a living laboratory for sustainability, but in 2002, Governor Locke tasked all state agencies with meeting new sustainability standards (Thigpen et al., 2011). WSDOC, determined to meet his expectations, launched an effort, leveraging the power of creativity to reduce its annual budget and prepare inmates for the outside world. Thus, The Evergreen State College (TESC) and WSDOC partnered and joined with inmates in a project so named The Sustainable Prison Project, at Cedar Creek Correctional Center (CCCC), a minimum-security men’s prison. They focused in three areas 1) green-collaring training and education; 2) sustainable operations of prisons; and 3) scientific research and conservation (Thigpen et al., 2011).

Green-collar training and education included lectures tailored to the population on plant and wildlife ecology, sustainable agriculture, urban horticulture, and alternative energy and building with recycled materials (Thigpen et al., 2011). Over 1800 inmates attended these
lectures. One example of how the lectures changed both the inmates and staff at CCCC was seen after a lecture on how to decrease water use, which helped WSDOC avoid spending $1.4 million on the expansion of the water treatment plant as prisoners and staff began using simple procedures taught in the lecture. But, the savings on society are not the only positives in the project. Inmates are trained in worthwhile green projects for employment outside of incarceration. Additionally, the program hosts a dog training program with a local shelter, they are trained on projects that help with facility operations, and are gaining skills in horticulture, composting, and beekeeping. Since its inception, the prison project has also helped the environment with the release of butterflies and tree frogs that were once endangered species.

The third engages inmates in scientific research and projects to help the environment. They partnered with the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife to restore endangered species and threatened habitats (Thigpen et al., 2011). The most well-known of these projects is the raising, care, and release of the Oregon Spotted Tree Frog. The benefits of the DOC’s project go beyond saving money (in five years over 3.5 million were saved) and the training that the inmates procure. When evaluated, the inmates revealed they gained a sense of purpose and contribution to society, an elevation in self-esteem, and more positive social interactions with other inmates and corrections administrators (Thigpen, Beauclair, & Carroll, 2011). Today, CCCC collaborates with local schools, churches, and businesses on community projects including food drives, The Rochester Organization of Families (ROOF) program and annual Adopt-a-Family (WSDOC, 2015). Inmates also fundraise and donate to ROOF, St. Jude’s Hospital, and Littlerock school dog program for veterans. CCCC partners with the Department of Natural Resources and provides workers to maintain trails and campgrounds, and it has a
The Green Life at San Quentin State Prison in California began in 2009 as a North Block peer educator group with co-leaders Pandora Thomas and Angela Sevin (Ganahl, 2013). Since its inception, Thomas and Sevin have facilitated an assortment of speakers, lecturers, and class covering a wide array of topics including recycling, waste management, green building, biodiversity, environmental justice, and public policy. Through the program, the inmates have designed and implemented their own program for sustainability while taking on the role of educators and leaders as well as taking what they have learned to lobby prison officials to use sustainability within the prison system. Thomas and Sevin hope that through their learning, inmates have learned both technical and interpersonal skills to move into green jobs upon release bettering their world.

Thomas and Sevin met while at a conference on social and environmental awareness—marrying social justice with environmental practice (Ganahl, 2013). At that time, Thomas was interested in finding a way to help his family members who were incarcerated or at least figuring out his role in their lives. Sevin happened to be working at San Quentin and wanted to start a green project. Together they created Green Life giving inmates a chance to explore passion and joy in their lives. The Insight Gardening Program (IGP), also within the California Department of Corrections and San Quentin, began in 2002 (IGP, 2015). This program brought curriculum focused on holistic gardening. IGP is based on a transformational approach that involves both the *inner* and *outer* gardener.

The inner gardener classes integrate transformational tools such as meditation, emotional process work, and ecotherapy while the outer gardener uses flower and vegetable gardens to
teach participants organic gardening, human-ecological systems, and useful life and work skills (IGP, 2015). The program is based on the latest neuroscience research on learning strategies combined with experiential gardening. The approach is also collaborative to change and build relationships with other programs, including the California Reentry Program, Sustainability in Prisons Project, Prison Law Office, and Plant Justice, and it supports efforts to reduce recidivism, restore people and communities through programming, reentry resources, legal avenues, and sustainability in prisons. Studies support that IGP is an evidenced-based practice and that it has lowered recidivism among parolees.

A 2011 recidivism study of 117 of IGP participants paroled between 2003 and 2009 found less than 10% returned once released—an approximate savings of $40 million to the state and tax payers (IGP, 2015). Among many of IGP’s accomplishments is the start of programs in Solano and Donovan State Prisons both in California. As IGP claims are founded in research, so is horticulture therapy. As a matter of fact, horticulture therapy is a person-plant relationship that requires participants to learn the qualities of caring for a living being. It teaches responsibility, empathy, and discipline that transfers to the interpersonal realm; by growing plants, people also grow.

Gallagher, (2013) conducted research at WSDOC to meet her Masters requirements at TESC. The research was designed to include how, by use of SPP, the prison reduced recidivism, contributed to safer inmate environments and how it provided offenders with positive personal changes that would benefit them in the community after release. The main tool in her research was a reliable Life & Work (L&W)(Gallagher, 3013) survey that was given to offenders and assessed for environmental attitudes, interest in continued education, level of satisfaction with their work environments and relationships with others, sense of well-being, and prospects for the
future; a second survey was given to inmates that had a high level of engagement in the SPP program and worked directly with living things, in collaboration with the community, and sustainability (Gallagher, 2013). The WSDOC provided information prior to the survey about the offenders such as age, race, type of offense, time in prison, time left of sentence, and risk level. Because not all offenders are allowed to work while in prison, the sample of offenders represent those who work with the SPP and those who do non-SPP, Class III (entry level) jobs (custodians, laundry workers, and clerks). The surveys were conducted at nine of twelve WSDOC prisons and included 293 prisoners; 80 control group members whose jobs included porters, gas shack attendants, recreation assistants, laundry works, and skilled positions such as welders and electricians; and, 213 “Experimental” group members whose jobs were divided into nine categories related to sustainability: community service crew (23), dog training (24), forestry (23), grounds-keeping (37), horticulture (27), kitchen (17), recycling (25), SPP flagship (21 including endangered species rearing, conservation and restoration programs, and sustainability focused community projects), and other (16 including composting and bicycle refurbishing). The New Ecological Paradigm (NEP)(Dunlap, Van Liere, Mertig, & Jones, 2000) questionnaire and WSDOC Offender Needs Assessment were also included as part of the survey in their entirety. Based on the scores results concluded that inmates who participated in SPP flagship scored higher than any other group on the NEP which suggests that more flagship programs should be included in work assignments. These include education and training, work with living things, and the opportunity to participate in community based programs. The NEP scores and SPP jobs also implied positive pro-environmental and pro-social attitudes among prisoners. Furthermore, the positive relationships found in this study between job index scores and NEP scores suggests that “providing more offenders with the opportunity to engage in jobs
with higher levels of education/training, work with living things, and community contribution opportunities may translate into pro-environmental and pro-social behaviors” (Gallagher, 2013, p. 45). As many prisoners are incarcerated because of anti-social behavior, beginning programs in sustainability among prisons would not only encourage inmates socially, but would benefit the larger community in environmental efforts.

The Offender Needs Assessment (ONA) also showed positive results when compared to L&W relating to a decrease in “need” over six domains during the study participants’ time in prison (Gallagher, 2013). As a whole, the 288-person group showed improvement in interpersonal relationships, employment, coping skills, attitudes and behaviors, and education. Although Gallagher suggests that further research is needed, the study does support the idea that education/training and related opportunities to work with the outside community are significant contributors to more positive attitudes among inmates. It is notable also that L&W scores contained more positive attitudes with those inmates who worked directly with the dog training program. Additionally, because of the pro-environmental and pro-social changes in the inmates, green-collar training and job opportunities contribute to society and lead to “safer communities both inside and outside of prison, reducing the environmental, economic, and social costs of incarceration” (Gallagher, 2013, p. 51).

At this time, Minnesota is adopting some sustainability practices through cabinetmaking and carpentry, but there are many more efforts that deserve attention in the state. Thigpen et al., (2011) recommend the following for each correctional facility:

- *Create a sustainability work group* – form a local team to develop a green plan.
- *Hold a retreat for that team* – ask for ideas, involve local people, provide an overview of what it means to go green and the benefits, lay out the rationale by
providing information about career opportunities after release, recidivism, and cost savings.

- **Implement budget strategies and offender employment opportunities** – mine your waste with recycling centers, support local partnerships by restoring bikes, beginning seeds for Kiwanis Clubs, and organic gardening to offset food prices.

- **Implement transportation protocol** – reduce fleet size, buy local, use electric or hybrid vehicles.

- **Use cell dog programs and scientific projects** – this will provide people with companion or service dogs and help the environment by replacing specific plants and animals that have been endangered.

- **Use local experts/resources** – partner with colleges and local businesses to help offset cost and give training.

- **Work with anything alive** – the use of beekeeping, dogs, cats, cows, plants, etc. builds character, morale, self-esteem, and empathy in inmates.

- **Offender email** – allows offenders to speak with loved ones and saves the cost of visitation activities.

All correctional facilities would benefit from the use of one or more of these recommendations. The correctional facilities of the future would look predominantly different with care and management in green, sustainable practices. Jails would likely be urban, vertical, and part of a neighborhood; prisons would be suburban, horizontal, and economic (Thigpen et al., 2011). In both cases, their presence would create an appearance of purpose, focused on creating active, valued citizens, and reduce recidivism.
Conclusion

In the USA today, there are more prisons than Walmarts and more prisoners than farmers (Lyons, 2012). A generalized reason for this is a culmination of the SRA and the “War on Drugs” that put prisons in rural areas. Concurrent to these two things, agribusiness began to take over the family farm leaving rural communities with little earnings. The skyrocketing inmate population because of the War on Drugs brought with it a need for prison construction. The solution was to buy rural property at low-cost and build a prison industry. With rural prison construction, politicians hoped to flood communities with money and accommodate the growing inmate population. Instead, prison construction was given to large companies, which did not support the local communities, and rural areas further declined as a result (Lyons, 2012). The possibility now is that the prison system and local governments can begin to build on the call for well-grown local food and the action needed to become an environmentally healthy country.

At this time, little information is found on local practices in sustainability in prisons. Adler would have believed this to be a mistake at this juncture in history. The CCCC model of green corrections has given way to purpose, social interest, and horizontal striving in its population with administrators and inmates working toward a common goal of green living in a cost effective way. At Stafford Creek Correctional Center (SCCC) a recycling center, completed in 2009, earned an annual saving of 102,000 dollars per year by using inmates to sort garbage from reusable items (Izatt, 2011). Composting of food, to later be used in organic gardening is projected to save 75,000 dollars annually and gardens that used composting grew 10,000 pounds of food by 2011 (Izatt, 2011). These are small efforts that can be practiced with little cost to correctional facilities, but more than that, inmates are learning to work together for a greater purpose.
Adler thought that when people work together “They strive by using a community-based orientation while at work” (Stone, 2007, p. 97). Additionally, working together gives purpose and social inclination. Social inclination is future-oriented; it allows us to develop human relationships that enable us to improve upon the future rather than living with past limitations (Dreikurs-Ferguson, 2003). Social inclination is the most important aspect of mental health in Adler’s view. It encourages healthy persons to make society fertile by encouraging those who are neurotic or criminal to live within the context of a communal feeling.

Many different theories were used to write this paper, however the basis of each can be found in Adler, because each, in turn used some principle of social interest. Adler’s theory was based in childhood perceptions and later life striving to meet one’s worldview; the life course perspective does the same, yet Adler is not cited in its details.

As lawmakers and Congress lead in justice and all that it means, one should appeal to their sensibilities through the use of Adlerian Individual Psychology. It seems that increasing awareness of why one acts the way he does would improve the system dramatically. Additionally, it would afford inmates the opportunity to succeed with social interest as critical components in life process and sustainability. Nature has long been known to have benefits to human cognitions and social and communal involvement. For prisoners, gardens often contrast with the communities in which they were raised; the garden is safe, welcoming, friendly, non-judgmental, non-discriminating, and non-threatening (Khatib & Krasny, 2015). Plants respond to care, no matter who is providing it, and for individuals who are incarcerated plants teach a valuable lesson about empathy and understanding that also gives prisoners a sense of self-worth and a set of skills upon release. For these reasons, the greening of prisons and prison horticulture have diminished recidivism in California and Washington, connected inmates with society in a
greater sense of community, and provided them with a set of skills to care for living things
giving them better employability and a sense of communal interest.
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