

Summarizing a relative handful of studies, the NRC report implies that we can have safe streets without the cost, financial and moral, of locking up so many criminals — since it's "unlikely" that increased incarceration had a "large" positive impact on crime rates.

It would be nice if there were no trade-off between crime and punishment, but common sense says it's not so. An analysis by the Brookings Institution's <u>Hamilton Project</u>, similar in both tone and timing to the NRC report, acknowledges that increasing incarceration can reduce crime and that this effect is greatest when the overall rate of incarceration is low.

Ergo, increasing the incarceration rate now would do little to reduce crime, but the crimefighting benefits were probably substantial back in the high-crime, low-incarceration days when tougher sentencing was initially imposed.

It's easy to pass judgment on the policymakers of that violent era, when the homicide rate was double what it is today and crime regularly topped pollsters' lists of voter concerns.

That had a racial component, but minorities were, and are, disproportionately *victims* of crime, too. The NRC report extensively discusses the negative effect on communities of incarcerating criminals, but it has comparatively little to say about the social impact of unchecked victimization.

Buried within the report is the fact that, in 1981, the average time served for murder was just five years; by 2000, it had risen to 16.9 years. The numbers for rape were 3.4 and 6.6 years, respectively. Insofar as "mass incarceration" reflects those changes — and the majority of state prisoners are in for violent crimes — it's a positive development.

In an oft-quoted but empty phrase, the NRC report declares the growth of incarceration in the United States "historically unprecedented and internationally unique."

The same might be said for the United States itself. This is the only nation on earth with more than 100 million people, effective, democratically accountable law enforcement and a lot of crime.

If we released all drug offenders, the incarceration rate would still be much higher than that of Europe. Ditto if we released all minorities. Nor are U.S. racial disparities unique. Canadian statistics show that, for unknown reasons, the black share of Canada's prison population is three times that of the general population — the same as in the United States.

Instead of ignoring recent positive trends, researchers should try to understand them. The decline in incarceration may represent the delayed effect of falling crime and the diminished flow of new offenders it necessarily entails.

Sentencing reform, too, is taking hold, based on changing public attitudes. The percentage of Americans who say criminals are not punished harshly enough has fallen nearly 23 points since 1994 — when the crime wave peaked — according to data compiled by Arizona State University professor Mark Ramirez.

After erring on the side of leniency in the 1960s, then swinging the opposite way in the 1980s and 1990s, the United States may be nearing a happy medium.

But this probably would not be possible if 48 percent of Americans felt unsafe walking at night within a mile of their homes, as the Gallup poll found in 1982.

To sustain moderate public opinion we must keep the streets safe, and to do that we must learn the right lessons from the recent past.

Read more from Charles Lane's archive, follow him on Twitter or subscribe to his updates on Facebook.

## Read more on this topic:

George F. Will: The sledgehammer justice of mandatory minimum sentences













