Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

- Eight Amendment of the U.S. Constitution
Excessive be. Punishments nor; Bail nor cruel inflicted not imposed unusual required; fines, and excessive shall

- Amendment the Eight U.S. of Constitution
the architecture of oppression
a.01: extreme realities
SOLITARY CONFINEMENT SENTENCES CAN LAST DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS, YEARS OR EVEN DECADES.

There is no official organization that regulates the use of solitary confinement. Individual institutions freely use isolation tactics however they see fit.
5 OUT 6 SENTENCES TO SOLITARY CONFINEMENT ARE FOR NON-VIOLENT MISBEHAVIOR.

This includes infractions such as:

- Excessive possession of postage stamps
- Selling of chewing tobacco
- Failure to meet dress standards
'I tried to measure the passing of days by counting food trays. Without being able to keep track of time, though, sometimes I thought the officers had left me and were never coming back. I thought they were gone for days, and I was going to starve. It's likely they were only gone for a few hours, but I had no way to know.'
The war on drugs and mass incarceration

The U.S. State and Federal prison population has increased over 800% in only 40 years.

The U.S. prison population is its fourth largest

Includes those held in state and federal prisons, local jails and other correctional facilities.
a.02: institution
brooklyn naval hospital

RD. Medical Supply Depot

R95. Administration Main

R2/R3. Quarters

R1. Surgeon's Residence
a.03: strange attractors
‘It is sometimes necessary to hang a man, villains often deserve whipping, and perhaps having their ears cut off; but are we in the future to be prevented from inflicting these punishments because they are cruel?’
DURING CONGRESSIONAL CONSIDERATION OF THIS PROVISION ONE MEMBER OBJECTED TO "THE IMPORT OF [THE WORDS] BEEN TOO INDEFINITE" AND ANOTHER MEMBER SAID: "NO CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT IS TO BE INFLICTED; IT IS SOMETIMES NECESSARY TO HANG A MAN, VILLAINS OFTEN DESERVE WHIPPING, AND PERHAPS HAVING THEIR EARS CUT OFF; BUT ARE WE IN THE FUTURE TO BE PREVENTED FROM INFlicting THESE PUNISHMENTS BECAUSE THEY ARE CERUB" IF A MORE LENIENT MODE OF CORRECTING VICE AND DEFERRING OTHERS FROM THE COMMISSION OF IT WOULD BE INVENTED, IT WOULD BE VERY PRUDENT IN THE LEGISLATURE TO ADOPT IT, BUT UNTIL WE HAVE SOME SECURITY THAT THIS WILL BE DONE, WE OUGHT NOT TO BE RESTRAINED FROM MAKING NECESSARY LAWS BY ANY DECLARATION OF THIS KIND." IT IS CLEAR FROM SOME OF THE COMPLAINTS ABOUT THE ABSENCE OF A BILL OF RIGHTS INCLUDING A GUARANTEE AGAINST CERUB AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENTS IN THE RATIFYING CONVENTIONS THAT TORTURES AND BARBAROUS PUNISHMENTS WERE MUCH ON THE MINDS OF THE COMPLAINANT, BUT THE ENGLISH HISTORY WHICH LED TO THE INCLUSION OF A PREDECESSOR PROVISION IN THE BILL OF RIGHTS OF 1689 INDICATES ADDITIONAL CONCERN WITH ARBITRARY AND DISPROPORTIONATE PUNISHMENTS.

THOUGH FEW IN NUMBER, THE DECISIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT INTERPRETING THIS GUARANTEE HAVE APPLIED IT IN BOTH SENSES. AT FIRST, THE COURT WAS INCLINED TO AN HISTORICAL STYLE ON INTERPRETATION, DETERMINING WHETHER OR NOT A PUNISHMENT WAS "CERUB AND UNUSUAL" BY LOOKING TO SEE IF IT OR A SUFFICIENTLY SIMILAR VARIATION WAS CONSIDERED "CERUB AND UNUSUAL" IN 1789. BUT IN WICKS V. UNITED STATES IT WAS CONCLUDED THAT THE FRAMEIS NOT MERELY INTENDED TO BAR THE REINSTITUTION OF PROCEDURES AND TECHNIQUES CONDEMNED IN 1789, BUT HAD INTENDED TO PREVENT THE AUTHORIZATION OF "A COERCIVE CRUELTY BEING EXERCISED THROUGH OTHER FORMS OF PUNISHMENT." THE AMENDMENT THEREFORE WAS OF AN "EXPANSIVE AND VITAL CHARACTER" AND, IN THE WORDS OF A LATER COURT, "MUST DRAW ITS MEANING FROM THE EVOLVING STANDARDS OF DECENCY THAT MARK THE PROGRESS OF A MATURING SOCIETY." THE PROPER APPROACH TO AN INTERPRETATION OF THIS PROVISION HAS BEEN ONE OF THE MAJOR POINTS OF ISSUE AMONG THE JUSTICES IN THE CAPITAL PUNISHMENT CASES. "DIFFICULTY WOULD ATTEND THE EFFORT TO DEFINE WITH EXACTNESS THE EXTENT OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION WHICH PROVIDES THAT CERUB AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENTS SHALL NOT BE INFLICTED, BUT IT IS SAFE TO AFFIRM THAT PUNISHMENTS OF TORTURE (SUCH AS DRAGGING AND QUIVERING, EMBOWELING ALIVE, BEEING, PUBLIC DISSECTING, AND BURNING ALIVE), AND ALL OTHERS IN THE SAME LINE OF UNNECESSARY CRUELTY, ARE FORBIDDEN BY THAT AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION." IN THIS UPHOLDING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT INFLICTED BY A FIRING SQUAD, THE COURT NOT ONLY LOOKED TO TRADITIONAL PRACTICES BUT EXAMINED THE HISTORY OF EXECUTIONS IN THE TERRITORY CONCERNED, THE MILITARY PRACTICE, AND CURRENT WRITINGS ON THE DEATH PENALTY, THE COURT NEXT APPROVED, UNDER THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT'S DUE PROCESS CLAUSE RATHER THAN UNDER THE EIGHTH AMENDMENT, ELECTROCUTION AS A PERMISSIBLE METHOD OF ADMINISTERING PUNISHMENT. MANY YEARS LATER, A DIVIDED COURT, ASSUMING THE APPLICABILITY OF THE EIGHTH AMENDMENT TO THE STATES, HELD THAT A SECOND ELECTROCUTION FOLLOWING A MECHANICAL FAILURE AT THE FIRST WHICH INJURED BUT DID NOT KILL THE CONDEMNED MAN DID NOT VIOLATE THE PROSCRIPTION. DEVISERSTIUF THE CITIZENSHIP OF A NATURAL BORN CITIZEN WAS HELD IN TROY V. DULLES, AGAIN BY A DIVIDED COURT, TO BE CONSTITUTIONALLY FORBIDDEN AS A PENALTY MORE CRUEL AND "MORE PRIMITIVE THAN TORTURE," INSMUCH AS IT ENTAILS STATELESSNESS OR "THE TOTAL DESTRUCTION OF THE INDIVIDUAL'S STATUS IN ORGANIZED SOCIETY." THE QUESTION IS WHETHER (A) PENALITY SUBJUGATES THE INDIVIDUAL TO A FATE FORBIDDEN BY THE PRINCIPLE OF CIVILIZED TREATMENT GUARANTEED BY THE EIGHTH AMENDMENT; (B) A PUNISHMENT MUST BE EXAMINED "IN LIGHT OF THE BASIC PROHIBITION AGAINST INHUMAN TREATMENT," AND THE AMENDMENT WAS INTENDED TO PRESERVE THE "BASIC CONCEPT . . . [OF THE DIGNITY OF MAN]" BY ASSURING THAT THE POWER TO IMPOSE PUNISHMENT IS "EXERCISED WITHIN THE LIMITS OF CIVILIZED STANDARDS."
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