

Małgorzata Kuć

## THE PURPOSES OF EXECUTING THE PENALTY OF IMPRISONMENT PURSUANT TO THE EXECUTIVE PENAL CODE

### Introduction

The penalty of imprisonment is the harshest penalty provided for in the Penal Code.<sup>1</sup> It is nowadays the main retaliatory and deterrent measure used against an offender. Its use is justified for the most serious criminal offences. Imposition of the penalty should be the last resort (*ultima ratio*). If a provision of criminal law for a specific offence gives the court the possibility to choose the type of punishment, the court shall impose the penalty of imprisonment without conditional suspension only if another penalty or penal measure cannot fulfil the purposes of the penalty. Against the background of such a rule, the question of defining the purposes of executing imprisonment penalties is of particular importance, since it is only at the stage of the execution of the penalties that their expediency and effectiveness are ultimately reflected.

The aim of this article is to analyse the purposes of executing imprisonment penalties as defined by the legislator in the Executive Penal Code of 1997.<sup>2</sup> In this scope, the characteristics cover the provisions of the EPC, executive acts thereto, as well as the provisions of the Prison Service Act.<sup>3</sup> Additionally, the views of the doctrine of law and auxiliary sciences of executive penal law have been analysed.

---

DR. MAŁGORZATA KUĆ, Department of Criminal Law, Faculty of Law, Canon Law and Administration, the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin; correspondence address: Al. Raclawickie 14, 20-950 Lublin, Poland; e-mail: edyta03@poczta.onet.pl; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8224-4935>

<sup>1</sup> Journal of Laws of 2018, item 1600 as amended.

<sup>2</sup> Journal of Laws No. 90, item 557 as amended [hereinafter: EPC].

<sup>3</sup> Journal of Laws of 2010, No. 79, item 523.

## 1. Purposes for executing imprisonment penalties as defined in the EPC

K. Krajewski points out that “the purposes of executing imprisonment penalties is one of the most disputed and most difficult issues to resolve in science and practice. It is connected with the discussion on the theory of punishment. It also touches on basic issues of criminology” [Krajewski 1994, 89]. The EPC, in the provision of Article 67, para. 1 thereof, addressed to all bodies of executive proceedings, defines the purposes which a penalty of imprisonment should serve.

Executing the penalty of imprisonment aims at instilling in the convicted person the will to cooperate in developing his or her socially desired attitudes, in particular, the sense of responsibility and the need to observe the legal order and, thus, to refrain from returning to crime (Article 67(1) EPC). Such a complex goal of the penalty of deprivation of liberty means that the dignity the convict person, his subjectivity and right to choose the way of correction are recognized [Bramska and Kiryluk 2002, 33]. The EPC has therefore identified special prevention as the primary purpose of executing the penalty of imprisonment. The basis for the adopted regulation concerning the purpose of imprisonment was the Polish criminal law tradition (both the doctrine and the positive law) and the provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights,<sup>4</sup> the UN Minimum Rules<sup>5</sup> and the European Prison Rules,<sup>6</sup> which see the purpose of imprisonment as enabling the convicted person to return to society, and as preventing recidivism.<sup>7</sup> Pursuant to Article 67 EPC, executing a penalty of imprisonment is to serve the implementation of the purposes

---

<sup>4</sup> Journal of Laws of 1977, No. 38, item 167.

<sup>5</sup> The Resolution UN Minimum Standards for the Treatment of Prisoners, the so-called Nelson Mandela Rules, adopted by the UN General Assembly on 7 October 2015, General Assembly resolution 70/175, annex.

<sup>6</sup> Recommendation Rec (2006) 2 KM to member states RE European Prison Rules adopted on 11 January 2006 at the 952<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the delegates, “Przegląd Więziennictwa Polskiego” 2011, no. 72-73, p. 33-69.

<sup>7</sup> “Uzasadnienie rządowego projektu kodeksu karnego wykonawczego.” In *Nowe kodeksy karne – 1997 z uzasadnieniami*, edited by Irena Fredrich-Michalska, and Barbara Stachurska-Marcińczak, Wydawnictwo Prawnicze, Warszawa 1997 [hereinafter: Expl. Mem.], p. 545.

of the penalty in terms of its individual impact. Executing the penalty is intended to have an impact first and foremost on the convicted person himself/herself, in accordance with the specific preventive purpose of the penalty. The main purpose is resocialisation aimed at preventing him or her from returning to crime. The desired effect is such that after serving the sentence, the convicted person develops the conviction that every violation of the law will cause a quick reaction from the state, whose institutions guard the legal order [Szczygieł 2017, 526].

The purposes of executing imprisonment penalties included in Article 67 EPC differ from the regulations in this regard included in the Executive Penal Code of 1969.<sup>8</sup> In this respect, the rule that prisoners should be subjected to discipline and rigours as the primary means of treatment is abandoned. The rule was the theoretical and legal basis for the repressive nature of the correctional system. The EPC abandons those elements of the severity of executing the penalty that do not arise from the mere fact of isolation or the need to ensure security in prison and the protection of society. The changes concerning the rules of executing imprisonment penalties result from the adoption by the EPC which has a different axiology and philosophy of executing a penalty than in the Executive Penal Code of 1969 [Kuć and Gałązka 2013, 113].

The Explanatory Memorandum states that the resocialisation treatment administered against a convicted person is to become his or her entitlement or an offer by the executing authority, which he or she does not have to utilise (Expl. Mem., 529). The purposes of executing imprisonment penalties are therefore defined as: 1) enabling convicted persons to return to society and to function properly in it; 2) preventing recidivism; 3) protecting society against crime (Article 73 EPC).

An important assumption of the current executive penal law is recognising the activity of convicted persons (“arousing the will to cooperate”) as a basic condition for the effectiveness of executing a penalty of imprisonment. The EPC abandons the obligation to re-socialise convicted adults, leaving the use of resocialisation measures in the sphere of their rights. The legislator decided, based on the results of scientific research, that

---

<sup>8</sup> Journal of Laws No. 13, item 98 as amended.

treating adult convicts in a way that they themselves choose, accept and acknowledge their responsibility for the effects of the treatment is more effective. The provisions of the executive penal law are in favour of recognising human freedom, thus excluding in principle the right of the state to forcibly interfere with the personality of an adult human being during the course of resocialisation treatment, the integrity of which is one of the inalienable rights. Such an assumption fundamentally was the basis for resigning from using the term “resocialisation” in defining the purpose of imprisonment, and results from respecting the dignity of the convicted person [Kuć and Gałązka 2013, 114].

In the light of the Explanatory Memorandum, “the subjectivation of convicts is one of the major factors of stimulating their activity and sense of responsibility” (Expl. Mem., 529). Hence, the great emphasis of the current legal regulation and enforcement practice on ensuring the implementation of subjective rights of convicted persons while maintaining the principle of their compliance with their obligations.

As L. Bogunia and T. Kalisz point out, “in the course of executing a penalty of imprisonment, it is necessary to aim at creating a specific attitude to life in the convicted person, which expresses his or her views, convictions, including the way of acting, behaving towards certain phenomena, events, and especially towards people. Speaking of a socially desirable attitude of a human being, we are in fact touching on relatively permanent dispositions manifesting themselves in behaviours, whose feature is – in this particular case – a positive emotional attitude to values and behaviours, generally accepted and desired by society” [Bogunia and Kalisz 2010, 126].

The assumption that guided the legislator during the codification of the executive penal law was “to strive for a rational reduction of the social costs of crime reduction” (Expl. Mem., 529). The EPC in its binding form also seeks to make the execution of penalties and penal measures more social, which is achieved by allowing convicted persons to have contact with the outside world (family, relatives, chaplains of churches and religious associations, representatives of institutions and associations, use of the press, television, permission to temporarily leave the prison). An important regulation in this respect is Articles 38-43 EPC, concerning public participation in executing sentences, and assistance in social

re-adaptation of convicted persons. Public participation plays an important role in “humanising the penitentiary system, providing assistance to convicted persons and their families.”

The regulation in Article 73 EPC concerning discipline and order in prison serves the purpose of achieving the purposes of imprisonment penalties. According to its wording, discipline and order are maintained in prisons in order to ensure security and the fulfilment of the tasks of imprisonment penalties, including protecting the society against crime. The tasks of imprisonment penalties indicated in the cited provision should be equated with the purposes of executing the penalties, and discipline and order should be understood as “a set of imperatives and prohibitions arising from: the law, the rules of executing imprisonment penalties or other regulations issued on their basis, or the rules of order established in the correctional institution or place of work” [Lelental 2001, 237].

The purposes of executing imprisonment penalties are implemented through the conducted correctional treatment. In every system of executing imprisonment penalties, in correctional institutions and detention centres, correctional treatment aiming at implementing the purposes of executing imprisonment penalties, as defined in the EPC, is carried out. They are carried out in the form of individualised actions adjusted to the psychological and physical characteristics of a convicted person, as well as actions towards a group of convicted persons. The range of correctional treatment depends on the system of executing imprisonment penalties and on the kind and type of institution. In the light of Article 67, para. 3 EPC, influencing convicted persons while respecting their rights and demanding that they fulfil their duties, especially work, in particular work conducive to acquiring relevant professional qualifications, teaching, cultural, educational and sports classes, maintaining family ties and contact with the outside world as well as therapeutic measures. The Regulation of the Minister of Justice of 21 December 2016 on the Organisational and Orderly Rules for the Execution of Prison Sentences supplements the catalogue with disciplinary punishments and rewards (para. 40).<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Regulation of the Minister of Justice of 21 December 2016 on the Organisational and Orderly Rules for Executing Imprisonment Penalties, Journal of Laws item 2231 [hereinafter: the Regulation].

The process of resocialisation carried out in correctional institutions raises many controversies both among researchers considering it in terms of the situation of convicts themselves and the work of prison staff [Machel 2008, 149-57]. The effectiveness of treatment of convicted persons depends on the following factors: knowledge of the convicted person's personality, appropriate selection of correctional measures, the degree of cooperation of the convicted person in executing the penalty and the extent to which penalties and correctional measures are modified in accordance with the progress of resocialisation. The effect of positive treatment on convicted persons is thus to be achieved through the use of correctional treatment measures, which mean strictly defined actions aimed at modifying the attitudes or aspirations of an individual or a collective [Lelental 2001, 69].

W. Rostkowski uses the notion of so-called beneficial compulsion applied in the name of the good of an individual to describe legal consent to interference in human personality, which we are dealing with in the case of resocialisation measures. It is applied towards people "who are not aware of the reprehensibility of their own behaviour or when they insist on satisfying their needs at the expense of others, contrary to legal norms" [Rostkowski 2001, 329].

The basic issue of the methodology of dealing with prisoners is defining the purposes of treatment, which are the determinant of both the circle of addressees and the possible methods and measures applied to them [Szczeplaniak 2008, 163]. The convicted person's role in the process of the treatment presupposes his or her active attitude ("will to cooperate"), his or her motivation to change in order to improve his or her behaviour. The EPC indicates to the convicted person the purposes of the activity they should undertake in the form of shaping socially desired attitudes, specified as the sense of responsibility and the need to observe the legal order.

The literature points out that "refraining from returning to crime, as a goal of treatment, is by definition not the result of a sovereign decision of the convicted person, supported by state bodies and the society, but on the contrary, it is a statutory programme (arbitrarily, at the will of state bodies)" [ibid., 168]. The EPC mentions subordinating the convicted person to the enforcement proceedings authorities (Article 5, para. 2 EPC – the convicted person is obliged to comply with the instructions

aimed at executing the judgement issued by competent authorities; Article 116 EPC – the convicted person is obliged to carry out the instructions of superiors and other authorised persons). The task of the corrective institutions' staff in the course of the undertaken treatment is to motivate the convicted person to take responsibility for his or her attitudes and actions. Despite the fact that in Article 67 EPC the legislator does not expressly refer to resocialisation, in a number of other provisions the legislator refers to the notion, e.g. in Article 38, para. 2 EPC the legislator mentions resocialisation activities, in Article 86, para. 2 EPC – resocialisation considerations, in Art. 76, para. 1, item 4 EPC – progress in resocialisation, in Article 78, para. 2 EPC – the directions for resocialisation work, in Article 145, para. 2 EPC – educational considerations, in Article 212, para. 1 EPC – special educational considerations. The legislator therefore consistently assumes that the work undertaken during a convicted person's imprisonment is resocialisation work, although it presupposes a large share of the convicted person's decision-making in its planning and implementation. The legislator explicitly abandons compulsory resocialisation as a general rule [Rostkowski 2001, 333]. Some exceptions are juvenile convicts obligatorily serving their sentences in the programmed treatment system, and convicts requiring specialist treatment – sentenced to serve their sentences in the therapeutic system [Linowski and Wysocki 2006, *passim*].

Fulfilling the purposes of executing imprisonment penalties is possible through applying methods of correctional work, measures of correctional treatment on the basis of assigning convicted persons to the types of correctional institutions specified in the EPC (juvenile correctional institution, correctional institution for persons serving their sentences for the first time, correctional institution for penitentiary recidivists and correctional institution for persons serving sentences of military arrest – Article 69 EPC), the types of correctional institutions (closed type, semi-open type, open type – Article 70, para. 1 EPC), systems of executing penalties (programmed treatment system, therapeutic system, ordinary system – Article 81 EPC). The selection of the appropriate type of penal institution, the type, the system of executing the imprisonment penalty, the methods and measures of treatment used takes place in accordance with the principle of individualisation, which assumes knowledge of the convicted person

and adequate adjustment of the treatment “tools” (methods and measures of treatment).

## **2. Programmed treatment system in the context of fulfilling the purposes of executing imprisonment penalties**

The programmed treatment system is, together with the therapeutic system and the ordinary system, one of the systems of executing imprisonment penalties (Article 81 EPC). It is the system in which the purposes of executing imprisonment penalties are achieved most intensively, due to the specificity of defining and implementing the correctional treatment adopted therein [Sitnik 2011, 263]. Juvenile convict and adult convicts who choose whether or not to agree to participate in the development and implementation of the correctional treatment programme, after being presented its draft version (Article 95, para. 1 EPC), serve their sentences in the programmed treatment system [Szymanowska 2003, 184]. The consent of the convicted person is a declaration of commitment to cooperate in all activities aimed at social re-adaptation. The correctional offer of a correctional institution is contained in individual programmes of treatment developed for each convicted person [Bramska and Kiryluk 2002, 43; Szymanowska 2003, 333]. The correctional programmes define especially: the types of employment and teaching for the convicted persons, their contacts with their families and other relatives, how they spend their free time, their ability to fulfil their obligations, and other undertakings as required to prepare the convicted persons to return to the society (Article 95, para. 2 EPC) [Bramska and Kiryluk 2002, 35]. The EPC stipulates that the programmes are subject to periodic evaluation and that they may be amended (Article 95, para. 3 EPC). The individual treatment programme is prepared by the educator, established by the correctional commission and reviewed once every 6 months. The development of each programme is preceded by a diagnosis, which is an attempt to answer the question of what has led the individual to unlawful behaviour, what criminogenic factors have determined the individual to enter the path of crime. The aim of the diagnosis is also to identify the basic problems of the convicted person to work on, and his or her potential (assets, interests, qualifications), which may prove useful in developing pro-social



competences in the course of the programmed treatment. The diagnosis is made on the basis of collected documentation on the convict (psychological opinions, court records, community interviews) and on the basis of a conversation with the convict. The analysis concerns information directly concerning the convicted person and his or her personality (disorders, maladjustment, problems, specificity of interpersonal relations, the educational course, social and living issues) as well as the environment and the family of the convicted person, indicating the type of relations of the convicted person with his or her closest ones. Obtaining a holistic picture of the person's functioning and his or her problems provides the basis for setting the purposes of correctional treatment and the measures through which the purposes are to be achieved. The main goal is always the re-adaptation of the convicted person, but in order to achieve this, specific (indirect) goals are set, e.g. completing any missing school education, acquiring vocational qualifications, learning the mechanisms of proper functioning in interpersonal relations, establishing lost contacts with family and relatives, preventing addictions. Each convicted person who implements the individual treatment programme is given deadlines for completing particular tasks. Evaluation of their completion is a part of the periodic assessment of the convicted person's behaviour, which indicates his or her progress in re-socialisation. According to para. 49.1. of the Regulation, the convicted person is subjected to periodic assessments of their progress in re-socialisation not less frequently than every 6 months. The recommendations contained in the programme are confronted with the convicted person's progress, adapted to the changing situation, taking into account the efforts made by the convicted person to work on the deficits. The proposals to amend the programme are intended to overcome the remaining difficulties in changing the prisoner's attitudes and behaviour. The tasks included in the individual programme of treatment are subject to change along with the convicted person's achievements, motivation, and psychological and social condition. Due to the fact that, as a rule, commencement of an individual treatment programme must be preceded by the convicted person's consent, the lack of such consent in the course of programme implementation results in the convicted person's withdrawal from the programme. Such a decision on the unwillingness to continue work on the programme may be taken by the convicted

person himself or herself or by the correctional commission if the convicted person does not fulfil the tasks imposed on him or her, does not comply with the conditions of cooperation. In the other case, i.e. in the case of the correct implementation of the programme tasks, cooperation with the educator or psychologist, reliable fulfilment of the programme obligations, and real commitment of the convicted person resulting in taking up employment, learning, establishing close ties with the family, participating in preventive programmes, and securing post-penitentiary needs, the convicted person is properly prepared to return to the society and to function properly within it. The work of the educational staff aims to rebuild the personality of the convict person, and the convict person actively collaborates in the development and implementation of an individual program of influence [Bramska and Kiryluk 2002, 33, 36; Sitnik 2011, 262].

### **3. Tasks of the Prison Service in the scope of achieving the purposes of executing imprisonment penalties**

The tasks of the Prison Service are stipulated in the Act of 9 April 2010 on Prison Service.<sup>10</sup> With a view to achieving the purposes of executing imprisonment penalties, it should be pointed out that the basic tasks of the Prison Service include (Article 2, sect. 2 PS): conducting correctional and re-socialisation activities with respect to persons sentenced to imprisonment, above all by organising work conducive to acquiring professional qualifications, teaching, cultural and educational activities, physical culture and sport activities and specialist therapeutic treatment. Officers and employees of the department are the direct executors of treatment methods and measures adopted in the unit for the entrusted educational groups. The Prison Service is to ensure that persons sentenced to imprisonment or in pre-trial detention, as well as persons subjected to imprisonment penalties and coercive measures resulting in imprisonment, have their rights respected, in particular with reference to humanitarian living conditions, dignity, health and religious care. The Prison Service is obliged to treat imprisoned persons in a humanitarian manner, to protect the public from perpetrators of criminal or fiscal offences imprisoned

---

<sup>10</sup> Journal of Laws of 2020, item 848, as amended [hereinafter: PS].

in correctional institutions and pre-trial detention centres. In addition, the Prison Service ensures order and security in the correctional institutions and pre-trial detention centres. When dealing with the imprisoned persons, the Prison Service officers and employees are obliged, in particular, to be guided by the principles of the rule of law, impartiality and humanitarianism,<sup>11</sup> to respect their rights and dignity and positively influence them by their example (Article 27 PS). The Prison Service officers and employees have the duty to make their best efforts to ensure that the execution of the sentence contributes to the preparation of the convicted persons for life in the society and to help the convicted persons to solve their problems (actively support the convicted persons in solving conflict situations). The entirety of the activities undertaken necessitates interdisciplinary preparation for the tasks [Jędrzejak 2001, 783-95; Szałański 2008, 273-91]. The Prison Service, through their correctional treatment of imprisoned persons, influence the change of their behaviour and shape their attitudes in accordance with the binding social norms, thus fulfilling the goal set by the legislator in Article 67, para. 1 EPC. In fulfilling their tasks, the Prison Service cooperate with the state and local self-government bodies, associations, foundations, organisations and institutions whose purpose is cooperation in executing imprisonment penalties, as well as with churches, religious associations, universities and scientific institutions and trustworthy persons (Article 4 PS). Such a provision of the PS remains in connection with Article 38 EPC, which expresses the principle of public participation in executing sentences and assisting in the social re-adaptation of convicted persons. Entities authorised under Article 38, para. 1 EPC (associations, foundations, organisations and institutions, churches, religious associations) in the field of crime prevention and social re-adaptation of convicted persons undertake activities to increase the effectiveness of the operation of state bodies and to strengthen the lawful functioning of the bodies (Article 38, para. 1a EPC). The entities may, in agreement with the head of a correctional institution or detention centre, participate in conducting re-socialisation, social, cultural, educational, sporting and religious activities in the institutions and detention centres

---

<sup>11</sup> See Constitution of the Republic of Poland of 2 April 1997, Journal of Laws of 1997, No. 78, item 483 as amended, Article 41, section 4.

(Article 38, para. 2 EPC).<sup>12</sup> The experience of cooperation between the Prison Service and eligible entities is abundant in good practices of such cooperation. The output of the cooperation corresponds directly with the tasks of the Prison Service in terms of achieving the purposes of imprisonment, understood as enabling convicted persons to return to the society and function properly within it, as well as preventing their return to crime. The actions performed by the Prison Service aimed at individualised treatment of convicts [Lelental 1970, *passim*; Wierzbicki 1976, *passim*; Górny 1996, *passim*] especially in the scope of the implementation of the programmed treatment system are aimed at preventing secondary deviation (recidivism) in offenders. The actions taken by the Prison Service aim to raise the usually low self-esteem of the convicted person. In this respect, it is important that they do not have to compensate for their low self-esteem by participating in criminal groups and achieving success through criminal activities. The active consent of the convicted person and their cooperation in the resocialisation process are intended to bring the goal closer. The Prison Service, in order to properly carry out the tasks assigned to them, must care for the correct educational atmosphere, which is one of the conditions necessary for ensuring results in terms of the purposes of the re-socialisation institution. This is a particularly demanding task due to the totality of the prison institution and its asocial specificity [Machel 2004, 151].

In terms of achieving the purpose of executing imprisonment penalties understood as protecting the society against crime, the Prison Service plays an important role in activities undertaken to ensure public order and safety. It ensures the protection of the society against offenders incarcerated in correctional facilities, isolating them from the society and preparing them for proper functioning within it without coming into conflict with the law. In the latter aspect, they undertake measures to deter offenders from returning to the path of crime and carry out re-socialisation and re-adaptation activities.

---

<sup>12</sup> See Regulation of the Prime Minister of 28 December 2016 on cooperation between entities in the execution of penalties, penal measures, compensatory measures, security measures, preventive measures and forfeiture, and on social control over their execution, Journal of Laws item 2305.

## Summary

The analysis of contemporary correctional systems leads to the conclusion that their extremely important purpose is to prevent the recidivism of the persons to whom they are applied. This is also the case with the Polish correctional system. The goal can be achieved in various ways: by treating the convicted with great severity, by escalating various types of hardship towards them, and also in another way – by reducing the severity and hardship to the necessary minimum set by the very essence of the imprisonment penalty and subjecting them to corrective (correctional, resocialisation) treatment. Nowadays the second model is dominant. It was also adopted by the Polish legislator, emphasising the subjectivity of convicted persons, respecting the rights and freedoms of human beings to decide for themselves and recognising that the only effective treatment is that which they accept.

The resocialisation of a convicted person is the result of the entirety of the activities of the prison staff and the entirety of the convicted person's experience in the penitentiary institution. It is a multidimensional process conditioned by various factors, both on the part of the correctional staff, the convicted persons themselves and the institutional characteristics of the place where it takes place.

## REFERENCES

- Bogunia, Leszek, and Tomasz Kalisz. 2010. "W sprawie interpretacji art. 67 k.k.w. Rozważania o celach wykonywania kary pozbawienia wolności i kierunkach współczesnej polityki penitencjarnej." In *Nowa Kodyfikacja Prawa Karnego*, edited by Leszek Bogunia, 123-36. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Bramska, Mieczysława, and Małgorzata Kiryłuk. 2002. "Realizacja systemu programowanego oddziaływania w toku wykonywania kary pozbawienia wolności." *Przegląd Więziennictwa Polskiego* no. 37:33-49.
- Górny, Jerzy. 1996. *Elementy indywidualizacji i humanizacji karnia w rozwoju penitencjarystyki*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły im. Marii Grzegorzewskiej.
- Jędrzejak, Krzysztof. 2001. "Czynniki determinujące interdyscyplinarny charakter przygotowania funkcjonariuszy Służby Więziennej." In *Więziennictwo nowe wyzwania*, edited by Brunon Hołyst, Wiesław Ambrozik, and Piotr Stępnik,

- 783-95. Warszawa–Poznań–Kalisz: Centralny Zarząd Służby Więziennej, Polskie Towarzystwo Penitencjarne, Centralny Ośrodek Szkolenia Służby Więziennej.
- Krajewski, Krzysztof. 1994. *Teorie kryminologiczne a prawo karne*. Warszawa: Dom Wydawniczy ABC.
- Kuć, Małgorzata, and Małgorzata Gałązka. 2013. *Prawo karne wykonawcze*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo C.H. Beck.
- Lelental, Stefan. 1970. *Indywidualizacja wykonywania kary pozbawienia wolności*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Lelental, Stefan. 2001. *Kodeks karny wykonawczy. Komentarz*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo C.H. Beck.
- Linowski, Krzysztof, and Izydor Wysocki. 2006. *Oddziaływania psychokorekcyjne na skazanych agresywnych w warunkach penitencjarnych*. Ostrowiec Świętokrzyski: Stowarzyszenie na Rzecz Rozwoju Wyższej Szkoły Biznesu i Przedsiębiorczości w Ostrowcu Świętokrzyskim.
- Machel, Henryk. 2004. "Personel więzienny – gwarancje skutecznego wypełniania roli." In *Więzienie mokotowskie. Historia i terażniejszość*, edited by Maria Gordon, 130-44. Warszawa: Drukarnia nr 1.
- Machel, Henryk. 2008. "Czy więzienie może wychowywać – spór o poprawczą funkcję więzienia." In *Misja Służby Więziennej a jej zadania wobec aktualnej polityki karnej i oczekiwań społecznych. IV Polski Kongres Penitencjarny*, edited by Wiesław Ambrozik, Henryk Machel, and Piotr Stępiak, 149-57. Poznań–Gdańsk–Warszawa–Kalisz: Centralny Ośrodek Szkolenia Służby Więziennej.
- Rostkowski, Wiesław. 2001. "Zasady optymalnego oddziaływania wychowawczego w zakładzie karnym." In *Więziennictwo nowe wyzwania*, edited by Brunon Hołyst, Wiesław Ambrozik, and Piotr Stępiak, 329-41. Warszawa–Poznań–Kalisz: Centralny Ośrodek Szkolenia Służby Więziennej.
- Sitnik, Katarzyna. 2011. "Indywidualny program wykonywania kary pozbawienia wolności jako podstawa systemu programowanego oddziaływania." In *Nowa Kodyfikacja Prawa Karnego*, edited by Leszek Bogunia, 261-71. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Szałański, Jan. 2008. "Wybrane wymiary osobowości personelu a ty zakładu karnego i rodzaj kontaktów z osadzonymi." In *Misja Służby Więziennej a jej zadania wobec aktualnej polityki karnej i oczekiwań społecznych. IV Polski Kongres Penitencjarny*, edited by Wiesław Ambrozik, Henryk Machel, and Piotr Stępiak, 273-91. Poznań–Gdańsk–Warszawa–Kalisz: Centralny Ośrodek Szkolenia Służby Więziennej.

- Szczepaniak, Paweł. 2008. "Oddziaływania penitencjarne na więźniów w świetle współczesnej pedagogiki i penitencjarystyki." In *W dziewięćdziesięciolecie polskiego więziennictwa. Księga jubileuszowa*, edited by Zenon Jasiński, Andrzej Kurek, and Dariusz Widelak, 151-88. Opole: Instytut Nauk Pedagogicznych UO, NSZZ Funkcjonariuszy i Pracowników Więziennictwa – Zarząd Główny w Warszawie.
- Szczygieł, Grażyna. 2017. "Cele wykonywania kary pozbawienia wolności – kilka refleksji." In *Nowa Kodyfikacja Prawa Karnego*, edited by Leszek Bogunia, 523-32. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Szymanowska, Aleksandra. 2003. *Więzienie i co dalej?* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademickie „Żak”.
- "Uzasadnienie rządowego projektu kodeksu karnego wykonawczego." 1997. In *Nowe kodeksy karne – 1997 z uzasadnieniami*, edited by Irena Fredrich-Michalska, and Barbara Stachurska-Marcińczak, 525-71. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Prawnicze.
- Wierzbicki, Piotr. 1976. *Indywidualizacja penitencjarna w Polsce*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Prawnicze.

### **The Purposes of Executing the Penalty of Imprisonment Pursuant to the Executive Penal Code**

#### Abstract

This article discusses the purposes of executing the penalty of imprisonment pursuant to the Executive Penal Code of 1997. The Polish legislator considers special prevention to be the basic purpose of executing the penalty of imprisonment. Moreover, the Polish legislator has stated that the purpose is also to protect society against criminal acts. The purposes of executing the penalty of imprisonment, specified in Article 67, para. 1 of the Executive Penal Code, are supposed to be achieved using the means of influencing convicts, which include work, teaching, cultural and sports activities, contacts with family members and the outside world, therapeutic measures and disciplinary penalties and awards. This article presents the significance of the penalty of imprisonment in the programmed rehabilitation system with regard to the achievement of the purposes of executing the penalty of imprisonment. A section of the article discusses the tasks of the Prison Service in this regard.

**Keywords:** penalty of imprisonment, correctional treatment, correctional measures, resocialisation, social reintegration of convicts

**Cele wykonywania kary pozbawienia wolności na gruncie  
*Kodeksu karnego wykonawczego***

Abstrakt

Artykuł omawia problematykę celów wykonywania kary pozbawienia wolności na gruncie *Kodeksu karnego wykonawczego* z 1997 r. Ustawodawca uznał za podstawowy cel wykonywania kary pozbawienia wolności prewencję szczególną. Ponadto wskazał, że celem tym ma być także ochrona społeczeństwa przed przestępczością. Realizacja celów wykonywania kary pozbawienia wolności wskazanych w art. 67 § 1 *Kodeksu karnego wykonawczego* ma się odbywać poprzez stosowanie środków oddziaływania na skazanych, do których zalicza się pracę, nauczanie, zajęcia kulturalno-światowe i sportowe, kontakty z rodziną i światem zewnętrznym, środki terapeutyczne, nagradzanie i karanie dyscyplinarne. Artykuł przedstawia znaczenie wykonywania kary pozbawienia wolności w systemie programowanego oddziaływania w kontekście realizacji celów wykonywania kary pozbawienia wolności. Oddzielne miejsce w artykule zajmuje omówienie zadań Służby Więziennej w tym zakresie.

**Słowa kluczowe:** kara pozbawienia wolności, oddziaływanie penitencjarne, środki penitencjarne, resocjalizacja, readaptacja społeczna skazanych

**Informacje o Autorze:** DR MAŁGORZATA KUĆ, Katedra Prawa Karnego, Wydział Prawa, Prawa Kanonicznego i Administracji, Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski Jana Pawła II; adres do korespondencji: Al. Raławickie 14, 20-950 Lublin, Polska; e-mail: edyta03@poczta.onet.pl; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8224-4935>