Thank you for sharing your thoughtful insights, Harley. You've hit on a critical distinction between **static and dynamic security**, correctly pointing out that while static methods provide an immediate level of safety, they don't address the underlying issues. I agree wholeheartedly that the CBS video is a perfect example of this. The reliance on punitive measures and lockdowns only created more tension and hostility, proving that a purely control-based approach is counterproductive. Your point that a successful violence reduction strategy must integrate **rehabilitation** is spot on. When staff build trust and focus on personal growth, they're not just reducing violence but are actively creating a safer, more humane environment. This balance of dynamic security with rehabilitative goals is what truly prepares young people for a better future, both inside the facility and upon their release. .

Angel, your post is very insightful, especially given your professional experience. Your firsthand account as a correctional lieutenant adds a powerful layer to your points about **dynamic security**. I completely agree that training in **trauma-informed care and crisis intervention** is essential; these are the skills that empower officers to de-escalate without resorting to force, which in turn builds the trust you mentioned. Your emphasis on **structured programming and risk assessment** also highlights key proactive strategies that go beyond mere observation. As you noted, keeping youth engaged and properly classified prevents the very situations that lead to violence. The idea that a safer environment is a prerequisite for effective rehabilitation is a perfect summary of why these two concepts are not mutually exclusive—they are, in fact, mutually reinforcing. Thank you for sharing your expertise.