

384

CRIMINALS: Slaves of the Twentieth Century

CRIMINALS: SLAVES OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

By

RONNIE ALEXANDER MALOTT B.A. B.S.W.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies  
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree  
Master of Arts

McMaster University

September 1979

MASTER OF ARTS (1979)  
(Sociology)

McMaster University  
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: CRIMINALS: Slaves of the Twentieth Century

AUTHOR: Ronnie Alexander Malott, B.A., B.S.W.  
(McMaster University)

SUPERVISOR: Dr. Marylee Stephenson

NUMBER OF PAGES: ix, 219

## Abstract

In developing this thesis I became quite discouraged because of the fact that the similarities between the "total institution" and the "closed system" seemed to be generated largely by the functional/operational aspects of these systems. For the longest time I related these similarities to the power of administrators over the lives of their captors, and the apparent lack of personal self control granted to inmates/residents. Having been personally involved with both of these systems for quite sometime, I began to realize that both systems were very contradictory to "normal" human nature, and thus, in some sense damaging many of the positive images generated by life within "free society." I asked myself, if prisons are supposed to "correct" individuals, and Community-Based Residential Centres (C.R.C.'s) are supposed to be more humane and of greater assistance to "rehabilitate" criminal tendencies, why then, has there been little, if any change, in the alarming recidivism of inmates?

Rehabilitation presupposes that damage has been endured by an individual, whether it be of a physical or emotional nature. After having undergone personal damage of some form, the individual must be socialized into accepting this new status, and trained to respond positively to the expectations and norms allotted to this status. It became unclear to me during this study just what was being "corrected" within

the prison realm, that required that the inmates be more humanly "rehabilitated" by C.R.C.'s. It soon became clearer that the problem was strongly rooted within the realm of the compulsive "socialization" process in both systems. Socialization per se, in the "normal" sense, was designed to teach people in a particular society the norms, values, roles, etc. of that society. If the society is free the process itself will be based upon the freedom of that Society.

Using the theory of "closed" and "total" systems, I have explored the socialization of inmates incorporating Stanley M. Elkins theory of the closed system of slavery in America, coupled with the extreme "closedness" of P.O.W.'s in concentration camps experienced by Bruno Bettelheim. These of course, are extreme examples of "closed" and "total" systems but, I believe, quite appropriate accounts, which help to illustrate my point adequately. In the more immediate context, by looking at such writers as Erving Goffman, Gresham M. Sykes, and other recent writers of penal reform in North America, the reality of the socialization process to which inmates are exposed tends not to differentiate radically from the accounts recorded by Elkins and Bettelheim. These, in fact are "abnormal" forms of the socialization process. Whether this abnormal process is explicit and unquestionable as those experienced in slavery and concentration camps, or implicit as in prisons or community-based resource centres, the effect, though varying in degree, is the same - negative socialization.

Thus, if positive images are transmitted in the "normal" socialization process, it can be expected that negative images and low self-esteem will be fostered because of exposure to this abnormal process. In the case of prisoners who possibly come into these systems as the result of low self-esteem, etc. the total/closed system serves to reinforce and/or create a further or complete disintegration of the personality of the prisoners. Henceforth, a prisoner who is incarcerated with an already low self-esteem becomes even less equipped, once released, to cope within a "free" society. My data will show why socialization within a closed/total system produces negative images which are not conducive to survival in, or acceptance by the "outside" society.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to extend my personal thanks to Dr. Marylee Stephenson for her many hours of concern and direction, especially at one point when I experienced a sense of negative self worth because of my exposure to certain negative aspects of the graduate program. I would also like to extend a personal thank you to Dr. Barry Edginton who, having me thrust upon him, agreed and did help me to complete this project. I would also like to extend a big thank you to Dr. Sam Lanfranco and Dr. Harry Penny who not only helped me with this project but, gave me encouragement and guidance throughout the entire five years I have been at McMaster. I have had two very helpful and unofficial advisors, Dr. Francis Grell and Mr. Barry Thompson who have had the chore of having to be my friends, and unfolding the shocking reality of the expectations of graduate work at McMaster. The many, many endless rap sessions with them were instrumental in the completion of this thesis.

Next I would like to thank Ms. Linda Cullum for the many sleepless and tolerable hours she gave in editing and typing of this thesis. Also when the dead-

line approached, emergency typing was needed. I am indebted to Ms. Sandra Donovan, Ms. Linda Burgess, Ms. Sharon Moral and Ms. Linda G. for their needed assistance, I would like to extend a special thanks to my respondents, those persons who spent many hours putting in a clearer perspective the reality of their lives, and reminding me of mind. With the completion of this thesis I don't wish them good luck, instead I wish for my thesis to give them hope that the social scientist of today recognizes their plight and that in some way, something may be done.

Lastly and certainly not in order of importance, I would like to thank Society Sal, for without her encouragements, pride and love, I would never have come to McMaster, never mind undertaking this study. Once again my friends, much thanks.

Ronny A. Malott

P.S. Special thanks to Barbara Jane for any and all of her contributions during this study.



CONTENTS

ABSTRACT . . . . .	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	vi
GENERAL INTEREST FOR THIS AREA OF STUDY: INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
CHAPTER 1 Provincial Prison System . . . . .	20
1a General Physical Description of the Prison . . . . .	27
CHAPTER 2 Community-Based Residential Centres (CRC's) . . . . .	31
2a Physical Character of CRC . . . . .	37
CHAPTER 3 Methodology . . . . .	49
CHAPTER 4 Data Findings . . . . .	75
CHAPTER 5 Troublesome Aspects of Prison (physical) . . . . .	83
5a Troublesome Nature of Prisons RE: Functional/Operational Aspect. . . . .	93
5b Reaction of Inmates to Fuck-ups. . . . .	110
CHAPTER 6 Troublesome Physical Character of CRC . . . . .	120
6a Problem Related Issues/Responses of Residents of CRC's Living Area: Functional Aspects. . . . .	127
6b Reaction of Residents. . . . .	135
CHAPTER 7 Work and Related Issues. . . . .	147
CONCLUSION . . . . .	175
GLOSSARY . . . . .	182
APPENDIX ONE . . . . .	186

APPENDIX TWO . . . . . 195  
APPENDIX THREE . . . . . 207  
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . 217

### General Interest for This Area of Study

I became interested in the study of prisons and criminals for two main reasons. Firstly, I am a sociologist, one who is supposed to study, and hopefully research, issues which may be problematic to the society in which we live. As a sociologist, it is hoped that I should explore virgin, neglected areas in my field. Of course, the areas of penology and penal reform per se are not virgin areas of sociological investigation, but I do believe that a true version of the effects and consequences to inmates subjected to various penal measures is long overdue. What emotional and psychological effects take place in the minds of persons subjected to "due process," "just punishment," and various other attempts to "rehabilitate" their way of life? I think it's time we asked "them" in their own territory, those persons who most sociologists see as respondents, subjects or a mystic segment of our society. "What happens to you when you are in captivity of one form or another, and what, or how have we helped or hindered you with our massive costs and efforts at "rehabilitation" and our alleged knowledge of the social animal?"

Secondly, and not necessarily in order of importance, I am one of "them" who has been subjected to "due process," "just punishment" and various attempts at "rehabilitation."

2

I have personal views based on my experiences, which I hope will illustrate this sociological exploration of the issues and problems affecting large numbers of persons living in like settings. After this personal experience, I began to ask myself, "If penal reform "rehabilitates" criminals, then why are many of the people I was in prison with either, (1) unemployed, (2) strung out on dope, (3) alcoholics, (4) back in prison, or (5) dead?"

If only a few were unemployed, if only a few were strung out on dope, apathetic alcoholics, back in prison or dead, then this could be viewed as the result of personal "troubles," as illustrated by C. Wright Mills, whereby the individual(s) could be held responsible for their apparent plight (C.W. Mills). However, the problems, frustrations and hang-ups are felt and endured daily by many ex-inmates from various forms of "total institutions" (E. Goffman, 1961:4-5) and closed systems (S. Elkins, 1959:82). Thus, I began to suspect that this depressing circumstance reflects a failure within the structural and functional aspects of the penal and reform systems. I believe disclosing institutional failure to be a "sociological issue" and that the system must accept the responsibility for this failure. I therefore, believe this to be an area for exploration which, more than most, warrants extensive sociological investigation.

The fact that prisons are oppressive and destructive to the inmates is a fairly well-accepted sociological position

by now. As one response to the limits of the rehabilitative capacities of prisons, Community-based Residential Centres (CRC's) or halfway houses, designed to ease the convicts' transition into non-prison life, have been developed over the last decade or so. My personal experience has made me familiar with their character, and in the process, I have begun to wonder how they actually function in relation to their explicit goal of providing a freer, genuinely rehabilitative setting for the ex-convict. Because of my exposure to both systems (prisons and CRC), I have set out to research systematically, the character and function of the CRC with special concern and attention directed towards the effects upon the residents and ex-residents themselves.

In order to study the nature and effectiveness of the CRC, it is necessary to first understand to some degree the penal system which has occupied a significant portion of the prior life experience of the CRC resident. We proceed largely in terms of two comparisons - the prison vs the CRC and the CRC vs the totally "outside" life. By looking at the CRCs from this viewpoint, we may be able to evaluate the character of the CRC as an institution of Social Control.

The prison setting fits well into what Erving Goffman describes as one of the various forms of a total institution (E. Goffman, 1961:4-5). Goffman places prisons and

penitentiaries in his third type category, which he claims was "organized to protect the community against what are felt to be intentional dangers to it, with the welfare of the persons thus sequestered not the immediate issue...", (pgs. 4-5). From Goffman's interpretation, the "welfare" of the inmates is not a primary social concern. However, if society is to be truly protected, not only from "immediate intentional dangers," but future potential dangers, then I believe the "welfare" of the inmates should be of equal concern and should be dealt with in ways appropriate to promoting long-range changes in the attitudes of society, and true rehabilitation for the inmates themselves.

The inmate who has undergone a period of time within a total institution, usually finds this experience to be very negative (G. Sykes, 1958:65). The dangers that an ill-equipped, angry, socially-viewed inferior, and desperate individual may pose to society once released from the institution, often far surpass the initial immediate threat posed by the inmate. To illustrate this point, one needs only to look at juvenile and first offenders in correctional situations and observe the desperate state many juveniles encounter after a period of incarceration and association with a criminal realm (C. Brown).

It is because of these potential threats that prisons have slowly altered their more punitive nature and allegedly

altered their goals to be more "corrective." Hence the creation of a term like "correctional institution" often replaces the term "prison." Jessica Milford in describing the Federal penal system in the United States contends, "Effective July 8th, 1970...there were no more prisons; in their places instead, stood six maximum security correctional facilities..." (J. Milford, 1973:8) The word "corrective" implies that some positive, constructive measures will be employed. The negative, punitive nature of prisons, is undergoing changes, in order to better prepare the individual for his/her return to society.

I contend along with Jessica Milford that nothing of the experience within the walls of the "total institutional" setting had changed except the names of various structures and the persons involved (J. Milford, 1973: 8). To change the nature of a correctional institution, one must eliminate the isolated, harshly repressive nature of the institution itself, and the societal factors that lead to widespread crime, inhumane punishment and inadequate rehabilitation. The mental deterioration of people forced into a total institution can be far more damaging than former barbaric treatment of prisoners (M. Foucault, 1975: 133-62). Gresham M. Sykes gives some light to this contention:

Such attacks on the psychological level are less easily seen than the sadistic beatings, a pair of shackles in the floor, or the caged man on a treadmill, but the destruction of the psyche is no less fearful than bodily affliction. Whatever may be the pains of imprisonment, than in the custodial institution of today, we must explore the way in which the inmate's personality or sense of personal worth. (G. Sykes, 1958:64).

This study concentrates on examining whether one aspect of this formula-rehabilitation-can or does occur in one particular institution, the CRC, which is the aftermath of the prison experience. It is clear from the literature that a total institution has a number of negative effects upon the prisoners, and that in most cases it will not, or cannot, correct the criminal attitudes or negative self-esteem held by the inmates prior to their incarceration. Neither does it provide them with practical means of living differently if and when they get "outside" (R.J. Erickson, 1973: 23-5). The negative experience encountered while within the prison, often stifles or further limits the inmates' competence in the everyday skills required as coping mechanisms in the "outside" world. In conjunction with the negative attitude of the public and the negative effects of the prison experience, the aftermath experience of life within the CRC, is often of little help in the situation, because of the structure of the CRC and the attitudes and practices prevalent in its maintenance.

Gresham M. Sykes in his book, Society of Captives, argues it is the "pains of imprisonment" (G. Sykes, 1958:63-84), which are most responsible for the perpetration of the inmate's already low self-image. The "pains of imprisonment" within



the walls of a total institutional setting, are created by both the structural and functional aspects of the prison. There is a fair amount of agreement with Sykes that the "pains of imprisonment" and those very same deprivations and frustrations which pose a threat to the inmate's personality, in fact, damage and change it. This damage or change, initiated by the entire prison experience, creates what I will henceforth refer to as the decultured person. By decultured, I mean that the inmate becomes detached from the norms and values of the responsible adult status which had been granted to him before he entered prison. Stanley M. Elkins, referring to the experience of slavery claims that deculturation is accomplished because:

It was achieved partly by the shock experience inherent in the very mode of procurement but more specifically by the type of authority-system to which they were introduced and to which they had to adjust for physical and psychic survival. The new adjustment, to absolute power in a closed system, involved infantilization, and detachment was so complete that little trace of prior (and thus alternative) cultural sanctions for behavior and personality remained for the descendants of the first generation... (S. Elkins, 1959:88).

To deculture an adult is to create a person who is even less equipped than before imprisonment to face the world as a fully competent person per se (much less with the stigma of "ex-con"). Of course, Elkins' description of deculturalization is in the extreme sense of detachment,

but in dealing in the prison context, Sykes supports Elkins' contention, which he suggests is attained because of the inmate's inability to make choices:

The more important point, however, is that frustration of the prisoner's ability to make choices and the frequent refusals to provide an explanation for the regulations and commands descending from the bureaucratic staff involve a profound threat to the prisoner's self image because they reduce the prisoner to the weak, helpless, dependent status of childhood (G. Sykes, 1958: 75).

Given this destructive effect of the prison experience, I want to see how or if the CRC alters the negative self-concept and living skills of its residents once they are released from a total institution. The CRC is obviously not exactly like a prison setting in terms of being a classic total institution. Many of the physical barriers have been removed, e.g. walls, barbed wire, bars and the functional aspects, such as overt exercise of physical control. That there may be other features of the CRC that function similarly to the physical means of isolation and control is a question for study here. Because of these structural and functional alterations, I feel that the term total institution is no longer an appropriate term to describe this new institution, the CRC.

I will be using the term "closed system" as used by Elkins (S. Elkins, 1959: 81-133), whenever I am referring to the Community-based Residential Centres (CRCs), more commonly referred to as halfway houses. The recent development of CRCs

explains some of the variation in their titles and roles. Geographic locations, publications and the particular task of the authors, I believe, somewhat explain the different titles, in a report by the Task Force, Report of the Task Force on Community-Based Residential Centres, prepared for the Solicitor General of Canada, which describes the purpose of CRCs as follows:

The phrase "Community-based Residential Centre" describes a wide variety of residential services for many kinds of persons in need; these include the physically and mentally handicapped, the elderly and disturbed or delinquent children, as well as offenders. They stand between some form of complete institutionalization and complete integration into the community, providing a service to those moving from a dependent status such as "patient or inmate" to a less dependent one such as "dischargee or parolee." Equally, they may be provided as alternatives to a more comprehensive level of institutionalization as in probation camps or hostels or group homes, i.e., for persons moving from an independent status to a dependent one. They tend by and large, to be founded by sources other than the residents. They differ from boarding houses and hostels in that those responsible for their administration perceive of themselves as offering something in addition to room and/or board. This extra programme may range all the way from assistance in obtaining employment to intensive group counselling or a complete alternative lifestyle. (Solicitor General, 1973: X).\*

To illustrate the functional aspects of a "closed system," I will be looking at the operations of the institutions of slavery as offered by Stanley M. Elkins in his book, "Slavery, a Problem in American Institutional and Intellectual Life."

\* In some areas, the name varies slightly but the important issue is that they are community orientated, e.g., found within the community, unlike prisons in remote isolated areas. American studies term their CRCs as Community Treatment Centres (CTC) or Residential Communities (.R.) as described by Andrew T. Scull in his book, Decarceration. To avoid confusion, I will refer to them as Community-based Residential Centres (C.R.C.s)

In this book, Elkins looks at the effects of a "closed system" upon slaves (Elkins, 1959: 98-103). He achieves this by following the slaves through their capture, transportation and initial introduction to North American society, or to use Elkins' words, "the cultural shock one experiences upon entering a "closed system" (S. Elkins, 1959: 98).

I then intend to look at life within a "closed system" as discussed by Bruno Bettelheim (B. Bettelheim, 1947) and Gresham M. Sykes (G. Sykes, 1959). Both authors examine the closeness of both within two extreme settings, the concentration camp and the maximum security prison.

Sykes and Bettelheim both refer to the "closedness" of their respective institutions of study, even though these institutions exhibit overwhelmingly the physical characteristics common to many total institutions (E. Goffman, 1961: 4). Hopefully, by looking at Goffman's theory of "total institutions" and exploring the "closedness" from the works of Sykes and Bettelheim, I will be able to show the character which exists within a "total institution" and these factors, coupled with the functional aspects, creates which is characteristically a closed system and the CRC. I will then employ Elkins' theory of the possible effects upon persons forced to live within a closed system, to see if the CRCs, because of their functional aspects, are in fact, closed systems, and to see whether or not they are distinct from the total institution. The CRC may well extend many of

the negative aspects of the prison experience, rather than provide a truly rehabilitative experience.

I will show that the generation of a negative self-image, and the deterioration of practical life skills (such as job training, social interaction, etc.), which help to create and maintain a dependency that ill-equips many ex-inmates in functioning as responsible adults both during and after incarceration, are to a large extent present in the CRC. The negative aspects of both prisons and CRCs are important and are in part generated by the functional aspects of these systems.

The main aspect of these systems which most impedes the creation or reformation of a responsible adult attitude within the inmates is that of institutional authority, which is required to assure that the policies governing control and the corrective efforts to change the inmates/residents are maintained. Therefore, my study will focus on the concept of trouble, as defined below, within the confines of both systems, and after the men/women are "freed" to the community. I will see how the residents in the CRC react to the imposition of authority and the subsequent consequences (trouble).

I will not be dealing with the concept of trouble in a personal sense, but as a set of common problems which are experienced by many inmates. When many persons experience similar problems, they become a sociological issue, which, I contend, warrants sociological inquiry. The development of

the distinction of "troubles" and "issues" was made by C. Wright Mills and is as follows:

Troubles occur within the character of the individual and within a range of his immediate relations with others; they have to do with his self and with those limited areas of social life of which he is directly and personally aware. Accordingly, the statement and the resolution of troubles properly lie within the scope of his immediate milieu—the social setting that is directly open to his personal experience and to some extent, his willful activity. A trouble is a private matter and values cherished by an individual are felt by him to be threatened. (C.W. Mills, 1959:8).

In the case of CRCs, most residents do have problems which they view as more or less personal and individual. The problems are direct confrontation with administrators, with family, race, friends, and many of their own inner feelings of self. Each prisoner has a unique perspective, unique to him in some ways, and consequently, no two respond exactly the same in all ways to life within an institutional setting.

Of course, since these are personal problems, we may up to a point, look to the individual for the cause and resolution of these problems. However, if these personal problems are shared by many inmates in various settings they are then best viewed sociologically as an "issue" in Mill's terms. They become an issue because it would appear that some system or social structure has, in fact, via its functional aspects, created these problems, not only for the individual, but for a significant segment of others in like situations. Mills further contends that issues are not of a personal nature in their origin, but rather, originate due to organization into institutions of

a historical society. He therefore states:

Issues have to do with matters that transcend these local environments of the individual and the range of his inner life. They have to do with the organization of many such milieux into the institutions of an historical society as a whole, with the ways in which various milieux overlap and interpenetrate to form the larger structure of social and historical life. An issue is a public matter: some value cherished by publics is felt to be threatened. Often there is a debate about what that value really is and about what it is that really threatens it. This debate is often without focus if only because it is the very nature of an issue, unlike even widespread trouble that it cannot very well be defined in terms of the immediate and everyday environment of ordinary men. An issue, in fact, often involves a crisis in institutional arrangements, often too involves what Marxists call "contradictions or antagonisms..." (C.W. Mills, 1959: 8-9).

Many "issues" within total institutions (prisons) and "closed systems" (CRC) are created because life within either of these systems is indeed contradictory. Firstly, it is contradictory to human nature to lock people in cages as if they were animals, (literally or analogously), and secondly, life within these systems is at odds with any formerly learned values and sanctions, granted to those living within a "free" society at large. To place humans in cages can easily lead one to believe that those within the cages are animals, bred in a jungle in the literal sense, where indeed survival differs extremely from "traditional" civil societies. Therefore, people who must live in a psychic jungle must physically and mentally formulate personalities and values which will assure their personal survival. Prisoners, upon entering a total institution, become as vulnerable to life and expectations within the institution as

a tamed lion in a zoo, which becomes dependent upon the keeper and forgets how to fend for himself. In prison, a new society is formed: "the society of captives" (G. Sykes, 1958: 65). The inmate must learn new norms and values, many of which are contradictory to those taught in a conventional free society. Attempts by the administration to break the spirit or change deeply-imbedded norms become antagonistic to many inmates. Antagonism is created by efforts to control and change mass behaviors of a large block of persons. The attempts to change these mass behaviors are "issues" affecting a large sector of the institution's population, and should not be viewed as personal troubles.

It can be argued that prisoners have no former values or commitments to the "free" society at large, and therefore, life within an institution is not contradictory to their nature. However, I might point out that many inmates are in prisons for disobeying specific laws of society, not all laws of that society. Initially, a large proportion of inmates retain many of their formerly held values of the "free" society, but as captivity further impinges upon them, these values, sanctions and modes of moral conduct must disappear if they are to survive. Being thrust into the conditions of imprisonment imbitters most inmates towards the ways of society, because of the sanctions previously granted to them and the subsequent loss of security. Sykes



offers a possible explanation for this desire to detach oneself from the ways of the "free" society, once confined:

"But what makes this pain of imprisonment bite most deeply is the fact that the confinement of the criminal represents a deliberate, moral rejection of the criminal from the free community"...  
(G. Sykes, 1958: 65).

Therefore, what we have is a large population of individuals with various backgrounds, and different levels of comprehension and understanding, encountering difficulties conforming to the new regime of absolute power (S. Elkins, 1959: 101-3). These difficulties are issues affecting a large number of individuals. These issues are perpetrated because of, (1) "the culture shock" (S. Elkins, 1959: 99-101) and the indifference of the routine expectations and functional aspects of a "total institution," and (2) the extreme measures of social control employed to change (correct) criminal attitudes. The inmates of a total institution must detach themselves as much as possible from the outside world; they must learn and develop attitudes of a desired mode of conduct conducive for survival within this setting. The "issues" arise when the inmates reject or cannot accept these efforts of personality change (G. Sykes, 1958: 64). On the one hand, the individual is forced to adjust his/her personality to an institutional environment that is neither pleasant, nor like the social environment from which the inmates has just come. This is a difficult adjustment and makes little

sense in terms of the inmate's own values. With difficulty (trouble), adjustment takes place at the cost of self-dignity. On the other hand, what is learned while surviving in the institution, is a pattern of personality and behavior which is not suitable to the outside world. Thus the inmate who "adjusts" best to the institutional setting may be least adjusted to the outside world. Trouble, then, is the clashing of behaviour and expectations learned while in the "freer" community, with behavior and expectations of life within the "closed" or total systems. Trouble is largely viewed as an infraction of the house rules, or regulations governing the continued operations of the house (interview, the Man: Almost House). Inmates who feel antagonized by various meaningless, inappropriate rules will invariably break rules which are contradictory to their nature, rules which are, in fact, contradictory to anyone's human nature (G. Sykes, 1958: 99). If the inmate/resident learns how to live well within the confines of one of these systems, he could well become too dependent on authority to function well in an outside environment, and hence, quite likely to be in trouble on the outside.

Disobedience, disrespect, being uncooperative and/or antisocial are various troublesome situations for many inmates. In most cases the punishment meted out by administration is not purely physical in nature. Immediate

pain hurts only for a while, but threats, isolation and further deprivation of liberty and association can, and in most cases does, have a lasting effect. Hans von Hentig offers the following comment:

The effect of selection which penal law obtains by intimidation are not essentially more efficacious. As a psychological attempt to exercise compulsion, intimidation works in two directions. As association between the action can only be established in the mid and emotional life of the punished person as the result of simple infliction of pain... (Hentig, 1963: 135).

The ideal of punishment in a prison/mental hospital is not only to obtain immediate obedience. Long range obedience is desired and to attain this, punishment must be severe enough to attack the personality and the emotions of the inmates. Regarding punishment of mental patients, Hentig offers the following explanations of the desired effects it may obtain:

By means of strong and painful impressions, we extort the attention of the patient, accustom him to unconditional obedience and indisolubly impress in his heart the feeling of necessity. The will of his master must be for him a law so firm and unalterable that it as little occurs to him to disobey it as to fight against the elements...(S. Elkins, 1959: 140).

Consequently, what we have is a large population of individuals with various backgrounds and from different walks of life, who encounter difficulties conforming to the new regime of absolute power (S. Elkins, 1959: 103-15). The difficulties which they encounter are, in fact, issues that affect not only the individual but the prison population

as a whole. These issues are created by (1) "the cultural shock" (S. Elkins, 1959: 99-101), and indifference of personal routine, expectations and functional aspects of the "total institution," and (2) the extreme measures of social control which are employed to change (correct) criminal attitudes. Therefore, inmates, once admitted to a total institution, must detach themselves as much as possible from the outside world; they must learn and develop attitudes of moral conduct conducive to the prison setting. As aforementioned, issues arise when inmates reject or cannot accept these forced efforts of personality change. Trouble is viewed as an infraction of the rules and regulations used to attain this "correctiveness."

Inmates who are viewed as troublesome to the functioning and desired goals of the total institution are subject to disciplinary action. The situation suggest that punishment will be employed within the person rather than upon the person. This is the issue - personality and emotional damage intentionally inflicted on the self-worth of a person. This accentuates the already low self-esteem of the inmate, which adds practical problems, diminishes practical skills, and reduces the equality of opportunity because of the creation of a stigma (ex-convict).

With this brutalizing and crippling behind them, temporarily at least, the question then arises as to what happens

to those people when they are placed in a CRC. The CRC is a situation supposedly without the deleterious features of a total institution. What are the issues that arise, what are the troubles, and how are they perceived and treated by both the residents and the staff? I believe the character of the prison "total institution" has been adequately outlined, but I believe a closer look at the Canadian prison per se, is in order.

#### Prisons (The Total Institution)

In Canada today, we have two forms of prisons which inmates may encounter. Firstly, there are Provincial jails and reformatories under the administration and direction of the Provincial Government (R.T. Potter, 1974: 5). Secondly, there is the Federal Penitentiary System, under the administration and direction of the Federal Government.

## Provincial Prison System

Provincial institutions are operated by the province and the Government controlling that province and are used to house inmates who are serving from one day to two years less a day. These institutions are often termed "reformatories," regional detention centres or "city goals" (jails) (R.T. Potter, 1976). They are usually found within the city or on the immediate outskirts of it. The physical structure of the institutions is usually early 1900 style, resembling an ancient fortress.\* The city jails usually have stone walls (older ones) or frost wire fences, approximately 25-30 ft. high. Many city jails are viewed as maximum security institutions and operate with security and confinement taking top priority. Inmates are placed in city jails once arrested, to await hearings, trials, presentence reports, in lieu of fine defaultment and other short sentences, ie. for drunkenness. Inmates do not usually remain in most city jails for more than thirty days. City jails, in fact, act as holding stations until the courts and administrators decide when, where and what will be done with the accused. Non-dangerous offenders also serve short sentences resulting from fines being levied, or dry-out periods for apathetic alcoholics. In these settings, there are no "rehabilitative" programs or skilled workshop

\* Of course, many of these out-dated institutions have recently undergone structural changes. City jails are being replaced by new regional detention centres such as Maplehurst in Milton, Ont., or Barton Street Jail in Hamilton, Ontario.

training. This is justified by the contention that most inmates are transient and would not be there long enough to engage in, or complete a programme if it were offered. As aforementioned, the purpose of a city jail ( or goal) is to secure the individual until the courts can deal with him.

Regional detention centres are names given to the recently developed city jails, designed to serve a dual purpose: (1) to secure inmates for convicted inmates who are allowed to work daily in the community or attend school on the temporary absence program. (R.T. Potter, 1976: 21). In these institutions, inmates may remain for intermittent periods of up to two years less a day. Although to detain and secure the prisoners is still a top priority, the institutions offer a few more leisure-time activities such as library, T.V., gyms, etc., which are hoped to be some form of entertainment for prisoners remaining for longer periods. These institutions are quite modern with electronic operations of security, e.g., electronic doors and locks on cells and passageways into different areas.\* Like the city jails, regional detention centres have cells which house one, two or three persons per cell; they only differ in that they have no dormitories housing large numbers of persons serving

\* Personal tour of the new Hamilton Regional Detention Centre, on Barton Street East, revealed an electronic control unit operating the door systems rather than the old lock and key devices found in many older jails. (personal experiences).

sentences for fines or minor jail terms for non-dangerous offences.\*

Provincial reformatories are institutions to which inmates are sent after sentencing, depending on their classification, Inmates may serve from one day to two years less a day. These institutions are classified as maximum security.\*\* Most reformatories are found in the immediate areas of cities or certain communities e.g., Guelph, Ont., or in a more remote location, e.g., Burwash Reformatory, (Northern Ont., closed 1973). These institutions have 25-30' barbed-wire fences which encircle the grounds. They resemble small communities where persons may work, upgrade their education, or engage in skilled job training, with living and recreation areas provided. Persons serving time in a provincial reformatory are sometimes sentenced to definite and indefinite sentences.\*\*\*

\* There are three recently developed Regional Detention Centres in Ont., Regional Detention Centre in New Toronto, Thorold Detention Centre in St. Catharines, and the Hamilton Regional Centre, Barton Street East. These institutions have cells with two beds, sink & toilet in each cell. They have no dorms like older jails (Barton St. until 1976).

\*\* Maximum security institutions are used for inmates who are violent (past record) or have attempted to escape. Medium security institutions are used to house inmates who would not attempt an escape if the opportunity arose and are not considered dangerous to the public; most inmates fit into this classification. Minimum security institutions are usually for first term offenders, who are not likely to escape or to be a threat to the public at large. They must also have stable family relationships. Report to Parliament, Minister of Supply and Services, Canada, 1977, pg. 12 9-130).

\*\*\* Personal experience, 1966, sentence to 9 months definite - six months indefinite.



Upon completing the first portion of their sentence in a total institution, they could be further committed to a CRC, upon their release, for continued supervision. The population of Provincial Reformatories is from 450-1100 inmates.\* To conclude this topic of Provincial institutions, it must be stressed that they are institutions of short term incarceration, (1 day - 2 years less a day). The inmates are considered retrainable and various courses of retraining and upgrading are offered, once the inmate is transferred. Inmates may leave these institutions on an Ontario Parole or a National Parole, and the inmate may be sent to a CRC as a condition of parole.

#### Federal Penitentiary System

Historically, the first Canadian penitentiary began operation in 1835 in Kingston, Ontario and is still in operation. To date, there are fifty-six institutions operating under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government (Sub-Committee, 1976-7: 11). There are three main forms of institutional classification: maximum, medium and minimum security (Sub-Committee, 1976-7: 129). Generally speaking, maximum and medium security institutions are encircled by 30 feet of concrete or barbed-wire fences, with four armed observation towers, equally spaced about the perimeter. Inmates are required to live in

\* Personal interview with inmate in Guelph Reformatory, Guelph, Ont., 1979; inmate revealed that over a period of 8 months, the population was between 600 at first/78 and closer to 1000 as of March/79.

either individual cells, or dorms with a bed occupancy of 25-35 persons. Each portion of the individual's day is carefully planned and inmates have to carry out all aspects of daily living in the immediate company of others. (Goffman, 1961: 4).

The available literature clearly indicates that control of the inmates within penitentiary settings is of top priority. (Cohen, 1972: 9). The inmate is forced to comply with the rules and regulations of the institution; he is virtually forced to comply because of restricted personal freedom, little or no choice of the activities he wishes to engage in, and the fact that he must live under arbitrary rules which grant an almost omnipotent air of legitimacy to all actions of prison personnel. In our "free" society, individuals have an element of choice; within the walls of a penitentiary, this element is removed. Inmates are told when to rise, eat, work, dress, undress and when to relax. The daily routine of the penitentiary is quite similar to the alienation of self and the lack of personal autonomy which one experiences in a military setting. (J.W. Swackhammer, 1973: 22).

Because of the functional aspects of the penitentiary and its qualities analagous to military rule, the training of the individual to act in a prescribed manner, I am convinced, will be quite thorough and complete. Therefore, if the

desired effects of any prison organization are to "correct" and change criminal attitudes, the foundation of "authoritarian rule" could almost certainly assure the change of one's personality and attitude. However, if the desired changes are to be positive changes, the prison must encourage and develop a mode of operation, which by and large, will encourage the inmates, upon release, to perform as productive responsible adults. If the prison experience reinforces the negativity of self caused by little or no education, limited job skills and training, and lower income and status (generally attributed by many sociologists as reasons leading to involvement in crime), then penal institutions will quite likely suffice only to protect society from the immediate threat of criminality. The sub-committee, in its Report to Parliament, claims that positive incentives should be a part of the prison program for the following reasons:

Thus, there would be no continuity of humane treatment or follow up study as to its success or failure. Any logical mind would see; however, that no person can be prepared to live in normal, open society when the training is in the abnormal isolation of cages and repressive control over every decision, action or initiative... (Sub-Committee, Report to Parliament, 1976-1977: 10).

If the prison setting does not become a positive personal experience, many inmates may never experience normality or know what is a desired non-criminal way of life. As one inmate put it: "How do you expect me to be rehabilitated when I was never habilitated?" (Sub-Committee, Report to

Parliament, 1976-1977: 10). Some inmates have never encountered positive incentives by which to regulate their activities, as the previous statement reveals. A modern writer and social activist sums up the desired purpose of prisons in this fashion:

"The doctor can curse, beat or degrade a patient, but the doctor also knows that the patient will die if the disease is not treated. It should be the same with jailers and their "patients." A prisoner's ills can only be effectively treated by a restoration of human dignity. And if society is not willing to make prisons into wombs for true rehabilitation and rebirth, then society should stop using the word "rehabilitation" completely. Society should only admit that prisons are tombs for social outcasts designed merely for retribution and punishment."

(D. Gregory, 1976: 212).

## General Physical Description of the Prison

Most of my respondents described their living area while in the institution as either dormitory-fashion, or cell arrangements. Regardless of which of the two living arrangements the inmates lived under, they either ate in their cells or dormitory area, or cafeterias, generally viewed as dining halls (personal interviews and past experience). Some of my respondents lived in one or both of these institutional arrangements. Some also calimed to have been unfortunate enough to have lived for a significant period of time in disassociation or hole area.\* Both dormatories and cell descriptions will vary slightly depending on the compacity of the institution and when the institution was built. However, generally speaking, these areas are as follows:

### Cells

Cells are the individual homes of most inmates for the duration of their stay within the institution. Cells are arranged in cell blocks. G. Sykes offers a brief description of the composition of a cell block and its contents:

"A typical cellblock contains two banks of cells set

\*Dissassociation, isolation and detention etc. are organizational terms for what inmates term the hole. The inmates are sent to the hole because of inappropriate behavior. Inmates have been known to spend from one day to two years in these areas. Reasons given for this isolation are personal safety, P.C., or refusing to comply to regulations.

back to back, rising from floor to ceiling in the centre of the building, and it is in one of these structures that the inmates live for the duration of his sentence. Since the prison has grown piece-meal over a period of more than one hundred years the cell blocks differ in the details of their construction, such as the size and number of cells they contain, the nature of the locking devices for the cell doors or grills, and the means of ventilation. The largest cells in the institution are 15 feet long by 7½ feet wide and about 10 feet high; the smallest are 7½ feet long by 5½ feet wide, and 7 feet high. Regardless of their size, the official furnishing of these compartments are harshly Spartan, a toilet, a washbowl, a bed, a table, a footlocker, shelves, a light hanging from the ceiling comprise the list." (Sykes, 1958: 5).

The colours used to paint and brighten the atmosphere are usually institutional gray or green. Organizational in character, these colours are similar to those used by steel mills, e.g., Stelco green, or Dofasco gray. The cell furnishings are constructed with metal products. If an inmates is fortunate enough to have a mirror for shaving, it also will be fashioned from polished metal instead of breakable glass. The larger cells are of a regular nature, but the smaller cells are used as the disassociation area or hole area. To describe adequately the living conditions of cell life, once again a quote from Sykes should suffice:

"Indeed, if men in prison were locked forever in their cells, shut off from all intercourse with each other, and deprived of all activities of normal life, the dimensions of the cell would be the alpha and omega of life in prison. Like so many animals in their cages, the inmate population would be an aggregate rather than a social group, a mass of isolates rather than a society." (Sykes, 1958: 5)..

Men who chose to live in cells, if that option is available, spend on an average of 12 - 18 hours in lock-up,

but those who are placed in disassociation are locked up and deprived of the social intercourse Sykes just described for up to 23½ hours per day, with only one half hour of exercise.

### Dormitories

Dormitories are not used solely for the social intercourse of inmates and their ideas, but in most institutions inmates who are housed in dormitories are usually placed there for convenience of allocation because of their institutional duties.\* W.E. Mann claims that in 1967, Guelph Reformatory in Ontario, "has 16 dormitories, each accommodating 34 men, (W.E. Mann, 1967: 27)." In some penitentiaries, bed counts may rise as high as 25 per dorm (personal experience, Kingston, 1971). Inmates living in dorms must share their living space with from 16 - 25 others. Beds are arranged to accommodate as many as needed. Washrooms are communal (4 toilets and 4 wash basins). Usually in the back of each dorm are one or two shower stalls. Inmates must eat on their beds if no dining areas are provided. In some cases, small footlockers or boxes are used as storage also under beds. In the newer institutions, one T.V. and one radio are allowed in each dorm. Selection of programs on T.V. is "majority rules, unless."\*\*

\* Many inmates are placed in dorms because they are shift workers in the kitchen and bakery or dairy. Dorms are also preferred by some inmates because of their need to interact with others, and their claustrophobic fears of living in confined areas.

\*\* In this sense, unless implies unless the guard on duty wishes to watch sports or a specific program. A few inmates of a bullying nature have been known to influence or sway (sometimes by force) others to comply.

Discussion

From my own personal experience and conversations with some of my respondents, inmates who live in cells tend to isolate themselves from the large collectivity of others. They feel that cell life "allows them to do their own time and not other's." Many ex-cons, with whom I have spoken to, concur with my own feelings on the element of risk involved in dorm living. Living with a large diversified group of people, generates distrust, hostility and brutality. Weaker inmates are usually "in season"\* for wolves or gorilla inmates, thefts are frequent (and anyone of twenty-five others may be the culprit), and lastly, the dirty habits of others who stink, who will not clean up after themselves, quite often lead to physical confrontations. The physical character of the prison has built-in troubles, which affect the lives of the inmates. In the next section, some of my respondents reveal some of these structural difficulties.

---

\* "In season," is a con term suggesting that being young and more offensive than others is enough to provoke sexual advances from other, aggressive inmates. In season implies that there is a desired time for these activities by the wolves, and most of the time the 18 - 25 year olds are desired.



## Community-Based Residential Centres (CRCs)

Community-Based Residential Centres first appeared in Canada in the late fifties as the Beverley Lodge and the Elizabeth Fry Society House in Toronto, and at approximately the same time, the Sancta Marin House opened in Vancouver, B.C. These were private organizations described as the forerunners of the CRC movement, which did not fully get underway until some ten years later. (Solicitor General, Information Canada, 1973: IX). Across Canada there are now 345 CRCs which answer various needs for specific persons. Information Canada, in a report prepared for the Solicitor General of Canada, describes CRCs in the following manner:

The phrase, "community-based residential centre" describes a wide variety of residential services for many kinds of persons in need. These include the physically and mentally handicapped, the elderly and disturbed or delinquent children, as well as offenders. They stand between some form of complete institutionalization and complete integration into the community, providing a service to those moving from a dependent status such as "patient" or inmate, to a less dependent status such as "dischargee" or "parolee." Equally, they may be provided as alternatives to a more comprehensive level of institutionalization as in probation camps or hostels or group homes, ie, for persons moving from an independent status to a dependent one. They tend, by and large, to be funded by sources other than residents. They differ from institutions in that they tend to be smaller, more informal and to provide easier access to the community. They differ from boarding houses and hostels in that those responsible for their administration, perceive of themselves as offering something in addition to room and board. This extra programme may range all the way from assistance in obtaining employment to intensive group counselling or a complete alternative life-style. (Solicitor General, Information Canada, 1973: X).

However, in this study, I will be mainly concerned with the CRCs providing services for ex-offenders. It has been noted that of the 345 CRCs presently in operation, 156 of these will accept and provide special services for ex-offenders. (Solicitor General, Information Canada, 1973: IX). The general purpose of CRCs is three fold: to divert persons entirely from the criminal justice system and incarceration, to shorten the length of incarceration, and to provide temporary relief from incarceration. (Solicitor General, Information Canada, 1973: IX). As aforementioned, it would appear that genuine efforts have been made to divert, or shorten the amount of time an inmate must spend within a total institutional setting. These reasons (many previously cited in description of total institution) are as numerous as the arguments for subjecting some inmates to the confines of a total institution. Some of the reasons offered are that it is inhumane to lock people in cages away from family and loved ones, that isolation from the community to which one must someday return only momentarily protects society; and that the high cost of security is outrageous. In the American context, Andrew T. Scull, in his book, Decarceration, illustrates many of the reasons for further developing community treatment programs and CRCs per se:

We are told by those who run programs of this sort that keeping the criminal and the mentally disturbed in our midst is "humane." We are informed that it is a "more effective" means of "curing" and rehabilitating

board announcing meetings, social events, and personal messages. The kitchen is fully equipped with heavy duty restaurant equipment, two stoves, dishwasher, rinse tubs and centre island counter with ample storage space. The T.V. room has one T.V., two sets of couches and chairs. All these areas are carpeted, except for the kitchen, with indoor-outdoor carpet.

In the basement of this house, are two washers and dryers, an iron and ironing board. Also in this area is the locked food, bedding and a modernly equipped office for staff members.

In the basement of Betcha Can't House was a large, heavy-duty modern kitchen, supply room and a large dining area with one long communal eating table. This house also had laundry equipment - one washer and dryer - and a large room for ping-pong and house meetings. The second floor was largely bedrooms and bathroom area, three large rooms with 3-4 beds in each. Beds were similar and not too flashy or new (donated from nearby institution). The attic had been converted to one large room with 3 beds. In this area was also a 2-piece bath for use mainly for persons on this floor. Throughout the house was a combination of shag and indoor-outdoor carpeting. Rooms were all numbered and corresponded with the office information sheets. The furniture in this

such people. And miracles of miracles, we learn that this approach is also cheaper. With an alternative which embraces such an array of virtues, who can be too surprised to learn that mental hospitals are emptying faster and faster and with each passing day a convicted felon's chances of going to prison grow (A. Scull, 1977: ).

I believe, by looking at the CRCs physical structure and functional aspects, we may discover if Scull's phrase, "in our midst," is humane. Whether or not the CRC is a more effective means of "curing" attitudes or "rehabilitating" such people, will be my area of inquiry in this study.

#### Physical Character of CRCs

The two CRCs researched in this study are, (1) Almost House (pseudonym), a rather large CRC organization located in the Hamilton area, and (2) Betcha Can't (pseudonym), a small CRC in the Toronto area. Almost House is, in fact, two large recently renovated brick houses. These houses are centrally located in a neighbourhood which is well kept and would not be considered a slum or undesirable area. Being centrally located allows easy access to many services. The exteriors of these houses are well maintained and painted, the grounds are well kept and it would appear that the profile of the organization is generally acceptable to the neighbourhood. In Almost House, the ground floor has a pay phone, dining area, T.V. viewing rooms, and a large, modern, heavy-duty equipped kitchen. The dining area is a cafeteria type setting with four places per table. Also in this area, is the information

was ultra-modern at one time, corduroy couch and chair set, bean bag type occasional chairs. Betcha Can't House appeared relatively well kept but in need of paint, wall paper and new furnishings.

Many of the residents at Betcha Can't House were provincial prisoners, young offenders 18-23 years of age, serving sentences heavily drug and/or alcohol oriented. This may somewhat explain the drabness of the surroundings, ie, Provincial funding is somewhat less than Federal funding. Almost House, on the other hand, had a strong representation of older penitentiary prisoners and was funded by the Federal Government.\* Both organizations studied were mainly funded on a contractual per diem rate, which means that money is given in accordance with the number of residents the houses hold.\*\*

Almost House housed between 20-30 men, whereas Betcha Can't, being considerably smaller, housed between 6-11 men at the particular time of the interview. In contrast to Almost House which was centrally located, Betcha Can't was in a rural area only a few blocks away from the institution, from which all of its residents were sent.\*\*\*

The cost of keeping an inmate in a total institution

\*Personal observation and interview, March 25/79, with the "rookies," a member of the staff of Betcha Can't House - interview with director of Almost House.

\*\* Personal interview with parole administrators of National Parole, 125 Main St. W., Hamilton, February, 1979.

\*\*\*Personal interview with "rookie," staff members of Betcha Can't House.

(approximately \$25,000.00 per year) is considerably lessened by keeping the inmate in a CRC which costs approximately \$8,000.00 per year.\*\*\*\* This cost is also off-set by the fact that most residents of CRCs work and pay rent and taxes, or attend Provincially sponsored community colleges. Most certainly the physical characteristics of CRCs seem "more humane," as Scull phrased it, than the total institution, which is generally barbaric and primitive in character, but, whether or not CRCs are a more effective means of curing and rehabilitating offenders is questionable. One can clearly see that because of the structural/physical aspects of most CRCs, most of the "pains of punishment" created because of the physical character of the total institution are alleviated. However, I believe that similar institutional characteristics, e.g., cafeteria dining, industrial kitchens, common area, multi-bed rooms and staff offices, still remind the residents that they are not yet responsible (because of external controls) and still lack personal control over themselves. This reminder I believe, could reinforce the negativity perpetrated by the experience of life within most total institutions, which in fact, demands that the residents sustain an almost childlike, docile, dependent attitude, something that is not conducive to the creation of responsible, productive adults.

\*\*\*\* Personal interview, January 10, 1979, Almost House, Hamilton, Ontario, with director of house.

Physical Character of CRC (Troublesome)

During the 1970's, Canadian prisons were plagued with riots and uprising, which reportedly resulted in thousands and thousands of dollars in damage, (Information Canada, 1973: 28). It is my contention that the physical character of the prisons e.g., bars, locked and restricted areas, is at least in part responsible for the explosion of violence. Therefore, to test the similarities of problem areas within CRCs and prisons, the physical make-up of both settings must be explored. Because all of my respondents had been exposed to both prison and the CRC, I felt that their knowledge of both situations would be valid. Dealing with the CRC specifically, I briefly asked, "Is there anything about the physical make-up of the house that is troublesome to you (bums you out)?" Also, to attain another perspective, the staff of the CRCs were asked, "What is there about the physical structure of the house which may place residents in trouble situations?" (see interview schedule in appendix).

In this sample, sixteen of eighteen residents interviewed assisted me, seven of whom were at the house from one day to 3 months. Four had been at the house from 3 months to six months, and the remaining five were in the post-CRC stage, having spent 6 months and longer in the CRC. The staff sample included eight respondents, 5 of whom were currently employed in a CRC setting.

Relatively troublesome to the residents was, in some sense, the virtual duplication of an institutional atmosphere. Some of the variables which were largely responsible for these perception were: (1) the presence of bulletin board, which posted messages of coming events and possible job opportunities, (2) the cafeteria style of the dining romms, which was very similar to those of smaller institutions (e.g. farm annexs), (3) limited personal properties, (4) locked and monitored doors, (5) dirty common areas, and lastly, (6) the constant physical presence of persons over which residents had no control ie., inmates who are viewed as "undesirables" by other inmates, and the constant presence of staff.

#### Bulletin Boards and Pay Phones and Official Postings

This issue seemed troublesome to four respondents because they claimed it looked like a club or organization of some kind. These bulletins were usually situated quite conspicuously in either the dining area, hallways or common rooms, e.g.T.V. viewing rooms or meeting rooms. Some of the messages posted were of a personal nature, "Joe, call your P.O." (parole officer), or "If anyone wants a job contact Ken, it only pays minimum wage, but some money is better than none." In the house meeting room (which was also the room in which to entertain guests), the Alcoholics Anonymous signs were posted everywhere, e.g., "Accept God and he will



help guide you. Admit to yourself that alcohol is a problem and you won't have to show others." One of my respondents, Capt. Marvel asks, "How could you bring a guest into the room and feel comfortable? They would guess alright that you had more problems than just being an ex-con." (Capt. Marvel, Nov 8/78). It is evident that the atmosphere could discourage residents from bringing in guests. It is immediately obvious that this is not your average home and suggests that some authority is responsible for the entire operations. I might also add that these visual cues may be far more suggestive for residents than for guests or staff, reminding them of their former prison involvement.

#### Dining Area and Kitchen

In the CRCs studies (and I might add most CRCs), the kitchens were all equipped with heavy duty kitchen appliances. The reasons for this heavy duty equipment is quite evident from a statement offered by the Man, a staff member:

"Well, the heavy duty equipment won't break down as often as the average kitchen equipment. Let's face it, we have to feed up to thirty persons, that's a lot of dirty dishes in a day. We have to have reliable equipment with ample elements for cooking and cleaning."  
(the Man, Nov., 1978).

However, some of the men claim that this equipment detracts from normal home-like atmosphere. One must remember most of the residents are from the lower classes and their only exposure to these "modern" appliances has been within a formal organization, e.g., camps, reformatories, training schools and prisons. When

I asked Sticks to explain why the kitchen and dining area were troublesome for him he stated: "It don't look like a kitchen, not a kitchen in my house or any house I've been in" Why? (sic). "Well all of this equipment we never had them in our house, did you?" (Sticks, May 1979).

Captain Marvel offers the following supportive statement in agreement with Sticks: "The kitchen, well, it has a lot of heavy duty equipment like the joint, the picnic table in the dining room ain't exactly homey." (C. Marvel, 1979).

These features may well be troublesome to the residents and justifiably so, but the need for the heavy duty equipment and communal eating arrangements is understandable, given the large number of people that have to be fed. After all, the CRC is an organization which must meet the needs of up to thirty men. These needs range from washing and eating to counselling for personal problems, such as alcoholism.

#### Limited Personal Properties

The CRCs are generally furnished by the organization in conjunction and approval from the Board of Directors. The furnishings in the organizations which I studied were in many cases, used institutional issue (personal experience & knowledge attained from working within CRC for 2½ years). Some other institution had donated their old furnishing to the CRC when they remodelled their outdated equipment, e.g. hospitals, closed down institutions, old age homes (Macassa Lodge,) etc. These furnishings were not elaborate or new, but functional.

Consequently, many of the bedrooms had identical furnishings, and the common rooms had older furniture covered with slip covers.

Six of the residents felt that this created an impersonal atmosphere quite similar to that in an institution, in which all furnishings are provided by the institution. When asked about the furnishing and layout of the house, Sticks claims: "It's not a free atmosphere, it gives off institutional vibrations. In my room, all that is mine is my hammer (guitar) and a few books; I sleep on their bed, use their sheets and I even wash and dry my face with their towels. This gives me an institutional caged feeling." (Sticks, April 7/79).

A staff member, however, related to me that donated furnishings allow funds to be spent in more needed areas, e.g., renovating houses or higher wages for more competent employees, etc. "I went out "scabbing" one time and got all of that hospital equipment, remember right after the cutbacks." (Jolly ex-staff, 1968). This attitude tends to indicate that because of budget constraints, "scabbing" or bumming used furnishings is a normal practice, which provides the CRC with needed furnishings and allows their limited funds to be directed elsewhere.

#### Locked and Monitoring Doors

In the CRCs studied after curfew time was in effect, front doors were locked and monitoring alarm system was turned on to secure fire exits.\* All bedroom doors had locks on them

\*The outside doors were locked, opened only by a key & a staff person, who would ask why one was late and record findings in a book. Also an alarm system was hooked up to rear fire doors, which, if opened signaled to a staff person that someone had just "double-doored" (see glossary). An immediate check would be done to see who had left.

(somewhat inconsistent with most fire regulations for this type of organization) with numbers and names of occupants placed on them, corresponding with a master list in the staff office. The administration view these safeguards as somewhat a different light than the residents do:

"We have tried to eliminate many of the physical characteristics which place residents in trouble situations, by installing locks on all bedroom doors (to curtail thefts), and signal systems on all fire doors to eliminate the problem of "double dooring." (the Man, May 1979).

To the resident, the locked doors appear as an additional threat to freedom. Locks and name plates on doors are a reminder of prison (captive) experiences for some.\* Locked front doors require the resident to confront a staff member after curfew hours which immediately subjects the resident to the scrutiny of staff and assumptions as to his physical condition (e.g., drinking or possible use of drugs). One resident offered this remark: "The locks on all bedroom doors seem distrustful in a way. In the joint, our cells were open all day, if someone was stupid enough to steal we had our personal way of handling range thieves." (G. Hays Oct 29/79). Also the locks and alarms on the exterior doors can be quite troublesome to a resident returning late and possibly "tipsy" on some form of socially acceptable stimulant (alcohol or drugs). The Dick revealed that because of his light weight and agility, he was never hindered by locked exterior doors; however, he did relate problems encountered by others less fortunate:

\*In some maximum security prisons, e.g., Collins Bay, Joyceville Penitentiary, it is common practise to place the name of the inmate above cell doors, also listed is the inmate's "prison number", length of sentence and possible release date and expiration date, e.g., C, range, cell 18, Jones, 10 years, expiration 1985.

"Well you know why I never got caught for curfew violation or double dooring, I would climb in or jump out a window. Yes, can you imagine that, breaking into a joint. This ass-hole weighing 220 tried hanging on a ledge, it broke (ha ha); the mother woke up all kinds of problems and charges, e.g., double-dooring, damage to property and self; he also gave them the "office" and wised them up to my escape route." (Dick, May, 1979).

### Dirty Common Areas

Many of the residents seemed quite upset about the condition of common areas (7 of 16 respondents). The areas generally cited were T.V. viewing rooms, kitchen (after cook had left) and especially the washrooms. The residents claimed that some persons would not clean up food and litter from T.V. rooms and that the washrooms were in a state of constant filth. Rocky reveals how this condition somewhat affected him: "I hate others in my house. I don't like to pick up for others or after them. If they are dirty, you feel dirty. If they stink, you think it's you. (Rocky Feb. 6/79). Once again, in a non-tactful manner, but typical in style, Dick claims: "The bathrooms were always dirty, that would apply to every other room in the fucking house." (Dick, May 1979).

The staff's response to these conditions is largely "It's their house, they have to keep it clean or dirty it. However, some just don't care what they live in." (T. Terry, March 27/79). This attitude tended to be general with later follow-up conversations with staff in a more informal setting (bar). "It's their house," is somewhat a troublesome phrase, it demonstrates the expectation that residents should monitor or be responsible for themselves and others.

### Physical Presence of Others: Privacy Issue

Lastly, I will deal with an issue not actually related to the physical make-up of the house, but nevertheless a

problem for its residents - the constant physical presence of others. \*

Twelve of the sixteen residents interviewed claimed that a lack of privacy created by the constant presence of other residents and staff was often quite troublesome to them. It appeared that some problems were generated because of the presence of residents considered to be "undesirable" \*\* by other residents. From the point of view of the victim (the undesirable), T. Tim suggests that his mere presence created problems for him and others:

"I claimed I was not responsible for the argument or fight. Because of my charge (rape), others look upon me as king of a scape goat - if someone rats they think it's me. If something's going wrong for someone and I'm around, I'll become the problem and the person attacked.: (T. Tim, May 3/79).

T. Tim claimed to be the victim, the reason, and the probably solution to problems others might encounter while living in the CRC. Justifying Tim's claim somewhat is P. Paul, who states: "In regards to the fighting, I said the guy was a fucking rat, goof and if we were in jail he'd be dead." (P. Paul, Dec. 28/78).

Of course, the fights and arguments discussed by the two

\* I might note that this aspect of my study was disturbing to me, in the sense that the persons were in affect a part of the house; and they were a constant physical character, although transient in nature.

\*\*In most prisons, inmates are labelled by other inmates and guards as "undesirables" because of the nature of their offences, e.g., sex offenders, violent attacks upon the very young (children) or the elderly. Also in the category are persons viewed as squealers, rats or stool pigeons (informers).

respondents were unrelated incidents but they are illustrative of the problems created by the presence of those considered "undesirable." Whereas one resident was concerned about being the object of attack (T. Tim), the other, was exhibiting some learned inmate discernment as to who was and was not desirable and expressing his feelings regarding the deserved consequences.

Inmates/residents are not the only undesirables within the CRCs. Staff members, because of their position and their duties of maintaining social control, tend to invade the privacy of the residents simply because of their continuous twenty-four hour per day presence (see appendix agreement of Almost House between resident and staff). J. Bowery's comment is supportive of the physical presence of staff persons as being problematic:

"The man's always here, at night when we go to bed and in the morning when we rise. Not the same one mind ya; but some person to report to, you know what I mean? Like in the morning he'll wake you up, and at night he locks you in, and checks during the night to make sure you stay in." (J. Bowery, Nov 19/78).

The Dick claims that what is disturbing about the constant presence of staff is their similarity to prison guards: "Staff are like guards, they're always around, checking on you, looking for trouble." (Dick, May 1979).

The staff, however, see the lack of privacy issue as a problem of living within a collective, with little or no other choice. Q. McGraw claims: "overcrowding in the



bedrooms causes lack of privacy. Off limit areas, few private areas to sit and rap to friends (females) about private personal matters." (Jan. 29/79). J. Keeper, another staff member, claims that the "close proximity of other residents" may be a physical characteristic which would be problematic to the resident. When I inquired why he stated..."Because there is an element of no privacy, more of a group home setting than an individual home." (J. Keeper, May 22/79).

Regardless of whether or not it is the presence of staff persons or other residents, it appears quite evident that either or both of these elements are troublesome to residents in that they constitute a lack of privacy, with the staff persons, it may be because of their guard-like, monitoring nature. With other residents it may be because they are viewed as undesirable or because hostilities are generated due to distrust and inconvenience:

"Yea, a bunch of bummy people just lying around, and once again some of them are 'skunky,' some have about ~~one change of clothes and they are "humming".~~ How can you eat a sandwich with some degenerate walking by who reaps with stench, it makes you sick, or you come home from work at six p.m. and line up to shower and then the water's cold or some skunks don't wash up the tub or the floor, it's a bummer for sure (Yogi, Dec 4/78).

I feel the data does point out that hostilities can arise because of what appears to be not only an invasion, but a total lack of privacy. As aforementioned, the presence of other persons is not actually part of the physical make-up of a house, but does affect the atmosphere. The other persons may be

transient, ie, a resident who is paroled completely to the community or a staff person who leaves his/her present position, but another resident will fill the vacant bed and more than likely (with the unemployment rate presently at a staggering 9%) another staff person will be employed. Although the other persons present are not always the same, the presence is nevertheless constant, and it is this constant presence which is an important physical characteristic of most CRCs. The actualization of this idea will become clearer in my next section, in which I will explore the concept of "trouble", the reactions offered by those accused, and the consequences levied by those in control.

## Methodology

### Closed System

As aforementioned, I felt that similar data systematically collected from a "closed system" and "total institution" would present a clearer understanding of just what both systems represent. A closed system as illustrated by Stanley Elkins in his book, Slavery, "A Problem in American Institutional and Intellectual Life" prohibits the captives (slaves/inmates and residents) from escaping or altering their status or fate as slaves. To clarify, slavery in Latin American or the Carribean was not viewed as closed system because it affords the captives the opportunity to win or buy their freedom. If a child was born a slave, won the favour of his master, or accumulated some form of capital (from rewards, etc.) he could purchase his "freedom" and/or even purchase slaves and become a slave owner, thus altering his status. Escape was possible under this Latin American system. Upward mobility, rights to ownership, etc., were not only granted to the exceptional cases, but to each and every slave. There was equality of opportunity of attainment.

However, Elkins viewed slavery in the North American context as a form of "closed system." A popular slang used to illustrate the closedness or improbability to change an addiction status is: "once a junkie, always a junkie." What Elkins is in fact saying about North American slavery is "once a slave, always a slave." Of course, he does not deny the fact that

the exception might escape his slave status, or label (to the north or by some mandate of exclusion, be freed, say for saving the present master's life), but the general rule is that a slave born a slave in North America, would probably die a slave. All avenues of upward mobility are closed. A closed system bring with it connotation of improbability, largely because of the functional/operational aspects of that system. To assure that the status of a slave would not be altered, social stigmatization (branding), brute physical force (whipping, burnings) and coercion, (work or die - do this or your family is sold) were used.

#### Total Institutions

The most classic form of "total institution" is that which is illustrated by Erving Goffman in his book, Asylums. Goffman claims that the totality of the system is illustrated by (1) apparent physical barriers and (2) the absolute power of a totalitarian rule. The physical barriers restrict personal movement and the totalitarian rule prohibits self-control and individual ability to choose. Unlike the "closed system of slavery, there is hope for the inmate to (physically at least) change his present status. The captives can earn, and in some cases, buy their freedom. In some sense, our total institution would be quite close to Elkins' interpretation of the Latin American system of slavery, in that generally, everyone will or can be released (at least physically) - of course some might never be released (the extremely dangerous or habitual criminals) but the opportunity for release is

granted to almost all inmates.

In comparing the similarities and differences of the "closed system and total system," we immediately see that structurally, the total institution differs from the CRC\*. Even the locations of CRCs (in most communities) as opposed to the remote isolated locations of most prisons must be viewed as an important structural difference. Physical similarities are based heavily on the kitchen and laundry appliances required to satisfy the needs of some thirty plus adults. Heavy duty equipment and institutional room furnishings (old hospital issues - see data) may be quite similar to those found in many total institutions.

Another "physical characteristic which cannot be overlooked is the physical presence of persons over which the residents has no control (this "physical" nature is clarified in data findings section). Not only are residents required to live with other residents, but the constant presence of administrators (staff) and their offices, serve as constant reminders of guards and their "spaceship" control units.

The most significant similarities of the two systems, I believe, are revealed in the function/operational aspects of these systems. Rules and regulations must be adhered to in

\*At this time there are no walls or high barbed fences visible around CRCs; however, as the data indicates security measures are causing alarm systems to be installed on exit doors; front doors are locked after curfews and some CRCs are reportedly growing to such an extent that they are housing larger populations and their size could be compared to a "mini institution (farm annex).

both settings. Administrators sustain an omnipotent rule which allows them the power to reward or punish persons accordingly. Finally, the most significant factor is the socialization process which is undertaken in both settings, a socialization which is markedly different from that in a "freer" society. As aforementioned, data collected in both the closed and total system was desired, but the totality of the prison bureaucracy (another difference) would not allow a study of this nature to be undertaken without "red tape" procedures, for which permission would not have been granted until long after the projected completion date of this study. Therefore, for data referring to the prison per se, I am relying heavily upon what I must term "recall data", of both my respondents, and myself given I have experienced a significant period of time in the realm of a total institution. This should be looked upon as a valid, sophisticated form of "participant observation" quite similar to the methods of Hustlers, Beats and Others. (N. Polsky, 1969: 109-44). I felt that a brief clarification of both systems was in order if my methodological approach to research is to be viewed as it was intended.

The data collection of this study was both the most interesting and discouraging endeavour I have undertaken in quite some time. As aforementioned, I am an ex-convict; I found this aspect of my life to be advantageous in some cases, and to my disadvantage in others. Firstly, being an ex-convict, I myself have been approached by many sociologists, social-workers and researchers in hopes of obtaining information about my past. In many institutions and "rehabilitation" programs, the inmates must appear almost eager to be a respondent; otherwise he may be viewed as anti-social, or uncooperative. Reluctantly, many respondents submit to this exercise, believing that there will eventually be something in it for them, that it will be interpreted as a show of one's willingness to co-operate and that a good word on their behalf will be filtered to the administration.

Personally, I found interviews with head shrinkers, social workers, and researchers to be a waste of time and quite annoying. Fully aware that the research I was about to embark on would place me in the unpopular position of the researcher, I hoped my contacts and past experiences would somewhat legitimize my probing into the personal affairs of my respondents (and in many cases my friends). In some cases, this was advantageous to me, however, in others it worked to my disadvantage. Respondents would give ho-hum answers, or

yes and no, or, "you know what it's like man; you've been in the joint." Therefore on many occasions, I would have to justify my past by a blunt affirmation of "yes I know man, you know, but the squares who must read and evaluate this research have no idea about what we mean. It has to be in your words because different people experience the joint differently (sic.) With these apprehensions and cautions in mind, I embarked upon what I must now deem a very laborious, discouraging and time consuming task.

I began this study by devising an interview schedule which I hoped would be a very systematic, unbiased approach, and would be reflected as closely as possible in the words of the respondents.

Polsky in his book, Hustlers, Beats & Others, point out the importance of researchers doing research geared towards open-ended type schedules. This allows the respondent to answer a question the way he views the situations and not necessarily in a fashion consistent with the interviewer's train of thought. This allows the respondent to speak more freely. Also, if in his own territory and usual environment, the respondent might not feel as intimidated by the official surroundings of an office or laboratory. From this type of interviewing technique, the researchers will hear things quite likely out of text, and the interaction of respondents with others in their immediate realm will quite likely be beneficial in the sense that the researcher might make other contacts and possibly note the hows? whys? and daily activities of persons in a



'criminal lifestyle. (N. Polsky, 1969: 119).

To be unbiased, I could not concentrate entirely on the perceptions of inmates and the conditions under which they were forced to live. I could not only probate at the negative aspects of the experiences that they had undergone in both prison and the CRC, but I had to explore the possibility of positive aspects in both settings as well.

My personal experience as an inmate in total institutions (prisons) for approximately 5 years (in total), as a counsellor (staff) in a CRC, officially for about 2½ years and unofficially for another 2 years (after my dismissal,) has led me to believe that life within a prison is inhumane, damaging both physically and mentally, and virtually ineffective in its goal to "correct" the criminal attitudes of its inmates. In other words, efforts to instill positive social ideals within the minds of prison inmates (which hopefully would create responsible, productive adults once released), has been futile. I further submit that this organization/institutional failure has quite likely travelled with the inmate from the prison to the CRC. My reasons for this assumption as aforementioned, lie within the structural and functional aspects of both systems. It is my contention that prisons perpetuate the already negative self-esteem of the individual. This low self-esteem is reinforced in both settings, by prohibiting the inmate/resident from making choices and resuming many of the personal roles

granted to responsible adults.

Gresham M. Sykes, in his book, Society of Captives, sees the loss of these personal, responsible roles as one of the "pains of punishment." Given the conditions, which I have outlined in the previous chapter, I designed my interviews and research to inquire into the results and effects of the CRC upon the lives of its residents. I believe the "pains of punishment" present in prisons, also exist in most CRC's, although perhaps to a lesser degree. It is virtually impossible to create a responsible, productive adult upon expiration from either setting if the inmate/resident has been given little or no positive direction. Henceforth, my study in this area concentrate on positive incentives, and modes of action directed at the inmates/residents in response to possible troublesome situations. What is trouble in both settings? Are they trivial, childlike acts which create trouble for adults? Is trouble for an adult being forced to comply and act as a child, (decultured syndrome).

It was my contention when I began this project that prisons did not create responsible productive adults. I arrived at this conclusion because of my personal experience, which indicated that personal growth demands positive incentives for mature development something which was absent in a total institution. I content that this is so because of of functional aspects and rules of total institutions. I am not suggesting that CRCs are total institutions, but instead "closed systems," which do not offer their residents an element of choice. Closed systems exhibit strong functional

aspects and rules of total institutions. I am not suggesting that CRCs are total institutions, but instead "closed systems," which do not offer their residents an element of choice. Closed systems exhibit strong functional aspects and modes of operation quite similar to total institutions. It is these functional aspects which enhance and perpetrate the negativity created within the prison walls, and also which prohibit most inmates/residents from regaining the status and responsibilities awarded to adults upon their release. I felt by looking at troubles experienced by the inmate/resident population as a whole, I could show from the consequences and reaction to trouble, that the character of the prison is quite similar to that of the CRC. The concrete wall or barbed wire fence of the prison is replaced in the CRC, by a lack of responsibility which leads to the inability to function as a productive adult.

To help explore my assumptions, I had to know the experiences and perception of the men themselves. Further, since it's a relationship of power and social control, I also wanted to have some idea of the perspective of the administration. Therefore, with these goals (men's view of CRC) in mind, the best method seemed to be a modified Participation Observation technique, in which the researcher participates in the every day life of the CRC, and in the personal lives of the residents themselves. Ned Polsky in his book, Hustlers, Beats & Others, describes this technique:

"Studying a criminal in his natural setting means not only studying him outside of any law-enforcement context. It means studying him in his usual environment rather than yours, in his living quarters or streets or taverns, or wherever, not in your home, office or laboratory. If he wants to sit in front of his T.V. set and drink beer and watch a ball game for a couple of hours, so do you; if he wants to walk the streets or go bar-hopping, so do you." (N. Polsky, 1969: 129).

Using this type of format, without the restrictions and boundaries generally allotted to research, I developed a questionnaire that could be meaningful, in both the resident's and staff's terms. In devising this questionnaire, the vernacular fuck-up or fucking-up was used quite often. These terms were employed with the understanding that both staff and residents fully understand the implication of their usage in a somewhat personal, direct sense. The use of various street terms aided in making the respondents feel more at ease during the interviews and also helped to affirm and validate my past experience in their eyes.

Sample

The data rely heavily on focused, in depth, individual interviews with eighteen men. All eighteen respondents have had prison experience and all but two have also been a resident in a CRC.\* To attain a cross-section of opinion from the authorities and staff/guards, I initially wished to interview three persons from each sector, but because of their willingness and availability, I interviewed eight CRC staff and three ex-guards. Because I wanted to evaluate the effects

\*These two respondents were formerly housed in the same institution as I and insisted that I use them in my "book;" reflections of the prison experience was helpful and welcomed.

of the CRC, it seemed important to study the situation of men both new to and past the CRC life; therefore, I chose five men who had been in the CRC from one day to sixty days, six men who had resided at the house for two months previous to the interviews and five men in the post stages of the CRC experience.

In regards to the staff interviewed, three were long term employees. I found that ex-staff members, having been away from the CRC for sometime, were able to separate the ideals and assumed purpose of the system, and take a sincere look at the effects on residents of life in a CRC. Conversely, the guards presently employed with the Ministry of Corrections were very defensive and, in fact, two of them refused to assist in the interviewing because of the nature of the topic being discussed. One woman officer even refused to do an interview because she was referred to as a guard rather than a correctional officer. Therefore, the guards I did interview were no longer working for the Ministry of Corrections.

#### The Questionnaire

I felt it to be important to incorporate biographical information into the research, so that I might measure whether or not the resident's age, marital status or duration of time in the houses were in any way influential in the administration's response to trouble situations. I also felt to ask the questions relating to the living area, the physical character

of work, and trouble in both of these areas with regards to life within the CRC and also within the prison, would make both experiences more visible for evaluation. It is hoped that by exploring the similarities in both settings their operational and structural analogous nature may be exposed. An important area I also explored was the social and working hours of the individuals' lives which hopefully would allow me to measure with some authority a less or more dependent attitude of the residents, if indeed one was developed. And finally, by exploring similar areas in both settings, possibly some light may be shed on the functional/operational aspects of the prison and the CRC in response to troublesome situations.

The staff and guards had no formal biographical questions applied (this, I did intentionally because I felt that a professional might be offended and/or embarrassed if I began to probe into their lives in a more personal manner. They might have felt that they were the object of this study, and I in no way wanted this false meaning conveyed). Informally, I found that six of the eight staff respondents held university degrees in either the social sciences or humanity areas. The other two failed to complete the secondary requirements. Four were married and had lived in this immediate area for more than ten years, and the other four were single and have been in this area for at least five years. Three were former guards of a total institution and the other five had worked

in various parole-oriented agencies (social work). Two of the guards were ex-service men and the other was a recent graduate from a nearby university.

A very interesting development I might mention, is the creation of comic script pseudonyms. Because of the nature of this study and the predicament of many of my respondents, confidentiality was a must. The only way I could assure my respondents that it was what they said that was important, not who said it was to use pseudonyms. If there were any "colonial officials" who desired information; the code of comic names would assure the confidentiality of my respondents.

As mentioned earlier, the need for individual personal interviews was imperative. I decided on the personal factor as a must because (1) the length of interviews (overly long and in some cases overlapping because of investigating two quite similar settings) thus the need to probe and encourage the respondent of the importance of his input and assure him that the interview portion of this thesis was one of the vital aspects of the paper and there would be no thesis without his co-operation. Had there not been a personal aspect to the interview, many answers would have been, "I had no troubles, I didn't work, or I never fuck-up." Therefore, personal involvement was needed at some point for elaborate specific answers. Personal intervention was also required because of the various methods I attempted during the interviews. I tried several techniques in order to find a non-traditional method with which respondents would be comfortable. As well, I had to devise a method whereby I felt comfortable conducting interviews without feeling myself too removed from my respondents.

Polsky in the forthcoming statement, describes exactly the type of interviewer attitude I was conscientiously trying to avoid:

"reportage" and insists that the real way for him to learn about people is to place one or more screens between him and them. He can't see people anymore, except through punch cards and oneway mirrors. He can't talk with people anymore only "survey" them. Often he can't even talk about people anymore only about data... (N. Polsky, 1969: 119).

During the first two interviews, I recorded my respondent's answers. Eye contact was always broken and the alienated feeling I received was somewhat similar to that of my undergrad days, whereby, during lectures, I would be so busy writing notes, that by the end of the lecture I had no idea of what had been said, only high anxieties about what I might have missed. This was a "reportage" style which I quickly abandoned. My second attempt was very threatening and time consuming - it involved the use of a tape recorder. The residents were very uncomfortable with this technique, so much so that some refused to partake at all. Interestingly enough, CRC staff and guards were quite comfortable with this method. I found myself spending up to 3 hours in interviews plus three to six hours of tedious translating the tapes to the standard interview sheets. I quickly dropped this method because it was far too time consuming. I was beginning to see myself as a quasi-professional talking at people, so that I could, at a later time, lock myself away with their hidden secrets. This



method also caused a high level of suspicion amongst the residents, which tended to influence their responses.

However, I believe the third and final method was most appropriate. This method allowed the individual to take the interview sheet, think a bit about his answers, jot them down, and a short while later, we would meet and review portions of the interview to clear up and fill in any unsure issues. This method allowed the individuals to answer to the best of their understanding without me leading or influencing their answers. When we did meet, it was in a more informal non-working type setting. Eye contact could be maintained, autonomy of the respondent was assured, and I could actually give my undivided attention while the men were speaking. In our second meeting, we could sit in a bar, their homes, etc., and rehash the interview on a peer-friend basis, rather than in informant-reporter roles (Polsky, 1969: 119)\*

Given the special nature of this study, many of the respondents (resident) who did not know me personally would initially be quite apprehensive when answering questions relating to "things about the house which might bum you out or be troublesome to you." They were initially cautious because they did not know if I was who I said I was, doing what I said I did. Unfortunately, not many ex-cons come out of prison and "succeed" enough to attain a university degree, and still maintain contact or the desire to sustain good relations with their ex-convict peers.

\*On one occasion, my respondent insisted on smoking dope and partying during a taped interview; as a result we both got away with the aid of some scotch and other stimulants. While replaying the tape, not much was accomplished and much was missed. However, using the 3rd interview format, the respondent could be high or a little mellow because only minor points would need elaboration.

Many "successes" do not maintain good rapport with other cons because they try to hide their past and to forfeit persons associated with it. Secondly, some "doing well" ex-cons feel that if they maintain social contacts with, shall I say "practicing criminals," they could themselves become involved or suspected and hassled by authorities, who assume they are once again involved in criminal activities. The interview sheet in their possession, they could make inquiries as to my identity. Fortunately, I am well known and have contacts of relatives and peers in this circle. On several occasions, respondents returned answer sheets directly to my home. The tension would disappear, we would start to rap about the joint, and people doing time, who in many cases were doing time when I was. We'd have a few drinks at my house, fill in some blank spaces, and go out to a few bars. This is why the interviews and data collection had to be flexible and open-ended (very non-traditional), but of course, systematic. Each topic covered each man, but naturally, the data collection could not be held to a strict order because of the variation of the individuals I studied.\*\* Even though I have several "in's;

\*This was particularly helpful for residents who were initially living in other cities before their parole. I would also show them spots in town frequented by other cons - who would verify my "solidarity," thus in many cases, we would part on good terms and they would rap to others about my progress and interest.

\*\* Many cons doing long time in isolation or maximum security institutions are very reluctant to talk with anyone about administrative operations. Also, undesirables feel that their hidden secrets might reach the other residents in the CRCs and their hassles start over again, e.g., the beatings, thefts and etc.

within this circle of people, many residents would take an interview sheet with them, get a full parole and/or move in with women and start back in their old track, have no time for helping anyone but themselves. Of course, I understand their change of attitude, being allowed virtually no freedom of choice for years, when the opportunity arose, they simply chose to forget as much about the past as possible, and chose not to assist me.

However, even with these sometimes very discouraging problems which I encountered, the data collecting portion was the most rewarding for me. I was reunited with many persons I had not seen for many years (they were serving time in prison and I was doing my time at the machine, (university)). However, I was concerned about the small number of persons who succeeded after the prison experience. They were few and far between.\* Incidentally, this contention was not reinforced by the systematic structure of my interviews, it came instead from two very unofficial questions I asked my main respondents upon completion of the interviews. On many occasions as aforementioned, I would buy a few ales for the guys because many of them lacked the funds to frequent the local taverns and either in the bars or on the way back to the half-way house I would simply ask: "Do you feel better equipped to survive now that you have been through the prison (been retrained or whatever) and are living at

the CRC, than before you went in? As a man, do you think spending time in the joint and subsequently in a CRC has made you think differently about yourself? Do you think others see you differently than before you went in? Sometimes I phrased the questions differently but the content was the same. I found the answers to be truly perceptive, non-systematic but nevertheless, personal, burning issues that troubled many of the respondents. Their answers reflected undoubtedly (these answers will be presented in the data findings and conclusion in more detail) the truth of researcher/respondent intimidation.

During my systematic interviews, my topics of concentration were largely of a biographical nature. Of the residents in the CRCs, I inquired about their age, marital status, education, type of crime sentence and length of time in the CRC. I felt that this data might in some way correspond with why some inmates have troublesome situations in the house. For example, younger offenders may be high spirited and/or rebellious, marital status might create certain problems with spouses. A resident's educational background might affect problems with employment, or an individual's occupation may create problems due to availability. Some residents may have problem situations arise because of the nature of their crimes, e.g., rapes.

\* Of course, we have the exceptions, I could or would be considered one, but could or should one really be looked upon as a probability that anyone can do it. Could we gauge success from a handful of fortunates and blame failure as personal upon the thousands of prisoners in jail yearly?

In some cases, length of the sentence may affect personality or social stability, and lastly, the amount of time spent at the house might explain the number of troublesome situations one resident might encounter. I also felt that from the biographical data, I might receive some explanation for any difference in reactions to or consequences experienced due to troublesome situations.

In the remainder of the interview with the residents, I hoped to explore physical descriptions of, in some cases the institutional housing area and workplace. Then I attempted to discover if there was a physical characteristic about these settings which "bummed them out," which might be troublesome to the individual. Next, I simply asked what types of things (meaning actions or verbal outburst) might be viewed as troublesome for the resident within the institution. How would they react if accused of fucking-up (or acting out of the expectations of the administration)? How would administration counter their reactions (e.g. humanely, discerningly or have a set of lines to follow regardless of the circumstances)? Lastly, what were the consequences?

To test my assumption that CRC's are quite similar to the prison, because of the functional aspects and authoritarian structure, I then proceeded to ask identical questions pertaining to life within or working out of the CRC. If my assumptions are correct, the "pains of punishment" will be prevalent in the total institution, as indicated by

Sykes earlier. (G. Sykes, chapt. 3). It was my contention that an identical interview probing similar areas in the CRC would expose the fact that because of the similarities between total institutions and closed systems (CRCs), the reaction and/or consequences would be quite similar, e.g. further magnification of one or more of the "pains of punishment." This further magnification would lead to lessened personal control and regulation over the self, a process contrary to the normal maturing process.

Hopefully, this systematic approach answers questions about whether or not the already negative, low self-esteem of the prisoner is reinforced by the functional aspects of the total institution and whether or not the total institution perpetuates a regression of the maturing process and reduces or impairs the person's competence to handle his everyday life. In such a system the captive becomes dependent to a large extent upon his captors for rewards and sanctions, and if he complies, he is "assured" provision of his basic needs and hope of freedom.

Furthermore, if the "closed system" (CRC) is, in fact a sub-entity of the "total institution," minus only the primitive structural character of a prison, functioning in an identical fashion only employing updated sophisticated modes of operation, then the CRCs will in fact, enhance

this childlike, immature, dependent experience. This learned experience, I am sure, makes it virtually impossible for most inmates who have been exposed to both of these systems to return to society as responsible productive adults.\*

Therefore, I developed a similar questionnaire which explores identical areas of the man's personal daily experience.

This portion of the interview schedule I deem to be post CRC experience. In this section, I once again explore the physical character of the workplace and home area to see if any dissatisfaction exists. What types of things "bum out" the men, and why type of things may be problematic or troublesome to them? How do they react to accusations from authority figures, and of course to the consequences? This data examines whether similar problems arise in a closed system and a total institution. The data also reveal continuing dependency on others for lodging, instability of employment. I also believe that similar troublesome situations will arise towards persons of authority, e.g. police, landlords and employers.

A reason offered as an explanation for these problems may be irresponsibility, which I believe, is a trait learned from the foregoing systems. In all the inmate/resident data, I will examine the potential difficulties of the individual becoming totally self-reliant, lacking ability or wish to accept responsibility for his activities. Retaliation towards peer groups should appear similar to those in captivity (e.g.,

\* This may have something to do with the high 60% recidivism rate in Canada today. It would be the result, in part, not failure to learn or learning from other cons, but of learning how to survive in an authoritarian institution itself. Those who learn on the "inside" fail on the outside.

physical and verbal assaults), with the consequences of being returned to the total institution to begin this cycle once again. To illustrate this point in various prisons, inmates encounter troubles with other inmates because of their undesired status, e.g. rape, child molester or rat. This causes fights and sometimes recharge. Each time, the consequences is extended and time spent in the institution is increased. If, of course, conditions are similar in the CRC, this may account for the shocking recidivism rate of over 60% (Director, Almost House).

The remaining data was gathered from various agents of social control, e.g. CRC staff and prison guards. Once again, in a very systematic manner, I undertook this endeavour. My inquiry dealt with exactly the same areas of exploration as did those with the inmate/resident (only from, of course, the administrative perspective). I asked guards and staff what they thought could be troublesome about the physical character of both the housing area and workplace. What other aspects of living under these circumstances could create troublesome situations for the men? What would their response or actions be, and what were generally the consequences?

The data collected in the interviews was used to examine whether similar problems exist and are experienced by those living in total institutions (prisons) and in closed systems (CRCs). It was also used to examine the growth of dependence (e.g., on lodging, etc). and the potential for increased or decreased employability. Of



interest is whether or not attitudes towards authority developed while an inmate or resident of an institution carry over and become problematic in dealing with other authority figures (police, landlords, employers) outside the institution. Of interest, are not only the types of "trouble" but how the ex-inmate/resident responds to such situations. To what extent is the response "learned" while in one or the other of the institutions and does it differ between types of institutions?

Overall, the data will be examined to identify the potential difficulties facing the individual's attempt to become a self reliant adult in society outside the penal institutions. Also of interest is how the individual relates to the peer group once out of the institutional setting. An important issue is whether or not behaviour learned in the institution (e.g. physical and verbal abuse to settle disputes) is carried over to the "freer" society and likely to result in reincarceration. It is one thing to argue the post-institution problems are a result of anger built up while incarcerated, it is another to argue that survival behaviour learned while "doing time" is itself a source of trouble when carried outside the institution. Standardization or, as Goffman suggests, "institutionalization" presupposes that efficiency is maintained by controlling and moving persons in large groups or batches. (Goffman, 1961: 6). To accomplish

this task, the mind must be fully resocialized to accept this loss of autonomy and individual choice. To help illustrate the threat of one losing his former identity, Bruno Bettelheim discusses the effects of institutionalized controls:

Men under guard stand in constant danger of losing their identification with normal definitions of an adult, and the imprisoned criminal finds his picture of himself as a self-determining individual being destroyed by the regime of custodians. (B. Bettelheim, 1947: 306).

What this implies is that the operational aspects of institutions demand, so as to ensure the smooth functioning of the institution, that employees adhere to a strict code of authoritarian control. This in no way is intended to suggest that the custodian per se are inhumane in their treatment towards inmates. What it does suggest is a flaw in the functional and operational aspects of most societal institutions. Authority and the need to exert unjust, sometimes inhuman, demands and expectations upon persons having endured a significant period of time in restrictive "extreme situations" will almost certainly create more problems for those living under this control. This, in turn, leaves those individuals (inmates/residents) bitter, unsure and dependent, which adds up to a "product of the system," ill-equipped in most cases to be able to gain or regain the status of a responsible adult. Hopefully, the data will allow me to distinguish between failure as a consequence of the structure and function of

the institution, and failure as a personal characteristic. Of course, the failure perpetrated on the inmate/resident will always manifest itself as a personal failure since that is where it is observed. Here we are examining the prison and CRC as sources or causes of this failure. Failure is a "product of the system" packaged in the form of individual human beings who have internalized this failure.

There is reason to believe that under the prevailing values of a capitalist society, this personal sense of failure is reinforced by the degree of material deprivation experienced by the inmate/resident during and after doing time. This may also explain why those convicted of "White Collar Crimes" are sent to more comfortable facilities. Recall the places to which Watergate and the Hamilton Bay Dredging convict were sent in Canada and the U.S.A. Gresham M. Sykes maintains:

"The failure is his failure in a world where control and possessions of the material environment are commonly taken as sure indicators of a man's worth... But impoverishment remains as one of the most bitter attacks on the individual's self image that our society has to offer, and the prisoner cannot ignore the implications of his straitened circumstances. Whatever the discomforts and irritations of the prisoners Spartan existence may be; he must carry the additional burden of social definitions which equate his material deprivation with personal inadequacy. (G.M. Sykes, 1958: 70).

To conclude this section, I was interested in exploring the extent to which individuals encountering problems within, and after departure from, total and closed institutions, encounter these problems as a direct result of the nature of the institutions themselves. Are the problems of a personal

nature in origin or do they constitute a "social issue" in Mills' terms, an issue which pivots around the operations of the prison and the CRC itself? Of course, of key concern here is the extent to which there is a real difference between the roles of prisons and the role of the CRC in promoting or reducing this "social issue." Thus, if the failure is within the institutions, what are the consequences of this failure on the individual and society, and what is implied about the structure, functions and future of the respective institutions, i.e., the prisons and more particularly, the CRCs?

## Data Findings

### Introduction

Initially, a researcher hopes that the content and structure of his interview schedules will generate information which (1) allows a test of the general hypothesis and, (2) sheds some light on the problem which generated the investigation in the first place. In terms of my own views, I felt that life within the CRCs paralleled in many ways life within prison. The purpose of this investigation is to test this proposition. Of course, the geographical location of CRCs within our communities essentially prohibits many structural similarities. However, a few built-in safeguards such as locked doors, alarms, institutional-like operations in dining rooms, and other common areas\* are quite similar and to be sure, affect the resident both psychologically and emotionally. The walls of the total institution appear to have been torn down in the CRC. To a large extent, the development of CRCs has the potential significance of reducing the emotional damage created by the physical character of total institutions. The question remains as to whether these effects are eliminated entirely.

To test and compare the structural aspects of the CRC to those of a total institution, I began by simply asking, "Could you generally describe the house (CRC) physically?"

\*In most CRCs, common areas are usually kitchen, dining rooms, washrooms, T.V. and recreational rooms.

Of my eighteen respondents, two could not answer and commented solely on life within total institutions because they have never been admitted to a CRC. The remaining sixteen respondents generally describe the physical character as follows:

Group A generally describe the CRCs (Almost House & Betcha Can't)\* as having X amount of washrooms, Y number of bedrooms and in general, their descriptions were similar to that given earlier. There were six respondents who viewed the houses as homelike structures - clean, acceptable in outward appearance, and generally satisfactory to normal life within a community.

However, six other respondents viewed their houses as being quite similar to rooming houses, which transient or unattached persons may view as a temporary home, until their circumstances are changed. One respondent, Capt. Marvel, described Almost House(s) in the following manner:

"Two large rooming house types, approx. 10 bedrooms in each house. Some singles, many doubles, half triples and 4 rooms sleep, 4-5 guys ...Identical structures giving one

\*These two respondent, Pops and the Head did not live in a CRC, but because of the extensive time spent in institutions and their almost insistent willingness to take part in my study, I felt that they could be quite helpful and included them in this study.

\*\* Almost House(s) in Hamilton and Betcha Can't in Toronto differ considerably so to clarify the respondents describe the particular organizations they were involved with, basically as they saw them, which was free of stigmatizations, e.g. rooming houses, farm annex.

the impression of an organization that owns both houses."

(C. Marvel, Nov, 1978).

However, the remaining four respondents viewed these houses as Mini institutions or farm annex's.\* This contention is supported by the following quote from Yogi illustrating that he views the house in a different manner:

"it has the characteristics of a jail, not with bars but a farm annex, a regulating house-institutional kitchen, common rooms for eating, T.V. watching room, a pay phone. Room numbers and names on doors, like I was going to forget where I lived." (Yogi, Dec., 1978).

What these findings tend to indicate is that 40% of the residents of the CRCs studied, view the CRC in a somewhat home-like manner, in the sense that it is community-based and gives the residents some of the amenities of a home, formerly taken away because of the prison experience. These amenities may be in the form of freedom of movement within the entire house, or a sense of belonging, as the Dick points out: "In your home you allow persons to go anywhere they want, it gives you a sense of belonging to something if you have some say."

However, my findings also show that 40% of the respondents see the physical structure in an impersonal fashion, similar to most rooming house settings. Most of the respondents viewing the CRC in this fashion are 25 years of age and over. Many

\* Mini institutions, farm annex's are usually attached to a larger enclosed institution. Trustee inmates are transferred to one of those institutions as their sentence draws near an end or application for parole has been accepted. These institutions are farm-like in appearance. Crops are grown and harvested by the inmates. There are no walls, bars or gun towers. Inmates are free to roam outside until 10 P.M. when the doors are locked for the evening. Dining is cafeteria type, four per setting. Guards wear no uniforms.

have travelled extensively or have been forced to live in rooming house conditions because of previous release from prison and separations from home and family. Thus, rooming houses do not have positive associations for these men. They are impersonal in the sense that the men bring nothing with them when they enter, and likely take nothing with them when they leave\*. It is also implied in most rooming house settings that roomers do not have the freedom of the house. You live in one room, in many cases guests are not allowed in rooms overnight and there are usually common areas for all roomers, e.g. kitchen, bathrooms. Under certain conditions meals will also be provided; however, meals are on a regulated basis, whereby, if dinner is served from 5 p.m. - 6 p.m., and you come in after that, you go hungry. Usually, these rooming houses have a pay phone in the hallway, near which will be an events board to post messages, articles for sale, house rules and fire regulations (personal experience, 1967).

This in part, suggest that CRCs do not provide a homelike atmosphere\*\* in which the inmates are allowed to make the gradual transition from a total institutional setting back into

\* In all rooming houses, all of your furnishings are provided, bed, bedding, towels, etc. You use others' furnishings and they stay when you leave.

\*\* See introduction/literature review for purposes of CRC, Ontario.



the community. It is also in part, a reminder of the impersonal life encountered within the total institution, in which the institution provides one's basics - clean bedding and meals, etc.

The remaining 20% of my respondents described the physical characteristics of the CRC as institutional in appearance. These findings indicate that these respondents have been subjected to various forms of institutions with a quite similar character to that of the CRC, or the effects of life within a total setting, have been damaging enough to these respondents, that the general layout of any organizational structure will have an institutional-like character. These findings show that the physical character of the CRCs studied, has not been effective in alleviating the damaging physical nature of the prison, even though located in the community.

### Conclusion

From my sample and the illustration offered, I have shown (I believe) that the physical character of the CRCs studied, could have various effects upon their residents. Forty per cent view the physical character of the CRC as a homelike setting, with no similarities or stigmatizations, which they could associate with an institution. These 40% I believe, might not view the CRC (physical character) as damaging and as restrictive as the prison. However, the other 40% view the CRCs in an impersonal fashion, a place to visit in passing, a rooming house atmosphere where one is

not free to entertain, be tardy at mealtime, for whatever reason, or alter from the general rules of operation in any way. These respondents do have their basic necessities provided. The style is similar to that of prison life, whereby laundry is done systematically, meals are prepared for a group, and the common areas are for the use of all. These respondents view the CRC in a transient manner. They are and will remain dependent upon the administration for their daily needs, and more than likely do not take pride in the upkeep of the establishment, with its impersonal nature, as illustrated once again by the Dick: "The house wasn't the type of place I was proud of or the type of place that I really wanted to bring my friends to. It was more of a jail atmosphere than a home, ie, presence of staff acting like guards, numbers on rooms, communal washrooms, etc." These respondents also might have a sense of stigmatization resulting from the physical character of the houses and organizational implication of similar structures.

The remaining 20% feel that the CRCs are duplications of the prison setting, complete with its impersonal nature, institutional-like dining and sleeping quarters, and the constant reminder of numbers associated with names perpetrated in total institutions.\*

\* In many total institutions, Kingston, Collins Bay, it is a practise to post your cell number, inmate number, inmate name in slot or beside door. Also included on these cards is usually the amount of time this person has been sentenced to, eg. Cell 18-Jones-#5877-10yrs.

To this 20% of my sample, the entire physical character of the CRC could breed discontent, which will strongly impede "correctional" efforts at rehabilitation. The physical nature of these houses may not encourage pride, and respect for belongings of theirs or others. They harbour a paranoid sense of stigmatization, which could heighten one's feelings of being inadequate, a failure, and social outcast.

From these findings, it is clear to see that the transition from a total institution to a closed institution in a community setting removes many of the pains of punishment illustrated by Gresham M. Sykes, cited in the literature review earlier (G. Sykes, 1958: 63). Forty per cent of my respondents have gained a sense of "freedom" or freer than within the confines of a prison. The other forty per cent still sustain the impersonal feelings similar to those created within the prison setting. Also to some extent, they are restricted to certain areas and feel transient in nature. This transient feeling could be associated to a sense of low personal esteem, which in fact, could reinforce a part of the prison experience. The remaining twenty per cent feel that they are in another institution, an appendage if you like the total institution, from which they were supposedly released. For this twenty per cent, the physical character of the institution remains and is quite constant while living in the CRC setting. I believe a further investigation of the responses received may help to sharply illustrate my main contention, which is, because of the

functional aspects of a "closed system" (CRC) it is quite similar in nature to the "total institution". I will explore this contention by discovering what is troublesome to, or for the residents of CRCs in the physical composition and also what constitutes trouble for the resident because of the functional aspects of the CRCs, and the response to trouble on behalf of the CRC staff.

## Troublesome Aspects of Prisons (Physical)

### Introduction

Given this study is oriented heavily towards life within a "closed system" (CRC), I intend not to deal indepth with troubles and issues most common in the total institution (prison). I will briefly discuss similarities and differences experienced by the inmates in both systems. I will be able to compare various aspects of the prison to the CRC because my interview schedule was devised so that I might systematically investigate the concept of trouble in the prison as well as in the CRC (see interviews in appendix). The lines of questioning were quite similar in both systems.

Firstly, I inquired as to what of the physical character of prisons might be troublesome to the inmates. Secondly, I wanted to explore just what constituted a fuck-up to an inmate in his living area or cell block. How did they react to these accusations by administration, and lastly, what were the consequences? I believe that if I was concerning myself chiefly with the effect of life within the prison system, this area of my investigation would have been more thorough. However, I have used the prison setting mainly in analagous sense, given that the prison is instrumental via "cultural shock", and largely responsible for the initial "deculturization" of the inmate from life on the outside.

The following statement by Erving Goffman is somewhat illustrative of this issue:

"Upon entrance he is immediately stripped of the support provided by these arrangements. In accurate language of some of our oldest total institutions, he begins a series of abasements, degradations, humiliations and profanations of self. His self is systematically, and often unintentionally mortified. He begins some radical shifts in his moral career, a career composed of progressive changes that occur in the beliefs that he has concerning himself and significant others". (Goffman, 1961: 4).

The prison culture is learned quite rapidly by the inmates, and socialization within the walls may be so complete that an inmate may be "decultured" from the values and sanctions of the outside world so completely that when released may encounter quite some difficulty readapting to the norms of the outside world. Goffman once again suggests why this may happen:

"If cultural change does occur, it has to do perhaps with the removal of certain behavior opportunities and with the failure to keep pace with recent social changes on the outside. Thus, if the inmates stay is long, what has been called "deculturation" may occur, that is, an "untraining" which renders him temporarily incapable of managing certain features of daily life on the outside, if and when he gets back to it". (Goffman, 1961: 13).

Life within any total institution would quite likely be foreign to many of us. Given that many of us have never been in one (excluding the author), and assuming we have internalized our socialization process to the degree that we abide by many of the moral values and expectations of our given society, we also rely quite heavily upon the security and sanction our society has to offer. One might question

what happens to those persons who no longer live under this type of rule? What new expectations and prescribed lifestyle do they now live? How and what are the values, sanctions, and rewards? And how must one live to guarantee his personal security?

As aforementioned, persons committed to one kind of a total institution or another, have been placed there because to abide by some of the laws or expectations of their given society has for some reason proven to be too difficult. We might claim that these persons have what I will term "socialization defects". By claiming that someone or something is defected gives probable cause to believe that repairs can be made. General Motors or Sony Electronics often give warranties so that defective products may be returned to the factory and repaired. I believe inmates of most total institutions have been returned to the "factory" (prison) to have their attitudes "corrected". This correction is attempted by re-socialization, practically to the painful, docile and obedient state of a child. To attain from "adults" the mental status of a child, most personality and character must be stripped. Stanley Elkins, speaking about the institution of slavery, believes that the introduction to the institution (system) and the adjustment to absolute power is somewhat responsible for this regression of the maturation process:

"It was achieved partly by the shock experience inherent in the very mode of procurement but more specifically by the type of authority -

system to which they were introduced and to which they had to adjust for physical and psychic survival. The new adjustment to absolute power in a closed system, infantilization and detachment was so complete, cultural sanctions for behavior and personality remained for the descendants of the first generation". (Elkins, 1959: 88)

My concern here with prisons is, will a return to a childlike state be detrimental to an adult if and when he returns to the outside world, and is expected to once again, act as a responsible adult? Bruno Bettelheim believes that for some it may be quite difficult, which is quite evident in the following statement:

"Old prisoners seemed mainly concerned with the problem of how to live well within the camp. Once they had reached this attitude, everything to them even the worst atrocity, was real to them. No longer was there a split between one to whom things happened and one who observed them. When they reached this stage, the prisoners were afraid of returning to the outer world. Moreover, they then hardly believed they would ever return to it. They seemed aware that they had adapted themselves to life in the camp and that this process was co-existent with a basic change in their personality". (B Bettelheim, 1947: 303).

Hopefully, by exploring the concept of trouble in the prison setting, the inmates reaction and the consequences levied by administrators, we may be able to test this hypothesis.

#### Troublesome Aspects: re, Physical Character of Prisons

In this section of my study, all eighteen of my ex-inmate respondents volunteered to comment on life within the prison setting. Initially, I had hoped to interview two ex-guards and one guard presently employed by the ministry. Unfortunately, the nature of my study offended the female



guard presently employed in a local detention centre in Toronto. It was later revealed that the offensive nature of my inquiry was within the wording of my interview schedule in which I referred to her as a "guard" rather than a "correction officer" (see appendix interview). So commenting on the prison aspect, I have a total of twenty persons in this sample.

### Sample

From my data, the four main complaints about the physical character of a total institution were, (1) steel bars, (2) locks, (3) cell furnishings and colours and, (4) high walls and fences and gun towers.

### Steel Bars and Doors

All of my respondents (ex-inmates) stated that the steel bars were quite troublesome to them. Some of the reasons given were, "you feel like an animal" or "bars imply that something dangerous has to be locked up to protect the rest of society" and "I'm not an animal; in jail you sense how animals in the zoo feel". Pops, a somewhat elderly ex-con, related that the "closeness" created by cell doors was disturbing and degrading: "Cells create a 'closedness', we have no privacy, everyone packed into one area. It gives you a somewhat inferior feeling like animals". (Pops, Dec. 1978). Super Cop, a former guard of a local prison claims: "Bars and walls tend to make inmates feel hemmed in, inhibits and magnifies the loss of free movement". (Super Cop, Feb./79)

These bars and doors were used as a dual function, one to create a "closeness" which restricted movement, and its openness also gives the occupant little or no privacy. Inmates may not even engage in masturbation without detection and ridicule from guards and harrassment from other inmates.

### Locks

The issue of locks was extremely troublesome to many inmates (ten respondents). It was revealed that in some prisons, cells are operated automatically. This automation was disturbing to the inmate because "it would wake you up if you're sleeping" and "distort radio stations". The older prisons (which were all manually operated) would always cause the guards to rattle keys at all hours of the night and to bang them on the bars to get an inmate's attention. As usual the Dick had quite an illustrative comment on this issue: "Some guys don't like the automatic locks on doors, me, I prefer them over the old kind. I think they changed them before one of their pigs got killed and got his hook\* shoved up his fucking ass". (Dick, May 1979). Both guards interviewed also felt that locks could be annoying especially during shift changes at late hours of the night.

\* Hook is a jail term for old long keys.

### Cell Furnishings and Colours

Fifteen of my eighteen ex-inmate respondents saw the cell furnishings and colours as troublesome. Some of the reasons offered for their discontent were that every cell had identical furnishings, toilets were in immediate view even while eating. All furnishings belong to the joint\*, the inmate was allowed only one 12" x 18" cork bulletin board on which he could post personal belongings, eg, pictures of family and kids. All cells and corridors were painted either institutional gray or green. The Head, a junkie ex-con, claimed that a disturbing factor was:

"It bugged me to walk into someone's cell and he'd be eating a peanut butter sandwich and be sitting on the shitter\*\* too.  
(Head, March/79).

The two ex-guards did not view the cell furnishings and colours to be problematic enough to warrant immediate concern. It appeared that the cell furnishings and colours added to much of the routine of institutional life.

### High Walls and Barbed Fences and Gun Towers

The last troublesome character of major concern, at least to fourteen of my eighteen respondents and both ex-guards, was the issue of high stone walls and barbed fences with gun towers. Some of the reasons voiced were: "walls restrict your view of the outside and barb-wired fences

\* Joint - con name for prison or jail.

\*\* Shitter - con term for toilet.

make you feel like Steve McQueen in the Great Escape".

Captain Marvel, as his name might suggest, speculated on why the high fences were barbed and guarded:

"I think they place them there as a challenge, check this out, it would be quite a feat to scale that wall, like Steve McQueen in the Great Escape, but with the barbed wire and guns, one of the two is sure to get ya (ha ha). It's like they're saying, we bet you can't make it sucker".  
(Capt. Marvel, March 6/79).

Rocky claims the walls being so high keeps him there, escape is not even possible with one's imagination:

"I was glad they moved me to the third tier from the first. You can't even day dream if you can't visualize something other than this prison. On the third tier, I escaped every night, sometimes on a boat crusing by or to the hamburg joint down the road." (Rocky, Feb. 6/79).

Hutch, an ex-guard, felt that the disturbing thing about the wall is the gun towers and illustrates it with this statement:

"I would get the shakes if everytime I went within 10 feet of the wall, the man came out and lowered his 303 at me. Do you know the hole those things make in animals, never mind humans".  
(Hutch, Nov. 2/78).

### Conclusion

It is quite evident that the physical character of a total institution can be and is quite troublesome to the inmates. The steel bars both create a sense of "closeness" because of the restriction of movement, and an "openness" because of the visual access they allow any passerby of the cell and the person occupying it. The bars tend to intimidate and humiliate the prisoners. The prisoner would tend to generate a low sense of personal worth particularly if he

acquires a sense of a caged animal because of the physical character of bars and cages (cells). Secondly, locks and the need for an authority figure to operate them either manually or automatically would tend to create hostilities, because of the personal restrictions implied by locking one in, and towards the guard who possibly from the monotony of prison life may take sport in detaining an inmate longer than necessary, or disturbing the inmate by loud or offensive mannerism.

Cell furnishings and drab institutional colours once again add to the impersonal atmosphere of life within prisons. The colours and furnishings enhance the sense of loss of personal autonomy. In this type of environment where everyone has the same, does the same and is essentially the same, personal creativity and responsibility are not to be encouraged. I believe most illustrative of a prisoner's dislike for institutional colours and furnishings are the hundreds of thousands of dollars damage to institutional furnishings and structure during the riots of 1971-1976, (personal experience Kingston, April 1971, knowledge of Millhaven and B.C. Penitentiary). Lastly, and I believe most importantly, was the issue of the high walls, barbed fences and armed gun towers. Many of my respondents were Federal prisoners having served time in a penitentiary. All penitentiaries have twenty-five ft. high and one foot thick concrete walls, or towering barbed fences. There are also four armed gun towers. As earlier mentioned, these walls and fences magnify

one's captivity. This is illustrative of maximum deprivation of liberty and freedom of movement. This further illustrates to the inmate somewhat of a rejection by society and the withdrawal of sanctions and securities. The walls seem impregnable even with one's imagination, further suggesting that the inmate's world begins and ends at the perimeters of the walls. The armed guards once again give the inmates an inferior attitude, and their presence could very well suggest to the inmates that all of their person is under the control and will of the administration, and non-conformity could very well end a life. From the author's point of view and that of my respondents, the physical character of the prison does not seem conducive to the initiation of "positive" change.

Troublesome Nature of Prison  
re: Functional/Operational Aspect

Fuck-Ups

As earlier mentioned, I use the vernacular fuck-ups because both administration and inmates can openly relate to the full implication of this term. More conventional writers of course, will have varying terminologies which best suit their various studies, but I believe the true meaning of the term fuck-ups lies within the realm of trouble for those accused of fucking-up. Erving Goffman, in his book, Asylums, tactfully coins "trouble" as a form of "messing up". The terms we use vary slightly, but I believe the meaning is similar. I will use his definition as illustrative to my understanding of a traditional fuck-up:

Furthermore, the staff and inmates will be clearly aware of what in mental hospitals, prisons, and barracks, is called "messing up". Messing up involves a complex process of engaging in forbidden activity (including an effort of escape), getting caught and receiving something like full punishment. There is usually an alteration in privilege status, categorized by a phrase such as "getting busted". Typical infractions involved in messing up are: fights, drunkenness, attempted suicide, failure at examinations, gambling, insubordination, homosexuality, improper leave taking, and participation in collective riots. Although these infractions are typically ascribed to the offender's cussedness, villainy or "sickness", they do, in fact, constitute a vocabulary of institutionalized actions, but a limited one so that the same messing

up may occur for quite different reasons. Inmates and staff may tacitly agree, for example, that a given messing up is a way for inmates to show resentment against a situation felt to be unjust in terms of the informal agreement between staff and inmates, or a way of postponing release without having to admit to one's fellow inmates that one does not really want to go. Whatever the meaning imputed to them, messing up have some important social functions for the institution. They tend to limit rigidities which would occur were seniority the only means of mobility in the privilege system; further demotion through messing up brings old time inmates into contact with new inmates in unprivileged positions, assuring a flow of information concerning the system and people in it. (Goffman, 1961: 53-4).

### Introduction

It is quite evident that the punitive nature of prisons is due in a large part to their physical characteristics. The structural confines of the institution introduce inmates to a setting which is foreign to most of them. This gross change facilitates the correcting of the traditional lifestyle and attitudes of the offender. However, the physical character of the prison is not the only instrument used by administrators to affect change. A much more effective and damaging aspect of the penal system has to do with the functioning or operational nature of the prison per se. The introduction to life within a total institution could quite conceivably evoke immediate change and conformity, but the desired ideal of penal reform is to have a long term effect upon the inmates, one that remains even after they have left the physical structure. This long range effect is attained through the functional/operational aspects of the prison



system. Introduction to a total institutional system temporarily shocks persons into conformity. Although this temporary shock is instrumental in beginning long term behavior changes, its effects are bolstered by the constant absolute power of authority under which inmates must live. They eventually begin to internalize the will of their captors and the lifestyle necessary to survive within institutional confines, some so much so that they find it difficult on the outside. In all total institutions, all of the basic needs of the inmates are provided by administration. The cost to the inmate for these provisions being supplied is that of absolute conformity and docile obedience. I believe that to demand dependant docility status from adults will more than likely affect their personality and attitude and this effect will become evident once they are returned to the "outside" world. As aforementioned, the physical character of the prison setting warrants immediate credit for this initial change of character and attitude of many inmates, but I believe that the constant compulsion implied by a system of absolute control will be quite effective in long range "changes" in the personalities of the inmates. Using the institution of slavery, S. Elkins indicates that the closed character of an institution in itself is conducive to evoke these changes in persons living under an absolute rule:

It will be assumed that there were elements in the very structure of the plantation system- its "closed" character - that could sustain infantilism as a normal feature of behavior.

These elements having less to do with "cruelty" per se than simply with the sanction of authority, were effective and pervasive enough to require that such infantilism be characterized as something much more basic than mere "accommodation". It will be assumed that the sanctions of the system were in themselves sufficient to produce a recognizable personality type. (S. Elkins, 1959: 83).

Also illustrative of why inmates of total institutions must change their attitudes to "accommodate" the power of authority or what Elkins deems maybe the development of "infantilism" personality type, E. Goffman offers the following comment:

"In many of these total institutions the new impatient finds himself dearly stripped of many of his accustomed affirmations, satisfactions, and defences, and is subject to a rather full set of mortifying experiences; restriction of movement, communal living, diffused authority of a whole echelon of people." (Goffman, 1961: 22).

I will explore this contention of the new character learned by the inmate as a means of "making out" or serving "good time" in the words of administration, by looking at trouble or fuck-ups by the inmates in the prison setting.\* Hopefully, this investigation will reveal some of the functional/operational characteristics of the prison. This may be attained by looking at issues which are troublesome to inmates, administration response, inmate's reaction and the consequences.

\* Good time is an institutional term employed by cons and administrators which reflects that if an inmate is serving good time they are complying with administration and the cons code of ethics of a right guy "solid". This assures early release and rewards offered by the institution.

### Fuck-Ups

As earlier described, inmates either live in cell blocks or dormitories. In these areas the authority figure will be the turn-key or spaceship crew, responsible to the corporal of that particular block or dorm, or the L.U.O.\*. Inmates generally spend fifteen to eighteen hours per day in their living area (personal experience & interviews). Since the inmates spend much of their day in this area, there is a need for tighter social controls and security which tends to be quite problematic for most inmates. The fuck-ups most often voiced by my eighteen inmate respondents and two guards were: (1) disrespect for authority, (2) fighting, (3) out of bounds, (4) suspicion/possession of contraband and lastly, damaging institutional property. A closer look at each of these issues may indicate why these fuck-ups occurred.

### Disrespect for Authority

Fifteen of the eighteen inmates and both ex-guards all claimed that disrespect for authority would be troublesome for the offender. In some institutions, disrespect for authority could be, swearing at guards, disobeying an order, verbal confrontation, or defending oneself against wrongly directed allegations, implying that the authority figure is

\* Turn-key, the guard that simply locks and unlocks doors. Space ship crew, guards who simply unlock doors only, all are operated automatically from a central location in each block - termed spaceship. L.U.O., Living Unit Officer, the same as a corporal or someone who the spaceship crew is responsible to.

a liar. Sticks claims that suggestive facial expressions are at times, considered disrespectful:

"In some joints, disrespect for the man can be just about anything, if they don't like you. In Guelph, in the 60's, some forms of disrespect were suspicion of suspicion, dumb insolence and other nonsense reasons. Like I was charged with suspicion of suspicion, and sentenced on the grounds of disrespect. This pig was a fuck-in-the-ass, he really was. I had a bad day and paraded right past the man and forgot my mail. He comes to my cell, throws my mail at me and says, this ain't no delivery service, I hope the blue one is a Dear John.\* I jumps up, really hot, but I kept my cool and just stared him down. He charged me because he suspected that I wanted to scream obscenities or hit him, too much eh!" (Sticks, April, 1979).

Hutch, an ex-guard, claims that disrespect towards guards challenges their position and authority: "Almost anything which disobeys an order, indicates disrespect for an officer. We have a job to do; if an inmate is wise he won't make no waves because if we're put on a spot, we'll place him in a worse situation." (Hutch, Nov. 2/78).

### Discussion

From the data collected on this issue, it appears that the inmates feel that the charge of disrespect is nonsensical and used mostly as a personal vendetta by the guards towards specific inmates. The guards on the other hand, see the charge as necessary to maintain social control and order of their particular station. This suggests that

\* Dear John - a letter from home, wife or girlfriend, saying goodbye meaning since you've been gone, someone else has taken over your duties.

a division between the authority and inmate must be assured. Hostilities might arise because the inmate might feel as though he must save face because of the possible atrocity of the situation, which clashes with the guards' intention of doing the same thing. This may cause the "split" between the two groups, of which Goffman speaks:

In total institutions, there is a basic split between a large managed group, conveniently called inmates and a small supervisory staff. Each grouping tends to conceive of the other in terms of narrow hostile stereotypes, staff often seeing inmates as bitter, secretive, and untrustworthy, while inmates often see the staff as condescending, high-handed and mean. Staff tends to feel superior and righteous; inmates tend in some ways at least, to feel inferior, weak, blemeworthy and guilty.  
(Goffman, 1961: 7).

#### Possession/Suspicion of Contra-band

Given that there exists an element of distrust ascribed virtually by the roles and expectations of both the managed group and the administration group, the inmates tend to develop a sub-culture with a particular mode of operation (Irwin & Cressy, 1964: 65). Within the prisoner's sub-culture, there is a desire amongst most inmates to attain some of the material goods they became familiar with on the outside. The prison administration have labelled these goods contraband. Contraband may be any article not provided or permitted in the institution. Some forms of contraband are alcohol, drugs, pornographic literature and magazines, cheaters\*, money and extra gum or chocolate bars. If caught with these articles in his possession, the inmate would be

charged with possession of contraband. In the case of dope and alcohol, suspicion by a guard that an inmate is under the influence may lead to additional institution or street charges.\*\* Detection of contraband may occur via informers, or unscheduled cell and personal searches. This fact is easily illustrated by the following statement from Goffman:

The inmate himself may be frisked and searched to the extent often reported in the literature of a rectal examination. Later in his stay, he may be required to undergo searchings of person and of his sleeping quarters either routinely or when trouble arises. In all cases it is the searcher as well as the search that penetrates the private reserve of the individual and violates the territory of his self. (Goffman, 1961: 28-9).

When I asked Stormy if he had ever fucked-up, he responded in the following manner:

"We had regular searches of yourself and your cells. Often all of your goodies would be gone, eg. tailored clothes, joint issues, coffee, tea, sugar. It bummed me out; they got my 'cheater' and it took so long to get the fucking thing. It's hard going back to warm water from your tap after boiling it for a while. (Stormy, Jan. 17/79).

\* Cheaters are electronic devices made up from old appliance cords wrapped around bare metal. Once plugged in the element heats up, placed in a large container with water will cause the water to boil. By adding instant coffee or tea, the inmate may have built up three contraband charges, (1) possession of the cheater, (2) possessing coffee or tea (joint issue) and (3) stealing from the kitchen.

\*\* If caught with dope or dangerous weapons, or charged with wounding a guard or inmate, the offender may be transferred to an outside court for additional sentencing by societies' laws. They are then returned and re-charged.

One ex-guard, Dumb-dumb (con monologue) commenting on the need for searches and confiscation of contraband claims:

"We have to search regularly for contraband, some guys are merchants and are hustling most of the inmates (causing fights); others are dangerously stupid - like cheaters you can electricute yourself or burn down the whole fucking joint."  
(D. D., Feb. 3, 1979).

### Discussion

It seems quite evident that the inmates tend to see the routine of searches for contraband as nothing more than non-sensical activities, generally characteristic of most total institutions. Searches and confiscations tend to further illustrate the omnipotent power of the captors and their efforts to keep the inmates out of touch with the "outside" and some of its sanctions. From the guard's standpoint, confiscations and searches are viewed as a safeguard. By eliminating contraband you eliminate envy-desire and possible physical violence. Equipment is viewed as dangerous to the inmates and the institution "protects" the inmates from their own ignorance towards modern technology.

The inmates tend to be subjected to deprivations of various sorts. A loss of material goods further destroys the inmate's feelings of self worth. Maintaining a Spartan existence reinforces his sense of negative self-worth. I believe that one would be inclined to view this continued deprivation of material goods in a similar vein to Sykes:

The failure is his failure in a world where control and possession of the material environment are commonly taken as sure indicators of a man's worth...But impoverishment remains as one of the most bitter attacks on the individuals' self-image that our society has to offer and the prisoner cannot ignore the implications of his strained circumstances. Whatever the discomforts and irritations of the prisoners, Spartan existence may be. He must carry the additional burden of social definitions which equate his material deprivation with personal inadequacy. (Sykes, 1958: 70)

### Fighting

All of my respondents, eighteen inmates and both ex-guards, expressed that any physical confrontations with other cons or guards immediately constitutes a serious fuck-up. Some of the reasons offered for these confrontations are: "the guy is a fucking rat", "he came on to me, no goof is putting the arm on me",\* "sometimes we just punch out those in PC if we're feeling ornery anyway". G. Hays, a middle aged inmate, states that sometimes you have to become violent as a way of sustaining your status as a solid con:\*\* "During the riot in 71, everyone who had any sense carried a bar (off a cell), it would be like the old west, everyone had their gun. I barred the odd punk, sometimes out of

\* on the arm, this is a con term for being muscled or bullied out of whatever, your desserts, money, tobacco, or your ass.

\*\* Solid con - is the inmate's right guy, an inmate who stands behind the actions of inmates during riots, etc. Administration has the power but a solid con supports inmate ideals, regardless of the consequences. Many inmates prefer being solid, out of fear of what happens to undesirables.



anger, but mostly because if you weren't hitting, you were getting hit". (Gabby, Oct. 1978).

Hutch, an ex-guard, feels that the inmate code implies that if you're not a right guy, you're a wrong one. He claims you may become wrong in the following fashion:

"Any form of aggressiveness towards other inmates eg. rats, homos is a fuck-up. Undesirables are often the focus of assaults. Ratting out or becoming an undesirable will indicate a fuck-up. Not from us but from his own, and that's trouble for us. Of course, we have the young-bloods trying to get known, they fight because of anything.\* In prison you're in danger from attacks for having too much (merchant), too little (a goof), saying too much (a punk or rat), or by not saying enough, which could imply that you have no parts and should be challenged. (Hutch, Nov. 2/78).

It appears that inmate assaults are common for various reasons, however, to assault a guard is a different issue entirely as Officer Dumb-dumb (con name) tends to illustrate:

"If a guard is assaulted, the inmate has definitely fucked-up. If he hits another con, he loses some copper\*\* and is thrown in the hole. If he hit a guard, we have what is known as the "goon squad". These are usually the bigger oldtimers and they have been known to rough up an inmate. It would be like a cop-killer, when he's caught some of the policeman's friends are angry". (D. Dumb, Feb. 3/79).

\* Youngblood - this term is given to young more rowdy inmates, these young rebels are the hard core who adhere mostly to the inmate confidence code; fighting anyone at anytime for the slightest infraction is a must.

\*\* Copper - good time remission secured for good behaviour.

## Discussion

It would appear that physical violence is a type of emotional outcry. Inmates being forced to live in close proximity with a whole array of others from diverse backgrounds, living under a totalitarian rule, subjected to various deprivations and degradations, may at some point become hostile. This coupled with the pressures of family and loved ones on the outside may create extreme tensions for the inmate. These tensions once peaked, may cause the individual to become violent. These tensions are enhanced by the monotony, routine, peer and administrative expectations of the man.

Inmates might attack other inmates as aforementioned for various reasons. Although "undesirable" inmates are prime targets because of their morally appalling character which earned them their undesired status, they will not be the sole objects of attack. Lack of material goods might cause envy and cause others to become resentful towards others. Guards, because of the nature of their duties and/or possibly treatment towards specific inmates, quite often are attacked. Many of these attacks result in serious injury and in some cases, death (personal experience).

## Out of Bounds

All total institutions, because of their restrictive nature, will have areas in which inmates are not allowed.

Some of these areas are: within ten feet of the wall and gun towers, other workshops than your own, central control areas and other inmate's cells. J. Bowery, a younger con, illustrates this restrictiveness somewhat:

You're like a caged animal, your movement is restricted, you come to your grill\* and you know you are allowed to go no further. At every barrier its like someone's shouting STOP. If a couple of cons are in one cell, look out, you're suspected of everything, e.g., buggery, escape talks, etc. (J. Bowery, Nov. 1978).

Hutch, an ex-guard, in a follow-up interview explained (somewhat) some of the reasons for areas which are considered taboo for inmates as follows:

Some of the areas restricted to inmates are self explanatory. Like inmates in central control areas could over power guards and virtually control the institution. If they are within ten feet of the wall they may get in a blind spot of the tower man and attempt escapes (security). Inmates are not permitted in other cells in some joints because of homosexual rapes, use of dope, and in some cases to save lives. Several inmates have been killed while in the safety of their cells. (Hutch, May/79)

### Discussion

"Off limits" is a military term used in a similar vein to that of "out of bounds." Both terms are employed to control the movements of subordinates. In prisons though this restrictive nature as illustrated by Joe Bowery tends to be internalized, the mere vision of bars implies "go no further." This shall I say invision is learned while in prison so that the inmate may avoid possible consequences

\* Grill - con term for cell door

from administration. Avoiding crossing the taboo lines governing these restricted areas, may alleviate some of the suspicion generally attributed to persons who congregate and who have had known criminal tendencies. These built-in defences further humiliate and deprive the inmates. Administration, on the other hand, view restricted areas as a must for both security reasons and protection of other inmates.

### Damaging Institutional Property

An issue most definitely considered a fuck-up is damage or destruction of institutional property (Hamilton Spectator, May 9/79:10). Stormy, an inmate having served ten years in maximum security institutions, claims that the only way that the plight of the prisoners will be affective is if they "wreck the joint." He believes guards and administrators are unaffected by verbal insults or other personal attacks. He claims that because the inmates were always beat and gased at random they adopted the following approach simply to be heard by the public:

In Millhaven, we were locked up quite a bit and if someone got beat or gased by the man, our whole range would go up. All you can do is swear at the pigs or spit on them. So we used to smash up our cells, because that was the only way to get someone to hear what we had to say. If we wrecked the joint it hit the papers. Then we could tell them why we did it. (Stormy, Apr./79)

P. Paul claims that not all damage to the institution or property was always destructive. He claims that tailoring your "joint issues" (clothing) or placing pictures on the

walls (in restricted areas) could be a form of damaging institutional property:

I worked in the tailor shop. I use to taper my joint issue (clothing). You know, try to look good for visits and parole boards. I must have looked too good, they charged me because I altered my regular issue. I had an old sheet painted and set over my bed - when they busted my cell, I was again charged, said I ripped a sheet up; ain't that a bitch? (P. Paul, April, 1979).

Recently (May 9, 1979) the Hamilton Spectator, page 10, headlines read (in large bold print) "Province Promises Severe Penalties to Guelph Rioters." This incident apparently occurred because some inmates were placed in isolation and denied privileges because they were suspected of using alcohol or drugs. Damage was estimated at \$90,000. but this cost could be reduced to \$37,000. by using inmate labour. The corrections minister had the following comment on the issue:

The inmates who took part will be penalized to the severest extent open to the ministry, Mr. Walker said. They will be made to understand that their behavior will not be tolerated in the provincial correctional system. (G. Walker, May 9, 1979).

### Discussion

Of course the reasons for damaging institutional property are multiple and diversified. As Stormy pointed out "we wrecked our cells so we would be heard." Inmates believe various atrocities to human beings occur in our prisons everyday. Once under the rule of absolute control

some officials become deaf and occasionally blinded to various indignities endured by the inmates. P. Paul claims that any alteration of institution issues or its make-up may be viewed as damage to the physical character of the institution and its goals. This reflects an attempt by inmates to be different from their seven hundred plus peers, and to somewhat colour the routine character of prison life.

Administrators view riotous, damaging actions of the inmates as an animalistic and contemptuous attempt to modify the everyday operations of the penal system. They do not view the destruction of institutional property as the only means available to the inmates to verbalize their discontent and have their grievances heard and acted upon.

### Conclusion

It appears quite evident from the data collected and from the personal experiences of many unofficial peers and my personal experience that the functional/operations nature of prisons will cause many inmates to "fuck-up." From the inmate's standpoint the operational aspect of prisons will be quite troublesome. By reviewing the five mentioned fuck-ups: fighting, disrespect for authority, out of bounds, suspicion and possession of contraband, and the damaging of institutional property can be basically two main reasons for these fuck-ups.

The functional/operations character of any total institution has an effect upon the nature of the ruled and the rulers. Regulation of human activities brings with it many very staggering and damaging side effects. Hans von Hentig offers the following statement for consideration:

Considered pruely as a means of safeguarding human society, a system of punishment requires powerful motivating forces behind its actualization, its regulation and its rational administration. Here we are faced with an abundance of human problems erratically affecting the function and the effectiveness of the instrument of punishment, which can become refined or coarsened as changes take place in our spiritual development. Human progress - still more, human decline - is reflected in our need to punish and our skill to carry it out. (Hentig, 1973: 15-16).

Authority and its agents with their ascribed roles need numerous measure of regulating social control over their captives. With the exception of fighting, a fuck-up appears to be little more than lack of desire or inability on behalf of the inmate to conform to the rules and regulations employed by administrators to force a behavioral change in the inmates. Possibly if the rules and regulations governing prisons were used moderately and sensibly, the inmate might choose to modify or sophisticate somewhat his own understanding of self.

In regards to violence (fighting) in prisons, it is due to the regulations coupled with the close proximity of

many diverse others. Sykes helps clarify this point to some extent:

The prisoner must live in a world shrunk to 13½ acres and within this restricted area his freedom of movement is further confined by a strict system of passes, the military formations in moving from one point within the institution to another, and the demand that he remain in his cell until given permission to do otherwise. In short, the prisoners loss of liberty is a double one - first, by confinement to the institution and second by confinement within the institution. (Sykes, 1958: 65).

#### Reaction of Inmates to Fuck-ups

All twenty of my respondents (eighteen inmates and two ex-guards) generally agreed that inmates have basically three general responses when accused by administration of fucking-up. The three traditional responses were: (1) complete denial, (2) hostile response and, (3) to dummy-up.\* The nature of the fuck-ups previously mentioned to some extent justifies the responses offered. If inmates were charged by a guard for suspicion of drug usage or damaging institutional property, it would seem natural to deny either one or both of these charges. Firstly, it is assumed by an untrained person that you are under the influence of a drug, or given that there are approximately one hundred plus individuals in most cell blocks; for a guard to accuse a particular inmate of damaging that particular object out of intuition seems ludicrous, to say the least. Rocky claims

\* Dummy-up - is a con terms which simply means one remains silent once accused. The inmate will not admit or deny the charges. Within the institution, if someone is placed on the "DUMMY" essentially they are ostracized by a particular individual or group. Until at some point in time they once again become worthy of conversation.



that the aroma of pot at times will bring the man running. The cons claim these men are sniffers\* who zero in on the area, and anyone can be guilty, just as long as someone is:

A couple of us were blowing some reefer in this cell, so the man sniffs it out and comes on the rum. Like the rooms full of smoke and the roach is in the shitter by the time he's on the scene. I flushed the dope (only a roach). The man says I'm on charge, I says - for what? Possession of contraband, I says - where is it? (Rocky, Feb. 1979).

The charges of disrespect for authority and/or fighting are usually reacted to with either a hostile response or by dummies-up. The inmates claim disrespect is something given not just to someone because of their status and position, but that their disrespect for authority was generated by the official's treatment of them as persons. W. Bill's comment is quite illustrative of this point:

Well in many cases I use to argue that I didn't disrespect the officer in charge any more or less than he disrespected me as a human being. After trying futilely to express your views you just dummy-up. There is no sense talking, they become deaf to reason. (W. Bill, June, 1979).

Of course W. Bill is a little more articulate than most inmates, so he at least attempted to express his views but to no avail, thus resorted to the latter "dummying-up." Hutch, in regards to inmates caught or accused of fighting, claims:

The inmate code demands that when asked by administrators who is responsible, the rule of silence must be observed. If the inmates says, "he started it," that con is labelled a pigeon (rat) and most of the time his troubles have just begun. (Hutch, May, 1979).

\* Sniffers - is a con term used in a similar vain as a blood-hound or something which traces. Cons claim police in general are hired to search out trouble and the sniffer is employed in a similar fashion within the institution.

Discussion

It would appear that because of the totality of the prison and the rule of the officials that to deny a charge, that on occasion the guard cannot prove seems to be the only way to in some way, counter the pettiness of the charge in the first place. Sykes somewhat supports this contention of prison regulations:

...the custodians demand obedience to an extensive body of regulation peculiar to the prison alone. Many of these rules are theoretically intended to curb behavior which might endanger custody, but there remains a set of regulations intended to promote "quiet" peaceful or orderly relationships...When we examine these rules we cannot help but be struck by their apparent pettiness... that many such asinine injunctions could be eliminated immediately. Certainly a regime which involves such detailed regulation is distasteful from the viewpoint of democratic values. (Sykes, 1958:23).

The regulations governing inmates are as abundant as the consequences meted out (Sykes, 1958:42). Of course, both the charges and disposition are subject to change without notice and preferred treatment may be given to the more co-operative" inmates. Rocky sums up why he prefers to be silent and "unco-operative:"

Well, the fight, the same as any other fight, I always say ask them, I ain't no pigeon and if someone puts it on me that only confirms to the other cons that the dude is an asshole and pigeon. (Rocky, Feb. 1979).

Consequences

In the total institutional setting punishment is the sole responsibility of administrators and their agents.

That is to say, administrative punishment is meted out to those who willfully disobey or disregard demands.\* Once the accused has been sentenced to a prison, the courts or the laws and sanctions governing social control in the free society are no longer applicable to him. Charges laid against inmates and the consequences for them are at the discretion of their captors. Michel Foucault views the objective of punishment as being constant through expanding the number of punishments, but diluting the gross physicality of it:

...to make of the punishment and repression of illegalities a regular function, co-extensive with society; not to punish less, but to punish better; to punish with an attenuated severity perhaps, but in order to punish with more universality and necessity; to insert the power to punish more deeply into the social body. (Foucault, 1975:82)

In the prison setting, the reasons for punishment and to what degree one may be punished tend to support Foucault's contention of consistency. In prisons, the more often others are punished, the more immediate the resulting consequences will remain in the minds of the prison population as a whole.

From my data, I discovered that the four main consequences were: loss of privileges (O.P.), isolation and special diet, a loss of copper\*\* and lastly, street charges. Over 3/4 of my respondents have been on O.P. and in isolation at one time

\*Of course there is a network of punishment within the inmate realm of thought. Inmates often punish other inmates quite severely, sometimes even to the point of death, given that specific actions are not accepted or in fact condemned by the inmate population.

\*\*Copper - earned remission

or another. Half have lost some copper over one issue or another, and only five respondents have been sent to "out-side court" for a formal recharge resulting from institutional misconduct or charges which would also be viewed as crimes in the "freer" society, e.g. possession of dope or murder, etc.

### Off Privileges

When inmates are placed on O.P., they are denied the privileges granted to the more complying inmates in the general population.\* Inmates are placed on O.P. for minor infractions, from one day to an indefinite period of time. Prisoners on O.P. must remain in cells when the activities they are denied are taking place. In some cases, visitors travel hundreds of miles to see inmates and are turned away because of the inmate's O.P. status (personal experience, 1971 Kingston Penitentiary). The loss of these privileges is more antagonising emotionally than brutal in the physical sense, and further maximizes the deprivation of goods and services, which Sykes claims is one of the "pains of punishment" (Sykes, 1958:68).

T. Timmy claims that he was placed on O.P. for a mere argument:

For the argument all priveleges were suspended for one week and we were told we would be watched in the future. On O.P. you're cool if you have some partners with some goodies stashed\*\*, but if there is a good \*Privileges - are granted upon arrival in some institutions and taken away if inmates fuck-up, some of these privileges are" cigarette tabacco, visits, T.V. Viewing, recreation, canteens, shows, blankets, mattress, clothes and regular meals.  
\*\* Stashed - on the side, hidden contraband

duster\* on at the show, it can really piss  
you off, especially on the Saturday afternoon  
and your pinched\*\* ( T. Timmy, May, 1979).

\* Duster - a con term for western movie

\*\* Pinched - caught fucking-up and charged

and a light burns night and day in these cells. Exercise is often no more than a thirty-minute daily walk in a seventy-five foot corridor. (McNiel & Vance, 1978:17)

Living under these conditions is bad enough, but they may be worsened depending on the severity of your charge. The warden may include that you be placed on a "special diet." Special diets are two pieces of brown bread and one piece of "punished meat loaf," twice a day, with water.\* Under the croakers\*\* instruction you must have one hot meal every ten days, which is usually luke warm and not hot. (personal experience, Guelph, 1967). Some inmates have been known to be in this area on special diet for up to 2 years; (Andy Bruce, B.C. Penitentiary, 1975) however, the usual stay is one week to 3 months. O.J., an ex-inmate of Kingston in 1965, claims that, "sometimes if they liked you, you could get a package deal before entering and upon leaving the "hole:"

If you shove some mouthy punk or a sweet kid, bust up a guard in 65, they still had the belt. That was an electric machine with a ye-thick leather strap (motions the size of belt), which automatically whipped your ass. Some guys used to faint and your ass would bleed. I spent 3 months in the hole that winter. Some smart pig said, "that should help warm things up, I don't know how guys say they freeze their ass off in there, ha ha." (O.J. Nov., 1978).

\*Punished meatloaf is scraps of meat from the previous week, blended together and left in the air to harden.

\*\* Croakers - doctor

The conditions are so appalling in this area that self-inflicted damage has been recorded as follows:

In these places, men often die. They commit suicide. They have heart attacks or strokes at unusually young ages. Many survive but with scars visible and invisible. To get attention, they occasionally set themselves afire, or slash themselves with razor blades. Arms and torsors are covered with the scars of the blades. (McNeil & Vance, 1978: 18).

To conclude this issue, chapter two of McNeil and Vance's book, Cruel and Unusual, has a quote by John Braithwaite, Deputy Commissioner, Inmate Programs, Canadian Penitentiary Service: "Whoever said prisons had to be pleasant?" (McNeil & Vance, 1978: 17).

#### Loss of Copper

Copper, (or the term generally employed by administrators "good time remission") is earned remission or a reduction of your sentence of approximately 3 days per month, which is awarded to inmates who have kept good conduct.\* Inmates could lose some or all of this earned remission if charges are repeated and just as severe. Usually inmates will be sent to isolation and lose some or all of their "good time" (con term) too. Charges which may warrant the loss of copper would be attempt escape, hostage taking, fighting, wounding and etc. T. Timmy claims for fighting the following occurred:

\* This earned remission is now a thing of the past in Federal Penitentiaries, this incentive has been changed, inmates now must serve this time on the street in the form of Mandatory parole.

"For fighting, we were placed in solitary confinement (hole) for one week and 3 days of good time was lost. (T. Timmy, May, 1979).

### Street Charges

Usually if inmates are transferred to an outside court to face "street charges", they will have already been victims of O.P., solitary and loss of all copper. Inmates will be recharged on the outside if they are caught with dope, holding hostages, wounding or damaging institutional property and murder. Commenting on the recent riot at Guelph reformatory, Gordon Walker, Corrections Minister, made the following promise to the public:

H e said all inmates involved will lose some or all of their earned remission from sentences, which allows for early release, and would forfeit their weekly incentive allowances and savings (canteen). In some instances, inmates may be charged with a criminal offence if there is enough evidence. The inmates who took an active part will be penalized to the severiest extent open to this ministry. (G. Walker, Spectator, May 9, 1979:10).

### Discussion

From my data, I believe I have shown that the charges open to the administration within prison are used at random and to whatever severity they chose to employ. Inmates tend to react in a hostile fashion or in a mute fashion because of the injustice of the charges and the



consequences arising from them. As a "corrective" measure, one would wonder how subjecting slightly shifted persons to physical and mental anguish will alter the attitudes of these persons. Alter yes, but I believe that embittered, abused persons who are forced to make character alterations under these conditions will do so in a negative vein which will endanger other inmates, administrator and society at large, if and when they are released. A consequence is definitely a punishment within the prison realm. Hans von Hentig gives us somewhat of a modest description of punishment:

Considered purely as a means of safeguarding human society, a system of punishment requires powerful motivating forces behind its actuation, its regulation and its rational administration. Here we are faced with an abundance of human problems erratically affecting the function and the effectiveness of the instrument of punishment, which can become refined or coarsened as changes take place in our spiritual development. Human progress - still more, human decline - is reflected in our need to punish and in our skill in carrying it out. (Hentig, 1973:5)

#### Troublesome Physical Character of CRC

During the 1970's, Canadian prisons have been plagued with riots and prison uprising, which reportedly resulted in thousands and thousands of dollars in damage to their respective institutions. You may ask if conditions within the prisons are deplorable, then why attack the physical

character of the prison? Mainly, it is precisely the physical character and physical presence of undesirable inmates which set off the explosion which gives way to riotous conditions. Henceforth, to test the similarities of trouble within both the prison and CRCs, the residents of CRC's had to be asked, "Is there anything about the physical make-up of the house that is troublesome to you (bums you out)? As aforementioned from my sample of eighteen ex-convicts, only sixteen related to both conditions in prison and CRC's; the other two respondents had never entered a CRC per se. Also to attain another perspective, I also devised interview sheets for the staff of CRC's in which I asked, "What is there about the physical structure of the house which may place residents in trouble situation?" (see interviews in appendix). In this sample 8 staff members consented to assist me in my endeavour. From these eight members, five are actively employed at a CRC and three were formerly employed with one of the CRC's studied.

Relatively troublesome to the residents was a virtual duplication of an institutional atmosphere. Some of the factors which were largely responsible for these perceptions were: the presence of bulletin boards which posted messages, coming events and possible job opportunities. The dining rooms were cafeteria style very similar to those of smaller institutions (E.G., farm annex), limited personal properties:

the constant presence of a staff member and the presence of other cons (undesirables mainly). \* Some of my respondent's comments were: "The kitchen, well, it has a lot of heavy duty equipment, like the joint, and the picnic table in the dining room ain't exactly homey. (C. Marvel)

P. Paul claims that an undesirable inmate was largely responsible for a trouble situation he found himself in; "I said the guy was a fucking rat goof and if we were in jail he would be dead." The possible sixteen respondents claimed this factor was troublesome to them. Of the eight staff members interviewed, six members stated that institutional characteristics are present in the CRC setting. The staff however, view the institution character by overlapping rules and regulations to assure control. The Rookie, a staff member of Betcha' Can't states: "There are certain rules involving passes, visitors etc; that are necessary to enforce simply for the fact that the number of people in the house at one time need to be controlled."

Another staff member, C. Kent, states: "I guess to some it's like a mini institution or farm annex setting. We have to have regulations and persons to regulate them."

(C. Kent, Jan. 8/79) Commanding even more attention is the issue concerning lack of privacy. Twelve of the sixteen residents interviewed expressed this as a major concern.

Batman, a middle-aged con claims that: "More than one person in a room creates kind of a dorm setting of prison." Also supporting this allegation was six out of the eight staff members interviewed.

\* See interview with the Dick, pg. 1 & 2, living area CRC.

J Keeper, a staff member also claims how lack of privacy may be troublesome: "Because there is an element of no privacy. It gives more of a group setting than an individual home."

Four of the sixteen residents interviewed expressed extreme concern about the locked doors on rooms and the doors after curfew hours have ended.\* This association is compared by Batman in the following manner: "The doors are locked at 11 p.m. which is quite similar to lights out in the joint. There, you know you're in for the night and silence rule is in effect."

Similarly they stated that the person's room being numbered and names on the individual bedrooms was another disturbing factor which they associated with most total institutions. Strangely enough, five out of eight staff members also revealed that locked doors could be a troublesome issue to the men.\* Dirty common areas eg. washrooms, hallways and T.V. rooms were viewed as troublesome to the inmates. Lastly, cited was the issue of inadequate facilities. Supporting this issue was Batman, who stated: "There are not many guys at the house now, but you sometimes still have to wait to get in the shitter." Four of the sixteen residents found this issue troublesome. Once again none of the eight staff members interviewed shared these views.

### Conclusion

The lack of privacy is a top priority for twelve out of sixteen respondents. This lack of privacy is felt because of living with such a large collectivity of others (11-30 in all three CRC's studied), supporting this con-

tention almost whole-heartedly is six out of eight staff members. There is no privacy in bedrooms with more than one bed in them; dining areas where ten to fifteen persons eat at the same time. Washrooms are sometimes co-opped eg. one showering, one shaving, and T.V. rooms are always over populated. P. Paul offers this statement to illustrate this issue:\* "It's like a jail, no home quality. Everyone is there because they have to be, not because they want to be. More than one person in each room, lack of privacy. Dining area reminds me of small jail dining room." (P. Paul, Dec. 1978)

In support of this is C. Kent, a previous staff member of Almost House in the Hamilton area who claims:

"I guess to some it's like a mini institution or farm annex setting. We have to have rules and persons to regulate them. I guess the basic structure is that of communal living, more strategic than a rooming house, and less restrictive than a jail."  
(C. Kent, Jan. 1979)

The next area of concern which is of a somewhat physical nature is the sense of the presence of an institutional atmosphere. These feelings are largely transmitted because of the constant presence of staff, cafeteria dining arrangements, bulletin boards and pay phones in dining areas, furniture which is organizationally owned, and the very important issue of forced living conditions with undesirable ex-cons.\* Ten of the sixteen respondents sometimes became quite angry when discussing this troublesome issue, which is quite evident in a statement

\* All front doors are locked after 1 p.m. Residents must encounter the staff on duty for entrance and placed in book for breaking curfew. (Rookie, May, 1979)

\*

The staff members were largely claiming that the fire

from Rocky who states:

"Yeh, it's like the joint. Well, not entirely a jail. I would say more of a training school or farm annex. Bowmanville (training school) was like this place; no locks but many rules. I hate others in my house. I don't like to pick up for others or after them. If they are dirty, you feel dirty. If they stink you think it's you." (Rocky, Feb. 1979)

T. Terry, an employee of Betcha Can't House in Toronto was asked, "What could be troublesome about the physical character of the house?" he simply replied, "It is not exactly an example lifestyle." When I asked her to expand on this issue she replied, "Well, it is full of cons needing rules and regulations, little or no privacy-staff always present and locks and alarms on doors."\* (T. Terry, March, 1979)

Four of my sixteen respondents felt the locked doors with names posted on them to be troublesome. Five of the eight staff members interviewed felt that this would be highly problematic to residents, but their concern was directed more to the necessity of locks and alarms placed on entrance and exit doors. to curtail sneaking in or out after curfew. One staff member offers this supportive statement;

"We have tried to eliminate many of the physical characteristics which place residents in trouble situations by installing locks on all bedroom doors (to curtail thefts), and signal system on all fire doors to eliminate the problem of double dooring." (the Man, May, 1979)\*

It is quite evident that measures employed by CRC staffs to protect shall I say, the contractual aspects of the residents stay in a CRC . are in fact, the very

\* would be most troublesome to residents rather than rooms locked.

\* See interview with Yoni

issues which disturb and remind the residents most of their prison experience.

Strangely enough, dirty common areas, a problem voiced by seven out of sixteen residents, and inadequate facilities, mentioned only by four out of the sixteen sampled was not seen as a troublesome issue to any staff in both CRC's. This might have been over-looked for possibly two reasons by staff members. Firstly, they might not have visited these washrooms before the men leave for work, or once they get off the job, whereby 10-30 men are trying to perform the same function in four washrooms. Under these circumstances, I'm sure no one has the time or desire to assure that everything is clean for the next man. However, the staff possibly did not see this issue as troublesome because the staff has it's own private washroom facilities, so they are not subjected to the strain of overcrowding. Possibly the need for more facilities would have been evident to them if they were lining up waiting.

\* "double dooring" is a term employed to imply that a person comes in through the front before curfew time, and out the back door for the evening.

Problem Related Issues/Responses for Residents of  
C.R.C.'s Living Area - Functional Aspects

Trouble (Fuck-ups)

In the prior section I discussed some of the physical characteristics of C.R.C.'s which are troublesome to the residents. As aforementioned, the structural aspects of many total institutions tend to have an immediate and damaging effect upon the psyche of the inmates. I felt it important to discover if any of this physical character was present in the C.R.C. However, of prime importance, are the operational or functional aspects of the C.R.C.'s which are possibly responsible for the continual reinforcement of negative self-esteem. To test this aspects of C.R.C.'s, I felt it important to ask both residents and staff members what would be considered trouble for a resident in a C.R.C.

I did not want the hypothetical responses from sixteen respondents, telling me what is generally troublesome for some in C.R.C. Therefore, if those troubles were consistent for a significant number of others, I felt that they could then be seen as issues\*. Being familiar with the inmate jargon, trouble could imply implicitly anything troublesome in general. After testing this assumption informally with a couple of ex-cons, I discovered that a more specific meaning was attached to the vernacular "Fucked-up"\* I also found that both staffs of C.R.C.'s and guards of prisons understood the full meaning of this implication, and were neither

\* issues - as discussed in the introduction

\* fuck-ups - as discussed



embarrassed or offended by the use of this phrase in its present context (women staff also).

Therefore, the question which I asked the residents of C.R.C.'s was: "Have you ever done things in the house which the man would call fucking-up?" My question to the staff was worded similarly but essentially maintain the same implication which is quite evident: "What types of issues constitutes a fuck-up for a resident in the housing area?" I might mention that none of the sixteen respondents did not understand the direction of my questioning, and similarly none of the eight staff respondents found this phrase difficult to understand or deal with.

The four major fuck-ups listed by both residents and staff were (1) breaking any and all house rules, viewed as troublesome to twelve to sixteen respondents and supported by all eight staff members, (2) fighting or violence within the house, affirmed by nine residents and seven staff members, (3) the issue of both usage and possession of alcohol or drugs on the premises. Nine residents and eight staff viewed this as trouble for the resident and, lastly, (4) of the shared beliefs of trouble for the residents was that of curfew breakage; whereby, eight residents and three staff members viewed this to be a troublesome area. An opinion not shared by any of the eight staff members, but viewed as troublesome to seven respondents was the issue of disrespect towards staff.

#### 1) House Rules

The issue of house rules is a standard "must" in

area of social control within both the C.R.C.'s studied. Some of these rules, of course, overlap with the five major problematic areas, but because they were of much concern for both staff and residents, I felt they warranted elaboration. This could account for the small mention of trouble in the other four areas cited. House Rules are employed to regulate the operations of the houses, and the attitude of it's residents (Rookie C.R.C. staff, Betcha Can't, Toronto). In response to the house rule issue, S. Simon, a resident of Almost House when it was just beginning (1972), claims that rules were at a minimum and seldom enforced. However, in the new house he claims: "Everything I do is a fuck-up, now - you're either breaking this rule or that one" (S.Simon, Feb. 13/79).

To somewhat support this allegation is Q. McGraw, a staff member of Betcha Can't House ruled: "They claim if there weren't so many rules, you couldn't break them." (Q.McGraw. Jan. 29/79.)

## 2.) Fighting

Fighting, which includes with staff or other residents and/or the persistent threat of violence towards either party can be very troublesome to residents. Fighting generally evolves in a common area; over such things as someone failing to clean up a washroom after them, choice of T.V. programs, or general harrasement directed at those residents viewed to be undesirables: This is viewed as quite problematic for the men because of the close proximity they are forced to live under,

and violence usually is more than enough for eviction, and/or return to the institution. Even as seemingly trivial an issue as coming from a maximum security prison and having to show others that you're as tough as the need for "maximum security measures" implies could start a fight. As Stormy claims: "because of peer expectations, I was put on the spot; I had to fight, to save face". (Stormy, March 7/79). Gabby, an older inmate claims reasons some fights start are: "One time I had to smack this punk kid in the face because he was minding my business instead of his own." (Gabby Hays, March 9/79). In the same vein, staff members view violence and violent oriented acts being initiated because one is performing their duty. L. Lady reports: "Any threats or acts of violence will be trouble for the resident....." In which sense? "Well, say a staff member reports a curfew violation or enforces an off limitss stipulation, if the man becomes verbally or physically aggressive, it will not be tolerated in many cases they will be kicked out or returned back to the prison." (L.Lady - Staff, Apr. 7/79.)

### 3.) Alcohol and Drugs

The next general area of concern for both staff and residents is the issue of possession and use of drugs and alcohol on the premises. Nine residents and all eight staff interviewed expressed this as a major troublesome area. The staff felt that this

restriction needed to be enforced because some parolees have a no drinking stipulation inserted in their conditions for parole\*, and secondly, those using drugs and alcohol excessively is not consistent with the expectation of society and could lead to further association with prior influencing crowds. An informal interview with the "Rookie", a staff member of Betcha Can't House claims: "Some guys can't handle their drink, some get down on everyone, even themselves. Persons who really wish to "correct" their ways will stay away from drugs and alcohol because drugs are against the law, the house rules and their parole conditions\*." (The Rookie, Mar.3/79).

The residents, however, view this restriction in somewhat of a personal attack against their manhood and ability to make choices in a "free" society. Comments were made by older residents on drinking like: "What am I supposed to do, start smoking pot? or, a grown man can't have a drink now and then?, what else have I got to do?" (S.Simon interview, Feb. 13/79).

\* National Parole regulation A prohibits some person with long records of alcohol or drug abuse from the use of alcohol, such as a condition of parole. See rules in appendix.

\*\* See following page for undesirables. \*

Rocky on the issue of drinking, viewed it as problematic because of using it in the house would be much less costly than hotels, and in general, he sees it as an infringement upon his "freedom":..."With the bottle in my room, I got really rude like I says to the man, Look, I'm free ain't I?, I can't afford hotels. I'm bummed out and all I want to do is lie here, have a drink and be alone". (interview with Rocky, Feb. 6/79).

#### Curfew (4)

Curfews\* were viewed as highly problematic by eight out of sixteen residents and only three out of eight staff members felt this to be an area of immediate concern. Some of the residents felt things just got started between the hours of 9 pm. to 1 am.\* Once again, some residents feel it is an attack against their personal character, in such that they have to be told when to be in so that (1) they will be off the street in trouble hours and, (2) unable them to rise in time for work the next day. They claim that they have entertained most of the evening. P. Paul stated: "I said I met a girl and she wanted me to stay with her. People knew where I was, I'd been drinking and fell asleep".

\*\* An undesirable inmate is usually an inmate who's charges are sex related, eg. rape, child molesting, buggery; some are deemed undesirable because of informant or goof status because of being a rat, fink.

\* Curfew hours in the CRCs vary. Almost house starts new arrivals off with a 9:30 pm. daily curfew, and gradually allows the men out until 1 pm. if their contractual agreements are being met. Betcha Can't house starts off at 10 pm. and extends to midnight on weekends.

Somewhat supporting this problematic nature of this type of experience in a follow-up interview with the Rookie, a staff member of Betcha Can't, I asked: "Why do you feel there is a need for curfews?" To which he replied: "Well for several reasons, (1) if a guy is working and has to get up early, he'll have to get to bed early. Have you ever tried to wake up someone when they just got to sleep? Secondly, the later a person is out the less they have to do; they might do something "criminal" if the opportunity is there. Lastly, it operates as an incentive device, like passes in prison you don't get them if you're not meeting our expectations, we have something to take away by shortening curfew hours (liesure time) or enhance it as a reward by extending curfew hours". (Rookie, May/79).

##### 5. Disrespect

The last problem issue, at least to seven of the sixteen residents, but to which no staff voiced as a problem was that of disrespect towards staff. It appears because of the rules and regulated life-styles of the residents, hostility sharpens when inmates are reprimanded or ordered by staff to perform certain tasks. P. C. Pat states: "I get very upset and I argue a lot with them (staff)...I was upset; chores seemed like the last thing I wanted to do. I said, look, get someone else just this once, I'm really burnt man". (march 16/79).

Batman once again offers a comment regarding a confrontation with a younger staff member: "Once I argued

about the schedule - you know, liesure time, work periods. They tried to tell me what to do with my liesure time. I said, fuck-you, it's not liesure time for me if you're telling me what to do with it...an arguement between me and a punk staff member". (Batman, Nov. 28/78).

Interestingly enough, no staff member felt that disrespect was a big issue. Possibly they felt this because of the overlapping of house rules in which disrespect would be viewed as an uncooperative attitude, or that the staff member felt the outburst was directed at the rule and not explicitly at them.

Concluding the personal problems and/or fuck-ups by the residents in living areas of the CRCs, it is quite evident that the personal problems voiced were shared by a very large proportion of my respondents. What is even more significant is that in all issues except that dealing with disrespect towards staff; the staff's view of the problems coincided to a great degree with that of the residents. That these issues would indeed be a fuck-up for a resident and place him in a troublesome situation. In the next section, I intend to deal with what reaction is offered to the staff's allegations to an apparent fuck-up, that will more likely demand some form of reprimand, and what are the consequences the residents tend to be given in answer to these organizational disruptions.

Reaction of Residents

Residents who have been accused of fucking-up in the living area of the CRC by a staff member, usually react to these accusations in one of the following ways: (1) excuses, (2) denial, (3) agree but explain, or (4) react violently. Amongst the sixteen of my respondents who admitted to invariably fucking-up in the CRC's living area, six have stated that they have used excuses of one sort or another.

Sticks, a resident of Almost House, stated that on all three times he was accused of curfew violation, he offered excuses like: "the taxi driver took the wrong turn, or, the kids were sick and I had to stay over night" (Sticks, April, 7/79). Some residents such as Capt. Marval, gave the following excuse: "I said, what everything's happening just after 9:30 pm..., I was rattling my wife and dosed off". These excuses tend to reflect an on-the-moment response, not one that was planned or rehearsed, possibly reflecting that the resident had intended to be on time, for how long could you be late if the cabby took a wrong turn? Capt. Marvel's response/excuse reflected concern that if he was in on time the rest of the world would pass him by. This suggests that most adult life begins after the chore of feeding the kids, satisfying their inquiries and sending them off to bed, that there then will be time to reunite personal ties amongst the



parents. His excuse about "rattling his wife and falling asleep" might not have been an excuse at all but a probable event if a hectic day was spent within a family desiring direct parental attention.

The staff, however, see these excuses as an attempt of not accepting the responsibility themselves, which is quite evident in a statement by C. Kent: "Even if they are caught in the act, either smoking some dope or sneaking a girl upstairs - they claim it was for some alternative reason eg., she had to go to the john or it's not pot, it's a lettuce cigarette". This infers that it is preconceived in many incidents that any explanation may, in fact, be an excuse or an attempt to not accept the responsibility to comply or conform.

Four respondents (out of sixteen residents) claimed that they completely denied the incident entirely either by claiming "no" I did not do it or by saying nothing inferred the same. Yogi indicates one manner in which complete denial may be inferred by silence in an incident in which they threw a "dirty dude", clothes and all, in a shower: "I acted kool as if they weren't even talking to me", or a favourite one used in fights is to say nothing because of the inmate code;\*

\* Most inmates coming from prisons have an unwritten rule about informing, squealing or ratting out. Rather than be accused by other cons as ratting on another inmate they are quick to state in the open, "I don't know nothing, ask him how it got started".

they will say nothing, but it is looked upon as a denial. To illustrate this point, when asked who & how did the fight start, Yogi states: "I just said ask him". (Yogi, personal interview, Feb. 6/79). So if accused of something for which they are not directly responsible for it may be implied by their silence, that they wish to cover the incident, when infact, the unwritten law of the residents infers that no response is the only safe response.

Thirdly, and what certainly looks like the most common response to a fuck-up is admitting to the fuck-up, and offering a seemingly reasonable explanation. Eleven out of sixteen residents stated that they admitted to the fuck-up of which they were accused and offered reasons as to why the incident occurred. In response to being intoxicated on several occasions, Stormy made the following statement: "Yes I have been drinking. I have no stipulations prohibiting one from drinking, and I wanted to escape from my shell, if even for a moment, or in this case, five hours". (Stormy, Jan. 17/79). This statement reflects the attitude of someone who might be undergoing some personal troubles and in an attempt to escape them, gets drunk on occasion. Some residents also admit to a staff member's accusations for more obvious reasons, which is evident in Yogi's reply: "I had to admit to being caught with someone out of bounds. I was caught with the bitch, it was cold turkey. Here I am stretched out with this little tighty in my arms. The door bursts open like a bust or something. A slight grin is on

the man's face as he surveys the room and says, get her out and see me in the office". (Yogi, Dec. 4/78). It would appear under these circumstances to accept the accusation is the only way out.

Six of the eight staff interviewed also agreed that many of the men would admit and explain to why they were fucking-up. J. Keeper claims that the men admit to their fuck-ups because they have sat down and thought the incident out. A premeditated kind of a decision before the incident even occurs: "If there is a legitimate excuse, it is usually laid out by the resident, often times the resident weights the act vs. the consequences and decides the consequences are worth it". (J. Keeper, May 22/79).

The last reported response to allegations or accusations of trouble was one of verbal or physical violence towards the staff person. Seven of sixteen residents claimed they had reacted in this manner. The reasons offered tended to relate to a personal nature, or the feeling that one's integrity was in question. J. Bowery commented in this fashion: "The man was coming on to me, claiming that I'd stolen food from the house. I told him I work all fucking day. I don't need your handouts. What makes you think it was me? He said someone said it was you. I said, go fuck yourself, and it went on from there", Violence is in this sense vulgarity towards authority for the mere acceptance of hearsay information, as fact. A claim most often cited by many inmates as reasons for being in prison relate to hearsay

information, eg. "the police heard I had a gun".

Q. McGraw claims that: "they admitted to verbal attacks on the staff because staff is acting irresponsible and rudely towards them as men, e.g., like a guard to con attitude"...(Q. McGraw, Jan. 29/79). This statement suggests that administering rules, regulations and their enforcement, creates a distance between staff and residents of CRCs. In fact, to the point that some might respond to, a resident in a indignant manner and that the violent reaction is infact a way of being just as indignant and irresponsible towards the character of the staff person.

### Conclusion

Various reasons could be inferred for these reactions of the resident towards to accusation of a fuck-up. Firstly, an inmate may offer a more non-sensical excuse to fucking-up because they feel that as adults, reasons as to why you are in half an hour later than expected, are childish and unwarranted; therefore, they respond in a childish or immature manner. They could also be old habits of which they have not been encouraged (via any punitive efforts) to correct. In reaction to what he says if accused of fucking-up Rocky says: "I mostly respond with excuses I'm good at those." The staff tend to expect and in some cases except them as a legitimate response to their allegations. T. Terry claims: "They always offer excuses which take little or no thought

such as, I didn't think it would matter; I didn't think it would show. I forgot, the car broke, etc." (T. Terry, Mar. 27/79). The expected response could, in fact, be given because of the manner and character of the staff member involved in the interaction. Self fulfilling prophecies may be encouraged because of the character and expectations inferred by the persons(s) in charge.

The residents may deny an accusation made by a staff person simply because they didn't do it. Incidents which occur in communal living arrangements may not always involve who it seems is at fault. Of course, they might also deny involvement in the incident because of the similarities/associations they formulate of the operational aspects of a prison with the CRC. If having been exposed to the dangers present in most total institutional settings, and a person finds themselves in a similar setting (similar in the sense that firstly, cons are present and secondly, rules and regulations are governing their lives to some extent) they could once again adopt certain protective attitudes prevalent in the inmate sub-culture which guarantees their personal safety. So by refusing to say who is responsible for the act should not imply that silence is a irresponsible act or denial, rather than a learned safeguard.

Many of the men (residents) admitted to fucking-up. They, to the best of their ability, tried to offer or seek a rational explanation as to why the act was, in fact, fucking-up. Their main explanations were directed towards the normal actions

and desires of any responsible adult. They attempted to imply that yes they were responsible adults and they could, if given the chance act accordingly.

The violent responses tended to indicate an attack of a personal nature. Many of the men could have been personally insulted or offended by the accusation inferred. Many might have physically or verbally attacked the staff present, not as a personal vendetta, but, they attacked that person because they were the person who was most visible and appeared to be still directly restricting their lives. It could be inferred that violence evolves as a result of conflicting interests. One interest is the responsibility and duty of staff persons to assure that each resident complies and conforms to the rules and regulations, and secondly, these rules and regulations for the resident could resemble to quite a degree life within a captive setting similar to that one (prison) they were supposedly released.

#### Consequences For a Residents Fuck-Up

In most institutional environments, infractions of the governing rules and regulations usually have a standardized consequence which suffice as deterrents to some, and punishments to others. Standardized in the sense that regardless of age, size or seniority of years within the confines of that setting, the punishment meted out seldom varies. I use the word seldomly because I do not wish it imply that exceptions never occur, in view that human nature and preferences unlike

the machine may be influenced by extenuating circumstances. The consequences in reaction to trouble in a CRC setting usually meted out were: (1) a warning or threat responded to by all sixteen residents and four staff persons, (2) loss of privileges, supported by six residents and all eight staff interviewed, (3) curfew cutback voiced as common occurrence by ten residents and seven staff persons, and (4) the resident being kicked out of the house and/or returned to institution. \*

### Warning or Threat

A warning or threat is generally given in response to the first infraction of house rules or expectations. This could be so because it is assumed that a certain amount of adjustment is required to adapt to the community setting from the total confinement of prisons. Also, if a person is new to a city, it might be expected that he would get lost or miss a bus, initially. Further, ignorance on the part of the resident as to just what the expectations are might be viewed as an administrative error.\*\* However, in some cases, the mental stability of the resident might warrant warning because of knowledge of his condition by the staff. Wild Bill sees this in a different vein; however,

\* In some cases, (day-parolees - full-parolees) if a resident is kicked out the house it means automatic return to institution. This is so because to some living in a CRC is a condition of parole.

\*\*Generally upon entry to a CRC, a staff member is assigned as counsellor. It is their duty to make explicit demands and run down the contract and conditions before they are signed by the resident; however, on occasion, these duties may be overlooked for a day or two (Interview, "the man," Almost House, Nov. 3, 1978).

when asked about consequences to some of his various fuck-ups, he stated: "No consequences; I could do what I wanted. They told me that. The most they did was talked about asking me to leave. I think they were afraid!"

### Curfew Cut

This consequence seems to be one of the more commonly used disciplinary actions. It is used mostly as a means of checking tardiness towards curfews in general, discourages sleeping in, and is a punishment which would further impede the resident's somewhat confused notions of freedom. In regards to the curfew theme, Rocky states the following: "For sleeping in I was warned several times, then I had my 1:00 a.m. curfew cut-back to 11:30 p.m. for two weeks. They said if I got to bed earlier, I wouldn't have trouble getting up."

(interview with Rocky, Feb. 6/70).

### Loss of Privileges

The loss of privileges can be most annoying for the men. This is so because it can virtually restrict an individual from walking out of the front door. In some CRCs, the loss of privileges, can mean no visitors in, no store passes for cigarettes, no leisure or work passes, or no evening or weekend passes. When I inquired what the consequences would be to certain fuck-ups, the man (a staff member) stated:



"usually a privilege, e.g. weekend passes, free time in the evening is withdrawn when the situation warrants," (the man, Feb. 7/79). This statement could imply that it is up to the discretion of whoever is in charge, the consequence being the lost privilege of personal freedom.

#### Kicked Out - Return to Institution

This consequence seems to be one which is the least used. In the cases where it does occur, this measure is meted out for violence towards staff or other residents, this is quite evident in L. Ladies response:

"Well, say a staff member reports a curfew violation or enforces an off limits, if the man becomes verbally or physically aggressive, it will not be tolerated; he will be kicked out or returned to prison in many cases." (L. Lady, May, 1979, Staff)

This ruling could be used for various reasons; as a deterrent to others; as a show of power on behalf of the staff; and as a protection measure for the staff so that they are not threatened out of performing their duty, by a resident who either physically beats or verbally threatens a staff person if, in fact, they do report them.

#### Conclusion

While looking over the consequences, it could be inferred that minor infractions might be overlooked momentarily. But, any direct or purposely ignored order to the resident by the staff will, in fact, hold a consequence. It could be the most effective consequence tends to be to restrict, even more, the personal freedom of the individual and their control over self in areas of choice. Curfew breaks means

tighter reigns placed upon personal freedom. Insubordination might require a loss of privileges. (The privilege of visitors or the further deprivation of liberty (e.g. loss of leisure time)). Each consequence might appear to be more synonymous to a regression back towards the organization of the "total institutional" experience setting. This begins with a faint warning and reminder of life within the institution. Finally, these threats could, and in many cases, do become a reality. In most "total institutions" great emphasis is placed upon getting out, to "the freer" society. All efforts and punishments are seen as a means of keeping one from the free society or immediate contact with it.

In concluding this section on trouble in the living areas of CRCs, I believe I have shown that the operational aspect of CRCs appears to be largely authoritarian in nature. The residents are expected to fashion their lives in a manner prescribed by the ruling order. The rewards for compliance are extended hours of freedom and the privilege of being allowed to remain "freer." Consequences generally are meted out at a gradual pace, beginning with warnings, lectures and threats by administration. These threats I believe, cause the individual to mentally replay the prison experience, and in some cases help to curtail undesirable activities. However, as the punishments become harsher, with

the loss of "free" time in the form of curfew cuts and privilege losses, many men could view the operational aspects of the CRC in a sense analagous to that of total institutions. Tempers tend to flare and the troubles will grow, possibly to a point quite similar to constant temper flares directed at guards and prison administrators within "total institutions." The threat of the "loss of personal freedom," will create anxieties and frustrations. This, coupled with the subtle physical reminders of the "total institution" (already outlined) of most CRCs, which reinforce the conformity and compliance ideal of prison, could in fact, (sub-consciously) place the resident in a similar defensive atmosphere to that of prison. As mentioned in the review of literature section "the cultural shock" which the individual undergoes once being introduced to a "closed system" allows the individual to place up guards through personality, attitudes and other protective devices. Once a resident mentally views the structural and operational aspects of a CRC in somewhat a synonymous sense to a prison, they may revert to many of the inmate patterns of behavior. which assured their physical and mental survival while in prison. Just how much the resident remains in the inmate realm of thought within the CRC might be determined by a brief look at various trouble aspects within the confines of a total institution.

## Work and Related Issues

Employment in many capitalist societies, to some extent, will be illustrative of one's ability to succeed within that given society. Unemployment tends to magnify one's inability to function in a successful manner. Success is more than just being employed, however, persons who are gainfully employed in a position whereby they might embark upon some meaningful career indicates some probable successes, in other areas of that society.\* In many societies, the poor or the working poor are the uneducated, unskilled, the elderly, physically and mentally handicapped, recent immigrants, certain racial or ethnic groups, and the lawless (ex-criminal).\*\* In many cases, the labels attached to persons which can, in time affect their employability, will suffice as a means of initiating a self-fulfilling prophecy. Erving Goffman claims that societal stigmatization and ignorance could in fact lead to the following for those discredited persons:

One such deviation is important here, the kind presented by individuals who are seen as declining voluntarily and openly to accept the social place accorded them, and who act irregularly and somewhat rebelliously in connection with our basic institutions.. these are the folk who are considered to be engaged

\*If you have a good paying career oriented position, you have likely succeed in the educational realm to some degree. Post graduate work has placed professionals in lucrative positions. Skilled tradesmen enjoy rewards from their learned skills via accumulation of material and monetary security.

\*\*All criminals are not "poor", certain exception, such as Elliot (dreging scandal, Hamilton, Ont.) or Harold Ballard. These ex-inmates, fortunately have been well educated; they enjoy monetary security and henceforth will not be affected by the stigmatization implied by status of ex-con.

in some kind of collective denial of the social order. They are perceived as failing to use available opportunity for advancement in various approved runways of society; they show open disrespect for their betters; they lack piety; they represent failure in the motivational schemes of society. (Goffman, 1963:143-4).

It is quite evident that having been stigmatized, stifles one's chances for employment. This fact, I believe to be secondary as opposed to the primary issue of knowing how to work and being able to choose to work at meaningful tasks which will be, (1) personally satisfying, (2) accompanied by sufficient monetary rewards. I will briefly explore this issue in both the "total institutions" (prisons) and the "closed system" (CRCs).

#### Prison Work

In most prisons, inmates are required to work in order to enjoy some of the privileges offered by the administrators. Work becomes a privilege, which if rules are broken privileges are withdrawn. Fourteen of my eighteen inmates respondents claimed that the working part of their day was occupied by educational programs, shop training or a joint job.\*

#### Educational Programs

The educational programs provided in most institutions usually deal with academic, upgrading of English, Science and Math to the grade 10 level. There are also basic life skills

\*In detention centres and county jails, remand prisoners are not allowed to work. Also in certain areas in penitentiaries e.g., I.D.L. (indefinite lock up) inmates choose not to work; they are locked up 23½ hours/day; they receive no canteen or weekly savings.

whereby inmates may learn how to read, write and find out about basic health and employment needs once released. (J. Daniels, C.O. Worworth Institute, 1978).

At the post-secondary level most courses are of a correspondence nature or with temporary leaves of absence, or passes so that on occasion, inmates may travel to neighbouring community colleges or universities for courses in Sociology, Social Work or other Humanities courses. The calibre of this "intensive" training may be illustrated by S. Simons following comment:

I was in school for a couple of weeks. You know, I really wanted to get going, rehabilitate myself (ha). I was there two weeks, had been charged twice and bounced to the cleaning crew.\* In two weeks I wrote one paragraph, done one chapter in math and seen the teacher twice. It's a waste of time. (S. Simon, Feb./79).\*

S. Simon, like many of the other respondents, (eight on this issue) felt a desire for a positive "change" or wished to try and better himself via the route of educational attainment. The quality of the education and its instructors may come into questions because of attending classes infrequently and therefore making only half-hearted attempts at assignments. I might add that the education offered is not recognized or certified by the Ministry of Education. Graduates of these programs receive a Provincial certificate, which is said to be an "equivalent" to achievements reached in regular schools.\*\* (McNeil and Vance, 1978:99).

\*In most prisons attending school of either academic upgrading or skilled trade training is considered working or "playing the prison game." If inmates are not in one of these programs, they will be required to work at a joint-job, which many inmates phrase as a labourer or a slave for the system.

\*\*This certificate can be somewhat misleading if inmates are asked what level and where they had attained their education, employers who recognize the difference will note; "you have grade 10 but not in the regular sense."

School does not hold the same connotations on the "inside" as it does in the freer community. It's called a "gaft" or "stall." It is not expected that the inmate will become a scholar while in prison. Conditions are not conducive to scholarly achievement. As many inmates claim, "it looks good on paper, but it don't mean a thing." Some inmates prefer school to working at a "joint job" or being a "slave" by cutting grass, shovelling snow or doing kitchen or laundry duties. Unfortunately, this opportunity is a waste of valuable time and money. A captive audience could make an ideal teaching/learning relationships, given that subject matter studied, and the instructors ability were geared to hold the students' attention and interest. Unfortunately this is not the case.

### Shop Training

In many prisons various forms of skilled and semi-skilled courses are given by provincial instructors but are not looked upon or recognized by the Federal Trades Commission as bonifide qualification to practise this trade. (McNeil & Vance, 1978:87).

In a Report to Parliament, the sub-committee on the Penitentiary System in Canada clarify this contention:

At the present time, some 1,350 (or 15%) of the 9,158 inmates in our penitentiaries are enrolled in vocational training courses. There is; however, concern about the quality and applicability of some of the courses given. A complaint commonly heard from ex-inmates is that the vocational training they received in our institutions was in fact useless to them after having

taken courses in plumbing, carpentry and the like, their achievements were not recognized as valid by outside employers, since the courses given to them by CPS were either insufficient or outdated. (Sub-committee, 1976-7:111,540).

Conducted under proper conditions, the learning of these skills could accomplish two things, (1) teach persons how to work by developing good work habits, and (2) give the trainees satisfaction of skillfully completing projects. Of course, ideally, this could be accomplished but ten of my eighteen respondents felt that these trades in general were quite similar to the upgrading programs, which look good on paper, but in practise they are another thing. O.J. comments on the uselessness of the redundant skill he learned while in a reformatory:

The trade I chose in the "Wash" was oil burner repairman.\* It really sounds silly now eh! There are no fucking oil burners to repair, and if they were still around, I'd have to wait in line for a job. Dig this, where's the demand. You have 100 burners in the world to repair and 10,000 cons who were trained to repair them from 1956---on. (O.J. April, 1979).

Given this antiquated training, encouraging or forcing individuals to train in one of these areas, seems to many inmates quite non-sensical.

The trades which could be used on the "outside" seem useless because of the amount of practise inmates receive. In many institutions inmates may learn barbering, which is one of the only trades which offers Ontario certification and Federal recognition. Inmates are trained to cut hair only



in a primitive fashion:

152

(It took me one year to earn my barbers licence. Our shops were one of the better ones; you could actually learn something. I graduated, and got released too. I was on top of the world, some big money was ahead. I got a job one week after my release and quit two days later. Why? Because I couldn't cut hair on the street. No one wanted a square back, crew-cut or military cut and that's what I was trained to do. A customer would come in and ask for a shag or a layer and I thought they wanted to get fucked. (personal experience, 1971).

### Discussion

Many of the skill trades learned in prisons are hindered by regulations, e.g. inmates must have military cuts, only instructors will work on guards cars, or let the inmates repair the cars but have no keys to start them. Military cuts are a thing of the past, learning these skills inevitably keeps the trainee in the past also. This becomes discouraging and in many cases magnifies the inadequate ability of the man. The equipment will either be of a primitive nature or too sophisticated to be found in many outside shops. Hours and days of instruction and training must take place. Instruction of a realistic nature must be taught whereby skills are learned which will be applicable and consistent with everyday living on the outside. (Sub-committee, 1976-7:111, 541).

### Joint - Jobs

As earlier mentioned, inmates will attend school, shop training or work. Work in most institutions are deemed to be joint-jobs by the inmates, mainly because they are working either to beautify or clean the joint, or in some way saving the institution money. Some of these jobs are cleaners,

kitchen, laundry, tailorshop, maintenance and ground crews, and administrator cleaners. All of these duties are monitarily non-rewarding. All inmates not involved in Work T.A.P.s earn on the average of \$3.65 per week, some of which is compulsory savings and the rest is used for canteen.\* The inmates term a joint-job as "slaving it," quite possibly because their duties are heavily oriented towards domestic duties usually granted to "good slaves" or unskilled workers. Yogi was a kitchen worker who made the following comment:

I worked in the kitchen; I was fry cook in the staff Cafeteria. It was like a small greasy spoon only cleaner and more modern. Our biggest chore was trying hard to do nothing. Who wants to work for the man. We learned how to do as little as possible and get through the day. (Yogi, Dec 1978).

It becomes problematic for inmates to adapt to non-sensical, non-rewarding employment position while within the prison realm. Erving Goffman claims this might be so because:

But to say that inmates of total institutions have their full day scheduled for them is to say that all their essential needs will have been planned for. Whatever the incentive given for work, then this incentive will not have the structural significance it has on the outside. There will have to be different motives for work and different attitudes towards it.

\* Recently industry has begun on the prison grounds. In shop if inmates are cleared for work T.A.P. inmate will receive minimum wages for hours worked. This is more than inmates working within institutions receive, but considerably less than "free workers" doing the same job only going home each night. These programs tend to be used basically as incentives to demand conformity and compliance. Inmates working under these conditions must send half of the wages home, pay \$25.00 - \$35.00/week room and Board, yet eat the same food as the rest of the inmates. (Sub-Committee, 1976-7:111,333).

This is a basic adjustmeent required of the inmates and of those who must induce them to work... Whether there is too much work or too little, the individual who was work oreinted on the outside tends to become demoralized by the work system of the total institution. (Goffman, 1961:10-11).

### Discussion

It is apparent that "joint-jobs" encouraged inmates not to perform. These jobs were in no way viewed as productive or rewarding, either personally or monitarily. In prison, non-workers are called stallers. They stall because they have no incentive to work; the jobs are highly orientated towards the unskilled, untrained work previously set aside for women and children. B. Bettelheim claims that these duties might affect the prisoners in the following matter:

Another factor contributing to the regrssion into childhood behaviour was the work prisoners were forced to perform. Prisoners were forced to perform non-sensical tasks, such as carrying heavy rocks from one place to another, and back to the place where they had picked them up...they felt debased when forced to perform "childish" and stupid labour, and preferred even harder work when it produced something that might be considered useful. There seems to be no doubt that the task they performed as well as the mistreatment of the Gestapo (sic) (guards) which they had to endure contributed to their disintegration as adult persons. (B. Bettelheim, 1947:308-9).

The type of work offered in most prisons and the realized rewards offered by that system divert many persons from developing good work habits. (Sub-committee, 1976-7:109,526). I believe whether the work be non-sensical, non-rewarding and childish, or too strenuous that Goffman concludes this section most notably: "whether there is too much work or too little, the individual who was work oriented on the outside tends to become demoralized by the work system of the total

### Trouble and Consequences

Trouble for inmates in the school, shop and work areas are quite similar. All three of these alternatives are viewed as work. (Sub-committee, 1976-7: 107,511). In the school and trade programs, inmates are usually in groups of 15-25 in number (Thompson, C.P.S. Programs Director, 1977). Inmates fuck-up for various reasons in these areas. The four main reasons cited by most of my respondents were disrespect, fighting, cheating and refusing to work.

#### Disrespect

Disrespect is a charge most inmates opted for when they become tired of waiting for some form of instruction or wish to be "bounced" to another gang.\* Dick states: "I got tired of doing nothing all day. I finally forced myself on the man; I said he gave me the wrong info, and he should be teaching dog obedience rather than education. I got bounced to the body shop." (Dick, May 1979).

#### Fighting

Fighting in designated work areas can occur for several reasons. Instructors will have to deal with the varying demands of all workers or students. Given that the instructor is usually busy, or appearing that way, attacks

\*Bounced - a forced job change, something like being fired

will often occur upon "undersible" inmates and/or persons whom might cause a temper flare:

Like I got a golden opportunity, here I was in the same room as this rat who helped my partner get pinched. Everyone else solid, the man was out, and my six man was at the door. I did his ass in good.\* (Head, Nov. 1978).

Fights will also occur because of persons who can excel easily at whatever they do. While others become envious and angry because they appear to fail to comprehend the simplest task. The persons who excels are called "brownners" and appear as constant reminders of the "A" student type, but even more antagonistic. This magnifies the inability of the slower learners and their somewhat inferior level of comprehension.\*

### Cheating

This charge or allegation is used by instructors who wish to rid themselves of troublesome inmates. The nature of this charge could be quite similar to a suspicion charge because it involves little verification besides the instructors word. It is also very hard to disprove. This contention maybe an acceptable one as P. Paul puts it, "Everyone cheats, it's part of the prison game":

\* Solid - a right con, trustworthy.

\*\* Six Man - someone who watches for someone to return, eg. I'll six the front door for the heat (I'll watch).

\*\*\* Brownners - are persons who appear to win the favour of most instructors and employers because of their ability to learn quickly. They receive favours and special treatment should information be requested of parole board or work passes.

I was informally accused of cheating on my assignments. What a joke you see. I've been in three joints and started in school or shop in all of them. Like it could be your ticket out. A "parole shot" everyone cheats; the papers you receive ain't worth shit, except to the show the man that you want to play ball and play the prison game.\* (P. Paul, Dec. 1978).

### Refusing to Work

Inmates refuse to work by verbal expression or dumb insolence. They will refuse to work because of the nature of the work, the man in charge, and the persons they have to work with. Whether the inmate explicitly says "I will not work", or claims for health or personal reasons not wanting to work, the charge is refusing to work. Gabby claimed that he would like another job because of the other persons whom he had personal confrontations with were working there:

There was two tailor shops, one of them full of rats and "diddlers", and the other with straight cons. I explained this to the man, he said, "you's are all the same- cons. Are you refusing to work"? I said "No", I want to go in the other section. His response, "Either you work here or you go on charge". He charged me. (G. Hays, Oct. 1978).

\* Parole shot - part of the prison game, whereby the inmates via action and participation appear to want to change. This looks good for the parole boards and temporary absence boards. The choice inmate phrase most often used is "I'm looking like I'm doing what I am suppose to be doing".

\*\* Diddler- a child molester.

Consequences

In the areas related to work and/or inmates fucking-up in them, the consequences are either job change, off privileges and isolation. Most commonly used is the job change and C.P., the rationale for this being, "if you don't like this job try this one", or, "if you don't work you don't receive any rewards". The belief of administrators is that many of the inmates have not learned how to work. The desired affect is to force them to work at what they (authorities) view as work they wish done regardless of implications. (Sub-committee, 1976-7:107, Prin. 13) Perhaps this is why physical punishment very often never exceeds that of more work and of a distasteful nature, with the further loss of material goods and services. Hentig, I believe, sums up why inmates must work at jobs designated by administrators:

Reform and intimidation are preliminary steps in the social process of selection, which lead to massive measures of elimination should it turn out that more superficial interference has not led to social adoption. (Hentig, 1973:142)

Educational and work programs would definitely serve as a positive means of "correcting" or changing the attitudes of inmates. Given of course, these courses are experienced in a positive vein by the inmates. Positive in the sense that the work required is sensible, productive work. Productive competitive work, conducive to work on the outside with equivalent financial incentives, would encourage inmates to develop appropriate working skills, required for continued

satisfying gainful employment in the outside world. Education and skills learned must be taught at a constant progressive level consistent with levels which are expected and demanded by their respective trade unions. If this cannot be attained, the sub-committee contends that growth of a positive nature is quite likely not to occur:

Positive growth cannot occur in an environment where one has minimal rights and responsibilities, no freedom of choice and is denied normal human contact. There are few substantial trade programs, little or no effective schooling available and no opportunity to grow and develop as a responsible citizen. (The Quaker Committee on Jails & Justice, 24A:23, Sub-committee:103).

Work: "In and Out" of CRC's

Commenting on work issues evolving around life within the CRC, my respondents state that they either worked in the CRC's at maintenance of the grounds and general repairs to the house. These jobs are compulsory and viewed as general upkeep of the houses. No wages are paid and all residents must contribute. (see appendix, re. house rules) On rare occasions when renovations are needed (eg. complete rooms & exterior painting) residents not gainfully employed or attending school will be paid \$3.00/hr. wage for doing these spare jobs. The Man claims: "We give them \$3.00/hr. to do complete jobs, it gives them spending money for cigarettes and needed sundries. No pay is given for general clean up and upkeep of the house, the contract you sign states that this is a compulsory requirement". (The Man, Nov. 1978).



Those residents who work at regular jobs or go to school must also help undertake clean-up duties. This time averages about 2 hours per day, either before or after work. Frances F. Piven somewhat illustrates the ideal desires of administration and possibly indicate why they are able to exert these kinds of demands.

Any institution that distributes the resources men and women depend upon for survival can readily exert control over them. The occasion of given virtually needed assistance can easily become the occasion inculcating the work ethic, for example and of enforcing work itself for those who resist, risk withdrawal of that assistance. (Piven, 1971:22)

#### Educational and Skilled Training

During my investigations at the CRCs, seven of my eighteen respondents were attending courses in either basic upgrading/skill training or Basic Life Skills, sponsored by Canada Manpower. Manpower pays a "living allowance" which suffices as a pay equivalent to unemployment insurance or welfare assistance. From this allowance, residents are required to pay \$25-35 per week depending at which CRC they are housed. The remaining twenty-five or thirty dollars were used to contribute to family needs, personal needs, transportation, etc.

The main complaint of some of my respondents was that the monies they received as a living allowance were quite inadequate to suit or meet the individual's needs and the compulsory rent at this stage was problematic:

Going to school, I make \$65/wk. and I have to

pay \$30 rent. After I get by bus pass I've got less than \$20 for the week. Some guys make \$200 plus a week and only have to pay \$35. The Government also pay X amount of dollars for me to stay here; someone's making some bread eh!  
(Sticks, April 7, 1979)

It would appear that the residents involved in these educational/trade programs have been motivated by some drive of success or attainment. In prison, they may have been reintroduced to the myth that education is the stairway to success and good paying jobs. Impoverishment while attending school and with the abundance of immediate needs recently released inmates have to contend with, may cause discouragement and discontinuation:

"I quit school, because my needs were more more than the money I was getting. I either had to quit and get a job, or go to school and steal to finance it". (Dick, 1979)

\* Living Allowance - Is approximately \$65 weekly or \$260/month. Students are required to attend school on an average of six hr./day. This is similar to time allotted for inadequate trade training offered in prison. Some courses are Academic Upgrading - to and on rare occasions beyond grade 10, welding, painting, decorating, machine shop & bar tending. These programs are also allotted 6 hr./day training, similar to prisons.

### Working "Out" of CRC

Of the remaining eleven respondents, eight were presently employed and the remaining three were actively seeking employment. Even though four of my respondents had successfully completed trade courses offered by C.P.S.\* only one was fortunate enough to attain a job in his area of training:

I've been an electrician long before I was arrested. I took their mickey mouse course inside, then I worked on maintenance. I'm a union man so it was easy for me to get a fair paying job. I think I'm one of a few fortunate enough to have had union support, before the joint training. (T. Timmy, May, 1979).

The remaining seven respondents were employed at labouring minimum wage positions, some of which were: gas station attendants, factory workers, landscapers, waiters, short order cooks, etc. Of course on the inside where all basic needs are met, the minimum wage rate might suffice in helping to get some money saved for outside life. However, once outside (but still inside the confines of the CRC), minimum wage tends to frustrate the person. Because they have conformed to the work ethic, they feel that rewards granted to most workers should be coming their way. They expect general rewards like new clothes, small savings, (for furniture), and pocket money with which to socialize somewhat, and pick up on life again. Batman claims minimum wage jobs might be quite difficult in attaining these hopes: "I work 48 hours a week at minimum wage. I figured I could save enough money to buy furniture, come time for me to blow this joint, what a joke. I even owe money to the house for

\* C.P.S. - Canadian Penitentiary Service

back rent". (Batman, Nov. 1978).

In many cases, residents are required to have jobs prior to their release. Q. McGraw, a staff person in a CRC study, discusses some of the jobs residents take regardless of their trades or training:

They usually get labourer and minimum wage jobs. Alot got to school for upgrading because the employment rate is so high. A few men formerly skilled before incarceration get back in their trades, but they are far and few. Most guys take anything so that they can get out of the joint. (Q. McGraw, Jan. 1979).

Staff members claim that they to constantly reinforce how fortunate they are to have attained employment, even at minimum wage.

The remaining three unemployed respondents evidently suffered from the psychological and economic effects (overlapping as they are) of prolonged unemployment. O.J. claims he went through the following changes: "Man this worlds to fucking much, people closing doors in your face cause you're a con, I say fuck-it. I'm working my old scam again. I'll be fucked if people will say I had it better in the joint than I had it on the outside". (O.J. May, 1979)

The work ethic was spurred via the coercive nature of the prison, which claims, "you can work your way to freedom". Once "freed" to the community residents must work to remain "free". Given the common difficulties this quite likely will breed dissatisfaction because of the compulsion for the men to work at anything, and possibly withdraw all hopes of becoming "successful".

Fuck-Ups and Consequences - :The CRC Work Situation

Residents may fuck-up simply by not attaining a job within a given time or by giving up a job without an acceptable substitute. If conditions of parole require the man to be gainfully employed, they could quite likely be returned to their respective institutions. (G. Townsen, National Parole, Nov. 1978). Other reasons cited as fuck-ups by most of my respondents were, tardiness, absenteeism, disrespect, alcohol or drug abuse. For these infractions, residents are either warned, docked pay, suspended or fired. As far as being tardy and/or absent, residents claimed that "other residents' loud and abusive nature kept them up all night and caused them to sleep in or scratch the day".\*

Disrespect was noted largely as refusing to act immediately when an order was given by an employer, as Capt. Marvel claimed:

I wasn't used to working a full day. After lunch, I wanted to doze off, like in the joint, come two o'clock. I was ready to throw in the towel. The routine of the joint has me. When the man said, "I want you to assemble 5 units", I thought I had a week to do them, not 8 hours. (C. Marvel, March, 1979)

The ensuing conversation once the job was not performed in most cases was "put it up your fucking ass, I'm no slave" and the employee would inevitably be fired.

\*Scratch- not go in, not to do.

It appears that forced abstinence from alcohol and drugs because of incarceration generally caused the residents to lose control of their usage as opposed to other more "accustomed" workers, who were less liable to abuse alcohol or drugs that extensively. For ex-cons, however, the fact that their bodies were no longer accustomed to these stimulants was problematic, as O.J. states:

Man, I was doing some day work for this moving firm. At lunch we stopped for 3 drafts. Man, I was fucked, I passed out in the truck; when I woke up the boss just looked at me and said later. (C.J., May, 1979)

While in the total institution (prison) the inmates became totally dependant upon the will of administrators to guide their every move. Once released, the freedom to choose between right and wrong becomes somewhat abstract. The rules of the "freer" society may have changed and/or even removed from the inmates consciences and replaced by a mode of conduct conducive to life on the inside. Henceforth a fuck-up on the "outside" might seem to be a good move on the "inside". The deprivation of human needs for an extensive period of time, will cause any human animal to celebrate the reintroduction to self.

#### Social Life: re Prisons and CRCs

I believe that I have shown that life within the prison and CRC realm is very restricted. Various aspects of both the inmates and ex-inmates' lives are in fact denied to them given their specific station in life. We have seen

that inmates and residents must either be employed and/or in an educational program if they are to increase their privileges or chances or parole. Most hours of both groups' days are controlled by some authoritarian figure. I suppose this is true to some extent of all individual existence. People are social animals. They evolve from their interaction with significant others. (Goffman, 1961, 14) It is believed under normal conditions in the "free" society that the restrictions and demands placed upon people because of their usage by bureaucracies, technology and modern science that the very human "nature" of people are being robbed. C. Wright Mills may help clarify this point with the following statement:

Man's chief danger today lies in the unruly forces of contemporary society itself, with its alienating methods of production, its developing techniques of political domination, its international anarchy in a work it's pervasive transformation of the very "nature" of man and the conditions and aims of his life. (C.W. Mills, 1959:13).

Under normal conditions in the "free" society human aims tend to lean heavily towards success per se, but within a captive realm the inmates/residents tend first to have to satisfy the aims of their respective institutions with their demands and "success" is satisfying these demands. What happens if a person has little or no control over their social life or interaction with significant others? What happens when systems and institutions breed on human deprivations, degradations and humiliations? I feel this topic may best be explored by looking at the social lives allotted

to the prisoners of the total institutions (prisons) and the prisoners in our community (residents of CRCs).

### Prison Social Life

In this study I have set out to explore systematically similar aspects in both the prison and CRC. Henceforth, it was necessary to compare the social life of the ex-inmates within the CRC and inprison, as they recalled it. The difficulty I experienced was simply mustering up the nerve to inquire with many reservations. "Socially in the joint, either in the cell-block or workplace, how was your social life fucked-up by the man"?\* Usually the reply was, "what you say", what the fucks the matter with you man, you been in school too long? You know there ain't no social life in the joint". Gabby, an older ex-con claims:

"There is nothing sociable in the joint, personally each joint (max. - med. - min.) has its own social setting. In some joints just being left alone could be considered a social event. In the Max., you have no social life.\* After all, we do up to 22 hrs. per day cell time, with one hour no contact visits a month, restricted movement and association with the silence rule being observed fifteen of a twenty-four hour day.  
(G. Hays, Oct., 1978)

\*I was very reluctant to make this inquiry because to approach this issue, in this vein, automatically caused suspicion amongst my respondents as to the validity of my ex-inmate status. This was so because of the apparent naïveté inferred by this statement.

\*Max. - con term for maximum security prison.



It appears that the only socializing one may do within the confines of a prison is that which is granted by administration. Under prison conditions socializing may be deemed forced association (with cons and guards) compulsory routines and regulations. It is the very nature of the totalitarian rule of the prison which forbids inmates from enjoying any form of social life, and as Goffman points out, this is a desired affect:

In many institutions, the privilege of having visitors or of visiting away from the establishment is completely withheld at first, ensuring a deep initial break with past roles and an appreciation of role dispossession. Although some rules can be re-established by the inmate if and when he returns to the world, it is plain that other losses are irrevocable and may be painfully experienced as such. It may not be possible to make up, at a later phase of the life cycle, the time not now spent on educational or job advancement, in courting or in rearing one's children. (Goffman, 1961:14-15)

Social life to most of my respondents was seen as something that was left behind on the outside, any, and all attempts from the man, which prohibits this desired interaction, whether it be by mail, visits, or simply restricting the inmates visual image of the free society was, in fact, fucking-up his social life.

In the same reluctant vein, I summed up my rather long interview schedule with, "Was there anything positive about life with the prison?" Invariably, my respondents and some-time exhibiting great hostilities would say "NC" or "fuck-off", "are you crazy" and "Yes, I know someday I'd be getting out".

In closing, Capt. Marvel explains why there can be little or no positive aspects of prison life:

Ha - I think no more needs to be said, life within a prison is the shits. It's like in the army, you better obey or you are fucked. You forget how to think; you lose all sense of responsibility and the desire to achieve because everything is done for you. I imagine it's the same as being rich. You can't function productively because you don't need to. Mummy and Daddy will handle all the heavy decisions. you need not even think. You are just there and if you're not, someone else will be, so fuck it.  
(C. Marvel, March 1979).

The Sub-committee in its report to parliament, is very supportive of C. Marvel's closing comment to the extent that they note:

The result is, in the incisive language of one inmate who privately summed up with telling frankness observations made by a great many of our witnesses. After five years in this place, you get to be like a zombie or a robot. It's too late after that even when a man gets out, he'll stand in front of an open door waiting for someone to tell him it's OK to walk through... In other words, penitentiaries rather than strengthening the abilities of inmates to make autonomous decisions or said another way, to handle freedom instead conduce to what might be called institutional dependency. This merely weakens further abilities an inmate had before incarceration, which in most cases must have been less than satisfactory in the first place, to regulate his own behaviour through appropriate choices in a free society... Almost everything that could conceivably be of any value either to the inmates or anyone else is lost in the internal contradictions of the system.  
(Sub-committee, 1976-7:105, 500-1).

### CRC Social Life

When inmates are "released" to a CRC not only the laws of that given community govern his actions. Residents in CRCs must abide by the parole conditions and rules and conditions of the house in which they live. with three

independent governing forces, the social aspect of one's life will be affected. In looking at the social life of the CRC resident my initial supposition was that it would be radically different and far richer than that available in the prison setting. However, reviewing my data, and further informal talks with my respondents disclose some striking similarities in regards to the resident's social intercourse with significant others. When I inquired, "Who are your friends now"?, twelve out of eighteen residents responded other cons: four said mostly squares and two a mixture of both. Being older and having served more time inside than most, G. Hays stated: "Cons mostly. I've been in the joint for 6 years: who else would I know? Oh yea, I have a girlfriend I see from time to time". (G. Hays, Oct. 1978).

Having served extensive time within the prison setting, Gabby like most ex-inmates formed some rather strong liasions with other cons. You are forced to associate or be in the company of cons. You are taught via disciplinary measures to somewhat "get along". The rules regulating most CRCs demand that inmates spend various hours of their day within the house which can readily promote continued association with other cons. This may not be appreciated by the residents, who often have negative reactions to certain types of offenders. Illustrative of this fact Yogi claims, "I can't stand fucking diddlers or rapist. My happiest moment I can recall about the joint was when they rammed that steel pipe thru that diddler Enser's

head during the riot in 7I". (Yogi, Feb. 1979)

As we see from the social aspect of prisons, compulsive association and regulated aspects of social interaction, hinders the individual to choose how, when and with whom he will socialize with. Therefore, areas of the individual's life in which he is compelled to obey the rules and regulations of another governing body would constitute an invasion of one's social realm. This is accomplished by house regulations which restricts (to some extent) freedom of movement, freedom of association, freedom to engage in heterosexual relations and freedom from a similar coercive threat, which forces one to take any job rather than one which is preferred but at this time is not available.

#### Curfews

By definition as used in The American Heritage Dictionary, a curfew is: an order or regulation enjoining specified classes of the population to retire from the streets at a prescribed hour, and the signal was a bell announcing it. (W. Morris, 1969.) By definition a curfew is the restriction of one's personal freedom. It can readily affect a persons social life by denying them the opportunity to socialize with whoever they choose, when ever they choose to do so. All persons living at any government funded CRC have curfew hours, they must abide by.

It appears that during the day they are partially liberated from the house in a physical sense, but still restricted

to an area of employment. In many cases, this area of employment is not of choice, but is compelled upon them in order to remain in the "free" community. The few hours of liberation comes after the supper hour, unless compulsory house meetings of assessment sessions are not ordered.

Realistically, the resident is "free" to socialize by choice from the hours of 7p.m. to 9:30 p.m. initially, 7p.m. to midnight, and finally 7p.m. to 1a.m. , which is at a maximum 4 hours a day. Even then conditions of parole or house regulations somewhat propel the resident to go only in specific locals, drink alcohol or not, and associate only with specific individuals.\* It's no wonder that one resident claimed, "fuck, you got no social life, unless they allow you one. What good are passes if you know no one or got no place to go. How can you meet a lady or other friends when you're locked in the house at early hours. My old lady even accuses me of laying up with other bitches when I'm actually running home like Cinderella before midnight". (S. Simon, Feb. 1979)

I have witnessed grown, once responsible adults, running to their respective houses, conceiving wild, childish excuses to tell the keeper waiting on the door. The anxieties created by the very nature of "success" in the CRC is not con-

\* Many ex-inmates are not allowed to drink, leave the immediate area or associate with specific individuals. If caught or disobey one of these rules, a return to the institution is warranted.

ducive to desired social arrangements for children, never mind grown adults. The program outline of Betcha Can't House begins with the statement, "The primary purpose of the centre is to assist residents in dealing with the problems relating to their eventual return to the community of their sentence by means of "gradual release" program while at the same instance, providing a warm residential environment. (see appendix II). It would appear that this "assistance" coupled with the issue of "gradual release" continues to demand that the resident deny himself of the personal nature of "self" in exchange for "success" as viewed by his captors. Many residents have internalized this "success" ethic to the extent, suggested earlier by one inmate, to the point that they become "zombies or robots".

The CRC as an "institution", operates to control various aspects of individual freedom. The strain placed upon the residents' social life comes from within the functional/operational aspects of the CRC and not from the physical veneers as such. Therefore, if the operational aspects of the CRC are not indifferent to those of the prison, one may conclude that these institutions could well be one and the same.

Concluding my investigation, I inquired about the positive aspects of living within a CRC. Fifteen of my respondents, when asked, "Was there anything good about the CRC experience", agreed that the "freer" atmosphere was better compared to the confines of prison. The positive tones were mainly contrasting with prison the physical character of CRC

and the given back of a slight amount of personal control and freedom. The Dick illustrates this point somewhat:

It allowed me time to check out myself, see some woman; it allowed me partial freedom more than jail offered me; but curfew rules and regulations would not allow you to be free. (Dick, May, 1979).

Most of my respondents related that the physical atmosphere was "freer" cleaner, more homely and in many cases, preferred over the prison life. The functional/operational aspect was another issue and I believe that, I have shown throughout my thesis, that this is the analogous character of a "total institution" (prison) and a "closed system".

The emphasis which administrators of both systems place upon "success" and achievement creates the damage to the adult ego, in fact, it creates a character within a character. If you like, a miniature jailer who will say it's okay to pass through the "open door".

## Conclusion

I began this thesis by discussing the theory of socialization. I showed that socialization had two dimensions: one dimension we consider "normal", the other "abnormal". Normal socialization is the process in which members of a society or culture learn behaviour patterns, values and norms of functioning. In a society such as North America, a free society, members are supposed to learn how to be free and harmonious with other members of that society. That learning process can be considered to be normal socialization. Those subjected to that process develop positive self images and identities and are able to conduct themselves competently in the practical, everyday worlds. But there is another dimension, as mentioned. It is this aspect that the thesis has been concerned with, which is the development of negative self images and accompanying social incompetence, resulting from an abnormal socialization process.

In this thesis, the process of prison socialization studied was shown to operate within two systems - the "total" and "closed" systems. Not only is this process "abnormal", as it denies freedom, but given the nature of these systems, the process is deliberately negative



either explicitly or implicitly. In the slave system and concentration camps where the process was designed to alter the personality structure of the slave and prisoners, the process was explicit; the end was to change human beings to animals or "objects" and to extract freedom from them. In the prison and CRC systems as we know them I have shown that often the process is implicit but the end result is not dissimilar. We find that the authority structure is not unlike that of a slave or concentration camp system - it denies inmates' "freedom", whether of movement or choice, which in many ways reduces them to the level of children, and either develops or reinforces negative self images and sense of personal worth. Thus, over a period of time, once this learning process takes root, ex-inmates confronting the "normal" system find it difficult or impossible to function. This difficulty is made worse in that it is coupled with the fact that the inmates are stigmatized by the "normal society", for being ex-cons.

The prison, it is suggested here, is a modern or slightly updated closed or total system not unlike those of slavery and concentration camps. The result as we have shown in the body of the thesis is that the prison as a closed system with its process of abnormal sociali-

zation initiates, develops or reinforces negative self images and identities on the pathway to "freedom".

CRC's are manifestly designed to ease the ex-convict to the life of a competent, free individual, yet once an inmate is supposedly "freed" the CRC experiences often reinforce this negative process. Participation in the continuing restrictions of the CRC establishment and its governing rules and regulations is the price the ex-inmates must pay in order to remain nominally free.

I have shown by exploring the prisoners' own accounts that the inmate/resident in fact undergoes a continuing loss of autonomy because of his subjection to strict authority structures and limited access to everyday privileges, such as good jobs, unlimited social contacts, etc. Also the structures of these systems is such that both guards/staff and prisoners, although differently, have been affected by this abnormal socialization process of the "closed system" (which, in fact, is the prison). This is evident, not only in the abusive language and mannerisms of the inmates/residents, but also in the attitudes and actions of the guards and staff. These destructive interactions amongst the institutions and the occupants of them contribute greatly

to Canada's high recidivism rate. This indicates once again that CRC's are not effective in enabling the ex-inmates to cope with life on the "outside".

In this thesis I have been concerned with examining the nature and effectiveness of the CRC as a rehabilitative institution. By talking with the inmates I examined their rehabilitational experiences while in an institution. I used the conceptual framework of the total institution. I studied their experiences in prison to a limited degree and their CRC experiences in more detail. Here I looked at the setting, their work and their social situation. From this data, it is evident that the CRC has various aspects very similar in nature to the prison. The CRC setting is physically less restrictive than the prison; however, the functional aspects of both settings restrict both freedom of movement (at specified times) and freedom of choice. The work situations differ slightly, but because of the inadequate training and nonsensical work available in prisons, once released, the ex-convict/resident can usually only obtain and maintain unskilled, dead-end employment which offers nominal monetary reward.

Socially, life within both settings is controlled by administrators and their regulating forces. In both settings, one may sense an human contamination. Because of the rules and regulations governing life within these settings, forced association with other convicts is inevitable. Contamination may be generated because of constant association and conversation with like individuals who are undergoing similar crises in their lives.

All of this adds up to the maintenance of an already damaged self-concept because of the lack of availability to learn or practice everyday "normal" life skills. This, in turn, breaks down or weakens any existing skills. Therefore the CRC is ineffective and cannot or will not produce positive self-images in the minds of many of its residents. The abnormal culture learned within any closed/total institution will not prepare the inmate/resident for life within the "normal" freer society. CRC's, then, are not conducive to the generation of positive changes in the minds or lives of their captives.

Recommendations: For changes in the rehabilitation process  
at the community level

Because of the functioning/operational aspect of closed/total systems, rehabilitation as we know it fails miserably. Some alteration must be made in the operations of a closed system in a way that rehabilitation does not serve to create or sustain social and emotional incompetence in the ex-convicts. Possibly by altering the operational aspects of the closed system the injurious nature of that system upon inmates and residents will be ended or alleviated.

From my experience and from the results of this study, I would strongly suggest two courses of action. The first is preventive. Diversion is a must. More time, money and energy must be spent on the potential youthful offender so that he/she is never subjected to any form of closed/total system. I believe it would make much more sense to try to create genuine life skills in those whom we view as children. This means much more than what is presently offered in various reform institutions. To divert or change criminal tendencies, interesting and realistic education, job training and probable full employment must be open to youth with

problem backgrounds.

Secondly, given that a number of people are, or have already been exposed to a correctional system, there must be radical changes, if their best interests are to be considered. My only suggestion at this point would be that they be given realistic pre-release education and job training. This, of course, must also be available to them upon release. Also, we should assure that their freedom is genuine in nature. Transferring the inmates from one system to another (from a prison to a CRC) is not acceptable as a move towards freedom.

I would suggest an adoption type process, whereby concerned citizens, by their choice and, of course the inmate's choice, agree to have an inmate in their home upon his release from prison. In this way, the inmate will be subjected to the sense of normal socialization provided by a stable family unit. This would place the ex-inmate in an environment that would help to generate and develop positive self images and enhance his social skills in realistic societal living. Further, it would assist the man in functioning and possibly making some positive contributions to society.

GLOSSARY

- I. Pig - screw, hack, or the man - refers to guard or other administrators.
2. Con - Inmate.
3. Fish - new inmate.
4. Punk - some considered by old cons as a fuck in the ass, loud mouth.
5. Kid - a sexual object/companion.
6. Lugging - carrying contraband goods in or out of restricted areas.
7. Gorilla - a youth who often beats on the weaker for sex or material goods.
8. Wolf - usually older con (homosexual) trying to be friendly to younger inmates for sexual favours - guys who like girls on the outside, boys on the inside.
9. Shive - knife or something fashioned after a knife (weapon)..
10. P.C. - protective custody, inmates are placed in this restrictive area so that other inmates will not harm them. eg. rapist, stool pigeons, etc.
11. Rapist - rape artist.
12. Rat - stool pigeons, finks.
13. Burnt out - almost done in either from drugs, serving time or lack of hope.
14. O.P. - off privileges, not allowed to engage in the benefits offered within the joint, eg. tobacco, T.V. , recreation or passes.
15. T.A.P. - Temporary Absence Pass - granted on a compassionate reason, weddings, deaths, unite with spouse.
16. The Hole - more severe than segregation, the hole got its name literally because your toilet is nothing more than a hole in the ground, no privileges, one meal every ten days, bread & water the other nine days.

17. Special Diet - one hot meal every ten days (doctor's orders) every other meal consist of two pieces of brown bread & water.
18. Baby Dolls - special canvas dresses used to further humiliate the inmate by wearing a simulated dress (baby doll pyjamas).
19. The Joint - the institution of which one was in.
20. Head - a dooper either grass or heavy narcotics, always on the look to get high anyway he can.
21. Whip or Wiz - Methamphetamine (speed).
22. Dissociation - solitary confinement.
23. Diddler - child molester.
24. Ducket - to be placed on report.
25. Drum - cell.
26. Hack, screw, pig, or the man - guard.
27. Jug up - meal time.
28. N.G. - nogood.
29. Jail house merchant - prisoner who sells two for one.
30. Patch - to put the fix in.
31. Range - open area outside the cells.
32. Sweet kid - a boy who teams up with older inmates.
33. Scoff - food.
34. Shiving - knifing.
35. Scratch - money.
36. Shafted - double crossed.
37. Scored - succeeded at attempt to secure whatever.
38. Hard time - serves time against the norm, eg. in isolation constant thoughts of the street and people in it.



39. Torch - flashlight.
40. Torching - burn an inmate out with gasoline.
41. Wasting - to kill.
42. Belt or paddle - a leather strap used on the "buttocks" of rebel prisoners, was recommended by a judge and left to the discretion of the superintendent for hard to handle prisoners - outlawed approx. 1968.
43. Jointman - prisoner who behaves like a guard.
44. Blower - telephone.
45. Rounder - a guy who knows his way around the underworld.
46. Bad mouth or flapping the trap - threatening verbal attack.
47. Croaker - doctor.
48. Double doored - in the front door and out the back door.
49. Lifer - an inmate doing life.
50. Short time - near the end of sentence usually last three months.
51. The hitch - habitual criminal.
52. Mark or Sucker - someone who is gullible.
53. Fence - one who buys stolen goods.
54. Nutbar - a mental case, unpredictable.
55. Street time - paroled or living in a supervised halfway house.
56. Oldlady - girlfriend or wife.
57. Partner - a friend who partakes in 50/50 activities with you usually someone you can trust.
58. Wrecked - stoned or drunk.
59. Surviving - doing anything illegal to maintain a couple of dollars.
60. Lunch bucket - working everyday.

- 61. Busted - caught and charged.
- 62. Using - back on dope.
- 63. Clean - not using dope or engaging in crime.
- 64. O.R. - Ontario Reformatory.
- 65. K.P. - Kingston Penitentiary.
- 66. Being Kool - doing what you should or wish without detection from authorities.
- 67. Heat - when your illegal activities have been brought to the attention of the authorities.

## Appendix One

### Almost House Rules

All residents are expected to satisfy the following conditions of their stay as part of their contract with Almost House. Residents are to become familiar with the routine of the residence - staff and other residents.

#### A. House Maintenance

Each resident will assist in the cleaning and maintenance of the houses and yards. Specifics will be made known to them by staff persons.

Each resident is responsible for cleaning in personal and common areas.

All bedrooms are to conform to standards acceptable to the house manager (i.e. health regulations). Any failure to maintain clean and orderly rooms will be reported to the appropriate counsellor.

Dirty linens are collected each Wednesday morning. Each resident is expected to roll up his bottom sheet, towel and pillow case and leave the bundle at the bottom of the bed.

#### B. House Meetings

Each resident is required to attend formal assessment meetings with his assigned counsellor. These meetings will be arranged on a weekly basis.

Each resident is required to attend weekly house meetings. Small house meetings (6 or 7 residents) will take place weekly for the first three weeks of each month. During the first week of each month, on Wednesday at 6:30 p.m. , there will be a general house meeting of all residents and staff.

#### C. Curfews

Each resident will observe an initial curfew of 9:30 p.m. . This curfew may be adjusted to a maximum of 1:00 a.m.. These adjustments are negotiated by resident and staff.

All residents will be out of bed by 7:30 a.m. (Monday to Friday). Exceptions will be made for those residents employed on shift work.

#### D. Room and Board

Room and board for all residents employed full time is computed at \$7.50 daily to a maximum of \$35.00 weekly.

Room and board for all residents on manpower training, educational or U.I.C. programs, or on pensions (old age, workmen's compensation, disability) is computed at \$3.50 daily to a maximum of \$17.50 weekly.

Room and board is expected to be paid on Friday of each week.

No resident will be allowed to be owing at anytime, an amount greater than two weeks room and board.

#### E. General Rules

Violence is not tolerated. Persons involved in or threatening violence will be required to leave the residence

immediately.

Alcohol and non-prescribed drugs are not permitted in the house.

Each resident is responsible for guests that he invites to the houses. Upstairs areas are "off-limit" to anyone but staff and residents. All guests are to be out of the house by 11:00 p.m. (Sunday-Thursday) and 1:00 a.m. on weekends.

ALMOST HOUSE WEEKLY PROGRESS REPORT

Resident's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Week of: \_\_\_\_\_ Staff Member(s): \_\_\_\_\_

I. Each of the letter questions below should be answered in terms of the behaviour of the resident during the past week; that is, his progress or degree of improvement in each of the "need areas" checked off in the Initial Assessment form.

FOR EACH ITEM, CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER(S) OR FILL IN THE BLANK.

A&B. Employment or School Progress:

1. Employed. No. of days at work in the past week: \_\_\_ days.

2. Student. No. of days at school in the past week: \_\_\_\_\_ days.

3. Unemployed: disabled or unable to work.

4. Unemployed: looking for work.

a. Satisfactory progress in this area.

b. Unsatisfactory progress in this area.

C. No. of times alcohol has been used excessively in the past week: \_\_\_\_\_ times.

D. No. of times drugs have been abused: \_\_\_\_\_ times.

Name of drug(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

E. Did the resident handle his money well in the past week?  
Yes or No.

- F. Did the resident have any family related problems in the past week? Yes or No.
- G. Has the resident had any difficulty in getting along with the other people? Yes or No.
- H. The resident's attitude toward himself in the past week:
1. Low self-esteem
  2. Adequate self-esteem
  3. Overly self-confident
- I. The type of friends of the resident:
1. No friends
  2. Acceptable friends
  3. Unacceptable friends
- J. The resident's ability to realize his problems:
1. No problems
  2. Adequate realization
  3. Inadequate realization of problems
- K. The resident's relationship(s) with the oppsite sex:
1. No relations with women
  2. No problems
  3. Problems have arisen
- L. The resident's expectations of life on the street:
1. Realistic expectations
  2. Unrealistic expectations
- M. Personal appearance and hygiene during the past week:
1. Satisfactory hygiene
  2. Unsatisfactory hygiene

N. Physical health:

I. No problems

2. Health has been a problem

O. Resident's use of leisure time:

I. Satisfactory use of leisure time

2. Unsatisfactory use of leisure time

P. Other "need areas" of the resident: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_



2. Describe the progress of the resident using the need areas identified in Question 1.
- 
- 

3. Describe the assistance provided to the resident in the past week by: (A) the house staff, (B) other agencies in the community.

A. 1. No assistance has been provided by the house staff in the past week.

2. Yes, assistance has been provided in the following areas. (For example, if counselling has occurred, state the nature of the problem or situation, what staff members were involved, and the length of the counselling session.)

B. 1. No community agencies or services have been used in the past week by this resident.

2. Yes, some agencies have been used. (List the agencies referred, the reason, and results.)

4. Did the resident attend a house meeting in the past week?

1. Yes    2. No    3. No house meeting in past week.

5. Did the resident participate in any house activities in the past week?

1. Yes    2. No    3. no house activities in past week.

6. If applicable: Number of times the resident broke curfew in past week: \_\_\_\_\_ times.

7. Number of times the resident broke other house rules in the

past week: \_\_\_\_\_ times.

8. If specific objectives have been set with this resident, describe the progress that has been made towards achieving them in the past week.

I. No specific objectives have been set with this resident.

2. Yes, specific objectives were set. The progress has been:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_.

I, \_\_\_\_\_, agree to satisfy the conditions of stay at Almost House as they are outlined in the House Rules. I further agree to participate, to the best of my ability, in house programs and activities. I agree to attend regular counselling sessions with my designated counsellor, and to follow through on my release plans and conditions as follows:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

I, \_\_\_\_\_, as staff at Almost House agree to assist \_\_\_\_\_ in his reintegration into the Hamilton community. I attest that Almost House will provide accommodation, meals, and 24 hr. availability of staff. I further agree to act as a liaison with various community facilities and resources and will meet with \_\_\_\_\_ in regular formal counselling and assessment sessions.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix Two

### Part I- Program Outline for Betcha Can't House

Betcha Can't House is a Community Resource Centre under contract to the Ministry of Correctional Services.

The primary purpose of the Centre is to assist residents in dealing with problems relating to their eventual return to the community on completion of their sentence by means of a gradual "release" program while at the same instance providing a warm residential environment.

The basic dynamics of the program are deceptively simple.

The program involves;

- A. Rewards; i.e. social mobility revolving around;
  - 1. passes
  - 2. visits
  - 3. possibly eventual inclusion in staff meetings
- B. Consequences; social restrictions revolving around;
  - 1. passes
  - 2. visits
  - 3. return to parent institution
- C. Delivery revolves around the behaviour of the individual in terms of;
  - 1. personal interaction
  - 2. job or job search

3. education
4. punctual return from passes

Thereforeas the individuals behaviour is the qualifier which determines the delivery of either rewards or consequences the individual is taught what it means to be held accountable for one's actions on a day to day basis.

### Definitions

The interaction of the individual is assessed in terms of;

1. observance of house rules
2. contribution to the day to day smooth operation of the centre
3. promotion of well being among other residents
4. execution of chores
5. participation in house meetings and activities
6. adherence to job related rulings
7. senstivity to community censure

### The Job

An employers agreement must be signed by the Ministry of Correctional Services or their designate and the residents employer. This will spesify hours of employment and wage. A residents employer will be contacted from time to time and a report made on job, attitude, performance, etc.

A resident may change his job if;

1. permission of the centre is given in writing
2. another job has been arranged

sufficient notice has to be given to the employer.

The resident must allow entry of all pertinent infor-

mation regarding place of employ, wage, hours, type of job, name of employer, and the name of his supervisor to be entered into the work book. If a resident acts improperly thereby reducing the chances of another resident securing work with that employer it will result in loss of mobility or removal from the program.

If a resident should lose a job and it should be deemed due to irresponsibility or negligence on the residents part loss of mobility or removal from the program may result.

If a day off work is required no penalties will be imposed if;

1. permission of the house is given
2. permission of the employer is given
3. information was logged and verified 24 hrs. in advance

Lateness for work or return from work will be treated in the same way as lateness from a pass. Sickness must be verified by a doctor and where possible the residents will inform the employer of their inability to work that day. In instances where residents are too sick to go to work they are also too sick to partake of passes over the duration of their illness. Any overtime work must be verified and commitments fulfilled. Failure to comply will result in consequence.

### Banking

The resident will be expected to open a joint account with the director of the program into which all residents

income must be deposited. All transactions will be recorded in a banking record log that will be used by residents and director. This is to help educate the individual about financing recording, budgeting and planning. Withdrawals will be made upon the account according to need, i.e. family support, restitution, clothing, leisure money. Residents will be expected to maintain a minimum balance of \$50.00 in their accounts. Banking will be done one day per week towards the end of each week. Residents are expected to anticipate their need for the coming week.

Residents will be entitled to a weekly allowance after all other financial obligations have been taken into consideration.

Calculations for personal/leisure withdrawals operate by the criteria of \$5.00 for every \$25.00 net (take home) to the nearest \$25.00.

Travel expense withdrawals to and from work will be calculated on an individual basis.

Those leaving on weekend passes will be allowed to draw \$25.00 more than their basic allowance rate for that period.

#### Payment of Rent

Room and board must be paid by each and every resident the exception of course being those who are not employed or involved in an educational program.

Room and board is \$6.00 per day or \$42.00 per week,

payable in advance each and every week.

### Job Search

A resident must have plans of the area he wishes to visit at the time he requests a job search pass and where possible the specific employer to be visited is to be mentioned.

A suitable length for the pass will be determined and logged at the time the pass is requested.

A resident must ask employers visited to sign the job search form and list phone number.

The job search form will be returned to the counsellor to be reviewed with resident.

Failure on the part of the resident to have the job search form signed by the employer will result in consequence.

On weekdays any unemployed resident not taking a job search pass must be up by 06:30 hrs. to report to temporary manpower or casual employment offices. The resident should be signed out until 10:00 hrs. and must phone the house before this time if a job is obtained. If no job is obtained he must be back to the centre by the specified time call to inform the staff why he will be late. This will be logged.

The time the resident is permitted to spend in finding employment is left to the discretion of the staff.

The house reserves the right to forbid work at any place or job they feel would be detrimental to the progress of resident.



### Education

Passes for fulfill educational commitments will be handled in the same way as work passes. Staff are expected to assist residents with educational materials when asked, in the most beneficial way possible. Sick leave and any change in time schedule are dealt with in the same way as the working man.

Residents are expected to be involved in either a job search or some type of educational program (university, manpower adjustment/diversion programs etc.)

### Family relationships

I. All payments of support are to made by certified cheque only made out to the senior dependent.

2. We encourage beneficial interactions of the family but will intervene if their seems to be great difficulties in the relationship.

3. We will offer home visits by staff, financial assessments of home situation and basically try to get involved and lend the man's family support.

The centre's program obviously places great emphasis on the resident assuming responsibility for his actions.

Therefore all cases of misconduct likely to bring discredit upon the centre will be consequated directly in proportion to their magnitude. Staff will explain to residents what kind of behaviours are inappropriate and why so.

All damage to centre property through irresponsible

behaviour will require payment of cost of replacing item or replacing same.

As well allow me to point out that at this place and time the house does not intend to allow any residents to operate a motor vehicle.

### House Meetings

These will function to allow residents to briefly state any grievences or complaints. These will be stated through the chairman of the meeting. Meetings will also function as "group" sessions, the emphasis being explain and demonstrate the dynamics and growth processes to the group as they occur. One of the main points here will be to point out the individuals tendency towards dialectic manipulation. Therefore staff may play back inappropriate behaviour to residents and supply alternate supportive behaviour.

By operating in this fashion we hope to improve the individuals own ability for introspection so as to enable him to reach levels of integrity. Once he begins to develop his level of morality it won't be long before he can accept social norms and conventions.

These sessions will be facilitated by the director or an invited professional. The meeting will be held once each week and it is mandatory for all residents not working shift to be there and for the night and day staff for that day to attend as well. At the end of the house meeting the director

will offer supervision to staff.

It is the intention of this centre to provide satellite programs which will be created over an unspecified period of time. These may include manpower out reach programs, the creation of a non-profit casual labour service, to serve inmates who are hard to employ and try it together with the other regional residences. Liaison with community, business and municipal associations. Children's christmas parties for underprivileged families arranged and carried out by residents. Involve the business community in donations for the kids party etc.

All art work and renovation work offered by the residents is welcome.

We will try to arrange movies every Friday night for those not on pass.

will offer supervision to staff.

It is the intention of this centre to provide satellite programs which will be created over an unspecified period of time. These may include manpower out reach programs, the creation of a non-profit casual labour service, to serve inmates who are hard to employ and try it together with the other regional residences. Liaison with community, business and municipal associations. Children's christmas parties for underprivileged families arranged and carried out by residents. Involve the business community in donations for the kids party etc.

All art work and renovation work offered by the residents is welcome.

We will try to arrange movies every Friday night for those not on pass.

Part II- Betcha Can't House

I. Absolutely no alcohol, illicit drugs (all prescription drugs must be surrendered to staff for ministrations), firearms, weapons of any kind or property of dubious origin is to be allowed on the property. Failure to comply would not only result in immediate expulsion from the program but could result in institutional charges being laid.

Although we cannot control usage of contraband by residents while they are away on pass all T.A.P. regulations still apply. If on return to the house a resident is deemed by the staff to have abused alcohol or drugs the resident will face the appropriate consequence.

2. No violence or threat of violence is allowed at the centre. This infraction will lead to immediate expulsion and possibly institutional charges being laid.

3. Attendance at house meetings unless house meetings conflict with shift.

4. All information concerning work; name, telephone, address of employer, type of work, wage and hours, supervisors name must be volunteered to staff for recording in log book.

5. Open up joint bank account with the director. Pay cheques to be deposited into account and all withdrawal authorized according to house banking rules.

6. Residents hours are liable to terms of day and week-

end passes. Infractions could lead to expulsions depending upon magnitude.

7. Residents will use pay phone for their calls.

8. Visitors may come by after previous arrangements have been made with director. (Visits are contingent upon residents behaviour) Residents are responsible for their guests. Guests are not allowed on the upper floors. The period of time a guest may visit will be determined before the visit is authorized.

9. Each individual is expected to involve themselves in either work, job search, or an educational program,

10. Breakfast available upto 08:30 hrs. only. Supper is served at 17:30 hrs. and will be kept warm for those individuals who will be late for supper. Snacks will be available in the evening.

11. No individual having any history of being involved in or having been convicted of arson will be admitted to the program.

12. No individual having any history of being involved in or convicted of a sexual offense will be admitted to the program.

### 13. Chores

The residents will create their own rotating chore schedule for cleaning all communal spaces, i.e. all spaces which are not their own personal bedroom space. The bedroom space is the individuals responsibility. Failure to execute chores ade-

quately and failure to keep house in reasonable order will result in consequence. Chore lists to be approved by director.

14. Dishes

Residents will again arrange their own rotating schedule for dishes subject to the directors approval.

15. Laundry

Personal will be done floor by floor. Each floor having one day out of the week to do their personal laundry. To conserve energy only full loads are to be washed. Linen will be washed every Monday night by staff with residents assistance. Clean linen will be distributed when old laundry is presented.

16. All cases of misconduct likely to bring discredit to the centre will be consequated and depending upon magnitude may result in removal from program.

17. All residents who must pay support, restitution, etc. must do so by certified cheque.

18. Any resident causing damage to centre property through irresponsible behaviour will be required to pay either the cost of repairing or replacing the item.

19. The resident is held entirely accountable for all of his actions.

20. In the house means house property during daylight hours but when the streetlights come on residents are restricted to the balcony.

21. In the interests of hygiene regular baths and showers will be taken by the residents.

22. Residents are expected to be responsible for their own punctuality regarding wakeup after their first week at the centre. This will usually mean the purchase of an alarm clock.

23. Lastly the centre reserves the right to initiate new rulings as the need arises.



Appendix Three

Inmates: In regards to the CRC

Living Area

Personal Data

Age:

Marital Status:

Education:

Occupation:

Type of Crime:

Sentence:

How Long at House:

1. Could you generally describe the house physically? i.e., rooms, eating areas, recreation areas.
2. Is there anything about the physical make-up of the house that is troublesome to you (bums you out)? i.e. rooms too small, bathrooms, etc.
3. Have you ever done things in the house which the man would call fucking-up? What were they in regards to - sleeping area, eating area, recreation areas, other.
4. What types of reaction have you offered when they accuse you of fucking-up?
5. What are the consequences of your reaction? (What does the man do?) i.e. detention, charge, etc.

Inmate:Working at or out of CRC

- I. Do you work at the house or elsewhere?
  - Ia. How did you get the job?
2. Could you describe your workplace and duties?
  - 2a. If you only work in the house what do you do - time it takes?
3. Have you ever done things at work which may be considered a fuck-up? If not, why not?
4. What were they?
5. What has been your reaction when they say you're fucking-up?
6. Consequences (what does the man do)?
7. What do you do in your spare time?
  - 7a. Who are your friends now? i.e. squares, other cons, etc.
  - 7b. Socially does living in the house affect your social life, if so how?

Ex-Inmate/Residence: on Prisons

## Cell Block or Living Area

1. Could you give me a general description of where you lived in the joint - i.e. not shops or school but cells, dorms. dining halls, recreation area.
2. Physically what bummed you out about where you lived in the joint?
3. Have you ever fucked-up while in your living area?
4. How did you fuck-up?
5. How did you react to their suspicions of fuckinġ-up? i.e. complete denial, offered excuse, etc.
6. What were the consequences? (What did the man do?)i.e. detention, charge, etc.

Ex-Inmate/Resident, Regarding Workplace in Prison

(Joint-job)

1. What and where was your joint job?
2. Did you ever fuck-up while at your joint-job? How? i.e. not working, carrying on merchant business, etc.
3. How did you react if you were accused or caught fucking-up?
4. What were the consequences? (What did the staff do?)
5. Socially in the joint, either in the cell block or workplace, how was your social life fucked-up by the man? i.e. visits, screening, clique break-ups, etc.
6. Was there anything positive about life within the prison?  
What?

Post - CRC Experience

Home of ex-inmate, ex-residence

1. Where do you live now? How did you find it? What does it cost?
2. Is there any physical things about it that bum you out?
  - 2a. Are there any advantages to your living situation?
3. Do you ever encounter problems with others in and around your home? How?
4. Have you done anything to fuck-up with the landlord?  
i.e. noise, no rent dope, police visits, etc.
5. What was your reaction when and if he accused you of fuck-ing-up?
6. What are the consequences? What happens? i.e. kicked out, warning, rent increase, police, etc.

Post - CRC Experience

Workplace of ex-inmate residence

1. Are you working now? Where? How did you get the job?
2. Have you ever fucked-up while on the job? How?
3. How did you react, or what did you do if the man accused or caught you fucking-up?
4. What were the consequences? What did the foreman/boss do?
5. Has this job helped or hurt you socially? i.e. friends, money, benefits, etc. Why?
6. Socially who are your friends now? (ex-cons, squares, etc)  
Do you have better friends now that you're outside of the prison and CRC? Why?

CRC- Staff

## Housing Area

1. What is there about the physical characteristics of the house which may place residents in trouble situations?
2. What types of issues constitutes a fuck-up for a resident in the housing area? (i.e. drinking, etc)
3. What types of rationale is offered in reply by the residents to a staff's allegations of a resident's fuck-up?
4. What are the consequences? What action is taken by administration?
5. Socially how might the house and its operations generate troublesome situations for the residences? i.e. curfew, visitors, passes, etc.
- 5a. How might it be helpful?
6. In your words, what is CRC suppose to do? Does it fulfill its goals?

CRC- Staff

## Workplace

1. What types of jobs do the residents regularly get?
2. Are the men required to work within the house; at what kinds of jobs?
3. What kind of things in the workplace may indicate a resident may be fucking-up at work or school? i.e. late, absent.etc.
4. What are the consequences residents face from employer, CRC staff, or from parole if they fuck-up on the job?
5. What response may be offered by the residents? i.e. denial, admit, etc.
6. How do you feel a job may hinder or enhance the social life of the residents?



Prison Guards: Living Area

- I. What physical characteristics of the institution and its operations could create, from your experiences, troublesome inmates? i.e. overcrowding, isolation, temporary pass, etc. Why?
- Ia. Are there any aspects of the institution that you see as helpful/beneficial to the inmates?
2. What types of actions, by the inmates, in the cell/housing area could be considered trouble for the inmate? (How might he fuck-up from administration's point of view?)
3. What types of response is offered by the inmate who is caught and accused?
4. What are the consequences they might face? (How does administration handle troublesome inmates?)
5. In terms of their social life, how does the prison setting restrict or create trouble situations for the inmate?  
i.e. visits, passes, etc.

Prison Guards: In the Workplace

1. What physical and operational aspects of the inmate's workplace may cause troublesome inmates? i.e. cold area dangerous hard work, etc.
2. What are some of the troubles inmates could get into in their work or school areas?
3. What are some of the responses offered by inmates if accused of being in trouble? (fucking-up)
4. What do you (as administration) do in answer to inmates creating trouble (consequences, what happens)?
5. What do you think prisons are suppose to do?
6. Do they succeed in attaining their goal? Why or why not?

### Bibliography

- Bettelheim, Bruno. "Individual and Mass Behaviour in Extreme Situations", Social Psychology, III (1958), 303-305.
- Bogdon, Robert., and Taylor, Steven J. Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1975.
- Carter, Robert., Glasser, Daniel., and Wilkins, Leslie T., Correctional Institutions. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1972.
- Cohen, Stanley., and Taylor, Laurie. Psychological Survival. Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books, Inc., 1972.
- Davis, Nanette J. "Labeling Theory in Deviance Research: A Critique and Reconsideration", The Sociological Quarterly, XIII, Michigan State University, 1972.
- Elkins, Stanley M. Slavery: A Problem in American Institutional and Intellectual Life. London: University of Chicago Press, Ltd., 1959.
- Erickson, Rosemary J., Crow, W.J., Zurcher, L.A., and Connett, A.V. Paroled But Not Free. New York: Behavioural Publications, Inc., 1973.
- Foucault, Michel. Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. Toronto: Random House of Canada Ltd., 1975.
- Goffman, Erving. Asylum. New York: Anchor Books, 1961.
- Goffman, Erving. Stigma. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. : Prentice - Hall, Inc., 1963.
- Goffman, Erving. The Effects of Inmate Status : Deviance. by Rubington and Weinberg.
- Government of Canada. Community Involvement in Criminal Justice. Report of the Task Force on the Role of the Private Sector in Criminal Justice. Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1977.
- Government of Canada. Report of the Task Force on Community Based Residential Centres. Ottawa: Information Canada, 1973.

- Gregory, Dick. Up From Nigger. Crest Books, CBS Publications, 1976.
- Haag, Ernest van den. Punishing Criminals. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1975.
- Hawkins, Gordon. The Prison: Policy and Practice. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1976.
- Hentig, Hans Von. Punishment: It's Origin, Purpose and Psychology. Montclair, N.J.: Patterson Smith Publishing Corporation, 1973.
- Irwin, John., and Cressy, Donald R. Thieves, Convicts and the Inmate Culture: Social Problems. University of California, Los Angeles and Santa Barbra, 1964 - 1965.
- Irwin, John. The Felon. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
- Kwarther, Richard. Behind Bars: Prisons in America. Toronto: Random House of Canada, Ltd., 1977.
- MacGuigan, Mark. Report to Parliament The Sub-Committee on the Penitentiary System in Canada. Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1977.
- Mann, W.E. Society Behind Bars. Toronto: Copp Clark Publishing Company, 1967.
- McNeil, Gerard., and Vance, Sharon. Cruel and Unusual. Deneau and Greenberg Publishers, Ltd., 1978.
- Menninger, Karl. The Crime of Punishment. New York: Viking Press, Inc., 1975.
- Merton, Robert K. Social Structure. New York: The Free Press, 1965.
- Mills, Wright C. The Sociological Imagination. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 1959.
- Mitford, Jessica. Kind and Usual Punishment. Toronto: Random House of Canada, Ltd., 1974.
- Piven, Frances F. Regulating the Poor: The Function of Public Welfare. New York: Random House, Inc., 1971.
- Polsky, Ned. Hustlers, Beats and Others. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1969.

Potter, R.T. Correctional Programs in Ontario- Adult Male Institutions. Ministry of Correctional Services, 1974.

Roebuck, Julian. Thieves, Convicts and the Inmate Culture: Social Problems Journal. Louisiana State University, 1964-1965.

Rudovsky, D., Bronstein, A.J., and Koren, E.I. The Rights of Prisoners. New York: Avon Books, 1977.

Sykes, Gresham M. Society of Captives. Princeton University Press, 1958.

Wicker, Tom. A Time To Die. Toronto: Ballantine Books of Canada, Ltd., 1976.

Zeitoun, Louis. "The Development of Community Based Residential Centres in Canada", Speech delivered at the First International Conference on Community Residential Care for the Disadvantaged or Socially Stigmatized, University of Surrey Guildford, Surrey, U.K. 1976. Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada, Ottawa, Canada.