

CORRECTIONS

HEARINGS
BEFORE
SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
NINETY-SECOND CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION
ON
CORRECTIONS
PART II
PRISONS, PRISON REFORM, AND PRISONERS' RIGHTS:
CALIFORNIA

OCTOBER 25, 1971

Serial No. 15

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1971

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

EMANUEL CELLER, New York, *Chairman*

PETER W. RODINO, Jr., New Jersey	WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH, Ohio
HAROLD D. DONOHUE, Massachusetts	RICHARD H. POFF, Virginia
JACK BROOKS, Texas	EDWARD HUTCHINSON, Michigan
JOHN DOWDY, Texas	ROBERT McCCLORY, Illinois
ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, Wisconsin	HENRY P. SMITH III, New York
DON EDWARDS, California	CHARLES W. SANDMAN, JR., New Jersey
WILLIAM L. HUNGATE, Missouri	TOM RAILSBACK, Illinois
JOHN CONYERS, Jr., Michigan	EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR., Pennsylvania
ANDREW JACOBS, Jr., Indiana	CHARLES E. WIGGINS, California
JOSHUA EILBERG, Pennsylvania	DAVID W. DENNIS, Indiana
WILLIAM F. RYAN, New York	HAMILTON FISH, JR., New York
JEROME R. WALDIE, California	R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN, Pennsylvania
EDWIN W. EDWARDS, Louisiana	WILEY MAYNE, Iowa
WALTER FLOWERS, Alabama	LAWRENCE J. HOGAN, Maryland
JAMES R. MANN, South Carolina	WILLIAM J. KEATING, Ohio
ABNER J. MIKVA, Illinois	JAMES D. McKEVITT, Colorado
PAUL S. SARBANES, Maryland	
JOHN F. SEIBERLING, Ohio	
JAMES ABOUREZK, South Dakota	
GEORGE E. DANIELSON, California	
ROBERT F. DRINAN, Massachusetts	

BESS E. DICK, *Staff Director*

BENJAMIN L. ZELENKO, *General Counsel*

GARNER J. CLINE, *Counsel*

HERBERT FUCHS, *Counsel*

WILLIAM P. SHATTUCK, *Counsel*

JEROME M. ZEIFMAN, *Counsel*

JOSEPH FISCHER, *Law Revision Counsel*

DONALD G. BENN, *Associate Counsel*

FRANKLIN G. POLK, *Associate Counsel*

THOMAS E. MOONEY, *Associate Counsel*

SAMUEL A. GARRISON III, *Associate Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE No. 3

ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, Wisconsin, *Chairman*

JOHN CONYERS, Jr., Michigan	TOM RAILSBACK, Illinois
WILLIAM F. RYAN, New York	EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR., Pennsylvania
ABNER J. MIKVA, Illinois	HAMILTON FISH, JR., New York
ROBERT F. DRINAN, Massachusetts	R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN, Pennsylvania

HERBERT FUCHS, *Counsel*

HOWARD EGLIT, *Special Counsel*

THOMAS E. MOONEY, *Associate Counsel*

CONTENTS

Testimony of—	Page
— Apfel, Barney, secretary-treasurer, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Local 960, San Francisco, Calif.....	59
— Berg, Richard P., attorney.....	77
— Burton, Hon. Phillip, A Representative in Congress from the State of California.....	2
— Caldwell, Edwin, Esq.....	72
— Camacho, Moe, president, California Correctional Officers Association.....	57
— Dellums, Hon. Ronald V., A Representative in Congress from the State of California.....	22
— Irwin, John, associate professor of sociology, San Francisco State University.....	87
— Jackson, Popeye.....	92
— Kerr, Henry W., chairman, California Adult Authority.....	22
— Madigan, Frank, sheriff of Alameda County.....	56
— Park, W. L. James, associate warden, administration, San Quentin State Prison.....	46
— Procunier, Raymond K., director, California Department of Corrections.....	4
— Read, Aaron, statewide coordinator for correctional employees, California State Employees Association.....	61
— Sawyer, Lewis O.....	91
— Sieroty, Hon. Alan, Assemblyman, California State Legislature.....	104
— Stender, Fay, attorney.....	32
— Zimbardo, Dr. Philip G., professor of psychology, Stanford University.....	110
Additional information—	
Prepared statements:	
— Berg, Richard P., Esq.....	145
— Camacho, Moe.....	142
— Kerr, Henry W.....	129
— Park, Warden, W. L. James.....	138
— Procunier, Raymond K.....	122
— Stender, Fay, Esq.....	133
— Zimbardo, Dr. Philip G.....	152
Statements submitted for the record:	
— American Correctional Association Ad Hoc Committee for the Provision of Legal Research Materials.....	158
— Bay Area Social Responsibilities Round Table, American Library Association.....	159
— Coordinating Council of Prisoner Organizations of Northern California.....	161
Appendices:	
— Berg, Richard P., Esq.:	
— Prisoners' petition to subcommittee No. 3.....	351
— Hearings on motions for summary judgment and preliminary injunction, <i>Danny Brenneman, et al. v. Frank I. Madigan, et al.</i> , No. 70-1911, Mar. 11, 1971.....	352
— Kerr, Henry W.:	
— A. California Adult Authority orientation information.....	165
— B. Charts:	
— Percentage with crimes against either property or persons.....	173
— Percentage with weapon.....	174
— Average age at first arrest.....	175
— Percentage with multiple offenses.....	176
— Mean prior-criminal-record (arrests).....	177

Additional information—Continued

Stender, Fay, Esq.—Continued

G. <i>Clutchette v. Procunier</i> , U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California (Zirpoli, J.)-----	Page 289
H. The "Adjustment Center Bill," A.B. 2904, S.B. 1610, introduced in the 1970 session of the California Legislature by Assemblyman John Dunlap (Democrat, of Vallejo) and Senator Mervyn Dymally (Democrat of Los Angeles), coauthored by Assemblyman (Rev.) Richard E. Barnes (Republican, of San Diego)-----	303
I. Article—Part 1, "San Quentin: Murder on the installment plan"; Part 2, "Inside San Quentin—At the Mercy of the Merciless," by Maharibi Muntu (Larry West), "The Village Voice," October 7, 14, 1971-----	312
United Prisoners Union Bill of Rights-----	355

**STATEMENT OF PHILIP G. ZIMBARDO, PH. D., PROFESSOR OF
PSYCHOLOGY, STANFORD UNIVERSITY**

Dr. ZIMBARDO. Although I am a psychologist at Stanford University, I really come here just as a researcher and a concerned citizen. I would like to use the microphone so that the hardy band of people who stayed here can hear some of my comments. It should be noted most of the correctional officers and people from the California correctional institutions did not feel it worthwhile to stay to hear anything but their own comments.

I would like a few minutes to read a brief version of the report that I presented for the record.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Yes. Your report that you have will be accepted and printed in full in the record, and we will be happy to hear your abbreviated version of it.

(Dr. Zimbardo's statement appears at p. 152.)

Dr. ZIMBARDO. "I was recently released from 'solitary confinement' after being held therein for 37 months. The silent system was imposed upon me, and to even whisper to the man in the next cell resulted in being beaten by guards, sprayed with chemical mace, blackjacked, stomped, and thrown into a strip cell naked to sleep on a concrete floor without bedding, covering, wash basin, or even a toilet. The floor served as toilet and bed, and even there the silent system was enforced. To let a moan escape your lips because of the pain and discomfort resulted in another beating. I spent not days but months there during my 37 months in solitary.

"I have filed every writ possible against the administrative acts of brutality. The State courts have all denied the petitions. Because of my refusal to let the 'things die down' and 'forget' all that happened during my 37 months in solitary, I am the most hated prisoner in— Penitentiary, and called a 'hard-core incorrigible.'

"Professor Zimbardo, maybe I am an incorrigible, but, if true, it is because I would rather die than to accept being treated less than a human being. I have never complained of my prison sentence as being unjustified except through legal means of appeals. I have never put a knife on a guard's throat and demanded my release. I know that thieves must be punished, and I don't justify stealing even though I am a thief myself. But now I don't think I will be a thief when I am released. No, I am not rehabilitated. It is just that I no longer think of becoming wealthy by stealing. I now only think of 'killing.'

"Killing those who have beaten me and treated me as if I were a dog. I hope and pray for the sake of my own soul and future life of freedom that I am able to overcome the bitterness and hatred which eats daily at my soul, but I know to overcome it will not be easy."

This eloquent plea for prison reform, for humane treatment of human beings, for the basic dignity that is the right of every American, came to me this week in a letter from a prisoner who cannot be identified because he is still part of a State correctional institution in Ohio. He sent it to me because he read of an experiment I conducted recently at Stanford University. In an attempt to understand just what it means psychologically to be a prisoner or a prison guard, we created our own prison, in part because we cannot get into prison to study what happened.

A very brief description of the experiment: We put an advertisement in the newspaper asking for volunteers for a study on prison life. We got over 70 volunteers and screened each one individually. My students, Craig Haney and Curt Banks, did psychological interviews of each one. We selected two dozen of the most mature, emotionally stable, normal, intelligent young men that we could find. These were what I would call the cream of the crop of this generation. They were primarily middle class or well to do. In every way they were within the normal range on every dimension. They were quite homogeneous to begin with.

Half were arbitrarily designated as prisoners by a flip of a coin, the other half as guards. So we began with a group of boys that were identical in every way, no difference at all except we said, "you half are prisoners, you half are guards." The guards were simply told that they were going to go into a situation that could be serious and have perhaps some danger, although they knew it was an experiment, of course. They made up their own rules for maintaining law, order, and respect. They were free to improvise any new rules. They served 8-hour, three-man shifts.

The prisoners were unexpectedly picked up by the police. Unknown to them, we made arrangements with the police department to send an on-duty squad car with an officer who picked each prisoner up individually at his house, booked them on a charge of armed robbery, searched them, handcuffed them, brought them to the station, went through a whole booking routine, which left the would-be prisoners quite shocked and dazed. They were then taken down to the "prison." We had physically recreated a prison, putting bars on cells, and had three prisoners living in small quarters night and day. We had started out with the intention that it would run for 2 weeks. Now, they were getting \$15 a day for this work—which was very good pay. Being an experiment, they figured it would be fun and games. They needed the money. It was summer and most of them were without work.

We observed and recorded on videotapes all the significant daily events. We interviewed and tested prisoners and guards at various points throughout the study. We are in the process of writing a book, reporting all of this which I will submit to this committee when we do. Some of the videotapes which recorded what actually occurred between prisoners and guards will be presented on NBC news feature, *Chronolog*, Thanksgiving weekend, November 26.

In the short time available at this hearing I would like to describe what are the main results, and, how this experiment we did relates to the "experiment" that the correctional authorities are doing all over the country with real prisoners, and then, very briefly, to make a few proposals about prison reform that stem from our study.

At the end of only 6 days, we had to close down the mock prison. It was no longer apparent to us or most of the subjects where they ended and their roles began. The majority had indeed become prisoners or guards, no longer able to clearly differentiate between role-playing and self. There were dramatic changes in virtually every aspect of their behavior, the way they acted, the way they talked, the way they stood, the way they felt. In less than a week, the experience of imprisonment undid, although temporarily, a lifetime of learning; human values were suspended, self-concepts were challenged, and the ugliest, most base, pathological side of human nature surfaced.

We were horrified because we saw some boys, "guards," treat other boys as if they were despicable animals, taking pleasure in cruelty, while other boys, "prisoners," became servile, dehumanized people who thought only of escape, who thought only of their own individual survival, and finally over the days, they began to hate the guards more and more.

We had to release three prisoners in the first 4 days because they had such acute situational traumatic reactions as hysterical crying, confusion in thinking, and severe depression. That is within 4 days. Others begged to be paroled, and that word "paroled" became very important. When we said, "we will parole you if you are willing to forfeit all the money you earned"—they had gone through all kinds of hell—all but three said "yes, if you parole me, I will forfeit all the money." We said, "OK, go back to your cell and we'll consider it." Each one got up and went back to his cell. Now, they as students, thinking they were subjects in an experiment, at that point if they no longer wanted the money, they should have said, "I quit your experiment." But by then, their pattern of thinking had changed so that the reality was the word "parole" and only we had the right to grant it. They did not have the right to quit. They no longer felt they had any rights.

By the last days, and that was by day 5 and 6, the earlier solidarity among the prisoners dissolved. On the second day the prisoners attempted to rebel, and the guards had systematically broken this down. It is interesting to note the first technique the guards used was physical force. Prisoners had barricaded themselves, and the guards just broke in, stripped them and took away their beds.

But the really effective thing was psychological pressure. This has been underestimated in everything I have heard in today's testimonies. You can understand how men can be broken with physical force or physical abuse, but psychological pressure is much more effective. You can resist physical force, hate the person who uses it, but subtle psychological pressure such as brainwashing in the Korean war, and police interrogations of suspects is much more effective.

One of the things the guards did was to set up one cell as a privilege cell. They told those in the other two cells, they could not eat. They gave this one cell food, and by the end of the day the prisoners who were rebelling were now afraid to talk to the guys in the "good" cell because they assumed there must be an informer there. So now you had not one group of prisoners, you had two groups. One group of prisoners was rebelling, and the others who had privileged treatment were not—they began to mistrust one another. Once the guards did this, then they set the men against each other.

What happened to the guards? About a third of the guards became tyrannical in their arbitrary use of power. It was clear that they enjoyed the simple act of controlling some other person. They were corrupted by the power of their roles and became quite inventive in their techniques of breaking the spirit of the prisoners, making them feel worthless. Some of the guards merely did their jobs; in fact, the prisoners said they were tough, but fair, correctional officers. Several were good guards. By this they meant they did small favors, they were friendly, they told the prisoners their names, but the really important message, and a subtle one, is that no good guard ever interfered. The bad guards would humiliate prisoners, would get a prison-

er who refused to use obscenity because of his religion and force him to use obscenity and have the other prisoners humiliate him. They were even beginning to promote homosexuality, but the good guards never intervened, they never interfered in any way. They never came to me and said, "Look, these guys are doing this awful thing that I dislike." They never went to the bad guard and said, "Look, it is only an experiment, ease off." Some of the bad guards were so brutal that, for example, we had a rule you could not be kept in solitary confinement for more than an hour. This was a small closet 2 feet by 2 feet. One of the guards kept a prisoner there 3 hours without eating and was going to keep him overnight and none of the other guards would intervene.

My assistant, Curt Banks, was there and said, "You cannot do this, it is not permissible." In a sense, if you think about it, the bad guards, the mean ones, the brutal ones, created a sense of terror in the prison. But it really was the good guards who perpetuated the prison because, actually, they needed the bad guys in order to make themselves be good guys. They used the brutality of the bad guys to establish themselves as good. They needed to be liked so much, that they never objected to the bad guys. They needed the prisoners to like them, so they befriended them. In one sense, they created a social reality which made rebellious prisoners be good prisoners, in a sense, to go along with the system, not to make trouble.

By the end of the week, the experiment became a reality, as if it were a Pirandello play directed by Kafka that just keeps going after the audience walks out.

The consultant of our prison, Carlo Prescott, an ex-con friend of mine, who served 16 years in almost all of California's jails, would get so depressed when he came down that he had to leave because it was so realistic.

A former prison chaplain, Father Coughlin, came down because our prisoners wanted church service. He talked to each of the prisoners, and he said—after seeing how they were in only 4 days—they were just like the first offenders he had seen, totally confused, disoriented.

In the end I called the experiment off, in 6 days, not because of the horror I saw, not because of what I saw boys doing to other boys, but really because of the horror of realizing that I could easily have traded places with the most brutal guard or become the weakest prisoner full of hate at being so powerless that I could not eat, sleep, or go to the toilet unless I got somebody's permission. It became clear to me I could have been Calley at Mylai, George Jackson at San Quentin, or I could have been one of the men at Attica. One of the important messages from this study, I think, is that every one of you could, too. No one here, I think, can assert that he could not be either brutal or powerless when put in the situation.

There are two main significant implications of this study. One, I think, is individual behavior is largely under the control of social forces and environmental contingencies, things that occur, rather than some vague notions of personality traits, character, will power, or other empirically unvalidated constructs. Thus, we create an illusion of freedom by attributing more internal control to ourselves, to the individual, than actually exists. We thus underestimate how powerful are the forces in the social environment that we are in because we over-

estimate, we put too much stock in, some notions of character, free will or personality traits for which there is no evidence, psychologically, that they exist.

In large measure, we are and do what is determined by situations that we are in. Very often these are non-obvious and subtle, so we are unaware of them. Very often we avoid situations where we might be controlled and finally we label as weak or deviant people in those situations that we are not in when they behave different from us. We would also behave that same way, but we don't enter those situations to see.

Each of us carries around in our heads a very favorable self-image. We could not imagine hurting somebody without just cause; in fact, without a lot of provocation. However, there is a large body of research literature that says most people, even a majority, can be made to do almost anything if you put them in psychologically compelling situations, regardless of their morals, ethics, values, attitudes, beliefs, or personal convictions.

We have done experiments where we have mild-mannered college girls in a situation where they are told to deliver punishment to another, likeable girl, who is a stranger to them. If you made them feel anonymous, they were even more punitive or punishing. This is for no reason other than an authority says this is what you must do, you must obey authority. The significance of this study with regard to prisoners, I think, is that the mere act of assigning labels to people, calling some people prisoners and other guards, is sufficient to elicit pathological behavior.

This pathology is not predictable from any available diagnostic indicators we have in the social sciences. We could not tell which guards would become sadistic. There is no indication that the sadistic guards are people who are sick to begin with. There were a few guards who became really disturbed. It is the situation that makes people disturbed and not only that disturbed people enter those situations.

The prison situation in our country is guaranteed to generate severe enough pathological reactions in both guards and prisoners as to debase their humanity, lower their feelings of self-worth, and make it difficult for them to be part of a society outside of their prison.

Not one of our prospective applicants wanted to be a guard because they said, "I could not imagine going to college in order to become a guard." They all wanted to be prisoners. That says something important as to the attitude regarding correctional officers.

The last thing I would like to say, here are some general conclusions and some very specific recommendations.

For me, a prison is any situation in which one person's freedom and liberty are denied by virtue of the arbitrary power exercised by another person or group. Thus our prisons of concrete and steel are really only metaphors for the social prisons we create and maintain through enforced poverty, racism, sexism, and other forms of social injustice. They are also the physical symbol of the psychological prisons we create for others, by making even our loved ones feel inadequate or self-conscious, we put them in prison, and, worst of all, the kind of imprisonment we impose on our own minds and actions through neurotic fears.

The need for prison reform, then, is a cry not only to change the operating procedures in our penal institutions but a more basic plea to change the conditions in our society which make us all prisoners, every one of us, all less happy than we could be, all less productive, less free to grow, and less concerned about our brothers than about our own survival. Once these conditions occur, then you are in a prison of some kind.

It seems to me that our national leaders for years have been pointing to the enemies of freedom, to the Fascist or Communist threat to the American way of life. In so doing, they have overlooked the threat of social anarchy obviously building up within our country without any outside agitation. As soon as a person comes to the realization that he is being imprisoned by his society, some part of it, or individuals in it, then, in the best American tradition, he demands liberty and rebels, accepting death as an alternative. The third alternative, which is obvious, if you want liberty, is to become a "good" prisoner; "good" in the view of the guards, is docile, cooperative, uncomplaining, conforming in thought, and complying in deed. Which one of those three categories do you fit in?

Our prison authorities now point to the militant agitators as still part of some vague Communist plot. They have left college campuses and are now in prison. They imply that there would be no trouble, riots, hostages, or death if it were not for this small band of "bad" prisoners. There is something about those people, some personality trait that makes them incorrigible.

Of course, once you say somebody is incorrigible, it means you don't have to do anything to change them. Once you call somebody a vandal, it means his behavior is senseless, it is not motivated. You can't change somebody who is inherently bad. That is the argument that they present. I think that is one of the key fallacious arguments presented by correctional authorities. So we learn, then, if they had the full permission to really break these men, to put them in maximum security prison, then life would return to normal again in our Nation's prisons.

It seems to me that the riots in prisons are coming from within, not from without; every man and woman who refuses to let the system turn them into an object, a number, a thing, or worse, a no-thing, is not Communist inspired. I think they are inspired by the spirit of American freedom. No one wants to be enslaved. To be powerless, to be subject to the arbitrary exercise of power, to not be recognized as a human being, is to be a slave.

To be a militant prisoner, to me, is to become aware that the physical jails are but more blatant extensions of the forms of social and psychological oppression people experience every day in the Nation's ghettos from which I, myself, come. They are trying to awaken the conscience of the Nation to the ways in which the American ideals are being perverted in the so-called name of justice and law and order, but actually operating under the banner of apathy of the public, fear of people who are different from us, and hatred of minority groups of all kinds.

If we do not listen to the pleas of the prisoners of Attica—what was their plea: their plea was to be treated like a human being—then we have all become brutalized by our priorities for property rights over human rights. The consequence will be loss of all of those ideals on which this country is founded.

Specifically, I make the following recommendations:

One, it is important for us not to demand simple solutions for complex problems of crime and law enforcement. When you talk to a layman, what do you want to do, give me a one-liner, how can we change all of this? The thing most obvious, sitting here listening to the testimony, it is a very complex problem. It is a social problem. It is a psychological problem. It is a problem of politics. There is no one-line solution, but that does not mean that we should not continue to search for solutions. Why does somebody commit a crime? What is the nature of the criminal? What functions do the prisons serve now? What functions should they serve? I think Congress ought to appropriate money for more support for research into these problems, but more important, to keep members of the legislature and public informed about these issues.

The next point I would like to make, we should put the question of prison reform in the broader context of societal reforms and social injustice which may account for why many commit crimes in the first place.

What is happening in prison, the kinds of attitudes expressed by prison authorities and prisoners, really reflect basic attitudes of our society.

It becomes important to investigate the attitude of the public about punishment and retribution. Recent surveys show that 45 percent of the public do not want prisoners to be rehabilitated. They want them to be punished as means of retribution. If it is true that authorities and other people in the legislature think rehabilitation is important, what I think we should do is have mass education; the same way we are getting people to join the Army with advertisements on TV, we can change the attitudes of the public toward rehabilitation.

We might also insist that judges have a continuing interest in what happens to people they sentence. Once someone is sentenced, it is as if the legal system ends and a new system of control takes over.

Next, we can help make the public aware—I think this is an important point, I just realized it myself the other day—they are the ones who own the prisons, and that their business is failing. The 70 percent recidivism rate which is typically quoted, as well as escalation in severity of crimes committed by graduates of our prisons, are evidence that current prisons fail to rehabilitate inmates. In fact, they are breeding grounds for hatred of the establishment. They not only breed hatred for particular guards who may brutalize them psychologically or physically, but what the guard represents, white, middle-class, establishment, power, the nation, a hatred that makes every citizen a target of violent assault.

Prisons are a bad investment for us as taxpayers. Until now, we have not really cared. What we have said is, look, we don't want these people who are bad and evil to jeopardize us, our children, our property, take them away. Now we are horrified to find out what has been happening in prisons, we don't really want to take prisoners back, but we now say something ought to be done. The reaction of Warden Nelson in a sense is really like a child to whom you have loaned your toy. He and the others forgot that it is really not theirs; they act as if it is their prison. They are upset that Congressmen want to go there. I was shocked to learn that I was refused permission to join this committee to go into the prison in order to see the degree to which what I had done was related to what happens in prison. Earlier Associate Warden

Park said, "There is no relationship of your fun and games study to what really happens." I approached the warden at Soledad asking could I come in with a small group of students to see, to observe the facilities? Those requests were denied. It becomes important, then, I think they continue to be concerned. Unless we are, then petty thieves, just like the person quoted in the beginning, may be turned into murderers and we are cooperating through our apathy.

Another point is that we have to remove the cloak of secrecy from the prisons. It is inconceivable that when we see prisoners claiming to be brutalized we can completely believe them. As Attorney Caldwell said, prisoners say they are being brutalized and guards say it is a lie. Well, who do we believe? We would really like to believe the guards. Deep down in your heart, every one of you, you would really like to believe the guards. Even Mr. Conyers, I believe, who has made some of the most perceptive remarks I have ever heard, there was a shadow of doubt in his acceptance of Popeye Jackson's remarks. I didn't believe this account of the prison I quoted except it coincides with what I learned from Carlo Prescott. We don't believe it because we really believe in a humane world. We can't believe people would treat other people in this horrible way. But unless we remove the cloak of secrecy completely, all we have is two opposing forces each of which has a vested interest in their biased point of view.

I have heard some people speak of an ombudsman. We need some third and impartial source so that we, the public, lawyers, judges, can know what is really happening.

The last three points are guards must be given better training now for the job that society imposes on them. Again we find out that guards have 1 week's work at training and 50 hours on the job. You wouldn't let somebody fix your car with that little experience let alone try to "fix" people in prison.

So my concern is not simply to improve prisons or make prisons change in basic ways so that they would not brutalize prisoners, but they really brutalize guards in the same way. To be a prison guard as is now constituted is to put a person in a situation just like we did our students, where they receive constant threat. Every guy there, every prisoner is a potential danger to a guard, and in addition, they have no social recognition. A guard is one of the lowest status positions a person could have in our society.

As was shown graphically at Attica, prison guards are really prisoners. If we just think about what happened to prison guards, they were sacrificed to the demands of the public to be punitive, not to be soft, as well as to the New York politicians and other politicians who had to preserve an image. Those guards are prisoners no less than the other prisoners. Social scientists and business training personnel should be called upon to help design and carry out this special training.

In line with this new human relations training—I think this is an important novel suggestion—would be to change the perceived roles of guards and prisoners. Instead of calling them guards, you could call them counselors or teachers, and the prisoners would be trainees. The important change is the reinforcement each teacher would get. Bonuses and advancement would be contingent upon whether the trainees learned new social and technical skills which will enable them to leave the training-rehabilitation center as early as possible and not come back.

If each guard saw himself as a counselor or a teacher, if he got money, got a bonus, was advanced not as a function of keeping things quiet or maintaining order, but as a function of how quickly he got somebody out of prison, how long they stayed out, I think you would get guards thinking totally differently about prisons and what their role is.

Prisons could be changed dramatically if we substituted positive reinforcement for both prisoners and guards in place of coercion, threats, isolation, as ways of controlling behavior.

Important other changes. There has been a lot of emphasis on rehabilitation giving a prisoner adequate skills. We need that, but I think the more important thing is giving them social training, training in social skills. If you talk to a lot of prisoners, they say in their early life, they lacked meaningful social ties, social connections to a family and community. Prisons could be reconstituted to provide the opportunity for such people to have positive, real, social experiences.

For example, you could train prisoners to become psychiatric aides, and social workers, who, when in prison, could help other prisoners, and when they got out and went back to their community, those are valuable skills which every community needs. This notion which is called "peer management"—peers managing one another rather than some authority managing them—has been shown in other circumstances, in mental hospitals, juvenile delinquent centers, as the best way not only to train someone else, but to build your own sense of self-worth in the community. College students and professional social psychologists could volunteer their services as part of the VISTA campaign.

The last thing I would like to mention is, once a trainee has finished a prescribed course, there should be no stigma attached to his "training." There is no need to report to prospective employers that he or she was a prisoner or labeled as an ex-con. In fact, the Government could provide the necessary papers as if he or she were being honorably discharged from military service or military school. It becomes important, it seems to me, that the main ingredient necessary to effect any change at all in prison reform, in the rehabilitation of the single prisoner—it is hard for me to think in vague concepts—I think of the people I know, Carlo Prescott, Popeye Jackson, or specific guards that I have met—that the critical thing is caring. All reform really has to start with people caring about the well-being of other people, especially people with power, like those on this committee really caring about the most hardened, allegedly incorrigible prisoner in solitary confinement. It seems to me that underneath the toughest, society-hating convict, rebel, or anarchist is a human being who wants his existence to be recognized by his fellows and who wants someone else to care about whether he lives or dies and to be sad if he lives imprisoned rather than lives free.

The question I ask myself, that I would like you to think about, suppose you know you could avert someone from a life of crime if you gave up one full day of your life, would you be willing to give up that one day? Most of us are not even willing to do that for our children. I doubt if most of us would be willing to do it for a prisoner. Unless we get people caring for one another at this human level, psychological level, then these notions, vague notions about

prison reform tend to vanish in the hot air of politics and national dispute.

I am privileged to be allowed to talk to this committee and take its time.

Thank you.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Thank you, professor. You have an excellent statement.

I might just comment on one part to which I might take exception. I am sorry that you were not able to visit San Quentin or Soledad and, in fact, that the news media were not able to visit San Quentin or Soledad. That was not a decision, of course, of the subcommittee.

I think the conclusion that the guided tour would only be of prison show rooms is a little bit mistaken. We were able to talk to and visit any and all inmates, and to visit maximum security areas.

As a matter of fact, criticism could probably somewhat better be made, if it must be made, of the fact that we spent an undue amount of time in the Adjustment Center, and in sections A and B, and in O wing.

Dr. ZIMBARDO. My comments were based on what former prisoners said that I had spoken to. Typically when grand juries come in, there are places in the prison that they never get to go to. If you have a 3-hour visit or 5-hour visit, you can fill up that full time visiting. Unless you know about the prison, you don't know there is a south block C wing. I should apologize to the committee.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I should perhaps modify my own statement to say I don't apologize for spending that much time in those areas, although I suspect some of the comments of the correctional authorities that we do not have an entirely balanced view of the total spectrum of the California prison facilities is probably true. We saw maximum security facilities and minimum security facilities, and we made an effort to see those areas that might be the most revealing in the sense of treatment of human beings.

But, I suggest, I don't think this subcommittee failed.

Mr. CONYERS. Well, I take specific and on-the-record exception to the remarks about the total cooperation that this subcommittee has been given. I do not concur in any suggestions that your remarks are inaccurate. We could not bring in tape recorders. We were specifically forbidden from taking certain prisoners—"political prisoners"—into private quarters to be interviewed. The fact that we were in many of these isolated wings was a result of our insistence, and not a part of the planned tour. I think there were many subtleties that were in operation. Given the fact that as a congressional subcommittee we were in any one institution for X number of hours, obviously the more things we looked at, the less time we would have to get into some of the basic problems.

Now, I think it is very important that we appreciate the fact that the heads of institutions are only having to contend with us one time in their life, for 1 day, for a certain number of hours that day. I have constantly heard members of the subcommittee who felt, and of course that is their prerogative, that they received the full cooperation of the authorities here, but this is one member who most emphatically did not receive that full cooperation. I want that recorded very clearly.

Dr. ZIMBARDO. If I might just inject one word. I earlier have done work on psychological tactics that detectives use in securing confes-

sions from suspects. This was prior to the *Miranda* case. My evidence was, I reviewed all of the manuals that detectives use in training other detectives to do interrogation. I was horrified by some of the things they describe. Virtually they say, use any trick or tactic necessary to get a confession, we assume innocent people would not confess to the crimes they did not commit, and then they go on to describe the deceptive tactics used to elicit confessions. Well, I did some research on it which I presented in a report. I was asked to present this at the National Conference on Law Enforcement, and then they said, "Oh, no, we don't do these kinds of things." When I asked, could I observe an interrogation behind a one-way screen, they said no, it is not allowed. No one—judges, lawyers, Congressmen—no one is allowed to observe it. I can't understand a system of justice in which you have opposing forces which rule out the possibility that the rest of society could even observe their actions. I don't want to intervene. I would be only behind a screen or have a tape recorder. I see the parallel in the prisons is exactly the same. The notion is that it is their prison and you are interfering. You are the Government. You are running the whole show, and you are not allowed in except with their permission. I just can't understand that concept. This is not the place to go into it in the brief time available.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. We are guests of the State of California. We are not running the show for the California Department of Corrections.

One of the rules was that we had to surrender any guns or tape recorders if we were going to visit the system, on the grounds of security. I personally did not feel that this was an unreasonable request, but there may be a difference of opinion.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I want the record to show that I was very happy to surrender my guns. But to tell a Congressman, traveling on a legislative function 2,000 miles from Washington, that he has to copy down everything by hand and is not allowed to have a tape recorder because of an incident involving a tape recorder connected with a prison escape, goes directly toward one of the witness' comments—that everything was tailored. I am not saying that we didn't see anything; we saw a lot. Members of this subcommittee, because of their training, were able to obtain a great deal of information, but to think that we had a complete exhaustive exposure of the system, within the confines of the brief period that we were here, does not concur with my experiences here on the West Coast.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRESTER. In view of the lateness of the hour, I wonder if we could return to the matter of substance, with respect to the experiment which was conducted. There was a phenomenon I noticed in O wing at Soledad. I could be wrong, but I think it was O wing at Soledad, a phenomenon which made very little sense to me. I gave it kind of a facile interpretation and I passed it off until now. I went through four of the cells in that block. In each of those four cells, each of them, there was at least one, perhaps two, perhaps three, swastikas of various sizes scratched into the metal bench, scratched onto the wall. In one of the four cells there was even the beginnings of an outline of the Nazi eagle across the back of the wall. I gave it a rather fast look. I wonder whether there isn't something deeper in that, and I wonder if you have any comments.

Dr. ZIMBARDO. Well, I think the way it relates to some of the comments I made is that the appeal that fascism and nazism has is purely this appeal to an individual's need to have power over other people. I mean, if you just look at what people in the American Nazi Party say, or if you read *Mein Kampf* or any of the writings by the Nazis, they are really just statements about power.

Mr. BIESTER. It is more about power, is it not, than it is about race?

Dr. ZIMBARDO. You are right. It happens to get compounded with race because the Nazis also hate blacks as well as Jews, and Catholics, et cetera, but I think it is a statement about power. I think the point I was trying to make, we all are subject at some level to being corrupted by power. It may be as children we start off with an unfair power disadvantage where adults tell us what to do and we have to do it. Maybe at some level we are seeking to redress that imbalance.

It seems to me every one of us could be easily corrupted by being put in the position where we really have total power over someone else. We admire it. I was shocked years ago, for example, when they had the first film of Nazi concentration camps. Millions of people all over the country went to see these things. Some people I know went back several times. I know it wasn't to get the message of social justice. It was really to watch someone kill someone else for no reason.

Total power is to confront someone whom you have nothing against and kill them only because you want to. I think that is the appeal in prison to nazism.

Mr. BIESTER. Obviously it was the prisoners who did.

Mr. ZIMBARDO. Yes. Again, what I am trying to do in my research is to show how prisoners and guards are subject to the same psychological principles.

Mr. BIESTER. That is the point I got when you were discussing various psychological manifestations that occurred in the minds of the prisoners, and I just wanted to take this opportunity to clarify the significance of that.

Let me just take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to extend the subcommittee's thanks to the witnesses, also to the stenographer who has been here since 9:30 a.m.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Is there anyone else who has a question?

Mr. FISH. I just want to thank you, Dr. Zimbardo.

I wish you had been at the start as well as the end, because in your discussion of your experiment, in view of other observations, you certainly helped me a great deal in clarifying some of the things we have seen the past few days and understanding them.

Dr. ZIMBARDO. I would like to mention in no way am I a criminologist. I never even was interested in prisons until late spring when I happened to meet this man Carlo Prescott, so it is not that I have a history of training in prisons. It just became obvious that here is a psychological situation where horrible things were happening.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. This concludes the hearing on prisons, prison reform, and prisoners' rights, but this by no means ends this subcommittee's role of seeking information in the field of corrections.

There being no further witnesses, the subcommittee stands adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 6:30 p.m., the hearing in the above-entitled matter was adjourned.)

which the money is furnished. I think that certain minimum standards should be required for any county jail or community correctional facility that obtains federal funds. These standards should cover living conditions, treatment, classification procedures, and disciplinary procedures.

Finally, I think that it is important to provide outsiders to screen prisoners' complaints. This should include both ombudsmen and attorneys who are in no way connected to the correction establishment. Jails, like all other institutions, should be subject to public scrutiny and the rule of law.

In conclusion, enough words have been written about the intolerable, overloaded, neglected, expensive, cruel, and inefficient jail system. The time is long overdue for effective action, not more studies, to get the American jail system off its present disaster course of human destruction and self-defeat. Isolation within such punitive and barbaric environments deprives inmates of fundamental human rights, and promotes a hostile attitude towards law enforcement officials, the correctional process, and the community itself. The ultimate victim of correctional failure is the citizen. The existence of our present jail system threatens the moral fabric of our society, and can only further, rather than prevent, the commission of more crimes.

(The document referred to at p: 110 follows:)

STATEMENT BY PHILIP G. ZIMBARDO, PH. D., PROFESSOR OF PSYCHOLOGY, STANFORD UNIVERSITY

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL POWER AND PATHOLOGY OF IMPRISONMENT

SOURCE CREDIBILITY

(a) *Professional, academic credentials*

Since graduating from Yale University in 1959 with a Ph. D., I have taught at Yale, New York University, Columbia and Stanford. I am presently Full Professor of Psychology at Stanford and Director of the Social Psychology Training Program. This year I am a Fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences. I am the author of 6 books and about 40 research articles. One book, *Psychology and Life*, is a leading text in introductory psychology courses read by over 100,000 students a year. As a recipient of federal research grants from the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Mental Health and the Office of Naval Research, I have studied extensively problems of "Attitudes and Behavior Change," "Social Motivation," "Loss of Control over Behavior," "Dehumanization" and "Violence."

(b) *Expertise re: Prisons, crime law enforcement*

I have done research, written articles about, and presented an invited address to the National Conference on Law Enforcement on "The Psychology of Police Confessions." This work analyzed the use of psychological coercion tactics to elicit confessions and admissions from suspects and evidence from witnesses during interrogation by detectives.

I have organized and taught an accredited course at Stanford this summer on "The Psychology of Imprisonment."

This course was co-taught by Mr. Carlo Prescott, a former prisoner of sixteen years at San Quentin, Soledad, Folsom, Chino and other California prisons.

In addition to preparation for this course and knowledge gained in it, I have learned much about the mentality developed by the prison experience from over a hundred hours of discussion with Prescott, as well as other former convicts, parole officers, a former prison lieutenant, a chaplain, a half-way house staff, and lawyers.

The major reason I have been invited to this hearing is because I have recently conducted a unique experiment in which we created a simulated prison at Stanford University and observed the unbelievably powerful effects imprisonment had on "prisoners," "guards," and "administrative staff." The study has been given extensive coverage in the press (reported in *Life* 10/15/71) and will be shown as a feature on NBC's monthly news show *Chronolog*, November 26. I will submit a full report of its finding to this committee in about two months when we have analyzed all the data.

Finally, having grown up in the South East Bronx section of New York City, a traditionally high crime, "ghetto area," many of my friends served time in New York jails, and shared their experiences with me.

(c) *Biases*

I am personally committed to using the knowledge I have gained as a trained psychologist to improve the social environment which affects how people relate to each other and how they develop a sense of self-dignity and self-fulfillment. My goal is to understand better those factors which limit the fullest development of human potential; to discover the socially imposed and self-inflicted constraints which cripple people psychologically. In so doing, I examine and question basic assumptions underlying all forms of behavioral control, whether they be institutionalized, as is the case with so-called "correctional" institutions, or informal, as is the case with interpersonal tactics we all utilize to limit some other individual's freedom.

The idealistic goal of these observations and investigations is to help effect social change through productive social action. The end state of this change is an individual whose life is one of joy, not desperation, who perceives he/she has meaningful choices and is free to make them, who is able to assume responsibility for such decisions, and who is dedicated to promoting, rather than imprisoning, the growth of all other fellow human beings. A collection of such individuals constitutes the kind of society in which I would want to live. Blind loyalty to anything less is selling short the human potential for creating such a nation and reducing our chances of ever having true psychological freedom and liberty.

"I was recently released from 'solitary confinement' after being held therein for 37 months [months!]. A silent system was imposed upon me and to even 'whisper' to the man in the next cell resulted in being beaten by guards, sprayed with chemical mace, black-jacked, stomped, and thrown into a 'strip-cell' naked to sleep on a concrete floor without bedding, covering, wash basin, or even a toilet. The floor served as toilet and bed, and even there the 'silent system' was enforced. To let a 'moan' escape your lips because of the pain and discomfort . . . resulted in another beating. I spent not days, but months there during my 37 months in solitary . . . I have filed every writ possible against the administrative acts of brutality. The State Courts have all denied the petitions. Because of my refusal to let the 'things die down' and 'forget' all that happened during my 37 months in solitary . . . I am the most hated prisoner in _____ Penitentiary, and called a 'hard-core incorrigible.'

"Professor Zimbardo, maybe I am an incorrigible, but if true, it's because I would rather die than to accept being treated less than a human being. I have never complained of my prison sentence as being unjustified except through legal means of appeals. I have never put a knife on a guard's throat and demanded my release. I know that thieves must be punished and I don't justify stealing, even though I am a thief myself. But now I don't think I will be a thief when I am released. No, I'm not rehabilitated. It's just that I no longer think of becoming wealthy by stealing. I now only think of 'killing.' Killing those who have beaten me and treated me as if I were a dog. I hope and pray for the sake of my own soul and future life of freedom, that I am able to overcome the bitterness and hatred which eats daily at my soul, but I know to overcome it will not be easy."

This eloquent plea for prison reform, for humane treatment of human beings, for the basic dignity that is the right of every American, came to me this week in a letter from a prisoner, who cannot be identified because he is still part of a state correctional institution. He sent it to me because he read of an experiment I conducted recently at Stanford University. In an attempt to understand just what it means psychologically to be a prisoner or a prison guard, we created our own prison. We carefully screened over 70 volunteers who answered an ad in the Palo Alto City newspaper and ended up with about two dozen young men who were selected to be part of this study. They were mature, emotionally stable, normal, intelligent college students from middle class homes throughout the United States and Canada. They appeared to represent the "cream of the crop" of this generation. None had any criminal record and all were relatively homogeneous on many dimensions initially.

Half were arbitrarily designated as "prisoners" by a flip of a coin, the others as "guards." These were the roles they were to play in our simulated prison. The guards were made aware of the potential seriousness and danger of the situation, and their own vulnerability. They made up their own formal rules for maintaining law, order, and respect, and were generally free to improvise new

ones during their 8-hour, 3-man shifts. The prisoners were unexpectedly picked up at their homes by a City policeman in a squad car, searched, handcuffed, fingerprinted, booked at the Station House, and taken blindfolded to our jail. There they were stripped, deloused, put into a uniform, given a number, and put into a cell with two other prisoners where they expected to live for the next two weeks. The pay was good (\$15 a day) and their motivation was to make money.

We observed and recorded on videotape the events that occurred in the prison, and we interviewed and tested the prisoners and guards at various points throughout the study. These data will be available to the committee in a forthcoming report. Some of the videotapes of the actual encounters between the prisoners and guards can be seen on the NBC news features *Chronolog*, November 26, 1971.

In the short time available at this hearing, I can only outline the major results of this experiment, and then briefly relate them to the "experiment" which our society is conducting using involuntary subjects. Finally, I wish to suggest some modest proposals to help make "real" prisons become more successful experiments.

At the end of only six days we had to close down our mock prison because what we saw was frightening. It was no longer apparent to us or most of the subjects where they ended and their roles began. The majority had indeed become "prisoners" or "guards," no longer able to clearly differentiate between role-playing and self. There were dramatic changes in virtually every aspect of their behavior, thinking and feeling. In less than a week, the experience of imprisonment undid (temporarily) a lifetime of learning; human values were suspended, self-concepts were challenged, and the ugliest, most base, pathological side of human nature surfaced. We were horrified because we saw some boys ("guards") treat other boys as if they were despicable animals, taking pleasure in cruelty, while other boys ("prisoners") became servile, dehumanized robots who thought only of escape, of their own individual survival, and of their mounting hatred of the guards.

We had to release three "prisoners" in the first four days because they had such acute situational traumatic reactions as hysterical crying, confusion in thinking, and severe depression. Others begged to be "paroled," and all but three were willing to forfeit all the money they had earned if they could be "paroled." By then, the fifth day, they had been so programmed to think of themselves as "prisoners," that when their request for "parole" was denied, they returned docilely to their cells. Now, had they been thinking as college students acting in an oppressive experiment, they would have quit once they no longer wanted the \$15 a day we used as our only incentive. However, the reality was not "quitting an experiment," but "being paroled by the parole board from the Stanford County Jail." By the last days, the earlier solidarity among the prisoners (systematically broken by the guards) dissolved into "each man for himself." Finally, when one of their fellows was put in solitary confinement (a small closet) for refusing to eat, the prisoners were given a choice by one of the guards: give up their blankets and the "incurable prisoner" would be let out, or keep their blankets and he would be kept in all night. They voted to keep their blankets and to abandon their brother, a suffering prisoner.

About a third of the guards became tyrannical in their arbitrary use of power, in enjoying their control over other people. They were corrupted by the power of their roles and became quite inventive in their techniques of breaking the spirit of the prisoners and making them feel they were worthless. Some of the guards merely did their jobs as "tough but fair" correctional officers. Several were "good guards" from the prisoners' point of view, since they did them small favors and were friendly. However, no "good guard" or any other one ever interfered with a command by any of the "bad guards"; they never interwened on the side of the prisoners, they never told the others to ease off because it was only an experiment, and they never even came to me as Prison Superintendent or Experimenter in charge to complain. In part, they were "good" because the others were "bad"; they needed the others to help establish their own egos in a positive light. In a sense, they perpetuated the prison more than the other guards because their own needs to be liked prevented them from disobeying or violating the implicit guard's code. At the same time, the act of befriending the prisoners created a social reality which made the prisoners less likely to rebel.

By the end of the week, the experiment had become a reality, as if it were a Pirandello play directed by Kafka that just keeps going after the audience has left. The consultant for our prison, Carlo Prescott, an ex-con with 16 years im-

prisonment in California's jails, would get so depressed and furious each time he visited our prison, because of its psychological similarity to his experiences, that he would have to leave. A Catholic priest, who was a former prison chaplain in Washington, D.C., talked to our "prisoners" after four days and said they were just like the "first-timers" he had seen.

But in the end, I called off the experiment not because of the horror I saw out there in the prison yard, but because of the horror of realizing that I could have easily traded places with the most brutal guard, or become the weakest prisoner full of hate at being so powerless that I could not eat, sleep or go to the toilet without permission of the authorities. I could have become Calley at My Lai, George Jackson at San Quentin, one of the men at Attica, or the prisoner quoted at the beginning of this report. I believe *you* could too.

Significance of these findings

(1) Individual behavior is largely under the control of social forces and environmental contingencies rather than "personality traits," "character," "will power" or other empirically unvalidated constructs. Thus we create an *illusion of freedom* by attributing more internal control to ourselves, to the individual, than actually exists. We thus underestimate the power and pervasiveness of situational controls over behavior because: (a) they are often non-obvious and subtle, (b) we often can avoid entering situations where we might be so controlled, (c) we label as "weak" or "deviant" people in those situations who do behave differently from how we believe we would.

Each of us carries around in our heads a favorable self-image in which we are essentially just, fair, humane, understanding, etc. For example, we could not imagine inflicting pain on others without much provocation, or hurting people who had done nothing to us, who in fact were even liked by us. However, there is a growing body of social psychological research which underscores the conclusion derived from this prison study. Many people, perhaps the majority, can be made to do almost anything when put into psychologically compelling situations—regardless of their morals, ethics, values, attitudes, beliefs, or personal convictions. My colleague, Stanley Milgram, has shown that more than sixty percent of the population will deliver what they think is a series of painful electric shocks to another person even after the victim cries for mercy, begs them to stop, and then apparently passes out. The subjects complained that they did not want to hurt him more, but blindly obeyed the command of the authority figure (the experimenter) who said that they must go on. In my research on violence, I have seen mild-mannered co-eds repeatedly give "shocks" (which they thought were causing pain) to another girl, a stranger whom they had rated very favorably, simply by being made to feel anonymous and put in a situation where they were expected to engage in this activity.

Observers of these and similar experimental situations never predict their outcomes, and estimate that it is unlikely that they themselves would behave similarly. They can be so confident only when they are outside the situation, but since the majority of people in these studies do act in these "non-rational," "non-obvious" ways, then it follows that the majority of observers would also succumb to the social psychological forces in the situation.

(2) With regard to prisons, we can state that the mere act of assigning labels to people, such as "prisoners" and "guards," and putting them into a situation where those labels acquire validity and meaning, is sufficient to elicit pathological behavior. This pathology is not predictable from any available diagnostic indicators we have in the social sciences, and is extreme enough to modify in very significant ways fundamental attitudes and behavior. The prison situation, as presently arranged, is guaranteed to generate severe enough pathological reactions in both guards and prisoners as to debase their humanity, lower their feelings of self-worth, and make it difficult for them to be part of a society outside of their prison.

General conclusions and specific recommendations for reform

Prison is any situation in which one person's freedom and liberty are denied by virtue of the arbitrary power exercised by another person or group. Thus our prisons of concrete and steel are only metaphors for the social prisons we create and maintain through enforced poverty, racism, sexism, and other forms of social injustice. They are also the physical symbol of the psychological prisons we create for others, by making even our loved ones feel inadequate or self-conscious, and, worst of all, the imprisonment we impose on our own minds and actions through neurotic fears.

The need for "prison reform," then, is a cry not only to change the operating procedures of our penal institutions, but a more basic plea to change the conditions in our society which make us all prisoners, all less happy, less productive, less free to grow, and less concerned about our brothers than about our own survival.

Our national leaders for years have been pointing to the enemies of freedom, to the fascist or communist threat to the American way of life. In so doing, they have overlooked the threat of social anarchy that is building within our own country without any outside agitation. As soon as a person comes to the realization that he is being "imprisoned" by his society or individuals in it, then, in the best American tradition, he demands liberty and rebels, accepting death as an alternative. The third alternative, however, is to allow oneself to become a "good prisoner," docile, cooperative, uncomplaining, conforming in thought and complying in deed.

Our prison authorities now point to the "militant agitators" who are still vaguely part of some communist plot, as the irresponsible, "incorrigible" trouble-makers. They imply that there would be no trouble, riots, hostages, or deaths if it weren't for this small band of "bad prisoners." In other words, if they could break these men, then everything would return to "normal" again in the life of our nation's prisons.

The riots in prison are coming from within—from within every man and woman who refuses to let *The System* turn them into an object, a number, a thing, or a no-thing. It is not Communist-inspired, but inspired by the spirit of American freedom. No man wants to be enslaved. To be powerless, to be subject to the arbitrary exercise of power, to not be recognized as a human being is to be a slave.

To be a "militant prisoner" is to become aware that the physical jails are but more blatant extensions of the forms of social and psychological oppression experienced daily in the nation's ghettos. They are trying to awaken the conscience of the nation to the ways in which the American ideals are being perverted in the name of "justice," but actually under the banner of apathy, fear, and hatred. If we do not listen to the pleas of the prisoners at Attica to be treated like human beings, then we all have become brutalized by our priorities for property rights over human rights. The consequence will not only be more prison riots, but a loss of all those ideals on which this country was founded.

Recommendations:

(1) Do not demand simple solutions for the complex problems of crime and law enforcement.

(2) Do continue to search for solutions, to question all assumptions regarding the causes of crime, the nature of the criminal, and the function of prisons. Support research which might provide some answers to these issues, and continue to keep the legislature and the public informed about these issues.

(3) Put the specific question of prison reform in the broader context of societal reforms and social injustice which may account for why many commit crimes in the first place.

(4) Investigate the public's latent attitudes about punishment and retribution, and then initiate programs to reeducate the public as to the rehabilitative purposes and goals of our correctional institutions.

(5) Insist that judges have a continuing interest in what happens to people they sentence.

(6) Help make the public aware that they own the prisons, and that their business is failing. The seventy percent recidivism rate, and the escalation in severity of crimes committed by graduates of our prisons are evidence that current prisons fail to rehabilitate the inmates in any positive way. Rather, they are breeding grounds for hatred of the establishment, a hatred that makes every citizen a target of violent assault. Prisons are a bad investment for us taxpayers. Until now we have not cared, we have turned over to wardens and prison "authorities" the unpleasant job of keeping people who threaten us out of our sight. Now we are shocked to learn that their management practices have failed to improve the product, and instead they are turning petty thieves into murderers. We must insist upon new management or improved operating procedures.

(7) Remove the cloak of secrecy from the prisons. Prisoners claim they are brutalized by the guards, guards say it is a lie. Where is the impartial test of the truth in such a situation? Prison officials have forgotten that they work for us,

that they are only public servants whose salaries are paid by our taxes. They act as if it is *their* prison, like a child with a toy he won't share. Neither lawyers, judges, the legislature, nor the public are allowed into prisons to ascertain the truth unless the visit is sanctioned by "authorities" and until all is prepared for their visit. I was shocked to learn that my request to join this committee's tour of San Quentin and Soledad was refused, as was that of the news media. However, after talking with convicts, it is apparent that such a *guided* tour would be the same kind an American general would get in Moscow. Did this committee visit A section of the South Block, the upper floors of the adjustment center, B section, third tier, any floor above the bottom one in the hospital? It is likely they did not, because these are not part of the prison's "show rooms" in San Quentin.

(8) There should be an ombudsman in every prison, not under the pay or control of the prison authority, responsible only to the courts, state legislature and the public. Such a person could report on violations of constitutional and human rights.

(9) Guards must be given better training than they now receive for the difficult job society imposes upon them. To be a prison guard as now constituted is to be put in a situation of constant threat from within the prison, with no social recognition from the society at large. As was shown graphically at Attica, prison guards are also prisoners of the system who can be sacrificed to the demands of the public to be punitive and the needs of politicians to preserve an image. Social scientists and business training personnel should be called upon to design and help carry out this training.

(10) In line with this new human relations training, would be changes in the perceived role of the "guards." They would instead be "teachers" or "counselors" and the "prisoners" would be "trainees." The reinforcement (bonus, advancement) for such a "teacher" would be contingent upon the "trainees" learning new social and technical skills which will enable them to leave the "training-rehabilitation" center as early as possible, and not come back.

Positive reinforcement would replace coercion, threats and isolation as means of behavior management. Most prisoners want to return to their community, to be capable of earning a living, to be socially responsible and to be needed by others. Many are in prison not because they don't have a manual trade, but because of deficits in social training. Prisons should be reconstituted to provide the opportunity for such people to have positive social experiences, to be responsive to and responsible for others. This could be done by giving them training as psychiatric aides and social workers who must care for other disturbed prisoners. This "peer management" is the best way to build an individual's sense of self-worth and a feeling of community. In addition, these skills are vitally needed in the communities to which the "trainees" will return. College students and professional social scientists could volunteer their services or be part of a Vista campaign to produce such training.

(11) The relationship between the individual (who is sentenced by the courts to such a center) and his community must be maintained. How can a "prisoner" return to a dynamically changing society, that most of us cannot cope with, after being out of it for a number of years? There should be more community involvement in these rehabilitation centers, more ties encouraged and promoted between the trainees and family and friends, more educational opportunities to prepare them for returning to their communities as more valuable members of it than they were before they left.

(12) Once a trainee has finished the prescribed course and is judged ready to leave the institution, there should be no stigma attached to his training, no need to report to prospective employers that he/she was a "prisoner," no need to be labeled an "ex-con."

(13) Finally, the main ingredient necessary to effect any change at all in prison reform, in the rehabilitation of a single prisoner, or even in the optimal development of your own child, is *caring*. That is where all reform must start—with people caring about the well-being of others, especially people with power, like those on this committee, really caring about the most hardened, allegedly incorrigible prisoner in solitary confinement. Underneath the toughest, society-hating convict, rebel, or anarchist is a human being who wants his existence to be recognized by his fellows and who wants someone else to care about whether he lives or dies and to be sad if he lives imprisoned rather than lives free.