

PRISONERS UNION PROPOSAL

1981 - 1982

Prisoners Union
1317 13th Street
San Francisco, Ca. 94107

(415) 648-2880

PRISONERS UNION JOURNAL PROPOSAL

1981-1982

CONTENTS

Definition and Purpose	1
Sentencing Laws	1
Civil and Human Rights	2
Prisoners' Work in Prisons	3
Visiting Procedures and Return to Society	4
Prisoners Union Journal	6
Budget	9
Exhibit A	10

Prisoners Union
1317 18th Street
San Francisco, Ca. 94107

Contact: Edward H. Seksay
Executive Secretary
(415) 648-2880

DEFINITION AND PURPOSE

The Prisoners Union is an organization composed of prisoners, their families and friends, ex-prisoners and others interested in improving conditions and assisting in the rehabilitation of those housed in California State prisons. This group is dedicated to the following goals:

1. The achievement of uniform and equitable sentencing laws.
2. Restoration of basic civil and human rights to prisoners.
3. Payment of fair wages for productive work accomplished, safe working conditions, and compensation for injuries that are work related.
4. Facilitating the successful return of prisoners to society in a secure and productive environment.

In order to accomplish our goals we are concentrating on two main issues; education of interested individuals through our newspaper, the Prisoners Union Journal, and the improvement of the visiting process for family and friends of prisoners.

SENTENCING LAWS

The Prisoners Union has worked tirelessly since its foundation in 1971, to abolish the indeterminate sentence, a long time source of bitterness, frustration, and despair for convicts and their families. In 1976, our efforts began to bear fruit with the passage of S.B.42, the Uniform Determinate Sentencing Act in California. Unfortunately, S.B. 42 had barely become law when the concept of uniform and determinate sentencing was being sacrificed to interest groups who advocated harsher punishment. S.B. 42 was altered before it even came into effect by A.B. 476, emergency legislation which resulted in many of the same evils experienced under the old Indeterminate Sentencing Law.

Beneath the aegis of S.B. 42 the practice of parole was to be limited to one year, with the possibility of being extended to eighteen months because of revocation. Under the harsher guidelines of A.B. 476, parole has now been extended for up to five years by new legislation. Prison terms are now getting longer and longer. Longer sentences mitigate against equitable sentencing since, under this system, a few convicts are scapegoated to do long years, while other prisoners get probation or shorter terms. Much of the possibility of uniform punishment has been lost by raising the ranges for prison terms and removing the limitations on aggravations that can be added. The Prisoners Union does not reject the concept of just punishment, but as things now stand, we are faced with the difficult task of attempting to ameliorate the destructive aspects of long years of incarceration.

CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS

The Prisoners Union has worked in many forms since its inception toward its goal of establishing civil and human rights for prisoners. On January 1, 1976, the California Legislature repealed the old Civil Death statute and replaced it with a new law that states that prisoners retain all civil rights except those which must necessarily be taken from them for the reasonable needs of security of the institutions and the safety of the public (Penal Code 2600). Since this law was passed, the Union has worked on many fronts to make it a reality. Prisoners Union attorneys have brought lawsuits for the right to vote, to free prison newspapers of unreasonable censorship, for the right of prisoners to be able to wear a Prisoners Union lapel button, and for the right of ex-convicts working with the Prisoners Union to write to prisoners inside California State prisons as part of their job with the Union.

The problems of the prison system (e.g., abuse of the Inmate Welfare Fund, excessive reliance on the "Hole", inadequate law libraries) are boundless.

These problems have been recognized by elements within the Department of Corrections itself. The Fudge Report, a document prepared by a Department of Corrections senior staff member and was to be used to justify the construction of four new prisons, severely criticized the C. D. C. as a bloated bureaucracy with no clear purpose, conflicting goals, no uniform rules, and an ad-hoc crises management style of operation. The official response to this report was to delete all negative remarks and sanitize the report for the Legislature.

This head in the sand response to prisoners rights is emblematic of what we feel the root problems of the present penal system to be -- the complete isolation of prisons from the community that permits them to be run as lawless fiefdoms.

Louis Brandeis of the U. S. Supreme Court said 50 years ago, "Sunlight is the best disinfectant". Until citizens from every strata of society can look closely at what their dollars are buying from the prison system, no real change is possible.

PRISONERS' WORK IN PRISONS

Historically, working conditions in California State prisons have been little better than slave labor. We have been continuously working to better this situation, but progress has been slow and difficult. In 1976, this state passed a workmen's compensation law for prisoners who are permanently disabled by hazardous machinery while incarcerated. Unemployment benefits have now been made available for prisoners who leave prison and are unemployed, but eligibility is limited to prisoners who were able to work for money in prison, a situation unavailable to many in the California State prisons. We continue to press for payment of fair wages for productive work accomplished by prisoners, so they can in turn send money to their families, many of whom are on welfare as a result of the incarceration of the prisoner. Also, money from these jobs could be made available to the victims

of crimes in appropriate situations.

The state of vocational training programs in California State prisons is abysmal. Total program slots number under 2,000, less than one spot for every ten prisoners. The trades taught are not reflective of current conditions on the job market, and enable very few of those enrolled to find work upon release.

Other prisoners work at a variety of make-work or maintenance jobs. Only 40% of prisoners receive any money at all; for those who are paid, the average salary according to Auditor General's Report, was \$14.15 per month. That same report estimated that the minimum amount of money to meet basic needs is \$25.00 per month. Under this system, obviously, no prisoner can save any money for his or her release, or contribute anything towards the support of a family.

Finally, safety conditions are horrendous throughout prison industries. Several prisoners are maimed each year by hazardous equipment.

VISITING PROCEDURES AND RETURN TO SOCIETY

As of January 1, 1976, personal visits became a right and not a privilege. There is no better index to successfully making it after release from prison than contact with their families and friends while in prison.

Nevertheless, though the prison system officially recognizes the value of visits, their actions indicate otherwise. Visiting facilities are inadequate at every prison. A waiting period of one hour for prison visits is the rule; a four hour wait is not uncommon. Hours are limited and space is cramped.

In addition to the failure to devote more than a negligible amount of resources to this question, arbitrary, capricious, and illegal administrative decisions are the only rules in this area. People have had their visits terminated because of physical contact that had been permitted one week earlier. Many regulations frequently change without notice and it seems that visiting and clothing regulations are constantly in a state of flux. Prison visitors are routinely told that if they do not strip and submit to a skin search, they will lose their visiting "privilege"

for up to six months, or even longer. There is no other problem that produces as many heartfelt complaints and pleas, than the request that our office "do something" in the area of visitation.

The Prisoners Union has been in the forefront of a series of proposed improvements in the procedures surrounding the visiting process. During the past year, with the assistance of other interested groups, we put together the following proposed changes to Title 15 of the California Administrative Code:

- I. The Placement of Prisoners in the Institution Closest to Their Home.
- II. Establishment of a Program For Home Visits.
- III. Requirement That Visitors be Processed into the Institution in Thirty Minutes.
- IV. Establishment of Family Centered Visiting Environments.
- V. Requirement That Visitors Who Are Denied Visiting or Restricted in Visiting be Notified in Writing on the Day the Action is Taken.
- VI. Controls on Use of Strip Searches and Prohibition of Denial of Visits on the Basis of Refusal to Submit to a Strip Search.
- VII. Requirement That Wardens and Superintendents Give Notice to the Interested Public and Inmates Before Changing Institutional Visiting Rules.
- VIII. Establishment of a Toll Free Information Number for Visitors to Prisons.
- IX. Family Visits Reserved for Those Not Eligible for Home Visits.

The Department of Corrections refused to implement these recommendations, ignoring the very broad support for these changes from many groups and individuals, including leading members of the Legislature. We are continuing to press for these changes, using to a large extent, the Prisoners Union Journal as our medium of education. As an example of the support for these changes, a bill has been entered in this session of the Legislature which would require the Department of Corrections to place prisoners in the institution closest to their home, upon their request. The bill has been sent from the Legislative Committee with a recommendation

for passage by the full Legislature.

Exhibit A outlines the pertinent facts which stress the importance of a proper visiting environment to insure the maintenance of family ties which, in turn, results in a drastically reduced percentage of recidivism.

PRISONERS UNION JOURNAL

Our newspaper, originally called the Outlaw, was founded in November, 1971, in order to give prisoners some general information on prison issues. Over the years the paper has gone through some changes. In October of 1979, following an in depth review of its purposes, we decided to begin to use the paper as an organizing and educational tool, for both prisoners and those on the outside. We also changed the name of the paper to the Prisoners Union Journal, to more effectively portray the true nature and purpose of the publication.

We embarked upon an exciting new venture of expansion for the Journal. This plan, when completed, will allow us to reach not only a greater number of convicts, but also a broader spectrum of society, including members of the legal profession, universities, libraries, and the business community, as well as the general public. This in turn will help to eliminate many of the unfortunate misunderstandings surrounding the prison system. This end result can only benefit our society.

Perhaps the most tangible benefit which has accrued as a result of this educational arm of the Prisoners Union is in the rehabilitative process for those housed in the California State prisons. This paper has proven to be an invaluable tool in assisting and educating prisoners and their families with respect to their rights and their responsibilities.

It is our plan to expand the mailing list for our paper, the Prisoners Union Journal, to 15,000, the bulk of which would go without charge to prisoners in California State prisons. Now that the paper is our major educational tool, we intend to greatly increase the literary contributions from prisoners to the paper. We also intend to contract with an "institutional reporter" in each of the prisons in the

state. We will pay this individual monthly stipends of \$15.00, which is the same amount of money that the editor of an institutional newspaper within the prison now receives. In exchange for this sum, we will expect the reporter to write articles each month giving perspectives on events and policies within the prisons, and to suggest possibilities for change. We will also encourage the reporter to make known to other prisoners within the prison the opportunity to write for the paper. A fee would be paid to these other contributors if the article is published.

We also intend to invite a larger number of people outside of the prisons to contribute articles for the paper. These would be legislators, attorneys, husbands and wives of prisoners, people involved in various areas of prison reform, and people involved in making and implementing policy that affects prisoners. The paper will focus primarily on issues and events in California. We are attempting through the medium of our publication to limit our work to assisting prisoners in California. It is our goal that, by the Fall of 1982, the Journal will be self-sustaining, with the majority of individuals and organizations receiving the Journal outside of prison paying from \$5.00 to \$15.00 per year for their subscription.

We plan to continue to be the authoritative journal about prisons in California and, as such, expect to develop a paying readership among the segments of the population of California who are sincerely interested in prisons and those housed within them. These subscribers, be they lawyers, university professors, librarians ministers, or the families of prisoners will sustain the subscriptions that will be sent to prisoners. We have learned from experience that the medium of mail is our most efficient means of communicating with our members. The law in California states that a prisoner may receive "any and all legal materials, newspapers, periodicals, and books accepted for distribution by the United States Post Office, except those which describe the making of any weapon, explosive, poison or destructive device" (Penal Code Section 2601). This means that our paper, by law, has to be received by those prisoners to whom it is addressed.

The Prisoners Union Journal is rapidly becoming the only vehicle available for communicating to prisoners the changes in the law and proposed changes that will effect them and their families. Institutional newspapers in California prisons have grown pitiably small over the last few years in the wake of Proposition 13 and other cut-backs on availability of funds for publication of institutional papers. Prisons have also simply curtailed completely the publication of prison newspapers in the wake of the recent use of Artie Bailey and the Prisoners Union v. Loggins and its attempts to require the establishment of guidelines for censorship of prison publications and a speedy review of said censorship. We are now at a critical time for the Prisoners Union newspaper to gain wide readership in the California State prisons and to play a vital role in educating prisoners and their families on how to achieve their goals through the political system.

The Prisoners Union has established itself firmly in the ten years of its existence. It has had an immeasurable positive impact on the correctional system in California and across the country. It has accomplished many solid results and is a widely respected organization. Much remains to be done, however, and we remain firmly dedicated to our goals and the means to reach those goals which have brought us together. We are confident in our strategy and look to you for help in this vial endeavor.

PRISONERS UNION JOURNAL - BUDGET 1981-1982

EXPENSE

Newspaper Preparation

Typesetting, Camera, Layout, etc.	\$5,000
Printing	4,000
Postage	1,800
File Maintenance	1,200
Institutional Reporters	1,980
Other Contributors to Journal	700

\$14,680

* Staff

Executive Secretary	\$2,400
Mileage & Travel	1,700

\$4,100

* Building

Mortgage Payment	\$1,300
Utilities	500
Telephone	175
Maintenance	700

\$2,675

TOTAL EXPENSE

\$21,455

INCOME (Projected 12 months ending August of 1982)

** Subscriptions

Individuals	1,000 at \$10.00	\$10,000
Institutions	70 at 15.00	1,050
Students	150 at 5.00	750
Members	300 at 5.00	1,500
		<u>\$13,300</u>

* Rental \$6,000

Fund Raising Events \$1,500

Miscellaneous Donations \$ 700

TOTAL INCOME

\$21,500

* Pro-rated amount of Income and Expense related to Prisoners Union Journal

** Estimated number of subscriptions as of August, 1982
Present Income from subscriptions is approximately \$4,000 per year

A P P E N D I X A

RESEARCH EVIDENCE MANDATING RULE
CHANGES FOR MAINTAINING PRISONERS' FAMILY TIES

Reprinted From:
Proposed Changes To Title 15
California Administrative Code
1980

RESEARCH EVIDENCE MANDATING RULE CHANGES I, II, AND III,
FOR MAINTAINING PRISONERS' FAMILY TIES

Imprisonment can severely damage family relationships, to the detriment of both prisoner and family. Prisoners critically need to maintain their family ties. Indeed, the maintenance of these ties is an extremely important factor in parole success.

The families of prisoners are the "hidden victims" of the penal process. Research has consistently shown that children, deprived of a parent because of his or her imprisonment, are at high risk emotionally and socially and have their own chances of becoming delinquent dramatically increased. Studies of prisoners' wives have revealed the crippling costs of attempting to maintain family life in the face of the stress and stigmatization of parental imprisonment.

Research about these issues is presented here to underscore the critical need for:

1. The placement of prisoners in institutions closest to their homes.
2. The establishment of a program for home visits.
3. The establishment of parent-child visiting environments in prison.

A. THE IMPORTANCE TO THE PRISONER OF MAINTAINING FAMILY TIES:

Once the retributive process has begun for the prisoner, the maintenance of his/her family relationships becomes critical in terms of his or her future social and emotional health. Indeed,

active and positive contact with one's family while imprisoned has been shown to have a consistently positive relationship to parole success upon release from prison. This is to say that whatever prisons may be said to do, either in terms of punishment or rehabilitation, they must provide for meaningful contact with family and community or the battle with recidivism and the "revolving door" of the penal system is doomed from the start.

Studies of parole success point to the importance to the prisoner of maintaining these ties. The earliest study was performed by Lloyd Ohlin in his efforts to develop a parole success prediction scale for Illinois. Using a sample of releases from 1920-35, he discovered that 75% of inmates classified as having "active family interest" while imprisoned were successful on parole as compared to only 34% for those regarded as lacking community and family ties.¹ Glaser used Ohlin's classification scale with a sample of 1956 releases from federal prisons with very similar results. He found that 71% of the "active family interest" group had success on parole, as compared with 50% of the "no contact with relatives" group.² Holt and Miller replicated such results in their study for the California Department of Corrections in 1968-69. Studying 412 men paroled from the Southern Conservation Center, they found that only 50% of the "no contact" group completed their first year on parole without being arrested, while 70% of those with family visitors were free of arrests during that year. By comparison, the "loners" were six times more likely to be returned to prison during the first year.³

As Holt and Miller point out: "The convergence of these studies should be emphasized. Ohlin's study focused on inmates

paroled in Illinois over a ten year period. Glaser's work replicated Ohlin's findings with releases during one year from federal prisons as well as from a reformatory type population. The same results characterize our study's sample of 1968-69 releases from a minimum security institution in California. The positive relationship between strength of social ties and success on parole has held up for 45 years of releases across very diverse offender populations and in different localities. It is doubtful if there is any other research finding in the field of corrections which can approximate this record."⁴ (italics in the original)

Holt and Miller's study should be given particular attention, in terms of improving administrative rules for prisoners' visiting, because their findings and recommendations are based specifically on California's population of felons. Their overall conclusion to the Department of Corrections was that, ". . . it might be well to view the inmate's family as the prime treatment agent [for the prisoner] and family contacts as a major correctional technique."⁵

Holt and Miller's recommendations, concerning how to successfully maintain the prisoners' family relationships, have relevancy to the rule changes proposed here: (paraphrased)

1. Extensive use should be made of temporary releases that allow prisoners to visit with their families in the community. Temporary releases should be utilized during the entire period of incarceration as pre-release preparation.
2. Regulations governing prison visiting should be streamlined to promote prisoner-family contact. The further

visitors have to travel and the more difficult the procedures, the more likely are the visitors to reduce contact as the sentence is served.

3. Every attempt must be made to place the inmate in the institution closest to his home in order to facilitate family contacts.
4. The Family Visit Program (conjugal visits in prison) should be reserved for those inmates who cannot make use of temporary releases. Since common law marriages are increasingly prevalent, those of some duration should be recognized in both groups.

B. THE HIGH SOCIAL COSTS OF FAMILY BREAKDOWN BECAUSE OF PARENTAL IMPRISONMENT:

When we incarcerate someone in this society, his or her other family members are likely to be punished too. Children left in the community are deprived of critical ties with their imprisoned parents. In the case of maternal incarceration, this can be particularly damaging to children, because of the importance of the mother-child bond. In the case of the male inmate parent, where there is more likely to be still a parent in the home, these spouses must try and hold their families together while being subjected to considerable emotional and social stress. Studies are presented here which attest to the extremely high costs of breaking up families by parental incarceration.

Perhaps the most tragic victims of parental imprisonment are the children of prisoners. This hidden population is a substantial one. A recent study found that of the approximately 25,000

sentenced women imprisoned in America each year, an average of about 75% have children under the age of 18.⁶ If we take into account more than one child per mother and the fact that many more women are incarcerated without being sentenced, a conservative estimate is that a quarter of a million children experience the trauma of their mothers' imprisonment each year.⁷ No one has ever tried to estimate the numbers of children deprived of a male parent because of his going to prison. Since there are close to 20 times as many men imprisoned in this society as there are women, the numbers of their children could well be staggering.

What becomes of these children? The few studies about their welfare point up a range of problems. These include: their being subjected to tenuous and shifting substitute care arrangements, being stigmatized themselves, sometimes by family as well as peers; and seldom receiving the supportive social and psychological services they need. Being deprived of a parent because of imprisonment can cause a child considerable emotional trauma and can even lead him/her into a variety of anti-social activity, even to formally processed delinquency.

Studies of male delinquents and/or male prisoner parents have consistently recorded the high relationship of juvenile delinquency to parental criminality. Early studies by the Gluecks found that 84% of youthful male delinquents at the Massachusetts Reformatory came from homes in which one or both parents had been incarcerated.⁸ Jerome G. Sacks studied the economic and social adjustment in families of male prisoners at the District of Columbia Reformatory for Men. In his sample of 24 families, 12 of the children were reported as showing serious anti-social behavior.⁹

Studies of inmate-mothers and their children have shown a discouraging relationship between maternal incarceration and serious social problems for children on the "outside." In 1964 Serapio Zalba conducted research at the California Institution for Women to determine the fate of the children of women there. He found that more than half of his sample of 124 women had minor dependent children, and that a majority of these were under six years of age.¹⁰ In talking with social workers involved with these children, Zalba discovered that 70% of these dependents had special needs and problems related to their mothers' imprisonment: "Thirty six of the caseworkers identified the problems as feelings of rejection and loss of self-esteem because the mother had left, albeit for prison; others cited social adjustment in general, the stigma of having a parent in prison affecting the children's relationships with others, etc."¹¹ Studying the families of women at Pleasanton Federal Correctional Institution in 1978, McCall discovered that of 23 families, 18 were reporting problems with substitute care situations set up for children in their mothers' absence, six families described serious problems for children in school and with peers, and in the case of five families, children had been processed formally for delinquent behavior.¹²

In a unique study of the children of both male and female inmates at Lexington Federal Correctional Institution, Fritsch and Burkhead found what they hypothesize as different behavioral reactions in the children of inmate-fathers as compared to those of inmate-mothers.¹³ Sixty one percent of their sample of 91 inmates (38 male and 53 female) reported serious problems for their children on the outside. For the children of male inmates,

these were categorized as "acting out" behavior, of overtly aggressive or anti-social character. Inmate-mothers' children, in contrast, appeared to exhibit patterns designated as "acting in," such as crying, nightmares and withdrawal from family and peers.

Fritsch and Burkhead concluded: "It is interesting that parents included in this study report problems with their children in precisely those areas where they would traditionally accept major responsibility for the rearing of children if living at home. Absence of the father who normally assumes the role of disciplinarian leads to acting out behavior. On the other hand, absence of the mother whose usual function is to nurture and provide emotional support for her children contributes to acting in behavior."¹⁴

Indeed, the effect on the family of the female inmate, as contrasted with that of the male, should be considered somewhat differently because of the often quite different roles they play in their children's lives. Female offenders are, on the average, young, unmarried mothers with dependent children who are under the age of 18. Recent studies indicate that the typical female offender is between the ages of 22 and 30 (50%), has dependent children (up to 75%), is unmarried (up to 90%) and must expect to be self-supportive upon her release from imprisonment (70-90%). Studies of inmate-mothers, therefore, have focused on the imprisoned parent herself, her need to maintain a relationship with her children and her problems in doing so. Male offenders, in contrast, are much more likely to have a wife on the outside to care for children in their absence. As a result, studies of their family relationships have considered the situations and problems of their wives and dependents in the community.

In 1963 Dorothy Zeitz conducted the first study of the social service needs of mothers incarcerated at the California Institution for Women, America's largest prison for females.¹⁶ Zeitz was particularly concerned that an inmate-mother's right to motherhood was significantly abrogated by imprisonment: "The inmate-mother is dependent on her family, the institutional staff and the community agencies to act for her on behalf of her children. . . . She is, in fact, deprived of one of the most significant prerogatives of motherhood--that of being able to personally concern and involve herself in her child's life."¹⁷

Zeitz found a lack of communication between inmate-mothers and the social workers involved with their children on the outside. In fact, in several instances, court actions to remove a mother's legal custody of her children had been instigated summarily, with little or no contact with the mother. In interviewing a group of prison mothers, she found that such a lack of contact with social workers and with surrogate parents on the outside, coupled with their fears that they would lose their children altogether, threatened these women's mental stability and seriously interfered with their taking part in any rehabilitative activities inside of prison.

In McCall's study at Pleasanton Federal Correctional Institution, inmate-mothers' expressions of guilt and concern about their children dominated their interviews, yet few had been able to maintain good contact with their offspring. Only 10 of the 23 had been able to visit with their children while incarcerated. They spoke of two concerns in regard to visiting in prison. The first was in problems that guardians were having in bringing

children to prison, either because of their fears or distrust of the prison environment or their refusal to cooperate with the mother in her wishes to see her children. The second was in the mother's discomfort with regular visiting at the prison. They spoke of the sterile atmosphere for family visits, the lack of equipment and toys that were appropriate for children, and many mentioned their own defensiveness vis-a-vis prison guards when their children were there.¹⁸

There have been several studies of the wives of male prisoners, all pointing to patterns of emotional stress and social difficulties. Sacks, for example, found in his study of 23 male felons at the District of Columbia Reformatory for Men, that only four of their families had made a satisfactory "economic and social adjustment."¹⁹ Sacks was particularly concerned about problems of communication that had arisen, between the inmate-parent and his family and between his wife and local social service agencies.

Pauline Morris, in her seminal study of 932 male inmates in England and Wales, also found most wives and children to be in crisis, with little assistance from social services agencies.²⁰ She rated 18% of these families as suffering serious economic and social deprivation. The main problem for wives, apart from financial ones, concerned managing the children. Their problems ranged from fighting at home, to problems in school to, in a few cases, attempts to replicate their fathers' crimes. Morris concluded that the survival of these families was dependent on a high level of maturity on the part of these mothers and their ability to manage under constant stress.

Donald Schneller, in his study of 93 Black male inmates and their families, confirmed such problems for wives. In his study, the most problematic area of stress for wives was their emotional and sexual frustration at being separated from their husbands.²¹

It is clear that removing a parent from home because of his/her imprisonment is quite likely to place the rest of the family at high risk emotionally and socially. It is most important to provide ways in the correctional system for inmate-parents to have meaningful contact with family members and to participate as much as possible in fulfilling their family responsibilities while incarcerated. It is only with such participation that the inmate parent can hope to resume his or her family role upon release. And it is only through such contact with the inmate parent that his or her children and other family members can continue to see that parent as a meaningful and viable part of their lives.

NOTES

1. L. E. Ohlin, The Stability and Validity of Parole Experience Tables. (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1954) cited in D. Glaser, The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System (note 2, below).
2. Daniel Glaser. The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System. New York: The Bobs-Merril Co., Inc., 1964.
3. Norman Holt and Donald Miller, Explorations in Inmate-Family Relationships. Sacramento: Research Division, State Department of Corrections, January 1972, Report Number 46.
4. Ibid., p. 61.
5. Ibid., p. v.
6. Ruth Glick and Virginia Neto, National Study of Women's Correctional Programs. Sacramento: State Department of Corrections, 1976.
7. Brenda G. McGowan and Karen L. Blumenthal, Why Punish the Children? Hackensack: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1978.
8. Sheldon Glueck and Eleanor Glueck, One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934.
9. Jerome G. Sacks, The Social and Economic Adjustments of Families of a Selected Group of Imprisoned Families. Unpublished master's thesis, The Catholic University of America, School of Social Work, 1938.
10. Serapio R. Zalba. Women Prisoners and Their Families. Sacramento: State Department of Social Welfare, 1964.
11. Ibid., p. 111.
12. Carolyn McCall, "The Issues Involved in Maternal Incarceration." Hackensack: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1979.
13. Travis A. Fritsch and John D. Burkhead, "Behavioral Reactions of Children to Parental Absence Due to Imprisonment." Lexington: Federal Correctional Institution, 1978.
14. Ibid., p. 9.
15. Ruth Glick and Virginia Neto, op. cit.
16. Dorothy Zeitz, "Child Welfare Services in a Women's Correctional Institution," Child Welfare, April 1963, pp. 186-186.

17. Ibid., p. 187.
18. Carolyn McCall, op. cit.
19. Jerome G. Sacks, op. cit.
20. Pauline Morris, Prisoners and Their Families. New York: Hart Publishing, 1965.
21. Donald P. Schneller, The Prisoner's Family: A Study of the Effects of Imprisonment on the Families of Prisoners. San Francisco: R and E Research Associates, 1976.